## Econ 220B Final Exam Winter 2016

DIRECTIONS: No books or notes of any kind are allowed. 250 points are possible on this exam.

If you want your final exam returned to your mailbox, sign the form on the last page and turn that page in. If you do not want your final exam returned to your mailbox, do not sign and turn in the last page.

1.) (30 points possible) Consider the following regression model

$$y_t = x_t \beta + u_t \qquad t = 1, \dots, T$$

where  $x_t$  is a scalar. Describe how you would implement White's  $R^2$  test of the null hypothesis of homoskedastic residuals.

2.) (20 points possible) Comment on the following statement:

Economists often overlook the fact that a constant term  $x_t = 1$  makes a perfectly good instrument. As long as the residual  $u_t$  has mean zero and the explanatory variable  $z_t$  does not have mean zero, the instrument  $x_t = 1$  is both valid and relevant.

3.) (110 points possible) This question concerns the following regression model

$$y_t = z_t \beta + u_t$$
  $t = 1, 2, ..., T.$ 

Here  $z_t$  is a scalar and the  $(2 \times 1)$  vector  $(z_t, u_t)'$  is stationary and ergodic with second moment matrix given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} E(z_t^2) & E(z_t u_t) \\ E(u_t z_t) & E(u_t^2) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{zz} & \sigma_{zu} \\ \sigma_{uz} & \sigma_{uu} \end{bmatrix}$$

with  $\sigma_{zu} > 0$ .

a.) (30 points) Write down the formula for the OLS estimate of  $\beta$  and calculate its plim. Describe in words the problem with using this as an estimate of  $\beta$ .

b.) (30 points) Suppose you have a scalar instrument  $x_t$ . Write down the definitions of what it means for  $x_t$  to be valid and relevant, and give the 2SLS estimate of  $\beta$  using  $x_t$  as an instrument.

c.) (15 points) Describe how you would implement the 2SLS *t*-test of the null hypothesis that  $\beta = 0$ .

d.) (20 points) Describe how you would implement the Anderson-Rubin test of the null hypothesis that  $\beta = 0$ . What is the main advantage of the Anderson-Rubin test over the 2SLS test?

e.) (15 points) Can you suggest a way of implementing the Anderson-Rubin test in (d) that would also be robust to conditional heteroskedasticity, that is, that would have the correct asymptotic size even if  $E(u_t^2|x_t) \neq E(u_t^2)$ ? 4.) (90 points total) If  $E[\mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{w}_t)] = \mathbf{0}$ , the GMM estimate of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is defined as the value that minimizes

$$T[\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}_T)]' \mathbf{\hat{S}}^{-1}[\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}_T)]$$

where

$$\mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{Y}_T) = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}_t)$$

and  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$  is a consistent estimate of

$$\mathbf{S} = \lim_{T \to \infty} T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{v=-\infty}^{\infty} E\left\{ \left[ \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0}, \mathbf{w}_{t}) \right] \left[ \mathbf{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0}, \mathbf{w}_{t-v}) \right]' \right\}.$$

The usual asymptotic distribution of the GMM estimator is

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_T - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \xrightarrow{L} N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V})$$

where  $\mathbf{V}$  can be estimated consistently from

$$\begin{split} \hat{\mathbf{V}} &= (\hat{\mathbf{D}}\hat{\mathbf{S}}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{D}}')^{-1} \\ \hat{\mathbf{D}}' &= \left. \frac{\partial \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta};\mathbf{Y}_T)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}'} \right|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}. \end{split}$$

In this question you are asked to use the GMM framework to explore the properties of maximum likelihood estimation for lognormally distributed random variables. This question asks you to consider a sample of size T of positive random variables (denoted  $x_1, x_2, ..., x_T$ ) that are independently and identically distributed from a standard lognormal distribution. A random variable  $x_t$  is said to have a standard lognormal distribution if its density is given by

$$f(x_t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{x_t \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\log x_t - \mu)^2}{2}\right] & \text{if } x_t > 0\\ 0 & \text{if } x_t \le 0. \end{cases}$$
(R1)

Here are the mean, variance, and some other facts about the standard lognormal distribution that you may find useful in answering the questions below:

$$E(x_t) = \exp(\mu + 0.5) \quad (R2)$$
$$E[x_t - E(x_t)]^2 = (e - 1) \exp(2\mu + 1) \quad (R3)$$
$$\log x_t \sim N(\mu, 1)$$
$$e = 2.781828...$$

a.) If you were to use the GMM principle to form an estimator of  $\mu$ , one option would be to use the mean (R2) above as the basis for estimation, that is, to set  $h(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{w}_t) = \exp(\mu + 0.5) - x_t$ .

i.) (15 points) For this specification of h(.), use the GMM formulas on the previous page to find the expression for  $\hat{\mu}_{GMM}$ .

ii.) (15 points) Calculate the values of S and D that are implied by this specification of h(.).

iii.) (10 points) Use the results from (a.ii) to find the asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\mu}_{GMM}$ .

b.) An alternative way to apply GMM is to use the score of the likelihood function.

i.) (10 points) Use (R1) to calculate the score of the *t*th observation and show that it indeed has expectation zero.

ii.) (10 points) Find the values of S and D that are implied by using the score statistic as h(.).

iii.) (10 points) Use the results from (b.ii) to find the asymptotic distribution of  $\hat{\mu}_{MLE}$ .

c.) (20 points) Use results (a.iii) and (b.iii) to show that  $\hat{\mu}_{MLE}$  has a smaller asymptotic variance than  $\hat{\mu}_{GMM}$ . Is that a result you'd expect to find in general or is there something very special about this example that produced it?

## STUDENT CONSENT FOR RELEASE OF STUDENT INFORMATION (Buckley Waiver)

I hereby authorize the UCSD Economics Department to return my graded final examination/research paper by placing it in a location accessible to all students in the course. I understand that the return of my examination/research paper as described above may result in disclosure of personally identifiable information, that is not public information as defined in UCSD PPM 160-2, and I hereby consent to the disclosure of such information.

| Quarter     | Course | Date |
|-------------|--------|------|
|             |        |      |
| Instructor  |        |      |
| Student ID# |        |      |
| Print Name  |        |      |
| Signature   |        |      |