

2006 Spring Part 2

Note that all x_i 's are $1 \times k$ vector in Part 2.

1. GLS model

See Hao's solution. (week 7 note in TA link)

(a)

Since observations are independent, we can do WLS.

$$\text{Run OLS of } \frac{y_i}{\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}w_i\gamma\right)} \text{ on } \frac{x_i}{\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}w_i\gamma\right)}$$

Thus

$$\hat{\beta}_{GLS} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i x_i}{\exp(w_i\gamma)} \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i y_i}{\exp(w_i\gamma)}$$

(b)

Individual likelihood function is

$$f(y_i|x_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \exp(w_i\gamma)}} \exp\left[-\frac{(y_i - x_i\beta)^2}{2 \exp(w_i\gamma)}\right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}w_i\gamma - \frac{(y_i - x_i\beta)^2}{2 \exp(w_i\gamma)}\right]$$

Log likelihood function is

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^n \log f(y_i|x_i) = -\frac{n}{2} \log 2\pi - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i\gamma - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(y_i - x_i\beta)^2}{\exp(w_i\gamma)}$$

FOC is

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \beta} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i (y_i - x_i\beta)}{\exp(w_i\gamma)} = 0 \tag{1}$$

Therefore, ML estimator is

$$\hat{\beta}_{ML} = \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i x_i}{\exp(w_i\gamma)} \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i y_i}{\exp(w_i\gamma)} \tag{2}$$

which is the same with GLS estimator obtained in (a)

(c)

Note that (i) linear model and (ii) independent observations are given in the question.

$$\text{(iii) } E \left[\left\| \frac{x_i}{\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}w_i\gamma\right)} \right\|^{2+\delta} \right] < \Delta < \infty \quad \forall i$$

$$\text{(iv) } E \left[\left\| \frac{x'_i \varepsilon_i}{\exp(w_i\gamma)} \right\|^{1+\delta} \right] < \Delta < \infty \quad \forall i$$

$$\text{(v) } E(x'_i \varepsilon_i) = 0 \quad \forall i \quad \text{which implies } E \left[\frac{x'_i \varepsilon_i}{\exp(w_i\gamma)} \right] = 0 \quad \forall i$$

$$\text{(vi) } E \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i x_i}{\exp(w_i\gamma)} \right] : \text{ uniformly p.d. } \quad \text{which implies identification}$$

Note here that transformed variables are not identical. Refer to lecture note 7, p.26 about the definition of uniform positive definiteness.

From (2),

$$\widehat{\beta}_{ML} - \beta = \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i x_i}{\exp(w_i \gamma)} \right]^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i \varepsilon_i}{\exp(w_i \gamma)} \quad (3)$$

(iii) and (vi) imply

$$\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i x_i}{\exp(w_i \gamma)} \right]^{-1} \xrightarrow{p} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i x_i}{\exp(w_i \gamma)} \right] \right)^{-1}$$

and (iv) and (v) imply

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i \varepsilon_i}{\exp(w_i \gamma)} \xrightarrow{p} 0$$

For asymptotic normality, we need the following assumptions in addition to (i),(ii),(iii),(v), and (vi)

$$(vii) \quad E \left[\left\| \frac{x'_i \varepsilon_i}{\exp(w_i \gamma)} \right\|^{2+\delta} \right] < \Delta < \infty \quad \forall i \quad \text{which implies } \text{var} \left[\frac{x'_i \varepsilon_i}{\exp(w_i \gamma)} \right] < \infty \quad \forall i$$

$$(viii) \quad \bar{\sigma}_n^2 \equiv E \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i^2 x'_i x_i}{\exp(2w_i \gamma)} \right] : \text{uniformly p.d.}$$

From (3),

$$\sqrt{n} (\widehat{\beta}_{ML} - \beta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, B_0^{-1} \Omega_0 B_0^{-1})$$

where

$$B_0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x'_i x_i}{\exp(w_i \gamma)} \right], \quad \Omega_0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\sigma}_n^2$$

(d)

We first estimate γ . For this, run OLS of y_i on x_i and get $\widehat{\varepsilon}_{i,OLS} = y_i - x_i \widehat{\beta}_{OLS}$. Then do NLS of $\widehat{\varepsilon}_{i,OLS}^2$ on $\exp(w_i \gamma)$ with the regression model $\widehat{\varepsilon}_{i,OLS}^2 = \exp(w_i \gamma) + \eta_i$.

$$\min \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n [\widehat{\varepsilon}_{i,OLS}^2 - \exp(w_i \gamma)]^2$$

FOC is

$$-\sum_{i=1}^n [\widehat{\varepsilon}_{i,OLS}^2 - \exp(w_i \gamma)] \exp(w_i \gamma) w'_i = 0 \quad (4)$$

Obtain $\widehat{\gamma}_{NLS}$ and with this, do feasible GLS in the same way in (a).

(e)

Differentiating log likelihood function with respect to γ

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \gamma} &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n w'_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i \beta)^2 \exp(-w_i \gamma) w'_i = 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^n [(y_i - x_i \beta)^2 - \exp(w_i \gamma)] \exp(-w_i \gamma) w'_i &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$\widehat{\beta}_{ML}$ and $\widehat{\gamma}_{ML}$ are the solution to (1) and (5). Note that (5) has a similar form with (4) since $y_i - x_i \beta$ can be regarded as a residual. Of course, two equations are not the same, so $\widehat{\beta}_{ML}$ and $\widehat{\gamma}_{ML}$ will be different from $\widehat{\beta}_{NLS}$ and $\widehat{\gamma}_{NLS}$, but they would have asymptotically the same distribution. Note again that since FOC with respect to β is the same for both cases, $\widehat{\beta}_{ML}$ is obtained by (2) with $\gamma = \widehat{\gamma}_{ML}$.