Suggested Answers for Problem Set 2

Oct. 18, 2002

1a
$$\hat{\beta}_{1} = \bar{Y} - \hat{\beta}_{2}\bar{X},$$

 $\hat{\alpha}_{1} = \bar{Y} - \hat{\alpha}_{2}\bar{x} = \bar{Y},$ where $x_{i} = X_{i} - \bar{X}, \bar{x} = \frac{1}{n}\sum X_{i} - \bar{X} = 0$
 $\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{1}) = \frac{\sum X_{i}^{2}}{n\sum x_{i}^{2}}\sigma^{2},$
 $\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\alpha}_{1}) = \frac{\sum X_{i}^{2}}{n\sum (x_{i} - \bar{x})^{2}}\sigma^{2} = \frac{\sigma^{2}}{n}.$

Therefore, neither the estimates nor the variances for $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $\hat{\alpha}_1$ are equal.

1b
$$\hat{\beta}_2 = \frac{\sum x_i y_i}{\sum x_i^2},$$

 $\hat{\alpha}_2 = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x}) y_i}{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2} = \frac{\sum x_i y_i}{\sum x_i^2},$
 $\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum x_i^2},$
 $\operatorname{Var}(\hat{\alpha}_2) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sum x_i^2}.$

Therefore, the estimates and variance for $\hat{\beta}_2$ and $\hat{\alpha}_2$ are identical.

2 If we multiply each X by 2, the residuals and fitted values for Y will not change. Initially, let $Y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_i = u_i$, then $\hat{\beta}_2 = \frac{\sum (X_i - \bar{X})(Y_i - \bar{Y})}{\sum (X_i - \bar{X})^2}$, $\hat{\beta}_1 = \bar{Y} - \hat{\beta}_2 \bar{X}$, $\hat{Y}_i = \hat{\beta}_1 + \hat{\beta}_2 X_i.$ Now let $Z_i = 2X_i$ and let $Y_i = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 Z_i + u_i$, then

$$\hat{\alpha}_{2} = \frac{\sum (Z_{i} - \bar{Z})(Y_{i} - \bar{Y})}{\sum (X_{i} - \bar{X})^{2}} = \frac{\sum (2X_{i} - 2\bar{X})(Y_{i} - \bar{Y})}{\sum (2X_{i} - 2\bar{X})^{2}} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\beta}_{2}$$
$$\hat{\alpha}_{1} = \bar{Y} - \hat{\alpha}_{2}\bar{Z} = \bar{Y} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\beta}_{2}2\bar{X} = \hat{\beta}_{1}$$
$$\hat{Y} = \hat{\alpha}_{1} + \hat{\alpha}_{2}Z_{i} = \hat{\beta}_{1} + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\beta}_{2}2X_{i} = \hat{\beta}_{1} + \hat{\beta}_{2}X_{i}$$

The analysis is analogous if a constant is added to X_i .

3a All of these estimators are unbiased.

3b $\operatorname{Var}[\hat{\mu}_1] = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}$, $\operatorname{Var}[\hat{\mu}_2] = \sigma^2$, $\operatorname{Var}[\hat{\mu}_3] = \frac{n\sigma^2}{4(n-1)}$. Therefore, $\hat{\mu}_1$ is the most efficient.

3c Only Var[$\hat{\mu}_1$] converges to 0, it converges in mean square which implies plim $\hat{\mu}_1 =$ μ . Therefore, $\hat{\mu}_1$ is consistent.

4 The log-likelihood function is

$$\ln L = -n\ln\theta - \frac{\sum X_i}{\theta}$$

The first order condition is

$$\frac{\partial \ln L}{\partial \theta} = -\frac{n}{\theta} + \frac{\sum X_i}{\theta^2} = 0$$

Therefore, the ML estimator of $\hat{\theta} = \frac{\sum X_i}{n} = \bar{X}$.

5a True. Unbiasedness of the estimators does not require a normally distributed population error term. It does require that the error term has an expected value of zero.

5b True. Since $\hat{\beta}_1 = \bar{Y} - \hat{\beta}_2 \bar{X}$, if the slope coefficient is zero, then the intercept is estimated by the sample mean of Y, \bar{Y} .

6 If $r^2 = 1$, all the points lie on a straight line. So, whether we minimize sum of squares of vertical distances (regression of Y on X) or horizontal distances (regression of X on Y) does not matter. Both are zero in this case.

On the other hand, if the simple regression line of Y against X coincides with the simple regression line of X againist Y, then $\hat{\beta}_2^{YX} = \frac{1}{\hat{\beta}_2^{XY}}$ where $\hat{\beta}_2^{YX}$ is the slope coefficient of regressing Y on X and $\hat{\beta}_2^{XY}$ is the slope coefficient of regressing X on Y. Therefore,

$$\hat{\beta}_{2}^{YX}\hat{\beta}_{2}^{XY} = \frac{\sum x_{i}y_{i}}{\sum x_{i}^{2}}\frac{\sum x_{i}y_{i}}{\sum y_{i}^{2}} = r^{2} = 1.$$

7a For (Y_i, X_i) , we have $u_i \sim IN(0, 1)$. For (\bar{Y}_i, \bar{X}_i) , the errors are IN(0, 2) since the errors are $u_1 + u_2$, $u_3 + u_4$, \cdots . For (Y_i^*, X_i^*) , the errors are correlated but normally distributed with variance $\frac{1}{2}$. Note that the errors are $\frac{u_1+u_2}{2}$, $\frac{u_2+u_3}{2}$, $\frac{u_3+u_4}{2}$ etc. The consecutive errors are correlated. There covariance is $\frac{1}{4}$.

7b Yes, since the classical assumptions are statisfied with annual data.