

- 1 (c)
 2 (d)
 3 (b)
 4 (a)
 5 (b)
 6 (d)
 7 (b)
 8 (d)
 9 (d)
 10 (b)
 11 (a)
 12 (b)
 13 (b)
 14 (b)
 15 (b)

二、非選擇題：

1a β_2 is not identified since there are no instruments available for equation (1) (i.e. there are no omitted exogenous regressors in (1) which are present in (2)).

γ_2 is identified because we can use Z as an instrument in equation (2), because it is independent of v (exogenous) and is correlated with Y (relevant) as long as $\beta_3 \neq 0$.

1b Solving the system yields

$$Y = \frac{1}{1 - \beta_2\gamma_2}(\beta_1 + \beta_2\gamma_1 + \beta_3Z + u + \beta_2v)$$

and thus

$$\text{Cov}(Y, v) = \frac{\beta_2}{1 - \beta_2\gamma_2} \sigma_v^2$$

since u, v , and Z are uncorrelated.

1c We have

$$\hat{\gamma}_2^{OLS} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})(X_i - \bar{X})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})X_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2}$$

and substituting (2) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\gamma}_2^{OLS} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 Y_i + v_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2} \\ &= \gamma_2 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})v_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2}\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\gamma}_2^{OLS} &\xrightarrow{p} \gamma_2 + \frac{\text{Cov}(Y, v)}{\text{Var}(Y)} \\ &= \gamma_2 + \frac{\beta_2 \sigma_v^2}{1 - \beta_2 \gamma_2 \sigma_Y^2} \neq \gamma_2\end{aligned}$$

$\hat{\gamma}_2^{OLS}$ is in general not consistent. However, if $\beta_2 = 0$, then Y is not influenced by X , there is no simultaneity and $\hat{\gamma}_2^{OLS}$ will be consistent.

1d γ_2 is identified because the exogenous variable Z is omitted in equation (2), so it can be used as instrument as it is independent of v . Since it is present in equation (1) it is correlated with Y (relevant) if $\beta_3 \neq 0$.

The IV estimator is

$$\hat{\gamma}_2^{IV} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \bar{Z})(X_i - \bar{X})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \bar{Z})(Y_i - \bar{Y})} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \bar{Z})X_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \bar{Z})(Y_i - \bar{Y})},$$

and substituting equation (2) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\gamma}_2^{IV} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \bar{Z})(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 Y_i + v_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \bar{Z})(Y_i - \bar{Y})} \\ &= \gamma_2 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \bar{Z})v_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \bar{Z})(Y_i - \bar{Y})} \\ &\xrightarrow{p} \gamma_2 + \frac{\text{Cov}(Z, v)}{\text{Cov}(Z, Y)} = \gamma_2\end{aligned}$$

because $\text{Cov}(Z, v) = 0$ and $\text{Cov}(Z, Y) \neq 0$ if $\beta_3 \neq 0$ since

$$\text{Cov}(Z, Y) = \frac{\beta_3}{1 - \beta_2 \gamma_2} \text{Var}(Z),$$

and thus the IV estimator $\hat{\gamma}_2^{IV}$ is consistent.

1e The 2SLS estimator is

$$\hat{\gamma}_2^{2SLS} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{Y}_i - \bar{\hat{Y}})(X_i - \bar{X})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{Y}_i - \bar{\hat{Y}})^2} \equiv \frac{s_{\hat{Y}X}}{s_{\hat{Y}}^2},$$

where $s_{\hat{Y}X}$ is the sample covariance between \hat{Y} and X in the second stage. Because $\hat{Y}_i = \hat{\delta}_1 + \hat{\delta}_2 Z_i$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\gamma}_2^{2SLS} &= \frac{s_{\hat{Y}X}}{s_{\hat{Y}}^2} \\ &= \frac{\hat{\delta}_2 s_{ZX}}{\hat{\delta}_2^2 s_Z^2} = \frac{s_{ZX}}{\hat{\delta}_2 s_Z^2} \\ &= \frac{s_{XZ}}{s_{YZ}} \quad \text{since } \hat{\delta}_2 = \frac{s_{YZ}}{s_Z^2} \\ &= \hat{\gamma}_2^{IV}\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\hat{\gamma}_2^{2SLS}$ is equivalent to $\hat{\gamma}_2^{IV}$, and therefore consistent.

1f If $\gamma_1 = 0$, then we have

$$\frac{\bar{X}}{\bar{Y}} = \frac{\gamma_2 \bar{Y} + \bar{v}}{\bar{Y}} = \gamma_2 + \frac{\bar{v}}{\bar{Y}} \xrightarrow{p} \gamma_2$$

because

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v} &\xrightarrow{p} E(v) = 0 \\ \bar{Y} &\xrightarrow{p} E(Y) = \frac{1}{1 - \beta_2 \gamma_2} E(\beta_1 + \gamma_1 \beta_2 + \beta_3 Z + u + \beta_2 v) \neq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\frac{\bar{X}}{\bar{Y}}$ is a consistent estimator of γ_2 .

2a

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y_t) &= E\left(\sum_{i=1}^t u_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^t E(u_i) = 0. \\ \text{Var}(Y_t) &= \text{Var}\left(\sum_{i=1}^t u_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^t \text{Var}(u_i) = t\sigma_u^2, \end{aligned}$$

since $\text{Cov}(u_i, u_j) = 0$ for $i \neq j$.

2b $Y_i = \sum_{i=1}^t u_i$ and $Y_{t-k} = \sum_{i=1}^{t-k} u_i$, so that $\text{Cov}(Y_t, Y_{t-k}) = (t-k)\sigma_u^2$.

2c From (a) the variance of Y_t depends on t , from (b) the covariance between Y_t and Y_{t-k} also depends on t , so Y_t is nonstationary.

3a For the differences estimator, the regression model is

$$Y_{i2} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i2} + (\alpha_i + u_{i2}),$$

the variance of the error term is

$$\text{Var}(\alpha_i + u_{i2}) = \text{Var}(\alpha_i) + \text{Var}(u_{i2}) + 2\text{Cov}(\alpha_i, u_{i2}) = \sigma_\alpha^2 + \sigma_u^2.$$

Therefore, the variance of the differences estimator is

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1^{\text{differences}}) = \frac{\text{Var}(\alpha_i + u_{i2})}{n\text{Var}(X_{i2})} = \frac{\sigma_\alpha^2 + \sigma_u^2}{n\text{Var}(X_{i2})}.$$

3b For the differences-in-differences model, the regression model is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Y_i = Y_{i2} - Y_{i1} &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 \Delta X_i + \Delta u_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (X_{i2} - X_{i1}) + (u_{i2} - u_{i1}) \\ &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i2} + (u_{i2} - u_{i1}), \text{ since } X_{i1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the variance of the error term is

$$\text{Var}(u_{i2} - u_{i1}) = \text{Var}(u_{i2}) + \text{Var}(u_{i1}) - 2\text{Cov}(u_{i2}, u_{i1}) = 2\sigma_u^2$$

Therefore, the variance of the differences-in-differences estimator is

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1^{\text{diffs-in-diffs}}) = \frac{\text{Var}(u_{i2} - u_{i1})}{n\text{Var}(X_{i2})} = \frac{2\sigma_u^2}{n\text{Var}(X_{i2})}$$

3c From the results in (a) and (b), when $\sigma_\alpha^2 > \sigma_u^2$, $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1^{\text{differences}}) > \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1^{\text{diffs-in-diffs}})$, then differences-in-differences estimator is more efficient than the differences estimator. Thus, if there is considerable large variance in the individual-specific effects, α_i , it is better to use the differences-in-differences estimator.

4a From model (1) in the STATA log file, the call-back rate for whites is the estimated intercept, 0.097, and the call-back for blacks is $0.097 - 0.032 = 0.065$. The difference is -0.032, which is statistically significant at the 1% level (t -statistic = -4.11). This number implies that 9.7% of resumes with white-sounding names generated a call back. Only 6.5% of resumes with black-sounding names generated a call back. Since the average call-back rate as shown in the summary statistics is 8.05%, the difference of 3.2% is large in a real-world sense.

4b From model (2) in the STATA log file, the call-back rate for male blacks is $0.097 - 0.038 = 0.059$, and for female blacks is $0.097 - 0.038 + 0.008 = 0.067$. The difference is 0.008, which is the coefficient of the interactive term between *black* and *female*, and is not significant at the 5% level (t -statistic = 0.69).

4c From model (3), the call-back rate for low-quality resumes is 0.073 and the call-back rate for high-quality resumes is $0.073 + 0.014 = 0.087$. The difference is 0.014, which is not significant at the 5% level, but is at the 10% level (t -statistic = 1.80).

4d From model (4), the (high-quality)/(low-quality) difference for whites is 0.023 and for blacks is $0.023 - 0.018 = 0.005$; the black-white difference is 0.018 which is not statistically significant at the 5% level (t -statistic = -1.14).