**1.(a)** We have  $\mathbf{x}'_i \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  as prediction of  $y_i = \mathbf{x}'_i \boldsymbol{\beta} + u_i$ . under classical assumptions including normal error,

$$\begin{split} y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} &= \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} \boldsymbol{\beta} + u_i - \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) + u_i \sim \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} \sigma^2 (\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i^* + \sigma^2] \\ \Rightarrow \qquad y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sim \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \{1 + \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} (\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i^*\}] \\ \Rightarrow \qquad \frac{y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 \{1 + \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} (\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i^*\}}} \sim \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{0}, 1] \\ \Rightarrow \qquad \frac{y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\sqrt{s^2 \{1 + \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} (\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i^*\}}} \sim T_{N-k} \\ \Rightarrow \qquad 95\% \text{ CI is } \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \pm t_{N-k;.025} \times \sqrt{s^2 \{1 + \mathbf{x}_i^{*\prime} (\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i^*\}}. \end{split}$$

(b) We have

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 = (\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1'[\mathbf{X}_1'\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \mathbf{X}_2\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 + \mathbf{u}] = \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + (\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_2\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 + (\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{u}.$$
  

$$\mathbf{E}[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1] = \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + (\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_2\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 \text{ as } \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{u}] = \mathbf{0}.$$

Conclude that OLS is biased unless  $\mathbf{X}_1'\mathbf{X}_2 = \mathbf{0}$ .

(c) We have

$$\mathbf{y} = \left[ egin{array}{cc} \mathbf{l} & \mathbf{X}_2^* \end{array} 
ight] \left[ egin{array}{cc} lpha_1 \ eta_2 \end{array} 
ight] + \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{Z} oldsymbol{\gamma} + \mathbf{u}.$$

The usual  $(\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z})^{-1}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{y}$  becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\alpha}_1 \\ \widehat{\beta}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{l'}\mathbf{l} & \mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{l} \\ \mathbf{l'}\mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'} & \mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{X}_{2}^{*} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{l'y} \\ \mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} N & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{X}_{2}^{*} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{l'y} \\ \mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{N} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & (\mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{X}_{2}^{*})^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{l'y} \\ \mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{N}\mathbf{l'y} \\ (\mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{X}_{2}^{*})^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{y} \\ (\mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{X}_{2}^{*})^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{2'}^{*'}\mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}$$

**2.(a)** We have  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sim \mathcal{N}[\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}]$ , so  $\mathbf{R}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - r \sim \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{r}, \sigma^2\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{R}']$ . Under  $H_0$  this simplifies as  $\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$ , so  $\mathbf{R}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - r \sim \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{R}']$ . Forming the quadratic gives the chi-square test statistic (assuming rank[ $\mathbf{R}$ ] = q)

$$W = (\mathbf{R}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{r})'[\sigma^2 \mathbf{R} (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{R}']^{-1} (\mathbf{R}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{r}) \sim \chi^2(q)$$

(b) Here  $\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 \end{bmatrix}$  and r = 0, so  $\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - r = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 5\\2 \end{bmatrix} = 1$ , and  $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{R}' = \mathbf{R} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1\\1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1}\mathbf{R}' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1\\-1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1\\-2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & -3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1\\-2 \end{bmatrix} = 10.$ So  $W = (1)'[0.1 \times 10]^{-1}(1) = 1.$ The critical value is  $\chi_1^2(0.05) = z_{,025}^2 = 1.96^2 = 3.84.$ Since W < 3.84 we do not reject  $H_0 : \beta_1 = 2\beta_2$ . [Since q = 1 here this can also be done as a z-test].

(c) Asymptotically we can replace  $\sigma^2$  by a consistent estimate  $s^2$  such as  $s^2 = \hat{\mathbf{u}}'\hat{\mathbf{u}}/(N-k)$ . Then  $W^* = (\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{r})'[s^2\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{R}']^{-1}(\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{r}) \sim \chi^2(q)$ . Alternatively can use  $F = W^*/q = (\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{r})'[s^2\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{R}']^{-1}(\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{r})/q \sim F(q, N-k)$ 

## **3.** Various topics

(a) An adequate answer is that a sequence of random variables  $b_N \xrightarrow{p} b$  if for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ 

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \Pr[|b_N - b| < \varepsilon] = 1.$$

(b) A multivariate central limit places conditions on the vector components  $\mathbf{x}_i$  of the vector average  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_N$  such that

$$\left( \operatorname{V}[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_N] \right)^{-1/2} \left( \bar{\mathbf{X}}_N - \operatorname{E}[\bar{\mathbf{X}}_N] \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}].$$

(c) The IV estimator (in the just-identified case) is  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{IV} = (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{y}$  where  $\mathbf{Z}$  is an  $N \times k$  matrix of instruments with the property that  $\operatorname{plim} N^{-1}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ .

It has the advantage of being consistent even if OLS is inconsistent due plim  $N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$ .

(d) For  $\mathbf{u} \sim [\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}], \, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathrm{GLS}} = (\mathbf{X}' \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}' \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{y}.$ 

The key property compared to OLS is that GLS is efficient (BLUE in the linear regression model]. It is also unbiased and consistent whenever GLS is unbiased.

(e) The variance of the OLS estimator is estimated by

$$\begin{split} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] &= (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1} \text{ where } \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \text{ Diag}[\widehat{u}_i^2] \\ &= (\sum_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i')^{-1} \sum_i \widehat{u}_i^2 \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i' \left(\sum_i \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i'\right)^{-1}. \end{split}$$

(f) We have  $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{y}'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{y} - 2\mathbf{y}'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\beta}'\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ , so

$$\Rightarrow \ \partial(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})/\partial\boldsymbol{\beta} = -2\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{y} + 2\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0} \Rightarrow \ \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{y} \Rightarrow \ \boldsymbol{\beta} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{y} \text{ [does not simplify further as } m > k]$$

4.(a) We have  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{u}) = \boldsymbol{\beta} + (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}.$ So  $\mathrm{E}[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] = \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathrm{E}[(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}] = \boldsymbol{\beta} + (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathrm{E}[\mathbf{u}] = \boldsymbol{\beta}, \text{ as } \mathrm{E}[\mathbf{u}] = \mathbf{0}.$ And  $\mathrm{V}[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] = \mathrm{E}[(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})'] = \mathrm{E}[((\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}) \times (((\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u})']$  $= (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathrm{E}[\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}']\mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X})^{-1} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\Sigma\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X})^{-1}.$ 

(b) We have

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{\beta} + \left(N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}$$
$$\xrightarrow{p} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \left(\operatorname{plim} N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}\operatorname{plim} N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}$$
$$\stackrel{p}{\longrightarrow} \boldsymbol{\beta} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \left(\operatorname{plim} N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}\operatorname{plim} N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}$$

 $\xrightarrow{P} \beta$  since first plim is finite and second is zero.

(c) We have

$$\begin{split} \sqrt{N}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \left(N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u} \\ &\stackrel{d}{\to} \left(\operatorname{plim} N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\right)^{-1} \times \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{0}, \ \mathbf{B}] \\ &\stackrel{p}{\to} \mathcal{N}\left[\mathbf{0}, \left(\operatorname{plim} N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\right)^{-1} \ \mathbf{B} \left(\operatorname{plim} N^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}\right] \end{split}$$

(d) Here

$$\mathbf{B} = \lim \mathbf{V} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u} \right] = \lim \mathbf{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X} \right] = \lim N^{-1} \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}.$$
  
 
$$\Rightarrow \quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \stackrel{a}{\sim} \mathcal{N}[\boldsymbol{\beta}, (\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X})^{-1}].$$

**5.(a)** Here  $\hat{y} = 350.8251 + 0.0017691 \times 179420.7 = 668.2382 = \overline{value}$ . Not surprised. Since OLS residuals sum to zero,  $\overline{\hat{y}} = \overline{y} + \overline{\hat{u}} = \overline{y} + \overline{\hat{u}} = \overline{y}$ .

(b) The claim is the alternative, so we reject if  $\beta_{\text{hhsize}} > 0$  and here  $\hat{\beta}_{\text{hhsize}} = 69.27 > 0$ . The p-value for a one-sided test is half that for two-sided test: 0.054/2 = 0.027. Since p = 0.027 < 0.05 we reject  $H_0$ :  $\beta_{\text{hhsize}} \leq 0$  at level 0.05 and confirm the claim.

(c) This is not clear. The  $R^2$  increases from 0.8983 to 0.9194, though we should adjust for degrees of freedom and this is not given here [Stata does not report  $\overline{R}^2$  when the robust option is used, though we could calculate it given the reported root MSE and standard deviation of rent.] Vacrate is clearly statistically insignificant at 5%, hhsize is borderline, and percrent is clearly statistically significant at 5%.

(d)(i) The Stata command is test vacrate hhsize percrent

[Note that if errors are heteroskedastic then we cannot use the usual F-test in terms of sums of squared residuals. For this reason Stata did not give the ANOVA table when the robust option was used in regress. Instead we use  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \stackrel{a}{\sim} \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}]$  gives  $W = (\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{r})'\hat{\mathbf{V}}^{-1}(\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{r}) \stackrel{a}{\sim} \chi^2(q)$  under  $H_0: \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$ , where  $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$  is the heteroskedastic robust estimate. The Stata command test gives an F-version of this F = W/q].

(ii) The Stata command is regress rent value, robust

(e) The third equation directly gives the elasticity.  $t = (\hat{\beta} - 1)/s_{\hat{\beta}} = (0.5149396 - 1)/0.0208438 = -23.27. |t| > t_{56;.025} \simeq 2.$ Very strong rejection of  $H_0: \beta = 1$  against  $H_a: \beta \neq 1.$ 

(f)(i) Plot rent against value along with an OLS regression line and see of variability around the line increases as value increases.

(ii) See whether there is a big difference between heteroskedastic-robust standard errors and standard errors that assume homoskedastic errors.

(g) Run the OLS regression

$$\frac{\mathrm{rent}}{\mathrm{value}} = \beta_1 \frac{1}{\mathrm{value}} + \beta_2 \frac{\mathrm{value}}{\mathrm{value}} + u^*$$

since the error  $u^* = u/\text{value} \sim [0, \sigma^2]$  if  $u \sim [0, \sigma^2 \text{value}^2]$ .

	Exam / 50		Exam / 50		
75th percentile	43 (86%)			$\mathbf{B}+$	28 and above
Median	38.75 (77.5%)	А	43 and above	В	20.5 and above
25th percentile	34.5 (59%)	A-	35.5 and above		