

EXAM 2 KEY

(i)

	u	NU
F	$\beta_0 + \beta_1 + \beta_4 + \beta_5$	$\beta_0 + \beta_4$
M	$\beta_0 + \beta_1$	$\beta_0$

(i)

(a) Note: Ref group = M, NU

∴  $\beta_4$  = differential for F  
 $\beta_5$  = " " F, u

(b)

	u	NU
F	$\delta_0 + \delta_5$	$\delta_0 + \delta_3$
M	$\delta_0$	$\delta_0 + \delta_4$

(2)

(c) Now, Ref group = M, u.

∴  $\delta_3$  = differential for F, NU  
 $\delta_4$  = " " M, NU  
 $\delta_5$  = " " F, u

(ii) Algebraically :

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_0 &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 \\ \delta_5 &= \beta_4 + \beta_5 \\ \delta_3 &= \beta_4 - \beta_1 \\ \delta_4 &= -\beta_1 \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, you could show  $\beta$ 's in terms of  $\delta$ 's.....

$$E(\ln(\text{wage})|x)$$

	Male	Female
Union	$\underbrace{\delta_0 + \delta_1 \text{exp} + \delta_2 \text{Edn}}_{\text{call it } aa}$	$aa + \delta_5$
Non-union	$aa + \delta_4$	$aa + \delta_3$

(c) (i) Mean log wage difference Male and Female (in the union group)

$$\text{is } aa - (aa + \delta_5) = -\delta_5$$

$$\dots \dots \dots \text{ in the Non-union group } aa + \delta_4 - (aa + \delta_3) = \delta_4 - \delta_3$$

$\Rightarrow$  No difference if  $\delta_5 = 0$  and  $\delta_4 - \delta_3 = 0$ .

F test.

• Run the model with the above restrictions, i.e.,

(restricted)  $\ln \text{wage} = \delta_0 + \delta_1 \text{Exp} + \delta_2 \text{Edn} + \delta_3 \text{Non-union} + u$

(unrestricted) given in (2). Compute  $F = \frac{(\text{SSR}_{\text{rest}} - \text{SSR}_{\text{un}}) / \# \text{rest}}{\text{SSR}_{\text{un}} / \text{d.f.}}$

$\# \text{rest} = 2$ ,  $\text{d.f.} = n - 6$ .

(ii) Mean diff in log wage between Union and Non Union

(for male) is  $aa - (aa + \delta_4) = -\delta_4$

$\dots \dots \dots$  for female  $= aa + \delta_3 - (aa + \delta_5) = \delta_3 - \delta_5$ .

No diff.  $\Rightarrow \delta_4 = 0$  and  $\delta_3 - \delta_5 = 0$

F test.

Restricted model  $\ln \text{wage} = \delta_0 + \delta_1 \text{Exp} + \delta_2 \text{Edn} + \delta_3 \text{Female} + u$

F test as before — Same d.f. for both the numerator and denominator

(d) If there is no difference between U and NU wages, the model will be the restricted model in (ii) above, i.e.,

$$\ln \text{wage} = \delta_0 + \delta_1 \text{EXP} + \delta_2 \text{Edu} + \delta_3 \text{Female} + u.$$

Note: if  $\delta_3 = \delta_5$  then you can combine the two terms  $\delta_3 \text{Female} + \text{Non-Union} + \delta_5 \text{Female} * \text{Union}$

$$= \delta_3 \text{Female} (\underbrace{\text{Non-Union} + \text{Union}}_{= 1})$$

$$= \delta_3 \text{Female}.$$

② (a) White test

1. Run (4). Get  $\hat{u}^2$

2. Run  $\hat{u}^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X + \alpha_2 X^2 + e$

3. F-test where  $H_0: \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$ .

(b) If ignored, then OLS estimates are not BLUE  
To correct it, w/o knowing the form of  $h(x)$ ,  
use FGLS.

1. Assume  $V(u|x) = \sigma^2 \underbrace{(e^{\delta_0 + \delta_1 X})}_{h(x)}$

$$\Rightarrow u^2 = \sigma^2 e^{\delta_0 + \delta_1 X} \cdot v$$

2. Run  $\log(\hat{u}^2) = \alpha_0 + \delta_1 X + e$  (Get  $\hat{u}$ 's from  $Y$  on  $X$ )

3. Get fitted values  $\hat{z}$ . Then  $\hat{h} = e^{\hat{z}}$ .

4. Divide everything in original equation by  $\sqrt{\hat{h}}$ . Run  $Y^*$  on  $X^*$

(c)	$Y$	$X$	$Y^* = \frac{Y}{X}$	$X^* = \frac{1}{X}$
	2	1	2	1
	6	4	1.5	.25
	15	3	1.875	.125
	20	10	2	-.1
	30	16	1.875	.0625

New run  $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X$  and  $Y^* = b_0 + b_1 X^*$   
 $\hat{\beta}_0 = -.47$   $\hat{b}_0 = 1.81$   
 $\hat{\beta}_1 = 1.73$   $\hat{b}_1 = .13$

$$(3) \quad (a) \quad \hat{y} = 5.83 + 5(.869) \frac{x}{5} \quad \underbrace{x^*}$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{y} = 5.83 + 4.345 x^* \\ (1.23) \quad (.585)$$

$$(b) \quad \underbrace{\hat{y}}_{y^*} = \frac{5.83}{10} + \frac{.869}{10} x$$

$$\Rightarrow y^* = .583 + .0869 x \\ (.123) \quad (.0117)$$

(c) Nothing. (How could we improve fit by changing scale?!!)

$$(d) \quad \hat{b} = \left( \frac{s_x}{s_y} \right) \hat{\beta} = \frac{5}{6} (.869) = .724 \\ \uparrow \\ \text{Beta coeff.}$$