

#Jenny



Finally I get this ebook, thanks for all these I can get now!

#Rio



Cool! I'am really happy

#Markus Jensen



I did not think that this would work, my best friend showed me this website, and it does! I get my most wanted eBook

#Hun Tsu



wtf this great ebook for free?!

#Che Salsa



My friends are so mad that they do not know how I have all the high quality ebook which they do not!

#Diego Butler



so many fake sites. this is the first one which worked! Many thanks

15

where we use the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z}) = 0$ always. Now ϵ_{it} is a function of the z_i and u_{it} and the expected value of each ϵ_{it} is zero conditional on all z_i and u_{it} in the sample. Therefore, conditional on these values,

$$E(\hat{\beta}_1) = \beta_1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})E(u_{it})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2} = \beta_1$$

because $E(u_{it}) = 0$ for all i .

(ii) From the fourth equation in part (i) we have (again conditional on the z_i and u_{it} in the sample),

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1) = \frac{\text{Var}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})u_{it}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2 \text{Var}(u_{it})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2} = \sigma^2 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2}$$

because of the homoskedasticity assumption $\text{Var}(u_{it}) = \sigma^2$ for all i . Given the definition of ϵ_{it} , this is what we wanted to show.

(iii) We know that $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1) = \sigma^2 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2}$. Now we can rearrange the inequality in the hint, drop \bar{z} from the sample covariance, and cancel σ^2 everywhere, to get $\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2 / \sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2 \geq 1/4 \sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})^2$. When we multiply through by σ^2 we get $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1) \geq \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_1)$, which is what we wanted to show.

11.15 (i) The degrees of freedom of the first regression is $n - k - 1 = 353 - 1 - 1 = 351$. The degrees of freedom of the second regression is $n - k - 1 = 353 - 2 - 1 = 350$. The standard error is smaller than the simple regression equation because one more explanatory variable is included in the second regression. The SSR falls from 126,396 to 108,475 when another explanatory variable is added, and the degrees of freedom also falls by one, which affects the standard error.

(ii) Yes, there is a positive moderate correlation between *years* and *ehowr*. $\text{VIF}_{\text{years}} = \frac{1}{1 - R^2_{\text{years}}} = \frac{1}{1 - 0.2307} = 2.48139$; from this value, we can say that there is little collinearity between *years* and *ehowr*.

[Download PDF version of :](#)
Wooldridge Solution