

Econ 583

Multiple Equation GMM Examples

Eric Zivot

November 21, 2011

Example: Simultaneous Equations Model (Klein's Model 1)

Reference: Berndt (1991, Chapter 10), *The Practice of Econometrics*, Addison Wesley.

Three equation macro model with five accounting identities (annual data):

1. consumption function
2. investment function
3. labor demand function

## Consumption function

$$CN_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1(W_{i1} + W_{i2}) + \alpha_2P_i + \alpha_3P_{i-1} + \varepsilon_{i1}$$

$$W_{i1} + W_{i2} = \text{private} + \text{public wage income}$$

$$P_i = \text{profit income}$$

## Net Investment function

$$I_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1P_i + \beta_2P_{i-1} + \beta_3K_{i-1} + \varepsilon_{i2}$$

$$K_i = \text{capital stock}$$

## Labor Demand (wage bill)

$$W_{i1} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1E_i + \gamma_2E_{i-1} + \gamma_3(i - 1931) + \varepsilon_{i3}$$

$$E_i = \text{private product}$$

## Accounting Identities

$$\text{Total product} : Y_i + TX_i = CN_i + I_i + G_i$$

$$\text{Income} : Y_i = P_i + W_i$$

$$\text{Capital} : K_i = I_i + K_{i-1}$$

$$\text{Wages} : W_i = W_{i1} + W_{i2}$$

$$\text{Private product} : E_i = Y_i + TX_i - W_{i2}$$

where

$TX_i$  = indirect business taxes

$G$  = net government demand.

Remarks:

1.  $W_{i1}$  and  $P_i$  are endogenous variables in consumption function
2.  $P_i$  is endogenous in investment function
3.  $E_i$  is endogenous in labor demand function
4.  $\varepsilon_{1i}, \varepsilon_{2i}$  and  $\varepsilon_{3i}$  may be correlated and heteroskedastic

Total endogenous variables

$$CN_i, I_i, W_{i1}, Y_i, P_i, K_i, W_i, E_i$$

Total predetermined variables (potential instruments)

$$1, G_i, W_{2i}, TX_i, i - 1931, K_{i-1}, P_{i-1}, E_{i-1}$$

## 3SLS Specification in Hayashi Notation

Consumption function

$$y_{i1} = CN_i$$
$$\mathbf{z}_{i1} = (1, W_i, P_i, P_{i-1})', \boldsymbol{\delta}_1 = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)', L_1 = 4$$

Investment function

$$y_{i2} = I_i$$
$$\mathbf{z}_{i2} = (1, W_i, P_i, P_{i-1})', \boldsymbol{\delta}_2 = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)', L_2 = 4$$

Labor demand function

$$y_{i3} = W_{1i}$$
$$\mathbf{z}_{i3} = (1, E_i, E_{i-1}, i - 1931)', \boldsymbol{\delta}_3 = (\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)', L_3 = 4$$

## Instruments

$\mathbf{x}_i = x_{i1} = \dots = x_{iM} =$  same instruments for each equation  
 $K \times 1$

$$= (1, G_i, W_{2i}, TX_i, i - 1931, K_{i-1}, P_{i-1}, E_{i-1})', \quad K = 8$$

$$\text{total parameters: } L = L_1 + L_2 + L_3 = 12,$$

$$\text{total moments: } MK = 3 \times 8 = 24$$

$$\Rightarrow MK - L = 12 \text{ overidentifying restrictions}$$

## Example: Exchange Rate Regressions

$$s_{i,m} = \alpha_m + \beta_m f_{i-1,m} + \varepsilon_{i,m}$$
$$i = 1, \dots, n \text{ (months); } m = 1, \dots, M \text{ (currencies)}$$

where

$s_{i,m}$  = log of spot exchange rate between home currency and currency  $m$  in month  $i$

$f_{i,m}$  = log of price of forward contract for delivery of currency  $m$  in month  $i + 1$

Note

$\text{cov}(\varepsilon_{i,m}, \varepsilon_{i,h}) \neq 0$  due to common shocks affecting all currencies

## Forward Rate Unbiased Hypothesis (Uncovered Interest Rate Parity)

Under rational expectations and risk neutrality

$$\begin{aligned} E[s_{i,m}|I_{i-1}] &= f_{i-1,m}, \quad m = 1, \dots, M \\ \Rightarrow \alpha_m &= 0, \quad \beta_m = 1 \text{ and } E[\varepsilon_{i,m}|I_{i-1}] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Notes:

1. Note:  $\{\varepsilon_{i,m}, I_{i-1}\}$  is a MDS as a result of rational expectations
2. We would like to test all restrictions together for a more powerful test

Problem:  $s_{i,m}$  and  $f_{i,m}$  are nonstationary (behave like random walks) and GMM must be applied to stationary and ergodic data.

Solution: Recast UIP using stationary data

$$\begin{aligned} E[s_{i,m}|I_{i-1}] &= f_{i-1,m} \Rightarrow \\ E[s_{i,m}|I_{i-1}] - s_{i-1,m} &= f_{i-1,m} - s_{i-1,m} \Rightarrow \\ E[\Delta s_{i,m}|I_{i-1}] &= f_{i-1,m} - s_{i-1,m} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, UIP is typically tested using the so-called differences regression:

$$\Delta s_{i,m} = \gamma_m + \delta_m (f_{i-1,m} - s_{i-1,m}) + \varepsilon_{i,m}$$

$$\Delta s_{i,m} = s_{i,m} - s_{i-1,m}$$

Now, UIP implies

$$\gamma_m = 0, \delta_m = 1 \text{ and } E[\varepsilon_{i,m} | I_{i-1}] = 0$$

$$m = 1, \dots, M$$

## SUR Model Specification in Hayashi Notation

$$y_{im} = \Delta s_{i,m}$$

$$\mathbf{z}_{im} = (\mathbf{1}, f_{i-1,m} - s_{i,m-1})'$$

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_m = (\gamma_m, \delta_m)', \quad L_m = 2$$

$\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{z}_i =$  union of  $z_{i1}, \dots, z_{iM} =$  instruments for each equation  
 $K \times 1$

$$= (\mathbf{1}, f_{i-1,1} - s_{i-1,1}, \dots, f_{i-1,M} - s_{i-1,M})', \quad K = M + 1$$

$$\text{total parameters: } L = 2M,$$

$$\text{total moments: } MK = M(M + 1)$$

$$\Rightarrow M(M + 1) - 2M = M(M - 1) \text{ overidentifying restrictions}$$

Sargan's Specification Test (SUR J-statistic)

$$J(\hat{\delta}_{SUR}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}), \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}) \\ = n \left( \underline{\mathbf{S}}_{xy} - \underline{\mathbf{S}}_{xz} \hat{\delta}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}) \right)' \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1} \left( \underline{\mathbf{S}}_{xy} - \underline{\mathbf{S}}_{xz} \hat{\delta}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}) \right) \sim \chi^2(M(M - 1))$$

Testing UIP using GMM Wald and LR statistics

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\delta}_m = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_m \\ \delta_m \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, m = 1, \dots, M$$
$$H_0 : \begin{matrix} \mathbf{R} & \boldsymbol{\delta} \\ (2M \times 2M) & (2M \times 1) \end{matrix} = \begin{matrix} \mathbf{r} \\ (2M \times 1) \end{matrix}$$

where

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I}_{2M}, \mathbf{r} = (0, 1, 0, 1, \dots, 0, 1)'$$

Wald Statistic

$$\begin{aligned} Wald_{\text{GMM}} &= n(\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} - \mathbf{r})' [\mathbf{R}' \widehat{\text{avar}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}) \mathbf{R}]^{-1} (\mathbf{R}\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} - \mathbf{r}) \sim \chi^2(2M) \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}} &= \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}(\mathbf{S}_{SUR}^{-1}) \\ \widehat{\text{avar}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}) &= [\underline{\mathbf{Z}}' (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{SUR}^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{I}_n) \underline{\mathbf{Z}}]^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

LR (Difference in J) Statistic

$$LR_{GMM} = J(\boldsymbol{\delta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}) - J(\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{SUR}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}), \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}) \sim \chi^2(2M)$$
$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_0 = (0, 1, 0, 1, \dots, 0, 1)'$$

Note: Since the null hypothesis is linear in  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ , the Wald and LR statistics are numerically equivalent.

Example: Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM)

$$R_{im} - r_i^f = \alpha_m + \beta_m(R_i^M - r_i^f) + \varepsilon_{im}$$

$m = 1, \dots, M$  assets;  $i = 1, \dots, n$  months

$\text{cov}(\varepsilon_{im}, \varepsilon_{ih}) \neq 0$ ,  $\varepsilon_{im}$  is conditionally heteroskedastic

where

$R_{im}$  = return on asset  $m$  in month  $i$

$R_i^M$  = return on market index in month  $i$

$r_i^f$  = return on risk free asset in month  $i$

CAPM pricing relationship

$$\begin{aligned} E[R_{im}] - r_i^f &= \beta_m (E[R_i^M] - r_i^f) \\ &\Rightarrow \alpha_i = 0 \text{ for } m = 1, \dots, M \end{aligned}$$

One test of the CAPM has null hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &: \alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_M = 0 \\ &M \text{ zero restrictions} \end{aligned}$$

## SUR Model Specification in Hayashi Notation

$$y_{im} = R_{im} - r_i^f$$

$$\mathbf{z}_{im} = (\mathbf{1}, R_i^M - r_i^f)' = \text{same for all equations!}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_m = (\alpha_m, \beta_m)', L_m = 2$$

$$\underset{K \times 1}{\mathbf{x}_i} = \mathbf{z}_i = \text{union of } z_{i1}, \dots, z_{iM} = \text{instruments for each equation}$$

$$= (\mathbf{1}, R_i^M - r_i^f)', K = 2$$

$$\text{total parameters: } L = 2M$$

$$\text{total moments: } MK = 2M$$

$$\Rightarrow 2M - 2M = 0 \text{ overidentifying restrictions}$$

Sargan's Specification Test (SUR J-statistic)

$$\begin{aligned} & J(\hat{\delta}_{SUR}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}), \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}) \\ &= n \left( \underline{\mathbf{S}}_{xy} - \underline{\mathbf{S}}_{xz} \hat{\delta}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}) \right)' \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1} \left( \underline{\mathbf{S}}_{xy} - \underline{\mathbf{S}}_{xz} \hat{\delta}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_{SUR}^{-1}) \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

because the system is exactly identified.

## Testing the CAPM

$$H_0 : \alpha_m = 0, m = 1, \dots, M$$

$$H_0 : \begin{matrix} \mathbf{R} & \boldsymbol{\delta} \\ (M \times 2M) & (2M \times 1) \end{matrix} = \begin{matrix} \mathbf{r} \\ (M \times 1) \end{matrix}$$

where

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$
$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$$