

**NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LESOTHO**  
**MSc EXAMINATIONS**  
**EC6507 – Advanced Econometrics Theory and Practice**

**January 2024**

**100 Marks**

**3 Hours**

---

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

- 1) Answer Question one and any other three questions
- 2) Explain your answers and show workings (*useful information is provided in the appendix*).
- 3) Students are allowed to use calculators and statistical tables. However, no additional material should be brought into and used in the examination.

## Question 1

- a. The Russian Ukraine war led to several external shocks in many economies across the globe. This is not unrelated to the fact that Russia and Ukraine export nearly a third of the world's wheat and barley and more than 70 percent of its sunflower oil. The war disrupted global supply chains across many countries in Africa that are largely self in-sufficient in food such as Lesotho. In relation to this,
- i. State a valid research question and objective that applies to the Lesotho economy [2]
  - ii. Specify the economic or conceptual model [2]
  - iii. Specify the econometric model [2]
  - iv. Specify the null and alternative hypothesis [2]
  - v. Specify the nature and source of data required for such a study [2]
  - vi. Explain whether panel data and spatial data can be employed for this study [2]
  - vii. What kind of model will you be estimating? [2]
  - viii. How will you justify the variables that you will be selecting? [2]
  - ix. What are the dangers with omitting a variable on one hand and over-specifying a model on the other hand. In your view, which is worse? [4]
- b. Likotsi, Libuseng and Hlalefang investigated the expenditure pattern for Lesotho consumers using a sample of 6334 households in the 2021 Lesotho Consumer Expenditure Survey. They performed the following three regressions. The first regression shows the result of regressing ***LGFDHO***, the logarithm of annual household expenditure on food eaten at home, on ***LGEXP***, the logarithm of total annual household expenditure, and ***LGSIZE***, the logarithm of the number of persons in the household. The second regression shows results of regressing ***LGFDHOPC***, the logarithm of food expenditure per capita (***FDHO/SIZE***) on ***LGEXPPC***, the logarithm of total expenditure per capita (***EXP/SIZE***). The third regression shows results of ***LGFDHOPC*** regressed on ***LGEXPPC*** and ***LGSIZE***. The STATA output results of the three regressions they performed are shown in Appendix I below.
- i. Explain why the second model is a restricted version of the first, stating the restriction. [4]

- ii. Perform an *F test* of the restriction. Use 1 percent level of confidence. [5]
- iii. Perform a *t test* of the restriction. Use 1 percent level of confidence. [4]
- iv. Summarize your conclusions from the analysis of the regression results. [7]

**Question 2**

- a. Assume that you want to estimate the relationship between the age of the CEO and stock market return using the regression model based on a sample containing cross sectional data for 100 companies in 2023. In the sample you find that your data for age of the CEOs all happen to be in the range 45-47. Will this be a concern? Explain why or why not? [4]
- b. Increasing the sample size is said to alleviate multicollinearity problem by reducing the degree of micro-numerosity.
  - i. But what about increasing samples by identical observations? [3]
  - ii. What happens to the variance of the coefficients? [3]
  - iii. Comment on the claim that more data is no remedy for the multi-collinearity problem if the data are simply "more of the same". [3]
  - iv. What is the biggest danger with multicollinearity? [3]
- c. The variance of the estimator is derived as

$$Var[\hat{\beta}|X] = E [(\hat{\beta} - \beta)(\hat{\beta} - \beta)^T] = \sigma^2(X^T X)^{-1}$$

Where, the assumptions of homoscedasticity and zero autocorrelation is used in the derivation. State and explain the assumptions for homoscedasticity and autocorrelation that validate this expression. [4]

**Question 3**

- a. Mahapa, Matseliso and Mpho investigating whether government expenditure tends to crowd out investment fits the regression (standard errors in parentheses):

$$\hat{I} = \frac{18.10}{(7.79)} - \frac{1.97}{(0.14)}G + \frac{0.36}{(0.02)}Y \qquad R^2 = 0.99$$

where *G* is government recurrent expenditure, *Y* is gross domestic product and *I* is investment. Instead Nkobolo, Tlhalefo and Ntsoaki run the following regressions as alternative specifications of the model ran above (standard errors in parentheses):

$$\frac{\hat{I}}{\bar{P}} = -\frac{0.03}{(0.28)} \frac{1}{\bar{P}} - \frac{0.69}{(0.16)} \frac{G}{\bar{P}} + \frac{0.34}{(0.03)} \frac{Y}{\bar{P}} \quad R^2 = 0.97$$

$$\frac{\hat{I}}{\bar{P}} = \frac{0.39}{(0.04)} + \frac{0.03}{(0.42)} \frac{1}{\bar{Y}} - \frac{0.93}{(0.22)} \frac{Y}{\bar{P}} \quad R^2 = 0.78$$

$$\widehat{\log I} = -\frac{2.44}{(0.26)} - \frac{0.63}{(0.12)} \log G + \frac{1.60}{(0.12)} \log Y \quad R^2 = 0.98$$

where  $G$ ,  $Y$ , and  $I$  are as before and  $P$  is population.

In each case the regression is run again for the subsamples of observations with the 11 smallest and 11 greatest values of the sorting variable, after sorting by  $G/Y$ ,  $Y/P$  and  $\log Y$ , respectively. The residual sums of squares are as shown in table 1.

**Table 1**

	<i>11 smallest</i>	<i>11 largest</i>
(1)	1.43	12.63
(2)	0.0223	0.0155
(3)	0.573	0.155

Perform a Goldfeld–Quandt test at 1 percent level of confidence for each model specification and discuss the merits of each specification. [14]

Is there evidence that investment is an inverse function of government expenditure?

[1]

- b. Rabeah, Mamanyena and Mamazondo save the residuals from the full-sample regression in (a) and regress their squares on  $G$ ,  $Y$ , their squares, and their product. The STATA output results are shown in Appendix II below. Perform a White test for heteroskedasticity at 1 percent level of confidence. [5]

#### Question 4

- a. Describe all the steps that are carried out when running a two stage least square (2SLS) regression with one endogenous variable, one exogenous variable and one instrument. [5]
- b. What are the identification classifications of parameters in regression and briefly explain them? [6]
- c. What are the two conditions that a valid instrument must satisfy? [2]
- d. Mohapi, Mabela and Nthabeleng perform an OLS regression of the logarithm of hourly earnings on *S*, *EXP*, *ASVABC*, *MALE*, *ETHBLACKS* and *ETHHISP* using EAWWE data set and an IV regression using *SM*, *SF*, and *SIBLINGS* as instruments for *ASVABC*. The STATA outputs of the two regressions (IV and OLS) are shown in Appendix III below. Perform a Durbin–Wu–Hausman test at 5 percent confidence to evaluate whether *ASVABC* appears to be subject to measurement error. [7]

#### Question 5

- a. What is autocorrelation and why is it a problem in time series data? [2]
- b. What is an autoregressive (AR) model, distributed lag (DL) model and autoregressive distributed lag (ADL) model. Give an example of each in terms of *X* and *Y*, where *Y* is the dependent variable and *X* is the independent variable. [3]
- c. The tables in Appendix IV show the Eviews output results of a regression model explaining the relationship between food consumption and disposable income. Using the Eviews output results in Appendix IV, perform the Breusch-Godfrey test for autocorrelation at 1 percent level of confidence. [7]
- d. Using the same results in Appendix IV, perform the Durbin-Watson test for autocorrelation at 1 percent level of confidence. [8]

## APPENDICES

### Appendix I

. reg LGFDHO LGEXP LGSIZE

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	868
Model	138.776549	2	69.3882747	F( 2, 865) =	460.92
Residual	130.219231	865	.150542464	Prob > F =	0.0000
Total	268.995781	867	.310260416	R-squared =	0.5159
				Adj R-squared =	0.5148
				Root MSE =	.388

LGFDHO	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
LGEXP	.2866813	.0226824	12.639	0.000	.2421622	.3312003
LGSIZE	.4854698	.0255476	19.003	0.000	.4353272	.5356124
_cons	4.720269	.2209996	21.359	0.000	4.286511	5.154027

. reg LGFDHOPC LGEXPPC

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	868
Model	51.4364364	1	51.4364364	F( 1, 866) =	313.04
Residual	142.293973	866	.164311747	Prob > F =	0.0000
Total	193.73041	867	.223449146	R-squared =	0.2655
				Adj R-squared =	0.2647
				Root MSE =	.40535

LGFDHOPC	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
LGEXPPC	.376283	.0212674	17.693	0.000	.3345414	.4180246
_cons	3.700667	.1978925	18.700	0.000	3.312262	4.089072

. reg LGFDHOPC LGEXPPC LGSIZE

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	868
Model	63.5111811	2	31.7555905	F( 2, 865) =	210.94
Residual	130.219229	865	.150542461	Prob > F =	0.0000
Total	193.73041	867	.223449146	R-squared =	0.3278
				Adj R-squared =	0.3263
				Root MSE =	.388

LGFDHOPC	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
LGEXPPC	.2866813	.0226824	12.639	0.000	.2421622	.3312004
LGSIZE	-.2278489	.0254412	-8.956	0.000	-.2777826	-.1779152
_cons	4.720269	.2209996	21.359	0.000	4.286511	5.154027

## Appendix II

reg EI2 G Y G2 Y2 GYPROD

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 30		
-----+-----				F( 5, 24) = 389.39		
Model	229715064	5	45943012.8	Prob > F = 0.0000		
Residual	2831715.29	24	117988.137	R-squared = 0.9878		
-----+-----				Adj R-squared = 0.9853		
Total	232546779	29	8018854.45	Root MSE = 343.49		
-----+-----						
EI2	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----						
G	-36.11647	7.400742	-4.88	0.000	-51.39085	-20.84209
Y	5.522015	1.188795	4.65	0.000	3.068463	7.975567
G2	.5463273	.027054	20.19	0.000	.4904907	.602164
Y2	.007948	.0003913	20.31	0.000	.0071403	.0087556
GYPROD	-.1350344	.0060013	-22.50	0.000	-.1474204	-.1226485
_cons	196.4158	92.97307	2.11	0.045	4.528833	388.3028
-----+-----						

## Appendix III

. ivreg LGEARN S EXP MALE ETHBLACK ETHHISP (ASVABC=SM SF SIBLINGS)

Instrumental variables (2SLS) regression

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 500		
-----+-----				F( 6, 493) = 22.29		
Model	27.631679	6	4.60527983	Prob > F = 0.0000		
Residual	121.501359	493	.246453061	R-squared = 0.1853		
-----+-----				Adj R-squared = 0.1754		
Total	149.133038	499	.298863804	Root MSE = .49644		
-----+-----						
LGEARN	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
-----+-----						
ASVABC	-.0938253	.1319694	-0.71	0.477	-.3531172	.1654666
S	.1203265	.0251596	4.78	0.000	.0708931	.1697599
EXP	.0444094	.0092246	4.81	0.000	.026285	.0625338
MALE	.1909863	.0456252	4.19	0.000	.1013424	.2806302
ETHBLACK	-.1678914	.1355897	-1.24	0.216	-.4342963	.0985136
ETHHISP	.075698	.0828383	0.91	0.361	-.0870617	.2384576
_cons	.6503199	.3570741	1.82	0.069	-.0512548	1.351895
-----+-----						

Instrumented: ASVABC

Instruments: S EXP MALE ETHBLACK ETHHISP SM SF SIBLINGS

. estimates store IV1

```
reg LGEARN S EXP ASVABC MALE ETHBLACK ETHHISP
```

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	500
Model	33.5095496	6	5.58492493	F( 6, 493) =	23.81
Residual	115.623489	493	.234530403	Prob > F =	0.0000
				R-squared =	0.2247
				Adj R-squared =	0.2153
Total	149.133038	499	.298863804	Root MSE =	.48428

LGEARN	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
S	.0953713	.0106101	8.99	0.000	.0745246	.1162179
EXP	.043139	.0089279	4.83	0.000	.0255976	.0606805
ASVABC	.0477892	.0282877	1.69	0.092	-.00779	.1033685
MALE	.1954406	.0443323	4.41	0.000	.1083371	.2825441
ETHBLACK	-.0448382	.074738	-0.60	0.549	-.1916824	.102006
ETHHISP	.1226463	.0692577	1.77	0.077	-.0134303	.258723
_cons	.9766376	.1938648	5.04	0.000	.5957345	1.357541

```
. estimates store OLS1
```

```
hausman IV1 OLS1, constant
```

	---- Coefficients ----			
	(b)	(B)	(b-B)	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B))
	IV1	OLS1	Difference	S.E.
ASVABC	-.0938253	.0477892	-.1416145	.1289021
S	.1203265	.0953713	.0249552	.022813
EXP	.0444094	.043139	.0012704	.0023208
MALE	.1909863	.1954406	-.0044543	.0107847
ETHBLACK	-.1678914	-.0448382	-.1230532	.1131318
ETHHISP	.075698	.1226463	-.0469484	.0454484
_cons	.6503199	.9766376	-.3263177	.2998639

```

b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from ivreg
B = inconsistent under Ha, efficient under Ho; obtained from regress
Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic
      chi2(7) = (b-B)' [(V_b-V_B)^(-1)] (b-B)
            = 1.21
      Prob>chi2 = 0.9908

```



## Appendix IV

Dependent Variable: RLGFOOD

Method: Least Squares

Sample (adjusted): 1961 2003

Included observations: 43 after adjusting endpoints

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	0.071220	0.277253	0.256879	0.7987
LGDPPI	0.000251	0.006491	0.038704	0.9693
LGPRFOOD	-0.015572	0.051617	-0.301695	0.7645
RLGFOOD(-1)	1.009693	0.163240	6.185318	0.0000
RLGFOOD(-2)	-0.289159	0.171960	-1.681548	0.1009

R-squared	0.602010	Mean dependent var	0.000149
Adjusted R-squared	0.560117	S.D. dependent var	0.020368
S.E. of regression	0.013509	Akaike info criter	-5.661981
Sum squared resid	0.006935	Schwarz criterion	-5.457191
Log likelihood	126.7326	F-statistic	14.36996
Durbin-Watson stat	1.892212	Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000

Dependent Variable: LGFOOD

Method: Least Squares

Sample: 1959 2003

Included observations: 45

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	2.236158	0.388193	5.760428	0.0000
LGDPPI	0.500184	0.008793	56.88557	0.0000
LGPRFOOD	-0.074681	0.072864	-1.024941	0.3113

R-squared	0.992009	Mean dependent var	6.021331
Adjusted R-squared	0.991628	S.D. dependent var	0.222787
S.E. of regression	0.020384	Akaike info criter	-4.883747
Sum squared resid	0.017452	Schwarz criterion	-4.763303
Log likelihood	112.8843	Hannan-Quinn crite	-4.838846
F-statistic	2606.860	Durbin-Watson stat	0.478540
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000		