# Syracuse University SURFACE

Center for Policy Research

Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs

provided by Syracuse University Res

2007

# Consistent Estimation with Weak Instruments in Panel Data

Chihwa Kao Syracuse University

Long Liu Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: https://surface.syr.edu/cpr

Part of the Mathematics Commons

## **Recommended Citation**

Kao, Chihwa and Liu, Long, "Consistent Estimation with Weak Instruments in Panel Data" (2007). *Center for Policy Research*. 70. https://surface.syr.edu/cpr/70

This Working Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Center for Policy Research by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

ISSN: 1525-3066

Center for Policy Research Working Paper No. 95

CONSISTENT ESTIMATION WITH WEAK INSTRUMENTS IN PANEL DATA

Chihwa Kao and Long Lui

Center for Policy Research Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs Syracuse University 426 Eggers Hall Syracuse, New York 13244-1020 (315) 443-3114 | Fax (315) 443-1081 e-mail: ctrpol@syr.edu

May 2007

\$5.00

Up-to-date information about CPR's research projects and other activities is available from our World Wide Web site at **www-cpr.maxwell.syr.edu**. All recent working papers and Policy Briefs can be read and/or printed from there as well.

## **CENTER FOR POLICY RESEARCH – Spring 2007**

Timothy Smeeding, Director Professor of Economics & Public Administration

### **Associate Directors**

Margaret Austin Associate Director Budget and Administration

Douglas Wolf Professor of Public Administration Associate Director, Aging Studies Program John Yinger Professor of Economics and Public Administration Associate Director, Metropolitan Studies Program

## SENIOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

Badi Baltagi	Economics
Pablo Beramendi	Political Science
Dan Black	Economics
William Duncombe	Public Administration
Gary Engelhardt	Economics
Deborah Freund	Public Administration
Madonna Harrington Meyer .	Sociology
Christine Himes	Sociology
William C. Horrace	
Duke Kao	Economics
Eric Kingson	Social Work
Thomas Kniesner	
Jeffrey Kubik	Economics
Andrew London	Sociology

Len Lopoo Jerry Miner Jan Ondrich John Palmer Lori Ploutz-Snyder David Popp Grant Reeher Christopher Rohlfs Stuart Rosenthal Ross Rubenstein Margaret Usdansky Michael Wasylenko	Economics Economics Public Administration Exercise Science Public Administration Political Science Economics Public Administration Sociology
Michael Wasylenko Janet Wilmoth	

## **GRADUATE ASSOCIATES**

Javier Baez Sonali Ballal	
Jesse Bricker	
Maria Brown	Social Science
Mike Eriksen	Economics
Qu Feng	Economics
Katie Fitzpatrick	
Alexandre Genest	Public Administration
Julie Anna Golebiewski	
Nadia Greenhalgh-Stanley	Economics
Tamara Hafner	Public Administration
Yue Hu	Economics

Sung Hyo Hong Joseph Marchand	
Neelakshi Medhi	Social Science
Larry Miller	Public Administration
Wendy Parker	Sociology
Emily Pas	Economics
Shawn Rohlin	Economics
Cynthia Searcy	Public Administration
Jeff Thompson	Economics
Coady Wing	Public Administration
Daniel Yanulavich	Public Administration
Ryan Yeung	Public Administration

#### STAFF

Kelly Bogart	Administrative Secretary
Martha Bonney	Publications/Events Coordinator
Karen Cimilluca	Administrative Secretary
Kitty Nasto	Administrative Secretary

Candi Patterson	Computer Consultant
Mary Santy	Administrative Secretary
Tammy Tanner	Librarian/Office Coordinator

# Abstract

This note analyzes the asymptotic distribution for instrumental variables regression for panel data when the available instruments are weak. We show that consistency can be established in panel data.

JEL classification: C33

Key Words: Weak Instrument; Two Stage Least Squares; Panel Data; Concentration Parameter.

## Consistent Estimation with Weak Instruments in Panel Data

Chihwa Kao, Long Liu<sup>†</sup> Syracuse University

April 20, 2007

#### Abstract

This note analyzes the asymptotic distribution for instrumental variables regression for panel data when the available instruments are weak. We show that consistency can be established in panel data. Key Words: Weak Instrument; Two Stage Least Squares; Panel Data; Concentration Parameter.

### 1 Motivation and Results

In recent year, economists have been concerned with the problem of weak instruments or partial identification, see Stock, Wright and Yogo (2002) for an excellent survey. Economists found that the first stage F statistic in the two stage least squares (2SLS) regression is often low, say, less than 10. In this case, the usual asymptotic normal approximations can be quite poor, even if the number of observations is large. To provide better asymptotic approximations in this case, Staiger and Stock (1997) derive the weak-instrument asymptotics for instrumental variables estimators. Staiger and Stock show that the 2SLS is inconsistent (i.e., converges to a random variable) and has a nonstandard limiting distribution. In this note we study the asymptotics of 2SLS with weak instruments in panel models. We show that the consistency of 2SLS can be established in panel data. We use  $(n, T) \stackrel{\text{seq}}{\to} \infty$  to denote the sequential limit, i.e.,  $n \to \infty$  followed by  $T \to \infty$ .

Consider the following panel linear IV regression model with a single endogenous regressor

$$y_t = Y_t \beta + u_t \tag{1}$$

and

$$Y_t = Z_t \Pi + v_t \tag{2}$$

 $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ , where  $y_t$  and  $Y_t$  are  $n \times 1$  vectors of observations on endogenous variables,  $Z_t$  is a  $n \times k$  matrix of instruments,  $\Pi$  is a  $k \times 1$  coefficient vector, and  $u_t$  and  $v_t$  are  $n \times 1$  vectors of disturbance terms.

<sup>\*</sup>Address correspondence to: Chihwa Kao, Center for Policy Research, 426 Eggers Hall, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244-1020; e-mail: cdkao@maxwell.syr.edu.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Long Liu: Economics Department, 110 Eggers Hall, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244-1020; e-mail: loliu@maxwell.syr.edu.

Let  $u_{it}$  and  $v_{it}$  be *i*th element of  $u_t$  and  $v_t$  respectively. The errors  $(u_{it}, v_{it})'$  are assumed to be iid  $N(0, \Sigma)$ , where the elements of  $\Sigma$  are  $\sigma_u^2, \sigma_{uv}$  and  $\sigma_v^2$ , and let  $\rho = \sigma_{uv}/(\sigma_u \sigma_v)$ . In this note, the errors are assumed be iid for simplicity. This assumption can be relaxed to weak dependence across time series and cross-section at the expense of complicated notations and will be studied in a different paper. Equation (1) is the structural equation and  $\beta$  is the scalar parameter of interest. The reduced-form equation (2) relates the endogenous regressor to the instruments. As proposed by Staiger and Stock (1997), the following assumption is used to describe the nature of weak instruments.

Assumption 1  $\Pi = C/\sqrt{n}$ , where C is a  $k \times 1$  constant matrix.

The strength of instrument can be measured by the concentration parameter  $\lambda_t^2$ , which is defined as

$$\lambda_t^2 = \Pi' Z_t' Z_t \Pi / \sigma_v^2$$

Under Assumption 1 we obtain

$$\lambda_t^2 = \Pi' Z_t' Z_t \Pi / \sigma_v^2 = C' Z_t' Z_t C / \left( n \sigma_v^2 \right) \xrightarrow{p} C' Q C / \sigma_v^2 \equiv \lambda^2 \tag{3}$$

as  $n \to \infty$  where we assume for a give t,

$$\frac{1}{n}Z'_tZ_t \xrightarrow{p} Q = E\left(Z'_tZ_t\right).$$

Then the panel 2SLS estimator is

$$\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( Y_t' P_{Z_t} y_t \right) / \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( Y_t' P_{Z_t} Y_t \right)$$

where  $P_{Z_t} = Z_t (Z'_t Z_t)^{-1} Z'_t$ .

#### Theorem 1 Under assumption 1,

1.

$$\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} \xrightarrow{p} \beta + \frac{\sigma_u \rho k}{\sigma_v \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)}$$

$$\sqrt{T}\left(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} - \beta - \frac{\sigma_u \rho k}{\sigma_v \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)}\right) \xrightarrow{d} N\left(0, \frac{\sigma_u^2 \left[\lambda^2 + k\left(1 + \rho^2\right)\right]}{\sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)^2}\right)$$

as  $(n,T) \stackrel{\text{seq}}{\to} \infty$ .

# 2 Proof and Discussion

Define  $\zeta_{1tn} = Y'_t P_{Z_t} u_t$ ,  $\zeta_{2tn} = Y'_t P_{Z_t} Y_t$ ,  $\xi_{1Tn} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_{1tN}$ , and  $\xi_{2Tn} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \zeta_{2tn}$ . Hence

$$\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} - \beta = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} (Y_t' P_{Z_t} u_t)}{\sum_{t=1}^{T} (Y_t' P_{Z_t} Y_t)} = \frac{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \zeta_{1tn}}{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \zeta_{2tn}} = \frac{\xi_{1Tn}}{\xi_{2Tn}},$$

We first present the following lemma:

Lemma 1 Under Assumption 1

1.  $\zeta_{1tn} = \sigma_v \sigma_u \left(\lambda z_{tu} + s_{tuv}\right) + o_p\left(1\right)$  as  $n \to \infty$ , where  $z_{tu} = \frac{\Pi' Z'_t u_t}{\sigma_u \sqrt{\Pi' Z'_t Z_t \Pi}}$  and  $s_{tuv} = \frac{v'_t P_{Z_t} u_t}{\sigma_v \sigma_u}$ , 2.  $\zeta_{2tn} = \sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + 2\lambda z_{tv} + s_{tvv}\right) + o_p\left(1\right)$  as  $n \to \infty$ , where  $z_{tv} = \frac{\Pi' Z'_t v_t}{\sigma_v \sqrt{\Pi' Z'_t Z_t \Pi}}$  and  $s_{tvv} = \frac{v'_t P_{Z_t} v_t}{\sigma_v^2}$ , 3.  $\xi_{1Tn} \xrightarrow{p} \sigma_v \sigma_u \rho k$  as  $(n, T) \xrightarrow{\text{seq}} \infty$ , 4.  $\xi_{2Tn} \xrightarrow{p} \sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)$  as  $(n, T) \xrightarrow{\text{seq}} \infty$ .

**Proof.** Consider (1) and (2). Following Rothenberg (1984), we know

$$\begin{split} \zeta_{1tn} &= Y'_t P_{Z_t} u_t = \Pi' Z'_t u_t + v'_t P_{Z_t} u_t \\ &= \sigma_v \sigma_u \left( \sqrt{\frac{\Pi' Z'_t Z_t \Pi}{\sigma_v^2}} \right) \left( \frac{\Pi' Z'_t u_t}{\sigma_u \sqrt{\Pi' Z'_t Z_t \Pi}} \right) + (\sigma_v \sigma_u) \left( \frac{v'_t P_{Z_t} u_t}{\sigma_v \sigma_u} \right) \\ &= \sigma_v \sigma_u \lambda_t z_{tu} + (\sigma_v \sigma_u) s_{tuv} \\ &= \sigma_v \sigma_u \left( \lambda_t z_{tu} + s_{tuv} \right) \end{split}$$

and

$$\begin{split} \zeta_{2tn} &= Y_t' P_{Z_t} Y_t = \Pi' Z_t' Z_t \Pi + 2\Pi' Z_t' v_t + v_t' P_{Z_t} v_t \\ &= \sigma_v^2 \lambda_t^2 + 2\sigma_v^2 \left( \sqrt{\frac{\Pi' Z_t' Z_t \Pi}{\sigma_v^2}} \right) \left( \frac{\Pi' Z_t' v_t}{\sigma_v \sqrt{\Pi' Z_t' Z_t \Pi}} \right) + \sigma_v^2 \left( \frac{v_t' P_{Z_t} v_t}{\sigma_v^2} \right) \\ &= \sigma_v^2 \lambda_t^2 + 2\sigma_v^2 \lambda_t z_v + \sigma_v^2 s_{vv} \\ &= \sigma_v^2 \left( \lambda_t^2 + 2\lambda_t z_v + s_{tvv} \right) \end{split}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} z_{tu} &= \frac{\Pi' Z'_t u_t}{\sigma_u \sqrt{\Pi' Z'_t Z_t \Pi}}, \\ z_{tv} &= \frac{\Pi' Z'_t v_t}{\sigma_v \sqrt{\Pi' Z'_t Z_t \Pi}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$s_{tuv} = \frac{v_t' P_{Z_t} u_t}{\sigma_v \sigma_u},$$

and

$$s_{tvv} = \frac{v_t' P_{Z_t} v_t}{\sigma_v^2}.$$

As stated in Rothenberg (1984), the  $(z_{tu}, z_{tv})'$  is bivariate normal with zero means, unit variances, and correlation coefficient  $\rho$ . The random variable  $s_{tuv}$  has mean  $k\rho$  and variance  $k(1 + \rho^2)$  and  $s_{tvv}$  has mean k and variance 2k.

It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{1tn} &= \sigma_v \sigma_u \left( \lambda_t z_{tu} + s_{tuv} \right) \\ &= \sigma_v \sigma_u \left( \lambda z_{tu} + s_{tuv} \right) + o_p \left( 1 \right) \\ &= \zeta_{1t} + o_p \left( 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{2tn} &= \sigma_v^2 \left( \lambda_t^2 + 2\lambda_t z_{tv} + s_{tvv} \right) \\ &= \sigma_v^2 \left( \lambda^2 + 2\lambda z_{tv} + s_{tvv} \right) + o_p \left( 1 \right) \\ &= \zeta_{2t} + o_p \left( 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \to \infty$  where  $\zeta_{1t} = \sigma_v \sigma_u \left(\lambda z_{tu} + s_{tuv}\right)$  and  $\zeta_{2t} = \sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + 2\lambda z_{tv} + s_{tvv}\right)$ .

Consider (3). As  $T \to \infty$ ,

$$\xi_{1Tn} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \zeta_{1tn} \xrightarrow{p} E\left(\zeta_{1tn}\right) = E\left(\sigma_v \sigma_u \left(\lambda z_{tu} + s_{tuv}\right)\right) = \sigma_v \sigma_u \rho k$$

by a law of large numbers (LLN) and  $E(z_{tu}) = 0$  and  $E(s_{tuv}) = \rho k$ .

\_

Similarly,

$$\xi_{2Tn} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \zeta_{2tn} \xrightarrow{p} E\left(\zeta_{2tn}\right) = E\left[\sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + 2\lambda z_{tv} + s_{tvv}\right)\right] = \sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)$$

proving (4).  $\blacksquare$ 

#### **Proof of Theorem** 1

**Proof.** For (1), recall that  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} - \beta = \frac{\xi_{1Tn}}{\xi_{2Tn}}$ . Using the Lemmas 1.3 and 1.4, we obtain

$$\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} = \beta + \frac{\xi_{1Tn}}{\xi_{2Tn}} \xrightarrow{p} \beta + \frac{\sigma_v \sigma_u \rho k}{\sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)} = \beta + \frac{\sigma_u \rho k}{\sigma_v \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)}$$

as  $(n,T) \xrightarrow{\text{seq}} \infty$ .

Consider (2). First we write

$$v_t = E\left(v_t|u_t\right) + \eta_t = \frac{\sigma_{uv}}{\sigma_u^2}u_t + \eta_t$$

where  $\eta_t$  and  $u_t$  are independent. Then

$$Var(\zeta_{1t})$$

$$= Var(\sigma_v \sigma_u (\lambda z_{tu} + s_{tuv}))$$

$$= \sigma_v^2 \sigma_u^2 [\lambda^2 Var(z_{tu}) + Var(s_{tuv}) + 2Cov(z_{tu}, s_{tuv})]$$

$$= \sigma_v^2 \sigma_u^2 [\lambda^2 + k(1 + \rho^2)]$$

because  $Var(z_{tu}) = 1$ ,  $Var(s_{tuv}) = k(1 + \rho^2)$ , and

$$Cov (z_{tu}, s_{tuv})$$

$$= E (z_{tu}s_{tuv}) - E (z_{tu}) E (s_{tuv})$$

$$= E \left( z_{tu} \frac{v'_t P_{Z_t} u_t}{\sigma_v \sigma_u} \right)$$

$$= E \left[ z_{tu} \left( \rho \frac{u'_t P_{Z_t} u_t}{\sigma_u^2} + \frac{\eta'_t P_{Z_t} u_t}{\sigma_v \sigma_u} \right) \right]$$

$$= E \left[ \frac{\Pi' Z'_t u_t}{\sigma_u \sqrt{\Pi' Z'_t Z_t \Pi}} \left( \rho \frac{u'_t P_{Z_t} u_t}{\sigma_u^2} \right) \right] + E \left[ \frac{\Pi' Z'_t u_t}{\sigma_u \sqrt{\Pi' Z'_t Z_t \Pi}} \left( \frac{\eta'_t P_{Z_t} u_t}{\sigma_v \sigma_u} \right) \right]$$

$$= 0$$

 $\operatorname{since}$ 

$$E\left[E\left[\frac{\Pi'Z'_t u_t}{\sigma_u \sqrt{\Pi'Z'_t Z_t \Pi}} \left(\frac{\eta'_t P_{Z_t} u_t}{\sigma_v \sigma_u}\right) | u_t\right]\right] = 0$$

since  $E\left(\eta_t|u_t\right) = 0$  and

$$E\left[\frac{\Pi' Z_t' u_t}{\sigma_u \sqrt{\Pi' Z_t' Z_t \Pi}} \left(\rho \frac{u_t' P_{Z_t} u_t}{\sigma_u^2}\right)\right] = 0$$

e.g., Corollary 10.9.2 in Graybill (1983).

By a central limit theorem we have

$$\sqrt{T}\left(\xi_{1T} - \sigma_v \sigma_u \rho k\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\zeta_{1t} - \sigma_v \sigma_u \rho k\right) \stackrel{d}{\longrightarrow} N\left(0, \sigma_v^2 \sigma_u^2 \left[\lambda^2 + \lambda \left(1 + \rho^2\right)\right]\right)$$

as  $T \to \infty$ .

Similarly,

$$\xi_{2Tn} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \zeta_{2tn} \xrightarrow{p} E\left(\zeta_{2tn}\right) = E\left[\sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + 2\lambda z_{tv} + S_{tvv}\right)\right] = \sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)$$

by a LLN. Then we have

$$\begin{split} \sqrt{T} \left( \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} - \beta - \frac{\sigma_v \sigma_u \rho k}{\sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)} \right) &= \frac{\sqrt{T} \left[ \xi_{1Tn} - \sigma_v \sigma_u \rho k \right]}{\xi_{2Tn}} \\ & \xrightarrow{d} \frac{N \left( 0, \sigma_v^2 \sigma_u^2 \left[ \lambda^2 + k \left( 1 + \rho^2 \right) \right] \right)}{\sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)} \\ &= N \left( 0, \frac{\sigma_u^2 \left[ \lambda^2 + k \left( 1 + \rho^2 \right) \right]}{\sigma_v^2 \left(\lambda^2 + k\right)^2} \right) \end{split}$$

 $(n,T) \xrightarrow{\text{seq}} \infty$  proving the theorem.

Since  $\sigma_u, \sigma_v, \lambda^2$  and k are all positive, the sign of the bias term of panel 2SLS,  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$ , is determined by  $\rho$  which is the sample correlation of disturbance terms  $u_t$  and  $v_t$ . When  $\rho = 0$ , i.e.,  $Y_t$  is uncorrelated with  $u_t$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  becomes consistent; when  $\rho$  has the same sign as  $\beta$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  is overestimated; when  $\rho$  has a different sign from  $\beta$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  is underestimated.

Once  $\sigma_u, \sigma_v, \rho$  and  $\lambda^2$  are consistently estimated, the bias can be corrected by using a bias-corrected estimator. For example, the bias-corrected estimator can be constructed as

$$\tilde{\beta}_{BC2SLS} = \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} - \frac{\widehat{\sigma}_u \widehat{\rho} k}{\widehat{\sigma}_v \left(\widehat{\lambda}^2 + k\right)} \tag{4}$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_u, \hat{\sigma}_v$  and  $\hat{\rho}$  can be estimated from the residuals  $\hat{u}_{it}$  of 2SLS regression and  $\hat{v}_{it}$  of the first stage regression. A consistent estimator of  $\lambda$  can be constructed by following Moon and Phillips (2000).

In the cross-sectional case, when the concentration parameter stays constant as the sample size grows, the signal of the model is too weak comparing to the noise. Hence the model is weakly identified, i.e., the two stage least square estimator is inconsistent, and more importantly, 2SLS converge to a random variable. However, in the panel set-up, if time series dimension is large, the weak signal can be strengthened by repeating regression across the time series dimension. It is, in spirit, similar to the argument of establishing the consistency in the panel spurious regression, e.g., Phillips and Moon (1999) and Kao (1999).

## References

- [1] Graybill, F. A. (1983) Matrices with Applications in Statistics. Wadsworth.
- [2] Kao, C. (1999) Spurious Regression and Residual-Based Tests for Cointegration in Panel Data. Journal of Econometrics 90, 1-44.

- [3] Moon, H. R., and P. C. B. Phillips (2000) Estimation of Autoregressive Roots Near Unity Using Panel Data. *Econometric Theory* 16, 927-997.
- [4] Phillips, P. C. B., and H. R. Moon (1999) Linear Regression Limit Theory for Nonstationary Panel Data. Econometrica 67, 1057-1111.
- [5] Rothenberg, T. J. (1984) Approximating the Distributions of Econometric Estimators of Test Statistics, in *Handbook of Econometrics*. Vol. II, ed. by Z. Griliches and M.D. Intriligator. Amsterdam: North-Holland, 881-936.
- [6] Staiger, D., and J. H. Stock (1997) Instrumental Variables Regression with Weak Instruments. *Econo*metrica 65, 557-587.
- [7] Stock, H. J., H. J. Wright, and M. Yogo (2002) A Survey of Weak Instruments and Weak Identification in Generalized Method of Moments. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 20, 518-29.