

Pesaran, Mohammad Hashem; Yamagata, Takashi

**Working Paper**

## Testing slope homogeneity in large panels

CESifo Working Paper, No. 1438

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

*Suggested Citation:* Pesaran, Mohammad Hashem; Yamagata, Takashi (2005) : Testing slope homogeneity in large panels, CESifo Working Paper, No. 1438, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/18802>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

# TESTING SLOPE HOMOGENEITY IN LARGE PANELS

M. HASHEM PESARAN  
TAKASHI YAMAGATA

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 1438  
CATEGORY 10: EMPIRICAL AND THEORETICAL METHODS  
MARCH 2005

*An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded*

- *from the SSRN website:* <http://SSRN.com/abstract=700670>
- *from the CESifo website:* [www.CESifo.de](http://www.CESifo.de)

# TESTING SLOPE HOMOGENEITY IN LARGE PANELS

## Abstract

This paper proposes a modified version of Swamy's test of slope homogeneity for panel data models where the cross section dimension ( $N$ ) could be large relative to the time series dimension ( $T$ ). The proposed test exploits the cross section dispersion of individual slopes weighted by their relative precision. In the case of models with strictly exogenous regressors and normally distributed errors, the test is shown to have a standard normal distribution as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ . Under non-normal errors and in the case of stationary dynamic models, the condition on the relative expansion rates of  $N$  and  $T$  for the test to be valid is given by  $\sqrt{N}/T \longrightarrow 0$ , as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ . Using Monte Carlo experiments, it is shown that the test has the correct size and satisfactory power in panels with strictly exogenous regressors for various combinations of  $N$  and  $T$ . For autoregressive (AR) models the proposed test performs well for moderate values of the root of the autoregressive process. But for AR models with roots near unity a bias-corrected bootstrapped version of the test is proposed which performs well even if  $N$  is large relative to  $T$ . The proposed cross section dispersion tests are applied to testing the homogeneity of slopes in autoregressive models of individual earnings using the PSID data. The results show statistically significant evidence of slope heterogeneity in the earnings dynamics, even when individuals with similar educational backgrounds are considered as subsets.

JEL Code: C12, C33.

Keywords: testing slope homogeneity, Hausman type tests, cross section dispersion tests, Monte Carlo results, PSID earnings dynamics.

*M. Hashem Pesaran  
Cambridge University  
Department of Economics  
Sidgwick Avenue  
Cambridge, CB3 9DD  
United Kingdom  
mhp1@cam.ac.uk*

*Takashi Yamagata  
Cambridge University  
Department of Economics  
Sidgwick Avenue  
Cambridge, CB3 9DD  
United Kingdom  
Takashi.Yamagata@econ.cam.ac.uk*

We would like to thank Ron Smith and Aman Ullah for helpful discussions. We are also grateful to Costas Meghir and Luigi Pistaferri for kindly providing us with their processed PSID data set. Also our thanks go to Donggyu Sul for the Gauss codes used for the implementation of Phillips and Sul's G test. Financial support from the ESRC (Grant No. RES-000-23-0135) is gratefully acknowledged.

# 1 Introduction

In many empirical studies, it is assumed that the slope coefficients of interest in panel data models are homogeneous across individual units. When the cross section dimension ( $N$ ) is relatively small and the time series dimension of the panel ( $T$ ) large, the hypothesis of slope homogeneity can be tested using the SURE (seemingly unrelated regression equation) framework of Zellner (1962). This framework is particularly attractive as it also automatically deals with the possibility of cross section error correlations and dynamics when  $N$  is reasonably small (around 5-10) and  $T$  sufficiently large (around 80-100). However, in many empirical applications  $N$  is often (much) larger than  $T$  and the SURE approach would not be applicable.

In view of this Pesaran, Smith and Im (1996) proposed the application of the Hausman (1978) testing procedure where the standard fixed effects estimator is compared to the mean group estimator. However, as will be discussed below, such a procedure is not applicable in the case of panel data models that contain only strictly exogenous regressors and/or in the case of pure autoregressive models.

Recently Phillips and Sul (2003) have also proposed a ‘Hausman type’ test for slope homogeneity for stationary first-order autoregression (AR(1)) panel data models in presence of cross section dependence, with  $N$  fixed as  $T$  goes to infinity. It will be shown below that their testing approach is not valid under cross section independence.

This paper proposes a modified version of the test proposed by Swamy (1970) that applies to panel data models where the cross section dimension could be large relative to the time series dimension. The proposed test is applicable to static as well as to stationary dynamic panel data models, possibly with heteroskedastic errors. In the case of models with strictly exogenous regressors and normally distributed errors, the proposed test is shown to have a standard normal distribution as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ , where  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$  denotes  $N$  and  $T \rightarrow \infty$  jointly. Under non-normal errors and in the case of stationary dynamic models, the condition on the relative expansion rates of  $N$  and  $T$  for the test to be valid is given by  $\sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0$ , as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ .

The small sample properties of the proposed test are investigated by means of Monte Carlo experiments. It is shown that the test has satisfactory size and power for  $T$  as small as 10 with  $N$  as large as 200 in panel data models containing only strictly exogenous regressors, even with non-normal errors. For autoregressive (AR) models the proposed test performs well for moderate values of the root of the AR process under various  $N$  and  $T$  combinations. But for AR panels with  $T < N$ , and roots near unity, a bias-corrected bootstrapped version of the test is proposed which is shown to perform well even if  $N$  is large relative to  $T$ .

The use of slope homogeneity tests in empirical contexts is illustrated by applying them to testing the homogeneity of slopes in autoregressive models of earnings using the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) data. The results show evidence of slope heterogeneity in the real earnings dynamics, even when individuals with similar educational backgrounds are considered as sub-sets.

The plan of the paper is as follows. Section 2 sets up the model and reviews existing tests of slope homogeneity. Section 3 considers the asymptotic distribution of alternative dispersion type tests of slope homogeneity and establishes their asymptotic distribution in the context of panel data models where  $N$  could be large relative to  $T$ . Section 4 considers the application of the proposed  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test to stationary dynamic panel data models and develops the biased-corrected bootstrapped version of the test. Section 5 sets up the Monte Carlo design and summarizes the results. Section 6 discusses the empirical application, and Section 7 provides some concluding remarks.

## 2 The Model and Existing Tests of Slope Homogeneity

Consider the panel data model with fixed effects and heterogeneous slopes

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_i' \mathbf{x}_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\alpha_i$  is bounded on a compact set,  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  is a  $k \times 1$  vector of regressors,  $\beta_i$  is a  $k \times 1$  vector of unknown slope coefficients. Stacking the time series observations for  $i$  yields

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \alpha_i \boldsymbol{\tau}_T + \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{iT})'$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_T$  is a  $T \times 1$  vector of ones,  $\mathbf{X}_i = (\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{iT})'$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = (\varepsilon_{i1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{iT})'$ . Let

$$\mathbf{Q}_{iT} = T^{-1} (\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \mathbf{X}_i), \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} = T^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i, \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\mathbf{Q}_N = (NT)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-2} \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \mathbf{X}_i \right), \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\mathbf{M}_T = \mathbf{I}_T - \boldsymbol{\tau}_T (\boldsymbol{\tau}_T' \boldsymbol{\tau}_T)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\tau}_T'$ , and  $\mathbf{I}_T$  is an identity matrix of order  $T$ .

Consider now the following assumptions:

**Assumption 1:**  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim IID(0, \sigma_i^2)$  with  $0 < \sigma_i^2 < \infty$  for all  $i$ , and  $\varepsilon_{it}$  and  $\varepsilon_{js}$  are independently distributed for  $i \neq j$  and/or  $t \neq s$ .

**Assumption 2:** The  $k \times k$  matrices  $\mathbf{Q}_{iT}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , defined by (2.3) are positive definite,  $\mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1}$  has finite second order moments for each  $i$ , and  $\mathbf{Q}_{iT}$  tends to a non-stochastic positive definite matrix,  $\mathbf{Q}_i$ , as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Assumption 3:** The  $k \times 1$  vectors  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  defined by (2.3) are independently distributed across  $i$ , and for each  $i$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} \rightarrow_d N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{Q}_i)$ , as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Assumption 4:** The  $k \times k$  pooled observation matrix  $\mathbf{Q}_N$  defined by (2.4) is positive definite, and tends to a non-stochastic positive definite matrix,  $\mathbf{Q}$ , as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ .<sup>1</sup>

**Assumption 5:**  $(T-1)(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i)^{-1}$  has finite second order moments for each  $i$ .

The null hypothesis of interest is

$$H_0 : \beta_i = \boldsymbol{\beta} \text{ for all } i, \quad \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\| < K < \infty, \quad (2.5)$$

against the alternatives

$$H_1 : \beta_i \neq \boldsymbol{\beta}, \text{ for a non-zero fraction of slopes.}$$

**Assumption 6:** Under  $H_1$ , the fraction of slopes that are not the same does not tend to zero as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark 2.1** In the case of randomly distributed slopes, where  $\beta_i \sim IID(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \Sigma_\beta)$ , the null and the alternative hypothesis can be characterized by  $H_0 : \Sigma_\beta = \mathbf{0}$ , and  $H_1 : \Sigma_\beta \neq \mathbf{0}$ , respectively.

**Remark 2.2** The above assumptions cover both cases of strictly exogenous regressors, as well as when  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  contains lagged values of  $y_{it}$ .

**Remark 2.3** In the case where the errors,  $\varepsilon_{it}$ , are normally distributed Assumption 5 is met if  $T > 5$ . See, for example, Smith (1988) for a proof.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j}$  denotes joint asymptotics with  $N$  and  $T \rightarrow \infty$  in no particular order.

<sup>2</sup>Under normality, the  $r^{th}$  moment of the inverse of  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{A} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$  exists if  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}) > 2r$ , where  $\mathbf{A}$  is a  $T \times T$  positive semi-definite symmetric matrix.

## 2.1 The Standard $F$ Test

There are a number of procedures that can be used to test  $H_0$ , the most familiar of which is the standard  $F$  test defined by

$$F = \left[ \frac{N(T - k - 1)}{k(N - 1)} \right] \left( \frac{RSSR - USSR}{USSR} \right), \quad (2.6)$$

where  $RSSR$  and  $USSR$  are restricted and unrestricted residual sum of squares, respectively, obtained under the null ( $\beta_i = \beta$ ) and the alternative hypotheses. This test is applicable when the regressors are strictly exogenous and the error variances homoskedastic,  $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2$ . But it is likely to perform rather poorly in cases where the regressors might contain lagged values of the dependent variable and/or if the error variances are cross sectionally heteroskedastic.

## 2.2 Hausman Type Test by Pesaran, Smith and Im

For cases where  $N > T$ , Pesaran, Smith and Im (1996) propose using the Hausman (1978) test where the standard fixed effects (FE) estimator of  $\beta$ ,

$$\hat{\beta}_{FE} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{X}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{y}_i, \quad (2.7)$$

is compared to the mean group (MG) estimator defined by

$$\hat{\beta}_{MG} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\beta}_i, \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$\hat{\beta}_i = (\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{X}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{y}_i. \quad (2.9)$$

For the Hausman test to have the correct size and be consistent two conditions must be met, however.

- (a) Under the null hypothesis,  $\hat{\beta}_{FE}$  and  $\hat{\beta}_{MG}$  must both be consistent, with  $\hat{\beta}_{FE}$  being asymptotically more efficient such that

$$Avar \left( \hat{\beta}_{MG} - \hat{\beta}_{FE} \right) = Avar \left( \hat{\beta}_{MG} \right) - Avar \left( \hat{\beta}_{FE} \right) > 0.$$

- (b) Under the alternative hypothesis  $\hat{\beta}_{MG} - \hat{\beta}_{FE}$  should tend to a non-zero vector.

In the context of dynamic panel data models with exogenous regressors both of these conditions are met, so long as the exogenous regressors are not drawn from the same distribution, and a Hausman type test based on the difference  $\hat{\beta}_{FE} - \hat{\beta}_{MG}$  would be valid and is shown to have reasonable small sample properties. See Pesaran, Smith and Im (1996) and Hsiao and Pesaran (2004).

However, there are two major concerns with the routine use of the Hausman procedure as a test of slope homogeneity. It could lack power for certain parameter values, as its implicit null does not necessarily coincide with the null hypothesis of interest. Second, and more importantly, the Hausman test will not be applicable in the case of panel data models containing only strictly exogenous

regressors, and/or in the case of pure autoregressive models. In the former case, both estimators,  $\hat{\beta}_{FE}$  and  $\hat{\beta}_{MG}$ , are unbiased under the null and the alternative hypotheses and condition (b) will not be satisfied. Whilst, in the case of pure autoregressive panel data models  $\sqrt{NT}(\hat{\beta}_{FE} - \beta)$  and  $\sqrt{NT}(\hat{\beta}_{MG} - \beta)$  will be asymptotically equivalent and condition (a) will not be met.

### 2.3 $G$ Test of Phillips and Sul

Phillips and Sul (2003) propose a different type of Hausman test where instead of comparing two different pooled estimators of the regression coefficients (as discussed above), they propose basing the test of slope homogeneity on the difference between the individual estimates and a suitably defined pooled estimator. In the context of the panel regression model (2.2), their test statistic can be written as

$$G = \left( \hat{\beta}_N - \tau_N \otimes \hat{\beta}_{pooled} \right)' \hat{\Sigma}_g^{-1} \left( \hat{\beta}_N - \tau_N \otimes \hat{\beta}_{pooled} \right),$$

where  $\hat{\beta}_N = (\hat{\beta}'_1, \hat{\beta}'_2, \dots, \hat{\beta}'_N)'$  is an  $Nk \times 1$  stacked vector of all the  $N$  individual estimates,  $\hat{\beta}_{pooled}$  is a suitable pooled estimator of  $\beta (= \beta_i)$ , and  $\hat{\Sigma}_g$  is a consistent estimator of  $\Sigma_g$ , the asymptotic variance matrix of  $\hat{\beta}_N - \tau_N \otimes \hat{\beta}_{pooled}$ , under  $H_0$ . Under Assumptions 1-4 and assuming  $H_0$  holds and  $N$  is fixed, then  $G \rightarrow_d \chi^2_{Nk}$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , so long as the  $\Sigma_g$  is a non-stochastic positive definite matrix.

As compared to the Hausman test based on  $\hat{\beta}_{MG} - \hat{\beta}_{FE}$ , the  $G$  test is likely to be more powerful; but its use will be limited to panel data models where  $N$  is small relative to  $T$ . Also, the  $G$  test will not be valid in the case of pure dynamic models, very much for the same kind of reasons noted above in relation to the Hausman test based on  $\hat{\beta}_{MG} - \hat{\beta}_{FE}$ . This is easily established in the case of the stationary first order autoregressive panel data model considered by Phillips and Sul (2003) where

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i (1 - \lambda_i) + \lambda_i y_{it-1} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad |\lambda_i| < 1,$$

and the aim is to test  $H_0 : \lambda_i = \lambda$ . Phillips and Sul also consider the case where the errors,  $\varepsilon_{it}$ , are cross sectionally dependent through a single factor model. But, given the focus of our analysis, we shall abstract from this problem and continue to assume that  $\varepsilon_{it}$  are cross sectionally independent. Under this set up the appropriate form of the  $G$  statistic is given by

$$G = \left( \hat{\lambda}_N - \tau_N \hat{\lambda}_{pooled} \right)' \hat{\Sigma}_g^{-1} \left( \hat{\lambda}_N - \tau_N \hat{\lambda}_{pooled} \right),$$

where  $\hat{\lambda}_N = (\hat{\lambda}_1, \hat{\lambda}_2, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_N)'$  is the  $N \times 1$  vector of the individual estimates and  $\hat{\lambda}_{pooled}$  is a pooled estimator, such that  $(\hat{\lambda}'_N, \hat{\lambda}_{pooled})' \rightarrow_p \lambda \tau_{N+1}$  under the null hypothesis. Phillips and Sul consider a number of different estimators, including Andrew's (1993) median unbiased estimator and its extension to panels. But, as they note, all such estimators yield the same asymptotic covariance matrix as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Using the fixed effects estimator for  $\hat{\lambda}_{pooled}$ , and the least squares estimators of  $\lambda_i$  for  $\hat{\lambda}_i$ , it is easily verified that under  $H_0$

$$\begin{aligned} Avar \left[ \sqrt{T} (\hat{\lambda}_i - \hat{\lambda}_{FE}) \right] &= Avar \left[ \sqrt{T} (\hat{\lambda}_i - \lambda) - \sqrt{T} (\hat{\lambda}_{FE} - \lambda) \right] \\ &= (1 - \lambda^2) - \left( \frac{1 - \lambda^2}{N} \right), \\ Acov \left[ \sqrt{T} (\hat{\lambda}_i - \hat{\lambda}_{FE}), \sqrt{T} (\hat{\lambda}_j - \hat{\lambda}_{FE}) \right] &= - \left( \frac{1 - \lambda^2}{N} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\Sigma_g = \left( \frac{1 - \lambda^2}{T} \right) (\mathbf{I}_N - N^{-1} \boldsymbol{\tau}_N \boldsymbol{\tau}_N'),$$

where  $\text{Rank}(\Sigma_g) = N - 1$  and  $\Sigma_g$  is non-invertible.

## 2.4 Swamy's Test

Swamy (1970) bases his test of slope homogeneity on the dispersion of individual slope estimates from a suitable pooled estimator. Like the  $F$  test, Swamy's test is developed for panels where  $N$  is small relative to  $T$ , but allows for cross section heteroskedasticity. Swamy's statistic applied to the slope coefficients can be written as

$$\hat{S} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \hat{\beta}_i - \hat{\beta}_{WFE} \right)' \frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{X}_i}{\hat{\sigma}_i^2} \left( \hat{\beta}_i - \hat{\beta}_{WFE} \right), \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$\hat{\sigma}_i^2 = \frac{\left( \mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{X}_i \hat{\beta}_i \right)' \mathbf{M}_\tau \left( \mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{X}_i \hat{\beta}_i \right)}{(T - k - 1)}, \quad (2.11)$$

and  $\hat{\beta}_{WFE}$  is the weighted FE (WFE) pooled estimator of slope coefficients defined by

$$\hat{\beta}_{WFE} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{X}_i}{\hat{\sigma}_i^2} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{y}_i}{\hat{\sigma}_i^2}.$$

In the case where  $N$  is fixed and  $T$  tends to infinity, under  $H_0$  the Swamy statistic,  $\hat{S}$ , is asymptotically chi-square-distributed with  $k(N - 1)$  degrees of freedom.<sup>3</sup>

## 3 Dispersion Type Tests for Large Panels

Our survey of the literature suggests that there are no satisfactory tests of slope homogeneity in panels where  $N$  is large relative to  $T$ . The standard  $F$  test and its extension by Swamy (1970) are appropriate for panels where  $N$  is small relative to  $T$ . Hausman type tests advanced by Pesaran, Smith and Im (1996) apply to large  $N$  panels, but are not generally applicable and can suffer from low power. In this paper we propose standardized dispersion statistics that are asymptotically normally distributed as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ .

In addition to Swamy's test statistic,  $\hat{S}$ , defined by (2.10), we also consider the following version

$$\tilde{S} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \hat{\beta}_i - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE} \right)' \frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{X}_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2} \left( \hat{\beta}_i - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE} \right) \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\tilde{\sigma}_i^2$  is an estimator of  $\sigma_i^2$  based on  $\hat{\beta}_{FE}$ , namely

$$\tilde{\sigma}_i^2 = \frac{\left( \mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{X}_i \hat{\beta}_{FE} \right)' \mathbf{M}_\tau \left( \mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{X}_i \hat{\beta}_{FE} \right)}{T - 1}, \quad (3.2)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>See also Hsiao (2003, p.149).



and  $\tilde{\beta}_{WFE}$  is the weighted FE estimator also computed using  $\tilde{\sigma}_i^2$ , namely

$$\tilde{\beta}_{WFE} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \mathbf{X}_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \mathbf{y}_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2}. \quad (3.3)$$

Although the difference between  $\hat{S}$  and  $\tilde{S}$  might appear slight at first, the choice of the estimator of  $\sigma_i^2$  has important implications for the properties of the two dispersion tests as  $N$  and  $T$  tends to infinity.

To establish the asymptotic results for the Swamy's version of the dispersion test we need the following more restrictive version of Assumption 5:

**Assumption 5'**:  $\hat{\sigma}_i^2$  is a consistent estimator of  $\sigma_i^2$  such that

$$\frac{\sigma_i^2}{\hat{\sigma}_i^2} = 1 + O_p(T^{-1}), \quad (3.4)$$

and  $E(1/\hat{\sigma}_i^2)$  exists and is bounded.

We also note that under Assumptions 1-4

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}' \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} = O_p(1), \quad N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT} = \mathbf{Q}_N = O_p(1), \quad (3.5)$$

and

$$Avar \left( N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} \right) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT} \right) = \mathbf{Q} = O(1). \quad (3.6)$$

Consider first the Swamy's version of the dispersion test. Under  $H_0$  we have

$$\left( \hat{\beta}_i - \hat{\beta}_{WFE} \right) = T^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} - T^{-1/2} N^{-1/2} \left( N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT} \right)^{-1} \left( N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} \right), \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\mathbf{Q}_{iT}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}$  are given by (2.3). Using this result in (2.10) it is easily seen that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \hat{S} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}' \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}}{\hat{\sigma}_i^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}}{\sqrt{N}} \right)' \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}}{N} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}}{\sqrt{N}} \right).$$

In view of (3.5) and (3.6) and using (3.4) we have,

$$N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}' \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}' \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}}{\sigma_i^2} \right) + O_p \left( \frac{\sqrt{N}}{T} \right),$$

$$N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} + O_p \left( \frac{\sqrt{N}}{T} \right),$$

and

$$N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT} + O_p \left( \frac{1}{T} \right).$$

Hence (again using (3.5) and (3.6))

$$N^{-1/2}\hat{S} = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{iT} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}}{\sigma_i^2} \right) + O_p \left( \frac{\sqrt{N}}{T} \right) + O_p \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right),$$

or equivalently

$$N^{-1/2}\hat{S} = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{P}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i}{\sigma_i^2} \right) + O_p \left( \frac{\sqrt{N}}{T} \right) + O_p \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \right), \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$\mathbf{P}_i = \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{X}_i (\mathbf{X}'_i \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{X}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{X}'_i \mathbf{M}_\tau. \quad (3.9)$$

Consider now our modified version of Swamy's statistic,  $\tilde{S}$ , which under  $H_0$  can be similarly written as

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \tilde{S} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{iT} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}}{\sqrt{N}} \right)' \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}}{N} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}}{\sqrt{N}} \right). \quad (3.10)$$

Using (3.2) first note that after some algebra under  $H_0$  we have

$$(T-1)\tilde{\sigma}_i^2 = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{M}_\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - 2N^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_N^{*'} \mathbf{Q}_N^{*-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} + N^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_N^{*'} \mathbf{Q}_N^{*-1} \mathbf{Q}_{iT} \mathbf{Q}_N^{*-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_N^*.$$

where

$$\mathbf{Q}_N^* = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{Q}_{iT}, \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}_N^* = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}.$$

But using results in (3.5) and (3.6) and recalling that  $0 < \sigma_i^2 < \infty$ , we also have<sup>4</sup>

$$\mathbf{Q}_N^* = O_p(1), \quad \boldsymbol{\xi}_N^* = O_p(1).$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{\sigma}_i^2 = \frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{M}_\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i}{T-1} + O_p \left( N^{-1/2} T^{-1} \right). \quad (3.11)$$

It is also clear from (3.11) that for  $N$  sufficiently large  $\tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2}$  has second order moments for any  $T$  so long as Assumption 5 is satisfied. Therefore, under Assumptions 2 and 3 the second order moments of  $\tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}$  will exist for  $N$  large and we have

$$\begin{aligned} N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}'_{iT} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} &= N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{M}_\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i}{T-1} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}'_{iT} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} + O_p(T^{-1}), \\ N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} &= N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{M}_\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i}{T-1} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} + O_p(T^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>4</sup>Note that by assumption  $\mathbf{Q}_{iT}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT}$  have finite second order moments.

and

$$N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{M}_T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i}{T-1} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{iT} + O_p \left( N^{-1/2} T^{-1} \right).$$

Using these results in (3.10)

$$N^{-1/2} \tilde{S} = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{M}_T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i}{T-1} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}'_{iT} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} + O_p \left( T^{-1} \right) + O_p \left( N^{-1/2} \right),$$

or equivalently, since  $\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{iT} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{iT} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{P}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$ ,

$$N^{-1/2} \tilde{S} = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N z_i + O_p \left( T^{-1} \right) + O_p \left( N^{-1/2} \right), \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$z_i = \left( \frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{M}_T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i}{T-1} \right)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{P}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i. \quad (3.13)$$

A comparison of (3.8) and (3.12) clearly shows that for  $N$  and  $T$  large the  $\tilde{S}$  version of the dispersion test could be preferable to the  $\hat{S}$  version since the latter requires  $N$  and  $T$  to increase at the same rates whilst the former does not necessarily require this condition. In fact, as we shall see below, in the case of strictly exogenous regressors the slope homogeneity test based on  $\tilde{S}$  would be valid for  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ , whilst a test based on  $\hat{S}$ , in addition to  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$  would also require that  $\sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0$ . In the case of dynamic panels both versions of the dispersion test require the additional condition  $\sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0$ , and a bias-corrected bootstrapped test will be considered.

Before proceeding further we summarize the above results in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.1** *Consider the panel data model (2.1), and suppose that Assumptions 1-5 hold. Then the dispersion statistics  $\hat{S}$  and  $\tilde{S}$  defined by (2.10) and (3.1), respectively, can be written as*

$$N^{-1/2} \hat{S} = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{P}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i}{\sigma_i^2} \right) + O_p \left( N^{1/2} T^{-1} \right) + O_p \left( N^{-1/2} \right), \quad (3.14)$$

$$N^{-1/2} \tilde{S} = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N z_i + O_p \left( T^{-1} \right) + O_p \left( N^{-1/2} \right), \quad (3.15)$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_i$  and  $z_i$  are defined by (3.9) and (3.13), respectively.

This theorem is fairly general and applies irrespective of whether the regressors are strictly exogenous or contain lagged dependent variables, and holds for non-normal errors.

Consider now the case where the regressors are strictly exogenous and the errors are normally distributed,  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \sim IIDN(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{I}_T)$ . In this case  $\sigma_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_i \mathbf{P}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$  has a chi-square distribution with  $k$  degrees of freedom and the following standardized version of  $\hat{S}$  could be used when  $N$  and  $T$  are both large

$$\hat{\Delta} = \sqrt{N} \left( \frac{N^{-1} \hat{S} - k}{2k} \right). \quad (3.16)$$

Using (3.14) it is easily seen that

$$\hat{\Delta} = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\sigma_i^{-2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{P}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i - k}{2k} \right) + O_p \left( N^{1/2} T^{-1} \right) + O_p \left( N^{-1/2} \right),$$

and under  $H_0$ ,  $\hat{\Delta} \rightarrow_d N(0, 1)$  as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$  such that  $\sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0$ .

Turning to the  $\tilde{S}$  version of the test, using well known results in von Neumann (1941) on moments of the ratio of quadratic forms in standard normal variates, we first note that

$$E(z_i) = \frac{E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{P}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i)}{E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i) / (T-1)} = \frac{(T-1) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_i)}{\text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_\tau)} = k,$$

and

$$E(z_i^2) = \frac{E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{P}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{P}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i)}{E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i) / (T-1)^2} = \left( \frac{T-1}{T+1} \right) (k^2 + 2k),$$

so that

$$\text{var}(z_i) = v^2(T, k) = \frac{2k(T-1) - 2k^2}{T+1}. \quad (3.17)$$

These results, therefore, motivate the following standardized version of the  $\tilde{S}$  statistic

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \sqrt{N} \left( \frac{N^{-1} \tilde{S} - k}{v(T, k)} \right), \quad (3.18)$$

which in view of (3.15) can also be written as

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{z_i - k}{v(T, k)} \right) + O_p(T^{-1}) + O_p(N^{-1/2}).$$

Since  $(z_i - k)/v(T, k) \sim IID(0, 1)$ , using standard central limit theorems it follows that under  $H_0$ ,  $\tilde{\Delta} \rightarrow_d N(0, 1)$  as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ . The following theorem provides a formal statement of these results.

**Theorem 3.2** *Consider the panel data model (2.1), suppose that the  $k \times 1$  regressors  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  are strictly exogenous,  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \sim IIDN(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{I}_T)$ , and Assumptions 1-5 hold. Then under  $H_0$*

$$\hat{\Delta} \rightarrow_d N(0, 1), \text{ as } (N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty, \text{ such that } \sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0,$$

and

$$\tilde{\Delta} \rightarrow_d N(0, 1), \text{ as } (N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty,$$

where the standardized dispersion statistics,  $\hat{\Delta}$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}$  are defined by (3.16) and (3.18), respectively.

Under strictly exogenous regressors and normal errors the null distribution of the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  statistic does not depend on the relative expansion rates of  $N$  and  $T$ , whilst the same is not true of the Swamy version of the test. The differences between the two versions are, however, less clear cut as the exogeneity and the normality assumptions are relaxed. For example, if the normality assumption is relaxed, to eliminate the dependence of  $\tilde{\Delta}$  on the higher order moments of  $\varepsilon_{it}$ , we also need  $\sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0$ , as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ . This result is summarized in the following corollary to Theorem 3.2.

**Corollary 3.1** Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 3.2 are met, but the errors,  $\varepsilon_{it}$ , are not necessarily normally distributed. Instead assume that they are independently distributed over  $i$  and  $t$  and have finite fourth order moments. Then as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ ,  $\sqrt{N} \left( N^{-1} \tilde{S} - k \right) \rightarrow_d N(0, \text{var}(z_i))$ , if it is also required that  $\sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0$ , as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ . The finite  $T$  expression for  $\text{var}(z_i)$  in the case of non-normal errors would be rather complicated to obtain, but the result in (3.17) derived for the normal error case is likely to provide a reasonable approximation in practice.

See Appendix A.1 for a proof.

**Remark 3.1** The proposed testing approach can be readily extended to testing the homogeneity of a sub-set of slope coefficients. Consider the following partitioned form of (2.1):

$$\underset{T \times 1}{\mathbf{y}_i} = \alpha_i \underset{T \times 1}{\boldsymbol{\tau}_T} + \underset{T \times k_1}{\mathbf{X}_{i1}} \underset{T \times 1}{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i1}} + \underset{T \times k_2}{\mathbf{X}_{i2}} \underset{T \times 1}{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i2}} + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N,$$

or

$$\underset{T \times 1}{\mathbf{y}_i} = \underset{T \times (k_1+1)}{\mathbf{X}_{i1}^*} \underset{T \times 1}{\boldsymbol{\theta}_i} + \underset{T \times k_2}{\mathbf{X}_{i2}} \underset{T \times 1}{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i2}} + \varepsilon_i,$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_{i1}^* = (\boldsymbol{\tau}_T, \mathbf{X}_{i1})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = (\alpha_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i1})'$ . Suppose the slope homogeneity hypothesis of interest is given by

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i2} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_2, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (3.19)$$

Our version of the dispersion test statistic in this case is given by

$$\tilde{S}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{i2} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2,WFE} \right)' \frac{\mathbf{X}_{i2}' \mathbf{M}_{i1}^* \mathbf{X}_{i2}}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{i2} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2,WFE} \right),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{i2} &= (\mathbf{X}_{i2}' \mathbf{M}_{i1}^* \mathbf{X}_{i2})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{i2}' \mathbf{M}_{i1}^* \mathbf{y}_i, \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2,WFE} &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{X}_{i2}' \mathbf{M}_{i1}^* \mathbf{X}_{i2}}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{X}_{i2}' \mathbf{M}_{i1}^* \mathbf{y}_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2}, \\ \mathbf{M}_{i1}^* &= \mathbf{I}_T - \mathbf{X}_{i1}^* (\mathbf{X}_{i1}^{*'} \mathbf{X}_{i1}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{i1}^{*'}, \\ \tilde{\sigma}_i^2 &= \frac{(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{X}_{i2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2,FE})' \mathbf{M}_{i1}^* (\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{X}_{i2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2,FE})}{T_i - k_1 - 1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2,FE} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_{i2}' \mathbf{M}_{i1}^* \mathbf{X}_{i2} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_{i2}' \mathbf{M}_{i1}^* \mathbf{y}_i.$$

Using a similar line of reasoning as above, it is now easily seen that under  $H_0$  defined by (3.19)

$$\tilde{\Delta}_2 = \sqrt{N} \left( \frac{N^{-1} \tilde{S}_2 - k_2}{v(T, k_1, k_2)} \right) \rightarrow_d N(0, 1), \text{ as } (N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty,$$

where

$$v^2(T, k_1, k_2) = \frac{2k_2(T - k_1 - 1) - 2k_2^2}{T - k_1 + 1}.$$

**Remark 3.2** *The proposed slope homogeneity tests can also be extended to unbalanced panels. Denoting the number of time series observations on the  $i^{\text{th}}$  cross section by  $T_i$ , our version of the standardized dispersion statistic is given by*

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\tilde{d}_i - k}{v(T_i, k)} \right), \quad (3.20)$$

where

$$v^2(T_i, k) = \frac{2k(T_i - 1) - 2k^2}{T_i + 1},$$

$$\tilde{d}_i = \left( \hat{\beta}_i - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE} \right)' \frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{X}_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2} \left( \hat{\beta}_i - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE} \right),$$

$\mathbf{X}_i = (\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{x}_{i2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{iT_i})$ ,  $\mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} = \mathbf{I}_{T_i} - \tau_{T_i} (\tau_{T_i}' \tau_{T_i})^{-1} \tau_{T_i}'$  with  $\tau_{T_i}$  being a  $T_i \times 1$  vector of unity,

$$\hat{\beta}_i = (\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{X}_i)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{y}_i, \quad (3.21)$$

$$\tilde{\beta}_{WFE} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{X}_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2} \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{y}_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2}, \quad (3.22)$$

$\mathbf{y}_i = (y_{i1}, y_{i2}, \dots, y_{iT_i})'$

$$\tilde{\sigma}_i^2 = \frac{\left( \mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{X}_i \hat{\beta}_{FE} \right)' \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \left( \mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{X}_i \hat{\beta}_{FE} \right)}{T_i - 1},$$

and

$$\hat{\beta}_{FE} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{X}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{y}_i. \quad (3.23)$$

An extension to testing the homogeneity of a sub-set of slope coefficients in the case of the unbalanced panels is straightforward and is easily derived using the result in Remark 3.1.

### 3.1 Asymptotic Local Power of the $\tilde{\Delta}$ Test

For the analysis of the asymptotic power of the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test, we adopt the following local alternatives<sup>5</sup>

$$H_{1,NT} : \beta_i = \beta + \frac{\delta_i}{N^{1/4} T^{1/2}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (3.24)$$

where  $\delta_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  are  $k \times 1$  vectors of fixed constants. As we shall with  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , it is not necessary that  $\delta_i$  are non-zero for all  $i$ .

Under the above local alternatives and assuming that the regressors are strictly exogenous we have<sup>6</sup>

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{z_i - k}{v(T, k)} \right) + \frac{\psi_{NT}}{v(T, k)} + O_p(N^{-1/4}) + O_p(T^{-1}),$$

<sup>5</sup>Similar results also hold for the  $\hat{\Delta}$  version of the test.

<sup>6</sup>For a proof see Appendix A.2.

where

$$\psi_{NT} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \tilde{\delta}_i' \mathbf{Q}_{iT} \tilde{\delta}_i - \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \tilde{\delta}_i' \mathbf{Q}_{iT} \right) \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT} \tilde{\delta}_i \right).$$

Hence, it readily follows that under  $H_{1,NT}$

$$\tilde{\Delta} \rightarrow_d N \left( \frac{\psi}{\sqrt{2k}}, 1 \right), \text{ as } (N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty,$$

where

$$\psi = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-2} \delta_i' \mathbf{Q}_i \delta_i - \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-2} \delta_i' \mathbf{Q}_i \right) \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_i \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_i \delta_i \right) \right\}.$$

Recall that  $\mathbf{Q}_i = p \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (T^{-1} \mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \mathbf{X}_i)$ . The  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test has power against local alternatives if  $\psi > 0$ . Since  $\mathbf{Q}_i$  is a symmetric positive definite matrix, using the Cholesky decomposition,  $\mathbf{Q}_i = \mathbf{C}_i' \mathbf{C}_i$ , and setting  $\tilde{\delta}_i = \mathbf{C}_i \delta_i / \sigma_i$ , and  $\mathbf{W}_i = \sigma_i^{-1} \mathbf{C}_i$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\delta}_i' \tilde{\delta}_i - \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\delta}_i' \mathbf{W}_i \right) \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{W}_i' \mathbf{W}_i \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{W}_i' \tilde{\delta}_i \right) \right\} \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\delta}_i' \tilde{\delta}_i - \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\delta}_i' \mathbf{W}_i \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{W}_i' \mathbf{W}_i \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{W}_i' \tilde{\delta}_i \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\tilde{\delta} = (\tilde{\delta}_1', \tilde{\delta}_2', \dots, \tilde{\delta}_N')'$ , and  $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{W}_1', \mathbf{W}_2', \dots, \mathbf{W}_N')'$ , and write  $\psi$  as

$$\psi = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\tilde{\delta}' \mathbf{M}_w \tilde{\delta}}{N} \right),$$

where  $\mathbf{M}_w = \mathbf{I}_T - \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{W}'\mathbf{W})^{-1}\mathbf{W}'$ . Hence,  $\psi \geq 0$ , and in general the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test is asymptotically powerful if  $\delta_i \neq 0$  for a non-zero fraction of the cross section units in the limit, as specified under Assumption 6. Such an alternative, for example, allows a sub-set of the slope coefficients and/or a sub-set of cross section units to be homogeneous.

The above result also suggests that the power of the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test is likely to increase faster with  $T$  than with  $N$ .

## 4 Testing Slope Homogeneity in Autoregressive Models

Consider the stationary  $p^{th}$  order autoregressive (AR( $p$ )) processes

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_{ij} y_{i,t-j} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (4.1)$$

$i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , where the roots of the characteristic equation  $1 = \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_{ij} x^j$ , fall outside the unit circle, and assume that  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim IIDN(0, \sigma_i^2)$ . Testing the homogeneity of the slopes

$$H_0 : \lambda_{ij} = \lambda_j \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, N \text{ and } j = 1, 2, \dots, p, \quad (4.2)$$

can be carried out as computing the dispersion statistic, (3.1), with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{X}_i &= (\mathbf{y}_{i,-1}, \mathbf{y}_{i,-2}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{i,-p}), \\ \mathbf{y}_{i,-j} &= (y_{i,-j+1}, y_{i,-j+2}, \dots, y_{i,T-j})', \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, p.\end{aligned}$$

Using standard results from the literature of stationary autoregressive processes, it is easily established that Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied in the case of stationary autoregressive processes, and as a result Theorem 3.1 continues to hold in this case as well. In particular we have

$$N^{-1/2}\tilde{S} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N z_i + O_p(T^{-1}) + O_p(N^{-1/2}), \quad (4.3)$$

where  $z_i$  is defined by (3.13), with  $\mathbf{X}_i = (\mathbf{y}_{i,-1}, \mathbf{y}_{i,-2}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{i,-p})$ . However, in the case of AR processes exact expressions for the mean and variance of  $z_i$  are not easy to derive, and more importantly such exact results would in general depend on the unknown autoregressive coefficients,  $\lambda_{ij}$ , which further complicates any test that is directly based on the Swamy statistic,  $\tilde{S}$ . To deal with this problem we explore two alternative approaches. (i) An asymptotic procedure where  $E(z_i)$  and  $Var(z_i)$  are approximated by terms of up to order  $T^{-1}$ . (ii) A bootstrap approach where the small sample dependence of  $E(z_i)$  and  $Var(z_i)$  on  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i = (\lambda_{i1}, \lambda_{i2}, \dots, \lambda_{ip})'$  is taken into account using re-sampling techniques based on bias-corrected estimates of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_i$ .

#### 4.1 An Asymptotic $\tilde{\Delta}$ Test for AR( $p$ ) Panel Data Models

In the case of dynamic models the two versions of the dispersion tests,  $\hat{\Delta}$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}$ , are asymptotically equivalent. Consider the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  version of the test and using (3.9) in (3.13) first note that

$$z_i = \frac{\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \mathbf{X}_i}{\sqrt{T}}\right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \mathbf{X}_i}{T}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i}{\sqrt{T}}\right)}{(T-1)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i' \mathbf{M}_T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i}. \quad (4.4)$$

Since (4.1) is a stationary process it then readily follows that under  $H_0$

$$z_i \rightarrow_d \chi_p^2, \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore, it is reasonable to conjecture that up to order  $T^{-1}$ ,  $E(z_i)$  and  $Var(z_i)$  are given by  $p$  and  $2p$ , respectively. The proof of this conjecture turns out to be quite complicated. A rigorous proof is given in Appendix A.3 for the AR(1) case where it is established that indeed

$$E(z_i) = 1 + O(T^{-1}).$$

Supposing now that this result holds more generally, namely

$$E(z_i) = p + O(T^{-1}), \quad (4.5)$$

and write (4.3) as

$$\sqrt{N} \left( \frac{N^{-1}\tilde{S} - p}{v_z} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{z_i - E(z_i)}{v_z} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\sqrt{N}[E(z_i) - p]}{v_z} + O_p(T^{-1}),$$



where  $Var(z_i) = v_z^2$ . Hence, using (4.5) we have

$$\sqrt{N} \left( \frac{N^{-1}\tilde{S} - p}{v_z} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{z_i - E(z_i)}{v_z} \right) + O \left( \frac{\sqrt{N}}{T} \right) + O_p(T^{-1}).$$

Under  $H_0$ , the first term in this expression is scaled sums of i.i.d. random variables and tends to  $N(0, 1)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, under Assumptions 1-4, and assuming that (4.5) holds, we have (under  $H_0$ ):

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \sqrt{N} \left( \frac{N^{-1}\tilde{S} - p}{\sqrt{2p}} \right) \rightarrow_d N(0, 1) \text{ as } (N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty, \text{ such that } \frac{\sqrt{N}}{T} \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.6)$$

One important implication of this result is that the test is valid even when  $N$  increases faster than  $T$ , so long as  $\sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0$ . The  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test is clearly more restrictive when applied to dynamic models and requires  $T$  to be sufficiently large so that the small sample bias of  $E(z_i)$  and  $Var(z_i)$  become negligible relative to  $\sqrt{N}$ .

## 4.2 Bias-Corrected Bootstrap Tests of Slope Homogeneity for the AR(1) Model

One possible way of improving over the asymptotic test developed for the AR models would be to follow the recent literature and use bootstrap techniques.<sup>7</sup> Here we make use of a bias-corrected version of the recursive bootstrap procedure.<sup>8</sup>

One of the main problems in application of bootstrap techniques to dynamic models in small  $T$  samples is the fact that the OLS estimates of the individual coefficients,  $\lambda_i$ , or their FE (or WFE) counterparts are biased when  $T$  is small; a bias that persists with  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . To deal with this problem we focus on the AR(1) case and use the bias-corrected version of  $\tilde{\lambda}_{WFE}$  as proposed by Hahn and Kuersteiner (2002).<sup>9</sup> Denoting the bias-corrected version of  $\tilde{\lambda}_{WFE}$  by  $\circ$ , we have

$$\hat{\lambda}_{WFE} = \tilde{\lambda}_{WFE} + \frac{1}{T} \left( 1 + \tilde{\lambda}_{WFE} \right), \quad (4.7)$$

and estimate the associated intercepts as

$$\hat{\alpha}_{i,WFE} = \bar{y}_i - \hat{\lambda}_{WFE} \bar{y}_{i,-1},$$

where  $\bar{y}_i = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T y_{it}$ , and  $\bar{y}_{i,-1} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T y_{i,t-1}$ . The residuals are given by

$$\hat{e}_{it} = y_{it} - \hat{\alpha}_{i,WFE} - \hat{\lambda}_{WFE} y_{i,t-1},$$

with the associated bias-corrected estimator of  $\sigma_i^2$  given by  $\hat{\sigma}_i^2 = (T-1)^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it})^2$ . The  $b^{th}$  bootstrap sample,  $y_{it}^{(b)}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  can now be generated as

$$y_{it}^{(b)} = \hat{\alpha}_{i,WFE} + \hat{\lambda}_{WFE} y_{i,t-1}^{(b)} + \hat{\sigma}_i \zeta_{it}^{(b)}, \text{ for } t = 1, 2, \dots, T,$$

<sup>7</sup>For example, see Beran (1988), Horowitz (1994), Li and Maddala (1996) and Bun (2004), although none of these authors make any bias corrections in their bootstrapping procedures.

<sup>8</sup>Bias-corrected estimates are also used in the literature on the derivation of the bootstrap confidence intervals to generate the bootstrap samples in dynamic AR( $p$ ) models. See Kilian (1998), among others.

<sup>9</sup>Bias corrections for the OLS estimates of individual  $\lambda_i$  are provided by Marriott and Pope (1954), and further elaborated by Kendall (1954) and Orcutt and Winokur (1969). Bias corrections for the OLS estimates in the case of higher order AR processes are provided in Shaman and Stine (1988). No bias corrections seem to be available for FE or WFE estimates of AR( $p$ ) panel data models in the case of  $p \geq 2$ .

where  $y_{i0}^{(b)} = y_{i0}$ , and  $\zeta_{it}^{(b)}$  are random draws with replacements from the set of pooled standardized residuals,  $\hat{e}_{it}/\hat{\sigma}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , and  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ . With  $y_{it}^{(b)}$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  the bootstrap statistics

$$\tilde{\Delta}^{(b)} = \sqrt{N} \left( \frac{N^{-1} \tilde{S}^{(b)} - 1}{\sqrt{2}} \right), \quad b = 1, 2, \dots, B,$$

can be computed using (3.1) to obtain the bootstrap p-values

$$p_B = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B I(\tilde{\Delta}^{(b)} - \Delta),$$

where  $B$  is the number of bootstrap sample,  $I(A)$  takes the value of unity if  $A > 0$  or zero otherwise, and  $\tilde{\Delta}$  is the standardized dispersion statistic applied to the actual observations. If  $p_B < 0.05$ , say, we reject the null hypothesis of slope homogeneity.

## 5 Finite Sample Properties of Slope Homogeneity Tests

In this section we shall use Monte Carlo techniques to evaluate the finite sample properties of the alternative tests of slope homogeneity. We shall focus on our proposed test,  $\tilde{\Delta}$  defined by (3.18) and compare its performance to the Swamy and Hausman tests of slope homogeneity. We also considered the  $G$  test of Phillips and Sul (2003), but the  $G$  statistic could not be computed due to the singularity problem discussed in Section 2.3.<sup>10</sup> The Swamy's  $\hat{S}$  statistic is defined by (2.10) which we consider to be distributed as  $\chi_{k(N-1)}^2$  under  $H_0$ . For the Hausman test (called  $H$  test) we make use of the following statistic<sup>11</sup>

$$H = \left( \hat{\beta}_{MG} - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE} \right)' \hat{\mathbf{V}}_H^{-1} \left( \hat{\beta}_{MG} - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE} \right) \stackrel{a}{\sim} \chi_k^2, \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\hat{\beta}_{MG}$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_{WFE}$  are given by (2.8) and (3.3), respectively, and

$$\hat{\mathbf{V}}_H = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{\sigma}_i^2 (\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{X}_i)^{-1} - \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{X}_i' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{X}_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i^2} \right)^{-1}, \quad (5.2)$$

with  $\hat{\sigma}_i^2$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}_i^2$  being defined by (2.11) and (3.2), respectively. We report empirical size and power of these tests at 5% nominal level, for various pairs of  $N$  and  $T$ , including cases where  $N$  is much larger than  $T$  which is often encountered with micro data sets, as well as when  $T > N$  which is more prevalent in the case of macro data sets. We consider panels with strictly exogenous regressors, as well as simple dynamic panels.

Initially, we consider the following simple data generating process (DGP):

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_i x_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N,$$

---

<sup>10</sup>In e-mail correspondences Dr. Sul has confirmed to us that there is an error in equation (27) in Phillips and Sul (2003) that defines the  $G$  statistic.

<sup>11</sup>We also tried a number of other variants of the Hausman test. But they all performed very similarly.

where  $\alpha_i \sim N(1, 1)$ , with  $x_{it}$  generated as

$$x_{it} = \alpha_i(1 - \rho_i) + \rho_i x_{it-1} + (1 - \rho_i^2)^{1/2} v_{it}, \quad t = -49, \dots, 0, \dots, T, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad (5.3)$$

where  $\rho_i \sim IIDU(0.05, 0.95)$ ,  $v_{it} \sim IIDN(0, \sigma_{ix}^2)$  with  $\sigma_{ix}^2 \sim IID\chi^2(1)$ .  $\rho_i$  and  $\sigma_{ix}^2$  are fixed across replications. The first 50 observations are discarded to reduce the effect of initial value on the generated values of  $x_{it}$ .  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim IID(0, \sigma_i^2)$  is drawn from (i) standard normal distribution and (ii)  $(\chi^2(2) - 2)/2$ , and  $\sigma_i^2 \sim IID\chi^2(2)/2$ . Under the null hypothesis,  $\beta_i = 1$  for all  $i$ , and under the alternative hypothesis,  $\beta_i = 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, [2N/3]$ , and  $\beta_j \sim N(1, 0.04)$ , for  $j = [2N/3] + 1, \dots, N$ , where  $[2N/3]$  is the nearest integer value.  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\beta_i$ , and  $\sigma_i^2$  are fixed across replications. All combinations of  $T = 10, 20, 30, 50, 100, 200$  and  $N = 20, 30, 50, 100, 200$  are used as sample sizes.

For examining empirical size and power of the tests in the case of regression models with different numbers of covariates, the following DGP is used:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \sum_{\ell=1}^k x_{it\ell} \beta_{i\ell} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T,$$

where, as before,  $\alpha_i \sim IIDN(1, 1)$ ,  $x_{it\ell}$  is generated as specified in (5.3),  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim IIDN(0, \sigma_i^2)$ ,  $\sigma_i^2 \sim IID(k\chi^2(2)/2)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, 4$ , so that the population  $R^2$  of individual equations in the panel are invariant to the number of included regressors. Under the null hypothesis  $\beta_{i\ell} = 1$  for all  $i$  and  $\ell$ , and under the alternative hypothesis we set  $\beta_{i1} \sim IIDN(1, 0.04)$  and  $\beta_{i\ell} = \beta_{i1}$  for  $\ell = 2, 3, 4$ .  $\alpha_i$ ,  $x_{it\ell}$ ,  $\beta_{i\ell}$ , and  $\sigma_i^2$  are fixed across replications. For these experiments the sample sizes being considered are the combinations of  $T = 20, 30$  and  $N = 20, 30, 50, 100, 200$ .

In the case of dynamic models, two specifications are considered. The first is the AR(1) specification

$$y_{it} = (1 - \lambda_i) \alpha_i + \lambda_i y_{it-1} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad t = -49, \dots, 0, \dots, T, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N,$$

where  $\alpha_i \sim N(1, 1)$ ,  $\lambda_i$  is specified as (i)  $\lambda_i = \lambda = 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 0.9$  under the null hypothesis, and (ii)  $\lambda_i \sim IIDU(\lambda - 0.2, \lambda + 0.2)$  for  $\lambda = 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8$  and  $\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.0, 1.0)$ , under the alternative hypothesis.  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim IIDN(0, \sigma_i^2)$  with  $\sigma_i^2 \sim IID\chi^2(2)/2$ .  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\lambda_i$ , and  $\sigma_i^2$  are fixed across replications. The first 49 observations are discarded. For these experiments, we consider the combinations of sample sizes  $N$  and  $T = 20, 30, 50, 100, 200$ . For bootstrap, 499 bootstrap samples are generated and the combinations of the sample sizes  $T = 20, 30, 50$  and  $N = 20, 30, 50, 100, 200$  are considered.

The second dynamic DGP is:

$$y_{it} = (1 - \lambda_{i1} - \lambda_2) \alpha_i + \lambda_{i1} y_{it-1} + \lambda_2 y_{it-2} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad t = -49, \dots, 0, \dots, T, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where  $\alpha_i \sim N(1, 1)$ ,  $\lambda_2 = 0.2$ , and (i)  $\lambda_{i1} = 0.6$  for all  $i$  under the null hypothesis, and (ii)  $\lambda_{i1} \sim IIDU(0.4, 0.8)$  under the alternative.  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim IIDN(0, \sigma_i^2)$  with  $\sigma_i^2 \sim IID\chi^2(2)/2$ .  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\lambda_{i1}$ , and  $\sigma_i^2$  are fixed across replications. The first 48 observations are discarded. For these experiments, we consider the combinations of sample sizes  $N$  and  $T = 20, 30, 50, 100, 200$ .

For all experiments 2,000 replications are used.

## 5.1 Results

Tables 1 to 3 summarize the results for the DGP with strictly exogenous regressors. First, as predicted by the asymptotic theory, Swamy's  $\hat{S}$  test tends to over-reject when  $N$  is small relative to  $T$ , with the extent of over-rejection diminishing as  $T$  is increased relative to  $T$ . In the case of

$T = 20$  and  $N = 200$ , more typical of micro data sets, the empirical size of the  $\hat{S}$  test is as much as 34%, and only approaches its nominal size of 5% when  $T$  is increased to 200. The standardized dispersion test,  $\tilde{\Delta}$ , and the Hausman test,  $H$ , both have correct sizes. The power of the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test also seems to be satisfactory. However, as our theory predicts, the  $H$  test has no power in the case of these experiments. Table 2 suggests that the effect of non-normal errors might not be very important for the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test. Size and power estimates in Tables 1 and 2 are very similar. Even when  $N = 200$  and  $T = 10$ , where Corollary 3.1 predicts that the effects of error non-normality can be most serious for the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test, the empirical size of the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test is 4.50%. Table 3 reports the size and power of the tests in the case of regression models with different numbers of covariates,  $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . The results are similar to those provided in Table 1, although, considering that we have controlled for the overall fit of the regressions, the power of the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test decreases as  $k$  increases.

The results for the dynamic DGPs are given in Tables 4 and 5. In the case of these experiments the  $H$  test is not valid, and the  $\hat{S}$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}$  tests are asymptotically equivalent and their validity requires that  $\sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0$  as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$ . The results of the Monte Carlo experiments are in line with our theoretical findings. The  $H$  statistic is often negative, particularly for values of  $\lambda$  below 0.4, and in cases where it is positive (and hence applicable), the  $H$  test exhibits serious over-rejections. The dispersion tests have satisfactory sizes for most combinations of  $N$  and  $T$ , so long as  $\lambda$  is relatively small, namely  $\lambda \leq 0.4$ . For these values of  $\lambda$  the  $\hat{S}$  test tends to be more powerful than the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test. The  $\hat{S}$  test starts to over-reject as  $\lambda$  is increased to 0.6 and beyond. By comparison, the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test only shows evidence of significant over-rejection when  $\lambda$  is increased to 0.9 and only for values of  $N$  that are considerably larger than  $T$ . For the value of  $\lambda$  in the range of 0.6 to 0.8, the size of the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test continues to be close to its nominal value for all  $N$  and  $T$ . The same table also illustrates that the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test has reasonable power. Under the alternatives of  $\lambda_i \sim IIDU(\lambda - 0.2, \lambda + 0.2)$ , the power increases as  $\lambda$  increases, purely because the explanatory power of the estimated model increases. A power comparison of the  $\hat{S}$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}$  tests for values of  $\lambda \geq 0.6$  is complicated by the over-rejection tendency of the former test. Table 5 reports the performance of the tests for the heteroskedastic AR(2) case. Basically the results are similar to those summarized in Table 4 for the AR(1) case.

Table 6 compares the standard normal approximation, (conventional) bootstrap approximation, and Hahn and Kuersteiner (2002) bias-corrected bootstrap approximation of the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test.<sup>12</sup> The bias-corrected bootstrap procedure controls the size remarkably well, even when the value of  $\lambda$  is above 0.8. On the other hand, the conventional bootstrap (non-bias-corrected version) fails to reduce the size distortion of the test. Except when  $\lambda = 0.2$  and  $T = 20$ , the bias-corrected bootstrap method yields reasonable power.

Therefore, in practice, when  $N \leq T$  and it is believed that  $\lambda$  is not close to unity (say the value of  $\lambda$  is below 0.8), the asymptotic version of the  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test is recommended. For all  $N$  and  $T$ , and with the value of  $\lambda$  around 0.9, the Hahn and Kuersteiner (2002) bias-corrected bootstrapped  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test seems to be more appropriate.

## 6 Application: Testing Slope Homogeneity in Earnings Dynamics

In this section we examine the slope homogeneity of the dynamic earnings equations using the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) data set used in Meghir and Pistaferri (2004). Briefly, these authors select male heads aged 25 to 55 with at least nine years of usable earnings data. The

---

<sup>12</sup>A bias-corrected bootstrapped test based on  $\hat{S}$  could also be considered, but was not pursued as we expected it to perform very similarly to the bias-corrected bootstrapped test based on  $\tilde{\Delta}$ .

selection process leads to a sample of 2,069 individuals and 31,631 individual-year observations. We further select the individuals who have at least 15 observations, and this leaves us with 1,031 individuals and 19,992 individual-year observations. Following Meghir and Pistaferri (2004), we also categorize the individuals into three education groups: High School Dropouts (HSD, those with less than 12 grades of schooling), High School Graduates (HSG, those with at least a high school diploma, but no college degree), and College Graduates (CLG, those with a college degree or more). In what follows the earning equations for the different educational backgrounds; HSD, HSG, and CLG are denoted by the superscripts  $e = 1, 2$ , and  $3$ , and for the pooled sample by  $0$ . The number of individuals in the three categories are  $N^{(1)} = 249$ ,  $N^{(2)} = 531$ , and  $N^{(3)} = 251$ . The panel is unbalanced with  $t = 1, \dots, T_i^{(e)}$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N^{(e)}$ , and an average time period of around 18 years.

In the research on earnings dynamics, it is standard to adopt a two-step procedure where in the first stage log of real earnings is regressed on a number of control variables such as age, race and year dummies. The dynamics are then modelled based on the residuals from this first stage regression. The use of the control variables and the grouping of the individuals by educational backgrounds is aimed at eliminating (minimizing) the effects of individual heterogeneities at the second stage.

It is, therefore, of interest to examine the extent to which the two-step strategy has been successful in dealing with the heterogeneity problem. With this in mind we follow closely the two-step procedure adopted by Meghir and Pistaferri (2004) and first run regressions of log real earnings,  $w_{it}^{(e)}$ , on the control variables: a square of “age” ( $AGE_{it}^{(e)2}$ ), race ( $WHITE_i^{(e)}$ ), year dummies ( $YEAR(t)$ ), region of residence ( $NE_{it}^{(e)}, CE_{it}^{(e)}, STH_{it}^{(e)}$ ), and residence in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, ( $SMSA_{it}^{(e)}$ ), for each education group  $e = 0, 1, 2, 3$ , separately.<sup>13</sup> The residuals from these regressions, which we denote by  $y_{it}^{(e)}$ , are then used in the second stage to estimate dynamics of the earnings process.

Specifically,

$$y_{it}^{(e)} = \alpha_i^{(e)} + \lambda^{(e)} y_{it-1}^{(e)} + \sigma_i^{(e)} \varepsilon_{it}^{(e)}, \quad e = 0, 1, 2, 3,$$

where within each education group  $\lambda^{(e)}$  is assumed to be homogeneous across the different individuals. Our interest is to test the hypothesis that  $\lambda^{(e)} = \lambda_i^{(e)}$  for all  $i$  in  $e$ .

The test results are given in the first panel of Table 7. The  $\hat{\Delta}$  statistics and the associated bootstrapped  $p$  values by education groups all lead to strong rejections of the homogeneity hypothesis. Judging by the size of the  $\hat{\Delta}$  statistics, the rejection is stronger for the pooled sample as compared to the sub-samples, confirming the importance of education as a discriminatory factor in the characterizations of heterogeneity of earnings dynamics across individuals. The test results also indicate the possibility of other statistically significant sources of heterogeneity within each of the education groups, and casts some doubt on the two-step estimation procedure adopted in the literature for dealing with heterogeneity; a point recently emphasized by Alvarez, Browning and Ejrnæs (2002).

In Table 7 we also provide a number of different FE estimates of  $\lambda^{(e)}$ ,  $e = 0, 1, 2, 3$ , on the assumption of within group slope homogeneity. Given the relatively small number of time series observations available (on average 18), the bias corrections to the FE estimates are quite large. The cross section error variance heterogeneity also plays an important role in this application, as can be seen from a comparison of FE and WFE estimates with the latter being larger. Focussing

---

<sup>13</sup>Log real earnings are computed as  $w_{it}^{(e)} = \ln(LABY_{it}^{(e)}/PCED_t)$ , where  $LABY_{it}^{(e)}$  is earnings in current US dollar, and  $PCED_t$  is the personal consumption expenditure deflator, base year 1992.

on the bias-corrected WFE estimates, we also observe that the persistence of earnings dynamics rises systematically from 0.52 in the case of the school drop outs to 0.72 for the college graduates. This seems sensible, and partly reflects the more reliable job prospects that are usually open to individuals with a higher level of education.

The homogeneity test results suggest that further efforts are needed also to take account of within group heterogeneity. One possibility would be to adopt a Bayesian approach, assuming that  $\lambda_i^{(e)}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N^{(e)}$  are draws from a common probability distribution and focus attention on the whole posterior density function of the persistent coefficients, rather than the average estimates that tend to divert attention from the heterogeneity problem. Another possibility would be to follow Alvarez, Browning and Ejrnæs (2002) and consider particular parametric functions, relating  $\lambda_i^{(e)}$  to individual characteristics as a way of capturing within group heterogeneity. Finally, one could consider a finer categorization of the individuals in the panel; say by further splitting of the education groups or by introducing new categories such as occupational classifications. The slope homogeneity tests provide an indication of the statistical importance of the heterogeneity problem, but are silent as how best to deal with the problem.

## 7 Concluding Remarks

In this paper we have developed simple tests of slope homogeneity in linear panel data models where  $N$  could be much larger than  $T$ . The proposed tests are based on modifications of Swamy's dispersion statistic and examine the cross section "dispersion" of individual slopes weighted by their relative precisions. It is shown that this test is valid when earlier tests based on Hausman (1978) procedure fail to be applicable. The Monte Carlo evidence shows that the proposed  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test has good small sample properties in the case of panel data models with strictly exogenous regressors even if  $N$  is much larger than  $T$ . The  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test has satisfactory performance for moderately large  $T$  and  $N$  of similar orders of magnitude in the case of stationary dynamic models, when the dominant root of the process is not close to unity. In cases where  $N$  is much larger than  $T$  and/or the dominant root of the dynamic process is near unity, a bias-corrected bootstrap procedure is proposed which seems to perform reasonably well based on Monte Carlo experiments.

The proposed tests are applied to testing the slope homogeneity of the dynamic earnings equations using PSID data, and the results show evidence of slope heterogeneity, even if attention is confined to the individuals with similar educational backgrounds.

An important further extension of the tests developed in this paper is to consider testing slope homogeneity in panel data models with multi-factor error structures recently examined in Pesaran (2004). This is, however, beyond the scope of the present paper.

## Appendix A: Mathematical Proofs

### A.1 Proof of Corollary 3.1

We first note, suppressing the subscript  $i$  to simplify the notations, that  $z_i$  defined by (3.13) can be write as

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \frac{\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{M}_\tau\mathbf{v}/(T-1)} = \frac{\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v}}{(1+W_T)} \\ &= \mathbf{v}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v} \left( 1 - W_T + \frac{W_T^2}{1+W_T} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where

$$W_T = \frac{\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{M}_\tau\mathbf{v}}{(T-1)} - 1,$$

$\mathbf{v} \sim IID(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_T)$  and  $\mathbf{P}$  is defined by (3.9). Note also that in this case  $\mathbf{P}$  is a function of strictly exogenous regressors and by Assumption 5  $E[1/(1+W_T)]$  is bounded.

By using the moments of the quadratic forms in i.i.d. random variables<sup>14</sup>

$$E(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v}) = k,$$

and

$$E[(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{M}_\tau\mathbf{v})] = \gamma_2 \text{tr}(\mathbf{P} \odot \mathbf{M}_\tau) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_\tau) + 2\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{M}_\tau),$$

where  $\gamma_2$  is the Pearson's measures of kurtosis, which is zero for normal distributions, and  $\odot$  signifies Hadamard product. Since  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{P} \odot \mathbf{M}_\tau) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{P} \odot \mathbf{I}_T - \mathbf{P} \odot T^{-1}\boldsymbol{\tau}_T\boldsymbol{\tau}_T') = T^{-1}(T-1)^{-1}k$ ,  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_\tau) = T-1$ ,  $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{M}_\tau = \mathbf{P}$ ,

$$E[(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{M}_\tau\mathbf{v})] = \gamma_2 \frac{T-1}{T}k + k(T-1) + 2k,$$

so that the expectation of the second term of (A.1) is

$$E[(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v})W_T] = \frac{\gamma_2 k}{T} + \frac{2k}{T-1},$$

which is  $O(T^{-1})$ . Also,

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v} \left( \frac{W_T^2}{1+W_T} \right)\right] &\leq E|\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v}| E|W_T^2| E\left| \frac{1}{1+W_T} \right| \\ &= O(T^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

since  $E|\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{P}\mathbf{v}| = O(1)$  and  $E|1/(1+W_T)| = O(1)$ , and  $E(W_T^2) = \gamma_2/T + 2/(T-1) = O(T^{-1})$ , using results in Appendix A.5 of Ullah (2004). Hence,

$$E(z_i) = k + O(T^{-1}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Using (3.15) note that

$$\sqrt{N}(N^{-1}\tilde{S} - k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N [z_i - E(z_i)] + \frac{\sqrt{N}}{T} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N T[E(z_i) - k] \right\} + O_p(T^{-1}).$$

However, in the light of (A.2) it is clear that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N T[k - E(z_i)] = O(1),$$

and if  $\sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0$  as  $(N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty$  it will also follows that

$$\sqrt{N}(N^{-1}\tilde{S} - k) \rightarrow_d N(0, \text{var}(z_i)) \text{ as } (N, T) \xrightarrow{j} \infty \text{ such that } \sqrt{N}/T \rightarrow 0.$$

■

---

<sup>14</sup>For example, see Appendix A.5 in Ullah (2004).

## A.2 Proof of Asymptotic Power

Under the local alternatives (defined by (3.24))

$$\beta_i = \beta + \frac{\delta_i}{N^{1/4}T^{1/2}},$$

we first note that<sup>15</sup>

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_i - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE}) = \kappa_{iNT} + \varkappa_{iNT},$$

where

$$\kappa_{iNT} = \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT}^{-1} \tilde{\xi}_{iT} - N^{-1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_N^{-1} \tilde{\xi}_N,$$

and

$$\varkappa_{iNT} = \frac{\delta_i}{N^{1/4}} - \frac{1}{N^{1/4}} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_N^{-1} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \delta_i}{N} \right),$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} = \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_{iT}, \quad \tilde{\xi}_{iT} = \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \xi_{iT}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_N = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT}, \quad \tilde{\xi}_N = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\xi}_{iT}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} N^{-1/2} \tilde{S} &= \frac{T}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{\beta}_i - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE})' \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} (\hat{\beta}_i - \tilde{\beta}_{WFE}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \kappa'_{iNT} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \kappa_{iNT} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \varkappa'_{iNT} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \varkappa_{iNT} \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \kappa'_{iNT} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \varkappa_{iNT}. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is the component of the test statistic that remains under the null hypothesis and is already shown to be given by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \kappa'_{iNT} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \kappa_{iNT} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N z_i + O_p(T^{-1}) + O_p(N^{-1/2}).$$

Similarly,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \kappa'_{iNT} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \varkappa_{iNT} = N^{-1/4} \left[ \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\xi}'_{iT} \delta_i}{\sqrt{N}} \right) - \tilde{\xi}'_N \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_N^{-1} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \delta_i}{N} \right) \right] = O_p(N^{-1/4}),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \varkappa'_{iNT} \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \varkappa_{iNT} = \psi_{NT},$$

where

$$\psi_{NT} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta'_i \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \delta_i - \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta'_i \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \right) \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_{iT} \delta_i \right).$$

Therefore

$$N^{-1/2} \tilde{S} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N z_i + \psi_{NT} + O_p(N^{-1/4}) + O_p(T^{-1}).$$

Using this result in (3.18) we have

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{z_i - k}{v(T, k)} \right) + \frac{\psi_{NT}}{v(T, k)} + O_p(N^{-1/4}) + O_p(T^{-1}),$$

as required. ■

---

<sup>15</sup>This relation generalizes (3.7).



### A.3 Derivation of $E(z_i)$ in the Case of AR(1) Models with Normal Errors

Suppressing the subscript  $i$  to simplify the notations, the AR(1) model is given by

$$y_t = \alpha(1 - \lambda) + \lambda y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where  $\alpha$  is bounded on a compact set,  $|\lambda| < 1$ ,  $\varepsilon_t \sim IIDN(0, \sigma^2)$  with  $0 < \sigma^2 < \infty$ , and it is assumed that the process is initialized with  $y_0 = \alpha + \varepsilon_0$ , and  $\varepsilon_0 \sim IIDN(0, \delta^2)$ . The choice of  $\delta$  depends on the initialization of the process and will be given by  $\delta = \sigma(1 - \lambda^2)^{-1/2}$  if the process has started at  $t = -M$ , with  $M \rightarrow \infty$ . For this model specification  $z$  defined in (3.13) can be written as

$$z = \frac{\left(T^{-1/2} \varepsilon' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{y}_{-1}\right)^2}{\left[(T-1)^{-1} \varepsilon' \mathbf{M}_\tau \varepsilon\right] \left(T^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{-1}' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{y}_{-1}\right)},$$

where  $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_T)'$ ,  $\mathbf{y}_{-1} = (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{T-1})'$ , and as before  $\mathbf{M}_\tau = \mathbf{I}_T - \boldsymbol{\tau}_T (\boldsymbol{\tau}_T' \boldsymbol{\tau}_T)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\tau}_T'$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_T$  being a  $T \times 1$  vector of unity.

Rewrite the AR(1) processes in matrix notations as

$$\mathbf{y}^* = \alpha \boldsymbol{\tau}_{T+1} + \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{v}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where  $\mathbf{y}^* = (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_T)'$ ,  $\mathbf{v} = (\varepsilon_0/\delta, \varepsilon_1/\sigma, \dots, \varepsilon_T/\sigma)'$  so that  $\mathbf{v} \sim N(\mathbf{0}_{T+1 \times 1}, \mathbf{I}_{T+1})$ ,  $\mathbf{0}_{T+1 \times 1}$  is a  $(T+1) \times 1$  vector of zeros,  $\mathbf{I}_{T+1}$  is an identity matrix of order  $T+1$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{T+1}$  is a  $(T+1) \times 1$  vector of ones,  $\mathbf{D}$  is a  $(T+1) \times (T+1)$  diagonal matrix with its first element equal to  $\delta$  and the remaining elements equal to  $\sigma$ , and

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -\lambda & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & -\lambda & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Also  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{G}_0 \mathbf{y}^*$ ,  $\mathbf{y}_{-1} = \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{y}^*$ , where  $\mathbf{G}_0 = (\mathbf{0}_{T \times 1}, \mathbf{I}_T)$  and  $\mathbf{G}_1 = (\mathbf{I}_T, \mathbf{0}_{T \times 1})$ . Hence, noting that  $\mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_1 \boldsymbol{\tau}_{T+1} = \mathbf{0}$  we have

$$z = \frac{(\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v})^2}{(\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{C} \mathbf{v})},$$

where

$$\mathbf{A} = \frac{\mathbf{G}_0' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{D}}{\sqrt{T}}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\mathbf{B} = \frac{\mathbf{G}_0' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_0}{T-1}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\mathbf{C} = \frac{\mathbf{D} \mathbf{B}^{-1'} \mathbf{G}_1' \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{D}}{T}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

**Proposition A.1** *Under the stationary AR(1) specification with normal errors given by (A.5), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} E(z) &= E \left( \frac{4(\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v})^2}{bc} - \frac{2(\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v})^2 (\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{v})}{b^2 c} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{2(\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v})^2 (\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{C} \mathbf{v})}{bc^2} + \frac{(\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{v})^2 (\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{v})(\mathbf{v}' \mathbf{C} \mathbf{v})}{b^2 c^2} \right) + O(T^{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$= 1 + O(T^{-1}), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where  $\mathbf{v}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}$  are defined in (A.6), (A.7), (A.8), (A.9), respectively, and  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}) = b (= 1)$ , and  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}) = c > 0$ .

**Proof.** Firstly we show (A.10), then (A.11). Define<sup>16</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}' \mathbf{B} \mathbf{v} &= b(1 + X_T), \\ \mathbf{v}' \mathbf{C} \mathbf{v} &= c(1 + Y_T), \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>16</sup>Note that  $b = 1$  and  $c$  is  $O(1)$ . See Appendix B.

where  $X_T = b^{-1}(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v} - b)$ ,  $Y_T = c^{-1}(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{C}\mathbf{v} - c)$ . We also note that since by the assumption  $\mathbf{v} \sim N(\mathbf{0}_{(T+1) \times 1}, \mathbf{I}_{T+1})$ , and  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  are symmetric positive semi-definite matrices with rank  $T - 1$ , then

$$E\left(\frac{b}{\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v}}\right) = O(1),$$

and

$$E\left(\frac{c}{\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{C}\mathbf{v}}\right) = O(1),$$

so long as  $T > 3$  (Smith 1988).

Also

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \frac{(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2}{bc} \left(1 - X_T + \frac{X_T^2}{1 + X_T}\right) \left(1 - Y_T + \frac{Y_T^2}{1 + Y_T}\right) \\ &= \frac{(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2}{bc} \left[ (1 - X_T)(1 - Y_T) + \frac{Y_T^2}{1 + Y_T} - \frac{X_T Y_T^2}{1 + Y_T} + \frac{X_T^2}{1 + X_T} - \frac{Y_T X_T^2}{1 + X_T} + \frac{Y_T^2 X_T^2}{(1 + X_T)(1 + Y_T)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  are symmetric positive semi-definite matrices, by Lemma B.1 in Appendix B

$$E[X_T^2] = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}^2)}{[\text{tr}(\mathbf{B})]^2} = O(T^{-1}), \quad E[Y_T^2] = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}^2)}{[\text{tr}(\mathbf{C})]^2} = O(T^{-1}),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} E[z] &= E\left[\frac{(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2}{bc} (1 - X_T)(1 - Y_T)\right] + O(T^{-1}) \\ &= E\left[\frac{4(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2}{bc} - \frac{2(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v})}{b^2 c} - \frac{2(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{C}\mathbf{v})}{bc^2} + \frac{(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{C}\mathbf{v})}{b^2 c^2}\right] \\ &\quad + O(T^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} E\left|\frac{(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2}{bc} \frac{Y_T^2}{1 + Y_T}\right| &< E\left|\frac{(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2}{bc}\right| E\left|\frac{1}{1 + Y_T}\right| E|Y_T^2| \\ &= O(E|Y_T^2|) = O(T^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E\left|\frac{(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2}{bc} \frac{X_T Y_T^2}{1 + X_T}\right| &< E\left|\frac{(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2}{bc}\right| E|X_T| E\left|\frac{1}{1 + X_T}\right| E|Y_T^2| \\ &= O(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly  $E\left[\left|b^{-1}c^{-1}(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2\right| \left[X_T^2(1 + X_T)^{-1}\right]\right]$  and  $E\left[\left|b^{-1}c^{-1}(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2\right| \left[Y_T X_T^2(1 + Y_T)^{-1}\right]\right]$  are at most  $O(T^{-1})$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} E\left|\frac{(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2}{bc} \frac{Y_T^2 X_T^2}{(1 + X_T)(1 + Y_T)}\right| &< E\left|\frac{(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2}{bc}\right| E\left|\frac{1}{1 + Y_T}\right| E\left|\frac{1}{1 + X_T}\right| E|Y_T^2| E|X_T^2| \\ &= O(E|Y_T^2| E|X_T^2|) = O(T^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Consider now (A.11). By using the moments of the quadratic forms in i.i.d. standard normal random variables<sup>17</sup>

$$E\left[(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2\right] = [\text{tr}(\mathbf{A})]^2 + \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2 + \mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}).$$

Using (B.2) in Appendix B

$$E\left[(\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v})^2\right] = c + O(T^{-1}).$$

---

<sup>17</sup>For example, see Appendix A.4 Ullah (2004).

Also, using results in Ullah (2004, Appendix A.4), together with (B.2) and (B.3) in Appendix B, and noting that  $tr(\mathbf{AC}) = tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ (\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{Av})^2 (\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{Cv}) \right] &= [tr(\mathbf{A})]^2 tr(\mathbf{C}) + 4tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{C}) + 2tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{AC}) + 2tr(\mathbf{AA}'\mathbf{C}) \\ &\quad + 4tr(\mathbf{A}) tr(\mathbf{AC}) + tr(\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{A}^2 + \mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) \\ &= tr(\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) + O(T^{-1}) \\ &= c^2 + O(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Next, again using results in Ullah (2004, Appendix A.4), together with (B.2) and (B.4) in Appendix B

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ (\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{Av})^2 (\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{Bv}) \right] &= [tr(\mathbf{A})]^2 tr(\mathbf{B}) + 4tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{B}) + 2tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{AB}) + 2tr(\mathbf{AA}'\mathbf{B}) \\ &\quad + 4tr(\mathbf{A}) tr(\mathbf{AB}) + tr(\mathbf{B}) tr(\mathbf{A}^2 + \mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) \\ &= tr(\mathbf{B}) tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) + O(T^{-1}) \\ &= bc + O(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using results in Ullah (2004, Appendix A.4), together with (B.2) - (B.6) in Appendix B,

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ (\varepsilon'\mathbf{A}\varepsilon)^2 (\varepsilon'\mathbf{B}\varepsilon) (\varepsilon'\mathbf{C}\varepsilon) \right] &= [tr(\mathbf{A})]^2 tr(\mathbf{B}) tr(\mathbf{C}) \\ &\quad + 8tr(\mathbf{A}) tr(\mathbf{ABC} + \mathbf{A}'\mathbf{BC}) \\ &\quad + tr(\mathbf{B}) [4tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{C}) + 2tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{AC}) + 2tr(\mathbf{AA}'\mathbf{C})] \\ &\quad + tr(\mathbf{C}) [4tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{B}) + 2tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{AB}) + 2tr(\mathbf{AA}'\mathbf{B})] \\ &\quad + 2tr(\mathbf{A}^2) tr(\mathbf{BC}) + 2tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) tr(\mathbf{BC}) + 8tr(\mathbf{AB}) tr(\mathbf{AC}) \\ &\quad + 2[tr(\mathbf{A})]^2 tr(\mathbf{BC}) + 4tr(\mathbf{A}) tr(\mathbf{B}) tr(\mathbf{AC}) + 4tr(\mathbf{A}) tr(\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{AB}) \\ &\quad + tr(\mathbf{B}) tr(\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{A}^2) + tr(\mathbf{B}) tr(\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) \\ &\quad + 8tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{BC}) + 8tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{ABC}) + 8tr(\mathbf{AA}'\mathbf{BC}) + 8tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{CB}) \\ &\quad + 8tr(\mathbf{ABAC}) + 4tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{BAC}) + 4tr(\mathbf{ABA}'\mathbf{C}) \\ &= tr(\mathbf{B}) tr(\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) + O(T^{-1}) \\ &= bc^2 + O(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can conclude

$$E(z) = 1 + O(T^{-1}),$$

as required. ■

## Appendix B: Lemmas

**Lemma B.1** Suppose  $\mathbf{H}$  is a  $(T \times T)$  symmetric positive semi-definite matrix with bounded eigenvalues where  $\nu_t(\mathbf{H}) \geq 0$  for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$ , where  $\nu_t(\mathbf{H}) = O(1)$ . Then,

$$\frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{H}^2)}{[\text{tr}(\mathbf{H})]^2} = O(T^{-1}). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

**Proof.** We first note that

$$\frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{H}^2)}{[\text{tr}(\mathbf{H})]^2} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t^2(\mathbf{H})}{\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t(\mathbf{H})\right)^2} = \frac{T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t^2(\mathbf{H})}{T \left(T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t(\mathbf{H})\right)^2}.$$

But

$$\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t(\mathbf{H})\right)^2 = \sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t^2(\mathbf{H}) + 2 \sum_{t > t'} \nu_t(\mathbf{H}) \nu_{t'}(\mathbf{H}),$$

so

$$\left(\sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t(\mathbf{H})\right)^2 \geq \sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t^2(\mathbf{H}).$$

Hence (B.1) allows considering that  $\sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t(\mathbf{H}) = O(T)$  and  $\sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t^2(\mathbf{H}) = O(T)$ . ■

**Lemma B.2** Consider the non-stochastic matrices  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}$ , and  $\mathbf{C}$  defined by (A.7), (A.8), and (A.9) in Appendix A.3, respectively. Then,

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}) = 1, \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}) = O(1), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}) = O(T^{-1/2}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2) = O(T^{-1}), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}) = O(T^{-1/2}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{C}) = O(T^{-1}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}) = O(T^{-1}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{C}) = O(T^{-1}), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}) = O(T^{-1}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}) = O(T^{-1}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}) = O(T^{-3/2}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{B}) = O(T^{-1}), \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}) = O(T^{-1}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}) = O(T^{-3/2}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}) = O(T^{-3/2}), \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{C}\mathbf{B}), \\ &\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{C}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{C}), \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}) \text{ are at most } O(T^{-2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

**Proof.**

We first note that

$$\mathbf{H}_{01} = \mathbf{G}'_0 \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{1 \times T} & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 1} \\ \mathbf{M}_\tau & \mathbf{0}_{T \times 1} \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\mathbf{G}'_0 \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 1} & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times T} \\ \mathbf{0}_{T \times 1} & \mathbf{M}_\tau \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{G}'_1 \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}_\tau & \mathbf{0}_{T \times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1 \times T} & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrices  $\mathbf{G}'_0 \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_0$  and  $\mathbf{G}'_1 \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_1$  are idempotent with two zero eigenvalues and  $T-1$  unit eigenvalues. Therefore, noting that  $\mathbf{B}$  is a lower triangular matrix with unit diagonal elements and  $\mathbf{D}$  is a diagonal matrix with  $\sigma_{\max} = \text{Max}(\sigma, \delta) < K < \infty$  we have, using (A.9),

$$0 \leq \nu_t(\mathbf{C}) \leq \frac{\sigma_{\max}}{T},$$

where  $\nu_t(\mathbf{C})$  for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, T$  are the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{C}$ . Also it is easily verified that

$$\mathbf{G}_0 \mathbf{G}'_0 = \mathbf{I}_T, \quad \mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

and

$$\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B} = \frac{\mathbf{B}'^{-1} \mathbf{G}'_1 \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_0 \mathbf{G}'_0 \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_0}{T^{1/2}(T-1)} = (T-1)^{-1} \mathbf{A}', \quad (\text{B.8})$$

[B.1]

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B} = (T-1)^{-1}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

To prove the results in (B.2), we first note that

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{B}) = 1, \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}) = \sum_{t=0}^T \nu_t(\mathbf{C}) \leq \frac{(T+1)\sigma_{\max}}{T} = O(1). \quad (\text{B.10})$$

Since  $\sigma_{\max}$  is bounded, to simplify the derivations and without loss of generality in what follows we set  $\delta = \sigma = 1$ , (so that  $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{I}_{T+1}$ ) and note that

$$\mathbf{B}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda^{T-1} & \lambda^{T-2} & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ \lambda^T & \lambda^{T-1} & \cdots & \lambda & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} &= T^{-1/2} \mathbf{G}'_0 \mathbf{M}_\tau \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{B}^{-1} \\ &= T^{-1/2} (\mathbf{E} - \mathbf{F}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

$$\mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda^{T-2} & \lambda^{T-3} & \cdots & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda^{T-1} & \lambda^{T-2} & \cdots & \lambda & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{F} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ g_{T-1} & g_{T-2} & \cdots & g_0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ g_{T-2} & g_{T-3} & \cdots & g_0 & 0 \\ g_{T-1} & g_{T-2} & \cdots & g_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$g_\ell = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} \lambda^j = \frac{1}{T} \left( \frac{1 - \lambda^{\ell+1}}{1 - \lambda} \right) = O(T^{-1}) \quad (\text{since } |\lambda| < 1), \text{ for } \ell = 0, 1, \dots, T-1.$$

Therefore,

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}) = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{T-2} g_\ell = \frac{-1}{T\sqrt{T}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{T-2} \left( \frac{1 - \lambda^{\ell+1}}{1 - \lambda} \right) = O(T^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Consider now  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2)$ . Using (B.11)

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2) = T^{-1} [\text{tr}(\mathbf{E}^2) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{F}^2) - 2\text{tr}(\mathbf{EF})]. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

But it is easily seen that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(\mathbf{E}^2) &= 0, \\ \text{tr}(\mathbf{F}^2) &= \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{T-1} g_\ell \right) \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{T-2} g_\ell \right) = O(1), \\ \text{tr}(\mathbf{EF}) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{T-3} \left( \frac{1 - \lambda^{T-\ell-2}}{1 - \lambda} \right) g_\ell = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\ell=0}^{T-3} \left( \frac{1 - \lambda^{T-\ell-2}}{1 - \lambda} \right) \left( \frac{1 - \lambda^{\ell+1}}{1 - \lambda} \right) = O(1), \end{aligned}$$

which together with (B.13) establishes that  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^2) = O(T^{-1})$ .

To prove the results in (B.3), we observe that<sup>18</sup>

$$\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{C}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}^2) = \sum_{t=0}^T \nu_t^2(\mathbf{C}) \leq \frac{\sigma_{\max}}{T} = O(T^{-1}).$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$[\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C})]^2 \leq \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{C}) = \text{tr}([\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}]^2) \text{tr}(\mathbf{C}^2) = [\text{tr}(\mathbf{C}^2)]^2,$$

---

<sup>18</sup>Recall that  $\mathbf{C}' = \mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}$ .

which establishes  $|tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C})| = O(T^{-1})$ . Similarly, again by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and noting that  $\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C}$ ,

$$[tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{C})]^2 \leq tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}') tr(\mathbf{C}^2) = tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{C}^2),$$

which establishes  $|tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{C})| = O(T^{-1})$ . To derive the order of  $tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C})$ , again by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$[tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C})]^2 \leq tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) tr(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{C}) = tr(\mathbf{C})tr(\mathbf{C}^2).$$

Therefore, since  $tr(\mathbf{C}) = O(1)$ , it follows that  $|tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C})| = O(T^{-1/2})$ .

To establish the results in (B.4), by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$[tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{B})]^2 \leq tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{B}^2).$$

But

$$tr(\mathbf{B}^2) = \frac{tr[(\mathbf{G}'_0\mathbf{M}_\tau\mathbf{G}_0)^2]}{(T-1)^2} = \frac{tr[(\mathbf{G}'_0\mathbf{M}_\tau\mathbf{G}_0)]}{(T-1)^2} = \frac{1}{T-1} = O(T^{-1}),$$

hence,  $|tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{B})| = O(T^{-1})$ . Similarly,

$$[tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B})]^2 = [tr(\mathbf{C}\mathbf{B})]^2 \leq tr(\mathbf{C}^2) tr(\mathbf{B}^2) = O(T^{-2}),$$

which establishes  $|tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B})| = O(T^{-1})$ . Using (B.9)

$$tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}) = (T-1)^{-1}tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) = (T-1)^{-1}tr(\mathbf{C}) = O(T^{-1}).$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}) &= T^{-1/2}(T-1)^{-1}tr(\mathbf{G}'_0\mathbf{M}_\tau\mathbf{G}_1\mathbf{B}'^{-1}\mathbf{G}'_0\mathbf{M}_\tau\mathbf{G}_0) \\ &= T^{-1/2}(T-1)^{-1}tr(\mathbf{G}'_0\mathbf{M}_\tau\mathbf{G}_1\mathbf{B}'^{-1}) = \frac{1}{T-1}tr(\mathbf{A}) = O(T^{-3/2}). \end{aligned}$$

To prove the results in (B.5), a further application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}$  now yields

$$\begin{aligned} [tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C})]^2 &\leq tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) tr(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}) = tr(\mathbf{C})tr(\mathbf{B}^2\mathbf{C}^2), \\ [tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C})]^2 &\leq tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') tr(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}) = tr(\mathbf{C})tr(\mathbf{B}^2\mathbf{C}^2). \end{aligned}$$

But as easily seen

$$[tr(\mathbf{B}^2\mathbf{C}^2)]^2 \leq tr(\mathbf{B}^4) tr(\mathbf{C}^4) \leq O(T^{-6})$$

so that

$$|tr(\mathbf{B}^2\mathbf{C}^2)| \leq O(T^{-3}),$$

and hence

$$|tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C})| = O(T^{-3/2}), \text{ and } |tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C})| = O(T^{-3/2}).$$

Similarly,

$$[tr(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C})]^2 \leq tr(\mathbf{B}^2) tr(\mathbf{C}^2) = O(T^{-2}),$$

and  $|tr(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C})| = O(T^{-1})$ .

Finally, the various higher order terms in (B.6) can be established following similar lines. Firstly,

$$tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}) = tr(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}^2) \leq tr(\mathbf{B}^2)tr(\mathbf{C}^4) = O(T^{-4}),$$

so that  $|tr(\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}^2)| = O(T^{-2})$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} [tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C})]^2 &\leq tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{C}^2\mathbf{B}^2) = O(T^{-4}), \\ [tr(\mathbf{A}^2\mathbf{C}\mathbf{B})]^2 &\leq tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{C}^2\mathbf{B}^2) = O(T^{-4}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$[tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{C})]^2 \leq tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{A}') tr(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{C}) = tr(\mathbf{B}^2\mathbf{C}) tr(\mathbf{C}^3) = O(T^{-4}).$$

Furthermore,

$$[tr(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C})]^2 = [tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{A})]^2 \leq tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{A}) tr(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{C}\mathbf{A}) = tr(\mathbf{B}^2\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') tr(\mathbf{C}^2\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} [\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{C})]^2 &\leq \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{A}) \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{C}) = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{B}^2\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}^3), \\ [\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C})]^2 &\leq \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}'\mathbf{A}') \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}) = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{B}^2\mathbf{C}) \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}^2\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'). \end{aligned}$$

Also using (B.8) and (B.9) we have

$$\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}^2) = \frac{1}{T-1} \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{B}) = \frac{1}{(T-1)^2} \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') = \frac{\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A})}{(T-1)^2} = O(T^{-2}).$$

$$\begin{aligned} [\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}^2\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}')]^2 &= [\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{C}^2)]^2 \leq \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}') \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}^4) = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A}) \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}^4) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}^2) \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}^4) = O(T^{-4}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, it is easily established that

$$\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{B}^2\mathbf{C}) = O(T^{-2}), \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{C}^3) = O(T^{-2}).$$

Hence all the terms in (B.6) are of order  $O(T^{-2})$ . ■

## References

- Alvarez, J., Browning, M., Ejrnæs, M., (2002). Modelling income processes with lots of heterogeneity. Presented at: 10th International Conference on Panel Data, Berlin, July 5-6, 2002.
- Andrews, D.W.K., (1993). Exactly median-unbiased estimation of first order autoregressive/unit root models. *Econometrica* 61, 139-165.
- Beran, R., (1988). Prepivoting test statistics: A bootstrap view of asymptotic refinements. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 83, 687-697.
- Bun, M.J.G., (2004). Testing poolability in a system of dynamic regressions with nonspherical disturbances. *Empirical Economics* 29, 89-106.
- Hahn, J., Kuersteiner, G., (2002). Asymptotically unbiased inference for a dynamic panel model with fixed effects when both  $n$  and  $T$  are large. *Econometrica* 70, 1639-1657.
- Hausman, J.A., (1978). Specification tests in econometrics. *Econometrica* 46, 1251-1271.
- Horowitz, J.L., (1994). Bootstrap-based critical values for the information matrix test. *Journal of Econometrics* 61, 395-411.
- Hsiao, C., (2003). *Analysis of Panel Data*, second edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hsiao, C., Pesaran, M.H., (2004). Random coefficient panel data models. *CESifo Working Paper* No.1229.
- Kendall, M.G., (1954). Note on bias in the estimation of autocorrelation. *Biometrika* 41, 403-404.
- Kilian, L., (1998). Confidence intervals for impulse responses under departures from normality. *Econometric Reviews* 17, 1-29.
- Li, H., Maddala, G.S., (1996). Bootstrapping time series models. *Econometric Reviews* 15, 115-158.
- Marriott, F.H.C., Pope, J.A., (1954). Bias in the estimation of autocorrelations. *Biometrika* 41, 390-402.
- Meghir, C., Pistaferri, L., (2004). Income variance dynamics and heterogeneity. *Econometrica* 72, 1-32.
- Orcutt, G.H., Winokur, H.S., (1969). First order autoregression: Inference, estimation, and prediction. *Econometrica* 37, 1-14.
- Pesaran, M.H., (2004). Estimation and inference in large heterogeneous panels with a multifactor error structure. *CESifo Working Paper* No.1331.



- Pesaran, H., Smith, R., Im, K.S., (1996). Dynamic linear models for heterogenous panels. In: Matyas, L., Sevestre, P., eds, *The Econometrics of Panel Data: A Handbook of the Theory with Applications*, second revised edition, pp. 145-195.
- Phillips, P.C.B., Sul, D., (2003). Dynamic panel estimation and homogeneity testing under cross section dependence. *Econometrics Journal* 6, 217-259.
- Shaman, P., Stine, R.A., (1988). The bias of autoregressive coefficient estimators. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 83, 842-848.
- Smith, M.D., (1988). Convergent series expressions for inverse moments of quadratic forms in normal variables. *The Australian Journal of Statistics* 30, 235-246.
- Swamy, P.A.V.B., (1970). Efficient inference in a random coefficient regression model. *Econometrica* 38, 311-323.
- Ullah, A., (2004). *Finite Sample Econometrics*. Oxford University Press.
- von Neumann, J., (1941). Distribution of the ratio of the mean square successive difference to the variance. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 12, 367-395.
- Zellner, A., (1962). An efficient method of estimating seemingly unrelated regressions and tests for aggregation bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 57, 348-368.

**Table 1 : Size and Power of the Slope Homogeneity Tests,  
with Strictly Exogenous Regressors: Normal Errors**

N\T	10	20	30	50	100	200
<b>Size</b>						
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>						
20	25.25	11.70	9.75	7.70	6.00	6.40
30	31.20	13.45	10.60	8.10	5.45	5.00
50	39.45	17.75	10.70	8.70	6.50	6.00
100	61.05	21.15	15.00	10.65	7.50	5.95
200	82.35	33.90	18.30	12.90	7.95	6.65
<b>H test</b>						
20	7.95	6.55	4.55	6.35	5.20	4.10
30	8.75	6.95	6.50	4.70	4.90	5.35
50	6.60	5.25	5.95	4.80	5.15	5.50
100	6.85	6.20	5.85	5.00	5.30	5.40
200	9.10	5.90	5.40	6.30	5.80	5.30
<b><math>\tilde{\Delta}</math> test</b>						
20	4.60	4.20	3.70	3.95	3.80	4.05
30	4.95	4.50	4.30	4.75	3.80	4.15
50	4.85	4.80	4.05	4.35	4.60	4.90
100	4.40	5.00	4.95	5.60	5.00	4.80
200	5.20	5.75	4.55	4.85	4.70	4.95
<b>Power</b>						
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>						
20	29.05	21.80	23.30	31.00	58.65	88.80
30	43.45	45.25	52.40	81.80	99.10	100.00
50	64.50	68.05	80.15	96.65	100.00	100.00
100	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>H test</b>						
20	6.65	5.15	5.60	5.70	5.40	3.55
30	7.15	5.70	5.55	5.20	5.30	5.90
50	6.70	5.75	5.20	5.10	5.90	5.05
100	6.00	6.30	5.90	5.20	5.85	5.45
200	6.35	6.30	4.65	5.00	6.10	5.70
<b><math>\tilde{\Delta}</math> test</b>						
20	4.65	6.90	9.45	16.60	43.65	82.55
30	7.10	15.65	26.45	65.65	98.15	100.00
50	8.55	26.85	46.80	85.95	99.90	100.00
100	26.80	71.35	99.25	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	44.95	99.15	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Notes:  $\hat{S}$  test,  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test, and  $H$  test statistics are defined in (2.10), (3.18), and (5.1), respectively. The DGP is specified as  $y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_i x_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$ ,  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  where  $\alpha_i \sim N(1, 1)$ , with  $x_{it}$  generated as  $x_{it} = \alpha_i(1 - \rho_i) + \rho_i x_{it-1} + (1 - \rho_i^2)^{1/2} v_{it}$ ,  $t = -49, \dots, 0, \dots, T$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  where  $\rho_i \sim IIDU(0.05, 0.95)$ ,  $v_{it} \sim IIDN(0, \sigma_{ix}^2)$  with  $\sigma_{ix}^2 \sim IID\chi^2(1)$ .  $\rho_i$  and  $\sigma_{ix}^2$  are fixed across the replications. The first 50 observations are discarded to reduce the effect of initial value on the generated values of  $x_{it}$ .  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim IIDN(0, \sigma_i^2)$ , with  $\sigma_i^2 \sim IID\chi^2(2)/2$ . Under the null hypothesis,  $\beta_i = 1$  for all  $i$ , and under the alternative hypothesis,  $\beta_i = 1$  for  $i = 1, \dots, [2N/3]$ , and  $\beta_j \sim N(1, 0.04)$ , for  $j = [2N/3] + 1, \dots, N$ , where  $[2N/3]$  is the nearest integer value.  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\beta_i$ , and  $\sigma_i^2$  are fixed across replications. All tests are conducted at 5% nominal level. All the experiments are based on 2,000 replications.

**Table 2 : Size and Power of Slope Homogeneity Tests,  
with Strictly Exogenous Regressors:  $(\chi^2(2) - 2) / 2$  Errors**

N\T	10	20	30	50	100	200
<b>Size</b>						
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>						
20	23.85	13.45	8.50	5.85	5.30	5.55
30	30.90	13.10	10.15	8.40	6.40	4.75
50	40.70	15.50	11.15	8.85	6.30	6.80
100	59.65	23.00	14.70	9.55	7.35	5.35
200	81.50	32.35	19.30	11.40	8.60	6.40
<b>H test</b>						
20	6.45	6.60	6.45	4.95	4.90	5.90
30	7.60	5.75	5.90	5.20	5.00	5.05
50	7.35	6.10	5.70	5.15	5.30	4.50
100	6.75	6.55	5.25	5.05	5.25	4.40
200	8.05	6.35	6.15	5.40	4.70	5.60
<b><math>\tilde{\Delta}</math> test</b>						
20	3.50	4.35	3.30	3.35	3.95	3.80
30	4.65	3.75	4.10	4.30	4.45	4.20
50	5.25	3.95	4.45	4.60	4.80	5.20
100	6.15	4.70	4.60	4.65	3.65	4.65
200	4.50	4.40	3.65	4.40	4.55	4.70
<b>Power</b>						
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>						
20	28.55	23.15	24.20	33.15	61.85	89.90
30	49.95	49.90	59.10	75.85	99.20	100.00
50	67.10	67.95	84.30	91.95	100.00	100.00
100	99.75	99.95	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>H test</b>						
20	6.20	5.40	5.05	4.30	4.75	6.25
30	7.30	6.00	5.20	5.45	5.25	6.30
50	7.40	6.20	5.10	5.65	5.50	5.70
100	6.80	5.40	4.80	5.30	6.20	5.55
200	6.40	5.20	5.35	5.15	5.30	5.70
<b><math>\tilde{\Delta}</math> test</b>						
20	4.40	7.10	9.95	18.65	48.30	84.25
30	7.00	19.15	33.15	60.40	98.10	100.00
50	9.95	26.15	54.40	79.35	99.95	100.00
100	26.55	77.40	99.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	62.25	99.60	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Notes: See the notes on Table 1. The design is the same as that of Table 1 except  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim IID((\chi^2(2) - 2) / 2)$ .

**Table 3 : Size and Power of the Slope Homogeneity Tests with Strictly Exogenous Regressors with Different Numbers of Covariates ( $k$ )**

N\T	k=1		k=2		k=3		k=4	
	20	30	20	30	20	30	20	30
<b>SIZE</b>								
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>								
20	11.40	8.35	16.55	10.80	20.40	13.70	26.50	16.30
30	13.40	11.20	21.25	13.10	25.70	15.70	31.90	17.05
50	15.80	11.60	24.85	15.90	36.45	20.15	43.00	22.45
100	22.45	15.25	35.90	20.90	48.90	26.85	60.90	33.95
200	34.50	20.10	54.55	30.05	72.10	41.95	83.10	50.30
<b>H test</b>								
20	5.60	5.40	6.20	6.45	6.50	5.40	5.45	5.90
30	5.50	6.00	6.45	5.30	6.55	5.95	6.75	6.40
50	5.45	5.75	6.85	6.30	6.75	6.30	7.65	8.15
100	6.90	5.80	7.10	5.60	6.50	5.85	6.10	6.05
200	5.60	5.70	6.20	5.15	5.75	6.70	7.05	6.05
<b><math>\tilde{\Delta}</math> test</b>								
20	3.80	3.20	5.00	4.75	5.20	5.35	5.60	6.05
30	3.55	4.75	5.50	4.70	5.10	5.05	5.00	5.20
50	4.60	4.15	5.55	4.75	5.40	6.05	4.70	5.05
100	4.80	4.35	5.25	5.65	5.15	5.05	5.60	5.20
200	5.05	5.25	4.80	5.50	5.30	5.25	4.70	4.75
<b>Power</b>								
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>								
20	75.15	94.15	75.65	90.25	71.40	87.10	62.70	69.60
30	94.25	98.95	74.00	93.85	81.55	92.00	94.50	98.70
50	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
100	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>H test</b>								
20	6.90	8.40	6.40	7.05	6.25	6.90	6.75	5.90
30	5.95	4.55	7.35	5.95	6.45	6.15	6.20	5.80
50	6.30	5.40	6.70	5.85	6.90	6.65	6.35	5.75
100	4.85	5.65	6.00	4.95	6.55	6.75	6.80	6.30
200	6.10	5.10	6.90	5.25	6.00	5.80	5.95	5.65
<b><math>\tilde{\Delta}</math> test</b>								
20	46.35	84.50	38.10	67.30	21.70	52.80	10.40	25.05
30	70.15	94.25	28.50	68.35	26.55	58.15	32.05	73.05
50	100.00	100.00	99.05	100.00	94.85	100.00	75.70	99.90
100	99.65	100.00	98.70	100.00	98.25	100.00	98.45	100.00
200	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.95	100.00

Notes: The DGP is specified as  $y_{it} = \alpha_i + \sum_{\ell=1}^k x_{i\ell t} \beta_{i\ell} + \varepsilon_{it}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ,  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ , where  $\alpha_i \sim IIDN(1, 1)$ ,  $x_{i\ell t}$  is generated as specified in the notes to Table 1,  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim IIDN(0, \sigma_i^2)$ , where  $\sigma_i^2 \sim IID(k\chi^2(2)/2)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, 4$ , so that the goodness of fit for each equation in the panel  $i$  is invariant to the number of regressors. Under the null hypothesis  $\beta_{i\ell} = 1$  for all  $i$  and  $\ell$ , and under the alternative hypothesis we generate  $\beta_{i\ell}$  as  $\beta_{i1} \sim IIDN(1, 0.04)$  and  $\beta_{i\ell} = \beta_{i1}$  for  $\ell = 2, 3, 4$ .  $\alpha_i$ ,  $x_{i\ell t}$ ,  $\beta_{i\ell}$ , and  $\sigma_i^2$  are fixed across replications.

**Table 4 : Size and Power of the Slope Homogeneity Tests  
for Heteroskedastic AR(1) Specifications**

N\T	Size					Power				
	20	30	50	100	200	20	30	50	100	200
	$\lambda_i = 0.2$ for all $i$					$\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.0, 0.4)$				
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>										
20	4.60	5.10	5.60	4.35	4.50	13.85	22.55	42.95	82.55	99.75
30	5.50	5.60	4.40	4.80	6.30	20.25	35.25	62.70	96.45	100.00
50	4.50	4.90	4.05	4.60	4.15	24.75	45.30	78.85	99.70	100.00
100	3.55	4.60	4.40	5.50	4.75	41.75	74.90	98.45	100.00	100.00
200	3.30	5.00	4.85	5.00	5.80	62.30	93.85	99.95	100.00	100.00
<b>H test</b>										
20	38.50	53.40	65.75	73.40	78.00	51.35	75.05	93.80	99.40	100.00
30	45.55	65.25	79.75	88.30	91.45	64.70	89.45	99.00	100.00	100.00
50	62.80	85.25	96.30	98.60	99.50	93.80	99.60	100.00	100.00	100.00
100	89.15	98.85	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.70	99.95	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	99.65	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b><math>\tilde{\Delta}</math> test</b>										
20	2.55	2.20	2.80	3.10	2.90	2.40	8.80	25.80	71.75	99.20
30	3.05	2.95	3.15	4.00	3.95	3.70	14.25	43.55	92.55	100.00
50	4.55	4.10	4.05	4.40	3.70	3.75	18.10	59.00	99.30	100.00
100	8.90	5.80	4.65	4.40	4.35	6.50	39.85	93.55	100.00	100.00
200	18.95	8.95	6.45	4.25	4.55	9.25	65.90	99.80	100.00	100.00
	$\lambda_i = 0.4$ for all $i$					$\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.2, 0.6)$				
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>										
20	5.70	5.55	6.25	4.70	4.25	16.15	26.10	49.25	87.45	99.95
30	5.95	6.20	5.55	4.75	6.50	24.05	41.40	71.90	98.55	100.00
50	6.40	6.15	5.10	5.80	4.75	31.55	53.40	85.95	99.85	100.00
100	5.65	6.40	5.60	6.15	5.35	54.15	82.75	99.35	100.00	100.00
200	6.60	6.40	6.80	5.55	5.60	85.80	98.70	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>H test</b>										
20	73.25	87.20	92.80	94.65	96.20	83.45	95.55	99.65	100.00	100.00
30	90.30	96.45	99.15	99.40	99.70	96.75	99.65	100.00	100.00	100.00
50	99.15	99.95	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.95	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
100	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b><math>\tilde{\Delta}</math> test</b>										
20	2.80	2.20	3.00	3.20	3.15	3.70	11.05	31.75	78.75	99.85
30	2.70	3.05	3.40	3.85	4.70	4.60	18.40	53.15	96.60	100.00
50	3.40	3.65	3.95	4.55	3.40	6.35	25.15	69.35	99.70	100.00
100	6.35	4.65	4.15	4.05	4.70	10.15	54.00	97.60	100.00	100.00
200	12.50	6.30	5.65	4.05	5.00	18.45	81.30	99.95	100.00	100.00

Notes: See notes to Table 1.  $\hat{S}$  test,  $\tilde{\Delta}$  test, and  $H$  test statistics are defined in (2.10), (4.6), and (5.1), respectively. The DGP is specified as  $y_{it} = (1 - \lambda_i)\alpha_i + \lambda_i y_{it-1} + \varepsilon_{it}$ ,  $t = -49, \dots, 0, \dots, T$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , where;  $\alpha_i \sim N(1, 1)$ ;  $\lambda_i$  are as specified in the table;  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim IIDN(0, \sigma_i^2)$  with  $\sigma_i^2 \sim IID\chi^2(2)/2$ .  $\alpha_i$ ,  $\lambda_i$ , and  $\sigma_i^2$  are fixed for replications.  $y_{i,-49} = \alpha_i$ , and the first 49 observations are discarded. We reject the null hypothesis when we obtain negative ( $H$  test) statistics (due to negative variance estimates,  $\hat{V}_H$ ).

(Continued)

N\T	Size					Power				
	20	30	50	100	200	20	30	50	100	200
$\lambda_i = 0.6$ for all $i$						$\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.4, 0.8)$				
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>										
20	7.50	7.60	7.10	5.40	4.85	21.90	35.50	62.00	95.10	99.95
30	9.15	8.40	6.65	5.45	6.45	34.10	55.40	85.55	99.90	100.00
50	9.55	9.55	7.65	6.15	5.15	45.70	69.60	94.70	100.00	100.00
100	11.00	10.50	8.00	6.70	6.50	73.65	95.10	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	15.75	13.20	10.60	7.10	7.60	93.10	99.65	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>H test</b>										
20	91.45	97.00	98.50	98.95	99.35	96.45	99.50	100.00	100.00	100.00
30	98.95	99.70	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.90	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
50	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
100	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b><math>\tilde{\Delta}</math> test</b>										
20	2.40	2.35	4.15	3.05	3.05	5.95	16.00	44.60	90.50	99.95
30	2.35	3.10	3.60	3.40	5.10	8.75	29.40	72.90	99.40	100.00
50	2.65	3.75	3.95	4.15	4.40	12.15	40.30	87.10	100.00	100.00
100	4.35	3.65	3.80	4.40	4.90	25.30	77.30	99.90	100.00	100.00
200	6.15	4.00	4.80	3.90	4.70	44.35	96.20	100.00	100.00	100.00
$\lambda_i = 0.8$ for all $i$						$\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.6, 1.0)$				
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>										
20	13.40	11.45	10.05	6.35	5.50	34.55	54.20	84.45	99.95	100.00
30	16.10	14.25	11.35	7.35	8.20	54.75	78.65	98.10	100.00	100.00
50	20.75	17.00	12.40	9.25	7.05	73.15	94.05	100.00	100.00	100.00
100	29.55	24.40	17.90	10.50	9.20	93.80	99.90	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	46.30	35.30	25.45	13.70	11.45	99.85	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>H test</b>										
20	96.30	99.15	99.40	99.85	99.90	98.50	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
30	99.70	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.95	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
50	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
100	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b><math>\tilde{\Delta}</math> test</b>										
20	3.05	3.70	4.95	3.90	3.60	11.70	32.55	72.35	99.85	100.00
30	3.45	4.45	4.45	4.00	4.90	21.55	56.90	95.20	100.00	100.00
50	2.95	5.35	4.35	4.75	4.85	36.35	78.95	99.40	100.00	100.00
100	4.35	5.70	5.55	4.75	5.80	64.95	97.90	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	4.70	7.05	8.30	5.95	6.25	89.90	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

(Continued)

N\T	Size					Power				
	20	30	50	100	200	20	30	50	100	200
	$\lambda_i = 0.9$ for all $i$					$\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.0, 1.0)$				
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>										
20	20.40	18.20	15.30	9.50	7.70	89.15	99.55	100.00	100.00	100.00
30	27.30	22.10	18.40	10.65	9.40	99.30	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
50	37.80	30.35	22.60	15.20	10.00	99.95	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
100	56.40	47.20	36.50	21.30	14.35	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	79.40	70.50	54.65	33.10	19.90	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>H test</b>										
20	97.40	99.05	99.80	100.00	99.95	99.80	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
30	99.80	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
50	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
100	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b><math>\hat{\Delta}</math> test</b>										
20	4.85	6.10	6.75	5.20	4.60	69.00	97.55	100.00	100.00	100.00
30	6.00	7.55	8.00	5.95	6.25	94.70	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
50	8.15	9.70	10.05	8.10	5.95	99.65	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
100	13.85	15.90	14.95	11.30	8.95	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	24.00	26.35	25.05	16.25	10.80	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

**Table 5 : Size and Power of the Slope Homogeneity Tests for Heteroskedastic AR(2) Specifications**

N\T	Size					Power				
	20	30	50	100	200	20	30	50	100	200
	$\lambda_{1i} = 0.6$ for all $i$					$\lambda_{1i} \sim IIDU(0.4, 0.8)$				
<b><math>\hat{S}</math> test</b>										
20	14.60	13.30	10.40	6.80	6.50	30.45	39.60	63.70	96.90	100.00
30	18.65	16.20	11.05	7.00	6.50	46.15	59.25	88.80	100.00	100.00
50	25.75	19.85	13.25	8.75	6.15	60.50	78.50	97.75	100.00	100.00
100	37.05	26.95	19.10	12.05	9.25	85.05	97.20	99.95	100.00	100.00
200	56.50	42.45	26.90	15.50	10.05	97.60	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
<b>H test</b>										
20	90.65	96.25	98.35	98.45	97.60	95.00	98.60	96.80	98.05	100.00
30	98.45	99.55	99.50	99.35	99.00	99.60	99.25	97.90	99.75	100.00
50	100.00	100.00	99.90	99.80	99.75	99.95	99.55	99.20	100.00	100.00
100	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.95	100.00	100.00	99.80	99.45	100.00	100.00
200	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.80	100.00	100.00
<b><math>\hat{\Delta}</math> test</b>										
20	3.10	3.05	4.10	4.00	4.80	4.70	12.50	38.00	92.30	100.00
30	2.95	3.55	3.95	3.65	4.45	7.25	24.05	71.30	99.80	100.00
50	2.20	3.65	3.90	5.05	5.15	13.30	38.70	88.90	100.00	100.00
100	2.65	3.80	5.10	5.40	5.90	25.20	74.90	99.85	100.00	100.00
200	3.40	4.55	5.75	5.95	4.65	43.55	96.50	100.00	100.00	100.00

Notes: See notes to Table 1 and 4. The DGP is  $y_{it} = (1 - \lambda_{i1} - \lambda_2)\alpha_i + \lambda_{i1}y_{it-1} + \lambda_2y_{it-2} + \varepsilon_{it}$ ,  $t = -49, \dots, 0, \dots, T$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $\lambda_{1i}$  is as specified in the table,  $\lambda_2 = 0.2$ . The first 48 observations are discarded.

**Table 6 : Size and Power of the Bootstrap Test of Slope Homogeneity for Heteroskedastic AR(1) Specifications**

N\T	Size			Power		
	20	30	50	20	30	50
$\lambda_i = 0.2$ for all $i$				$\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.0, 0.4)$		
Standard Normal						
20	1.60	1.65	2.60	3.50	8.45	26.85
30	3.30	3.40	2.75	4.05	12.90	42.85
50	5.20	3.60	4.35	3.95	17.35	58.35
100	9.20	4.90	4.65	7.00	40.25	92.30
200	19.25	10.75	6.75	9.55	67.75	99.80
Bootstrap						
20	4.30	4.45	4.80	5.40	11.10	30.60
30	4.90	5.05	4.45	5.60	16.25	47.40
50	5.05	5.05	5.45	4.45	18.70	61.95
100	5.20	4.40	5.00	4.55	38.35	92.60
200	6.15	5.35	5.30	2.85	57.20	99.80
Bias-Corrected Bootstrap						
20	4.25	4.55	4.70	5.20	11.30	30.75
30	5.00	5.20	4.70	5.90	16.35	47.35
50	5.40	5.30	5.75	4.85	18.75	61.55
100	5.75	4.25	5.10	5.00	38.90	92.50
200	7.30	5.50	5.45	2.80	58.00	99.80
$\lambda_i = 0.4$ for all $i$				$\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.2, 0.6)$		
Standard Normal						
20	2.45	2.65	2.75	3.60	10.40	29.05
30	2.35	3.05	3.15	4.85	18.75	52.85
50	4.50	3.90	3.70	6.10	23.15	69.55
100	7.90	5.85	4.15	11.60	52.50	97.60
200	12.75	6.95	5.90	18.85	82.00	99.95
Bootstrap						
20	5.40	5.50	4.65	6.35	13.95	33.90
30	4.25	5.45	4.95	6.50	22.50	56.70
50	5.25	5.35	5.05	7.15	25.50	72.25
100	5.65	5.65	5.15	9.60	51.90	97.80
200	5.20	4.80	5.35	9.90	78.30	99.95
Bias-Corrected Bootstrap						
20	5.80	5.55	4.90	6.15	13.85	34.10
30	4.70	5.35	4.75	6.75	22.25	56.40
50	5.40	5.80	4.65	7.15	25.70	72.15
100	6.35	6.10	5.05	10.25	53.20	98.00
200	6.00	5.30	5.80	11.85	79.20	99.95

Notes: See the notes to Table 4. 499 bootstrap samples are generated, and rejection frequencies are based on 2,000 replications. “Bootstrap” is based on the bootstrap samples generated using  $\hat{\lambda}_{WFE}$ . The “Bias-Corrected Bootstrap” is based on the bootstrap samples generated using the bias-corrected estimator,  $\hat{\lambda}_{WFE}$ . For further details see Section 4.2.



(Continued)

N\T	Size			Power		
	20	30	50	20	30	50
	$\lambda_i = 0.6$ for all $i$			$\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.4, 0.8)$		
Standard Normal						
20	1.40	2.75	3.85	5.40	15.55	43.75
30	2.60	3.80	2.55	7.50	30.50	73.65
50	2.45	3.55	3.35	11.30	40.45	87.50
100	4.25	3.55	4.15	28.00	78.50	99.80
200	5.75	3.65	4.30	45.45	96.75	100.00
Bootstrap						
20	4.25	6.05	5.20	8.70	19.85	48.15
30	4.85	5.70	3.70	10.40	34.65	76.40
50	4.30	5.40	4.95	14.25	45.80	89.15
100	4.50	4.60	4.90	29.75	80.50	99.85
200	4.30	4.30	4.95	40.80	96.80	100.00
Bias-Corrected Bootstrap						
20	4.35	5.50	5.35	8.80	19.60	48.05
30	4.90	5.20	3.85	10.75	35.35	76.10
50	4.40	5.35	4.85	14.85	45.80	89.55
100	5.50	5.25	4.95	31.85	80.80	99.85
200	5.55	4.45	5.20	45.40	97.05	100.00
<hr/>						
	$\lambda_i = 0.8$ for all $i$			$\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.6, 1.0)$		
Standard Normal						
20	2.40	3.80	4.80	12.60	31.05	71.85
30	2.95	3.85	5.45	22.05	55.10	95.75
50	3.20	5.25	5.25	36.90	76.70	99.70
100	4.65	5.75	5.90	64.90	98.20	100.00
200	4.65	7.50	8.25	90.55	100.00	100.00
Bootstrap						
20	5.20	5.65	5.70	17.10	35.00	73.70
30	4.70	5.15	6.25	26.15	58.05	95.70
50	4.70	6.40	5.60	40.05	75.25	99.70
100	6.40	6.50	5.75	69.70	98.20	100.00
200	6.70	8.60	7.55	92.25	100.00	100.00
Bias-Corrected Bootstrap						
20	4.50	5.10	5.20	15.50	34.15	73.25
30	4.25	4.65	5.65	23.85	55.35	95.30
50	4.20	5.50	5.25	32.95	71.15	99.45
100	5.55	5.15	4.85	63.10	97.60	100.00
200	5.00	5.55	6.05	87.45	99.95	100.00

(Continued)

N\T	Size			Power		
	20	30	50	20	30	50
	$\lambda_i = 0.9$ for all $i$			$\lambda_i \sim IIDU(0.0, 1.0)$		
Standard Normal						
20	5.30	6.20	7.60	68.35	97.95	100.00
30	7.25	7.35	9.35	94.85	99.95	100.00
50	7.90	9.25	8.95	99.35	100.00	100.00
100	12.55	15.80	15.45	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	21.30	27.65	25.40	100.00	100.00	100.00
Bootstrap						
20	6.00	6.10	7.50	74.15	98.50	100.00
30	7.95	6.95	7.85	96.05	99.95	100.00
50	8.45	7.30	6.55	99.60	100.00	100.00
100	11.95	9.95	8.50	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	18.35	16.25	10.55	100.00	100.00	100.00
Bias-Corrected Bootstrap						
20	4.45	4.70	6.25	74.20	98.60	100.00
30	5.20	4.50	6.05	96.30	99.95	100.00
50	4.45	3.60	5.35	99.60	100.00	100.00
100	5.05	4.80	4.95	100.00	100.00	100.00
200	4.50	5.75	5.65	100.00	100.00	100.00

**Table 7: Slope Homogeneity Tests and Alternative Estimates of the Autoregressive Coefficient of the Real Earnings Equations**

	Pooled Sample $e = 0$	High School Dropout $e = 1$	High School Graduate $e = 2$	College Graduate $e = 3$
<b>N</b>	1,031	249	531	251
<b>Average <math>T_i</math></b>	18.39	18.36	18.22	18.79
<b>Total Observations</b>	18,961	4,572	9,673	4,716
<b>Tests for Slope Homogeneity</b>				
$\tilde{\Delta}$ test	Statistic	25.59	7.20	13.65
	Normal approximation p-value	[0.0000]	[0.0000]	[0.0000]
	Bias-corrected bootstrap p-value	[0.0000]	[0.0000]	[0.0000]
<b>Autoregressive Coefficient (<math>\lambda</math>)</b>				
<b>FE Estimates (<math>\hat{\lambda}_{FE}</math>)</b>	0.4841 (0.0065)	0.4056 (0.0147)	0.4497 (0.0095)	0.5538 (0.0106)
<b>WFE Estimates (<math>\tilde{\lambda}_{WFE}</math>)</b>	0.5429 (0.0056)	0.4246 (0.0133)	0.5169 (0.0086)	0.6002 (0.0095)
<b>Bias-Corrected WFE (<math>\hat{\lambda}_{WFE}</math>)</b>	0.6504 (0.0055)	0.5188 (0.0126)	0.6192 (0.0080)	0.7214 (0.0101)

Notes: Noting PSID data we used are unbalanced, FE estimator, and WFE estimator are defined by (3.23), and (3.22) in Remark 3.2, respectively, and their associated standard errors (shown in round brackets) are based on  $\hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}_{FE}) = \hat{\sigma}^2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{y}'_{i,-1} \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{y}_{i,-1} \right)^{-1}$ , where

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = (\mathcal{T} - N - 1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\lambda}_{FE} \mathbf{y}_{i,-1} \right)' \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \left( \mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\lambda}_{FE} \mathbf{y}_{i,-1} \right),$$

$$\mathcal{T} = \sum_{i=1}^N T_i, \text{ and } \hat{V}(\tilde{\lambda}_{WFE}) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\sigma}_i^{-2} \mathbf{y}'_{i,-1} \mathbf{M}_{\tau_i} \mathbf{y}_{i,-1} \right)^{-1}.$$

Bias corrected estimates are based on  $\hat{\lambda}_{WFE} = \tilde{\lambda}_{WFE} + (\mathcal{T}/N) \left( 1 + \tilde{\lambda}_{WFE} \right)$  and  $\hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}_{WFE}) = \mathcal{T}^{-1} \left( 1 - \hat{\lambda}_{WFE}^2 \right)$ . Bias-corrected bootstrapped tests also use  $\hat{\lambda}_{WFE}$  and the associated estimates to generate bootstrap samples (see Section 4.2 for further details).

# CESifo Working Paper Series

(for full list see [www.cesifo.de](http://www.cesifo.de))

---

- 1374 Sascha O. Becker, Karolina Ekholm, Robert Jäckle and Marc-Andreas Mündler, Location Choice and Employment Decisions: A Comparison of German and Swedish Multinationals, January 2005
- 1375 Christian Gollier, The Consumption-Based Determinants of the Term Structure of Discount Rates, January 2005
- 1376 Giovanni Di Bartolomeo, Jacob Engwerda, Joseph Plasmans, Bas van Aarle and Tomasz Michalak, Macroeconomic Stabilization Policies in the EMU: Spillovers, Asymmetries, and Institutions, January 2005
- 1377 Luis H. R. Alvarez and Erkki Koskela, Progressive Taxation and Irreversible Investment under Uncertainty, January 2005
- 1378 Theodore C. Bergstrom and John L. Hartman, Demographics and the Political Sustainability of Pay-as-you-go Social Security, January 2005
- 1379 Bruno S. Frey and Margit Osterloh, Yes, Managers Should Be Paid Like Bureaucrats, January 2005
- 1380 Oliver Hülsewig, Eric Mayer and Timo Wollmershäuser, Bank Loan Supply and Monetary Policy Transmission in Germany: An Assessment Based on Matching Impulse Responses, January 2005
- 1381 Alessandro Balestrino and Umberto Galmarini, On the Redistributive Properties of Presumptive Taxation, January 2005
- 1382 Christian Gollier, Optimal Illusions and Decisions under Risk, January 2005
- 1383 Daniel Mejía and Marc St-Pierre, Unequal Opportunities and Human Capital Formation, January 2005
- 1384 Luis H. R. Alvarez and Erkki Koskela, Optimal Harvesting under Resource Stock and Price Uncertainty, January 2005
- 1385 Ruslan Lukach, Peter M. Kort and Joseph Plasmans, Optimal R&D Investment Strategies with Quantity Competition under the Threat of Superior Entry, January 2005
- 1386 Alfred Greiner, Uwe Koeller and Willi Semmler, Testing Sustainability of German Fiscal Policy. Evidence for the Period 1960 – 2003, January 2005
- 1387 Gebhard Kirchgässner and Tobias Schulz, Expected Closeness or Mobilisation: Why Do Voters Go to the Polls? Empirical Results for Switzerland, 1981 – 1999, January 2005

- 1388 Emanuele Bacchiocchi and Alessandro Missale, Managing Debt Stability, January 2005
- 1389 Assar Lindbeck and Dirk Niepelt, Improving the SGP: Taxes and Delegation rather than Fines, January 2005
- 1390 James J. Heckman and Dimitriy V. Masterov, Skill Policies for Scotland, January 2005
- 1391 Emma Galli & Fabio Padovano, Sustainability and Determinants of Italian Public Deficits before and after Maastricht, January 2005
- 1392 Angel de la Fuente and Juan Francisco Jimeno, The Private and Fiscal Returns to Schooling and the Effect of Public Policies on Private Incentives to Invest in Education: A General Framework and Some Results for the EU, January 2005
- 1393 Juan C. Conesa and Carlos Garriga, Optimal Response to a Demographic Shock, January 2005
- 1394 Christian Gollier, Optimal Portfolio Management for Individual Pension Plans, February 2005
- 1395 Ruslan Lukach, Joseph Plasmans and Peter M. Kort, Innovation Strategies in a Competitive Dynamic Setting, February 2005
- 1396 Gebhard Kirchgässner, (Why) Are Economists Different?, February 2005
- 1397 Marko Köthenbürger, Panu Poutvaara and Paola Profeta, Why are More Redistributive Social Security Systems Smaller? A Median Voter Approach, February 2005
- 1398 Gabrielle Demange, Free Choice of Unfunded Systems: A First Assessment, February 2005
- 1399 Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro, Sustainability of Portuguese Fiscal Policy in Historical Perspective, February 2005
- 1400 Roel M. W. J. Beetsma and Koen Vermeylen, The Effect of Monetary Unification on Public Debt and its Real Return, February 2005
- 1401 Frank Asche, Petter Osmundsen and Maria Sandsmark, Is It All Oil?, February 2005
- 1402 Giacomo Corneo, Media Capture in a Democracy: The Role of Wealth Concentration, February 2005
- 1403 A. Lans Bovenberg and Thijs Knaap, Ageing, Funded Pensions and the Dutch Economy, February 2005
- 1404 Thiess Büttner, The Incentive Effect of Fiscal Equalization Transfers on Tax Policy, February 2005
- 1405 Luisa Fuster, Ayşe İmrohoroglu and Selahattin İmrohoroglu, Personal Security Accounts and Mandatory Annuitization in a Dynastic Framework, February 2005

- 1406 Peter Claeys, Policy Mix and Debt Sustainability: Evidence from Fiscal Policy Rules, February 2005
- 1407 James M. Malcomson, Supplier Discretion over Provision: Theory and an Application to Medical Care, February 2005
- 1408 Thorvaldur Gylfason, Interview with Assar Lindbeck, February 2005
- 1409 Christian Gollier, Some Aspects of the Economics of Catastrophe Risk Insurance, February 2005
- 1410 Gebhard Kirchgässner, The Weak Rationality Principle in Economics, February 2005
- 1411 Carlos José Fonseca Marinheiro, Has the Stability and Growth Pact Stabilised? Evidence from a Panel of 12 European Countries and Some Implications for the Reform of the Pact, February 2005
- 1412 Petter Osmundsen, Frank Asche, Bård Misund and Klaus Mohn, Valuation of International Oil Companies –The RoACE Era, February 2005
- 1413 Gil S. Epstein and Shmuel Nitzan, Lobbying and Compromise, February 2005
- 1414 Marcel F. M. Canoy, Jan C. van Ours and Frederick van der Ploeg, The Economics of Books, February 2005
- 1415 Eric A. Hanushek and Ludger Wößmann, Does Educational Tracking Affect Performance and Inequality? Differences-in-Differences Evidence across Countries, February 2005
- 1416 George Kapetanios and M. Hashem Pesaran, Alternative Approaches to Estimation and Inference in Large Multifactor Panels: Small Sample Results with an Application to Modelling of Asset Returns, February 2005
- 1417 Samuel Mühlemann, Jürg Schweri, Rainer Winkelmann and Stefan C. Wolter, A Structural Model of Demand for Apprentices. February 2005
- 1418 Giorgio Brunello and Lorenzo Rocco, Educational Standards in Private and Public Schools, February 2005
- 1419 Alex Bryson, Lorenzo Cappellari and Claudio Lucifora, Why so Unhappy? The Effects of Unionisation on Job Satisfaction, March 2005
- 1420 Annalisa Luporini, Relative Performance Evaluation in a Multi-Plant Firm, March 2005
- 1421 Giorgio Bellettini and Carlotta Berti Ceroni, When the Union Hurts the Workers: A Positive Analysis of Immigration Policy, March 2005
- 1422 Pieter Gautier, Michael Svarer and Coen Teulings, Marriage and the City, March 2005

- 1423 Ingrid Ott and Stephen J. Turnovsky, Excludable and Non-Excludable Public Inputs: Consequences for Economic Growth, March 2005
- 1424 Frederick van der Ploeg, Back to Keynes?, March 2005
- 1425 Stephane Dees, Filippo di Mauro, M. Hashem Pesaran and L. Vanessa Smith, Exploring the International Linkages of the Euro Area: a Global VAR Analysis, March 2005
- 1426 Hans Pitlik, Friedrich Schneider and Harald Strotmann, Legislative Malapportionment and the Politicization of Germany's Intergovernmental Transfer System, March 2005
- 1427 Konstantinos Angelopoulos and Apostolis Philippopoulos, The Role of Government in Anti-Social Redistributive Activities, March 2005
- 1428 Ansgar Belke and Daniel Gros, Asymmetries in the Trans-Atlantic Monetary Policy Relationship: Does the ECB follow the Fed?, March 2005
- 1429 Sören Blomquist and Luca Micheletto, Optimal Redistributive Taxation when Government's and Agents' Preferences Differ, March 2005
- 1430 Olof Åslund and Peter Fredriksson, Ethnic Enclaves and Welfare Cultures – Quasi-Experimental Evidence, March 2005
- 1431 Paul De Grauwe, Roberto Dieci and Marianna Grimaldi, Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Equilibria in the Foreign Exchange Market. A Behavioural Finance Framework, March 2005
- 1432 Peter Egger, Stefan Gruber, Mario Larch and Michael Pfaffermayr, Knowledge-Capital Meets New Economic Geography, March 2005
- 1433 George Economides and Apostolis Philippopoulos, Should Green Governments Give Priority to Environmental Policies over Growth-Enhancing Policies?, March 2005
- 1434 George W. Evans and Seppo Honkapohja, An Interview with Thomas J. Sargent, March 2005
- 1435 Helge Berger and Volker Nitsch, Zooming Out: The Trade Effect of the Euro in Historical Perspective, March 2005
- 1436 Marc-Andreas Muendler, Rational Information Choice in Financial Market Equilibrium, March 2005
- 1437 Martin Kolmar and Volker Meier, Intra-Generational Externalities and Inter-Generational Transfers, March 2005
- 1438 M. Hashem Pesaran and Takashi Yamagata, Testing Slope Homogeneity in Large Panels, March 2005