Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Economics Letters

Inference on modelling cross-sectional dependence for a varying-coefficient model

CrossMark

Bin Peng

Economics Discipline Group, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

In this note, I have studied a varying-coefficient model under cross-sectional dependence. The technique of Robinson (2011) is employed to mimic the dependence among cross-sectional data sets. The asymptotic normality is established for the proposed estimator.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The cross sectional dependence has been a hot topic for the past two decades. A dominant branch of modelling the cross-sectional dependence is to use a factor structure in panel data models (c.f. Pesaran, 2006, Bai, 2009 and so forth). Recently, Robinson (2011) and Lee and Robinson (2016) have employed the time series technique to model the dependence among cross-sectional data sets. Following the spirit of their work, I consider a varying-coefficient model with cross-sectional dependence in this study.

2. Model specification

The mode is as follows:

$$y_i = x_i'\beta(z_i) + u_i. \tag{2.1}$$

$z_i \in [0, 1]$ is the so-called univariate index variable (c.f. Wang and Xia, 2009) and x_i is a $p \times 1$ vector. For simplicity, we consider the scalar case for z_i only and it is straightforward to extend z_i to multivariate case. To distinguish x_i and z_i, they are referred to as regressors and covariates hereafter. In order to impose the cross-sectional dependence, we follow Robinson (2011) and Lee and Robinson (2016) and denote that

$$u_i = \sigma(x_i, z_i)e_i, \quad e_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_{ij}\varepsilon_j, \qquad b_{ii} \neq 0,$$

$$B_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} b_{ij}^2 < \infty \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^p \times [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$, the b_{ij} are real constants, and $\{\varepsilon_j, j \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of independent random variables with zero mean and unit variance, independent of $\{x_j, j \geq 1\}$ and $\{z_j, j \geq 1\}$.

Remark.

Notice $b_{ii} \neq 0$ rules out the case where the error term e_i does not change across index i. For example, without the restriction of $b_{ii} \neq 0$, one can let $\sigma(x_i, z_i) = 1$, $b_{i1} = 1$, $b_{ij} = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $j = 2, \dots, \infty$. Then the model will reduce to $y_i = x_i'\beta(z_i) + \varepsilon_1$. In this case, the consistent estimation cannot be achieved at all.

In this note, our kernel function is denoted as:

$$K_h(z_i - z) = \frac{1}{h}K\left(\frac{z_i - z}{h}\right), \tag{2.3}$$

where $K(w)$ is symmetric denoted on $[-1, 1]$ satisfying $\int_{-1}^{1} K(w) \, dw = 1$ and h is the bandwidth. In order to facility the development, we adopt the following assumptions.

E-mail address: Bin.Peng@uts.edu.au.

Assumptions.

1. $\{\varepsilon_j, j \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of independent random variables with zero mean and unit variance, independent of $\{x_j, j \geq 1\}$ and $\{z_j, j \geq 1\}$. $E[\varepsilon_j] = 0$, $E[\varepsilon_j^2] = 1$ and $\max_{j \geq 1} E[\varepsilon_j^{2+\nu}] < \infty$. $\sigma^2(x, z)$ is a uniformly bounded. Moreover, $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} E\|x_i\|^4 < \infty$ and $\max_{z \in [0,1]} \|\beta(z)\| < \infty$.

2. Let $E[x_i x_i' | z_i = z] = \Sigma_{xi}(z)$, where $\|\Sigma_{xi}(z)\|$ is uniformly bounded on $[0, 1]$. $\Sigma_{xi}(z)$ has bounded continuous second order derivative with respect to z uniformly in i. Moreover, x_i is the function of z_i and independent of z_j for $i \neq j$.

3. For $1 \leq i \neq j \leq N$, let $f_{ij}(w_1, w_2)$ denote the joint density function for (z_i, z_j) and be bounded uniformly in i, j. For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, let $f_i(w)$ denote the density function for z_i and be bounded uniformly in i. In addition, $f_i(w)$ has uniformly bounded continuous second order derivative with respect to w.

4. (a) $Nh \to \infty$, $h \to 0$;

   (b) $\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} B_i = B$ and $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} |B_i| \leq C_1$, where C_1 is a constant. Also, for $\forall z \in [0, 1]$, let $V_2(z) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Sigma_{xi}(z) f_i(z)$ be positive definite uniformly in z.

   (c) $\max_{1 \leq j \leq N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nh}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |b_{ij}| \to 0$;

   (d) $\frac{\Delta_{2N}}{N^2} \to 0$ and $\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_{1N}}}{Nh} \to 0$, where
   $$\Delta_{1N} = \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{N} \iint |f_{ij}(w_1, w_2) - f_i(w_1)f_j(w_2)| \times dw_1 dw_2,$$
   $$\Delta_{2N} = \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{N} |\gamma_{i,j}|, \quad \gamma_{i,j} = \text{Cov}(e_i, e_j).$$

Assumptions 1–4 are standard in the literature (c.f. Wang and Xia, 2009, Lee and Robinson, 2016), so the relevant discussions are omitted. In Assumption 4.c, $\max_{1 \leq j \leq N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nh}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |b_{ij}| \to 0$ certainly captures the i.i.d. case. For example, let $\sigma(x_i, z_i) = 1$. When u_i is i.i.d., the matrix $\mathcal{B} = \{b_{i,j}\}_{N \times N} = I_N$. Then it is easy to see that $\max_{1 \leq j \leq N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{Nh}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |b_{ij}| \to 0$ holds. Notice that if z_i is independent across i, one can easily show that $\Delta_{1N} = 0$ and $\gamma_{i,j} = 0$, so Assumption 4.d holds immediately.

For any given $z \in [0, 1]$, we investigate the next estimator.

$$\hat{\beta}(z) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i x_i' K_h(z_i - z) \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i y_i K_h(z_i - z). \quad (2.4)$$

Then the next result follows based on the above settings.

Theorem 2.1. *Under Assumptions 1–4,*

$$\sqrt{Nh} \left(\hat{\beta}(z) - \beta(z) - O_P(h^2) \right) \to_D N(0, V_2^{-1}(z) V_1(z) V_2^{-1}(z))$$

where

$$V_1(z) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(z) B_i \int \Sigma_{xx\sigma}(w) K^2(w) \, dw$$
$$+ \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{h}{N} \sum_{i_1=1}^{N} \sum_{i_2=1}^{N} \gamma_{i_1, i_2} f_{i_1}(z) f_{i_2}(z) \tilde{\eta} \tilde{\eta}',$$

where $\tilde{\eta} = \int \eta(w) K(w) dw$, $\eta(z_i) = E[x_i \sigma(x_i, z_i) | z_i]$, $\Sigma_{xx\sigma}(z_i) = E[x_i x_i' \sigma^2(x_i, z_i) | z_i]$ *and* $V_2(z)$ *is denoted in Assumption 4.*

3. Conclusion

In this note, I have studied a varying-coefficient model under cross-sectional dependence. The technique of Robinson (2011) and Lee and Robinson (2016) is employed to mimic the dependence among cross-sectional data sets. The asymptotic normality is established for the proposed estimator. The optimal bandwidth selection has been achieved under i.i.d. case in Li and Racine (2010), but what the optimal bandwidth looks like under cross-sectional dependence remains unsolved.

Appendix

Lemma A.1. *Let* $\zeta_i = (x_i, z_i)$ *and Assumption 3 hold. For any bounded function* $g(w)$ *with* $w = (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times [0, 1]$ *having that* $E[g(\zeta_i)g(\zeta_j)]$ *with* $i \neq j$ *and* $E[g(\zeta_i)]$ *exist uniformly in* $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, *we obtain that*

$$\left| \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{\infty} \left\{ E[g(\zeta_i)g(\zeta_j)] - E[g(\zeta_i)] E[g(\zeta_j)] \right\} \right| = O(\Delta_{1N}). \quad (A.1)$$

Proof of Lemma A.1.

$$\left| \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{\infty} \left\{ E[g(\zeta_i)g(\zeta_j)] - E[g(\zeta_i)] E[g(\zeta_j)] \right\} \right|$$
$$= \left| \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{\infty} \int g(w_1)g(w_2) \left(f_{ij}(w_1, w_2) - f_i(w_1)f_j(w_2) \right) dw_1 dw_2 \right|$$
$$= O(1) \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{\infty} \int |f_{ij}(w_1, w_2) - f_i(w_1)f_j(w_2)| \, dw_1 dw_2$$
$$= O(\Delta_{1N}). \quad (A.2)$$

Then the proof is complete. ∎

Lemma A.2. *Under Assumptions 1–4, for any given* $z \in [0, 1]$

1. $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i x_i' K_h(z_i, z) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Sigma_{xi}(z) f_i(z) = O_P(h^2) + O_P\left(\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_{1N}}}{Nh} \right)$;

2. $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i u_i K_h(z_i, z) = O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{Nh}} \right) + O_P\left(\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_{1N}}}{Nh} \right) + O_P\left(\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_{2N}}}{N} \right)$;

3. $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i x_i' \left(\beta(z_i) - \beta(z) \right) K_h(z_i - z) = O_P(h^2)$.

Proof of Lemma A.2. (1) Write

$$E\left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i x_i' K_h(z_i - z) \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} E\left[x_i x_i' K_h(z_i - z) \right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int \Sigma_{xi}(w) K_h(w - z) f_i(w) dw$$
$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int \Sigma_{xi}(z + hw) K(w) f_i(z + hw) dw$$
$$= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Sigma_{xi}(z) f_i(z) + O(h^2), \quad (A.3)$$

where the fourth equality follows from using Taylor expansion on each element of $\Sigma_{xi}(w)$ and $f_i(w)$.