Simple and Trustworthy Cluster-Robust GMM Inference

Jungbin Hwang

1 Introduction

2 Basic Setting and the First-step GMM Estimator

We want to estimate the d 1

The F-test version of the Wald test statistic is given by

$$
\boldsymbol{F}(\uparrow_1):=(\boldsymbol{R}\uparrow_1 \quad \boldsymbol{r}
$$

distributions, respectively. As $G=(G \quad p) > 1$ and $\mathbf{F}^1_{p;G \quad p} > 1$

estimators \hat{C}_1 and \hat{C}_2 and \hat{C}_3 where

$$
\wedge \left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \right) = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^{\infty}
$$

identi..cation restrictions is

 $J({}^{\wedge})$

and so

$$
\boldsymbol{J}(\uparrow_2) := \frac{\boldsymbol{G} \boldsymbol{q}}{\boldsymbol{q}} \frac{\boldsymbol{q} \boldsymbol{J}(\uparrow_2)}{\boldsymbol{G} \boldsymbol{q} \boldsymbol{J}(\uparrow_2)} \boldsymbol{f}^{\boldsymbol{q}} \boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{q};\boldsymbol{G}} \boldsymbol{q}.
$$

because we have

$$
G \t Bp \nBq \t Epp Epq \nEqq Eqq \nEqq Eqq \nBq \n= G4 Bp
$$

1, it is possible to show

 \mathbf{p} _—

Using

Similarly, the limiting distribution T

5 Asymptotic F and t tests

and that β_{p} is independent of S_{pp}^{-1}

t-statistic:

We can obtain the same expression for the CU-GMM estimator $\mathbf{P}_{\overline{N}(\hat{C}_{\text{CU-GMM}}-_{0})}$.

In view of the representation in (32), the corrected variance estimator for the CU type estimators can be constructed as follows:

 d r adjadj

dependence in each cluster. When $= 0$, there is no clustered dependence and our model reduces to that of Windmeijer (2005) which considers a static panel data model with only one regressor.

The individual ..xed e¤ects and shocks in group g are generated by:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}\n\mathbf{g} & \text{i.i.d.}\n\mathbf{N}(0; \quad), \text{vec}(\mathbf{e}_{(g),t}) & \text{i.i.d.}\n\mathbf{N}(0; \quad_e), \\
\mathbf{u}_{(g),t} & = & t^{-1/2} \left(\begin{array}{c} g_f g_f, \dots, g_f g_f \end{array} \right) \mathbf{g} \\
\mathbf{g} & \text{i.i.d.}\n\mathbf{U}[0.5; 1.5], \text{ and } \mathbf{f}_{it}^g & \text{i.i.d.}\n\frac{1}{2} \quad 1\n\end{array}\n\tag{33}
$$

for $i = 1; ...; L_N$ and $t = 1; ...; T$ where $t = 0.5 + 0.1(t - 1)$. The DGP of individual shock $u_{(g),t}$

uses the "plain" F-statistic $F_2 := F \sim_{c_1}$

Figure 1: Emprical size of the ... rst-step and two-step tests when $G = 50$

the empirical size of the …rst-step chi-square test (using $(us(s)8311(611(s)8(i)69s)8(ttu)129(f)-110(t)8(h18s)$

ones in other scenarios, i.e., when the cost of employing CCE weighting matrix outweighs the bene...t

close to each other.

The uncentered two-step GMM estimate of the e¤ect of access to domestic market is $d = d$ 2722:22. The reported standard error 400:5 is about 40% smaller than that of 2SLS. However, the plain two-step standard error estimate might be downward biased because the variation of the

References

[15] Dube, A., Lester, T. W., and Reich, M. (2010). "Minimum wage e¤ects across state borders:

Table 3: Empirical size of …rst-step and two-step tests based on the centered CCE when L_N = 50, number of clusters \boldsymbol{G} = 50

Figure 4: Size-adjusted power of ..rst-step (2SLS) and two-step tests with $G = 50$ and $L = 50$:

Figure 5: Size-adjusted power of ..rst-step (2SLS) and two-step tests with $G = 100$ and $L = 50$:

Figure 6: Empirical size of …rst-step and two-step tests based on the centered CCE when there is a heterogeneity in cluster size with the nominal size 5% (green line): Design I with \bm{G} = 50; \bm{q} = 8, and $p = 3$:

Table 9: Summary of the di¤erence between the conventional large- \bm{G} asympototics and alternative ..xed- G asympotics for the ..rst-step (2SLS) and two-step GMM methods.

	2SLS	
Variables		Large- G Asymptotics Fixed- G Asymptotics
Domestic market (A_i^d)	2713.2(712.1)	2713.2 (716.8)
	[4109.9; 1316.4]	[4138.0; 1288.0]
International market (

Table 11: Results for Emran and Hou (2013) data

10 Appendix: Application to Linear Dynamic Panel Model

We discusses how to implement our inference procedures in the context of a linear dynamic panel model:

$$
y_{it} = y_{it-1} + x
$$

where

$$
\mathbf{v} \mathbf{h} \mathbf{r}(\hat{h}) = \mathbf{N} \qquad \mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{W}_{n}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^{\mathbf{0}} \quad \mathbf{w} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{W}_{n}^{-1} \mathbf{A}^{\mathbf{0}} (\hat{h}) \mathbf{W}_{n}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^{\mathbf{0}} \quad \mathbf{w} \qquad \mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{W}_{n}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^{\mathbf{0}} \quad \mathbf{w} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{w} \q
$$

Let Z

and

$$
\frac{\mathscr{Q}^{\wedge} c(\)}{\mathscr{Q} j} = j^{\binom{\wedge}{1}} + \frac{\mathsf{O}(^{\wedge}_{1})}{j^{\binom{\wedge}{1}}}
$$

Appendix of Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1. Part (a).

Therefore,

 \equiv

Let U V^{\bullet}

For the estimator $\hat{ }$

with D_{12} and D_{22} given in (42). Therefore;

 $J({}^{\wedge}_{2}) = N g_{n}({}^{\wedge}_{2})^{\circ}$

of eigenvectors of $(RVA^{-1})^0(RVA^{-1})$: Let

$$
V = \begin{array}{cc} V_{d,d} & O \\ O & I_{q,q} \end{array}
$$

and de..ne

Then

 $W = \begin{pmatrix} p \\ W \\ I_q \end{pmatrix}$ **2** $R^{(p+q)}$ *a*.

 for

where the convergence holds jointly for $h = 1; ...; G$: As a result,

$$
\wedge c(\wedge) \stackrel{\bullet}{\mathbf{f}} \frac{1}{G} \stackrel{\text{M}}{g}
$$

in (51) as

 Ng

For the CU-GMM estimator, we let $\sqrt[3]{\binom{6}{\text{CU-GMM}}}$ be the *j*

and so

for each $\boldsymbol{j} = 1; ...; \boldsymbol{d}$: For the term, $e^{\lambda c}$

Also, $\mathbf{E}_{2n} = o_p(1)$ and we have

 \mathbf{dr}^{A}