



**FACULTEIT ECONOMIE
EN BEDRIJFSKUNDE**

**HOVENIERSBERG 24
B-9000 GENT**

**Tel. : 32 - (0)9 - 264.34.61
Fax. : 32 - (0)9 - 264.35.92**

WORKING PAPER

Reversed Score and Likelihood Ratio Tests ^{*}

Geert Dhaene

Ghent University

Olivier Scaillet

Université Catholique de Louvain

December 2000

2000/99

* We are grateful to Christian Gouriéroux for helpful comments. Address correspondence to: Geert Dhaene, Ghent University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Hoveniersberg 24, B-9000 Gent, Belgium. Tel.: (+32) 9 2648978. Fax : (+32) 9 2648995. E-mail: geert.dhaene@rug.ac.be.

Reversed Score and Likelihood Ratio Tests^a

Geert Dhaene
Ghent University

Olivier Scaillet
Université Catholique de Louvain

Abstract

Two extensions of a parametric model are proposed, each one involving the score function of an alternative parametric model. We show that the encompassing hypothesis is equivalent to standard conditions on the score of each of the extended models. The condition on the first extension gives rise to the standard score encompassing test, while the condition on the second extension induces a so-called reversed score encompassing test. A similar logic is applied to the likelihood ratio, generating a likelihood ratio and a reversed likelihood ratio encompassing test. The ensued test statistics can be based on simulations if certain calculations are too difficult to carry out analytically. We study the first order asymptotic properties of the proposed test statistics under general conditions.

JEL classification: C5, C3.

Key-words: score test, likelihood ratio test, encompassing, simulation-based inference.

^aWe are grateful to Christian Gouriéroux for helpful comments. Address correspondence to: Geert Dhaene, Ghent University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Hoveniersberg 24, B-9000 Gent, Belgium. Tel.: (+32) 9 2648978. Fax: (+32) 9 2648995. E-mail: geert.dhaene@rug.ac.be.

1 Introduction

Specification tests of parametric models are a central theme in the econometric literature. A standard approach is to confront a given parametric model with another, often non-nested, parametric model (see Gouriéroux and Monfort [1994] for a review), and therefore such tests are oriented towards this particular alternative model. The constraint underlying most of these tests is in fact the encompassing condition (see e.g. Mizon and Richard [1986], Hendry and Richard [1990], Smith [1994], Gouriéroux and Monfort [1995], Dhaene [1997], Dhaene, Gouriéroux and Scaillet [1998]), but not always (see Vuong [1989]). Another approach exploits moment conditions implied by the model under test without having a specific alternative model in mind. Information matrix tests (White (1982)) and unconditional and conditional moment tests (Newey [1985], Tauchen [1985], Bierens [1991]) are examples of the latter approach.

The approach taken in this paper falls into the former category. An arbitrary conditional parametric model is tested against another arbitrary, possibly non-nested, conditional parametric model. We expand on results reported in Gouriéroux and Monfort [1995] and Dhaene [1997], where score and likelihood ratio encompassing tests were proposed. These tests, and the new tests we propose, are generated by exponentially tilting the model under test in two alternative directions, each one involving the score function of the alternative model. Intuitively, the new tests are obtained from reversing the roles of the true distribution generating the data and the pseudo-true distribution of the model under test. This leads to what we call reversed score and likelihood ratio tests. The tests rely on simulations in order to avoid the need for analytic calculations of certain expectations in any particular application. In a recent paper, Chen and Kuan [2000] propose what they call the pseudo-true score encompassing test for non-nested hypotheses, which is based on essentially the same idea of reversing the roles of the two distributions just mentioned. The main differences with the present paper are as follows. We provide a heuristic argument, based on model extensions, which unifies the standard and the reversed score tests. Furthermore, we also apply the idea to the likelihood ratio test, we consider nested as well as non-nested hypotheses, we propose simulation-based versions of the tests, and provide robust asymptotic theory.

The framework is briefly presented in Section 2. Section 3 introduces two extensions of the model under test, obtained by exponential tilting. It also restates the encompassing condition in terms of these extensions and gives the intuition underlying the reversed score and likelihood ratio tests. The basic test statistics are presented in Section 4. Their first order asymp-

otic properties are studied in Section 5, in descending order of generality. Section 6 concludes.

2 Framework

We consider an arbitrary pair of conditional, possibly non-nested, possibly misspecified, parametric models for independent and identically distributed data.

Let X and Y be random vectors taking values x and y in \mathbb{R}^k and \mathbb{R}^l , respectively, and let P_X be the true marginal distribution of X and $P_{Y|X}$ the true conditional distribution of Y , given X . Assume that the available data are T independent drawings $(x_t; y_t)$, $t = 1; \dots; T$, from P_X and $P_{Y|X}$. Let $G = \{F_G(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^m\}$ and $H = \{F_H(\gamma) : \gamma \in \Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n\}$ be parametric models of $P_{Y|X}$. It is assumed that the distributions $F_G(\theta)$, $F_H(\gamma)$ and $P_{Y|X}$ admit conditional density functions $f_G(y|x; \theta)$, $f_H(y|x; \gamma)$ and $p_0(y|x)$, respectively, relative to some measure μ not depending on x , θ and γ . It is also assumed that the expectations of the log density functions exist whenever they are taken.

Accounting for the possibility that G is misspecified, i.e. $P_{Y|X} \notin G$, and likewise for H , it is of interest to define the pseudo-true values of θ and γ with respect to P_X and $P_{Y|X}$ (see e.g. Sawa [1978]):

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_0 &= \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} E_X E_0 \log f_G(Y|X; \theta) \\ \gamma_0 &= \arg \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} E_X E_0 \log f_H(Y|X; \gamma); \end{aligned}$$

where the mathematical expectations E_X and E_0 are taken with respect to P_X and $P_{Y|X}$, respectively. We assume that θ_0 and γ_0 exist, are unique and interior to Θ and Γ , respectively.

We shall be interested in testing G against H . Therefore, we also define the pseudo-true value of γ with respect to P_X and $F_G(\theta)$,

$$\gamma_\theta = \arg \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} E_X E_\theta \log f_H(Y|X; \gamma);$$

where the mathematical expectation E_θ is taken with respect to $F_G(\theta)$. We assume that γ_θ exists, is unique and interior to Γ and is continuously differentiable with respect to θ . By definition, G encompasses H , written $G \supseteq H$, if $\gamma_0 = \gamma_{\theta_0}$. It is well known that the implicit null hypothesis of many tests of G against H is characterized by the condition that $G \supseteq H$. See e.g. Mizon and Richard [1986], Gouriéroux and Monfort [1995], and Dhaene [1997].

Note that the underlying distributions P_X and $P_{Y|X}$ are crucial in determining whether or not $G \subseteq H$. The score functions of G and H are defined as

$$s_G(y|x; \theta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log f_G(y|x; \theta)$$

and

$$s_H(y|x; \eta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \log f_H(y|x; \eta);$$

respectively. It is assumed that the score functions are continuously differentiable in the parameters, that their expectations exist whenever they are taken, that

$$\begin{aligned} E_X E_0 s_G(Y|X; \theta) &= 0 \quad \text{only if } \theta = \theta_0; \\ E_X E_0 s_H(Y|X; \eta) &= 0 \quad \text{only if } \eta = \eta_0; \\ E_X E_{\theta} s_H(Y|X; \eta) &= 0 \quad \text{only if } \eta = \eta_{\theta}; \end{aligned}$$

and that the matrices $E_X E_0 [s_G(Y|X; \theta_0) s_G^0(Y|X; \theta_0)]$, $E_X E_0 [s_H(Y|X; \eta_0) s_H^0(Y|X; \eta_0)]$ and $E_X E_{\theta} [s_H(Y|X; \eta_{\theta}) s_H^0(Y|X; \eta_{\theta})]$ exist and are positive definite. Then, defining the score quantity

$$s_1 = E_X E_0 s_H(Y|X; \eta_{\theta_0})$$

and the likelihood ratio (LR) quantity

$$l_1 = E_X E_0 [\log f_H(Y|X; \eta_{\theta_0}) - \log f_H(Y|X; \eta_0)];$$

it is obvious that $G \subseteq H$ is equivalent to $s_1 = 0$ and also to $l_1 = 0$. This property has led to the development of score encompassing tests, based on estimates of s_1 (Gouriéroux and Monfort [1995]), and LR encompassing tests, based on estimates of l_1 (Smith [1994] and Dhaene [1997]). The purpose of this paper is to introduce tests that are based on quantities similar to s_1 and l_1 , in particular the quantities obtained from s_1 and l_1 by reversing the roles of $P_{Y|X}$ and $F_G(\theta_0)$. A heuristic argument for doing so is presented in the next section.

3 Model extensions

Consider the following extension of G :

$$G_1 = \{F_G^1(\theta; \eta_1) | (\theta; \eta_1) \in \mathbb{R}^n\};$$

where the distribution $F_G^1(\theta; \eta_1)$ has the following density function relative to π :

$$f_G^1(yjx; \theta; \eta_1) = \frac{f_G(yjx; \theta) \exp(\eta_1^0 s_H(yjx; \eta_0))}{E_\theta \exp(\eta_1^0 s_H(yjx; \eta_0))}$$

The density $f_G^1(yjx; \theta; \eta_1)$ is obtained from $f_G(yjx; \theta)$ by exponential tilting (Barndorff-Nielsen and Cox [1989]). Observe that $G \perp G_1$ and that the parameter vector $(\theta; \eta_1)$ need not be identified. Instead of putting $\eta = \eta_0$ in the random vector $s_H(YjX; \eta)$, one may alternatively put $\eta = \eta_0$, leading to another extension of G :

$$G_2 = \text{ff} F_G^2(\theta; \eta_2) j (\theta; \eta_2) \quad \eta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n g;$$

where the distribution $F_G^2(\theta; \eta_2)$ has the following density function relative to π :

$$f_G^2(yjx; \theta; \eta_2) = \frac{f_G(yjx; \theta) \exp(\eta_2^0 s_H(yjx; \eta_0))}{E_{\theta_0} \exp(\eta_2^0 s_H(yjx; \eta_0))}$$

The density $f_G^2(yjx; \theta; \eta_2)$ is also obtained from $f_G(yjx; \theta)$ by exponential tilting, but in a different direction. As before, $G \perp G_2$ and $(\theta; \eta_2)$ need not be identified. The motivation for considering the extended models G_1 and G_2 comes from the following proposition.

Proposition 1 The following equivalences hold:

- $G \perp H$ () $E_X E_\theta \log f_G^1(YjX; \theta; \eta_1)$ has a local maximum at $(\theta; \eta_1) = (\theta_0; 0)$
- () $E_X E_\theta s_H(YjX; \eta_0) = 0$;
- $G \perp H$ () $E_X E_\theta \log f_G^2(YjX; \theta; \eta_2)$ has a local maximum at $(\theta; \eta_2) = (\theta_0; 0)$
- () $E_X E_{\theta_0} s_H(YjX; \eta_0) = 0$;

Proof. The score functions associated with G_1 and G_2 are

$$s_G^1(yjx; \theta; \eta_1) = \begin{matrix} 0 \\ \text{mmmm} \\ \theta \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} s_G(yjx; \theta) \\ s_H(yjx; \eta_0) \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \frac{E_\theta [s_G(YjX; \theta) \exp(\eta_1^0 s_H(YjX; \eta_0))]}{E_\theta \exp(\eta_1^0 s_H(YjX; \eta_0))} \\ \frac{E_\theta [s_H(YjX; \eta_0) \exp(\eta_1^0 s_H(YjX; \eta_0))]}{E_\theta \exp(\eta_1^0 s_H(YjX; \eta_0))} \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \text{mmmm} \\ \theta \end{matrix}$$

and

$$s_G^2(yjx; \theta; \eta_2) = \begin{matrix} 0 \\ \text{mmmm} \\ \theta \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} s_G(yjx; \theta) \\ s_H(yjx; \eta_0) \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} \frac{E_\theta [s_G(YjX; \theta) \exp(\eta_2^0 s_H(YjX; \eta_0))]}{E_\theta \exp(\eta_2^0 s_H(YjX; \eta_0))} \\ \frac{E_\theta [s_H(YjX; \eta_0) \exp(\eta_2^0 s_H(YjX; \eta_0))]}{E_\theta \exp(\eta_2^0 s_H(YjX; \eta_0))} \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \text{mmmm} \\ \theta \end{matrix}$$

respectively. Putting $(\theta; \lambda_1) = (\theta; \lambda_2) = (\theta_0; 0)$ and taking expectations yields

$$\begin{aligned} E_X E_0 S_G^1(Y|X; \theta_0; 0) &= \frac{\bar{A}}{\bar{A}} \frac{E_X E_0 S_G(Y|X; \theta_0) \mid E_X E_{\theta_0} S_G(Y|X; \theta_0)}{E_X E_0 S_H(Y|X; \theta_0) \mid E_X E_{\theta_0} S_H(Y|X; \theta_0)} \\ &= \frac{0}{E_X E_0 S_H(Y|X; \theta_0)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E_X E_0 S_G^2(Y|X; \theta_0; 0) &= \frac{\bar{A}}{\bar{A}} \frac{E_X E_0 S_G(Y|X; \theta_0) \mid E_X E_{\theta_0} S_G(Y|X; \theta_0)}{E_X E_0 S_H(Y|X; \theta_0) \mid E_X E_{\theta_0} S_H(Y|X; \theta_0)} \\ &= \frac{0}{E_X E_{\theta_0} S_H(Y|X; \theta_0)} \end{aligned}$$

Given the assumptions made earlier, it follows that $G \geq H$ if and only if the functions $E_X E_0 \log f_G^1(Y|X; \theta; \lambda_1)$ and $E_X E_0 \log f_G^2(Y|X; \theta; \lambda_2)$ have a stationary point at $(\theta; \lambda_1) = (\theta_0; 0)$ and $(\theta; \lambda_2) = (\theta_0; 0)$, respectively. Now we need to show that, if $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{\theta_0}$, the stationary point $(\theta_0; 0)$ is indeed a local maximum of the functions involved. First, fixing $\lambda_1 = 0$, $E_X E_0 \log f_G^1(Y|X; \theta; 0)$ attains a global maximum at $\theta = \theta_0$, by definition. Secondly, fixing $\theta = \theta_0$, we find, if $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{\theta_0}$,

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \lambda_1^2} E_X E_0 \log f_G^1(Y|X; \theta_0; \lambda_1) \Big|_{\lambda_1=0} = - E_X E_0 [s_H(Y|X; \theta_0) s_H^0(Y|X; \theta_0)];$$

The latter matrix is negative definite by assumption, hence $E_X E_0 \log f_G^1(Y|X; \theta_0; \lambda_1)$ attains a local maximum at $\lambda_1 = 0$. The proof is complete by noting that the functions f_G^1 and f_G^2 are identical when $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{\theta_0}$. (Q.E.D.)

The proposition is in several respects similar to Theorem 1 in Chesher and Smith [1997], which restates moment conditions in terms of an extended parametric density. Here, an encompassing condition is restated in terms of extended parametric densities. The proposition shows that $G \geq H$ if and only if the extensions of G carrying the score function of H do not alter the pseudo-true value associated with G , at least not locally. In a sense, the extensions are thus ineffective in bringing G closer to $P_{Y|X}$, according to the Kullback-Leibler (1951) Information Criterion. Further, the condition $G \geq H$ is restated in terms of properties of the score function s_H in relation to the distributions $P_{Y|X}$ and $F_G(\theta_0)$. Interestingly, the two properties mirror each other in the sense that each one, compared to the other, reverses the roles of $P_{Y|X}$ and $F_G(\theta_0)$. After all, this should not come as a surprise since, for given θ_0 , the distributions $P_{Y|X}$ and $F_G(\theta_0)$ play a symmetric role in the

definition of encompassing. Thus, we are led to define the reversed score quantity

$$s_2 = E_X E_{\theta_0} S_H(Y|X; \theta_0);$$

and, applying the same logic, the reversed LR quantity

$$l_2 = E_X E_{\theta_0} [\log f_H(Y|X; \theta_0) - \log f_H(Y|X; \theta_0^*)];$$

The quantities s_2 and l_2 share the property with s_1 and l_1 that $G \subseteq H$ is equivalent to $s_2 = 0$ and also to $l_2 = 0$. This property enables us to develop reversed score encompassing tests, based on estimates of s_2 , and reversed LR encompassing tests, based on estimates of l_2 .

One may wonder whether the same reasoning of reversing the roles of $P_{Y|X}$ and $F_G(\theta_0)$ can also be applied to the Wald encompassing test to yield something interesting. The Wald encompassing test (Gouriéroux and Monfort [1995]) is based on estimates of the Wald quantity, defined as $w_1 = \theta_0' j \theta_0$. The reversed Wald quantity would then be $w_2 = \theta_0^* j \theta_0 = j w_1$, which obviously does not lead to an interesting new test. The reason for this finding is that $P_{Y|X}$ and $F_G(\theta_0)$ play similar roles in w_1 , apart from the sign. Hence, reversing their roles doesn't lead to anything new. Looking back now at s_1 and l_1 , we clearly see that $P_{Y|X}$ and $F_G(\theta_0)$ play essentially different roles. This is why reversing them happens to be fruitful.

4 Test statistics

Given the sample $(x_t; y_t)$, $t = 1; \dots; T$, of independent observations from P_X and $P_{Y|X}$, we seek to develop tests of the hypothesis that $G \subseteq H$. It follows from the properties derived in the previous section that estimates of the quantities s_1 , l_1 , s_2 and l_2 and of their covariance matrices naturally lead to tests of $G \subseteq H$. Note that this hypothesis is weaker than the hypothesis that G is correctly specified, i.e. $P_{Y|X} \in G$. Hence estimates of the same quantities are also suited for testing the hypothesis that G is correctly specified. A distinguishing feature between tests of $G \subseteq H$ and tests of $P_{Y|X} \in G$ is that, for the latter tests the distribution theory is usually based on the assumption that G is correctly specified, whereas for the former tests the distribution theory can at most be based on the assumption that $G \subseteq H$. The distribution theory presented in this paper considers the most general case, i.e. where G possibly does not encompass H .

The pseudo-maximum likelihood estimators $\hat{\theta}$ and $\hat{\Delta}$ solve

$$\max_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log f_G(y_t|x_t; \theta)$$

and

$$\max_{\theta} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log f_H(y_t | x_t; \theta);$$

respectively. Under regularity conditions such as given in White [1982], θ_0 and θ_0 . For any $\theta \in \Theta$, let $y_t^h(\theta)$, $t = 1, \dots, T$ and $h = 1, \dots, H$, be independent drawings from $F_G(\theta)$, given x_t . For any $h = 1, \dots, H$, the simulated pseudo-maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta}_\theta^{\Delta^h}$ is defined to solve

$$\max_{\theta} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log f_H(y_t^h(\theta) | x_t; \theta);$$

Under similar regularity conditions, $\theta_0^{\Delta^h}$ and $\theta_0^{\Delta^h}$. Here and in the sequel, stochastic limits are taken as $T \rightarrow \infty$, with H fixed, possibly at 1 . Then, define the simulated score and reversed score statistics as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}_1 &= \frac{1}{TH} \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{t=1}^T s_H(y_t | x_t; \theta_0^{\Delta^h}); \\ \hat{s}_2 &= \frac{1}{TH} \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{t=1}^T s_H(y_t^h(\theta_0^{\Delta^h}) | x_t; \theta_0^{\Delta^h}); \end{aligned}$$

respectively, and the simulated LR and reversed LR statistics as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{l}_1 &= \frac{1}{TH} \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\log f_H(y_t | x_t; \theta_0^{\Delta^h}) - \log f_H(y_t | x_t; \theta_0^{\Delta}) \right]; \\ \hat{l}_2 &= \frac{1}{TH} \sum_{h=1}^H \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\log f_H(y_t^h(\theta_0^{\Delta^h}) | x_t; \theta_0^{\Delta}) - \log f_H(y_t^h(\theta_0^{\Delta^h}) | x_t; \theta_0^{\Delta^h}) \right]; \end{aligned}$$

respectively. We have $\hat{s}_1 \xrightarrow{d} s_1$, $\hat{s}_2 \xrightarrow{d} s_2$, $\hat{l}_1 \xrightarrow{d} l_1$ and $\hat{l}_2 \xrightarrow{d} l_2$. The first order limit distributions of \hat{s}_1 , \hat{s}_2 , \hat{l}_1 and \hat{l}_2 are investigated in the next section.

5 Limit distributions

We need to introduce some additional notation. Let

$$l_G(\theta) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log f_G(y_t | x_t; \theta)$$

and

$$l_H(\theta) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log f_H(y_t | x_t; \theta)$$

be the normalized log likelihood functions of G and H based on the observed data $(x_t; y_t)$, $t = 1; \dots; T$, and let

$$l_H^h(-; \textcircled{R}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log f_H(y_t^h(\textcircled{R}) | x_t; -)$$

be the normalized log likelihood function of H based on the simulated data $(x_t; y_t^h(\textcircled{R}))$, $t = 1; \dots; T$. Correspondingly, define the normalized score functions

$$s_G(\textcircled{R}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \textcircled{R}} l_G(\textcircled{R});$$

$$s_H(-) = \frac{\partial}{\partial -} l_H(-);$$

and

$$s_H^h(-; \textcircled{R}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial -} l_H^h(-; \textcircled{R});$$

5.1 Limit distributions under general conditions

For sufficiently large T , \textcircled{R} satisfies the first order condition $s_G(\textcircled{R}) = 0$. Expanding $s_G(\textcircled{R})$ in a Taylor series around $s_G(\textcircled{R}_0)$, taking the probability limit of $[\frac{\partial s_G(\textcircled{R})}{\partial \textcircled{R}}]_{\textcircled{R}=\textcircled{R}_0}$ and rearranging yields the well known result (White [1982])

$$P_{\overline{T}}(\Delta_i \textcircled{R}_0) = P_{\overline{T}} K_G^{-1} s_G(\textcircled{R}_0) + o_p(1);$$

where

$$K_G = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} E_X E_{\textcircled{R}_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \textcircled{R}} s_G(\textcircled{R}) \Big|_{\textcircled{R}=\textcircled{R}_0};$$

Similarly,

$$P_{\overline{T}}(\Delta_i -_0) = P_{\overline{T}} K_H^{-1} s_H(-_0) + o_p(1);$$

where

$$K_H = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} E_X E_{-_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial -} s_H(-) \Big|_{-=-_0};$$

and

$$P_{\overline{T}}(\Delta_{\textcircled{R}_0}^h \textcircled{R}_0) = P_{\overline{T}} K_H^{-1} s_H^h(-_{\textcircled{R}_0}; \textcircled{R}_0) + o_p(1);$$

where

$$K_H = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} E_X E_{\textcircled{R}_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial -} s_H^h(-; \textcircled{R}) \Big|_{\textcircled{R}=\textcircled{R}_0; -=-_{\textcircled{R}_0}};$$

Further, expanding Δ_{\otimes}^h around $\Delta_{\otimes_0}^h$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\bar{T}}(\Delta_{\otimes}^h | \bar{\otimes}_0) &= \rho_{\bar{T}}(\Delta_{\otimes_0}^h | \bar{\otimes}_0) + \rho_{\bar{T}}B(\otimes | \otimes_0) + o_p(1) \\ &= \rho_{\bar{T}}K_H^{i-1}S_H^h(\bar{\otimes}_0; \otimes_0) + BK_G^{i-1}S_G(\otimes_0) + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

where (see Dhaene [1997])

$$B = \frac{\partial \log f_G(Y|X; \otimes)}{\partial \otimes} \bigg|_{\otimes=\otimes_0} = K_H^{i-1}J_{HG};$$

with

$$J_{HG} = E_X E_{\otimes_0} \frac{\partial \log f_H(Y|X; \bar{\otimes})}{\partial \bar{\otimes}} \bigg|_{\bar{\otimes}=\bar{\otimes}_0} \frac{\partial \log f_G(Y|X; \otimes)}{\partial \otimes} \bigg|_{\otimes=\otimes_0};$$

Now, expanding $s_H(\Delta_{\otimes}^h)$ around $s_H(\bar{\otimes}_0)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\bar{T}}(\hat{s}_1 | s_1) &= \rho_{\bar{T}}(s_H(\bar{\otimes}_0) | s_1) \frac{\rho_{\bar{T}}}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} K_H(\Delta_{\otimes}^h | \bar{\otimes}_0) + o_p(1) \\ &= \rho_{\bar{T}}(s_H(\bar{\otimes}_0) | s_1) \frac{\rho_{\bar{T}}}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} K_H BK_G^{i-1}S_G(\otimes_0) \\ &\quad + \rho_{\bar{T}}K_H K_H^{i-1} \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} s_H^h(\bar{\otimes}_0; \otimes_0) + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

where

$$K_H = \frac{\partial \log f_H(Y|X; \bar{\otimes})}{\partial \bar{\otimes}} \bigg|_{\bar{\otimes}=\bar{\otimes}_0};$$

Expanding $s_H(\Delta_{\otimes}^h; \otimes)$ around $s_H(\bar{\otimes}_0; \otimes_0)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\bar{T}}(\hat{s}_2 | s_2) &= \frac{\rho_{\bar{T}}}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} (s_H(\bar{\otimes}_0; \otimes_0) | s_2) \frac{\rho_{\bar{T}}}{H} K_H(\Delta_{\otimes}^h | \bar{\otimes}_0) \\ &\quad + \rho_{\bar{T}}J_{HG}(\otimes | \otimes_0) + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{\rho_{\bar{T}}}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} (s_H(\bar{\otimes}_0; \otimes_0) | s_2) \frac{\rho_{\bar{T}}}{H} K_H K_H^{i-1}S_H(\bar{\otimes}_0) \\ &\quad + \rho_{\bar{T}}J_{HG}K_G^{i-1}S_G(\otimes_0) + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_{HG} &= E_X E_{\otimes_0} \frac{\partial \log f_H(Y|X; \bar{\otimes})}{\partial \bar{\otimes}} \bigg|_{\bar{\otimes}=\bar{\otimes}_0} \frac{\partial \log f_G(Y|X; \otimes)}{\partial \otimes} \bigg|_{\otimes=\otimes_0} = J_{GH}^J \\ K_H &= \frac{\partial \log f_H(Y|X; \bar{\otimes})}{\partial \bar{\otimes}} \bigg|_{\bar{\otimes}=\bar{\otimes}_0}; \end{aligned}$$

This completes the asymptotic expansions for \hat{s}_1 and \hat{s}_2 . Turning to \hat{l}_1 , expanding $l_H(\hat{\Delta}_0^h)$ around $l_H(\bar{\Delta}_0)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\bar{T}}(\hat{l}_1; l_1) &= p_{\bar{T}}(l_H(\bar{\Delta}_0); l_H(\bar{\Delta}_0); l_1) + \frac{p_{\bar{T}}}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} s_H(\bar{\Delta}_0)^h (\hat{\Delta}_0^h - \bar{\Delta}_0) \\ &\quad + p_{\bar{T}} s_H(\bar{\Delta}_0)^h (\hat{\Delta}_0^h - \bar{\Delta}_0) + o_p(1) \\ &= p_{\bar{T}}(l_H(\bar{\Delta}_0); l_H(\bar{\Delta}_0); l_1) + p_{\bar{T}} s_1^l B K_G^l s_G(\bar{\Delta}_0) \\ &\quad + p_{\bar{T}} s_1^l K_H^l \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} s_H^h(\bar{\Delta}_0; \bar{\Delta}_0) + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

where it was used that $s_H(\bar{\Delta}_0) \stackrel{!}{=} 0$. Finally, for \hat{l}_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\bar{T}}(\hat{l}_2; l_2) &= \frac{p_{\bar{T}}}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} (l_H^h(\bar{\Delta}_0; \bar{\Delta}_0); l_H^h(\bar{\Delta}_0; \bar{\Delta}_0); l_2) + \frac{p_{\bar{T}}}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} s_H^h(\bar{\Delta}_0; \bar{\Delta}_0) (\hat{\Delta}_0^h - \bar{\Delta}_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{p_{\bar{T}}}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} s_H^h(\bar{\Delta}_0; \bar{\Delta}_0) (\hat{\Delta}_0^h - \bar{\Delta}_0) + p_{\bar{T}} (l_{GH}; l_{GH})^l (\bar{\Delta}_0; \bar{\Delta}_0) + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{p_{\bar{T}}}{H} \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} (l_H^h(\bar{\Delta}_0; \bar{\Delta}_0); l_H^h(\bar{\Delta}_0; \bar{\Delta}_0); l_2) + p_{\bar{T}} s_2^l K_H^l s_H(\bar{\Delta}_0) \\ &\quad + p_{\bar{T}} (l_{GH}; l_{GH})^l K_G^l s_G(\bar{\Delta}_0) + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

using $s_H^h(\bar{\Delta}_0; \bar{\Delta}_0) \stackrel{!}{=} 0$, with

$$\begin{aligned} l_{GH} &= E_X E_{\bar{\Delta}_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\Delta}_0} \log f_G(Y|X; \bar{\Delta}_0) \log f_H(Y|X; \bar{\Delta}_0) \Big|_{\bar{\Delta}_0 = \bar{\Delta}_0}; \\ l_{GH} &= E_X E_{\bar{\Delta}_0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\Delta}_0} \log f_G(Y|X; \bar{\Delta}_0) \log f_H(Y|X; \bar{\Delta}_0) \Big|_{\bar{\Delta}_0 = \bar{\Delta}_0}; \end{aligned}$$

To summarize the expansions, let

$$\hat{d} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \hat{s}_1 \\ \hat{s}_2 \\ \hat{l}_1 \\ \hat{l}_2 \end{pmatrix}; \quad d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ s_1 \\ s_2 \\ l_1 \\ l_2 \end{pmatrix};$$

$$w_t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ s_G(y_t | x_t; \theta_0) \\ s_H(y_t | x_t; \theta_0) \\ s_H(y_t | x_t; \theta_0) \text{ ; } s_1 \\ \frac{1}{H} \mathbf{P}_{h=1}^H s_H(y_t^h(\theta_0) | x_t; \theta_0) \text{ ; } s_2 \\ \frac{1}{H} \mathbf{P}_{h=1}^H s_H(y_t^h(\theta_0) | x_t; \theta_0) \\ \log f_H(y_t | x_t; \theta_0) \text{ ; } \log f_H(y_t | x_t; \theta_0) \text{ ; } l_1 \\ \frac{1}{H} \mathbf{P}_{h=1}^H \log f_H(y_t^h(\theta_0) | x_t; \theta_0) \text{ ; } \frac{1}{H} \mathbf{P}_{h=1}^H \log f_H(y_t^h(\theta_0) | x_t; \theta_0) \text{ ; } l_2 \end{pmatrix};$$

and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \text{ ; } K_{HG} B K_G^{-1} & 0 & \text{ | } 0 & \text{ ; } K_{HG} K_H^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ \text{ ; } J_{HG} K_G^{-1} & \text{ ; } K_{HG} K_H^{-1} & 0 & \text{ | } 0 & \text{ ; } 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \text{ ; } s_1^0 B K_G^{-1} & 0 & 0 & \text{ | } 0 & \text{ ; } s_1^0 K_H^{-1} & 1 & 0 \\ \text{ ; } (I_{GH} \text{ ; } I_{GH})^0 K_G^{-1} & s_2^0 K_H^{-1} & 0 & \text{ | } 0 & \text{ ; } 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix};$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\overline{T}}(\hat{d}_T - d) = \mathbf{P}_{\overline{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}_t' A w_t + o_p(1);$$

Observe that $E_X E_0 w_t = 0$. Assuming the existence of $V = E_X E_0(w_t w_t')$,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\overline{T}}(\hat{d}_T - d) \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} N(0; AVA')$$

by the central limit theorem. Note that all the submatrices in A can be consistently estimated, and hence A itself, by replacing $E_X E_0$ by $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T E_X$ by $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T$, E_{θ_0} by $E_{\hat{\theta}_0}$ or by $\frac{1}{H} \mathbf{P}_{h=1}^H$ and using $y_t^h(\hat{\theta}_0)$ in place of y_t , θ_0 by $\hat{\theta}_0$, θ_0 by $\hat{\theta}_0$, θ_0 by $\frac{1}{H} \mathbf{P}_{h=1}^H \hat{\theta}_0$, and $(s_1; s_2; l_1; l_2)$ by $(\hat{s}_1; \hat{s}_2; \hat{l}_1; \hat{l}_2)$, successively. Similar replacements in w_t yield \hat{w}_t and $\hat{V} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{w}_t \hat{w}_t'$ as a consistent estimator of V . A consistent estimator of $AV A'$ follows.

Inspection of $A w_t$ reveals that no general asymptotic equivalences hold between subvectors of \hat{d}_T . More precisely, there does not exist in general a fixed non-zero matrix C such that $\mathbf{P}_{\overline{T}} C(\hat{d}_T - d) = o_p(1)$, because V is not of reduced rank in general and A has not reduced row rank in general. This implies, in particular, that no general asymptotic equivalences exist between \hat{s}_1 , \hat{s}_2 , \hat{l}_1 and \hat{l}_2 . This finding, and the full characterization of the joint first order limit distribution of \hat{s}_1 , \hat{s}_2 , \hat{l}_1 and \hat{l}_2 opens perspectives for jointly exploiting the evidence contained in these statistics against any of the

hypotheses $G \in H$ and $P_{Y|X} \neq G$, thereby gaining in power compared to the standard score or LR test. The unresolved problem for doing this is to control the (asymptotic) size of the joint test. A fully joint test would typically take a quadratic form in $\sqrt{T}\hat{d}$, weighted by a consistent estimate of $(AV A^0)^+$, and refer to the \hat{A}^2 distribution with appropriate degrees of freedom. As we show below, asymptotic equivalences do appear when $G \in H$ (a fortiori when $P_{Y|X} \neq G$), making $AV A^0$ a singular matrix. In many cases of interest, consistent estimates of $AV A^0$ have an asymptotic rank that exceeds the rank of $AV A^0$, which makes consistent estimation of $(AV A^0)^+$ a difficult task (see also Andrews [1989]). In other words, the main difficulty for building a test on the full vector \hat{d} is that the rank of its covariance matrix depends on whether or not $G \in H$, which is precisely the hypothesis being tested.

5.2 Limit distributions under the condition $G \in H$

The first order limit distribution of \hat{d} when $G \in H$ is easily obtained using the results of the previous subsection. We then have $d = 0$ and

$$w_t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ s_G(y_t|x_t; \theta_0) \\ s_H(y_t|x_t; \theta_0) \\ s_H(y_t|x_t; \theta_0) \\ \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H s_H(y_t^{(h)}|x_t; \theta_0) \\ \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H s_H(y_t^{(h)}|x_t; \theta_0) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} :$$

Further, $K_H = K_H$, $K_H = K_H$, $J_{GH} = J_{GH}$, $B = K_H^{-1} J_{HG}$ and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & J_{HG} K_G^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ J_{HG} K_G^{-1} & K_H K_H^{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} :$$

from which we obtain $\sqrt{T}\hat{s}_1 = o_p(1) = \sqrt{T}\hat{s}_2$ and the asymptotic equivalence

$$\sqrt{T}\hat{s}_1 = J_{HG} K_G^{-1} \sqrt{T}\hat{s}_2 + o_p(1):$$

We can be more precise about the limiting behaviour of $\hat{\Gamma}_1$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_2$ by considering the expansions

$$\begin{aligned} T I_H(\Delta^h) &= T I_H(\Delta) + \frac{T}{2} (\Delta^h - \Delta)' K_H(\Delta^h - \Delta) + o_p(1); \\ T I_H^h(\Delta; \otimes) &= T I_H^h(\Delta^h; \otimes) + \frac{T}{2} (\Delta^h - \Delta)' K_H(\Delta^h - \Delta) + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

wherefrom

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2T} \hat{\Gamma}_1 &= \frac{T}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H (\Delta^h - \Delta)' K_H(\Delta^h - \Delta) + o_p(1); \\ \sqrt{2T} \hat{\Gamma}_2 &= \frac{T}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H (\Delta^h - \Delta)' K_H(\Delta^h - \Delta) + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

Upon gathering previous results,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\bar{T}}(\Delta^h - \Delta) &= P_{\bar{T}} K_H^{i-1} S_H^h(-_0; \otimes_0) + P_{\bar{T}} K_H^{i-1} J_{HG} K_G^{i-1} S_G(\otimes_0) + P_{\bar{T}} K_H^{i-1} S_H(-_0) \\ &= \sqrt{2T} K_H^{i-1} \xi_1 + o_p(1) \\ &= \sqrt{2T} K_H^{i-1} \xi_2 + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

yielding the asymptotic equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2T} \hat{\Gamma}_1 &= \sqrt{2T} K_H^{i-1} \xi_1 + o_p(1) \\ &= \sqrt{2T} K_H^{i-1} K_H K_H^{i-1} \xi_2 + o_p(1); \\ \sqrt{2T} \hat{\Gamma}_2 &= \sqrt{2T} K_H^{i-1} \xi_2 + o_p(1) \\ &= \sqrt{2T} K_H^{i-1} K_H K_H^{i-1} \xi_1 + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\sqrt{2T} \hat{\Gamma}_1$ and $\sqrt{2T} \hat{\Gamma}_2$ are not in general asymptotically equivalent. The limit distributions can be summarized as follows. Let

$$v_t = \begin{pmatrix} S_G(y_t | x_t; \otimes_0) \\ S_H(y_t | x_t; -_0) \\ \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H S_H(y_t^h(\otimes_0) | x_t; -_0) \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} J_{HG} K_G^{i-1} & K_H K_H^{i-1} & I \end{pmatrix} :$$

Now $E v_t = 0$, and letting $S = E(v_t v_t')$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\bar{T}} \xi_1 &\stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} N(0; K_H K_H^{i-1} D S D' K_H^{i-1} K_H); \\ P_{\bar{T}} \xi_2 &\stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} N(0; D S D'); \\ \sqrt{2T} \hat{\Gamma}_1 &\stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} M(\cdot, (K_H^{i-1} K_H K_H^{i-1} D S D')); \\ \sqrt{2T} \hat{\Gamma}_2 &\stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} M(\cdot, (K_H^{i-1} D S D')); \end{aligned}$$

where $M(\cdot(W))$ is the distribution of a weighted sum of independent \hat{A}^2 variates with weights equal to the eigenvalues of W . The matrices D and S and the necessary eigenvalues can be consistently estimated by the procedure outlined in the previous subsection. If we can determine the rank of the asymptotic covariance matrices of $\sqrt{T}\hat{s}_1$ and $\sqrt{T}\hat{s}_2$, asymptotic score and reversed score encompassing tests follow readily. Asymptotic LR and reversed LR encompassing tests follow also from the limit distribution given above. They require the calculation of critical values of weighted sum of chi-squares distributions, which can easily be obtained by simulation. Note that LR and reversed LR tests do not require the determination of the rank of a matrix.

5.3 Limit distributions under the condition $P_{Y|X} \geq G$

Further simplifications occur when $P_{Y|X} \geq G$. We have $F_G(\otimes_0) = P_{Y|X}$, wherefrom $K_H = K_H$, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T}\hat{s}_1 &= \sqrt{T}J_{HG}K_G^{-1}S_G(\otimes_0) + \sqrt{T}^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^H s_H(-_0) \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H s_H^h(-_0; \otimes_0) + o_p(1) \\ \sqrt{T}\hat{s}_2 &= \sqrt{T}J_{HG}K_G^{-1}S_G(\otimes_0) + \sqrt{T}^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^H s_H(-_0) \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H s_H^h(-_0; \otimes_0) + o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

and the asymptotic equivalences

$$\sqrt{T}\hat{s}_1 = \sqrt{T}\hat{s}_2 + o_p(1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2T}\hat{I}_1 &= \sqrt{T}\hat{s}_1^0 K_H^{-1} \hat{s}_1 + o_p(1) \\ &= \sqrt{T}\hat{s}_2^0 K_H^{-1} \hat{s}_2 + o_p(1); \\ &= \sqrt{2T}\hat{I}_2 + o_p(1); \end{aligned}$$

Note also that $s_H(-_0)$ and $s_H^h(-_0; \otimes_0)$, $h = 1; \dots; H$, are conditionally independent and identically distributed, given x_t , $t = 1; \dots; T$. Asymptotic score and reversed score tests and asymptotic LR and reversed LR tests of $P_{Y|X} \geq G$ can be constructed along the same lines as given in the previous subsection, taking advantage of the simplifications just mentioned.

6 Conclusion

We have outlined alternative procedures to the standard score and LR encompassing tests. They follow from restating the encompassing condition in

terms of exponentially tilted models. Intuitively, the alternative procedures are obtained from reversing the roles of the true distribution generating the data and the pseudo-true distribution of the model under test. Application requires the models to be estimable by the method of maximum likelihood. No analytic calculations are needed beyond the analytic first and second derivatives of the log likelihood functions. The need to calculate mathematical expectations analytically is avoided by the use of any finite number of simulations from the model under test.

References

- [1] Andrews, D.W.K. (1987), "Asymptotic Results for Generalized Wald Tests", *Econometric Theory*, 3, 348–358.
- [2] Barndorff-Nielsen, O.E. and D.R. Cox (1989), *Asymptotic Techniques for Use in Statistics*, London, Chapman and Hall.
- [3] Bierens, H. (1994), *Estimation, Testing, and Specification of Cross-Section and Time Series Models*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [4] Bierens, H. (1991), "A Consistent Conditional Moment Test of Functional Form", *Econometrica*, 58, 1443–1458.
- [5] Chen, Y.-T. and C.-M. Kuan (2000), "The Pseudo-True Score Encompassing Test for Non-Nested Hypotheses", presented at the 8th World Congress of the Econometric Society, Seattle.
- [6] Chesher, A. and R.J. Smith (1997), "Likelihood Ratio Specification Tests", *Econometrica*, 65, 627–646.
- [7] Dhaene, G. (1997), *Encompassing: Formulation, Properties and Testing*, Lecture Notes in Economic and Mathematical Systems, n° 446, Springer Verlag, Berlin.
- [8] Dhaene, G., C. Gouriéroux and O. Scaillet (1998), "Indirect Encompassing and Instrumental Models", *Econometrica*, 66, 673–689.
- [9] Gouriéroux, C. and A. Monfort (1994), "Testing Non-Nested Hypotheses", in *Handbook of Econometrics, IV*, ed. by R. Engle and D. McFadden, Elsevier Science, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2583–2637.

- [10] Gouriéroux, C. and A. Monfort (1995), "Testing, Encompassing and Simulating Dynamic Econometric Models", *Econometric Theory*, 11, 195–228.
- [11] Hendry, D.F. and J.-F. Richard (1990), "Recent Developments in the Theory of Encompassing", in *Contributions to Operations Research and Econometrics, The Twentieth Anniversary of CORE*, ed. by B. Cornet and H. Tulkens, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- [12] Mizon, G.E. and J.-F. Richard (1986), "The Encompassing Principle and its Applications to Testing Non-nested Hypotheses", *Econometrica*, 54, 657–678.
- [13] Newey, W. (1985), "Maximum Likelihood Specification Testing and Conditional Moment Tests", *Econometrica*, 53, 1047–1070.
- [14] Kullback, S. and R.A. Leibler (1951), "On Information and Sufficiency," *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22, 79–86.
- [15] Sawa, T. (1978), "Information Criteria for Discriminating among Alternative Regression Models", *Econometrica*, 46, 1273–1292.
- [16] Smith, R. (1994), "Consistent Tests of the Encompassing Hypothesis", CREST-DP 9403.
- [17] Tauchen, G. (1985), "Diagnostic Testing and Evaluation of Maximum Likelihood Models", *Journal of Econometrics*, 30, 415–443.
- [18] Vuong, Q. (1989), "Likelihood Ratio Tests for Model Selection and Non Nested Hypotheses", *Econometrica*, 57, 303–333.
- [19] White, H. (1982), "Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Misspecified Models", *Econometrica*, 50, 1–26.



WORKING PAPER SERIES

1

- 94/01 **L. GOUBERT, E. OMEY**, The long-term labour demand and the role of productivity in manufacturing in eight OECD-countries, June 1994, 24 p.
- 94/02 **F. HEYLEN**, Social, economic and political institutions and taxes on labour, September 1994, 38 p. (published in *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 1995).
- 94/03 **P. JOOS, H. OOGHE**, Comparison between market determined and accounting determined measures of risk : an empirical assessment for the non-financial firms listed on the Brussels stock exchange, October 1994, 35 p.
- 94/04 **R. VANDER VENNET**, Market structure and operational efficiency a determinants of EC bank profitability, September 1994, 25 p. (published in *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 1994).
- 94/05 **S. MANIGART, B. CLARYSSE, K. DEBACKERE**, Entry despite the network : exploring the relationship between network structure and entry patterns in emergent organizational populations, December 1994, 39 p.
- 95/06 **G. VAN HUFFEL, P. JOOS, H. OOGHE**, Semi-annual earnings announcements and market reaction : some recent findings for a small capital market, February 1995, 23 p. (published in *European Accounting Review*, 1996).
- 95/07 **H. SAPIENZA, S. MANIGART, W. VERMEIR**, A comparison of venture capitalist governance and value-added in the U.S. and Western Europe, February 1995, 31 p. (published in *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1996).
- 95/08 **F. HEYLEN, L. GOUBERT, E. OMEY**, Unemployment in Europe : a problem of relative or aggregate demand shocks ? , March 1995, 16 p. (published in *International Labour Review*, 1996).
- 95/09 **R. VANDER VENNET**, The effect of mergers and acquisitions on the efficiency and profitability of EC credit institutions, April 1995, 35 p. (published in *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 1996).
- 95/10 **P. VAN KENHOVE**, A comparison between the "pick any" method of scaling and the semantic differential, April 1995, 14 p.
- 95/11 **K. SCHOORS**, Bad loans in transition economies, May 1995, 42 p.
- 95/12 **P. JOOS, H. OOGHE**, Problemen bij het opstellen van classificatiemodellen : een toepassing op commerciële krediet scoring bij financiële instellingen, Juni 1995, 39 p. (gepubliceerd in *Tijdschrift voor Economie en Management*, 1998).
- 95/13 **I. DE BEELDE**, The evolution of industrial accounting thought in Belgium in the first half of the 20th century. A textbook approach, July 1995, 29 p.
- 95/14 **D. SCHOCKAERT**, Japanse laagconjunctuur en vastgoedmarktontwikkelingen, Oktober 1995, 24 p. (gepubliceerd in *Maandschrift Economie*, 1996).
- 95/15 **P. GEMMEL, R. VAN DIERDONCK**, The design of a MRP-based hospital service requirements planning system : the impact of different sources of uncertainty, October 1995, October 1995, 23 p.
- 95/16 **J. MATON**, The Cape of Good Hope. Employment and income distribution in South Africa, September 1995, October 1995, 59 p.
- 96/17 **D. WAEYTENS**, Activity-based information in budgeting : the impact on information asymmetry, budget slack creation and related dysfunctional behaviors - a lab experiment, February 1996, 40 p.
- 96/18 **R. SLAGMULDER**, Using management control systems to achieve alignment between strategic investment decisions and strategy, February 1996, 36 p. (published in *Management Accounting Research*, 1997).
- 96/19 **N. VALCKX, W. DE VIJLDER**, Monetary policy and asset prices : a comparison of the Fed's announcement policies 1987-1995, March 1996, 19 p. (published in *Bank- en Financiewezen*, 1996).
- 96/20 **S. VANDORPE, J. DENYS, E. OMEY**, De arbeidsmarktintegratie van afgestudeerden uit TSO en BSO : een longitudinale studie, Mei 1996, 21 p. (gepubliceerd in *Economisch en Sociaal Tijdschrift*, 1997)



WORKING PAPER SERIES

2

- 96/21 **N. VALCKX**, Business cycle properties of financial indicators in Germany, October 1996, 29 p.
- 96/22 **T. TERMOTE**, De arbeidsmarktparticipatie van de vrouw, ontwikkeling van de dienstensector en werkgelegenheid, November 1996, 35 p.
- 97/23 **M. VERHUE**, Demand for unemployment insurance : a survey-based analysis, January 1997, 25 p.
- 97/24 **R. VAN HOVE, R. FRAMBACH, P. VAN KENHOVE**, The impact of physical attractiveness in advertising on consumer attitude : the role of product involvement, January 1997, 25 p.
- 97/25 **I. DE BEELDE**, Creating a profession 'out of nothing'. The case of the Belgian auditing profession, February 1997, 27 p.
- 97/26 **L. GOUBERT**, De flexibiliteit van de Belgische relatieve lonen, Maart 1997, 27 p.
- 97/27 **S. MANIGART, K. DE WAELE, M. WRIGHT, K. ROBBIE**, Venture capitalist's appraisal of investment projects : an empirical study in four European countries, March 1997, 18 p. (published in *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 1997).
- 97/28 **P. DE PELSMACKER, J. VAN DEN BERGH**, Advertising content and irritation. A Study of 226 TV commercials, April 1997, 27 p. (published in *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 1998).
- 97/29 **R. VANDER VENNET**, Determinants of EU bank takeovers : a logit analysis, April 1997, 23 p. (published as 'Causes and consequences of EU bank takeovers', in S. Eijffinger, K. Koedijk, M. Pagano and R. Portes (eds.), *The Changing European Financial Landscape*, CEPR, 1999).
- 97/30 **R. COOPER, R. SLAGMULDER**, Factors influencing the target costing process : lessons from Japanese practice, April 1997, 29 p.
- 97/31 **E. SCHOKKAERT, M. VERHUE, E. OMEY**, Individual preferences concerning unemployment compensation : insurance and solidarity, June 1997, 24 p.
- 97/32 **F. HEYLEN**, A contribution to the empirical analysis of the effects of fiscal consolidation : explanation of failure in Europe in the 1990s, June 1997, 30 p. (revised version, co-authored by G. Everaert, published in *Public Choice*, 2000).
- 97/33 **R. FRAMBACH, E. NIJSSEN**, Industrial pricing practices and determinants, June 1997, 33 p. (published in D. Thorne Leclair and M. Hartline (eds.), *Marketing theory and applications*, vol. 8, Proceedings AMA Winter Conference 1997).
- 97/34 **I. DE BEELDE**, An exploratory investigation of industry specialization of large audit firms, July 1997, 19 p. (published in *International Journal of Accounting*, 1997).
- 97/35 **G. EVERAERT**, Negative economic growth externalities from crumbling public investment in Europe : evidence based on a cross-section analysis for the OECD-countries, July 1997, 34 p.
- 97/36 **M. VERHUE, E. SCHOKKAERT, E. OMEY**, De kloof tussen laag- en hooggeschoolden en de politieke houdbaarheid van de Belgische werkloosheidsverzekering : een empirische analyse, augustus 1997, 30 p. (gepubliceerd in *Economisch en Sociaal Tijdschrift*, 1999).
- 97/37 **J. CROMBEZ, R. VANDER VENNET**, The performance of conditional betas on the Brussels Stock exchange, September 1997, 21 p. (published in *Tijdschrift voor Economie en Management*, 2000).
- 97/38 **M. DEBRUYNE, R. FRAMBACH**, Effective pricing of new industrial products, September 1997, 23 p. (published in D. Grewal and C. Pechmann (eds.), *Marketing theory and applications*, vol. 9, Proceedings AMA Winter Conference 1998).
- 97/39 **J. ALBRECHT**, Environmental policy and the inward investment position of US 'dirty' industries, October 1997, 20 p. (published in *Intereconomics*, 1998).



WORKING PAPER SERIES

3

- 97/40 **A. DEHAENE, H. OOGHE**, De disciplineren van het management : een literatuuroverzicht, oktober 1997, 28 p. (published in *Economisch en Sociaal Tijdschrift*, 2000).
- 97/41 **G. PEERSMAN**, The monetary transmission mechanism : empirical evidence for EU-countries, November 1997, 25 p.
- 97/42 **S. MANIGART, K. DE WAELE**, Choice dividends and contemporaneous earnings announcements in Belgium, November 1997, 25 p. (published in *Cahiers Economiques de Bruxelles*, 1999).
- 97/43 **H. OOGHE**, Financial Management Practices in China, December 1997, 24 p. (published in *European Business Review*, 1998).
- 98/44 **B. CLARYSSE, R. VAN DIERDONCK**, Inside the black box of innovation : strategic differences between SMEs, January 1998, 30 p.
- 98/45 **B. CLARYSSE, K. DEBACKERE, P. TEMIN**, Innovative productivity of US biopharmaceutical start-ups : insights from industrial organization and strategic management, January 1998, 27 p. (published in *International Journal of Biotechnology*, 2000).
- 98/46 **R. VANDER VENNET**, Convergence and the growth pattern of OECD bank markets, February 1998, 21 p. (forthcoming as 'The law of proportionate effect and OECD bank sectors' in *Applied Economics*, 2001).
- 98/47 **B. CLARYSSE, U. MULBUR**, Regional cohesion in Europe ? The role of EU RTD policy reconsidered, April 1998, 28 p. (forthcoming in *Research Policy*, 2000).
- 98/48 **A. DEHAENE, H. OOGHE**, Board composition, corporate performance and dividend policy, April 1998, 22 p.
- 98/49 **P. JOOS, K. VANHOOF, H. OOGHE, N. SIERENS**, Credit classification : a comparison of logit models and decision trees, May 1998, 15 p.
- 98/50 **J. ALBRECHT**, Environmental regulation, comparative advantage and the Porter hypothesis, May 1998, 35 p. (published in *International Journal of Development Planning Literature*, 1999)
- 98/51 **S. VANDORPE, I. NICAISE, E. OMEY**, 'Work Sharing Insurance' : the need for government support, June 1998, 20 p.
- 98/52 **G. D. BRUTON, H. J. SAPIENZA, V. FRIED, S. MANIGART**, U.S., European and Asian venture capitalists' governance : are theories employed in the examination of U.S. entrepreneurship universally applicable ?, June 1998, 31 p.
- 98/53 **S. MANIGART, K. DE WAELE, M. WRIGHT, K. ROBBIE, P. DESBRIERES, H. SAPIENZA, A. BEEKMAN**, Determinants of required return in venture capital investments : a five country study, June 1998, 36 p. (forthcoming in *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2001)
- 98/54 **J. BOUCKAERT, H. DEGRYSE**, Price competition between an expert and a non-expert, June 1998, 29p. (forthcoming in *International Journal of Industrial Organisation*, 2000).
- 98/55 **N. SCHILLEWAERT, F. LANGERAK, T. DUHAMEL**, Non probability sampling for WWW surveys : a comparison of methods, June 1998, 12 p. (published in *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 1999).
- 98/56 **F. HEYLEN**, Monetaire Unie en arbeidsmarkt : reflecties over loonvorming en macro-economisch beleid, juni 1998, 15 p. (gepubliceerd in M. Eyskens e.a., *De euro en de toekomst van het Europese maatschappijmodel*, Intersentia, 1999).
- 98/57 **G. EVERAERT, F. HEYLEN**, Public capital and productivity growth in Belgium, July 1998, 20 p. (published in *Economic Modelling*, 2001).
- 98/58 **G. PEERSMAN, F. SMETS**, The Taylor rule : a useful monetary policy guide for the ECB ?, September 1998, 28 p. (published in *International Finance*, 1999).



WORKING PAPER SERIES

4

-
- 98/59 **J. ALBRECHT**, Environmental consumer subsidies and potential reductions of CO₂ emissions, October 1998, 28 p.
- 98/60 **K. SCHOORS**, A payment system failure and its consequences for interrepublican trade in the former Soviet Union, December 1998, 31 p.
- 98/61 **M. DE LOOF**, Intragroup relations and the determinants of corporate liquid reserves : Belgian evidence, December 1998, 29 p. (forthcoming in *European Financial Management*, 2000).
- 98/62 **P. VAN KENHOVE, W. VAN WATERSCHOOT, K. DE WULF**, The impact of task definition on store choice and store-attribute saliences, December 1998, 16 p. (published in *Journal of Retailing*, 1999).
- 99/63 **P. GEMMEL, F. BOURGONJON**, Divergent perceptions of TQM implementation in hospitals, January 1999, 25 p. (forthcoming in *Journal of Management in Medicine*, 2000)
- 99/64 **K. SCHOORS**, The credit squeeze during Russia's early transition. A bank-based view, January 1999, 26 p. (published as *CEPR Discussion Paper*, nr. 2229, 1999).
- 99/65 **G. EVERAERT**, Shifts in balanced growth and public capital - an empirical analysis for Belgium, March 1999, 24 p.
- 99/66 **M. DE LOOF, M. JEGERS**, Trade Credit, Corporate Groups, and the Financing of Belgian Firms, March 1999, 31 p. (published in *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, 1999).
- 99/67 **M. DE LOOF, I. VERSCHUEREN**, Are leases and debt substitutes ? Evidence from Belgian firms, March 1999, 11 p. (published in *Financial Management*, 1999).
- 99/68 **H. OOGHE, A. DEHAENE**, De sociale balans in België : voorstel van analysemethode en toepassing op het boekjaar 1996, April 1999, 28 p. (gepubliceerd in *Accountancy en Bedrijfskunde Kwartaalschrift*, 1999).
- 99/69 **J. BOUCKAERT**, Monopolistic competition with a mail order business, May 1999, 9 p. (published in *Economics Letters*, 2000).
- 99/70 **R. MOENAERT, F. CAELDRIES, A. LIEVENS, E. WOUTERS**, Communication flows in international product innovation teams, June 1999, p. (published in *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 2000).
- 99/71 **G. EVERAERT**, Infrequent large shocks to unemployment. New evidence on alternative persistence perspectives, July 1999, 28 p.
- 99/72 **L. POZZI**, Tax discounting and direct crowding-out in Belgium : implications for fiscal policy, August 1999, 21 p.
- 99/73 **I. VERSCHUEREN, M. DE LOOF**, Intragroup debt, intragroup guaranties and the capital structure of Belgian firms, August 1999, 26 p.
- 99/74 **A. BOSMANS, P. VAN KENHOVE, P. VLERICK, H. HENDRICKX**, Automatic Activation of the Self in a Persuasion Context, September 1999, 19 p. (forthcoming in *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2000).
- 99/75 **I. DE BEELDE, S. COOREMAN, H. LEYDENS**, Expectations of users of financial information with regard to the tasks carried out by auditors, October 1999, 17 p.
- 99/76 **J. CHRISTIAENS**, Converging new public management reforms and diverging accounting practices in Belgian local governments, October 1999, 26 p.
- 99/77 **V. WEETS**, Who will be the new auditor ?, October 1999, 22 p.
- 99/78 **M. DEBRUYNE, R. MOENAERT, A. GRIFFIN, S. HART, E.J. HULTINK, H. ROBBEN**, The impact of new product launch strategies on competitive reaction in industrial markets, November 1999, 25 p.
- 99/79 **H. OOGHE, H. CLAUS, N. SIERENS, J. CAMERLYNCK**, International comparison of failure prediction models from different countries: an empirical analysis, December 1999, 33 p.



WORKING PAPER SERIES

5

-
- 00/80 **K. DE WULF, G. ODEKERKEN-SCHRÖDER**, The influence of seller relationship orientation and buyer relationship proneness on trust, commitment, and behavioral loyalty in a consumer environment, January 2000, 27 p.
- 00/81 **R. VANDER VENNET**, Cost and profit efficiency of financial conglomerates and universal banks in Europe., February 2000, 33 p. (forthcoming in *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, 2001)
- 00/82 **J. BOUCKAERT**, Bargaining in markets with simultaneous and sequential suppliers, April 2000, 23 p. (forthcoming in *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 2001)
- 00/83 **N. HOUTHOOFD, A. HEENE**, A systems view on what matters to excel, May 2000, 22 p.
- 00/84 **D. VAN DE GAER, E. SCHOKKAERT, M. MARTINEZ**, Three meanings of intergenerational mobility, May 2000, 20 p. (forthcoming in *Economica*, 2001)
- 00/85 **G. DHAENE, E. SCHOKKAERT, C. VAN DE VOORDE**, Best affine unbiased response decomposition, May 2000, 9 p.
- 00/86 **D. BUYENS, A. DE VOS**, The added value of the HR-department : empirical study and development of an integrated framework, June 2000, 37 p.
- 00/87 **K. CAMPO, E. GIJSBRECHTS, P. NISOL**, The impact of stock-outs on whether, how much and what to buy, June 2000, 50 p.
- 00/88 **K. CAMPO, E. GIJSBRECHTS, P. NISOL**, Towards understanding consumer response to stock-outs, June 2000, 40 p.
- 00/89 **K. DE WULF, G. ODEKERKEN-SCHRÖDER, P. SCHUMACHER**, Why it takes two to build succesful buyer-seller relationships July 2000, 31 p.
- 00/90 **J. CROMBEZ, R. VANDER VENNET**, Exact factor pricing in a European framework, September 2000, 38 p.
- 00/91 **J. CAMERLYNCK, H. OOGHE**, Pre-acquisition profile of privately held companies involved in takeovers : an empirical study, October 2000, 34 p.
- 00/92 **K. DENECKER, S. VAN ASSCHE, J. CROMBEZ, R. VANDER VENNET, I. LEMAHIEU**, Value-at-risk prediction using context modeling, November 2000, 24 p.
- 00/93 **P. VAN KENHOVE, I. VERMEIR, S. VERNIERS**, An empirical investigation of the relationships between ethical beliefs, ethical ideology, political preference and need for closure of Dutch-speaking consumers in Belgium, November 2000, 37 p.
- 00/94 **P. VAN KENHOVE, K. WIJNEN, K. DE WULF**, The influence of topic involvement on mail survey response behavior, November 2000, 40 p.
- 00/95 **A. BOSMANS, P. VAN KENHOVE, P. VLERICK, H. HENDRICKX**, The effect of mood on self-referencing in a persuasion context, November 2000, 26 p.
- 00/96 **P. EVERAERT, G. BOËR, W. BRUGGEMAN**, The Impact of Target Costing on Cost, Quality and Development Time of New Products: Conflicting Evidence from Lab Experiments, December 2000, 47 p.
- 00/97 **G. EVERAERT**, Balanced growth and public capital: An empirical analysis with I(2)-trends in capital stock data, December 2000, 29 p.
- 00/98 **G. EVERAERT, F. HEYLEN**, Public capital and labour market performance in Belgium, December 2000, 45 p.