

JACKKNIFE EMPIRICAL LIKELIHOOD-BASED INFERENCE FOR S-GINI INDICES

Sreelakshmi N*, Sudheesh K Kattumannil^{**,†} and Rituparna Sen^{**}

^{*}Indian Institute of Technology, Chennai, India.

^{**} Indian Statistical Institute, Chennai, India.

ABSTRACT. Widely used income inequality measure, Gini index is extended to form a family of income inequality measures known as Single-Series Gini (S-Gini) indices. In this study, we develop empirical likelihood (EL) and jackknife empirical likelihood (JEL) based inference for S-Gini indices. We prove that the limiting distribution of both EL and JEL ratio statistics are Chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom. Using the asymptotic distribution we construct EL and JEL based confidence intervals for relative S-Gini indices. We also give bootstrap and bootstrap calibrated empirical likelihood confidence intervals for S-Gini indices. A numerical study is carried out to compare the performances of the proposed confidence interval with the bootstrap methods. A test for S-Gini indices based on jackknife empirical likelihood ratio is also proposed. Finally we illustrate the proposed method using an income data.

Key Words: Gini index; S-Gini index; Empirical likelihood; Jackknife empirical likelihood; U-statistics.

1. Introduction

Several indices of economic inequality, compatible with suitable axioms, have been proposed in the literature. For more than one century GMD and its derived measures (such as Gini index) celebrate a prominent role in the

[†] Corresponding author E-mail: skkattu@isichennai.res.in.

area of measurement of income inequality. Gini mean difference is extended to form generalized families which vary in their properties and one such family is S-Gini family (Yitzhaki and Schechtman, 2013). In this article, we discuss statistical inference associated with Single-Series Gini (S-Gini) family. We refer to Donaldson and Weymark (1980), Yitzhaki(1983), Zitikis and Gastwirth (2002), Zitikis (2003) and Barret and Donald (2009) and the references therein for the discussion on inference about S-Gini indices.

Finding simple reliable estimators of different income inequality measures and obtaining a consistent estimator for their asymptotic variance are important topic of research. Many authors discussed the estimation of income inequality as well as poverty measures based on theory of U-statistics. For review of U-statistics based estimators see Formby et al. (2001) and Xu (2007). Xu (2000) explained the estimation of asymptotic variance of generalized Gini indices using iterated bootstrap method proposed by Hall (1992). Zitikis (2003) obtained a plug in estimator for S-Gini index and showed that the estimator is consistent and has asymptotic normal distribution. Giorgi et al. (2006) studied the asymptotic distribution of the plug-in estimators of S-Gini indices and noted that bootstrap based confidence interval perform better than normal approximation interval. Barret and Donald (2009) obtained an estimator of S-Gini index and studied its asymptotic properties using influence function. Demuynck (2012) proposed an unbiased estimator for absolute S-Gini indices and studied asymptotic properties of the estimator using theory of combinatorics.

It is important to find the confidence interval for poverty and inequality measure to compare these measures in different population of interest. Empirical likelihood based confidence interval and likelihood ratio test (Owen 1988, 1990) received much attention recently. Qin et al. (2010) obtained an empirical likelihood confidence intervals for the Gini measure of income

inequality and showed that the intervals based on normal or bootstrap approximation are less satisfactory than the bootstrap calibrated empirical likelihood ratio confidence intervals for small or moderate sample size. Peng (2011) also independently discussed the empirical likelihood inference for Gini index and showed that the bootstrap calibration of the empirical likelihood method perform better than the some other bootstrap methods. Qin et al. (2013) discussed empirical likelihood-based inferences for the Lorenz curve. They obtained the profile empirical likelihood ratio statistics for the Lorenz ordinate under the simple as well as the stratified random sampling designs. Lv et al. (2017) obtained a bootstrap-calibrated empirical likelihood confidence intervals for the difference between two Gini index. In this work, first we obtain empirical likelihood based confidence interval for relative S-Gini indices.

Implementation of empirical likelihood method is difficult when the maximization involve non-linear constraints. Motivated by this, Jing et al. (2009) proposed jackknife empirical likelihood (JEL) inference for obtaining confidence interval of a desired parametric function. They illustrated the JEL method using one as well as two sample U-statistics. Wang et al. (2016) proposed a jackknife empirical likelihood based confidence interval for the Gini index. Wang and Shao (2016) derived the jackknife empirical likelihood for the difference of two Gini indices for dependent and independent data. Recently, Lou and Qin (2018) obtained a kernel smoothing estimator for the Lorenz curve and developed a smoothed jackknife empirical likelihood method for constructing confidence intervals of Lorenz ordinates. Sang et al. (2019) developed JEL based test for testing the equality of Gini correlation. In this work, we obtain a novel U-statistics estimator for S-Gini indices which allows direct utilization of the jackknife empirical likelihood without involving any nuisance parameter.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we derive empirical log likelihood ratio statistic for relative S-Gini indices and prove that its limiting distribution is chi square distribution with one degree of freedom. In Section 3, we obtain an estimators for S-Gini indices based on U-statistics and study its asymptotic properties. Making use of this we propose a jackknife empirical likelihood based confidence interval for relative S-Gini indices. In Section 4, we report the result of a numerical study done to evaluate the performances of the proposed confidence intervals. We also evaluate the performance of the jackknife empirical likelihood ratio test. We illustrate our method using per capita personal income of the United States and the result is reported in Section 5. We conclude our study in Section 6.

2. Empirical Likelihood Inference for Relative S-Gini indices

In this section, we construct an empirical likelihood based confidence interval for relative S-Gini index. First we review the concept of Gini index and its variant. Let X be a non-negative random variable with absolute continuous distribution function $F(\cdot)$ and finite mean $\mu = E(X)$. Lorenz curve is defined as

$$L(p) = \frac{1}{\mu} \int_0^{F^{-1}(p)} t dF(t), \quad (1)$$

where $p = F(x)$ and $F^{-1}(p)$ is the p -th quantile of X . The function L is non-decreasing and convex which maps on to the interval $[0, 1]$. Gini index is defined as twice the area between Lorenz curve and the line of equality. It is given by

$$G = 1 - 2 \int_0^1 L(p) dp. \quad (2)$$

Thus G measures an extend to which the distribution of income among individuals within an economy deviates from perfectly equal distribution.

Gini index can be expressed in terms of covariance between X and $F(X)$ as

$$G = \frac{2}{\mu} \text{Cov}(X, F(X)). \quad (3)$$

Suppose the random variables X_1 and X_2 are distributed as F . Gini mean difference (GMD) is defined as the expected absolute difference between X_1 and X_2 . That is

$$GMD = E|X_1 - X_2|.$$

Making use of the identity $|X_1 - X_2| = 2\max(X_1, X_2) - X_1 - X_2$, we can express GMD as

$$GMD = 4\text{Cov}(X, F(X)). \quad (4)$$

In view of (3), Gini index can be express as

$$G = \frac{GMD}{2\mu}. \quad (5)$$

Several income inequality measures are derived from GMD by taking different weights at the expectation and one among them is S-Gini family of indices. We refer to Yitzhaki and Schechtman (2013) for more details about Gini based parameter. The advantage of having S-Gini family is that the evaluation of robustness of result can be done by knowing one member of that family (Barrett and Donald, 2009). The absolute and relative S-Gini indices are defined, as

$$S_\nu = -\nu \text{Cov}(X, \bar{F}_X^{\nu-1}(X)); \nu > 0, \nu \neq 1 \quad (6)$$

and

$$R_\nu = \frac{-\nu}{\mu} \text{Cov}(X, \bar{F}_X^{\nu-1}(X)); \nu > 0, \nu \neq 1, \quad (7)$$

respectively, where $\bar{F}(x) = 1 - F(x)$ is the survival function of X at x . Suppose $X_{(i)}$ denotes the i -th order statistic based on a random sample X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n ; from F . The plug-in estimator of absolute Gini indices is

given by

$$\tilde{S}^\nu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(n-i+1)^\nu - (n-i)^\nu}{n^\nu} X_{(i)}. \quad (8)$$

Hence the plug-in estimator of relative S-Gini indices is given by

$$\tilde{R}^\nu = 1 - \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right]^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(n-i+1)^\nu - (n-i)^\nu}{n^{\nu-1}} X_{(i)}. \quad (9)$$

We use above estimators to obtain the empirical likelihood based confidence interval for R_ν . Next, we develop EL based confidence interval of relative S-Gini index.

Recalling the definition given in (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\nu &= \frac{-\nu}{\mu} \text{Cov}(X, \bar{F}_X^{\nu-1}(X)) \\ &= \frac{-\nu}{\mu} \int_0^\infty (x - \mu) \bar{F}^{\nu-1}(x) dF(x). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Hence relative S-Gini index can be expressed as

$$R_\nu = \frac{E[(1 - \nu \bar{F}^{\nu-1}(X))X]}{E(X)}. \quad (11)$$

We use the identity given in (11) to obtain the estimating equation that can be used to construct empirical likelihood of R_ν . Using a random sample X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n ; from F , the empirical likelihood for R_ν is defined as

$$EL(R_\nu) = \sup_{\mathbf{p}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n p_i; \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1; \sum_{i=1}^n p_i C(X_i, R_\nu) = 0 \right),$$

where $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ is a probability vector and

$$C(X_i, R_\nu) = [1 - \nu \bar{F}^{\nu-1}(X_i)] X_i - R_\nu X_i; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Since above equation depends on unknown $\bar{F}(\cdot)$, we replace $\bar{F}(\cdot)$ by $\bar{F}_n(\cdot)$, the empirical survival function of X . Hence the profile empirical likelihood

for R_ν is given by

$$EL_1(R_\nu) = \sup_{\mathbf{p}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n p_i; \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1; \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \widehat{C}(X_i, R_\nu) = 0 \right),$$

where

$$\widehat{C}(X_i, R_\nu) = [1 - \nu \bar{F}_n^{\nu-1}(X_i)] X_i - R_\nu X_i; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

By Lagrange multiplier method, the maximum occurs at

$$p_i = \frac{1}{n} \left(1 + \lambda \widehat{C}(X_i, R_\nu) \right)^{-1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

where λ is the solution of

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\widehat{C}(X_i, R_\nu)}{1 + \lambda \widehat{C}(X_i, R_\nu)} = 0.$$

Also note that, $\prod_{k=1}^n p_i$, subject to $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$, attains its maximum n^{-n} at $p_i = n^{-1}$. Hence, the empirical log likelihood ratio for R_ν is given by

$$L(R_\nu) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log [1 + \lambda \widehat{C}(X_i, R_\nu)].$$

The following theorem explains the limiting distribution of $L(R_\nu)$.

Theorem 1. *Let $h_1(x) = x\bar{F}^{\nu-1}(x) + (\nu-1) \int_0^x y\bar{F}^{\nu-2}(y)dF(y)$ and assume that $E(h_1^2(X)) < \infty$. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, the distribution of $L(R_\nu)$ is a scaled chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom. That is,*

$$L(R_\nu) \xrightarrow{d} \frac{\sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2} \chi^2(1),$$

where

$$\sigma_1^2 = \text{Var}[(1 - \nu \bar{F}^{\nu-1}(X) - R_\nu)X]$$

and

$$\sigma_2^2 = \text{Var}[(1 - 2h_1(X) - R_\nu)X].$$

Proof. Using the distribution function of $\min(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_v)$, it is easy to verify $E(h_1(X)) = E(\nu X \bar{F}(X))$. Consider

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n C(X_i, R_\nu) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n ((1 - 2h_1(X_i) - R_\nu)X_i + E(h_1(X))) + o_p(1).$$

Therefore by central limit theorem, as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n C(X_i, R_\nu) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma_2^2).$$

Since $E((1 - \nu \bar{F}(X) - R_\nu)X) = 0$, we have $\sigma_1^2 = E((1 - \nu \bar{F}(X) - R_\nu)X)^2$.

By law of large number, as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n C^2(X_i, R_\nu) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n ((1 - \nu \bar{F}_n(X_i) - R_\nu)X_i)^2 = \sigma_1^2 + o_p(1).$$

Therefore, by using Slutsky's theorem, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the empirical log likelihood ratio

$$\begin{aligned} L(R_\nu) &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log [1 + \lambda \hat{C}(X_i, R_\nu)] \\ &= \frac{\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{C}(X_i, R_\nu) \right]^2}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{C}^2(X_i, R_\nu)} + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{d} \frac{\sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2} \chi^2(1). \end{aligned}$$

□

Using the asymptotic distribution of empirical log likelihood ratio, we can construct EL based confidence interval for relative S-Gini indices. Let $\hat{\sigma}_1^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}_2^2$ be the plug in estimators of σ_1^2 and σ_2^2 , respectively. For $0 < \alpha < 1$, a $(1 - \alpha)$ level empirical likelihood based confidence interval for R_ν can be obtained as

$$\left(R_\nu : L(R_\nu) \leq \frac{\hat{\sigma}_2^2}{\hat{\sigma}_1^2} \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(1) \right),$$

where $\chi_{1-\alpha}^2(1)$ is the upper α percentile of chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom.

3. JEL based inference of relative S-Gini indices

The empirical likelihood can be implemented easily when we are maximizing a non-parametric likelihood subject to a set of linear constraints. However, maximization involving nonlinear constraints are computationally difficult. For example, if an estimator is a U-statistic with a kernel of degree 2 we need to consider constraints in quadratic form to maximize the non-parametric likelihood. In this scenario JEL is better alternative for empirical likelihood. In this section, we develop jackknife empirical likelihood based confidence interval for relative S-Gini indices. We also develop a jackknife empirical likelihood ratio test for testing $R_\nu = R_0$, where R_0 is a real number belongs to the interval $[0, 1]$. Accordingly, first we obtain an estimator of R_ν and discuss its properties.

Using equation (6), we can express absolute S-Gini index as

$$S_\nu = \mu - E [\min (X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots, X_\nu)],$$

provided ν is an integer. Suppose X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n are $n(\geq \nu)$ independent and identically distributed samples from F . Define a symmetric kernel $h(\cdot)$ of degree ν as

$$h(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu) = \frac{X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_\nu - \nu \min(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu)}{\nu}. \quad (12)$$

An unbiased estimator of absolute S-Gini index based on U-statistic is given by

$$\hat{S}_\nu = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{\nu}} \sum_{\binom{n}{\nu}} h(X_{i1}, X_{i2}, \dots, X_{i\nu}), \quad (13)$$

where the summation is over the set $\binom{n}{\nu}$ of all combinations of ν integers, $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_\nu$ chosen from $(1, 2, \dots, n)$. When $\nu = 2$, in terms of order statistics we have the following equivalent expression

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j < i}^n \min\{X_i, X_j\} = \sum_{i=1}^n (n-i)X_{(i)}.$$

And for $\nu=3$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j < i}^n \sum_{k=1, k < j}^n \min\{X_i, X_j, X_k\} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(n-i-1)(n-i)X_{(i)}}{2} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \binom{n-i}{2} X_{(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

In general, the estimator of absolute S-Gini index given in (13) can be expressed as

$$\hat{S}_\nu = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{\nu}} \left\{ \binom{n-1}{\nu-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_i}{\nu} - \sum_{i=1}^n \binom{n-i}{\nu-1} X_{(i)} \right\}. \quad (14)$$

Denote $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Hence an estimator of relative S-Gini index is the ratio of two U-statistics given by

$$\hat{R}_\nu = \frac{\hat{S}_\nu}{\bar{X}}. \quad (15)$$

Next we prove the asymptotic properties of the estimators given in (14) and (15) which we use to prove the limiting distribution of JEL ratio statistic. First we prove the consistency of the estimators (14) and (15). Since \hat{S}_ν is a U-statistic, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, \hat{S}_ν converges in probability to S_ν (Lehmann, 1951).

Theorem 2. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, \hat{R}_ν converges in probability to R_ν .*

Proof. By law of large numbers, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, \bar{X} converges in probability to μ . Since the estimator \hat{R}_ν can be written as

$$\hat{R}_\nu = \frac{\hat{S}_\nu}{S_\nu} \frac{\mu}{\bar{X}} \frac{S_\nu}{\mu},$$

we have the result. \square

Next we obtain the asymptotic distribution of the estimators \hat{S}_ν and \hat{R}_ν .

Theorem 3. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{S}_\nu - S_\nu)$ is Gaussian with mean zero and variance σ^2 where σ^2 is given by*

$$\sigma^2 = V\left(X(1 - \nu \bar{F}^{\nu-1}(X)) - \nu(\nu - 1) \int_0^X y \bar{F}^{\nu-2}(y) dF(y)\right).$$

Proof. The asymptotic normality of \hat{S}_ν can be proved using central limit theorem for U-statistics. The asymptotic variance is $\nu^2 \sigma_3^2$ (Hoeffding, 1948), where

$$\sigma_3^2 = \text{Var}\left(E(h(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu) | X_1 = x)\right). \quad (16)$$

Denote $Z = \min(X_2, X_3, \dots, X_\nu)$, then the distribution of Z is given by $1 - \bar{F}^{\nu-1}(x)$, where $\bar{F}(x) = 1 - F(x)$. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} E[\min(x, X_2, X_3, \dots, X_\nu)] &= E[xI(Z > x)] + E[ZI(Z \leq x)] \\ &= x\bar{F}^{\nu-1}(x) + (\nu - 1) \int_0^x y \bar{F}^{\nu-2}(y) dF(y). \end{aligned}$$

Using (12), we have

$$E(h(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu | X_1 = x)) = \frac{1}{\nu} \left(x(1 - \nu \bar{F}^{\nu-1}(x)) - \nu(\nu - 1) \int_0^x y \bar{F}^{\nu-2}(y) dF(y) \right).$$

Hence, from (16) we obtain the variance expression specified in the theorem. \square

Note that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, \bar{X} converges in probability to μ . Hence by Slutsky's theorem, from Theorem 2 we have the asymptotic normality of \hat{R}_ν and we state it as next result.

Corollary 1. *As $n \rightarrow \infty$, the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{R}_\nu - R_\nu)$ is Gaussian with mean zero and variance $\frac{\sigma^2}{\mu^2}$.*

Next, we discuss the construction of jackknife empirical likelihood ratio for R_ν . Let

$$\tilde{h}(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu; R_\nu) = \frac{1}{\nu}(X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_\nu)R_\nu - h(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu) \quad (17)$$

where $h(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu)$ is given in (12). Since $E(h(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu)) = R_\nu E(X)$ we have $E(\tilde{h}(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu; R_\nu)) = 0$. Define new estimating equation for R_ν as

$$\tilde{R}_\nu = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{\nu}} \sum_{\binom{n}{\nu}} \tilde{h}(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu; R_\nu) = 0. \quad (18)$$

The importance of the equation (18) is that we can study asymptotic properties of jackknife empirical likelihood under the framework developed by Jing et al. (2009). The jackknife pseudo values for R_ν are given by

$$\hat{V}_k = n\tilde{R}_\nu - (n-1)\tilde{R}_{\nu,k}; \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

where $\tilde{R}_{\nu,k}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ can be obtained from (18) using $(n-1)$ observations $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{k-1}, X_{k+1}, \dots, X_n$. The JEL for R_ν is defined as

$$JEL(R_\nu) = \sup_{\mathbf{p}} \left(\prod_{k=1}^n p_k; \sum_{k=1}^n p_k = 1; \sum_{k=1}^n p_k \hat{V}_k = 0 \right). \quad (19)$$

The maximum of (19) occurs at $p_k = \frac{1}{n} \left(1 + \lambda_1 \hat{V}_k \right)^{-1}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ where λ_1 is the solution of

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\hat{V}_k}{1 + \lambda_1 \hat{V}_k} = 0, \quad (20)$$

provided

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq n} \widehat{V}_k < \widehat{R}_\nu < \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \widehat{V}_k. \quad (21)$$

Also note that, $\prod_{k=1}^n p_i$, subject to $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$, attains its maximum n^{-n} at $p_i = n^{-1}$. Hence, the jackknife empirical log-likelihood ratio for R_ν is given by

$$J(R_\nu) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left[1 + \lambda_1 \widehat{V}_k \right]. \quad (22)$$

To find the JEL based confidence interval, we need to find the limiting distribution of jackknife empirical log-likelihood ratio statistic and the result is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *Let $g(x) = E \left(\tilde{h}(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_\nu; R_\nu) | X_1 = x \right)$ and assume that $E \left(\tilde{h}^2(X_1, \dots, X_\nu; R_\nu) \right) < \infty$ and $\sigma_g^2 = \nu^2 \text{Var}(g(X_1)) > 0$. Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$*

$$J(R_\nu) \xrightarrow{d} \chi^2(1).$$

Proof. Let $S^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \widehat{V}_k^2$. Since $\tilde{R}_\nu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \widehat{V}_k$, by strong law of large number we have

$$S^2 = \sigma_g^2 + o(1). \quad (23)$$

Using Lemma A.4 of Jing et al. (2009) we have

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} |\widehat{V}_k| = o(\sqrt{n}). \quad (24)$$

Above two equations yield

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n |\widehat{V}_k|^3 \leq |\widehat{V}_k| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \widehat{V}_k^2 = o(\sqrt{n}). \quad (25)$$

The λ_1 satisfies the equation (20) has the property (Jing et al., 2009)

$$|\lambda| = O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (26)$$

Hence using (24) we have

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \lambda |\widehat{V}_k| = o(1). \quad (27)$$

Hence

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \widehat{V}_k^3 \lambda^2 |1 + \lambda \widehat{V}_k|^{-1} = o(\sqrt{n}) O_p(1/n) o(1) = o_p(1/\sqrt{n}).$$

Since $\tilde{R}_\nu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \widehat{V}_k$, from (20), we obtain

$$\lambda = \frac{\tilde{R}_\nu}{S^2} + o_p(1/\sqrt{n}). \quad (28)$$

Using Taylor's theorem, we can express $J(R_\nu)$ given in (22) as

$$J(R_\nu) = 2n\lambda\tilde{R}_\nu - nS^2\lambda^2 + \text{Rim}(R_\nu), \quad (29)$$

where $\text{Rim}(R_\nu)$ is the reminder term. Using $|\lambda| = O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ and (25) it is easy to verify that the reminder term $\text{Rim}(R_\nu)$ is $o_p(1)$. Hence using (28), the expression in (29) can be written as

$$J(R_\nu) = \frac{n\tilde{R}_\nu^2}{S^2} + o_p(1). \quad (30)$$

Using the central limit theorem for U-statistics, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\sqrt{n}\tilde{R}_\nu$ converges in distribution to normal with mean zero and variance σ_g^2 . Accordingly $\frac{n\tilde{R}_\nu^2}{\sigma_g^2}$ converges in distribution to χ^2 with one degree of freedom. Since $S^2 = \sigma_g^2 + o(1)$ by Slutsky's theorem, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $J(R_\nu)$ converges in distribution to χ^2 with one degree of freedom. \square

Using Theorem 4, we can constructed a $100(1-\alpha)\%$ JEL based confidence interval for R_ν as

$$(R_\nu | J(R_\nu) \leq \chi_{1-\alpha}^2(1)),$$

where $\chi^2_{(1-\alpha)}(1)$ is the $(1 - \alpha)$ -th percentile of chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom. The performance of these confidence intervals are evaluated through Monte carlo simulation and the results are reported in Section 4.

Using the asymptotic distribution of jackknife empirical log likelihood ratio we can develop JEL based test for testing the hypothesis $R_\nu = R_0$, where R_0 is a specific value of R_ν . We reject the hypothesis if

$$J(R_\nu) > \chi^2_{1,1-\alpha},$$

where α is the desired significance level. Simulation study shows that the type 1 error rate of the test converges to desired significance level and has very good power for different alternatives. The results of the related simulation study are also reported in Section 4.

4. Simulation results

The proposed JEL based confidence interval and test are evaluated through numerical study. We compare the JEL based confidence interval with bootstrap based confidence intervals and the performance of these confidence intervals are compared in terms of coverage probability and average length. To evaluate the JEL based test, we find the empirical type 1 error and the power of the test. The simulation is done using R and repeated for thousand times.

First, we investigate performances of the confidence intervals based on bootstrap-t (Boot_t), bootstrap calibrated empirical likelihood (BCEL) and JEL methods. For comparison, we consider the BCEL confidence intervals over empirical likelihood ratio confidence intervals as it suffers from under

coverage problems for small sample sizes. We considered thousand bootstrap replicates to obtain Boot_t and BCEL confidence intervals.

Next, we summarize the procedures for the construction of BCEL confidence interval. The algorithm is given below.

- (1) For each bootstrap sample, indexed by $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$, draw a bootstrap sample $(X_1^b, X_2^b, \dots, X_n^b)$ with replacement from the original random sample X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n ; from F .
- (2) Calculate the empirical log likelihood ratio

$$L^b(R_\nu) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left[1 + \lambda^b \widehat{C}(X_i^b, R_\nu) \right],$$

where

$$\widehat{C}(X_i^b, R_\nu) = \left[1 - \nu \bar{F}_n^{\nu-1}(X_i^b) \right] X_i^b - R_\nu X_i^b; \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

and λ^b is the solution of

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\widehat{C}(X_i^b, R_\nu)}{1 + \lambda^b \widehat{C}(X_i^b, R_\nu)} = 0.$$

- (3) Find I_α , the upper $100\alpha\%$ sample quantile of $L^1(R_\nu), L^2(R_\nu), \dots, L^B(R_\nu)$.
- (4) A $(1 - \alpha)$ level BCEL confidence interval of R_ν is given by

$$(R_\nu | L(R_\nu) \leq I_\alpha).$$

Next, we discuss the algorithm for obtaining bootstrap_t confidence interval. Using a random sample X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n ; from F , a $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ bootstrap-t confidence interval is

$$\left(\widehat{R}_\nu - T_{1-\alpha/2} \widehat{se}(\widehat{R}_\nu), \widehat{R}_\nu - T_{\alpha/2} \widehat{se}(\widehat{R}_\nu) \right),$$

where $T_{1-\alpha/2}$, $T_{\alpha/2}$ and $\widehat{se}(\widehat{R}_\nu)$ can be computed as outlined below.

- (1) For each bootstrap sample, indexed by $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$, draw a sample $(X_1^b, X_2^b, \dots, X_n^b)$ with replacement from (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) .
- (2) Compute \hat{R}_ν^b from the b -th bootstrap sample.
- (3) Compute $\widehat{se}(\hat{R}_\nu)$, the sample standard deviation of the replicates \hat{R}_ν^b .
- (4) Compute $T^b = \frac{\hat{R}_\nu^b - \hat{R}_\nu}{\widehat{se}(\hat{R}_\nu^b)}$, $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$. To find $\widehat{se}(\hat{R}_\nu^b)$ one need to obtain further bootstrap sample $(X_1^{*b}, X_2^{*b}, \dots, X_n^{*b})$ from $(X_1^b, X_2^b, \dots, X_n^b)$.
- (5) Find the $(\alpha/2)$ -th and $(1 - \alpha/2)$ -th sample quantiles $T_{\alpha/2}$ and $T_{1-\alpha/2}$, from the ordered sample of replicates T^b .

TABLE 1. Exponential distribution ($\lambda = 1$)

n	Interval	Coverage probability	Average length
20	Boot_t	91.97	0.3397
	BCEL	93.77	0.3149
	JEL	94.18	0.3046
40	Boot_t	92.12	0.3223
	BCEL	93.97	0.2590
	JEL	94.42	0.2016
60	Boot_t	93.60	0.2163
	BCEL	92.35	0.1989
	JEL	94.19	0.1642
80	Boot_t	94.52	0.1931
	BCEL	94.28	0.1426
	JEL	94.94	0.1391

First, we simulate observations from unit exponential where the true value of R_3 is 0.67. We find 95% confidence intervals for relative S-Gini index using all three methods discussed above. The coverage probability and average length obtained for different sample sizes are reported in Table 1. Next, we find the confidence intervals for R_ν when observations are generated from Pareto distribution with survival function $\bar{F}(x) = (\frac{k}{x})^\alpha$; $x > k$. When $k = 1$ and $\alpha = 10$, the true value of R_3 is 0.068. The coverage probability and average length of the confidence intervals obtained for R_ν correspond to Pareto case are reported in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Pareto distribution ($\alpha = 10, k = 1$)

n	Interval	Coverage probability	Average length
20	Boot_t	90.82	0.1102
	BCEL	91.71	0.0904
	JEL	92.70	0.0844
40	Boot_t	92.30	0.0768
	BCEL	94.00	0.0589
	JEL	94.93	0.0559
60	Boot_t	92.76	0.0683
	BCEL	95.21	0.0725
	JEL	94.18	0.0455
80	Boot_t	95.70	0.0469
	BCEL	95.81	0.0640
	JEL	94.88	0.0337

TABLE 3. Log normal distribution ($\mu = 0, \sigma^2 = 1$)

n	Interval	Coverage probability	Average length
20	Boot_t	91.80	0.1102
	BCEL	92.34	0.0904
	JEL	92.82	0.0844
40	Boot_t	92.97	0.0768
	BCEL	94.83	0.0589
	JEL	94.96	0.0559
60	Boot_t	93.70	0.0683
	BCEL	94.92	0.0725
	JEL	94.85	0.0455
80	Boot_t	94.90	0.0469
	BCEL	95.01	0.0640
	JEL	94.98	0.0337

When the sample size increases, Boot_t and BCEL are comparable for the exponential distribution, but these show some over coverage problems for Pareto distribution. In almost all cases, Boot_t has wider length compared to BCEL except for Pareto distribution when $n = 60$. For small samples, JEL performs better than Boot_t as well as BCEL in terms of average length. Giorgi et al. (2006) explained the superiority of Boot_t intervals over normal approximation based intervals for relative S-Gini indices. Qin et al. (2010) discussed the performance of bootstrap calibrated empirical likelihood

TABLE 4. Empirical type 1 error for different values of ν

	n	Exp(1)	Pareto(1,2.5)	Log normal(0,1)
$\nu = 2$	25	0.098	0.087	0.123
	50	0.066	0.068	0.109
	100	0.062	0.060	0.089
	200	0.056	0.056	0.066
	300	0.051	0.052	0.060
$\nu = 3$	25	0.106	0.099	0.120
	50	0.068	0.069	0.105
	100	0.062	0.064	0.085
	200	0.055	0.057	0.062
	300	0.051	0.052	0.058
$\nu = 4$	25	0.990	0.892	0.114
	50	0.066	0.068	0.109
	100	0.062	0.061	0.080
	200	0.051	0.055	0.060
	300	0.051	0.052	0.056
$\nu = 5$	25	0.951	0.872	0.111
	50	0.064	0.066	0.106
	100	0.060	0.058	0.079
	200	0.051	0.052	0.058
	300	0.050	0.050	0.053

intervals over Boot_t intervals for Gini index. In our simulation study, in most of the cases, the jackknife empirical likelihood confidence interval performs better than the Boot_t and the bootstrap calibrated empirical likelihood confidence intervals for relative S-Gini indices.

Finally, we generated observations from log normal distribution with parameter $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$. The true value of R_3 is 0.660 and the result of the simulation study is reported in Table 3. From Table 3 it is clear that the JEL intervals have better coverage probability and shorter length than the Boot_t and BCEL intervals. For large sample size, even though the coverage probabilities of JEL and BCEL intervals are almost equal, JEL confidence interval has shorter length.

Next, we find the empirical type 1 error of the JEL based test and the result is reported in Table 4. We find the type 1 error rate for $\nu = 2, 3, 4, 5$

when the samples are generated from standard exponential, Paeto with parameters $k = 1$ and $a = 2.5$ and standard log normal distributions. From Table 4, it is evident that the empirical type 1 error reaches the nominal value $\alpha = 0.05$ as the sample size increases.

In Tables 5, 6 and 7 we report the empirical power of the JEL based test when the alternate hypothesis is specified by the scenario given below.

- 1) $R_2 = 0.218, R_3 = 0.479, R_4 = 0.609, R_5 = 0.687$ ($X \sim \text{Exp}(0.8)$)
 $R_2 = 0.382, R_3 = 0.588, R_4 = 0.691, R_5 = 0.753$ ($X \sim \text{Exp}(0.9)$)
 $R_2 = 0.777, R_3 = 0.851, R_4 = 0.888, R_5 = 0.911$ ($X \sim \text{Exp}(1.5)$)
- 2) $R_2 = 0.148, R_3 = 0.181, R_4 = 0.200, R_5 = 0.210$ ($X \sim \text{Pareto}(1, 4)$)
 $R_2 = 0.111, R_3 = 0.142, R_4 = 0.157, R_5 = 0.166$ ($X \sim \text{Pareto}(1, 5)$)
 $R_2 = 0.052, R_3 = 0.068, R_4 = 0.076, R_5 = 0.081$ ($X \sim \text{Pareto}(1, 10)$)
- 3) $R_2 = 0.711, R_3 = 0.836, R_4 = 0.884, R_5 = 0.910$ ($X \sim \text{Log normal}(0, 1.5)$)
 $R_2 = 0.842, R_3 = 0.930, R_4 = 0.958, R_5 = 0.971$ ($X \sim \text{Log normal}(0, 2)$)
 $R_2 = 0.966, R_3 = 0.991, R_4 = 0.996, R_5 = 0.998$ ($X \sim \text{Log normal}(0, 3)$)

From Tables 5, 6 and 7 it is clear that the proposed JEL test has good power even for small sample size in all the nine alternatives specified above.

5. Application to real data

We illustrate the proposed JEL based method using per capita personal income data of the United States. The data is collected from U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and it is available on <https://www.bea.gov>. The data illustrates quarter wise per capita personal income for the states in U.S. for the period 2013 to 2017 and is reported in dollar. Relative S-Gini index for $v = 3$ is calculated for each quarter and presented in Table 8. It can be noted that R_3 is slightly lower for the year 2016 and 2017. It suggest lesser inequality for that period.

TABLE 5. Empirical Power: Exponential Distribution

	n	$\theta = 0.8$	$\theta = 0.9$	$\theta = 1.5$
$\nu = 2$	25	0.739	0.742	0.740
	50	0.973	0.974	0.962
	100	0.995	0.999	0.984
	200	1.000	1.000	1.000
$\nu = 3$	25	0.753	0.766	0.794
	50	0.966	0.979	0.894
	100	1.000	1.000	1.000
	200	1.000	1.000	1.000
$\nu = 4$	25	0.780	0.794	0.798
	50	0.980	0.986	0.990
	100	0.995	1.000	1.000
	200	1.000	1.000	1.000
$\nu = 5$	25	0.786	0.808	0.804
	50	0.990	0.996	0.994
	100	1.000	1.000	1.000
	200	1.000	1.000	1.000

TABLE 6. Empirical Power: Pareto Distribution

	n	$\alpha = 4, k = 1$	$\alpha = 5, k = 1$	$\alpha = 10, k = 1$
$\nu = 2$	25	0.796	0.802	0.780
	50	0.930	0.944	0.934
	100	0.965	0.989	0.949
	200	0.997	1.000	0.992
$\nu = 3$	25	0.753	0.766	0.808
	50	0.866	0.879	0.885
	100	0.999	1.000	1.000
	200	1.000	1.000	1.000
$\nu = 4$	25	0.780	0.794	0.795
	50	0.838	0.846	0.850
	100	0.955	0.959	0.962
	200	0.999	1.000	1.000
$\nu = 5$	25	0.706	0.708	0.717
	50	0.902	0.917	0.930
	100	0.962	1.000	1.000
	200	1.000	1.000	1.000

We find the confidence interval for R_3 using jackknife empirical likelihood method and the result is reported in Table 8. From Table 8 we can see that the average length of the intervals is higher for the year 2015 to 2017. This explains that the data for these years have more variability compared to that of previous years, 2013 and 2014, across the states of US .

TABLE 7. Empirical Power: Log Normal Distribution

	n	$\mu = 0, \sigma^2 = 1.5$	$\mu = 0, \sigma^2 = 2$	$\mu = 0, \sigma^2 = 4$
$\nu = 2$	25	0.576	0.582	0.579
	50	0.730	0.774	0.742
	100	0.935	0.959	0.940
	200	0.998	1.000	1.000
$\nu = 3$	25	0.583	0.566	0.570
	50	0.766	0.763	0.759
	100	0.991	0.979	0.984
	200	0.998	1.000	1.000
$\nu = 4$	25	0.590	0.594	0.590
	50	0.798	0.786	0.792
	100	0.955	0.950	0.953
	200	0.999	1.000	1.000
$\nu = 5$	25	0.606	0.908	0.990
	50	0.806	0.990	0.990
	100	0.962	1.000	1.000
	200	1.000	1.000	1.000

TABLE 8. Per capita personal income: 95% confidence interval for R_3

Quarter	\hat{R}_3	Lower limits	Upper limits	Average length
Q1 2013	0.1509	0.1071	0.2152	0.1081
Q2 2013	0.1510	0.1069	0.2103	0.1034
Q3 2013	0.1508	0.1070	0.2044	0.0974
Q4 2013	0.1519	0.1074	0.2056	0.0982
Q1 2014	0.1514	0.1078	0.2264	0.1186
Q2 2014	0.1512	0.1074	0.2241	0.1167
Q3 2014	0.1515	0.1068	0.2250	0.1182
Q4 2014	0.1510	0.1060	0.2205	0.1145
Q1 2015	0.1506	0.1057	0.2750	0.1693
Q2 2015	0.1509	0.1059	0.2577	0.1518
Q3 2015	0.1503	0.1055	0.2553	0.1498
Q4 2015	0.1501	0.1055	0.2518	0.1463
Q1 2016	0.1501	0.1050	0.2749	0.1699
Q2 2016	0.1503	0.1050	0.2761	0.1711
Q3 2016	0.1506	0.1056	0.2745	0.1689
Q4 2016	0.1502	0.1052	0.2759	0.1707
Q1 2017	0.1490	0.1034	0.2757	0.1723
Q2 2017	0.1500	0.1048	0.2689	0.1641
Q3 2017	0.1503	0.1055	0.2749	0.1694
Q4 2017	0.1506	0.1057	0.2750	0.1693

6. Conclusion

Gini index are generalised into many families of income inequality measures and S-Gini indices is one among them. S-Gini indices are extensively used to study income inequality and to evaluate the performance of stocks in finance. We obtained simple non-parametric estimator for S-Gini indices and proved the asymptotic properties of the proposed estimator using the asymptotic theory of U-statistics. We derived the limiting distribution of empirical log likelihood ratio as well as jackknife empirical log likelihood ratio for relative S-Gini indices. The simulation study shows that JEL based confidence interval performs better than that of bootstrap-t and bootstrap calibrated empirical likelihood confidence intervals in terms of coverage probability and average length. The simulation study also shows that the proposed JEL based test has well controlled error rate and have good power for different alternatives. Finally we illustrate our method using per capita personal income data of the United States.

References

- [1] Barret, G. F. and Donald, S. G. (2009). Statistical Inference with Generalized Gini Indices of Inequality, Poverty, and Welfare, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 27(1), 1–17.
- [2] Demuynck, T. (2012), An (almost) unbiased estimator for the S-Gini index, *The Journal of Economic Inequality*, 10(1), 109–126.
- [3] Donaldson, D. and Weymark, J. A. (1980), A single-parameter generalization of the Gini indices of inequality, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 22(1), 67–86.
- [4] Formby, J., Kim, H. and Zheng, B. (2001), Sen measures of poverty in the united states: cash versus comprehensive incomes in the 1990s, *Pacific Economic Review*, 6 (2), 193–210.
- [5] Giorgi, G. M., Palmitesta, P. and Provasi, C. (2006), Asymptotic and bootstrap inference for the generalized gini indices, *Metron*, 64(1), 107–124.

- [6] Hall, P. (1992), *The bootstrap and Edgeworth expansion*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- [7] Hoeffding, W. (1948), A class of statistics with asymptotically normal distribution, *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 19(3), 293–325.
- [8] Jing, B. Y, Yuan, J. and Zhou, W. (2009), Jackknife empirical likelihood, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(487), 1224–1232.
- [9] Lehmann, E. L. (1951), Consistency and unbiasedness of certain non-parametric tests, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(2), 165–179.
- [10] Luo, S. and Qin, G. (2018). Jackknife empirical likelihood-based inferences for Lorenz curve with kernel smoothing, *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, online first, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610926.2017.1417426>
- [11] Lv, X., Zhang, G., Xu, X., and Li, Q. (2017). Bootstrap-calibrated empirical likelihood confidence intervals for the difference between two Gini indexes. *The Journal of Economic Inequality*, 15, 195–216.
- [12] Owen, A. B. (1988), Empirical likelihood ratio confidence intervals for a single functional, *Biometrika*, 75(2), 237–249.
- [13] Owen, A. B. (1990), Empirical likelihood ratio confidence regions, *The Annals of Statistics*, 18(1), 90–120.
- [14] Peng, L. (2011), Empirical likelihood methods for the Gini index, *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 53(2), 131–139.
- [15] Qin, Y., Rao, J. N. K. and Wu, C. (2010), Empirical likelihood confidence intervals for the Gini measure of income inequality, *Economic Modelling*, 27(6), 1429–1435.
- [16] Qin, G., Yang, B. and Hall, N. E. B. (2013), Empirical likelihood based inferences for Lorenz curve, *Annals of Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 65(1), 1–21.
- [17] Sang, Y, Dang, X. and Zhao, Y. (2019). Jackknife empirical likelihood methods for Gini correlations and their equality testing, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 199, 45–59.
- [18] Wang, D., Zhao, Y. and Gilmore, D.W. (2016). Jackknife empirical likelihood confidence interval for the Gini index, *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 110(1), 289–295.
- [19] Wang, D. and Zhao, Y. (2016). Jackknife empirical likelihood for comparing two Gini indices, *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 44(1), 102–119.
- [20] Xu, K. (2000), Inference for generalized gini indices using the iterated-bootstrap method, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 18(2), 223–227.

- [21] Xu, K. (2007), U-statistics and their asymptotic results for some inequality and poverty measures, *Econometric Reviews*, 26(5), 567–577.
- [22] Yitzhaki, S. (1983), On an extension of the Gini inequality index. *International economic review*, 24(3), 617–628.
- [23] Yitzhaki, S. and Schechtman, E. (2013), *The Gini Methodology: A Primer on a Statistical Methodology*, Springer.
- [24] Zitikis, R. (2003), Asymptotic estimation of E-Gini index, *Econometric Theory*, 19(4), 587–601.
- [25] Zitikis, R. and Gastwirth, J. L.(2002), The asymptotic distribution of the S-Gini index, *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 44(4), 439–446.