Regression Diagnostics and Troubleshooting

Jeffrey Arnold

May 3, 2016



How do regression diagnostics fit into analysis?



Steps in Regression

- For any model
 - 1. Run regression
 - 2. Check for departures from CLR assumptions
 - 3. Attempt to fix those problems
- Additionally, compare between models based on purpose, fit, and diagnostics

OLS assumptions

- 1. Linearity $y = X\beta + \varepsilon$
- 2. lid sample y_i, x'_i iid sample
- 3. No perfect collinearity X has full rank
- 4. Zero conditional mean $E(\varepsilon|X) =$)
- 5. Homoskedasticity $Var(\varepsilon|X) = \sigma^2 I_N$
- 6. Normality $\varepsilon | X \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_N)$
- 1-4: unbiased and consistent β
- 1-5: asymptotic inference, BLUE

1-6: small sample inference

OLS Problems

- 1. Perfect collinearity: Cannot estimate OLS
- 2. Non-linearity: Biased β
- 3. Omitted variable bias: Biased β .
- 4. Correlated errors: Wrong SEs
- 5. Heteroskedasticity: Wrong SEs
- 6. Non-normality: Wrong SEs p-values.
- 7. Outliers: Depends on where they come from

Topics for Today

1. Omitted Variable Bias

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三三 - のへぐ

- 2. Measurement Error
- 3. Non-Normal Errors
- 4. Missing data

Omitted Variable Bias: Description

The population is

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1,i} + \beta_2 X_{2,i} + \varepsilon_i$$

But we estimate a regression without X₂

$$y_i = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1^{(omit)} x_{1,i} + \varepsilon_i$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ 臣▶ ◆ 臣▶ ○ 臣 ○ の Q @

Omitted Variable Bias: Problem

Coefficient Bias

$$\mathsf{E}\left(\hat{\beta}_{1}^{(\textit{omit})}\right) = \beta_{1} + \beta_{2} \frac{\mathsf{Cov}(X_{2}, X_{1})}{\mathsf{Var}(X_{1})}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ 臣▶ ◆ 臣▶ ○ 臣 ○ の Q @

Bias Components

Omitted Variable Bias: Hueristic Diagnostic

- Heuristic: sensitivity of the coefficient to inclusion of controls
- If insensitive to inclusion of controls, OVB less plausible
- Note: sensitivity of coefficient not p-value.

"These controls do not change the coefficient estimates meaningfully, and the stability of the estimates from columns 4 through 7 suggests that controlling for the model and age of the car accounts for most of the relevant selection." (Lacetera et al. 2012)

・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・

Omitted Variable Bias: Diagnosing Statistic

▶ Suppose X and Z observed, and W unobserved in,

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \beta_2 Z + \beta_3 W + \varepsilon$$

Statistic to assess importance of OVB

$$\delta = \frac{\operatorname{Cov}(X, \beta_3 W)}{\operatorname{Cov}(X, \beta_2 Z)} = \frac{\hat{\beta}_C}{\hat{\beta}_{NC} - \hat{\beta}_C}$$

- ► If Z representative of all controls, then large δ implies OVB implausible
- Example in Nunn and Wantchekon (2011)

Omitted Variable Bias: Reasoning about Bias

If know omitted variable, may be able to reason about its effect

$Cov(X_1, X_2)$	$Cov(X_2, Y) > 0$	$Cov(X_2, Y) = 0$	$Cov(X_2, Y) < 0$
> 0	+	0	-
0	0	0	0
< 0	-	0	+

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三三 - のへぐ

Omitted Variable Bias: Solutions by Design

- OVB always a problem with methods relying on selection on observables
- Other methods (Matching, propensity scores) may be less model dependent, but still can have OVB
- Preference for methods relying on identification in other ways

- experiments
- instrumental variables
- regression discontinuity
- fixed effects/diff-in-diff

Measurement Error in X: Description

We want to estimate

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \epsilon$$

But we estimate

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1^* + \beta_2 X_2 + \epsilon$$

Where X₁^{*} is X₁ with measurement error

$$X_i^* = X_i + \delta$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

where E(delta) = 0, and $Var(\delta) = \sigma_{\delta}$.

Measurement Error in X: Problem

- Similar to OVB
- For variable with the measurement error
 - $\hat{\beta}_1$ biased towards zero (attenuation bias)
- For other variables:
 - $\hat{\beta}_2$ biased towards OVB bias.
 - When measurement error high, it's as if that variable is not controlled for

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三 のへぐ

Measurement error in Y

Population is

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1,i} + \epsilon$$

But we estimate

$$Y_i + \delta_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1,i} + \varepsilon_i$$

• β not biased, but larger standard errors

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{1,i} + (\epsilon_i + \delta_i)$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

where $E(\epsilon_i + \delta_i) = 0$, and $Var(\varepsilon_i + \delta_i) = \sigma_{\varepsilon}^2 + \sigma_{\delta}^2$. If each δ_i has different variances, then heteroskedasticity

Measurement Error: Solutions

- If in treatment variable:
 - get better measure
- If in control variables:
 - include multiple measures. Multicollinearity less problematic than measurement error.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

 Models for measurement error: Instrumental variables, structural equation models, Bayesian models, multiple imputation.

Non-Normal Errors

- Usually not-problematic
- Does not bias coefficients
- Only affects standard errors, only for small samples

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

- But may indicate
 - Model mis-specified
 - E(Y|X) is not a good summary
- Diagnose: QQ-plot of (Studentized) residuals

Missing Data in X

Listwise Deletion

- Drop row with any missing values in Y or X
- Problem: If missingness correlated with X, coefficients biased

Multiple Imputation

- Predict missing values from non-missing data
- Multiple imputation packages: Amelia, mice
- Almost always better than listwise deletion

More complicated Missing Data Problems

- ▶ MNAR: Missing not-at randrom in X.
 - Values in X do not predict missingness
 - Need to model the selection process
- Truncation or censored dependent variable: specific MLE models

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三 のへぐ