Testing 00000 WLS 0000000

Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

Variance Issues

Dr. Michael Fix mfix@gsu.edu

Georgia State University

9 March 2023

Note: The slides are distributed for use by students in POLS 8810. Please do not reproduce or redistribute these slides to others without express permission from Dr. Fix.



What is Heteroskedasticity?

- One of the Gauss-Markov assumptions requires that we have homoskedasticity, or consistant variance in the error term
- Heteroskedasticity is when there is unequal error variance over X
- Heteroskedasticity is common in observational social science data



Causes of Heteroskedasticity

- Two common causes of heteroskedasticity common in observational social science data are:
 - 1. Aggregation across subunits of differing size
 - 2. Pooled data across units

VLS 00000000

Problems Caused by Heteroskedasticity

- When heteroskedasticity is present, OLS estimates are still unbiased
- However, standard erros are no longer unbiased estimates
- Thus, OLS is no longer BLUE as other linear models may be more efficient
- Further, if our SEs are biased, our *t*-statistic, *p*-values, confidence intervals, etc will all be unreliable

Clustering 00000

Testing for Heteroskedasticity

- As heteroskedasticity is very common in observation social science data, it is important to test for it even if we have no theoretical reason to believe it likely (although we usually do)
- There are several tests for detecting heteroskedasticity,
- Two of the most common are to visually examine a plot of residuals vs fitted values and the Breusch Pagan Test

Testing ○●○○○ WLS 0000000

Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

Toy Model

- Check Ozlem's R script for details
- Sample: all countries, 1900-2021

Predictors of democracy in the world						
	Dependent variable:					
	Electoral Democracy Index					
GDP per capita	$\begin{array}{c} 0.018 \\ (0.0002) \\ t = 72.287 \\ p = 0.000 \end{array}$					
Urbanization	$\begin{array}{r} -0.027 \\ (0.009) \\ t = -3.032 \\ p = 0.003 \end{array}$					
Constant	0.186 (0.003) t = 65.317 p = 0.000					
Observations R2 Adjusted R2 Residual Std. Error F Statistic	15,125 0.279 0.279 0.214 (df = 15122) 2,931.659* (df = 2; 15122)					
Notes	Standard errors are in parentheses.					



WLS 00000000 Robust SEs

Clustering

Residual vs Fitted Plot

Looking for heteroskedasticity - plot residuals ~ fitted.value
ggplot(aes(x = .fitted, y = .resid)) +
geom_point(col = 'blue') +
geom_abline(slope = 0) +
labs(x = "Fitted values", y = "Residuals") +
theme_bw()



Testing ○○○●○

WLS 00000000 Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

How does homoskedasticity look like?



Fitted values

Testing 0000● WLS 00000000 Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

Breusch Pagan Test



- R output is not intuitive
- However, useful when sample size small
- Always use both residual vs. fitted values plot and Breusch Pagan test together

WLS •0000000 Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

Solutions for Modeling Heteroskedastic Data

- We will discuss three solutions for dealing with heteroskedastic data
 - 1. Weighted Least Squares (WLS)
 - 2. "Robust" Standard Erros
 - Clustering

Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

What is WLS?

WLS

- Where the OLS estimator assumes consistent error variance, weighted least square offers a relaxation of that assumption
- It does this by weighting each observation in a way that is inversely proportional to the error variance
- This requires that we know these weights!



Testing

WLS

Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

WLS in Practice

Let's start with a linear regression with a relaxed variance assumption:

 $Y_i = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta} + u_i$

with:

$$Var(u_i) = \sigma^2/w_i$$

where w_i is known.

Testing 00000 WLS

Robust SEs

Clustering

WLS in Practice

WLS now minimizes:

$$\mathsf{RSS} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i (Y_i - \mathbf{X}_i \beta).$$

which gives:

$$\begin{split} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{WLS} &= [\mathbf{X}'(\sigma^{2}\boldsymbol{\Omega})^{-1}\mathbf{X}]^{-1}\mathbf{X}'(\sigma^{2}\boldsymbol{\Omega})^{-1}\mathbf{Y} \\ &= [\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{X}]^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{Y} \end{split}$$

Testing 00000 WLS

Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

WLS in Practice

where:

$$\mathbf{W} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sigma^2}{w_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0\\ 0 & \frac{\sigma^2}{w_2} & \cdots & \vdots\\ \vdots & 0 & \ddots & 0\\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{\sigma^2}{w_N} \end{bmatrix}$$

With the variance-covariance matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Var}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{WLS}) &= \sigma^2 (\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \\ &\equiv (\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{X})^{-1} \end{aligned}$$



lesting

WLS

Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

WLS in Practice

A common case is:

$$\mathsf{Var}(u_i) = \sigma^2 \frac{1}{N_i}$$

where N_i is the number of observations upon which (aggregate) observation *i* is based.

Testing 00000 WLS

Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

Estimating WLS in R

Band-aid solutions to heteroskedasticity ---

Weighted standard errors ----

summary(weighted_model)

> summary(weighted_model)

Call:

lm(formula = democracy ~ gdp_per_capita + urbanization, data = my_data, weights = my_data\$e_pop)

Weighted Residuals: Min 1Q Median 3Q Max -68.175 -3.894 -1.358 1.099 168.204

Coefficients:



Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

Estimating WLS in R

- Check Ozlem's R script for a different example
- An example with defining the weights in such a way that the observations with lower variance are given more weight

Testing

WLS 00000000 Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

WLS vs Robust SEs

- WLS is ideal when you have heteroskedasticity present
- However, it requires us to have a lot of knowledge about our error variances and we often lack this knowledge
- Robust standard errors offer an attractive alternative as they
 offer consistant standard error estimates in the presence of
 heteroskedasticity when we have no knowledge about the form
 of the heteroskedasticity

sting

WLS 00000000 Robust SEs

Clustering

WLS vs Robust SEs

However, nothing comes without a cost.

- Robust SEs are consistant, meaning *t*-statistic estimates (and *F* tests) are only *asymptotically* valid. They are potentially biased in small samples
- They are less efficient than OLS estimates if errors are actually homoskedasticity (i.e. when Var(u) = σ²I)

Nonetheless, Robust SEs are "better" than OLS estimates anytime heteroskedasticity is present, just be careful with small sample sizes as their accuracy improves as N increases

Robust SEs

Clustering

Estimating "Robust" SEs

The formula for the variance-covariance of the parameters under heteroskedasticity:

$$\begin{split} \mathsf{Var}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathsf{Het.}}) &= (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{X})(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1} \\ &= (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\,\mathbf{Q}\,(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1} \end{split}$$

where $\mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathbf{W} = \sigma^2 \mathbf{\Omega}$.

We can rewrite ${\boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}}$ as

$$egin{aligned} \mathbf{Q} &= \sigma^2 (\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1} \mathbf{X}) \ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}'_i \end{aligned}$$

Estimating this would require us to know Ω (and **W**).

WLS 0000000

Robust SEs

lustering

Estimating "Robust" SEs

Huber and White's solution was to estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{Q}}$ as:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{Q}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{u}_i^2 \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i'$$

Yields:

$$\begin{split} \widehat{\mathsf{Var}(\beta)}_{\mathsf{Robust}} &= (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1} (\mathbf{X}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1}\mathbf{X}) (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1} \\ &= (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1} \left[\mathbf{X}' \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{u}_i^2 \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}'_i \right)^{-1} \mathbf{X} \right] (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1} \end{split}$$



WLS 00000000 Robust SEs

Clustering 00000

Estimating Robust SEs in R

Robust standard errors ---

coeftest(mv model. vcov. = vcovHC(mv model. tvpe = "HCO")) coeftest(my mode], vcov, = vcovHC(my mode], type = "HCO")) test of coefficients: Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|) (Intercept) 0.26372283 0.00866490 30.4357 < 2.2e-16 *** odp per capita 0.01348383 0.00052046 25.9077 < 2.2e-16 *** urbanization 0.25342419 0.06114728 4.1445 5.045e-05 ***

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Robust SEs

Clustering

Estimating Robust SEs in R

<pre># Generate robust standard errors to use them in stargazer cov_m1 <- vcovHC(my_model, method = "HC3") rob_m1 <- sqrt(diag(cov_m1))</pre>
<pre># Use these robust standard errors in stargazer function stargazer(my_model, se = (list(rob_ml)), type = "text", title = "Predictors of democracy in the US", covariate.labels = c("GOP per capita", "Urbanization"), dep.var.labels = c("Electoral Democracy Index"), report = "vcstp", ci.level = 0.95, star.cutoffs = c(0.05), notes.align = "]", notes.append = FALSE", notes.label = "Notes", notes = "Standard errors are in parentheses.")</pre>



Robust SEs



Clustering SEs

- So far we have seen an approach for dealing with heteroskedasticity when we have a lot of information about the nature of the heteroskedasticity (WLS)
- ... and one for when we have *no* information about the nature of the heteroskedasticity (robust SEs)
- In practice we are often somewhere in the middle

Testing 00000 WLS 00000000 Robust SEs



Nested Data

• Often we have data were observations are nested into groups

• E.g. individuals within countries/states

• If we assume that the error variance *within* each group is the same but the error variance *between* each group is different, then we can account for this with a modified version of Huber-White Robust SEs

Testing 00000

WLS 0000000

Robust SEs

Clustering

Clustering SEs

A common case:

$$Y_{ij} = \mathbf{X}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\beta} + u_{ij}$$

with

$$\sigma_{ij}^2 = \sigma_{ik}^2.$$

"Robust, clustered" estimator:

$$\widehat{\mathsf{Var}(\boldsymbol{\beta})}_{\mathsf{Clustered}} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1} \left\{ \mathbf{X}' \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_j} \hat{u}_{ij}^2 \mathbf{X}_{ij} \mathbf{X}'_{ij} \right) \right]^{-1} \mathbf{X} \right\} (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}$$

Robust SEs



Estimating Clustered SEs in R

<pre># Get clustered standard errors coeftest(my_model, vcov. = vcovCL(my_model, cluster = ~ country_name)</pre>
<pre># Generate clustered standard errors to use them in stargazer cov_m2 <- vcovCL(my_model, cluster = ~ country_name) rob_m2 <- sqrt(diag(cov_m2)))</pre>
<pre># Use these robust standard errors in stargazer function stargazer(my_model, se = (list(rob_m2)), type = "text", title = "Predictors of democracy in the world", covariate.labels = c("GDP per capita", "Urbanization"), dep.var.labels = c("Electral Democracy Index"), report = "vcstp", ci.level = 0.95, star.cutoffs = c0.05), notes.align = "l", notes.append = FALSE, notes label = "Notes", notes = "standard errors are in parentheses.")</pre>

1

	Dependent variable:					
	Electoral Democracy Index					
	OLS Model	Weighted OLS	OLS with Robust SE	OLS with Clustered SE		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
GDP per capita	$\begin{array}{c} 0.018 \\ (0.0002) \\ t = 72.287 \\ 0.0002 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.018 \\ (0.0003) \\ t = 69.893 \\ 0.0000 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.018 \\ (0.001) \\ t = 19.994 \\ 0.000 \end{array}$			
	p = 0.000	p = 0.000	p = 0.000	p = 0.0002		
Urbanization	$\begin{array}{c} -0.027 \\ (0.009) \\ t = -3.032 \\ p = 0.003 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.322 \\ (0.014) \\ t = 23.427 \\ p = 0.000 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -0.027 \\ (0.016) \\ t = -1.736 \\ p = 0.083 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -0.027 \\ (0.076) \\ t = -0.357 \\ p = 0.722 \end{array}$		
Constant	$\begin{array}{c} 0.186 \\ (0.003) \\ t = 65.317 \\ p = 0.000 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.146 \\ (0.003) \\ t = 45.221 \\ p = 0.000 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.186 \\ (0.005) \\ t = 35.857 \\ p = 0.000 \end{array}$	0.186 (0.032) t = 5.788 p = 0.000		
Observations P ²	15,125	15,125	15,125	15,125		
Adjusted R ²	0.279	0.392	0.279	0.279		
Residual Std. Error (df = 15122)	0.214	10.316	0.214	0.214		
F Statistic ($dt = 2$; 15122)	2,931.659"	4,885.180	2,931.059**	2,931.059*		

Notes

Standard errors are in parentheses.