

Instrumental Variables

what if $E(\epsilon | X) \neq 0$? Possible reasons: ① omitted variables

② measurement errors

③ reverse causality (simultaneity)

Ex. ^{add} more police \Rightarrow reduce crime

(reverse causality)

$$① \text{ Crime} = \alpha + \beta \text{ Police} + \epsilon$$

Intuitively $\beta < 0$. But $\hat{\beta}_{OLS} > 0$ often

problem: cities w/ high crime have higher demand for police

In reality, it's

$$② \text{ Police} = \gamma + \delta \text{ Crime} + \eta \quad \text{expect } \delta > 0$$

$$\text{Crime} = -\frac{\gamma}{\delta} + \frac{1}{\delta} \text{ Police} - \frac{\eta}{\delta}$$

Sub. in eq. (1)

$$-\frac{\gamma}{\delta} + \frac{1}{\delta} \text{ Police} - \frac{\eta}{\delta} = \alpha + \beta \text{ Police} + \epsilon$$

$$\left(\frac{1}{\delta} - \beta\right) \text{ Police} = \frac{\eta}{\delta} + \frac{\gamma}{\delta} + \alpha + \epsilon$$

$$\text{cov}(\text{Police}, \epsilon) \neq 0 = \frac{\delta}{1 - \beta\delta} \text{var}(\hat{\epsilon}) \neq 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_{OLS} &= \frac{\widehat{\text{cov}}(\text{Crime}, \text{Police})}{\widehat{\text{var}}(\text{Police})} = \beta + \frac{\widehat{\text{cov}}(\epsilon, \text{Police})}{\widehat{\text{var}}(\text{Police})} \\ &= \beta + \frac{\delta}{1 - \beta\delta} \frac{\widehat{\text{var}}(\epsilon)}{\widehat{\text{var}}(\text{Police})} \quad \text{inconsistent} \end{aligned}$$

Ex. Sample selection

$$\text{Health} = \alpha + \beta \text{ New Medicines} + \epsilon$$

intuition $\beta > 0$

reality: $\hat{\beta}_{OLS} < 0$

because the people who try a new medicine are often the sickest and most desperate (negative ϵ 's)

so the people who choose a new medicine have negative ϵ 's (correlation

omitted variable bias: what we need is a previous health condition var (we need to model the choice of new medicine)

to remove the selection bias

Ex. measurement errors

Recall

True model $y_i = \beta x_i + \epsilon_i$

obs $x_i^o = x_i + u_i$

if we regress y on x^o , we get

$$y = \beta x^o + \epsilon - \beta u = \beta x^o + \eta$$

and

$$\text{cov}(x_i^o, \eta) = \text{cov}(x + u, \epsilon - \beta u) = -\beta \sigma_u^2 \neq 0$$
 x 's correlated w/ errors

so

$\hat{\beta}$ is inconsistent

Sol'n. Suppose we have another ~~noisy~~ noisy measurement of x

$$z_i = x_i + v_i, \quad v_i \text{ uncorrelated w/ } y_i, x_i, x_i^o$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} E(z_i x_i^o) &= E[(x_i + v_i)(x_i + u_i)] \\ &= E[x_i x_i + v_i x_i + x_i u_i + v_i u_i] \\ &= E[x_i x_i] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E(z_i y_i) = E[(x_i + v_i)(x_i + v_i)] = E(x_i y_i)$$

So instead of $\hat{\beta} = S_{xy} / S_{xx}$ we can use $\hat{\beta}_{IV} = \frac{S_{zy}}{S_{zx}}$

and in more general case $\hat{\beta}_{IV} = (Z'X)^{-1} Z'Y$

instrument needs to be correlated w/ regressors else disaster

General case:

$$y_i = x_i \beta + \varepsilon_i \quad E\varepsilon_i = 0 \quad E(x_i \varepsilon_i) \neq 0$$

k x 1

Suppose \exists instruments z_i s.t. $E(z_i \varepsilon_i) = 0$, $E(z_i x_i)$ invertible
L x 1, L x K

and X, Z well-behaved. Consider $\hat{\beta}_{IV} = (Z'X)^{-1} Z'Y$

$$plim\left(\frac{Z'Y}{n}\right) = plim\left(\frac{Z'X}{n}\right)\beta + plim\left(\frac{Z'\varepsilon}{n}\right)$$

Since $Z'X$ is a square matrix, it's invertible, and

$$\left[plim\left(\frac{Z'X}{n}\right)\right]^{-1} plim\left(\frac{Z'Y}{n}\right) = \beta \Rightarrow \text{consistent}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_{IV} - \beta) &= \sqrt{n} \left[(Z'X)^{-1} Z'(X\beta + \varepsilon) - \beta \right] \\ &= \sqrt{n} \left[(Z'X)^{-1} Z'\varepsilon \right] \\ &= \left(\frac{Z'X}{n} \right)^{-1} \frac{Z'\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\quad \downarrow P \qquad \downarrow \text{CLT} \\ &E(z_i x_i) \quad N(0, \text{Var}(z_i \varepsilon_i)) \\ &\quad \parallel \qquad \parallel \\ &D \qquad V \end{aligned}$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_{IV} - \beta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, D^{-1}VD^{-1})$$

To estimate: $\hat{D} = \frac{Z'X}{n}$ $V = E \begin{bmatrix} z_i \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_i' z_i' \\ z_i \varepsilon_i^2 z_i' \end{bmatrix}$
 $= E(z_i \varepsilon_i^2 z_i')$

$e_i = y_i - x_i' \hat{\beta}_{IV}$ $\hat{V} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i z_i' e_i^2$ same logic as white estimator

in homoskedastic case this reduces to

$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_{IV} - \beta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2 D^{-1} C D^{-1})$

$\hat{C} = \frac{Z'Z}{n}$ $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{e'e}{n}$ typically no d.f. correction because IV is a lg. sample result

Method of moments

fat tails example

2 moments \rightarrow 1 param

GMM

back to our IV setup

$y_i = x_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i$ $L \geq K$
 $E(\varepsilon_i | z_i) = 0$
 $K \times 1$ $L \times 1$

orthogonality condition

$E(\varepsilon_i | z_i) = 0 \Rightarrow E(z_i (y_i - x_i' \beta)) = 0$

and summing over all i

$E \left[\sum_{i=1}^n z_i (y_i - x_i' \beta) \right] = 0$ the population moment equation

basic idea of GMM: match sample moments to population moments

$\sum_{i=1}^n z_i (y_i - x_i' \hat{\beta}) = m(\hat{\beta}) = 0$

Note: if $z_i = x_i$, we are back to OLS.

So OLS is a special case of a GMM estimator.

Exactly identified: $L = K$

K o.c.'s, K params to estimate in $\hat{\beta}$, can get $m(\hat{\beta}) = 0$
single solution is all moments exactly zero

$$\hat{\beta} = (Z'X)^{-1} Z'y$$

Overidentified: $L > K$

L o.c.'s, K params to estimate in $\hat{\beta}$

let's use quadratic distance (least squares) as our loss function

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} m(\beta)' m(\beta)$$

F.O.C. $2 \frac{\partial m(\beta)'}{\partial \beta} m(\beta) = 0$ & $Q(\hat{\beta}) m(\hat{\beta}) = 0$
 $2 [(X'Z) Z'(y - X\hat{\beta})] = 0$

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{GMM}} = \left[\begin{matrix} (X'Z) & (Z'X) \\ K \times L & L \times K \end{matrix} \right]^{-1} \begin{matrix} (X'Z) & (Z'y) \\ K \times L & L \times 1 \end{matrix}$$

note that this reduces to $\hat{\beta}_{OLS}$ iff $L = K$

to obtain consistency and asymp. dists, we'll need

- GMM2 ergodic stationarity of $\{x_i, y_i, z_i\}$
- GMM3 $E(z_i x_i')$ is of rank L (rank condition)
- GMM5 $E(\varepsilon_i | \varepsilon_{i-1}, \dots, z_i, z_{i-1}, \dots, z_1) = 0$ innovation condition

and it can be shown that

$$\widehat{\text{Avar}}_{\text{GMM}}(\hat{\beta}) = n \left[(X'Z)(Z'X) \right]^{-1} (X'Z) \hat{V} (Z'X) \left[(X'Z)(Z'X) \right]^{-1}$$

$$\hat{V} = \frac{1}{n} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i^2 z_i z_i' + \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{t=l+1}^n \left(1 - \frac{l}{L+1}\right) \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t-l} (z_t z_{t-l}' + z_{t-l} z_t') \right]$$

If there's no autocorrelation, the \sum^L terms drop out

If there's no heterosk, then the 1st term reduces to $\frac{e'e}{n} \frac{1}{n} \sum z_i z_i'$

or $\hat{V} = \frac{e'e}{n} \frac{z'z}{n}$

~~Q~~ Is this efficient? No. Analogous to OLS

• Not clear that min sum of squares is at all optimal

Consider instead $\min_{\beta} m(\beta)' W m(\beta)$ for some p.d.f. weighting matrix W

F.o.c. $2 \frac{\partial m'(\hat{\beta})}{\partial \beta} W m(\hat{\beta}) = 0$

$2(X'Z)WZ'(y - X\hat{\beta}) = 0$

$\hat{\beta} = [(X'Z)W(Z'X)]^{-1} (X'Z)W(Z'y)$
KxL LxL LxK KxL LxL Lx1

and

$Avar(\hat{\beta}) = n [(X'Z)W(Z'X)]^{-1} (X'Z)WVW(Z'X) [(X'Z)(Z'X)]^{-1}$

Does the choice of W matter? Maybe.

$L=K$ (exactly identified): doesn't matter, only 1 choice of $\hat{\beta}$ that exactly matches $\sum z_i z_i' = 0 \Rightarrow$ use $W=I$ for simplicity

$L>K$ (overidentified): turns out optimal $W=V^{-1}$ in which case $Avar(\hat{\beta})$ reduces to \uparrow of GLS

$Avar(\hat{\beta}) = n [(X'Z)V(Z'X)]^{-1}$

where do we get \hat{V} ? use $W=I$ (1st stage), then \hat{V} as above, then use $W=V^{-1}$