

Section 4

Linear Regression and Randomized Experiments

Sooahn Shin

GOV 2003

Sept 30, 2021

Overview

- Logistics:
 - **Pset 4 released!** Due at 11:59 pm (ET) on Oct 6
 - Research project memo: Due at 11:59 pm (ET) on Oct 1
 - OH: Mondays **3-5pm**
- Today's topics:
 1. Linear regression and robust variance estimator
 2. Linear regression with covariates
 3. Block randomized trials
 4. Cluster randomized trials

Recap: Linear Regression

- Using OLS to estimate ATEs
 - $\hat{\tau}_{ols} = \arg \min_{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \alpha - \tau D_i)^2 = \hat{\tau}_{diff} \rightsquigarrow$ unbiased
 - Linearity? \rightsquigarrow justified by consistency assumption

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &= D_i Y_i(1) + (1 - D_i) Y_i(0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)] + D_i \tau + \{Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)]\} + D_i (\tau_i - \tau) \\ &= \alpha + D_i \tau + \epsilon_i \end{aligned}$$

- Mean independent errors: $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | D_i] = 0?$ \rightsquigarrow under randomization

Linear regression and robust variance estimator

- Can we use “standard” variance estimator: $\mathbb{V}[\varepsilon_i | \mathbf{D}] = \sigma^2, \forall i?$

- Inconsistent: $\widehat{\mathbb{V}}_{const} - \mathbb{V}[\widehat{\tau}] \xrightarrow{P} c \neq 0$ unless ...

- Bias:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(\widehat{\mathbb{V}}_{const}) - \mathbb{V}[\widehat{\tau}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_i^2\right) - \left(\frac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_0^2}{n_0}\right) \\ &= \frac{(n_1 - n_0)(n-1)}{n_1 n_0 (n-2)} (\sigma_1^2 - \sigma_0^2) \end{aligned}$$

- Unless

- Homoskedasticity holds: $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_0^2$
- Design is balanced: $n_1 = n_0$

Linear regression and robust variance estimator

- Use robust variance estimator! [Pset4 Q1 (b)]
 - Eicker-Huber-White (EHW) estimator: consistent for $\mathbb{V}(\widehat{\tau}_{\text{diff}})$

$$\widehat{\mathbb{V}}_{\text{EHW}} = \frac{\widetilde{\sigma}_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\widetilde{\sigma}_0^2}{n_0}, \quad \text{where} \quad \widetilde{\sigma}_d^2 = \frac{1}{n_d} \sum_{i:D_i=d} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_d)^2$$

- HC2 estimator: exactly the Neyman variance estimator \rightsquigarrow unbiased

$$\widehat{\mathbb{V}}_{\text{HC2}} = \frac{\widehat{\sigma}_0^2}{n_0} + \frac{\widehat{\sigma}_1^2}{n_1}$$

In R:

```
your_fitted_model <- lm(your_formula, data = your_data)
```

```
sandwich::vcovHC(your_fitted_model, type = 'HC2')
```

Or

```
estimatr::lm_robust(your_formula, your_data, se_type = 'HC2')
```

Linear regression with covariates

- What if we add covariates to increase **precision** of our estimates?
 - Intuition: less residual variation in Y_i after accounting for \mathbf{X}_i
 - Use **centered** covariates: $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i = \mathbf{X}_i - \bar{\mathbf{X}}$

$$(\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}, \hat{\alpha}_{\text{adj}}, \hat{\beta}_{\text{adj}}) = \arg \min_{\tau, \alpha, \beta} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \alpha - \tau D_i - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i' \beta)^2$$

- $\hat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}$ now **biased** but **consistent** for τ .

Linear regression with covariates

- Variance of adjustment estimator
 - Usually will help precision, but can hurt (Freedman 2008):

$$\mathbb{V}[\widehat{\tau}_{\text{diff}}] - \mathbb{V}[\widehat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}] = \frac{\sigma_{0x} \{ \sigma_{0x} + 2(1 - 2p)\sigma_{1x} \}}{np(1 - p)}$$

- If fully interacted, will never hurt precision (Lin 2013) [Pset4 Q1 (c)]

$$Y_i = \alpha + \tau D_i + \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_i' \beta + D_i \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_i' \gamma + \varepsilon_i$$

- Estimation: EHW robust variance estimators are consistent or asymptotically conservative for $\mathbb{V}[\widehat{\tau}_{\text{adj}}]$

Linear regression with covariates

Step 1: Compute centered covariates

```
your_data$Xtilde <- NULL
```

Step 2: Write down your formula

```
your_formula <- NULL
```

Step 3: Fit the model using `lm()` or `estimatr::lm_robust()`

```
your_fitted_model <- lm(your_formula, data = your_data)
```

Step 4: Compute robust standard errors (skip if you used `lm_robust`)

```
your_vcov <- sandwich::vcovHC(your_fitted_model, type = 'HC2')
```

Step 5: Check the point and se estimate of your coefficients

(look for tau hat!)

```
est <- cbind("coef" = your_fitted_model$coef,  
            "se" = sqrt(diag(your_vcov)))
```


Block randomized trials

- Setup: block randomized experiment with block indicators W_{ij} .
 - Block “fixed effects” $W_{ij} = 1$ if i is in block j , 0 otherwise.
 - Blocks $j \in \{1, \dots, J\}$ with sizes $w_j = n_j/n$ and propensity scores $p_j = n_{1,j}/n_j$
- Recall STAR project: within each school (block), classes were randomized.
- Naive approach: just include the block FEs in OLS [Pset4 Q2 (a)]

$$(\widehat{\tau}_{b,fe}, \widehat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \widehat{\alpha}_J) = \arg \min_{(\tau, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J)} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(Y_i - \tau D_i - \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j W_{ij} \right)^2$$

- $\widehat{\tau}_{b,fe}$ **not consistent** for the PATE unless ...

$$\widehat{\tau}_{b,fe} \xrightarrow{p} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j \tau_j}{\sum_{j=1}^J \omega_j} \quad \text{where} \quad \omega_j = w_j p_j (1 - p_j)$$

- Propensity scores are equal across blocks: $p_j = p$ for all j .
- ATEs are equal across strata $\tau_j = \tau$ for all j .

Block randomized trials: Correct analysis

1. Just use original Neyman analysis aggregating within-strata analyses. [Pset3 Q5]
2. Weight OLS by inverse of the propensity score. [Pset4 Q2 (b)]
3. Fully interact block FEs with treatment. [Pset4 Q2 (c)]
 - Check Imbens and Rubin (2015) Ch.9.6.1, second model
 - See this simulation study using DeclareDesign:
<https://declaredesign.org/blog/biased-fixed-effects.html>

Block randomized trials: Correct analysis

2. Weight OLS by inverse of the propensity score.

$$(\widehat{\tau}_{b,w}, \widehat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \widehat{\alpha}_J) = \arg \min_{(\tau, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_J)} \sum_{i=1}^n s_i \left(Y_i - \tau D_i - \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j W_{ij} \right)^2$$

where $s_i = \sum_{j=1}^J \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{p_j} \right) D_i + \left(\frac{1}{1-p_j} \right) (1 - D_i) \right\} W_{ij}$ and $p_j = n_{1,j}/n_j$.

In R

```
your_formula <- as.formula("outcome ~ treat + x_tilde1 + x_tilde2")
your_data <- data.frame(outcome, treat,
                        x_tilde1, x_tilde2,
                        weights, block)
your_fitted_model <- estimatr::lm_robust(your_formula, data = your_data,
                                         weights = weights, # s
                                         se_type = "HC2",
                                         fixed_effects = block)
```

Cluster randomized trials

- Treatment allocated at a higher level than the data.
 - Suppose schools are randomized and all the classes in same school receives same treatment
 - Now school is not a block, but cluster!
- Setup:
 - Clusters: $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$
 - Randomly choose K_1 treatment clusters, K_0 control.
 - Each cluster has units $i \in \{1, \dots, m_k\}$ with $\sum_{k=1}^K m_k = n$
 - Treatment assignment at cluster level: $D_{ik} = D_k$
 - Potential outcomes $Y_{ik}(d)$
- Cost of clustering
 - More similarity \rightsquigarrow each unit provides redundant information \rightsquigarrow less efficiency under clustering

Cluster randomized trials

- Use **cluster-robust variance estimator**

In R

```
your_formula <- as.formula("outcome ~ treat + x_tilde1 + x_tilde2")
your_data <- data.frame(outcome, treat,
                        x_tilde1, x_tilde2,
                        cluster)
```

```
your_fitted_model <- estimatr::lm_robust(your_formula, data = your_data,
                                         clusters = cluster,
                                         se_type = "CR2")
```

??estimatr::lm_robust # Check more options for se_type

Or

```
your_model <- lm(your_formula, data = your_data)
your_vcov <- clubSandwich::vcovCR(your_model, cluster = your_data$cluster,
                                  type = "CR2")
```

- You may have block and cluster design at the same time! [Pset4 Q3]