

Practical Computing for Economists

Notes on MCMC

Philip Barrett & John Eric Humphries

May 1, 2014

Model

Individuals are $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $j = 1, \dots, M$ measures of them (eg. repeated high school/college tests, or different interest rate measures). The DGP is

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{ij} &= \alpha_j \theta_i + \beta_1 X_i + \epsilon_{ij} \\ &\vdots \\ Y_{mj} &= \alpha_m \theta_i + \beta_m X_i + \epsilon_{im} \end{aligned}$$

The thing we want to estimate here is (the distribution of) θ_i . That's the hidden state, such as how IQ determines exam performance.

Only the Y_s and X_s are observed. We assume that θ is independent of ϵ and X . So we define $\tilde{Y} = Y - X\beta$, and use the notation $\sum_{\tilde{Y}} = \alpha \sum_{\theta} \alpha' + \sum_{\epsilon}$. This \tilde{Y} is the residualized version of Y and follows because of the uncorrelation of θ and X . We need 1) some normalizations of the factor (i.e. its units) and 2) some restrictions for identification.

The MCMC procedure

We assume that the errors are diagonal (for identification):

$$\epsilon_{i,j} \sim N(0, \sigma_j^2)$$

So the unknowns are $\beta, \theta, \alpha, \sigma$

And then the priors and posteriors are conjugate:

$$p(\sigma_j^2) \simeq IG(a, b) \qquad p(\sigma_j^2 | X, Y) \sim IG(a^*, b^*)$$

Where the posterior parameters are given by:

$$a^* = a + \frac{N}{2} \qquad b^* = b + \frac{1}{2} \sum \left[(Y_{ij} - X_i \beta_j - f_i \alpha_j)^2 \right]$$

We assume that all the other other parameters are normally distributed. The priors and posteriors are:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\beta_j) &\sim N(\mu, B) & p(\beta_j | \sigma^2, X, Y) &\sim N(\mu^*, B^*) \\ B^* &= \left[\frac{1}{\sigma^2} (X'X + B) \right]^{-1} & \mu^* &= B^* \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} X'Y_j + \frac{Bb}{\sigma^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

And for α :

$$p(\alpha) \sim N(c, A) \qquad p(\alpha | X, Y, \sigma) \sim N(c^*, A^*)$$

With analogous definitions of (c^*, A^*) . Then the distribution of the hidden factor is:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_i &\sim N(\gamma, F) & \theta_i^* &\sim N(\gamma^*, F^*) \\ F^* &= [\alpha'(\sigma^2)^{-1}\alpha]^{-1} & \gamma^* &= F^* (\alpha'(\sigma^2)^{-1}Y_i) \end{aligned}$$

An example

Imagine we have data on test scores, GPAs in maths and science GPA_s and GPA_m , and another test score TS . Then if this is driven by IQ and class size according to the following model:

$$GPA_m = \alpha_1 IQ_i + \beta_1 CS_i + \epsilon_{i1}$$

$$GPA_s = \alpha_2 IQ_i + \beta_2 CS_i + \epsilon_{i2}$$

$$TS = \alpha_3 IQ_i + \beta_3 CS_i + \epsilon_{i3}$$

For $i = 1, \dots, N$ individuals. Of course, IQ is hidden, so we want to infer it from the data. The normalization is that $\alpha_1 = 1$ and the identifying restrictions on the error process are:

$$\Sigma_\epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_2^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_3^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then the econometric problem is to compute the joint distribution of $\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, IQ_1, \dots, IQ_N$ and $\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \sigma_3^2$.

The aim of the exercise

Ultimately, we want to be able to compute the *joint* distribution of the parameters. MCMC lets us do this by holding all parameters but one fixed and then drawing correctly from the remaining conditional & marginal distributions. Doing this enough eventually produces draws from the joint distribution, which is what we want.