

# Identification Problems in Model Construction: Its Epistemological Scope

Virtual IOMW 2020

Ernesto San Martín

Interdisciplinary Laboratory of Social Statistics

February 2021 (Joint work with D. Avello)



Laboratorio  
Interdisciplinario de  
Estadística Social

- Structural models connect **theories** and **facts/data** (Frisch, 1934, 1948; Haavelmo, 1944).
- Structural modelling was/is developed under the motto **no measurement without theory** (Koopmans, 1947).

- Koopmans (1949):

*Statistical inference unsupported by economic theory applies to whatever statistical regularities and stable relationships can be **discerned in the data**. Such purely empirical relationships when discernible are likely to be due to the presence and persistence of the underlying structural relationships, and (if so) could be deduced from a knowledge of the latter. However, the direction of this deduction cannot be reversed -from the empirical to the structural relationships- except possibly with the help of a theory which specifies the form of the structural relationships, the variables which enter into each, and any further details supported by prior observation or deduction therefrom. The more detailed these specifications are made in the model, the greater scope is thereby given to statistical inference from the data to the structural equations. We propose to study the **limits** to which statistical inference, from the data to the structural equations (other than definitions), is subject, and **the manner in which these limits depend on the support received from economic theory**.*

- Standard presentation:

$$Y = \tau + \epsilon, \quad \tau \perp \epsilon, \quad E(\epsilon) = 0.$$

- Standard presentation:

$$Y = \tau + \epsilon, \quad \tau \perp \epsilon, \quad E(\epsilon) = 0.$$

- How  $\tau$  and  $\epsilon$  are interpreted?

- Standard presentation:

$$Y = \tau + \epsilon, \quad \tau \perp \epsilon, \quad E(\epsilon) = 0.$$

- How  $\tau$  and  $\epsilon$  are interpreted?
- This question can be answered once the **parameter of interest** is made explicit  
...

- Standard presentation:

$$Y = \tau + \epsilon, \quad \tau \perp \epsilon, \quad E(\epsilon) = 0.$$

- How  $\tau$  and  $\epsilon$  are interpreted?
- This question can be answered once the **parameter of interest** is made explicit ... **which leads to present correctly the CTT** according to Spearman.

- Standard presentation:

$$Y = \tau + \epsilon, \quad \tau \perp \epsilon, \quad E(\epsilon) = 0.$$

- How  $\tau$  and  $\epsilon$  are interpreted?
- This question can be answered once the **parameter of interest** is made explicit ... **which leads to present correctly the CTT** according to Spearman.
- This is done taking into account a **geometrical perspective** –which is the opposite of the **arithmetical perspective**: other perspective of measurement.



# Fundamental problem

- Why two observations  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  are correlated?

- Why two observations  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  are correlated?
- It is always (in  $L^2$ ) true that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{cov}(Y_1, Y_2) &= \text{cov}[E(Y_1 | \theta), E(Y_2 | \theta)] + \text{cov}[Y_1 - E(Y_1 | \theta), Y_2 - E(Y_2 | \theta)] \\ &= \text{cov}[E(Y_1 | \theta), E(Y_2 | \theta)]\end{aligned}$$

if the **weak version of the Axiom of Local Independence (WALI)** is assumed:

$$Y_1 \perp Y_2 | \theta.$$

- WALI is equivalent (in  $L^2$ ) to the zero partial correlation between  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  controlled by  $\theta$ , that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cor}[Y_1 - E(Y_1 | \theta), Y_2 - E(Y_2 | \theta)] &= \frac{\text{cor}(Y_1, Y_2) - \text{cor}(Y_1, \theta) \text{cor}(Y_2, \theta)}{\sqrt{1 - \text{cor}^2(Y_1, \theta)} \sqrt{1 - \text{cor}^2(Y_2, \theta)}} \\ &= \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_2 \cdot \theta) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

provided that the conditional expectations are affine linear functions.

- Let  $Y_1, Y_2, Y_3$  be three observations that satisfy the WALL:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 \perp Y_2 \mid \theta &\iff \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_2 \cdot \theta) = 0 \iff \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_2) = \text{cor}(Y_1, \theta) \text{cor}(Y_2, \theta) \\ Y_1 \perp Y_3 \mid \theta &\iff \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_3 \cdot \theta) = 0 \iff \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_3) = \text{cor}(Y_1, \theta) \text{cor}(Y_3, \theta) \\ Y_2 \perp Y_3 \mid \theta &\iff \text{cor}(Y_2, Y_3 \cdot \theta) = 0 \iff \text{cor}(Y_2, Y_3) = \text{cor}(Y_2, \theta) \text{cor}(Y_3, \theta). \end{aligned}$$

- It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cor}(Y_1, \theta)^2 &= \frac{\text{cor}(Y_1, Y_2)}{\text{cor}(Y_2, \theta)} \frac{\text{cor}(Y_1, Y_3)}{\text{cor}(Y_3, \theta)} \\ &= \frac{\text{cor}(Y_1, Y_2) \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_3)}{\text{cor}(Y_2, Y_3)}. \end{aligned}$$

- This is the tetrachoric relation.

- In this example, statistical regularities are represented through the correlations of the observables.
- Theoretically, it is assumed that there exists a third variable that **produces** such a correlation (WALI).
- In which sense? Under WALI it is possible to identify

$$\text{cor}^2(Y_1, \theta).$$

- Note that the sign of this correlation is identified provided some

$+ \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_2)$	$+ \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_3)$	$+ \text{cor}(Y_3, Y_2)$
$- \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_2)$	$- \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_3)$	$+ \text{cor}(Y_3, Y_2)$
$+ \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_2)$	$- \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_3)$	$- \text{cor}(Y_3, Y_2)$
$- \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_2)$	$+ \text{cor}(Y_1, Y_3)$	$- \text{cor}(Y_3, Y_2)$

# Acknowledgements

Partially funded by the FONDECYT Grant 1181261