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1. Models for Repeated Measures
   Growth Curve Models
Introduction
Longitudinal studies

- A longitudinal study tracks the same group of subjects over time
  - Subjects may be individuals, organisations etc.

- Classic longitudinal designs are prospective
  - A cohort study samples a group who experience an event at the same time (usually born in a given time period)
  - A panel study samples a cross-section of the population

- But longitudinal data may also be collected retrospectively, e.g. asking people to recall timing of events (births, marriages)
Causal inference using longitudinal data

- Cross-sectional data cannot be used for causal inference (unless from a randomised experiment). Longitudinal data can greatly reduce bias in estimating causal effects
  - E.g. how can we interpret cross-sectional associations between exercise (E), diet (D) and weight (W)?
  - E and D influence W, but high W may influence (encourage or discourage) changes in E and D

- Repeated measurements taken on the same individuals can help to disentangle complex interrelationships between all three variables
Age vs cohort effects

- How should we interpret a positive cross-sectional association between age and voting in elections?
  - Perhaps people become more socially responsible as they get older (an age effect)
  - Or perhaps people who grew up during periods of national instability take a greater interest in politics (a cohort effect)

- Longitudinal data can be used to distinguish age and cohort effects
  - Does a person’s chance of voting change with age? Is a 20-year old born in 1960 more likely to vote than a 20-year old born in 1970?
Types of longitudinal data

- Repeated measures
  - The same variable is measured on several occasions, e.g. height, test scores, attitudes
  - Collected prospectively

- Event history (duration) data
  - The duration until some event occurs (measured from time of becoming 'at risk' of the event), e.g. duration from marriage to divorce
  - Collected retrospectively or prospectively

This course focuses on the analysis of repeated measured data.
Example research questions and methods of analysis

- How does cognitive development vary between children (GCM)?
- Is there a gender difference in the rate of cognitive development (GCM)?
- What is the effect of income on subsequent mental health (adjusting for prior mental health) (DM)?
- What is the effect of a change in income on mental health (adjusting for mental health before income change) (DM)?

GCM - Growth curve model
DM - Dynamic model
Repeated Measures Data;
Introduction to Growth Curve Models
Example: Reading development

- Data from children of female respondents to the U.S. National Longitudinal Survey of Youth *
- Reading scores for 221 children on four occasions (only complete cases considered)
- Occasions spaced two years apart (1986, 1988, 1990 and 1992); children aged 6-8 in 1986
- Other variables: antisocial behaviour (also repeated measures), gender, amount of cognitive support at home

Interested in variation between children in their reading development (or reading trajectories)

*See http://www.unc.edu/~curran/srcd-docs/srcdmeth.pdf
Reading data in wide form

Repeated measures data often come in the form of 1 record per individual, with different measures stored as separate variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>child</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>homecog</th>
<th>read1</th>
<th>read2</th>
<th>read3</th>
<th>read4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading data in long form

Most methods of longitudinal data analysis require data to be restructured so there is 1 record per measurement occasion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>child</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>homecog</th>
<th>read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is straightforward to convert data from wide to long format.
Questions about reading development

- What is the nature of reading development with age? Linear or nonlinear?
- How much do children vary in their initial reading score and in the rate of development?
- Does the initial score and rate of change depend on child/family characteristics, e.g. amount of cognitive support at home?
Summary statistics for reading by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mean reading score increases by year
- But likely to be a large amount of variation between children in reading ability and speed of progress
Observed reading trajectories for 10 children

- Trajectories fairly monotonic (increasing with age), but nonlinear
- Individual variation in level (intercept) and rate of change (slope)
Repeated measures data: Notation

\( y_{ti} \) is the response at occasion \( t \) \((t = 1, \ldots, T)\) for individual \( i \) \((i = 1, \ldots, n)\).

Suppose that \( z_{ti} \) is the timing of occasion \( t \) for individual \( i \). For simplicity, we assume \( z_{ti} = t \) but in many applications time \( \equiv \) age, and individuals may vary in age at occasion \( t \).

- Occasions need not be equally spaced
- Individuals may have missing data because of attrition or by design

Can view data as having a 2-level hierarchical structure: responses (level 1) within individuals (level 2).
We begin with a model that allows for individual variation in the level of $y$ for individuals.

Ignoring covariates for now, a simple linear growth curve model is:

$$ y_{ti} = \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1} t + e_{ti} $$

$$ \beta_{0i} = \beta_{0} + u_{0i} \quad \text{(individual variation in level of } y) $$

where $u_{0i}$ is an individual-specific residual (or random effect) representing unmeasured individual characteristics that are fixed over time and $e_{ti}$ are occasion-level residuals.
Basic linear growth model: Assumptions and estimation

- Usually assume $u_{0i} \sim N(0, \sigma_{u0}^2)$ and $e_{ti} \sim N(0, \sigma_{e}^2)$ are normally distributed.

- Assume $\text{cov}(e_{ti}, e_{si}) = 0$, i.e. correlation between an individual’s $y$-values over time is explained by $u_{0i}$.

- The model can be viewed as a ’random intercept’ multilevel model, where $u_{0i}$ allows the level of $y$ (or intercept) to vary across individuals.

- The growth rate (coefficient of $t$, $\beta_1$) is fixed across individuals, which will usually be an unrealistic assumption.
Application of random intercept model: Reading

**Results from MLwiN (Iterative Generalised Least Squares)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Est</th>
<th>(SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept ($\beta_0$)</td>
<td>2.719</td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope of $t$ ($\beta_1$)</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (between-child) variance ($\sigma^2_{u0}$)</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>(0.080)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (within-child) variance ($\sigma^2_{e}$)</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>2202.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After accounting for a common time effect, $0.73/(0.73 + 0.42) = 63\%$ of the variation in $y_{ti}$ is due to differences between individuals.
Linear growth model with random slopes

A random intercept model will rarely be realistic for repeated measures data, so we now move to a random slope model.

\[ y_{ti} = \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i} t + e_{ti} \]

\[ \beta_{0i} = \beta_0 + u_{0i} \] (individual variation in level of \( y \))

\[ \beta_{1i} = \beta_1 + u_{1i} \] (individual variation in growth rate)

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  u_{0i} \\
  u_{1i}
\end{pmatrix}
\sim N
\begin{pmatrix}
  0 \\
  0
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
  \sigma_{u0}^2 & \sigma_{u01} \\
  \sigma_{u01} & \sigma_{u1}^2
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[ e_{ti} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2) \]
\[ y_{ti} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t \] is the average trajectory (but may not represent trajectory of any individual)

\[ u_{0i} \] is the individual departure about the intercept of this line

\[ u_{1i} \] is the individual departure about the slope of this line

\[ \sigma^2_{u0} \] is the between-individual variance in the mean of \( y \) at \( t = 0 \) (Code \( t \) so that 0 is in observed range, e.g. 1st occasion or mid-point.)

\[ \sigma^2_{u1} \] is the between-individual variance in the growth rate

\[ \sigma_{u01} \] is the covariance between the intercepts and slopes of the individual linear trajectories
### Results from MLwiN (IGLS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Est</th>
<th>(SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept ($\beta_0$)</td>
<td>2.719</td>
<td>(0.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope of $t$ ($\beta_1$)</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level 2 (between-child)**

- Variance of intercepts ($\sigma^2_{u0}$) | 0.516 | (0.071) |
- Intercept-slope covariance ($\sigma_{u01}$) | 0.029 | (0.022) |
- Variance in slopes of $t$ ($\sigma^2_{u1}$) | 0.069 | (0.013) |

**Level 1 (within-child)**

- Variance ($\sigma^2_e$) | 0.306 | (0.021) |

Deviance | 2119.05 |

$t$ is recoded $0, 1, 2, 3$ (i.e. centred at $t = 1$) so $\hat{\sigma}^2_{u0} = 0.52$ is the between-child variance at the first occasion.
Testing for between-individual variation in growth rate

Compare random intercept and random slope model using a likelihood ratio test.

Null hypothesis is $H_0: \sigma^2_{u1} = \sigma_{u01} = 0$

Compare change in deviance (twice the difference in the log-likelihoods between the 2 models) with a chi-squared distribution on 2 d.f.

In reading example, $LR = 2202.68 - 2119.05 = 83.6$ so strong evidence against the null $\Rightarrow$ the random slope model is preferred.
Interpretation of random slope model: Reading

- \( \text{read}_{ti} = 2.72 + 1.08t \) is the equation of the fitted average line, but children vary in their intercepts and slopes about this line.

- Between-child variance in the mean reading score at 1st occasion (age 6-8) is 0.52.

- Between-child variance in slope of time (growth rate) is 0.069.

- Covariance between child intercepts and slopes is 0.029 (translates to correlation of \( 0.029/(\sqrt{0.52} \times 0.069) = 0.15 \)).

- Within-child variance (between occasions) is 0.31.
Interpretation of intercept-slope covariance

$\sigma_{u01}$ is the covariance between the intercepts and slopes of the individual linear trajectories

E.g. $\sigma_{u01} > 0$ implies individuals with $u_{0i} > 0$ (above-average $y$ at $t = 0$) tend to have $u_{1i} > 0$

If 'average' slope $\beta_1 > 0$ then $u_{1i} > 0$ suggests a steeper-than-average growth rate

If $\beta_1 < 0$ then $u_{1i} > 0$ suggests a flatter-than-average growth rate
Predicted linear trajectories for first 10 children
Predicted linear trajectories for all 221 children

Some suggestion that the variability in reading scores increases with $t$ (age).
Weak positive correlation: children with above-average scores at $t = 0$ ($u_{0i} > 0$) tend also to progress more quickly ($u_{1i} > 0$).
Between-individual variance

Random slope for \( t \) implies that the between-individual variance depends on \( t \):

\[
\text{var}(u_0i + u_{1i}t) = \text{var}(u_{0i}) + 2\text{cov}(u_{0i}, u_{1i})t + \text{var}(u_{1i})t^2
= \sigma^2_{u0} + 2\sigma_{u01}t + \sigma^2_{u1}t^2
\]

i.e. a quadratic function of time with 'coefficients' \( \sigma^2_{u0} \), \( \sigma_{u01} \) and \( \sigma^2_{u1} \).

For children’s reading, between-child variance estimated as

\[
0.52 + 0.058t + 0.069t^2
\]

i.e. strictly increasing with age (as implied by 'fanning out' pattern in prediction lines)
Between-child variance in reading by time (age)
2. An Introduction to MCMC methods and Stat-JR
What will we cover in this first session?

• What is Bayesian Statistics? (as opposed to classical or frequentist statistics)
• What is MCMC estimation?
• MCMC algorithms and Gibbs Sampling
• MCMC diagnostics
• MCMC Model comparisons
• Stat-JR
WHAT IS BAYESIAN STATISTICS?
Why do we need to know about Bayesian statistics?

• In the practicals in this workshop we will be using Stat-JR and primarily MCMC methods which are a family of estimation methods used for fitting realistically complex models.
• MCMC methods are generally used on Bayesian models which have subtle differences to more standard (frequentist) models.
• As most statistical courses are still taught using classical or frequentist methods we need to describe the differences before going on to consider MCMC methods.
Bayesian Inference

In Bayesian inference there is a fundamental distinction between

- Observable quantities \( x \), i.e. the data
- Unknown quantities \( \theta \)

\( \theta \) can be statistical parameters, missing data, latent variables...

- Parameters are treated as random variables

In the Bayesian framework we make probability statements about model parameters

In the frequentist framework, parameters are fixed non-random quantities and the probability statements concern the data.
Prior distributions

As with all statistical analyses we start by positing a model which specifies \( p(x | \theta) \)
This is the **likelihood** which relates all variables into a ‘**full probability model’**

However from a Bayesian point of view:
- \( \theta \) is unknown so should have a probability distribution reflecting our uncertainty about it before seeing the data
- Therefore we specify a **prior distribution** \( p(\theta) \)
Non-informative priors

We often do not have any prior information, although true Bayesian’s would argue we always have some prior information!

We would hope to have good agreement between the frequentist approach and the Bayesian approach with a non-informative prior.

Diffuse or flat priors are often better terms to use as no prior is strictly non-informative!

For an example with an unknown mean, candidate priors are a Uniform distribution over a large range or a Normal distribution with a huge variance.
Posterior Distributions

Also $x$ is known so should be conditioned on and here we use Bayes theorem to obtain the conditional distribution for unobserved quantities given the data which is known as the **posterior distribution**.

$$p(\theta \mid x) = \frac{p(\theta)p(x \mid \theta)}{\int p(\theta)p(x \mid \theta)d\theta} \propto p(\theta)p(x \mid \theta) \quad \leftarrow \text{Bayes Theorem}$$

The prior distribution expresses our uncertainty about $\theta$ **before** seeing the data.

The posterior distribution expresses our uncertainty about $\theta$ **after** seeing the data.
Point and Interval Estimation

In Bayesian inference the outcome of interest for a parameter is its full posterior distribution however we may be interested in summaries of this distribution.

A simple point estimate would be the mean of the posterior. (although the median and mode are alternatives.)

Interval estimates are also easy to obtain from the posterior distribution and are given several names, for example credible intervals, Bayesian confidence intervals and Highest density regions (HDR). All of these refer to the same quantity.
MCMC METHODS
How does one fit models in a Bayesian framework?

Let us now consider a simple linear regression:

\[ \text{weight}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{height}_i + e_i \]

\[ e_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2) \]

With conjugate priors:

\[ \beta_0 \sim N(0, m_0), \beta_1 \sim N(0, m_1), \]

\[ \sigma^2 \sim \Gamma^{-1} (\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \]

where \( m_0 = m_1 = 10^6, \varepsilon = 10^{-3} \)

So our goal now is to make inferences on the joint posterior distribution:

\[ p(\beta_0, \beta_1, \sigma^2 \mid y) \]
MCMC Methods

Goal: To sample from joint posterior distribution:
\[ p(\beta_0, \beta_1, \sigma^2 \mid y) \]

Problem: For complex models this involves multidimensional integration

Solution: It may be possible to sample from conditional posterior distributions,
\[
p(\beta_0 \mid y, \beta_1, \sigma^2), p(\beta_1 \mid y, \beta_0, \sigma^2), p(\sigma^2 \mid y, \beta_0, \beta_1)
\]

It can be shown that after *convergence* such a sampling approach generates dependent samples from the joint posterior distribution.
Gibbs Sampling

When we can sample directly from the conditional posterior distributions then such an algorithm is known as Gibbs Sampling.

This proceeds as follows for the linear regression example:
Firstly give all unknown parameters starting values,
\[ \beta_0 (0), \beta_1 (0), \sigma^2 (0). \]

Next loop through the following steps:
Sample from
\[ p(\beta_0 \mid y, \beta_1(0), \sigma^2(0)) \] to generate \( \beta_0(1) \) and then from
\[ p(\beta_1 \mid y, \beta_0(1), \sigma^2(0)) \] to generate \( \beta_1(1) \) and then from
\[ p(\sigma^2 \mid y, \beta_0(1), \beta_1(1)) \] to generate \( \sigma^2(1) \).

These steps are then repeated with the generated values from this loop replacing the starting values. The chain of values produced by this procedure is known as a Markov chain, and it is hoped that this chain converges to its equilibrium distribution which is the joint posterior distribution.
Calculating the conditional distributions

In order for the algorithm to work we need to sample from the conditional posterior distributions.
If these distributions have standard forms then it is easy to draw random samples from them.
Mathematically we write down the full posterior and assume all parameters are constants apart from the parameter of interest.
We then try to match the resulting formulae to a standard distribution.
The Stat-JR software gives the derivations!
Algorithm Summary

Repeat the following three steps
1. Generate $\beta_0$ from its Normal conditional distribution. 
2. Generate $\beta_1$ from its Normal conditional distribution. 
3. Generate $1/\sigma^2$ from its Gamma conditional distribution 

Convergence and burn-in

Two questions that immediately spring to mind are:
1. We start from arbitrary starting values so when can we safely say that our samples are from the correct distribution?
2. After this point how long should we run the chain for and store values?
MCMC DIAGNOSTICS
Checking Convergence

This is the researchers responsibility!
Convergence is to a target **distribution** (the required posterior), not to a single value as in ML methods.

Once convergence has been reached, samples should look like a random scatter about a stable mean value.

Convergence occurs here at around 100 iterations.
How many iterations after convergence?

After convergence, further iterations are needed to obtain samples for posterior inference. More iterations = more accurate posterior estimates. MCMC chains are dependent samples and so the dependence or autocorrelation in the chain will influence how many iterations we need. Accuracy of the posterior estimates can be assessed by the Monte Carlo standard error (MCSE) for each parameter.
MCMC diagnostics (Example from Stat-JR)

We will describe each pane separately – Note MLwiN has similar six way plots!
Trace plot

This graph plots the generated values of the parameter against the iteration number. When multiple chains are run as here each chain is a different colour. A crude test of mixing with 1 chain is the ‘blue finger’ test. Here the red chain was plotted last so as mixing improves the plot becomes redder. These chains don’t mix that well but could be worse!
Kernel Density plot

This plot is like a smoothed histogram.

Instead of counting the estimates into bins of particular widths like a histogram, the effect of each iteration is spread around the estimate via a Kernel function e.g. a normal distribution. This means that at each point we get the sum of the Kernel function parts for each iteration.

The Kernel density plot has a smoothness parameter that can be modified. With multiple chains we hope each kernel plot is the same – here we see some variability due to short chain lengths.
Time series diagnostics

Here we have the Auto correlation function (ACF) and partial autocorrelation function (PACF) plots.

The ACF measures how correlated the values in the chain are with their close neighbours. The lag is the distance between the two chains to be compared. An independent chain will have approximately zero autocorrelation at each lag.

A Markov chain should have a power relationship in the lags i.e. if ACF(1) = $\rho$ then ACF(2) = $\rho^2$ etc. This is known as an AR(1) process.

The PACF measures discrepancies from such a process and so should normally have values 0 after lag 1.
Monte Carlo Standard Error

The Monte Carlo Standard Error (MCSE) is an indication of how much error is in the estimate due to the fact that MCMC is used.

As the number of iterations increases the MCSE → 0.

For an independent sampler it equals the SD/√n.

However it is adjusted due to the autocorrelation in the chain.

The graph above gives estimates for the MCSE for longer runs.
Brooks Gelman Rubin diagnostic

A multiple chain diagnostic that looks at how well the chains converge to the same distribution.

The green and blue lines show the between and within chain variability and the ratio shown in red is the diagnostic which should converge to 1.0.
Summary Statistics and Accuracy Diagnostics (available from Summary Statistics template)

Statistics given are:

- Mean and SD – from the chain.
- Median – by sorting the chain and finding the middle value.
- Other quantiles for 90% and 95% CIs as well as minimum, maximum and IQR. Thus one can obtain a non-symmetric interval.

Accuracy diagnostics:

- Brooks-Draper works on quoting the mean to \( n \) significant figures. It’s formulae uses the estimate, it’s s.d. and the ACF and it can often give very small or very large values!
- The ESS will be discussed next.
Effective Sample Size

This quantity gives an estimate of the equivalent number of independent iterations that the chain represents. This is related to the ACF and the MCSE. Its formula is:

$$n / \kappa \text{ where } \kappa = 1 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \rho(k).$$

In Stat-JR it is given in the ModelResults object as well as summary statistics and for the parameter above is 420 despite running for 3 chains of 2,000 iterations each!
Inference using posterior samples from MCMC runs

A powerful feature of MCMC and the Bayesian approach is that all inference is based on the joint posterior distribution. We can therefore address a wide range of substantive questions by appropriate summaries of the posterior. Typically report either the mean or median of the posterior samples for each parameter of interest as a point estimate. 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles of the posterior sample for each parameter give a 95% posterior credible interval (interval within which the parameter lies with probability 0.95)
Derived Quantities

Once we have a sample from the posterior we can answer lots of questions simply by investigating this sample.

Examples:
What is the probability that $\theta > 0$?
What is the probability that $\theta_1 > \theta_2$?
What is a 95% interval for $\theta_1/(\theta_1 + \theta_2)$?
Model Comparison in MCMC

In frequentist statistics there are many options including:

• Likelihood ratio (deviance) tests
• Wald Tests
• Information Criterion – e.g. AIC/BIC

Here we look at a criterion that can be used with MCMC and which for a linear regression model is equivalent to the AIC – the Deviance information criterion (DIC).
A natural way to compare models is to use a criterion based on a trade-off between the fit of the data to the model and the corresponding complexity of the model.

DIC does this in a Bayesian way.

DIC = ‘goodness of fit’ + ‘complexity’.

Fit is measured by deviance

$$D(\theta) = -2 \log L(data \mid \theta)$$

Complexity is measured by an estimate of the ‘effective number of parameters’ defined as

$$p_D = E_{\theta \mid y} [D] - D(E_{\theta \mid y} [\theta])$$

$$= \bar{D} - D(\bar{\theta})$$

i.e. Posterior mean deviance minus the deviance evaluated at the posterior mean of the parameters.
DIC (continued)

The DIC is then defined analogously to AIC as

\[
DIC = D(\bar{\theta}) + 2p_D \\
= \bar{D} + p_D
\]

Models with smaller DIC are better supported by the data.

- DIC is available in Stat-JR in the ModelResults object.
- DIC can be monitored in other packages such as MLwiN under the Model/MCMC menu and WinBUGS from (Inference/DIC menu).
Some guidance on DIC

- any decrease in DIC suggests a better model
- But stochastic nature of MCMC; so, with small difference in DIC you should confirm if this is a real difference by checking the results with different seeds and/or starting values.
- More experience with AIC, and common rules of thumb………
  - A model with a $\Delta$ value within 1-2 of the best model has substantial support in the data, and should be considered along with the best model.
  - A $\Delta$ value within 4-7 of the best model has considerably less support.
  - A $\Delta$ value $> 10$ indicates that the worse model has virtually no support and can be omitted from further consideration.
SUMMARY & COMPARISON WITH FREQUENTIST APPROACH
Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)

- MCMC methods are Bayesian estimation techniques which can be used to estimate multilevel models
- MCMC works by drawing a random sample of values for each parameter from its probability distribution
- The mean and standard deviation of each random sample gives the point estimate and standard error for that parameter
Estimating a model using MCMC estimation

• We start by specifying the **model** and our **prior** knowledge for each parameter (nearly always no knowledge!)
• Next we specify **initial values** for the model parameters
• We then run the MCMC algorithm and obtain the **parameter chains**
• We discard the initial **burn-in** iterations when the chains are settling down (converging to their **posterior** distributions)
• Summary statistics for the remaining **monitoring iterations** are then calculated:
  – Point estimates and standard errors are given by the means and standard deviations of the chains
Frequentist (IGLS) vs. MCMC (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IGLS</th>
<th>MCMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses MQL/PQL approximations to fit discrete response models, which can sometimes produce biased estimates</td>
<td>Produces unbiased estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot incorporate prior information</td>
<td>Can incorporate prior information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note that in practice we often do not incorporate prior information
- We want to protect our inferences from being influenced by our prior beliefs
  - True Bayesians have a very different take
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IGLS</th>
<th>MCMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence intervals based on normality are unreasonable for variance parameters</td>
<td>Normality not assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to calculate confidence intervals for functions of parameters</td>
<td>Easy to calculate confidence intervals for arbitrarily complex functions of parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to extend to new models</td>
<td>Easy to extend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model convergence is judged for you</td>
<td>You have to judge model convergence for yourself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IGLS vs. MCMC (3)

IGLS algorithm converges deterministically to a point
Convergence is therefore judge for you

MCMC algorithm converges stochastically to the equilibrium probability distribution
You have to judge convergence for yourself
Priors

• Our prior knowledge for each parameter is summarised by a probability distribution referred to as the prior distribution
  – Typically, we specify that we have no prior knowledge as we like the ‘data to speak for itself’
  – We therefore specify vague, diffuse or uninformative priors

\[ \beta_1 \sim N(0,10000) \approx U(-\infty, \infty) \]
MCMC samplers

- At the $t^{th}$ iteration we want to sample from the posterior distribution of each parameter in turn
  - If we can write down an analytical expression for the posterior distribution then we can use **Gibbs sampling**
    - Computationally efficient algorithm
    - Continuous response models
  - If we can’t write down an analytical expression for the posterior then we use **Metropolis-Hastings** sampling
Deviance information criterion (DIC) for model comparison

• **DIC** can be viewed as an **AIC** or **BIC** statistic for MCMC
• DIC balances goodness of fit and model complexity (i.e. deviance and number of parameters)
• Want to maximise fit and minimise complexity
  – Lower deviance and fewer parameters
• So “better” models have smaller DIC
• Note that the DIC does not have universal approval!
Stat-JR

- Stat-JR is a new statistical software package named after our former colleague Jon Rasbash
- It is based around the concept of templates that perform a specific statistical task and can be slotted together to form a statistical software package.
- The big vision was an all-singing all-dancing system where expert users could add functionality easily and which interoperates with other software. Stat-JR has an underpinning algebra system which can be used to create model fitting templates.
STAT-JR component based approach

Below is an early diagram of how we envisioned the system. Here you will see boxes representing components some of which are built into the STAT-JR system. The system is written in Python with currently a VB.net algebra processing system. A team of coders work together on the system.
Templates

Backbone of Stat-JR.

Consist of a set of code sections for advanced users to write. A bit like R packages.

For a model template it consists of at least:

• an *inputs* method which specifies inputs and types
• A *model* method that creates (BUGS like) model code for the algebra system
• An (optional) *latex* method can be used for outputting LaTeX code for the model.

Other optional functions required for more complex templates
Regression 1 Example

from EStat.Templating import *

class Regression1(Template):
    'A model template for fitting 1 level Normal multiple regression model in eStat only.'
    tags = ['Model', '1-Level', 'eStat', 'Normal']
    engines = ['eStat']
    inputs = '''
y = DataVector('Response: ')
x = DataMatrix('Explanatory variables: ', allow_cat=True, help= 'predictor variables')
beta = ParamVector(parents=[x], as_scalar=True)
    help = 'predictor variables')
    tau = ParamScalar()
    sigma = ParamScalar(modelled = False)
    sigma2 = ParamScalar(modelled = False)
    deviance = ParamScalar(modelled = False)
'''

model = '''
model{
for (i in 1:length(${y})) {
    ${y}[i] ~ dnorm(mu[i], tau)
    mu[i] <- ${mmult(x, 'beta', 'i')}
}

# Priors
% for i in range(0, x.ncols()):
  beta${i} ~ dflat()
% endfor
  tau ~ dgamma(0.001000, 0.001000)
  sigma2 <- 1 / tau
  sigma <- 1 / sqrt(tau)
}
'''

latex = r'''
\begin{aligned}
\text{${y}}_i & \sim \text{N}(\mu_i, \sigma^2) \\
\mu_i & = {mmulttex(x, r'\beta', 'i')}
%for i in range(0, len(x)): \\
\beta_{${i}} & \propto 1 \\
%endfor
\tau & \sim \Gamma (0.001,0.001) \\
\sigma^2 & = 1 / \tau
\end{aligned}'''}
An example of STAT-JR – setting up a model
An example of STAT-JR – setting up a model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Response:</strong></th>
<th>normexam remove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanatory variables:</strong></td>
<td>cons, standlrt remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of chains:</strong></td>
<td>3 remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Random Seed:</strong></td>
<td>1 remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of burnin:</strong></td>
<td>500 remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of iterations:</strong></td>
<td>2000 remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thinning:</strong></td>
<td>1 remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use default algorithm settings:</strong></td>
<td>Yes remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generate prediction dataset:</strong></td>
<td>Yes remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use default starting values:</strong></td>
<td>Yes remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of output results:</strong></td>
<td>out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equations for model and model code

\[ \text{normexam}_i \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma^2) \]
\[ \mu_i = \beta_0 \text{cons}_i + \beta_1 \text{standlrt}_i \]
\[ \beta_0 \sim 1 \]
\[ \beta_1 \sim 1 \]
\[ \tau \sim \Gamma(0.001, 0.001) \]
\[ \sigma^2 = 1/\tau \]

All objects created available from one pull down and can be popped out to separate tabs in browser.
Equations for model and model code

\[ \text{normexam}_i \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma^2) \]
\[ \mu_i = \beta_0 \text{cons}_i + \beta_1 \text{standlrt}_i \]
\[ \beta_0 \propto 1 \]
\[ \beta_1 \propto 1 \]
\[ \tau \sim \Gamma(0.001, 0.001) \]
\[ \sigma^2 = 1/\tau \]

- Note: Equations use MATHJAX and so underlying LaTeX can be copied and paste. The model code is based around the WinBUGS language with some variation.
Model code in detail

model{
  for (i in 1:length(normexam)) {
    normexam[i] ~ dnorm(mu[i], tau)
    mu[i] <- cons[i] * beta0 + standlrt[i] * beta1
  }
  # Priors
  beta0 ~ dflat()
  beta1 ~ dflat()
  tau ~ dgamma(0.001000, 0.001000)
  sigma2 <- 1 / tau
  sigma <- 1/sqrt(tau)
}

For this template the code is, aside from the length function, standard WinBUGS model code.
Algebra system steps
Algebra system steps

\[
\tau \sim \Gamma \left( 0.001 + 0.5 \times \text{length(normexani)}, 0.001000 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexani)}} (\text{normexani}_{i} - \beta_{0} \times \text{const}_{i} - \beta_{1} \times \text{standlrt}_{i})^2}{2} \right)
\]

Deviance Function

\[
\text{deviance} = 2 \times \left( \frac{\tau \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexani)}} (\text{normexani}_{i} - \beta_{0} \times \text{const}_{i} - \beta_{1} \times \text{standlrt}_{i})^2 \right)}{2} + 0.5 \times (\ln(\tau) - \ln(\tau)) \times \text{length(normexani)} + 0.34657390379073 \times \text{length(normexani)} \right)
\]

Conditional posterior for beta0 for Gibbs sampling

\[
\beta_{0} \sim N \left( \frac{\tau \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexani)}} \text{const}_{i} \times (\text{normexani}_{i} - \beta_{1} \times \text{standlrt}_{i}) \right)}{\tau \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexani)}} \text{const}_{i}^2 \right)}, \frac{\tau \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexani)}} \text{const}_{i}^2 \right)}{\tau} \right)
\]

Conditional posterior for beta1 for Gibbs sampling

\[
\beta_{1} \sim N \left( \frac{\tau \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexani)}} \text{standlrt}_{i} \times (\text{normexani}_{i} - \beta_{0} \times \text{const}_{i}) \right)}{\tau \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexani)}} \text{standlrt}_{i}^2 \right)}, \frac{\tau \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexani)}} \text{standlrt}_{i}^2 \right)}{\tau} \right)
\]

Deterministic formula for parameter sigma

\[
\sigma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}}
\]

Deterministic formula for parameter sigma2

\[
\sigma_{2} = \frac{1}{\tau}
\]
Algebra system steps

Use Gibbs sampling from conditional posterior for beta1:

$$\beta_1 \sim N \left( \frac{\tau \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexam)}} \text{standl}\text{rt}_i \times (\text{normexam}_i - \beta_0 \times \text{cons}_i) \right)}{\tau \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexam)}} \text{standl}\text{rt}_i^2 \right)}, \tau \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\text{length(normexam)}} \text{standl}\text{rt}_i^2 \right) \right)$$

$$\beta_1 \sim N(0.000249799765395 \times (2382.12631198 + \beta_0 \times (-7.34783096611)), 4003.20632175 \times \tau)$$

Here the first line is what is returned by the algebra system – which works solely on the model code. The second line is what can be calculated when values are added for constants and data etc. System then constructs C code and fits model
Output from the E-STAT engine

Estimates and the DIC diagnostic can be viewed for the model fitted.
Output from the E-STAT engine

E-STAT offers multiple chains so that we can use multiple chain diagnostics to aid convergence checking.

Otherwise the graphs are borrowed from the MLwiN 6-way plotting.

Graphics are in svg format so scale nicely.
INTEROPERABILITY
Interoperability with MLwiN

MLwiN can be chosen as an alternative estimation engine. Here macro files to be run in MLwiN are constructed and the output from MLwiN is translated into a ModelResults object. Currently we are unable to get windows back from MLwiN into Stat-JR.
Other templates - XYplot

There are also templates for plotting.

For example here is a plot using the Xyplot template.

Shown is the plot whilst the Python command script is also available.
Different forms of STAT-JR and E-books

- TREE (Template Reading and Execution Environment) - the format we have demonstrated up to now. Allows user to investigate 1 template and 1 dataset. A dataset can be output from 1 template and then used by the next.
- Cmdtest – this format involves the use of a Python script and allows the template to be called from within a script. Helpful for our test suite and potentially for tasks like simulations. We have code to run Stat-JR from Stata and R using this interface.
- DEEP (Ebooktest) – mixing up templates with textboxes to make executable books – this is covered later.
- Note Stat-JR currently runs on Windows but should soon be platform independent.
Stat-JR writes commands, etc., to perform requested function. Stat-JR prompts the user for input.

Template + Dataset ->

Function performed

(If applicable) external software opened, run, then closed, with results returned to Stat-JR. E.g...

Results
Model:
DIC: 9766.506
Parameters:
Beta1: 0.594

Results of function produced

Results outputted as dataset to be fed back in...

myModel <- glm(normexam ~ Summary(myModel)
plot(myModel, 1)

Select Open Worksheet
Select datafile.dta
Select Equations from Fi

Scripts, Macros, Equations, Point & click instructions

normexam_i \sim N(\mu_i, \sigma^2)
\mu_i = \beta_0 cons_i
\beta_0 \propto 1
\tau \sim \Gamma(0.001, 0.001)
\sigma^2 = 1/\tau

Results
Charts
Tables
3. Further Growth Curve Models
Allowing for nonlinear growth

We can allow for nonlinear growth, e.g. a quadratic polynomial

\[ y_{ti} = \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i}t + \beta_{2i}t^2 + e_{ti} \]

\[ \beta_{0i} = \beta_0 + u_{0i} \]
\[ \beta_{1i} = \beta_1 + u_{1i} \]
\[ \beta_{2i} = \beta_2 + u_{2i} \]

where the three individual-level random effects \((u_{0i}, u_{1i}, u_{2i})\) follow a trivariate normal distribution.

\( t \) and \( t^2 \) treated as explanatory variables in multilevel model for \( y \).
The order of polynomial that can be fitted depends on the number of occasions $T$.

For $T$ observations can fit up to a $T - 1$ order polynomial, e.g. cubic for $T = 4$.

But for $T = 4$ the covariance matrix for $y$ has 10 parameters: 4 variances and 6 covariances. Fitting cubic leads to a $4 \times 4$ covariance matrix at individual level, i.e. 10 parameters. So cannot also estimate an occasion-level variance.
We begin by adding $t^2$ to the 'fixed' part of the model only (i.e. as an explanatory variable with fixed coefficient).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>IGLS</th>
<th>MCMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Est</td>
<td>(SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept ($\beta_0$)</td>
<td>2.534</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$ ($\beta_1$)</td>
<td>1.641</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t^2$ ($\beta_2$)</td>
<td>$-0.186$</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2 (between-child)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept variance ($\sigma^2_{u_0}$)</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>(0.070)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept-$t$ covariance ($\sigma_{u_01}$)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$ variance ($\sigma^2_{u_1}$)</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1 (within-child)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance ($\sigma^2_e$)</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance = 2006.4</td>
<td>DIC = 1576.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the addition of $t^2$ improve the model?

- The coefficient of $t^2$ is $-0.187$ with a standard error of 0.017 which is highly significant.
- The change in deviance is $2119 - 2006 = 113$ which far exceeds the critical value of 3.84 for $\chi^2_{1;0.05}$.
- The DIC decreases from 1766 to 1576, a difference of 190.

So we conclude that the addition of the quadratic in $t$ improves model fit. We now allow the coefficient of $t^2$ to vary randomly between children.

For all following analyses we present only MCMC results (see Practicals for details of number of chains, burn-in, and number of iterations).
Reading: Quadratic growth with random $t^2$ effect

We next allow the coefficient of $t^2$ to vary randomly between children. The coefficient of $t^2$ becomes $\beta_{2i} = \beta_2 + u_{2i}$.

3 new terms are added to the level 2 random part of the model:

- Covariance between intercepts and coefficients of $t^2$, $\text{cov}(u_{0i}, u_{2i}) = \sigma_{u02}$

- Covariance between coefficients of $t$ and coefficients of $t^2$, $\text{cov}(u_{1i}, u_{2i}) = \sigma_{u12}$

- Variance of coefficients of $t^2$, $\text{var}(u_{2i}) = \sigma_{u2}^2$

The DIC decreases from 1576 to 1492, so conclude random coefficient for $t^2$ is necessary to better capture between-individual variation in trajectories.
Predicted quadratic trajectories for first 10 children
Adding covariates

Covariates can be added to a growth model, and these can be individual-level (fixed over time) or time-varying.

Often interested in how trajectories differ between groups, e.g.:

► Does level of reading score depend on amount of cognitive support at home ($x_i$)?
  ➤ Test by adding $x_i$ as a covariate to growth model
  ➤ Does $x_i$ explain variation in intercept ($\sigma^2_{u0}$)?

► Does reading progress depend of cognitive support?
  ➤ Test by adding $x_i$ plus its interaction with time, $x_i t$, to model
  ➤ Does $x_i t$ explain variation in progress ($\sigma^2_{u1}$)?
Results from MCMC estimation (fixed part coefficients only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept ($\beta_0$)</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>(0.204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$ ($\beta_1$)</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>(0.060)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t^2$ ($\beta_2$)</td>
<td>$-0.186$</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homecog ($\beta_3$)</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A 1-unit increase in homecog is associated with a 0.053 point increase in reading score
- But little change in between-individual intercept variances (see Practical)
Does the effect of homecog depend on the child’s age? Add an interaction between $t$ and homecog.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept ($\beta_0$)</td>
<td>2.166</td>
<td>(0.243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$ ($\beta_1$)</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t^2$ ($\beta_2$)</td>
<td>$-0.186$</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homecog ($\beta_3$)</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t \times$ homecog ($\beta_4$)</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- At baseline ($t = 0$), a 1-unit increase in homecog is associated with a 0.041 point increase in reading score
- Effect of homecog increases with $t$
- But little change in between-individual variances/covariances (see Practical)
Reading progress by cognitive support at home

Predicted reading scores for quartiles of homecog
Allowing for residual autocorrelation

So far occasion-level (time-varying) residuals $e_{ti}$ have been assumed independent. But we might expect residuals to be correlated across occasions, especially if measurements are close together in time.

A common autocorrelation structure is the 1st-order autoregressive, AR(1), structure:

$$\text{corr}(e_{ti}, e_{si}) = \alpha |t - s|$$

which, for $|\alpha| < 1$, implies the correlation decays with time difference $|t - s|$.
AR(1) structure for reading data

For 4 measurements, the correlation matrix for \((e_{1i}, e_{2i}, e_{3i}, e_{4i})\) is:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 \\
\alpha & 1 \\
\alpha^2 & \alpha & 1 \\
\alpha^3 & \alpha^2 & \alpha & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Allowing for AR(1) autocorrelation therefore involves one additional parameter \(\alpha\).

We can test for autocorrelation using a (frequentist) t-test of \(H_0 : \alpha = 0\).

If Bayesian estimation is used, can examine credible intervals.
Reading model with AR(1) residuals

- Using Stata `xtmixed` the autocorrelation parameter $\alpha$ is estimated as $-0.291$ with a standard error of $0.213 \implies$ we cannot reject $H_0 : \alpha = 0$

- Using MCMC in Stat-JR $\hat{\alpha} = -0.327$ (SE = 0.222). However chains show poor mixing, which suggests model may not be well identified.
Random intercept model with AR(1) residuals

A flexible model (with random coefficients on time variables) may sufficiently capture individual variation in trajectories, removing need to allow for autocorrelation at occasion level.

Suppose we fit a quadratic for \( t \) but allow only the intercepts to vary across children.

- Using \texttt{xtmixed} \( \alpha \) is now estimated as 0.67 with a SE of 0.08, so strongly significant
- Using MCMC in Stat-JR, \( \alpha \) estimated as 0.693 (SD = 0.065)
- But we know that this simple model insufficiently captures variation between children’s trajectories
Handling highly variable trajectories

Growth curve models are most useful for developmental processes (e.g. cognitive measures, height, weight).

Although they can be applied in any situation where the concept of a 'trajectory' is useful, the model may need to be extremely complex to adequately represent change that is highly nonlinear with large between-individual variation in the shape of trajectories.
Observed trajectories in antisocial behaviour for 10 children

A low-order polynomial growth curve will not capture this variation, even with random coefficients.
Treating time as categorical: multivariate model

Include dummies for $t$ in fixed part of model ($t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4$) and estimate separate residual variance for each $t$.

$$\text{read}_{ti} = \beta_0 t_1 + \beta_1 t_2 + \beta_2 t_3 + \beta_3 t_4 + e_{ti}$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} e_{0i} \\ e_{1i} \\ e_{2i} \\ e_{3i} \end{pmatrix} \sim N \left( \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{e0}^2 & \sigma_{e01} & \sigma_{e12} & \sigma_{e23} \\ \sigma_{e01} & \sigma_{e1}^2 & \sigma_{e2}^2 & \sigma_{e3}^2 \\ \sigma_{e02} & \sigma_{e12} & \sigma_{e2}^2 & \sigma_{e3}^2 \\ \sigma_{e03} & \sigma_{e13} & \sigma_{e23} & \sigma_{e3}^2 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$
Means and covariances for antisocial behaviour

When modelling change, we aim to capture the means and variances of $y_{ti}$ at each $t$, and their covariances across $t$, as simply as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anti1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti2</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti3</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti4</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample covariance matrix (correlations in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>anti1</th>
<th>anti2</th>
<th>anti3</th>
<th>anti4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anti1</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti2</td>
<td>1.16 (0.42)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti3</td>
<td>1.22 (0.44)</td>
<td>1.63 (0.51)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti4</td>
<td>1.35 (0.42)</td>
<td>2.00 (0.54)</td>
<td>2.24 (0.60)</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MCMC results from fitting multivariate model to antisocial behaviour

Fixed part estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t1 ( (\beta_0) )</td>
<td>1.50 (0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t2 ( (\beta_1) )</td>
<td>1.84 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3 ( (\beta_2) )</td>
<td>1.88 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t4 ( (\beta_3) )</td>
<td>2.07 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random part estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Param</th>
<th>Uniform Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Wishart Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{e0}^2 )</td>
<td>2.48 (0.25)</td>
<td>2.40 (0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{e01} )</td>
<td>1.21 (0.21)</td>
<td>1.16 (0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{e1}^2 )</td>
<td>3.36 (0.33)</td>
<td>3.25 (0.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{e02} )</td>
<td>1.28 (0.22)</td>
<td>1.23 (0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{e12} )</td>
<td>1.70 (0.26)</td>
<td>1.64 (0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{e2}^2 )</td>
<td>3.39 (0.34)</td>
<td>3.28 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{e03} )</td>
<td>1.41 (0.25)</td>
<td>1.35 (0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{e13} )</td>
<td>2.10 (0.31)</td>
<td>2.01 (0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{e23} )</td>
<td>2.35 (0.32)</td>
<td>2.25 (0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_{e3}^2 )</td>
<td>4.55 (0.45)</td>
<td>4.38 (0.42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model perfectly reproduces the observed means. Var/cov estimates sensitive to choice of prior; Wishart estimates closest to observed values.
Notes on multivariate model

- Very flexible and allows for autocorrelation

- But flexibility means that we cannot discern any general patterns in individual trajectories

- Equivalent to $T - 1$ polynomial (with no occasion-level residual) - same number of parameters and likelihood value, but multivariate model easier to interpret

- May be useful if trajectories are of limited interest and few measurement occasions, e.g. if effects of time-varying $x$ of major interest
4. Dynamic (Autoregressive) Models
Research questions about 'dynamic' relationships

The growth curve approach is appropriate when interest centres on trajectories in $y$ over time, and how they differ across groups.

For some types of process, we might expect a direct dependency of $y_t$ on previous $y$, e.g. earnings, depression.

We might also be interested in more dynamic questions, e.g.:

- How does health at $t$ depend on a change in employment status between $t - 1$ and $t$ (adjusting for health prior to $t$)?
- How does starting a new treatment at $t - 1$ affect depression at $t$ (adjusting for earlier depression)?
1st-order AR(1) dynamic model

The most commonly applied dynamic model assumes that $y_t$ depends on past $y$ through $y_{t-1}$:

$$y_{ti} = \delta y_{t-1,i} + \beta x_{ti} + u_i + e_{ti}, \quad t = 2, 3, \ldots, T$$

where $u_i \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$ and $e_{ti} \sim N(0, \sigma_e^2)$

- In practice we also include an intercept term in the model. This is set to zero here for simplicity.
- $\delta$ commonly assumed to be equal across individuals
- $u_i$ can be treated as fixed rather than random (see brief discussion later)
State dependence vs unobserved heterogeneity

Residual correlation between $y_t$ and $y_{t-1}$ is $\rho = \frac{\sigma_u^2}{\sigma_u^2 + \sigma_e^2}$.

Is correlation between $y_t$ and $y_{t-1}$ due to:

- **Causal** effect of $y_{t-1}$ on $y_t$?

  $\Rightarrow |\delta|$ close to 1 and $\rho$ close to 0 (**state dependence**)

- **Mutual** dependence on time-invariant omitted variables?

  $\Rightarrow |\delta|$ close to 0 and $\rho$ close to 1 (**unobserved heterogeneity**)
Example of state dependence vs unobserved heterogeneity

E.g. Explanations for pattern of high income over time:

- Current income determined by past income

  $\Rightarrow |\delta|$ close to 1 and $\rho$ close to 0 (state dependence)

- Dependence of income at all $t$ on unmeasured characteristics (qualifications, skills, ambition etc)

  $\Rightarrow |\delta|$ close to 0 and $\rho$ close to 1 (unobserved heterogeneity)
Endogeneity of lagged outcomes

\[ y_{ti} = \delta y_{t-1,i} + \beta x_{ti} + u_i + e_{ti}, \quad t = 2, 3, \ldots, T \]

A standard assumption of regression models is that residuals are uncorrelated with explanatory variables (\(y_{t-1}\) and \(x_t\) here):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{cov}(u_i, y_{t-1,i}) &= 0, \quad \text{cov}(e_{ti}, y_{t-1,i}) = 0 \\
\text{cov}(u_i, x_{ti}) &= 0, \quad \text{cov}(e_{ti}, x_{ti}) = 0
\end{align*}
\]

Assumption that \(\text{cov}(u_i, y_{t-1,i}) = 0\) is especially problematic as:

\[ y_{t-1,i} = \delta y_{t-2,i} + \beta x_{t-1,i} + u_i + e_{t-1,i} \]

\(y_{t-1}\) is said to be endogenous with respect to \(y_t\).
Dependence of $y_t$ on earlier $y$ for AR(1) model

Can show $y_t$ ($t = 2, \ldots, T$) depends on earlier $t$ entirely through $y_1$. Omitting covariates for simplicity:

$$y_{2i} = \delta y_{1i} + u_i + e_{2i}$$

$$y_{3i} = \delta y_{2i} + u_i + e_{3i}$$
$$= \delta^2 y_{1i} + (1 + \delta)u_i + \delta e_{2i} + e_{3i}$$

$$y_{4i} = \delta y_{3i} + u_i + e_{4i}$$
$$= \delta^3 y_{1i} + (1 + \delta + \delta^2)u_i + \delta^2 e_{2i} + \delta e_{3i} + e_{4i}$$

By repeated substitution, we find the effect of $y_1$ on subsequent $y_t$ is $\delta^{t-1}$ which diminishes with $t$ for $|\delta| < 1$
The 'initial conditions’ problem

As $y_t$ depends on previous $y$ through $y_1$, our assumptions about $y_1$ are important.

$y_1$ may not be measured at the start of the process

Can view as a missing data problem:

Observed  $(y_1, \ldots, y_T)$

Actual  $(y_{-k}, \ldots, y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_T)$

where first $k + 1$ measures are missing.

We can allow for endogeneity of $y_{t-1}$ by specifying a model for $y_1$. 
Modelling $y_1$

Our model for $y_t \ (t = 2, 3, \ldots, T)$ is:

$$y_{ti} = \delta y_{t-1,i} + \beta x_{ti} + u_i + e_{ti}$$

A general model for $y_1$ is:

$$y_{1i} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 x_{1i} + v_i + e_{1i}$$
Estimating the joint model for $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_T$

We can combine the models for $t = 1$ and $t \geq 2$ in one model.

Define $t_1$ and $t_{2T}$ as dummies for $t = 1$ and $t \geq 2$.

Form interaction variables $t_1x_{1i}$, $t_{2T}y_{t-1,i}$ and $t_{2T}x_{ti}$.

\[
y_{ti} = t_1\{\gamma_0 + \gamma_1x_{1i} + v_i + e_{1i}\} + t_{2T}\{\delta y_{t-1,i} + \beta x_{ti} + u_i + e_{ti}\}
\]

This can be viewed as a multilevel model with level 2 random coefficients for $t_1$ and $t_{2T}$ and complex level 1 variance.

To recover the 2 equations, set (i) $t_1 = 1, t_{2T} = 0$ and (ii) $t_1 = 0, t_{2T} = 1$. 

Some restrictions must be placed on the residuals $v_i$ and $e_{1i}$ in the model for $y_1$.

This is because we cannot separate between-individual and within-individual variances for $t = 1$.

Possible approaches include:

1. Allow separate variances for $e_{1i}$ and $e_{ti}$ ($t > 1$) but set $v_i = u_i$

2. Estimate variance of $v_i$ and its covariance with $u_i$ but set $\operatorname{var}(e_{1i}) = \operatorname{var}(e_{ti})$ for $t > 1$
What if we ignore the initial conditions?

Suppose we do not model $y_1$, and fit only the model for $y_2, \ldots y_T$:

$$y_{ti} = \delta y_{t-1,i} + \beta x_{ti} + u_i + e_{ti}$$

- The estimate of $\delta$ will be biased upwards because we have failed to allow for the shared dependency of $y_t$ and $y_{t-1}$ on $u_i$.

- The association between $y_t$ and $y_{t-1}$ is partly due to unmeasured time-invariant factors affecting $y$ across time.

- Estimates of covariate effects will also be biased if $x$ correlated with $y$ at $t$ and $t-1$.
Application of AR(1) Model to Antisocial Behaviour
Results ignoring initial condition

\[ anti_{ti} = \beta_0 + \delta anti_{t-1,i} + \beta_1 \text{male}_i + u_i + e_{ti}, \quad t = 2, 3, 4 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anti(_{t-1})</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cons</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-level variance ((\sigma_u^2))</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion-level variance ((\sigma_e^2))</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\hat{\delta} = 0.48\) (SD = 0.09) and \(\hat{\sigma}_u^2 = 0.22\) (SD = 0.27) \(\rightarrow\) state dependence rather than unobserved heterogeneity.
Models with initial condition

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{anti}_{1i} & = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \text{male}_i + v_i + e_{1i} \\
\text{anti}_{ti} & = \beta_0 + \delta \text{anti}_{t-1,i} + \beta_1 \text{male}_i + u_i + e_{ti}, & t = 2, 3, 4
\end{align*}
\]

Estimate two versions of model for \( y_1 \):

1. Allow separate variances for \( e_{1i} \) and \( e_{ti} \) \((t > 1)\) but estimate a common child-level random effect \( u_i \)

2. Estimate variance of \( v_i \) and its covariance with \( u_i \) but assume variance of occasion-level residual is same for all \( t \)
### Results for alternative AR(1) models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No IC</th>
<th>IC (1)</th>
<th>IC (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_{t-1} )</td>
<td>0.48 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.20 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{male} )</td>
<td>0.43 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.17)</td>
<td>0.71 (0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{cons} )</td>
<td>0.87 (0.16)</td>
<td>1.26 (0.14)</td>
<td>1.45 (0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{var at } t = 1 )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.96 (0.18)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{var at } t &gt; 1 )</td>
<td>0.22 (0.27)</td>
<td>0.96 (0.18)</td>
<td>1.70 (0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{covariance} )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.05 (0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occasion level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{var at } t = 1 )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.55 (0.19)</td>
<td>1.65 (0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{var at } t &gt; 1 )</td>
<td>2.44 (0.24)</td>
<td>1.97 (0.14)</td>
<td>1.65 (0.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments on AR(1) results

- Effect of $y_{t-1}$ overestimated and between-child variance ($\sigma^2_u$) underestimated if initial condition ignored
  - This impacts on the estimate for male

- Effect of $y_{t-1}$ depends on how $y_1$ is modelled (0.06 vs 0.20)
  - But $\text{corr}(u_i, v_i) = 1.05/\sqrt{0.83 \times 1.70} = 0.88$ which suggests model IC(2) is over-parameterised (2 extra parameters versus 1 extra for IC(1))

- In general, estimates can be sensitive to assumptions about initial condition for short panels

- In a real application, model for $y_1$ should include covariates $x_{1i}$ that capture history of $y$ up to $t = 1$ for better identification
Application of AR(1) Model to Mental Health and Employment
Another example: Mental health and employment

Question: What is the effect of change in employment status on subsequent mental health (adjusting for previous mental health)?

- Data from British Household Panel Study (25% sub-sample)

- 2808 men of working age observed annually for 2-18 years

- Mental health measured by General Health Questionnaire (scores 0-36, mean = 10)

- Employment status at each wave: employed (E) or non-employed (N)
  - Focus on change in employment status between $t - 1$ and $t$: EE, NN, EN and NE
Model specification

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{GHQ}_{1i} & = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \text{age}_{1i} + \gamma_2 \text{age}_{1i}^2 + \gamma_3 \text{employ}_{1i} + \nu_i + e_{1i} \\
\text{GHQ}_{ti} & = \beta_0 + \delta \text{GHQ}_{t-1,i} + \beta_1 \text{empNN}_{t-1,i} + \beta_2 \text{empEN}_{t-1,i} + \beta_3 \text{empNE}_{t-1,i} \\
& + \beta_4 \text{age}_{ti} + \beta_5 \text{age}_{ti}^2 + u_i + e_{ti}, \quad t = 2, \ldots, 18
\end{align*}
\]

- $t = 1$ corresponds to 1st wave of observation for an individual
- employ is a dummy for employment status at $t = 1$ (1=employed, 0=not employed)
- empNN, empEN and empNE are dummies for change in employment status between $t - 1$ and $t$: non-employed at both (NN), become non-employed (EN) and become employed (NE). Reference category is employed at both (EE)
Effects of GHQ and employment transitions for alternative AR(1) models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No IC</th>
<th></th>
<th>IC (1)</th>
<th></th>
<th>IC (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHQ_{t-1}</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empNN</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empEN</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empNE</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Assumption about $y_1$ has little impact in this long panel. Extended model for $y_1$ also included experience of unemployment up to $t = 1$ but conclusions the same.

- Compared to men who remain employed, being non-employed at both waves or becoming non-employed is associated with higher depression scores, while becoming employed is associated with lower depression scores.