

# MQE: Economic Inference from Data:

## Module 2: Fixed Effects

Claire Duquennois

6/9/2020

## Module 2: Fixed Effects

- ▶ Data Structures

- ▶ Fixed Effects

- A simulation

- Fixed effects as demeaned data

- Thinking about variation

- Example: Crime and Unemployment

## Controlling for unobservables

We saw with AGG(2006) that even with many covariates, unobservables are a problem.

Certain types of data allow us to control for more of these unobservables by using fixed effects.

## Example:

$$Income_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Schooling_i + \epsilon$$

$\beta_1$  cannot be interpreted as causal: big OVB problems, even with lots of control variables. Unlikely to have good measures of 'ability', 'enthusiasm', 'grit'...

What if I can control for unchanging individual characteristics?

## Data Structures: Cross-Section

Individual	Income	Schooling	Female
1	22000	12	1
2	57000	16	1
...	...	...	...
N	15000	12	0

Each individual is observed once.

## Data Structures: Panel Data

Individual	Income	Schooling	Female	Year
1	22000	12	1	2001
1	23000	12	1	2002
2	57000	16	1	2001
2	63000	17	1	2002
...	...	...	...	...
N	15000	12	0	2001
N	13000	12	0	2002

Each individual is observed multiple times.

## Data Structures: Panel Data Subscripts

Unique observations must be identified by both the individual and time dimensions. . . notice the new subscripts:

$$Income_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Schooling_{it} + \epsilon.$$

# Data Structures: Panel Data

Panel Data can be

- balanced**: same number of observations for each unit
- unbalanced**: some units are observed more often than others (probably good to look into why)



## Review: Indicator (Dummy) Variables

If I have multiple Female observation and multiple non-female observations I can control for the effect of being female on wages:

$$Income_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Schooling_{it} + \beta_2 Female_i + \epsilon.$$

## Fixed Effects as Individual Indicator Variables

Indiv	Income	School	Female	Year	Indiv1	Indiv2	...	IndivN
1	22000	12	1	2007	1	0	0	0
1	23000	12	1	2008	1	0	0	0
2	57000	16	1	2007	0	1	0	0
2	63000	17	1	2008	0	1	0	0
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
N	15000	12	0	2007	0	0	0	1
N	13000	12	0	2008	0	0	0	1

# Fixed Effects as Individual Indicator Variables

I can estimate:

$$Inc_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 School_{it} + \beta_2 Fem_i + \beta_{a1} Ind1_i + \beta_{a2} Ind2_i + \dots + \beta_{aN-1} Ind(N-1)_i + \epsilon.$$

What do the  $\beta_{ak}$  coefficients tell me?

Also:

- Why do the  $IndN$  indicators only have an  $i$  subscript?
- What is the implied assumption if  $Fem$  only has an  $i$  subscript?
- Why are there only  $(N-1)$  individual dummies?

# Fixed Effects as Individual Indicator Variables

## What will these individual controls control for?

- $\beta_{a1}$  will control for the effect of being individual 1 on income that is not explained by that person's gender or schooling.
- Any **time invariant** characteristic that affects individual 1's income, such as ability, grit, enthusiasm... will be controlled for by adding this individual dummy variable.
- These controls are known as individual **fixed effects**.

## For notational convenience:

$$Income_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Schooling_{it} + \beta_2 Female_i + \gamma_i + \epsilon.$$

# Fixed Effects

**With my panel data, what else can I control for?**

$$Income_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Schooling_{it} + \beta_2 Female_i + \gamma_i + \tau_t + \epsilon.$$

-What is  $\tau_t$ ?

-What is this estimation equivalent to?

## A Simulation:

You are a principle of a small school composed of four classrooms. You have just implemented a new option available to teachers for students to spend some small group reading time with a para-educator. You would like to know how this reading time is affecting reading scores.

**You have data for ten students in each class that tells you:**

- the class the student is in
- whether they participated in small group reading
- their reading score.

# Generating Simulated Data

I will work with a simulated dataset to show how the use of fixed effects can help us recover the true treatment effect.

I start by loading the dplyr package and “setting the seed”:

```
#install.packages("dplyr")  
library(dplyr)  
  
## Warning: package 'dplyr' was built under R version 3.6.3  
  
##  
## Attaching package: 'dplyr'  
  
## The following objects are masked from 'package:stats':  
##  
##     filter, lag  
  
## The following objects are masked from 'package:base':  
##  
##     intersect, setdiff, setequal, union  
  
set.seed(1999)
```

# A Simulation:

I generate a vector of class identifiers and a random error term.

```
class<-c(1,2,3,4)
scores<-as.data.frame(class)
scores<-rbind(scores,scores,scores,scores,scores,scores,scores,scores)
scores$error<-rnorm(40, mean=0, sd=5)
```

*#note: if you are not working in markdown you would just write head(scores)*  
knitr::kable(head(scores))

class	error
1	3.6633624
2	-0.1891486
3	6.0150457
4	7.3490101
1	0.6684515
2	2.5991362



# A Simulation:

I simulate some selection into treatment. The probability of getting treated is

-0.8 for students in classrooms 3 and 4

-0.2 in classrooms 1 and 2.

```
scores$treat1<-rbinom(40,1,0.2)
scores$treat2<-rbinom(40,1,0.8)
scores$treat[scores$class%in%c(1,2)]<-scores$treat1[scores$class%in%c(1,2)]
scores$treat[scores$class%in%c(3,4)]<-scores$treat2[scores$class%in%c(3,4)]

knitr::kable(head(scores))
```

class	error	treat1	treat2	treat
1	3.6633624	0	1	0
2	-0.1891486	0	1	0
3	6.0150457	0	1	1
4	7.3490101	1	0	0
1	0.6684515	0	1	0
2	2.5991362	0	1	0

# A Simulation:

I drop unneeded variables and generate a dummy variable for each classroom

```
scores<-scores%>%select(class,error,treat)
scores <- fastDummies::dummy_cols(scores, select_columns = "class")

knitr::kable(head(scores))
```

class	error	treat	class_1	class_2	class_3	class_4
1	3.6633624	0	1	0	0	0
2	-0.1891486	0	0	1	0	0
3	6.0150457	1	0	0	1	0
4	7.3490101	0	0	0	0	1
1	0.6684515	0	1	0	0	0
2	2.5991362	0	0	1	0	0