

Instrumental Variables Estimation

Tyler Ransom

Univ of Oklahoma

Mar 14, 2019

Today's plan

1. Review reading topics on when $E(u|\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$
 - 1.1 What are Instrumental Variables?
 - 1.2 How to estimate causal effects with IV
2. In-class activity: basic IV estimation in R

What are Instrumental Variables?

Instrumental Variables

- Suppose we have cross-sectional data, and one x might be endogenous
- We have basically two choices to resolve this problem:
 1. Collect good controls, hope that the variable becomes exogenous
 2. Find one or more **instrumental variables** for the endogenous x variable
- An IV (call it z) is a variable correlated with x , but not with u
 - IV's typically come out of so-called **natural experiments**
 - e.g. exogenous change in laws; school choice lotteries; military conscription

Example: Class size and student performance

- Consider a model in the population:

$$score = \beta_0 + \beta_1 classsize + u$$

where we think *classsize* is endogenous:

$$Cov(classsize, u) \neq 0$$

- Why would *classsize* be endogenous?
 - More motivated parents choose to live in better-funded school districts
 - Teachers prefer to teach in better districts, so can have more classrooms

Example: Class size and student performance

- Could try to put in proxies for family background, SES, etc.
- But probably won't be able to capture everything in u that affects score
- A solution: collect data on a variable z that satisfies

1. z is **exogenous** to the equation:

$$\text{Cov}(z, u) = 0$$

2. z is **relevant** for explaining x :

$$\text{Cov}(z, x) \neq 0$$

Testability of IV assumptions

- We **cannot** test condition (1)
 - Must appeal to theory or qualitative evidence
- We can test condition (2)
 - Can easily compute $\text{Corr}(z, x)$ and use a t -test

Deriving the formula for the IV estimator

- Take our population model and take $\text{Cov}(z, \cdot)$ to both sides:

$$\begin{aligned}y &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + u \\ \text{Cov}(z, y) &= \underbrace{\text{Cov}(z, \beta_0)}_{=0} + \text{Cov}(z, \beta_1 x) + \underbrace{\text{Cov}(z, u)}_{=0 \text{ (cond. 1)}} \\ &= \beta_1 \text{Cov}(z, x)\end{aligned}$$

then solving for β_1 we get:

$$\beta_1 = \frac{\text{Cov}(z, y)}{\text{Cov}(z, x)}$$

Deriving the formula for the IV estimator

- Translating the previous formula from population to sample gives:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\beta}_{1,IV} &= \frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})(y_i - \bar{y})}{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})(x_i - \bar{x})} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sum_{i=1}^n (z_i - \bar{z})(x_i - \bar{x})}\end{aligned}$$

Properties of IV

- $\hat{\beta}_{1,IV}$ is consistent, but biased! Bias \uparrow as $|\text{Corr}(z, x)| \downarrow$
- $\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{1,IV}) > \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{1,OLS})$

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{1,IV}) \approx \frac{\sigma_u^2}{n\sigma_x^2\rho_{x,z}^2}$$

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{1,OLS}) \approx \frac{\sigma_u^2}{n\sigma_x^2}$$

where $\rho_{x,z}^2$ is correlation between x and z

How much larger is $Var(\hat{\beta}_{1,IV})$ than $Var(\hat{\beta}_{1,OLS})$?

- Rule of thumb:

$$se(\hat{\beta}_{1,IV}) \approx \frac{se(\hat{\beta}_{1,OLS})}{|r_{xz}|}$$

where r_{xz} is the sample correlation between x and z

- This is the cost of doing IV when we could be doing OLS
- A type of bias-variance tradeoff
- Often $|r_{xz}|$ is small, so IV standard error is “large”; can offset with large N

How to estimate causal effects with IV

How to do IV in R, generally

Suppose our variables are y , x , and z

```
library(AER)
```

```
est.ols <- lm(y ~ x, data=df)  
est.iv  <- ivreg(y ~ x | z, data=df)
```

To check if x and z are correlated:

```
est.iv1 <- lm(x ~ z , data=df)
```

Example: Kids and Labor supply

- Just because a var. is randomized does not make it exogenous to a model
- Economic agents can change their behavior!
- Angrist and Evans (1998) look at Mom's hours worked with number of kids:

$$hours = \beta_0 + \beta_1 kids + u$$

for those who have at least 2 children

- IV: dummy for if first two kids are of same sex (call it *same sex*)
- Thought process: marginal cost of 2nd kid lower if of same sex as 1st

Example: Kids and Labor supply

- Use their data ($N = 666,384$)

```
df1 %>% select(KIDCOUNT, HOURSMOM, SAMESEX)
      %>% as.data.frame
      %>% stargazer(type='text')
```

```
=====
Statistic      N      Mean  St. Dev.  Min  Max
-----
KIDCOUNT    666,384  2.454    0.758      2   12
HOURSMOM     666,384 23.618   18.913     0   99
SAMESEX      666,384  0.504    0.500     0    1
-----
```

Descriptive stats look reasonable

Example: Kids and Labor supply

OLS estimates:

```
est.ols <- lm(HOURSMOM ~ KIDCOUNT, data=df1)
```

```
tidy(est.ols)
```

```
# A tibble: 2 x 5
```

	term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value
	<chr>	<dbl>	<dbl>	<dbl>	<dbl>
1	(Intercept)	32.0	0.0777	412.	0.
2	KIDCOUNT	-3.41	0.0303	-113.	0.

More kids \implies fewer hours worked

Example: Kids and Labor supply

Check that *samesex* is correlated with *kidcount*:

```
est.iv1 <- lm(KIDCOUNT ~ SAMESEX, data=df1)
tidy(est.iv1)
# A tibble: 2 x 5
```

	term <chr>	estimate <dbl>	std.error <dbl>	statistic <dbl>	p.value <dbl>
1	(Intercept)	2.41	0.00132	1832.	0.
2	SAMESEXTRUE	0.0806	0.00186	43.4	0.

So having same gender kids \implies couple will have more kids

Example: Kids and Labor supply

Now compute the IV estimates:

```
est.iv <- ivreg(HOURSMOM ~ KIDCOUNT | SAMESEX, data=df1)
tidy(est.iv)
# A tibble: 2 x 5
```

	term	estimate	std.error	statistic	p.value
	<chr>	<dbl>	<dbl>	<dbl>	<dbl>
1	(Intercept)	30.7	1.40	22.0	4.37e-107
2	KIDCOUNT	-2.90	0.570	-5.09	3.51e- 7

Notice: t-stat went from **-113 (OLS)** to **-5 (IV)**

Another way of viewing regression output

```
stargazer(est.ols,est.iv1,est.iv, type="text")
```

```
=====
                        Dependent variable:
-----+-----+-----+-----+
                HOURLSMOM      KIDCOUNT      HOURLSMOM
                OLS             OLS             instrumental
                (1)             (2)             variable
                (3)
-----+-----+-----+-----+
KIDCOUNT                -3.415***             -2.902***
                        (0.030)                 (0.570)

SAMESEX                                0.081***
                                      (0.002)

Constant                31.998***      2.414***      30.739***
                        (0.078)      (0.001)      (1.398)

-----+-----+-----+-----+
Observations                666,384      666,384      666,384
R2                        0.019           0.003           0.018
Adjusted R2                0.019           0.003           0.018
Residual Std. Error (df = 666382)  18.735           0.757           18.739
F Statistic (df = 1; 666382)  12,733.180***  1,886.461***

=====
Note:                        *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
```

Comparing OLS and IV SEs

From the previous example, can compute $\text{Corr}(\text{kidcount}, \text{samesex})$

```
cor(df1$KIDCOUNT, df1$SAMESEX)  
[1] 0.05313105
```

Actual ratio of IV se to OLS se:

```
.570/.030  
[1] 19
```

Ratio from rule-of-thumb:

```
1/0.05313105  
[1] 18.82139
```

One more time about the assumptions

- In the previous example, no way to test if *same*sex is exogenous
- We must assume it is in order to trust IV to be consistent
- In some cases, we can use other info to determine if IV is exogenous
- You'll explore this in PS4 (due next time!)
- Typically, need a richer data set to be able to do this

Multiple instruments, conditional exogeneity

- Nothing stops us from using multiple instruments
- In fact, the more instruments the better (so long as they're all exogenous!)
- Sometimes an instrument is only exogenous *conditional on* other x 's
- In this case, z must be *partially correlated* with the endogenous x
- We'll talk more next time about each of these cases

References

Angrist, Joshua D and William N Evans. 1998. "Children and Their Parents' Labor Supply: Evidence from Exogenous Variation in Family Size." *American Economic Review* 88 (3):450-477.
URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/116844>.