

## Table of Contents

### 1. MT Part III: Endogeneity and IV

#### 1. 3 1 Endogeneity

##### 1. Measurement Errors

##### 2. Omitted Variables

#### 2. 3 2 Instrument Variables

#### 3. 3 4 2 Local Average Treatment Effects

#### 4. 3 5 GMM

## MT Part III: Endogeneity and IV

### 3 1 Endogeneity

#### *Measurement Errors*

#### Measurement Error in Y $\rightsquigarrow$ No Problem #flashcard

- Consider an additive, zero-mean, uncorrelated with  $x_i$  measurement error in the dependent variable only:

$$y_i = y_i^* + v_i \iff y_i^* = y_i - v_i$$

- $y_i$  is the observed value
  - $y_i^*$  is the true value
  - $\mathbb{E}[v_i] = 0$  (zero mean)
  - $\mathbb{E}[x_i u_i] = 0$  (important assumption)
- We estimate the model:

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &= y_i^* + u_i \\ &= x_i \beta + v_i + u_i \end{aligned}$$

- We still have  $\mathbb{E}[(v_i + u_i)x_i] = 0 \implies$  OLS is consistent

#### Measurement Error in X $\rightsquigarrow$ Attenuation Bias (Case of Classical Errors-in-variable Assumptions) #flashcard

- General setup:

$$x_i = x_i^* + e_i \iff x_i^* = x_i - e_i$$

- Classical Error-in-variable assumptions:
  - $\mathbb{E}[x_i^* e_i] = 0$  measurement error is uncorrelated with the true value of  $x_i^*$
  - $\mathbb{E}[u_i e_i] = 0$  measurement error is uncorrelated with the true model error  $u_i$
  - $\text{Var}[e_i] = \sigma_e^2$  measurement error is homoskedastic
  - $\text{Var}[x_i^*] = \sigma_{x^*}^2$  population variance of the true  $x_i^*$  exists and is finite
- SLR

Now  $\hat{\beta}_{OLS} = (X'X)^{-1}X'y^* = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i^*}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i^*}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}$

*Use scalars here*

Using  $x_i = x_i^* + e_i$  and  $y_i^* = x_i^* \beta + u_i$  together with the above assumptions, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{OLS} &= \frac{\text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i^* + e_i)(x_i^* \beta + u_i)}{\text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i^* + e_i)^2} \\ &= \frac{\left( \text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{*2} \right) \beta + \text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^* u_i + \left( \text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^* e_i \right) \beta + \text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i e_i}{\text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^{*2} + 2 \text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^* e_i + \text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_i^2} \\ &= \frac{E(x_i^{*2})\beta + E(x_i^* u_i) + E(x_i^* e_i)\beta + E(u_i e_i)}{E(x_i^{*2}) + 2E(x_i^* e_i) + E(e_i^2)} = \frac{E(x_i^{*2})\beta + 0 + 0 + 0}{E(x_i^{*2}) + 0 + E(e_i^2)} \\ &= \underbrace{\left( \frac{\sigma_{x^*}^2}{\sigma_{x^*}^2 + \sigma_e^2} \right)}_{\leftarrow 4} \beta = \frac{\beta}{1 + (\sigma_e^2 / \sigma_{x^*}^2)} \neq \beta \quad \text{if } \sigma_e^2 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

*Slutsky Theorem*

$$\text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{OLS} = \frac{\beta}{1 + (\sigma_e^2 / \sigma_{x^*}^2)} < \beta \quad \text{for } \beta > 0 \text{ and } \sigma_e^2 > 0$$

$$\text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{OLS} = \frac{\beta}{1 + (\sigma_e^2 / \sigma_{x^*}^2)} > \beta \quad \text{for } \beta < 0 \text{ and } \sigma_e^2 > 0$$

- MLR

- The OLS estimator of the coefficient on the variable with ME will have attenuation bias
- The OLS estimator of other coefficients will also be biased, but with unknown directions

## Omitted Variables

### Omitted Variable in SLR

- True DGP:

$$y_i = x_{1i} \beta_1 + x_{2i} \beta_2 + u_i$$

with  $\mathbb{E}[x_{1i} u_i] = \mathbb{E}[x_{2i} u_i] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[u_i] = \mathbb{E}[x_{1i}] = \mathbb{E}[x_{2i}] = 0$  for simplicity

- We omit  $x_{2i}$  and estimate:

$$y_i = x_{1i} \beta_1 + (x_{2i} \beta_2 + u_i)$$

- Result:

$$\text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_1 = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \rho_{x_1, x_2}$$

- Proof:

*Since this is a demand SLR*

$$\hat{\beta}_{OLS} = (X'X)^{-1}X'y^* = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{OLS} &= \frac{E[x_i y_i]}{E[x_i^2]} = \frac{E[(x_i^* + e_i)(x_i^* \beta + u_i)]}{E[x_i^{*2} + 2x_i^* e_i + e_i^2]} \\ &= \frac{E[x_i^* \beta + e_i x_i^* \beta + u_i x_i^* \beta + u_i e_i]}{E[x_i^{*2} + 2x_i^* e_i + e_i^2]} \\ &= \frac{E[x_i^* \beta] + E[e_i x_i^* \beta] + E[u_i x_i^* \beta] + E[u_i e_i]}{E[x_i^{*2}] + 2E[x_i^* e_i] + E[e_i^2]} \\ &= \frac{\beta}{\frac{E[x_i^{*2}]}{\sigma_{x^*}^2} + \frac{E[e_i^2]}{\sigma_e^2}} = \frac{\beta}{1 + \frac{\sigma_e^2}{\sigma_{x^*}^2}} \neq \beta \quad \text{if } \sigma_e^2 \neq 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{cases} \text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{OLS} < \beta & \text{if } \beta > 0 \text{ and } \sigma_e^2 \neq 0 \\ \text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{OLS} > \beta & \text{if } \beta < 0 \text{ and } \sigma_e^2 \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

The OLS estimator of  $\beta_1$  is

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = (X_1'X_1)^{-1}X_1'y$$

Substituting for  $y = X_1\beta_1 + X_2\beta_2 + u$  from the true model

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\beta}_1 &= (X_1'X_1)^{-1}X_1'(X_1\beta_1 + X_2\beta_2 + u) \\ &= \beta_1 + [(X_1'X_1)^{-1}X_1'X_2] \beta_2 + (X_1'X_1)^{-1}X_1'u \\ &= \beta_1 + \hat{\delta}\beta_2 + (X_1'X_1)^{-1}X_1'u\end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{\delta} = (X_1'X_1)^{-1}X_1'X_2$  is the OLS estimator of ...

21

...the coefficient  $\delta$  in a linear projection of the omitted variable  $x_{2i}$  on the included variable  $x_{1i}$ , i.e.

$$x_{2i} = x_{1i}\delta + e_i$$

Taking probability limits, and using  $E(x_{1i}u_i) = 0$ , we obtain

$$\text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_1 = \beta_1 + (\text{p} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\delta})\beta_2 = \beta_1 + \delta\beta_2$$

## Omitted Variables in MLR #flashcard

### • Single Omitted Variable in MLR

- Model:

$$y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_{2i} + \cdots + \beta_{K-1} x_{K-1,i} + (\beta_K x_{Ki} + u_i)$$

where  $E[x_{ki}u_i] = 0$  for  $k = 1, \dots, K$

- Result:

$$\text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_k = \beta_k + \beta_K \rho_{x_k, x_K | x_{i \neq K}}$$

where  $\rho_{x_k, x_K | x_{i \neq K}}$  is the partial correlation between  $x_k, x_K$ , which can be obtained as  $\delta_k$  in the linear projection:

$$x_{Ki} = \delta_1 + \delta_2 x_{2i} + \cdots + \delta_{K-1} x_{K-1,i} + v_i$$

- Proof:

### Single omitted variable

$$y_i = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_{2i} + \dots + \beta_{K-1} x_{K-1,i} + (\beta_K x_{Ki} + u_i) \quad \textcircled{1}$$

where  $E(x_{ki}u_i) = 0$  for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  (and  $x_{1i} = 1$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ )

[Relation to general model:  $K_1 = K - 1$ ,  $K_2 = 1$ ]

Linear projection of omitted  $x_{Ki}$  on all the included variables

$$x_{Ki} = \delta_1 + \delta_2 x_{2i} + \dots + \delta_{K-1} x_{K-1,i} + v_i$$

s.t.  $E(x_{ki}v_i) = 0$  for  $k = 1, \dots, K - 1$  (by definition of linear projection)

Multiply  $x_{Ki}$  by  $\beta_K$  and substitute:

$$y_i = (\beta_1 + \beta_K \delta_1) + (\beta_2 + \beta_K \delta_2) x_{2i} + \dots + (\beta_{K-1} + \beta_K \delta_{K-1}) x_{K-1,i} + (u_i + \beta_K v_i)$$

29

$$y_i = (\beta_1 + \beta_K \delta_1) + (\beta_2 + \beta_K \delta_2) x_{2i} + \dots + (\beta_{K-1} + \beta_K \delta_{K-1}) x_{K-1,i} + (u_i + \beta_K v_i)$$

Now since  $E[x_{ki}(u_i + \beta_K v_i)] = 0$  for  $k = 1, \dots, K - 1$ , we have

$$p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_k = \beta_k + \beta_K \delta_k \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, K - 1$$

$$(\text{Or equivalently } p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_k = \beta_k + (p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\delta}_k) \beta_K)$$

$$x_{Ki} = \delta_1 + \delta_2 x_{2i} + \dots + \delta_{K-1} x_{K-1,i} + v_i$$

$$\beta_K x_{Ki} = \beta_K \delta_1 + \beta_K \delta_2 x_{2i} + \dots + \beta_K \delta_{K-1} x_{K-1,i} + \beta_K v_i$$

Substitute this into (1)

### Multiple Omitted Variable in MLR

- Model:

$$y = X_1 \beta_1 + (X_2 \beta_2 + u)$$

- We can show that:

$$p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_1 = \beta_1 + (p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (X_1^T X_1)^{-1} X_1^T X_2) \beta_2$$

- OLS estimators will be biased and inconsistent (unless all omitted variables are orthogonal to all included variables) but the direction is hard to predict

### Simultaneity Bias #flashcard

- The dependent variable and at least one of the explanatory variables are chosen jointly as part of the same decision problem.

## 3 2 Instrument Variables

THE FOLLOWING IS NOT A COMPREHENSIVE SUMMARY FOR THE IV PART!

### Formulas for 2SLS Estimator #flashcard

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} &= \left( \hat{X}^T \hat{X} \right)^{-1} \hat{X}^T y \\
 &= X^T \underbrace{Z(Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T}_{P_z} X \underbrace{X^T Z(Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T}_{P_z} y \\
 &= \left( \hat{X}^T X \right)^{-1} \hat{X}^T y \\
 &= (Z^T X)^{-1} Z^T y \quad (\text{only in the just-identified case})
 \end{aligned}$$

## 2SLS as Control Function #flashcard

1. Perform 1st stage projection
2. Plug in 1st-stage residuals as additional variables in the main regression

## 2SLS as Indirect Least Square #flashcard

- When **just-identified**, 2SLS coincides with indirect least squares
- Example: we have an IV  $z_i$  for the endogenous regressor  $x_i$
- 1. Run a first stage projection

$$x_i = z_i \pi + r_i$$

2. Run a reduced-form regression:

$$y_i = z_i d + u_i$$

3. Divide reduced-form coefficient by 1st-stage coefficient:

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{indirect square}} = \frac{\hat{d}}{\hat{\pi}}$$

## Consistency of 2SLS #flashcard

To establish conditions under which  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  is a consistent estimator of  $\beta$ , we express  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  in the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} &= (\hat{X}' X)^{-1} \hat{X}' y \quad (\text{3rd Expression}) \\
 &= (\hat{X}' X)^{-1} \hat{X}' (X \beta + u) \\
 &= (\hat{X}' X)^{-1} \hat{X}' X \beta + (\hat{X}' X)^{-1} \hat{X}' u \\
 &= \beta + \left( \frac{\hat{X}' X}{n} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{\hat{X}' u}{n} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

Taking probability limits

$$p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} = \beta + p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\hat{X}' X}{n} \right)^{-1} p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\hat{X}' u}{n} \right)$$

We assume the data on  $(y_i, x_i, z_i)$  are independent and identically distributed, with  $E(z_i u_i) = 0$  and  $E(z_i x_i) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow \pi \neq 0$

From the Law of Large Numbers, the vector of sample means

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i u_i \xrightarrow{P} E(z_i u_i) = 0$$

We can also write  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i u_i = \frac{1}{n} (Z' u)$ , so we have

$$\left( \frac{Z' u}{n} \right) \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

$\hat{\pi}$  is a consistent estimator of the coefficient vector  $\pi$  in the first stage linear projection, so we also have  $\hat{\pi} \xrightarrow{P} \pi \neq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} &= (\hat{X}' X)^{-1} \hat{X}' y \\
 &= (\hat{X}' X)^{-1} \hat{X}' (X \beta + u) \\
 &= (\hat{X}' X)^{-1} \hat{X}' X \beta + (\hat{X}' X)^{-1} \hat{X}' u \\
 &= \beta + (\hat{X}' X)^{-1} \hat{X}' u \\
 &= \beta + \left( \frac{\hat{X}' X}{n} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{\hat{X}' u}{n} \right) \\
 p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} &= \beta + p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\hat{X}' X}{n} \right)^{-1} p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\hat{X}' u}{n} \right) \\
 &\quad (\text{show this is 0}) \\
 \frac{\hat{X}' u}{n} &= \left( \frac{Z' u}{n} \right)' \hat{\pi} = \frac{\hat{\pi}' Z' u}{n} = \hat{\pi}' \frac{Z' u}{n} \\
 p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\hat{X}' u}{n} \right) &= p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \hat{\pi}' \frac{Z' u}{n} \right) = p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\pi}' p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{Z' u}{n} \right) = \hat{\pi}' E[Z' u] = \hat{\pi}' \times 0 = 0 \\
 &\quad (\text{show this is finite}) \\
 \frac{\hat{X}' X}{n} &= \left( \frac{Z' X}{n} \right)' \hat{\pi} = \frac{\hat{\pi}' Z' X}{n} = \hat{\pi}' \left( \frac{Z' X}{n} \right) \\
 p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\hat{X}' X}{n} \right) &= \hat{\pi}' p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{Z' X}{n} \right) = \hat{\pi}' E[Z' X] = \hat{\pi}' \pi \neq 0 \\
 &\quad \neq 0 \text{ by Information Assumption} \\
 \Rightarrow p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} &= \beta + (\hat{\pi}' \pi)^{-1} \times 0 = \beta \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\hat{X} = Z\hat{\pi}$ , we can express

$$\left(\frac{\hat{X}'u}{n}\right) = \left(\frac{(Z\hat{\pi})'u}{n}\right) = \left(\frac{(\hat{\pi}'Z')u}{n}\right) = \hat{\pi}'\left(\frac{Z'u}{n}\right)$$

Then using Slutsky's theorem, we have

$$p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\hat{X}'u}{n}\right) = \pi'0 = 0$$

Similarly, from the Law of Large Numbers, the vector of sample means

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i x_i \xrightarrow{p} E(z_i x_i) = M_{ZX} \neq 0$$

where  $M_{ZX} = E(z_i x_i)$  is an  $L \times 1$  column vector

27

We can also write  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i x_i = \frac{1}{n}(Z'X)$ , so we have

$$\left(\frac{Z'X}{n}\right) \xrightarrow{p} M_{ZX} \neq 0$$

Since  $\hat{X} = Z\hat{\pi}$ , we can express

$$\left(\frac{\hat{X}'X}{n}\right) = \left(\frac{(Z\hat{\pi})'X}{n}\right) = \left(\frac{(\hat{\pi}'Z')X}{n}\right) = \hat{\pi}'\left(\frac{Z'X}{n}\right)$$

Then using Slutsky's theorem, we have

$$p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\hat{X}'X}{n}\right) = \pi' M_{ZX} \neq 0$$

and

$$p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\hat{X}'X}{n}\right)^{-1} = (\pi' M_{ZX})^{-1} \text{ is finite}$$

28

Now recalling that

$$p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} = \beta + p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\hat{X}'X}{n}\right)^{-1} p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\hat{X}'u}{n}\right)$$

we have shown:

- i)  $p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\hat{X}'u}{n}\right) = 0$ , given the instrument validity condition  $E(z_i u_i) = 0$
- ii)  $p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\hat{X}'X}{n}\right)^{-1}$  exists and is finite, given the instrument informativeness condition  $E(z_i x_i) \neq 0 \leftrightarrow \pi \neq 0$

Given these two properties of the instrumental variables in  $z_i$ , we obtain the consistency result

$$p \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} = \beta \quad \text{or} \quad \hat{\beta}_{2SLS} \xrightarrow{p} \beta$$

29

## 2SLS as GMM #flashcard

- GMM tries to best match the sample analogue of population moment  $E[z_i u_i] = 0$
- Just identified case:  $\hat{\beta}_{GMM} = \hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$
- Over-identified case: the GMM estimator minimises a weighted quadratic distance:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_{GMM} &= \arg \min_{\beta} \{u^T Z W_n Z^T u\} \\ &= \arg \min_{\beta} \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(\beta) z_i^T \right) W_n \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i(\beta)^T z_i \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

- 2SLS uses a particular weight matrix  $W_{2SLS} = (Z^T Z)^{-1}$ , which is the most efficient one under homoskedascity

## Inference and Var Estimation for 2SLS #flashcard

- Assumptions: Validity + Informative

- Large-sample distribution:

$$\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} \sim^a N\left(\beta, \frac{V}{n}\right)$$

- Under homoskedasticity ( $\mathbb{E}[u_i^2|z_i] = \sigma^2$ ), the consistent estimator for estimation variance is:

$$\widehat{Var}(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}) = \frac{\hat{V}}{n} = \hat{\sigma}^2 (\hat{X}^T \hat{X})^{-1}$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{u}_i^2$

- Thus:

$$\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} \sim^a N\left(\beta, \hat{\sigma}^2 (\hat{X}^T \hat{X})^{-1}\right)$$

- Under heteroskedasticity, there is a HR estimator:

$$\widehat{Var}_{HR}(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}) = \frac{\hat{V}_{HR}}{n} = (\hat{X}^T \hat{X})^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{u}_i^2 \hat{x}_i \hat{x}_i^T \right) (\hat{X}^T \hat{X})^{-1}$$

- Thus:

$$\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} \sim^a N\left(\beta, (\hat{X}^T \hat{X})^{-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{u}_i^2 \hat{x}_i \hat{x}_i^T \right) (\hat{X}^T \hat{X})^{-1}\right)$$

- Note that  $\hat{u}_i = y_i - \hat{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  (we use the true  $x_i$  not the predicted  $\hat{x}_i$ )

## 2SLS Procedures and Conditions for Multiple Endogenous Variables #flashcard

- Notations:  $L$  is the number of exogenous variables,  $K$  is the number of all variables in the equation of interest,  $\underbrace{z_i^T}_{1 \times L}$  is a row vector of all exogenous variables (IVs and exogenous regressors),  $\underbrace{x_i^T}_{1 \times K}$  is a row vector of all variables in the equation of interest
- 1st-stage Projection:

$$\underbrace{X}_{n \times K} = \underbrace{Z}_{n \times L \times K} + \underbrace{R}_{n \times K}$$

note that if we have an intercept, we will always include an equation  $1 = 1$  and if some variables  $x_k$  are exogenous, we need to include  $x_k = x_k$

- Conditions:
  - Validity:  $\mathbb{E}[z_i u_i] = 0$
  - Informative
    - Order condition (necessary but not sufficient):  $L \geq K$
    - Rank condition (necessary and sufficient): the  $L \times K$  matrix has full rank
- Then, calculate  $\hat{X}$  and run the main regression

## Testing IV Validity in Over-identifying Cases #flashcard

- Idea: when we have over-identification ( $L > K$ ), we can examine whether the minimised value of the GMM criterion function is "small enough" to be consistent with our orthogonal assumption  $\mathbb{E}[z_i u_i] = 0$
- Conditional homoskedastic - **Sargan Test**
  - Sargan/J-test statistic:

$$= \frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}^2} \hat{u}^T Z (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T \hat{u}$$

where  $\hat{u}_i = y_i - \hat{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  and  $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{u}_i^2$

- Distribution under  $H_0 : \mathbb{E}[z_i u_i] = 0$ :

$$\sim^a \chi_{L-K}^2$$

- Conditional heteroskedastic - **Hansen Test**
- No detail description

## Testing Endogeneity #flashcard

- We assume the IVs are valid and informative
- Idea:  $\hat{\beta}_{OLS}$  and  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  should be similar if the variable is exogenous
- Conditional homoskedastic - **Hausman Test**
  - Assumption:
    - Valid and informative IVs
    - Conditional homoskedasticity:

$$\mathbb{E}[u_i^2 | z_i] = \sigma^2$$

- The  $K \times K$  matrix  $(\widehat{Var}[\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}] - \widehat{Var}[\hat{\beta}_{OLS}])$  is non-singular
  - If this is singular, we can use the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse with rank  $R$ , and the distribution will be  $h \sim^a \chi_R^2$
- $H_0 : \mathbb{E}[x_i u_i] = 0, H_1 : \mathbb{E}[x_i u_i] \neq 0$
- Test statistic:

$$h = (\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} - \hat{\beta}_{OLS})^T (\widehat{Var}[\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}] - \widehat{Var}[\hat{\beta}_{OLS}])^{-1} (\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} - \hat{\beta}_{OLS})$$

- Distribution under  $H_0$ :

$$h \sim^a \chi_K^2$$

- If we are only interested in a **sub-vector** of  $\beta$  with  $K_1$  variables, we simply repeat the above with our sub-vector, and the distribution will be  $\chi_{K_1}^2$
- If we are only interested in **one parameter**  $\beta_k$ , then the test simplifies to:

$$h = \frac{(\hat{\beta}_{k,2SLS} - \hat{\beta}_{k,OLS})^2}{\widehat{Var}[\hat{\beta}_{k,2SLS}] - \widehat{Var}[\hat{\beta}_{k,OLS}]} \sim^a \chi_1^2$$

- Alternative method (can deal with heteroskedasticity easily): **Control Function Test**
  - Perform 2SLS estimation using the control function method
  - If there is only 1 endogenous variable of interest: use a t-test to test whether the coefficient on the 1st-stage residual is 0 in the 2nd-stage regression
  - If there are more than 1 endogenous variables of interest: use a Wald test to test whether all coefficients on the 1st-stage residual are jointly 0 in the 2nd-stage regression
  - We can easily deal with heteroskedasticity using HR estimator of variance, but testing on a sub-vector of  $\beta$  will be hard due to "generated regressors" problem.

## Finite-Sample Problems #flashcard

- Overfitting:  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} \rightarrow \hat{\beta}_{OLS}$  as  $L \rightarrow n$ 
  - A simple way to investigate: calculate a sequence of 2SLS estimates based on smaller and smaller subsets of the original IVs, and check whether there's systematic tendency for  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  to move away from  $\hat{\beta}_{OLS}$

## Weak Instruments #flashcard



- Finite sample bias + Large inconsistency

### Tests for Weak Instruments #flashcard

- Run a Wald Test for the 1st stage:  $H_0 : \delta_0 m = \delta_1 = \dots = \delta_M = 0$
- Test statistics  $\sim F(M, n - L)$  and we typically require it to be greater than 10.

### Weak IV Robust Inference: Anderson-Rubin Test #flashcard

- The Anderson-Rubin test is a robust test for the significance of endogenous regressors in IV models, and unlike the usual Wald or t-tests, it remains valid even when instruments are weak.
  - It tests the null hypothesis:

$$H_0 : \beta = \beta_0$$

where  $\beta$  is the coefficient on the endogenous regressor.

#### • Procedures

- We start with the model:

$$y = X\beta +$$

and instrument  $X$  using  $Z$  (with  $\text{rank}(Z) = m$ , number of instruments).

- Instead of relying on 2SLS estimates, the AR test does the following:

1. Move the hypothesized value to the left-hand side:

$$y - X\beta_0 = u$$

2. Test if the residual  $u$  is uncorrelated with the instruments  $Z$ :

$$H_0 : \mathbb{E}[Z^T u] = 0$$

3. Form the test statistic:

$$AR(\beta_0) = \frac{\hat{u}^T P_Z \hat{u}}{\hat{\sigma}^2}$$

where:

- $P_Z = Z(Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T$  is the projection matrix onto the instrument space.
- $\hat{\sigma}^2$  is an estimator of the error variance (often from a reduced form).

4. Distribution under the null:

$$AR(\beta_0) \sim \chi_m^2$$

where  $m$  = number of instruments.

## 3 4 2 Local Average Treatment Effects

## 3 5 GMM

### GMM Estimator #flashcard

- Setup:

$$y_i - x_i^T \beta = u_i(\beta), \mathbb{E}[u_i] = 0, \mathbb{E}[z_i u_i] = 0$$

- GMM Estimator:

$$\hat{\beta}_{GMM} = \arg \min_{\beta} \hat{u}^T Z W_n Z^T \hat{u}$$

- Expressions and Weak Consistency:

- Assumptions:

- $y_i = x_i^T \beta + u_i$

- $(x_i, y_i, z_i)$  are iid

- $\text{Rank}(\mathbb{E}[z_i x_i^T]) = K$

- $W_n \xrightarrow{p} W$  is a symmetric and psd  $L \times L$  matrix

- Then:

$$\hat{\beta}_{GMM} = \left( (X^T Z) W_n (Z^T X) \right)^{-1} (X^T Z) W_n (Z^T y)$$

$\xrightarrow{p} \beta$

- and:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_{GMM} - \beta) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, V)$$