

# Instrumental Variables

EC 425/525, Set 8

Edward Rubin

08 May 2019

# Prologue

# Schedule

## Last time

Matching and propensity-score methods

- Conditional independence
- Overlap

## Today

Instrumental variables (and two-stage least squares)

## Upcoming

- Admin: Assignment/project proposal this weekend
- Admin: Midterm very soon

# Research designs

# Research designs

## Selection on observables and/or unobservables

We've been focusing on ***selection-on-observables designs***, *i.e.*,

$$(Y_{0i}, Y_{1i}) \perp\!\!\!\perp D_i | X_i$$

for **observable** variables  $X_i$ .

# Research designs

## Selection on observables and/or unobservables

We've been focusing on **selection-on-observables designs**, i.e.,

$$(Y_{0i}, Y_{1i}) \perp\!\!\!\perp D_i | X_i$$

for **observable** variables  $X_i$ .

**Selection-on-unobservable designs** replace this assumption with two new (but related) assumptions

1.  $(Y_{0i}, Y_{1i}) \perp Z_i$
2.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, D_i) \neq 0$

# Research designs

## Selection on observables and/or unobservables

Our main goal in causal-inference minded (applied) econometrics boils down to isolating **"good" variation** in  $D_i$  (exogenous/as-good-as-random) from **"bad" variation** (the part of  $D_i$  correlated with  $Y_{0i}$  and  $Y_{1i}$ ).

# Research designs

## Selection on observables and/or unobservables

Our main goal in causal-inference minded (applied) econometrics boils down to isolating **"good" variation** in  $D_i$  (exogenous/as-good-as-random) from **"bad" variation** (the part of  $D_i$  correlated with  $Y_{0i}$  and  $Y_{1i}$ ).

(We want to avoid selection bias.)



# Research designs

## Selection on observables and/or unobservables

Our main goal in causal-inference minded (applied) econometrics boils down to isolating **"good" variation** in  $D_i$  (exogenous/as-good-as-random) from **"bad" variation** (the part of  $D_i$  correlated with  $Y_{0i}$  and  $Y_{1i}$ ).

(We want to avoid selection bias.)

- **Selection-on-observables designs** assume that we can control for all *bad variation* (selection) in  $D_i$  through a known (observed)  $X_i$ .

# Research designs

## Selection on observables and/or unobservables

Our main goal in causal-inference minded (applied) econometrics boils down to isolating **"good" variation** in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  (exogenous/as-good-as-random) from **"bad" variation** (the part of  $\mathbf{D}_i$  correlated with  $\mathbf{Y}_{0i}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_{1i}$ ).

(We want to avoid selection bias.)

- **Selection-on-observables designs** assume that we can control for all *bad variation* (selection) in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  through a known (observed)  $\mathbf{X}_i$ .
- **Selection-on-unobservables designs** assume that we can extract part of the *good variation* in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  (generally using some  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ ) and then use this *good* part of  $\mathbf{D}_i$  to estimate the effect of  $\mathbf{D}_i$  on  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ .

# Research designs

## Selection on observables and/or unobservables

Our main goal in causal-inference minded (applied) econometrics boils down to isolating **"good" variation** in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  (exogenous/as-good-as-random) from **"bad" variation** (the part of  $\mathbf{D}_i$  correlated with  $\mathbf{Y}_{0i}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_{1i}$ ).

(We want to avoid selection bias.)

- **Selection-on-observables designs** assume that we can control for all *bad variation* (selection) in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  through a known (observed)  $\mathbf{X}_i$ .
- **Selection-on-unobservables designs** assume that we can extract part of the *good variation* in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  (generally using some  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ ) and then use this *good part* of  $\mathbf{D}_i$  to estimate the effect of  $\mathbf{D}_i$  on  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ . We throw away the *bad variation* in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  (it's bad).

# Research designs

## Which route?

So set of research designs is more palatable?

# Research designs

## Which route?

So set of research designs is more palatable?

1. There are plenty of bad applications of both sets.  
*Violated assumptions, bad controls, etc.*

# Research designs

## Which route?

So set of research designs is more palatable?

1. There are plenty of bad applications of both sets.

Violated assumptions, bad controls, *etc.*

2. **Selection on observables** assumes we know *everything* about selection into treatment—we can identify *all* of the good (or bad) variation in  $\mathbf{D}_i$ .

# Research designs

## Which route?

So set of research designs is more palatable?

1. There are plenty of bad applications of both sets.

Violated assumptions, bad controls, *etc.*

2. **Selection on observables** assumes we know *everything* about selection into treatment—we can identify *all* of the good (or bad) variation in  $\mathbf{D}_i$ .

Tough in non-experimental settings. Difficult to validate in practice.

# Research designs

## Which route?

So set of research designs is more palatable?

1. There are plenty of bad applications of both sets.

Violated assumptions, bad controls, etc.

2. **Selection on observables** assumes we know *everything* about selection into treatment—we can identify *all* of the good (or bad) variation in  $\mathbf{D}_i$ .

Tough in non-experimental settings. Difficult to validate in practice.

3. **Selection on unobservables** assumes we can isolate *some* good/clean variation in  $\mathbf{D}_i$ , which we then use to estimate the effect of  $\mathbf{D}_i$  on  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ .



# Research designs

## Which route?

So set of research designs is more palatable?

1. There are plenty of bad applications of both sets.

Violated assumptions, bad controls, etc.

2. **Selection on observables** assumes we know *everything* about selection into treatment—we can identify *all* of the good (or bad) variation in  $\mathbf{D}_i$ .

Tough in non-experimental settings. Difficult to validate in practice.

3. **Selection on unobservables** assumes we can isolate *some* good/clean variation in  $\mathbf{D}_i$ , which we then use to estimate the effect of  $\mathbf{D}_i$  on  $\mathbf{Y}_i$ .

Seems more plausible. Possible to validate. May be underpowered.

# Instrumental variables

## Introduction

**Instrumental variables** (IV)<sup>†</sup> is the canonical selection-on-unobservables design—isolating *good variation* in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  via some magical **instrument**  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ .

<sup>†</sup> For the moment, we're lumping together IV and two-stage least squares (2SLS) together—as many people do—even though they are technically different.

# Instrumental variables

## Introduction

**Instrumental variables** (IV)<sup>†</sup> is the canonical selection-on-unobservables design—isolating *good variation* in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  via some magical **instrument**  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ .

Consider some model (structural equation)

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{D}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

To guarantee consistent OLS estimates for  $\beta_1$ , want  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{D}_i, \varepsilon_i) = 0$ .  
In general, this is a heroic assumption.

<sup>†</sup> For the moment, we're lumping together IV and two-stage least squares (2SLS) together—as many people do—even though they are technically different.

# Instrumental variables

## Introduction

**Instrumental variables** (IV)<sup>†</sup> is the canonical selection-on-unobservables design—isolating *good variation* in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  via some magical **instrument**  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ .

Consider some model (structural equation)

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{D}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

To guarantee consistent OLS estimates for  $\beta_1$ , want  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{D}_i, \varepsilon_i) = 0$ .  
In general, this is a heroic assumption.

*Alternative:* Estimate  $\beta_1$  via instrumental variables.

<sup>†</sup> For the moment, we're lumping together IV and two-stage least squares (2SLS) together—as many people do—even though they are technically different.

# Instrumental variables

## Definition

For our model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

A valid **instrument** is a variable  $Z_i$  such that

1.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, D_i) \neq 0$

# Instrumental variables

## Definition

For our model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

A valid **instrument** is a variable  $Z_i$  such that

1.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, D_i) \neq 0$   
our **instrument** correlates with treatment

# Instrumental variables

## Definition

For our model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

A valid **instrument** is a variable  $Z_i$  such that

1.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, D_i) \neq 0$

our **instrument** correlates with treatment (so we can keep part of  $D_i$ )

# Instrumental variables

## Definition

For our model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

A valid **instrument** is a variable  $Z_i$  such that

1.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, D_i) \neq 0$   
our **instrument** correlates with treatment (so we can keep part of  $D_i$ )
2.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, \varepsilon_i) = 0$



# Instrumental variables

## Definition

For our model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

A valid **instrument** is a variable  $Z_i$  such that

1.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, D_i) \neq 0$   
our **instrument** correlates with treatment (so we can keep part of  $D_i$ )
2.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, \varepsilon_i) = 0$   
our **instrument** is uncorrelated with other (non- $D_i$ ) determinants of  $Y_i$

# Instrumental variables

## Definition

For our model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

A valid **instrument** is a variable  $Z_i$  such that

1.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, D_i) \neq 0$

our **instrument** correlates with treatment (so we can keep part of  $D_i$ )

2.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, \varepsilon_i) = 0$

our **instrument** is uncorrelated with other (non- $D_i$ ) determinants of  $Y_i$ ,  
i.e.,  $Z_i$  is excludable from equation (1).

# Instrumental variables

## Definition

For our model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

A valid **instrument** is a variable  $Z_i$  such that

1.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, D_i) \neq 0$

our **instrument** correlates with treatment (so we can keep part of  $D_i$ )

2.  $\text{Cov}(Z_i, \varepsilon_i) = 0$

our **instrument** is uncorrelated with other (non- $D_i$ ) determinants of  $Y_i$ ,  
i.e.,  $Z_i$  is excludable from equation (1). (**exclusion restriction**)

# Instrumental variables

## Example

Back to the returns to a college degree,

$$\text{Income}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Grad}_i + \varepsilon_i$$

OLS is likely biased.

# Instrumental variables

## Example

Back to the returns to a college degree,

$$\text{Income}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Grad}_i + \varepsilon_i$$

OLS is likely biased.

What if that state conducts a (random) **lottery** for scholarships?

# Instrumental variables

## Example

Back to the returns to a college degree,

$$\text{Income}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Grad}_i + \varepsilon_i$$

OLS is likely biased.

What if that state conducts a (random) **lottery** for scholarships?

Let **Lottery**<sub>*i*</sub> denote an indicator for whether *i* won a lottery scholarship.<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup> We'll have to focus on families who were eligible/who applied.

# Instrumental variables

## Example

Back to the returns to a college degree,

$$\text{Income}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Grad}_i + \varepsilon_i$$

OLS is likely biased.

What if that state conducts a (random) **lottery** for scholarships?

Let **Lottery**<sub>*i*</sub> denote an indicator for whether *i* won a lottery scholarship.<sup>†</sup>

1.  $\text{Cov}(\text{Lottery}_i, \text{Grad}_i) \neq 0$  ( $> 0$ ) if scholarships increase grad. rates.

<sup>†</sup> We'll have to focus on families who were eligible/who applied.

# Instrumental variables

## Example

Back to the returns to a college degree,

$$\text{Income}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Grad}_i + \varepsilon_i$$

OLS is likely biased.

What if that state conducts a (random) **lottery** for scholarships?

Let **Lottery**<sub>*i*</sub> denote an indicator for whether *i* won a lottery scholarship.<sup>†</sup>

1.  $\text{Cov}(\text{Lottery}_i, \text{Grad}_i) \neq 0$  ( $> 0$ ) if scholarships increase grad. rates.
2.  $\text{Cov}(\text{Lottery}_i, \varepsilon_i) = 0$  since the lottery is randomized.

<sup>†</sup> We'll have to focus on families who were eligible/who applied.



# Instrument variables

## The IV estimator

The IV estimator for our model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

with (valid) instrument  $Z_i$  is

$$\hat{\beta}_{IV} = (Z'D)^{-1} (Z'Y)$$

# Instrument variables

## The IV estimator

The IV estimator for our model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

with (valid) instrument  $Z_i$  is

$$\hat{\beta}_{IV} = (Z'D)^{-1} (Z'Y)$$

If you have no covariates, then

$$\hat{\beta}_{IV} = \frac{\text{Cov}(Z_i, Y_i)}{\text{Cov}(Z_i, D_i)}$$

# Instrument variables

## The IV estimator

The IV estimator for our model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

with (valid) instrument  $Z_i$  is

$$\hat{\beta}_{IV} = (Z'D)^{-1} (Z'Y)$$

If you have additional (exogenous) covariates  $X_i$ , then

$$Z = [Z_i \quad X_i]$$

$$D = [D_i \quad X_i]$$

# Instrumental variables

## Proof: Consistency

With a valid instrument  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{IV}$  is a consistent estimator for  $\beta_1$  in

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{X}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

$$\text{plim}(\hat{\beta}_{IV})$$

# Instrumental variables

## Proof: Consistency

With a valid instrument  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{IV}$  is a consistent estimator for  $\beta_1$  in

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{X}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

$$\text{plim}(\hat{\beta}_{IV})$$

$$= \text{plim}\left((\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D})^{-1} (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Y})\right)$$

# Instrumental variables

## Proof: Consistency

With a valid instrument  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{IV}$  is a consistent estimator for  $\beta_1$  in

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{X}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

$$\text{plim}(\hat{\beta}_{IV})$$

$$= \text{plim} \left( (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D})^{-1} (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Y}) \right)$$

$$= \text{plim} \left( (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D})^{-1} (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D}\beta + \mathbf{Z}'\varepsilon) \right)$$

# Instrumental variables

## Proof: Consistency

With a valid instrument  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{IV}$  is a consistent estimator for  $\beta_1$  in

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{X}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

$$\text{plim}(\hat{\beta}_{IV})$$

$$= \text{plim} \left( (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D})^{-1} (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Y}) \right)$$

$$= \text{plim} \left( (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D})^{-1} (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D}\beta + \mathbf{Z}'\varepsilon) \right)$$

$$= \text{plim} \left( (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D})^{-1} (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D}) \beta \right) + \text{plim} \left( \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D} \right)^{-1} \text{plim} \left( \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{Z}'\varepsilon \right)$$

# Instrumental variables

## Proof: Consistency

With a valid instrument  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{IV}$  is a consistent estimator for  $\beta_1$  in

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathbf{X}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

$$\text{plim}(\hat{\beta}_{IV})$$

$$= \text{plim} \left( (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D})^{-1} (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Y}) \right)$$

$$= \text{plim} \left( (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D})^{-1} (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D}\beta + \mathbf{Z}'\varepsilon) \right)$$

$$= \text{plim} \left( (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D})^{-1} (\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D}) \beta \right) + \text{plim} \left( \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{D} \right)^{-1} \text{plim} \left( \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{Z}'\varepsilon \right)$$

$$= \beta \quad \checkmark$$



# Two-stage least squares

# Two-stage least squares

## Setup

You'll commonly see IV implemented as a two-stage process known as **two-stage least squares** (2SLS).

# Two-stage least squares

## Setup

You'll commonly see IV implemented as a two-stage process known as **two-stage least squares** (2SLS).

**First stage** Estimate the effect of the instrument  $\mathbf{Z}_i$  on our endogenous variable  $\mathbf{D}_i$  and (predetermined) covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . Save  $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_i$ .

$$\mathbf{D}_i = \gamma_1 \mathbf{Z}_i + \gamma_2 \mathbf{X}_i + u_i$$

# Two-stage least squares

## Setup

You'll commonly see IV implemented as a two-stage process known as **two-stage least squares** (2SLS).

**First stage** Estimate the effect of the instrument  $\mathbf{Z}_i$  on our endogenous variable  $\mathbf{D}_i$  and (predetermined) covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . Save  $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_i$ .

$$\mathbf{D}_i = \gamma_1 \mathbf{Z}_i + \gamma_2 \mathbf{X}_i + u_i$$

**Second stage** Estimate model we wanted—but only using the variation in  $\mathbf{D}_i$  that correlates with  $\mathbf{Z}_i$ , i.e.,  $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_i$ .

$$\mathbf{Y}_i = \beta_1 \hat{\mathbf{D}}_i + \beta_2 \mathbf{X}_i + \varepsilon_i$$

*Note* The controls  $\mathbf{X}_i$  must match in the first and second stages.

# Two-stage least squares

## IV estimation

This two-step procedure, with a valid instrument, produces an estimator  $\hat{\beta}_1$  that is consistent for  $\beta_1$ .

$$\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} = (D'P_Z D)^{-1} (D'P_Z Y)$$

$$P_Z = Z(Z'Z)^{-1}Z'$$

where  $D$  is a matrix of our treatment and predetermined covariates ( $X_i$ ) and  $Z$  is a matrix of our instrument and our predetermined covariates.

# Two-stage least squares

## IV estimation

### Important notes

- The controls ( $\mathbf{X}_i$ ) must match in the first and second stages.
- If you have exactly **one instrument** and exactly **one endogenous variable**, then 2SLS and IV are identical.
- Your second-stage standard errors are not correct.

# Table of contents

## Admin

1. [Schedule](#)

## Two-stage least squares

1. [Setup](#)

## Instrumental variables

1. [Research designs](#)
2. [Introduction](#)
3. [Definition](#)
4. [Example](#)
5. [IV estimator](#)