

# Causal Inference II

MIXTAPE SESSION

---



# Roadmap

## Introduction

- Managing expectations

- Introducing difference-in-differences

- Potential outcomes

- Four averages and three subtractions

## Estimation

- OLS specification

- Inference

## Parallel trends violations

- How parallel trends can get violated

- DiD in Court

- Triple difference

- Placebo outcomes

# Introduction

- Welcome to Mixtape Sessions workshop on difference-in-differences and synthetic control (“Causal Inference II”)
- 8:00am to 5:00pm CST, 15 min breaks every hour, 1 hour lunch at noon CST
- Lecture, discussion, exercises, application

## What my pedagogy is like

- Long days that don't feel long because it's high energy, with regular breaks including lunch
- Move between the econometrics, history of thought, videos, applications, code, spreadsheets, exercises
- Ask questions at any point; I'll do my best to answer them

# Class goals

Pedagogical goal is to break down the procedures into plain English, rebuilding it into something you can and want to use, but also:

1. **Confidence:** You will feel like you have a good enough understanding of diff-in-diff and synthetic control, both in its basics and some more contemporary issues, so that by the end of the week it a very intuitive, friendly, and useful tool
2. **Comprehension:** You will have learned a lot both conceptually and in the specifics, particularly with regards to issues around identification and estimation in the diff-in-diff and synth context
3. **Competency:** You will have more knowledge of programming syntax in Stata and R so that later you can apply this in your own work

# Day 1 outline

## Introduction to DiD basics

- Potential outcomes review and the ATT parameter
- DiD equation (“four averages and three differences”), parallel trends and estimation with OLS
- Evaluating parallel trends with falsifications, event studies
- Compositional changes, triple differences and covariates

# Day 2 outline

## Differential timing

- TWFE Pathologies in static and dynamic specifications ("event study")
- Solution 1: Aggregating group-time ATTs
- Solution 2: Imputation estimators
- Solution 3: Stacked regression

## Day 3 outline

- Canonical synth (Abadie papers)
- Augmented synth (Ben-Michael, et al)
- Matrix completion with nuclear norm regularization (Athey, et al.)
- Exercises and estimation


# What is difference-in-differences (DiD)

- DiD is a very old, relatively straightforward, intuitive research design
- A group of units are assigned some treatment and then compared to a group of units that weren't
- One of the most widely used quasi-experimental methods in economics and increasingly in industry
- Mostly associated with “big shocks” happening in space over time

*“A good way to do econometrics is to look for good natural experiments and use statistical methods that can tidy up the confounding factors that nature has not controlled for us.” – Daniel McFadden  
(Nobel Laureate recipient with Heckman 2002)*

*Figure: Currie, et al. (2020)*

**A: Difference-in-Differences**



## Origins of diff-in-diff

- Difference-in-differences (DiD) was quietly and largely unnoticed introduced in the 19th century as a way to convince skeptics in health policy arguments
- Dominant disease theory in 19th century was *miasma* – disease caused by smelly vapor
- Keep in mind – microorganisms would not be identified until much later, partly caused by poor resolution in microscopes (Freedman 2007)

# Miasma I: Ignaz Semmelweis and washing hands

- 1840s, Vienna maternity wards had high postpartum infections in one wing compared to other wings
- One division had doctors and trainee doctors, but another had midwives and trainee midwives


# Miasma I: Ignaz Semmelweis and washing hands

- Ignaz Semmelweis notes the difference in 1841 when hospitals moved to “anatomical” training involving cadavers (Pamela Jakeila lecture notes on DiD)
- New training happens to one but not the other and Semmelweis thinks the mortality is caused by working with cadavers
- Proposes washing hands with chlorine in 1847 in the midwives’ wing and uses a DiD design of pre and post

## Miasma II: John Snow and cholera

- Three major waves of cholera in the early to mid 1800s in London
- John Snow believed cholera was spread through the Thames water supply which contradicted dominant theory about “dirty air” transmission
- Grand experiment: Lambeth moves its pipe between 1849 and 1854; Southwark and Vauxhall delay
- He can evaluate the effect in three ways (one of which is DiD)

*Figure: Two water utility companies in London 1854*



# 1) Simple cross-sectional design

*Table:* Lambeth and Southwark and Vauxhall, 1854

<b>Company</b>	<b>Cholera mortality</b>
Lambeth	$Y = L + D$
Southwark and Vauxhall	$Y = SV$

$$\hat{\delta}_{cs} = D + (L - SV)$$

What is  $L$  and  $SV$ ?

# 1) Simple cross-sectional design

*Table:* Lambeth and Southwark and Vauxhall, 1854

<b>Company</b>	<b>Cholera mortality</b>
Lambeth	$Y = L + D$
Southwark and Vauxhall	$Y = SV$

$$\widehat{\delta}_{cs} = D + (L - SV)$$

This is biased if  $L \neq SV$  (selection bias). Give an example when we're pretty sure they are equal.

## 2) Interrupted time series design

Table: Lambeth, 1849 and 1854

<b>Company</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Cholera mortality</b>
Lambeth	1849	$Y = L$
	1854	$Y = L + (T + D)$

$$\hat{\delta}_{its} = D + T$$

What is required for this estimator to be unbiased?

### 3) Difference-in-differences

Table: Lambeth and Southwark and Vauxhall, 1849 and 1854

<b>Companies</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	$D_1$	$D_2$
Lambeth	Before	$Y = L$	$T_L + D$	
	After	$Y = L + T_L + D$		
Southwark and Vauxhall	Before	$Y = SV$	$T_{SV}$	$D$
	After	$Y = SV + T_{SV}$		

$$\hat{\delta}_{did} = D + (T_L - T_{SV})$$

This method yields an unbiased estimate of  $D$  if  $T_{SV} = \textcolor{red}{T}_L$

## Orley goes to Washington

- Orley Ashenfelter graduated from Princeton in the 1970s, takes a job in Washington DC and begins studying “job trainings programs”
- Empirical crisis in empirical macro and empirical labor back in the 1970s – Orley, David Card, Bob Lalonde, Alan Krueger at Princeton all helped bring attention to it and began pushing for solutions, one of which was RCTs in labor but also diff-in-diff as well as better instruments
- Listen to Orley explain the connection he made between two way fixed effects and difference-in-differences; it was born out of a need to explain OLS to an American bureaucrat

<https://youtu.be/WnB3EJ8K71g?t=126>

# Steps of a project

1. Convert research question into causal parameter
2. Deduce beliefs needed to estimate that causal parameter with data
3. Create a calculator that will use data and estimate the causal parameter

Most of us skip (1) and maybe even (2) and instead simply “run regressions” and cross our fingers that that coefficient is causal, but is it? And why is it? And what is it? Let’s dig into Orley’s comment a little more.

# Equivalence

$$Y_{ist} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Treat_{is} + \alpha_2 Post_t + \delta(Treat_{is} \times Post_t) + \varepsilon_{ist}$$

$$\hat{\delta} = \left( \bar{y}_k^{post(k)} - \bar{y}_k^{pre(k)} \right) - \left( \bar{y}_U^{post(k)} - \bar{y}_U^{pre(k)} \right)$$

- Orley claims that the OLS estimator of  $\delta$  and the “four averages and three subtractions” are the same thing numerically
- And they are – they are numerically *identical*
- And under a particular assumption, they are also unbiased estimates of an aggregate causal parameter
- But to see this we need new notation – potential outcomes

## Potential outcomes notation

- Let the treatment be a binary variable:

$$D_{i,t} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if in job training program } t \\ 0 & \text{if not in job training program at time } t \end{cases}$$

where  $i$  indexes an individual observation, such as a person

## Potential outcomes notation

- Potential outcomes:

$$Y_{i,t}^j = \begin{cases} 1: \text{wages at time } t \text{ if trained} \\ 0: \text{wages at time } t \text{ if not trained} \end{cases}$$

where  $j$  indexes a counterfactual state of the world

# Treatment effect definitions

## Individual treatment effect

The individual treatment effect,  $\delta_i$ , equals  $Y_i^1 - Y_i^0$

Missing data problem: I don't know my own counterfactual

# Conditional Average Treatment Effects

## Average Treatment Effect on the Treated (ATT)

The average treatment effect on the treatment group is equal to the average treatment effect conditional on being a treatment group member:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\delta | D = 1] &= E[Y^1 - Y^0 | D = 1] \\ &= E[Y^1 | D = 1] - \textcolor{red}{E[Y^0 | D = 1]} \end{aligned}$$

This is one of the most important policy parameters, if not the most important, and coincidentally it's also the parameter you get with diff-in-diff (even with heterogeneity)

## Potential outcomes vs data

- ATT is expressed in terms of potential outcomes, but we do not use potential outcomes for estimation; we use data
- Potential outcomes are unknown and *hypothetical* possibilities describing states of the world but our data are realized outcomes, or "data", that actually occurred
- Potential outcomes become realized under treatment assignment

$$Y_{it} = D_{it}Y_{it}^1 + (1 - D_{it})Y_{it}^0$$

- Depending on how the treatment is assigned really dictates whether correlations reveal causal effects or bias

## DiD equation

Orley's "four averages and three subtractions", or what Bacon will call the 2x2

$$\hat{\delta} = \left( E[Y_k|Post] - E[Y_k|Pre] \right) - \left( E[Y_U|Post] - E[Y_U|Pre] \right)$$

$k$  are the people in the job training program,  $U$  are the untreated people not in the program,  $Post$  is after the trainees took the class,  $Pre$  is the period just before they took the class, and  $E[y]$  is mean earnings.

Does  $\hat{\delta}$  equal the ATT? If so when? If not why not?

# Potential outcomes and the switching equation

$$\hat{\delta} = \underbrace{\left( E[Y_k^1|Post] - E[Y_k^0|Pre] \right) - \left( E[Y_U^0|Post] - E[Y_U^0|Pre] \right)}_{\text{Switching equation}} + \underbrace{E[Y_k^0|Post] - E[Y_k^0|Post]}_{\text{Adding zero}}$$

## Parallel trends bias

$$\hat{\delta} = \underbrace{E[Y_k^1|Post] - E[Y_k^0|Post]}_{\text{ATT}} + \underbrace{\left[ E[Y_k^0|Post] - E[Y_k^0|Pre] \right] - \left[ E[Y_U^0|Post] - E[Y_U^0|Pre] \right]}_{\text{Non-parallel trends bias in 2x2 case}}$$

# Identification through parallel trends

## Parallel trends

Assume two groups, treated and comparison group, then we define parallel trends as:

$$E(\Delta Y_k^0) = E(\Delta Y_U^0)$$

**In words:** “The evolution of earnings for our trainees *had they not trained* is the same as the evolution of mean earnings for non-trainees”.

It's in red because parallel trends is untestable and critically important to estimation of the ATT using any method, OLS or “four averages and three subtractions”

## What is parallel trends

- Parallel trends assumes away the selection bias associated with comparisons
- The assumption is thought to be more plausible than simply assuming simple comparisons held equal
$$E[Y^0|D = 0] = E[Y^0|D = 1]$$
- But it is still a strong assumption, and differs from the assumptions have in the RCT which though also untestable, is nearly guaranteed by randomization
- Most of the hard part of the work involves the old fashioned detective work and the work of making good arguments with good exhibits (tables and figures)

# Understanding parallel trends through worksheets

Before we move into regression, let's go through a simple exercise to really pin down these core ideas with simple calculations

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/  
1onabpc14JdrGo6NFv0zCWo-nuWDLLV2L1qNogDT9SBw/edit?usp=  
sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1onabpc14JdrGo6NFv0zCWo-nuWDLLV2L1qNogDT9SBw/edit?usp=sharing)

# No Anticipation

- Additional assumption is “no anticipation” – poorly named as it doesn’t require literally no anticipation
- No anticipation means that the treatment effect happens only at the time that the treatment occurs or after, but not before
  - **Example 1:** Tomorrow I win the lottery, but don’t get paid yet. I decide to buy a new house today. That violates NA
  - **Example 2:** Next year, a state lets you drive without a driver license and you know it. But you can’t drive without a driver license today. This satisfies NA.
- We need NA because we are comparing to a baseline period and it needs to not be treated

# SUTVA

- Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (Imbens and Rubin 2015) focuses on what happens when in our analysis we are combining units (versus defining treatment effects)
  1. **No Interference:** a treated unit cannot impact a control unit such that their potential outcomes change (unstable treatment value)
  2. **No hidden variation in treatment:** When units are indexed to receive a treatment, their dose is the same as someone else with that same index
  3. **Scale:** If scaling causes interference or changes inputs in production process, then #1 or #2 are violated
- Shifts from defining treatment effects to estimating them, which means being careful about who is the control group, how you define treatments and what questions can and cannot be answered with this method

# Roadmap

Introduction

Managing expectations

Introducing difference-in-differences

Potential outcomes

Four averages and three subtractions

Estimation

OLS specification

Inference

Parallel trends violations

How parallel trends can get violated

DiD in Court

Triple difference

Placebo outcomes

# OLS Specification

- Simple DiD equation will identify ATT under parallel trends
- But so will a particular OLS specification (two groups and no covariates)
- OLS was historically preferred because
  - OLS estimates the ATT under parallel trends
  - Easy to calculate the standard errors
  - Easy to include multiple periods
- People liked it also because of differential timing, continuous treatments and covariates, but those are more complex so we address them later

# Minimum wages

- Card and Krueger (1994) have a famous study estimating causal effect (ATT) of minimum wages on employment
- Exploited a policy change in New Jersey between February and November in mid-1990s where minimum wage was increased, but neighbor PA did not
- Using DiD, they do not find a negative effect of the minimum wage on employment which is part of its legacy today, but I mainly present it to illustrate the history and the design principles



Binyamin Appelbaum

@BCAppelbaum



Replies to @BCAppelbaum

The Nobel laureate James Buchanan wrote in the Wall Street Journal that Card and Krueger were undermining the credibility of economics as a discipline. He called them and their allies "a bevy of camp-following whores."

3:49 PM · Mar 18, 2019



179



Reply



Share

[Read 18 replies](#)

## Card on that study

*"I've subsequently stayed away from the minimum wage literature for a number of reasons. First, it cost me a lot of friends. People that I had known for many years, for instance, some of the ones I met at my first job at the University of Chicago, became very angry or disappointed. They thought that in publishing our work we were being traitors to the cause of economics as a whole."*

But let's listen to Orley's opinion about the paper's controversy at the time. <https://youtu.be/M0tbuRX4eyQ?t=1882>


# OLS specification of the DiD equation

- The correctly specified OLS regression is an interaction with time and group fixed effects:


$$Y_{its} = \alpha + \gamma NJ_s + \lambda d_t + \delta(NJ \times d)_{st} + \varepsilon_{its}$$

- NJ is a dummy equal to 1 if the observation is from NJ
- d is a dummy equal to 1 if the observation is from November (the post period)
- This equation takes the following values
  - PA Pre:  $\alpha$
  - PA Post:  $\alpha + \lambda$
  - NJ Pre:  $\alpha + \gamma$
  - NJ Post:  $\alpha + \gamma + \lambda + \delta$
- DiD equation:  $(NJ \text{ Post} - NJ \text{ Pre}) - (PA \text{ Post} - PA \text{ Pre}) = \delta$

$$Y_{ist} = \alpha + \gamma N J_s + \lambda d_t + \delta (N J \times d)_{st} + \varepsilon_{ist}$$



$$Y_{ist} = \alpha + \gamma NJ_s + \lambda d_t + \delta(NJ \times d)_{st} + \varepsilon_{ist}$$



Notice how OLS is “imputing”  $E[Y^0|D = 1, Post]$  for the treatment group in the post period? It is only “correct”, though, if parallel trends is a good approximation

# Inference

- Bertrand, Duflo and Mullainathan (2004) show that conventional standard errors will often severely underestimate the standard deviation of the estimators
- Standard errors are biased downward (i.e., too small, over reject)
- They proposed three solutions, but most only use one of them (clustering)

## Inference

- 1 Block bootstrapping standard errors (if you analyze states the block should be the states and you would sample whole states with replacement for bootstrapping)
- 2 Clustering standard errors at the group level (in Stata one would simply add `, cluster(state)` to the regression equation if one analyzes state level variation)

Most people will simply cluster, but there are issues if you have too few clusters. They mention a third way but it's only a curiosity.

# Roadmap

Introduction

Managing expectations

Introducing difference-in-differences

Potential outcomes

Four averages and three subtractions

Estimation

OLS specification

Inference

Parallel trends violations

How parallel trends can get violated

DiD in Court

Triple difference

Placebo outcomes

## Violating parallel trends exercise

- Parallel trends are needed so we can impute the missing  $E[Y^0|D = 1]$  with  $E[Y^0|D = 0]$  either explicitly or implicitly
- Which means if parallel trends isn't true, then the imputation isn't correct and therefore estimates are biased
- To illustrate this, let's go through the document again

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/  
1onabpc14JdrGo6NFv0zCWo-nuWDLLV2L1qNogDT9SBw/edit?usp=  
sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1onabpc14JdrGo6NFv0zCWo-nuWDLLV2L1qNogDT9SBw/edit?usp=sharing)

## Violating parallel trends

- Parallel trends are in expectation only – we don't rely everybody to follow the same trend, just that the group average for  $Y^0$  be approximately the same for treated and control
- Violations are a form of selection bias and there are two straightforward ways that parallel trends will be violated
  1. Compositional differences in samples associated with repeated cross-sections
  2. Policy endogeneity

## Repeated cross-sections and compositional change

- One of the risks of a repeated cross-section is that the composition of the sample may have changed between the pre and post period in ways that are correlated with treatment
- Hong (2013) uses repeated cross-sectional data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CEX) containing music expenditure and internet use for a random sample of households
- Study exploits the emergence of Napster (first file sharing software widely used by Internet users) in June 1999 as a natural experiment
- Study compares internet users and internet non-users before and after emergence of Napster

Figure 1: Internet Diffusion and Average Quarterly Music Expenditure in the CEX




Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Internet User and Non-user Groups<sup>a</sup>

Year	1997		1998		1999	
	Internet User	Non-user	Internet User	Non-user	Internet User	Non-user
<b>Average Expenditure</b>						
Recorded Music	\$25.73	\$10.90	\$24.18	\$9.97	\$20.92	\$9.37
Entertainment	\$195.03	\$96.71	\$193.38	\$84.92	\$182.42	\$80.19
<b>Zero Expenditure</b>						
Recorded Music	.56	.79	.60	.80	.64	.81
Entertainment	.08	.32	.09	.35	.14	.39
<b>Demographics</b>						
Age	40.2	49.0	42.3	49.0	44.1	49.4
Income	\$52,887	\$30,459	\$51,995	\$28,169	\$49,970	\$26,649
High School Grad.	.18	.31	.17	.32	.21	.32
Some College	.37	.28	.35	.27	.34	.27
College Grad.	.43	.21	.45	.21	.42	.20
Manager	.16	.08	.16	.08	.14	.08

Diffusion of the Internet changes samples (e.g., younger music fans are early adopters)


## Repeated cross-sections

- Surprisingly underappreciated problem with almost no literature around it
- So what can you do? Check covariate balance by regressing the time-varying covariates instead of the outcome onto the treatment using your OLS specification
- They should be exogenous remember, so this covariate regression can be a helpful test of whether this is a problem
- “Difference-in-differences with Compositional Changes” by Pedro Sant’anna and Qi Xu (not yet released) is the only paper I’ve ever seen to look into it

# Types of evidence

- You are building a case, the prosecutor before a judge and jury, always in battle with the defense attorney
- Evidence has particular broadly defined forms that can help you on the front end
- Your goal in my humble opinion should be mixing tight logic based falsifications with particular kinds of data visualization, starting with the event study


# Event studies have become mandatory in DiD



# Intuition behind event studies

- Princeton Industrial Relations Section seems to be behind this – this intense focus on research design but also verifying assumptions
- The identifying assumption for all DD designs is parallel trends , but since we cannot verify parallel trends, we often look at pre-trends
- It's a type of check for selection bias, but you must understand what it is and what it isn't to see its value but not be naive about it (it is not a silver bullet)
- Even if pre-trends are the same one still has to worry about other policies changing at the same time (omitted variable bias is a parallel trends violation)

Plot the raw data when there's only two groups



## Evidence for parallel trends: pre-trends

Let's do the bonus questions on first and second tab now

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/  
1onabpc14JdrGo6NFv0zCWo-nuWDLLV2L1qNogDT9SBw/edit?usp=  
sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1onabpc14JdrGo6NFv0zCWo-nuWDLLV2L1qNogDT9SBw/edit?usp=sharing)

# Beware of naive reasoning

- Parallel pre-trends  $\neq$  parallel trends – these are often thought to be the same thing, and they aren't
- Equating them is a kind of *post hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy
- Parallel pre-trends is more like a smoking gun based on things "looking the same" before
- Similar to checking for covariate balance in RCTs
- But **cannot** substitute for domain knowledge!

# Event study regression

- Event studies have a simple OLS specification with only one treatment group and one never-treated group

$$Y_{its} = \alpha + \sum_{\tau=-2}^{-q} \mu_\tau D_{s\tau} + \sum_{\tau=0}^m \delta_\tau D_{s\tau} + \varepsilon_{ist}$$

- where  $D$  is an interaction of the treatment group  $s$  with the calendar year  $\tau$
- Treatment occurs in year 0, no anticipation, drop baseline  $t - 1$
- Includes  $q$  leads or anticipatory effects and  $m$  lags or post treatment effects

## Event study regression

$$Y_{its} = \alpha + \sum_{\tau=-2}^{-q} \mu_\tau D_{s\tau} + \sum_{\tau=0}^m \delta_\tau D_{s\tau} + \varepsilon_{ist}$$

Typically you'll plot the coefficients and 95% CI on all leads and lags  
(binned or not, trimmed or not)

Under no anticipation, then you expect  $\hat{\mu}$  coefficients to be zero, which gives you confidence that parallel trends holds (but is not a guarantee, and there are still specification issues – see Jon Roth's work)

Under parallel trends,  $\hat{\delta}$  are estimates of the ATT at points in time

# Medicaid and Affordable Care Act example



Volume 136, Issue 3  
August 2021

< Previous    Next >

## Medicaid and Mortality: New Evidence From Linked Survey and Administrative Data [Get access >](#)

Sarah Miller, Norman Johnson, Laura R Wherry

*The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Volume 136, Issue 3, August 2021, Pages 1783–1829,

<https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjab004>

Published: 30 January 2021

[Cite](#) [Permissions](#) [Share ▾](#)

### Abstract


We use large-scale federal survey data linked to administrative death records to investigate the relationship between Medicaid enrollment and mortality. Our analysis compares changes in mortality for near-elderly adults in states with and without Affordable Care Act Medicaid expansions. We identify adults most likely to benefit using survey information on socioeconomic status, citizenship status, and public program participation. We find that prior to the ACA expansions, mortality rates across expansion and nonexpansion states trended similarly, but beginning in the first year of the policy, there were significant reductions in mortality in states that opted to expand relative to nonexpander states. Individuals in expansion states experienced a 0.132 percentage point decline in annual mortality, a 9.4% reduction over the sample mean, as a result of the Medicaid expansions. The effect is driven by a reduction in disease-related deaths and grows over time. A variety of alternative specifications, methods of inference, placebo tests, and sample definitions confirm our main result.

**JEL:** H75 - State and Local Government: Health; Education; Welfare; Public Pensions, I13 - Health Insurance, Public and Private, I18 - Government Policy; Regulation; Public Health


**Issue Section:** Article

# Types of evidence


- **Bite** – show that the expansion shifted people into Medicaid and out of uninsured status
- **Placebos** – Show that there's no effect on mortality for groups it shouldn't be affecting (people 65+)
- **Event study** – Show leads and lags on mortality




(a) Medicaid Eligibility



(b) Medicaid Coverage



(c) Uninsured






Figure: Miller, et al. (2019) estimates of Medicaid expansion's effects on annual mortality

## Additional identification things

- Very common for readers and others to request a variety of “robustness checks” from a DD design
- We saw some of these just now (e.g., falsification test using data for alternative control group, the Medicare population)
- Triple differences uses a within-state untreated group; little trickier, so let's use the table again

# DDD Example by Gruber

TABLE 3—DDD ESTIMATES OF THE IMPACT OF STATE MANDATES  
ON HOURLY WAGES

Location/year	Before law change	After law change	Time difference for location
<b>A. Treatment Individuals: Married Women, 20–40 Years Old:</b>			
Experimental states	1.547 (0.012) [1,400]	1.513 (0.012) [1,496]	-0.034 (0.017)
Nonexperimental states	1.369 (0.010) [1,480]	1.397 (0.010) [1,640]	0.028 (0.014)
Location difference at a point in time:	0.178 (0.016)	0.116 (0.015)	
Difference-in-difference:		-0.062 (0.022)	
<b>B. Control Group: Over 40 and Single Males 20–40:</b>			
Experimental states	1.759 (0.007) [5,624]	1.748 (0.007) [5,407]	-0.011 (0.010)
Nonexperimental states	1.630 (0.007) [4,959]	1.627 (0.007) [4,928]	-0.003 (0.010)
Location difference at a point in time:	0.129 (0.010)	0.121 (0.010)	
Difference-in-difference:		-0.008 (0.014)	
<b>DDD:</b>		<b>-0.054</b> <b>(0.026)</b>	

Table: Difference-in-Difference-in-Differences numerical example

States	Group	Period	Outcomes	$D_1$	$D_2$	$D_3$	
Experimental states	Married women, 20-40yo	After	$NJ + T + NJ_t + l_t + D$	$T + NJ_t + l_t + D$	$D + l_t - s_t$	$D$	
		Before	$NJ$				
	Older 40, Single men 20-40yo	After	$NJ + T + NJ_t + s_t$	$T + NJ_t + s_t$	$l_t - s_t$		
		Before	$NJ$				
Non-experimental states	Married women, 20-40yo	After	$PA + T + PA_t + l_t$	$T + PA_t + l_t$	$l_t - s_t$		
		Before	$PA$				
	Older 40, Single men 20-40yo	After	$PA + T + PA_t + s_t$	$T + PA_t + s_t$	$l_t - s_t$		
		Before	$PA$				

**What is our identifying assumption?** Answer: just another parallel trend assumption but with a slightly different interpretation!

$l_t - s_t$  is the same for the experimental and non-experimental states. This is “change in inequality between two groups hourly wages” from pre to post. It’s a new parallel trend assumption.

# DDD in Regression

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{ijt} = & \alpha + \beta_2 \tau_t + \beta_3 \delta_j + \beta_4 D_i + \beta_5 (\delta \times \tau)_{jt} \\ & + \beta_6 (\tau \times D)_{ti} + \beta_7 (\delta \times D)_{ij} + \beta_8 (\delta \times \tau \times D)_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt} \end{aligned}$$

- Your panel is now a group  $j$  state  $i$  (e.g., AR high wage worker 1991, AR high wage worker 1992, etc.)
- Assume we drop  $\tau_t$  but I just want to show it to you for now.
- If the placebo DD is non-zero, it might be difficult to convince the reviewer that the DDD removed all the bias

# Great new paper to learn more



*Econometrics Journal* (2022), volume 00, pp. 1–23.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/econj/utac010>

## The triple difference estimator

ANDREAS OLDEN AND JARLE MØEN

*Dept. of Business and Management Science, NHH Norwegian School of Economics, Hellevn.  
30, N-5045 Bergen, Norway.*  
Email: [andreasolden@gmail.com](mailto:andreasolden@gmail.com), [jarle.moen@nhh.no](mailto:jarle.moen@nhh.no)

First version received: 14 May 2020; final version accepted: 10 May 2021.

**Summary:** Triple difference has become a widely used estimator in empirical work. A close reading of articles in top economics journals reveals that the use of the estimator to a large extent rests on intuition. The identifying assumptions are neither formally derived nor generally agreed on. We give a complete presentation of the triple difference estimator, and show that even though the estimator can be computed as the difference between two difference-in-differences estimators, it does not require two parallel trend assumptions to have a causal interpretation. The reason is that the difference between two biased difference-in-differences estimators will be unbiased as long as the bias is the same in both estimators. This requires only one parallel trend assumption to hold.

**Keywords:** DD, DDD, DID, DiDID, difference-in-difference-in-differences, difference-in-differences, parallel trend assumption, triple difference.

**JEL Codes:** C10, C18, C21.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The triple difference estimator is widely used, either under the name ‘triple difference’ (TD) or the name ‘difference-in-difference-in-differences’ (DDD), or with minor variations of these spellings. Triple difference is an extension of double differences and was introduced by Gruber (1994). Even though Gruber’s paper is well cited, very few modern users of triple difference credit him for his methodological contribution. One reason may be that the properties of the triple difference estimator are considered obvious. Another reason may be that triple difference was little more than a curiosity in the first ten years after Gruber’s paper. On Google Scholar, the annual number of references to triple difference did not pass one hundred until year 2007. Since then, the use of the estimator has grown rapidly and reached 928 unique works referencing it in the year 2017.<sup>1</sup>

Looking only at the core economics journals *American Economic Review* (AER), *Journal of Political Economy* (JPE), and *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (QJE), we have found 32 articles using triple difference between 2010 and 2017, see Table A1 in Appendix A. A close reading of these articles reveals that the use of the triple difference estimator to a large extent rests on

<sup>1</sup> More details on the historical development of the use of the triple difference estimator can be found in the working paper version of Olden and Møen (2020, fig. 1). In the working paper, we also analyse naming conventions and suggest that there is a need to unify terminology. We recommend the terms ‘triple difference’ and ‘difference-in-difference-in-differences’.

## Falsification test with alternative outcome

- The within-group control group (DDD) is a form of placebo analysis using the same *outcome*
- But there are also placebos using a *different outcome* – but you need a hypothesis of mechanisms to figure out what is in fact a *different outcome*
- Figure out what those are, and test them – finding no effect on placebo outcomes tends to help people your other results interestingly enough
- Cheng and Hoekstra (2013) examine the effect of castle doctrine gun laws on non-gun related offenses like grand theft auto and find no evidence of an effect

## Rational addiction as a placebo critique

Sometimes, an empirical literature may be criticized using nothing more than placebo analysis

*"A majority of [our] respondents believe the literature is a success story that demonstrates the power of economic reasoning. At the same time, they also believe the empirical evidence is weak, and they disagree both on the type of evidence that would validate the theory and the policy implications. Taken together, this points to an interesting gap. On the one hand, most of the respondents claim that the theory has valuable real world implications. On the other hand, they do not believe the theory has received empirical support."*

## Placebo as critique of empirical rational addiction

- Auld and Grootendorst (2004) estimated standard “rational addiction” models (Becker and Murphy 1988) on data with milk, eggs, oranges and apples.
- They find these plausibly non-addictive goods are addictive, which casts doubt on the empirical rational addiction models.

# Placebo as critique of peer effects

- Several studies found evidence for “peer effects” involving inter-peer transmission of smoking, alcohol use and happiness tendencies
- Christakis and Fowler (2007) found significant network effects on outcomes like obesity
- Cohen-Cole and Fletcher (2008) use similar models and data and find similar network “effects” for things that aren’t contagious like acne, height and headaches
- Ockham’s razor - given social interaction endogeneity (Manski 1993), homophily more likely explanation