Mested us. Non-Nested Models: 2 Bx. & Bxx+Bzx2 Empirical Economics-Cheat Sheet FD preferred if ust follows a random west Testing Non-Nested Models: CMA: model, + model 2 Test model: coefficients of an Divident Marking Test: Use F-test model 2 = 0 an Causal Effects, Experiments & Roccession Analysis Firstrumental variable estimation: Model 4= 3x + U exhibit p(x,u) =0 = 1 Instrumental variable: cov(z,x) =0 (relevance), Potential Outcome for binary DIE ? 0/17, Davidson-Mackimon Test: Tist: y= modely +filted model, y= modely+fitted modely Two Stage Least Squares B1 = cov(Z, Y) Wald Estinator outcome 4: (potential attorne if treated: 11: 4. They may be no clear winner (use R? as a decision) Y:= Yo:+(P1:-Poi) D: 7 = Y:- Yor (causal effect) Multiple Instruments: First stage BN = 92=1 - 42=06 Proxy variables (unobservables): y=BotB1x1+B2x2+B3x3+U3V Conditions of a good proxy: y=80+83x3+Y3 x=170+17, Z,+., film Zm+ Vall exogenous & instrum Second stages y=Bo+B,x+ other exog. vars + & Variance and Inference: Only one known = D makes causal inference difficult p(u,xi)=0 + P(u,x3)=0 P(12,xi)=0 1 ATE: ELY; - 70:) ATT: E[4:-4:10:=1 Measurement Error: CMEA: Elea)=0, (Rby, e0)=0 Var (B'r) = 02 - 1/2 = 1/2 (0) observed difference in means: E[Y:ID:=1]-E[Y:ID:=0] -Dependent variable: Remains unbiased & consistent but inefficie -Phologondent variable, Attenuation bias: By. Var (xx) = ATT + Selection bias, where Soia = E MoilD:= TEB -b biased howard zero Under random assignment; E[YoilDi=1]=E[YoilDi=0] Weak Instruments; If p(Z,X) small Dlarge SE Missing Data & Sample Selection: Exagenous: Based on X = DOLS remains consistent if equal for al Dunbiased estimation. Y = a+BD; + & FLY; - You R'is different as OLS and can be regulive, Endogenous: Based on Y=DOLS biased E(U/X) +O FLAIR Storp RD: deterministic D:= {10 offerwise yi = x1 - Y0; Model: Y:= a+BX:+pD: +n; where p = Y1 - Y0; Plantrol Lariables can be added to LAD: Mint 1y: - x: BI Ddead with of their improve the model, [Heterogenuas TE: Y: 2 13+17: D:+5: Das Recap: Gauss-Markov Assumptions given in exam Stimple Parel Models: Pooled Cross Sections combines multiple Effects of Assumptions: 1-6: By N/B; (75) 2 Identification: P= Im E[4: |x=x] - Lim E[4: |x:=x] cross-sectional dotasets sampted at different points in time 1-4: E[B; |X] = B; 1-5: Kar[B; |X] = 557; M-R2 => BLUE FUZZY RO: D:= 80 + 7. I(x; Zxo) + g(x;) + r; (probabilitic) Omore observations for preise estimation, allows testing for Asymptotic properties: 1-4 plim Bj=B; 1-5: B; ~N(B; 100) Wald Estinator: p= Roduced Form Discontinuity = E[Y|xo]-E[Y|xo]

First stage Discontinuity = E[D|xo] = [D|xo] Did estimation: y:t=Bo+Bod2+BaDi+&a(0;+d2)+vit Threats to int. val.; Endogeneity (OVB, ME, simult.), HC lefficery) Assumptions: Parallel treatment effect (ya, port - ya, pre) - (ya, post - ya, port) 236 specification: x+BX; + pD; +n; (with D; instrumented by 3 He teraskedusticity: Var (u, 1 X) = 0; > Wrong standard errors Fixed effect: git=Bo+Byxitta; tuit a: time-invariant indeffet Estimation Approaches: Parametric polynomial approximation = No longer BLOE (efficiency) & unbiasedness, consistent remains ? Testing for Heteroskedasticity OBrevsch-Pagar-Test (White Te N=d+ZBx(x:-xo) h 10 D; +E; Non parametric; Scal freu req; First difference Agie - yie - yie - BAXit Avik consistent it 1) 02=8+15: x+ v; =D Ho: 8:=0 V:21 Ha: 3: such that 6:=0 Balanced us. Wabalanced Parel: 11 same number of ubs. actoss time \$ = asg min & K(xi-xo) (4-d-B(xi-xo)-p0;) Test statistic: nRJ2NXk or F= (1-R) K FK, n-k-1 Validity checks: Conthirty of covariates check; Pre-treatment Estimation in First Offerences Conditions for consistency; strict ii) Use non-linear covariates/regressandesinply ind; covertates should not jump at Xo. Placebo Testi no dis J?=&+&1g+&9++, =>Ho: 8,=8=0 1=2,7-1-1 exageneity E[vit 1x7]=0 VT, no residual autocorrelation. I cannot estimate tire-invariant variables, variation in axit Dealing with Heteroskedasticity: i) WLS/FOLS in Irobust SEs Dimited tapendent Uniciple Models & Sample Selection Correction CD addrew by interaction term: Dy it= Backet & (Time, a)) iduls: Var(ulx) = o2 h(xi) = D divide energthing bything s.t. h>0 LPM. P(y=1/x)=Bo+x3/Logit Model: P(y=1/x)=Ao(x3)= Serial Attocorrelation Regress vit on their lags, use Fall it in FGLS: You don't know the contributing factor Destinate weight exp(xp), Probit Model: P(x=1|x) = P(xp)= 59(+) at Follow some procedure with This explosts sixi if significant AdBanced Panel Data Methods: Fixed Effect Estimate Latent Variable Francisco y x x 3+ E y= I(x =0) within transfermation = yit - yi = Ba (xit - xi) + (vit - vi) ii) Robust SE; Varis;) = 25: 0: = Dstill inefficient thous where & what thought or ENN(0,1) (probit) ii) LSDV: y: = Bo+ Bx; + ZZ; D+ vit Fremoves time-invariant HC &LPM: Assume yIE[0,1] and y: = a+BX+U Partial Effects, &P(y=1/x) = q(xB)B; where g()PDF Random Effects Estimator yit-Baxittaituit with plainail-0 love to 0 or TVar(y:1x:)=p(xi)[1.-p(xi)] value close to 0.3 (logistic/acroal). For descrete x; , compute: AP= G (xB+B3) FGLS transformation: yit-by:= B: (xit-0xi)+(1-0) Bo+(vit-0vi) @ Specification & Data Issues: Misspecification using RESETURED to Include higher order terms of dependent you where Itest: -G(xB) MLE: 2(P)= 2[Cy: log G(x;B)+(1-y:) log (1-8=1- Jos 1 the Hawman-Test for (7xiB) Lother Model Posse X; = exp(xiB)=P(y=h) 103 + Too Model comparisons; FE PRE y=BX+ SH+8243 = F= KU-RR (1-R2) Fgin-K-9 = e 1 / Assumption & Text 1 Log + Probl Dorrect distribut

Choosing between FERFD: FE preferred if U. Serially guto-