# Difference-in-Differences with Modern Advancements Applied Econometrics Resources

Kevin Li

## Classic Example

New Jersey increased minimum wage in April 1992. We want to find the causal effect of this on employment rate Y.

Within new jersey, we sample fast food restaurants. Each unit i is sampled both before and after the minimum wage increase:

- $\bullet$  Before t =0 (March 1992). Average employment rate  $\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{\mathsf{i}0}]$
- After t = 1 (December 1992). Average employment rate  $\mathbb{E}[Y_{i1}]$ .

Is the causal effect the difference in average  $Y_{it}$  between the two periods t?

$$\tau = \mathbb{E}[Y_{i1}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_{i0}]$$

 ${\bf No}.$  Why? maybe between  ${\bf t}=0,1$  there was a recession that lowered the employment rate. We wouldn't know if the change is due to the minimum wage increase, or the recession.

## Solution: Imputing Trends

So how can we isolate the causal effect if we don't know what the effect of the recession is? Let us look at another state, Pennsylvania. More formally:

- New Jersey (and its observations i) will be in group  $\mathsf{G}=1$ .
- Pennsylvania (and its observations i) will be in group G = 0.

Pennsylvania  ${\sf G}=0$  does not have minimum wage change between  ${\sf t}=0,1.$  But it is affected by recession.

So, we can calculate the effect of recession with the difference between pennsylvania between the two time periods:

Recession Effect = 
$$\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{\mathsf{i}1}|\mathsf{G}_{\mathsf{it}}=0]$$
 –  $\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{\mathsf{i}0}|\mathsf{G}_{\mathsf{it}}=0]$ 

#### Difference-in-Differences

We know the recession effect now.

So we can take the difference between  ${\sf t}=0,1$  in New Jersey, then adjust (minus out) the recession effect to get the causal effect:

$$\tau = \underbrace{(\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}|\mathsf{G}_{it}=1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i0}|\mathsf{G}_{it}=1])}_{\text{New Jersey diff.}} - \underbrace{(\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}|\mathsf{G}_{it}=0] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i0}|\mathsf{G}_{it}=0])}_{\text{Pennsylvania Diff.}}$$

- New Jersey diff is the original estimate not accounting for the recession.
- Pennsylvania difference isolates the causal effect.

Notice how it is the difference of two differences, hence, difference-in-differences.

- The first difference is the "correlation" between after and before treatment in the treated group.
- The second difference accounts for confounders/changes in time periods.

#### Parallel Trends

Of course, this technique requires a key assumption of **parallel trends**.

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{\mathsf{i}1}(0) - \mathsf{Y}_{\mathsf{i}0}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{\mathsf{i}} = 1] = \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{\mathsf{i}1}(0) - \mathsf{Y}_{\mathsf{i}0}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{\mathsf{i}} = 0]$$

- ullet Read: had the treated group  ${\sf G}=1$  never gotten treated in  ${\sf t}=1$ , they would have followed the same trend as the untreated  ${\sf G}=0$  group.
- In other words, had New Jersey not been treated, their difference would be equal to that of pennsylvania.
- Or even more intuitively: if New Jersey had not had a minimum wage change, it would have only been impacted by the recession (and other factors).

This impact of the recession (and other factors)should be consistent between New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

### Identification Proof

Let us prove that this difference-in-differences estimate really gets us a causal estimand, using potential outcomes:

$$\begin{split} \mathsf{DID} &= (\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i0}|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1]) - (\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 0] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i0}|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 0]) \\ &= (\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(1)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i0}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1]) - (\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 0] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i0}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 0]) \\ &= (\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(1)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i0}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1]) \\ &- (\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 0] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i0}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 0]) + (\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1]) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(1)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(0) - \mathsf{Y}_{i0}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{i} = 1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(0) - \mathsf{Y}_{i0}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{i} = 0] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(1)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(0)|\mathsf{G}_{it} = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(1)|\mathsf{D}_{it} = 1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathsf{Y}_{i1}(0)|\mathsf{D}_{it} = 1] \\ &= \mathsf{ATT} \end{split}$$

#### More Time Periods

In our example, we currently have only two time periods, t = 0, 1.

We can have more time periods. These time periods will be split into two types:

- Pre-treatment time periods (treated the same as t = 0)
- 2 Post-treatment time periods (treated the same as t = 1).

We will use the variable R to describe time periods:

- Pre-treatment time periods are negative values of R.
- Post-treatment time periods are 0 and positive values of R.
- ullet R = 0 is the first year that treatment  ${\sf G}=1$  adopts treatment.