

# Recent Developments in the Econometrics of Program Evaluation

GUIDO W. IMBENS AND JEFFREY M. WOOLDRIDGE\*

*Many empirical questions in economics and other social sciences depend on causal effects of programs or policies. In the last two decades, much research has been done on the econometric and statistical analysis of such causal effects. This recent theoretical literature has built on, and combined features of, earlier work in both the statistics and econometrics literatures. It has by now reached a level of maturity that makes it an important tool in many areas of empirical research in economics, including labor economics, public finance, development economics, industrial organization, and other areas of empirical microeconomics. In this review, we discuss some of the recent developments. We focus primarily on practical issues for empirical researchers, as well as provide a historical overview of the area and give references to more technical research.*

## 1. Introduction

Many empirical questions in economics and other social sciences depend on causal effects of programs or policies. In the last two decades, much research has been done on the econometric and statistical analysis of such causal effects. This recent theoretical literature has built on, and combined features of, earlier work in both the statistics and econometrics literatures. It has by now reached a level of maturity that makes it an important tool in many areas of empirical

research in economics and suitable for a review. In this article, we attempt to present such a review. We will focus on practical issues for empirical researchers, as well as provide an historical overview of the area and give references to more technical research. This review complements and extends other reviews and discussions, including those by Richard Blundell and Monica Costa Dias (2002), Guido W. Imbens (2004), and Joshua D. Angrist and Alan B. Krueger (1999) and the books by Paul R. Rosenbaum (1995), Judea Pearl (2000), Myoung-Jae Lee (2005a), Donald B. Rubin (2006), Marco Caliendo (2006), Angrist and Jörn-Steffen Pischke (2009), Howard S. Bloom (2005), Stephen L. Morgan and Christopher Winship (2007), Jeffrey M. Wooldridge (2002) and Imbens and Rubin (forthcoming). In addition, the reviews in James J. Heckman, Robert J. LaLonde,

\* Imbens: Harvard University and NBER. Wooldridge: Michigan State University. Financial support for this research was generously provided through NSF grants SES 0136789, 0452590 and 08. We are grateful for comments by Esther Duflo, Caroline Hoxby, Roger Gordon, Jonathan Beauchamp, Larry Katz, Eduardo Morales, and two anonymous referees.

and Jeffrey A. Smith (1999), Heckman and Edward Vytlacil (2007a, 2007b), and Jaap H. Abbring and Heckman (2007) provide an excellent overview of the important theoretical work by Heckman and his coauthors in this area.

The central problem studied in this literature is that of evaluating the effect of the exposure of a set of units to a program, or treatment, on some outcome. In economic studies, the units are typically economic agents such as individuals, households, markets, firms, counties, states, or countries but, in other disciplines where evaluation methods are used, the units can be animals, plots of land, or physical objects. The treatments can be job search assistance programs, educational programs, vouchers, laws or regulations, medical drugs, environmental exposure, or technologies. A critical feature is that, in principle, each unit can be exposed to multiple levels of the treatment. Moreover, this literature is focused on settings with observations on units exposed, and not exposed, to the treatment, with the evaluation based on comparisons of units exposed and not exposed.<sup>1</sup> For example, an individual may enroll or not in a training program, or he or she may receive or not receive a voucher, or be subject to a particular regulation or not. The object of interest is a comparison of the two outcomes for the same unit when exposed, and when not exposed, to the treatment. The problem is that we can at most observe one of these outcomes because the unit can be exposed to only one level of the treatment. Paul W. Holland (1986) refers to this as the fundamental problem of causal inference. In order to evaluate the effect of the treatment, we therefore always need to compare distinct units receiving the different levels of the treatment. Such a comparison

can involve different physical units or the same physical unit at different times.

The problem of evaluating the effect of a binary treatment or program is a well studied problem with a long history in both econometrics and statistics. This is true both in the theoretical literature as well as in the more applied literature. The econometric literature goes back to early work by Orley Ashenfelter (1978) and subsequent work by Ashenfelter and David Card (1985), Heckman and Richard Robb (1985), LaLonde (1986), Thomas Fraker and Rebecca Maynard (1987), Card and Daniel G. Sullivan (1988), and Charles F. Manski (1990). Motivated primarily by applications to the evaluation of labor market programs in observational settings, the focus in the econometric literature is traditionally on endogeneity, or self-selection, issues. Individuals who choose to enroll in a training program are by definition different from those who choose not to enroll. These differences, if they influence the response, may invalidate causal comparisons of outcomes by treatment status, possibly even after adjusting for observed covariates. Consequently, many of the initial theoretical studies focused on the use of traditional econometric methods for dealing with endogeneity, such as fixed effect methods from panel data analyses, and instrumental variables methods. Subsequently, the econometrics literature has combined insights from the semiparametric literature to develop new estimators for a variety of settings, requiring fewer functional form and homogeneity assumptions.

The statistics literature starts from a different perspective. This literature originates in the analysis of randomized experiments by Ronald A. Fisher (1935) and Jerzy Splawa-Neyman (1990). From the early 1970s, Rubin (1973a, 1973b, 1974, 1977, 1978), in a series of papers, formulated the now dominant approach to the analysis of causal effects in observational studies. Rubin proposed the

<sup>1</sup>As opposed to studies where the causal effect of fundamentally new programs is predicted through direct identification of preferences and production functions.

interpretation of causal statements as comparisons of so-called potential outcomes: pairs of outcomes defined for the same unit given different levels of exposure to the treatment, with the researcher only observing the potential outcome corresponding to the level of the treatment received. Models are developed for the pair of potential outcomes rather than solely for the observed outcome. Rubin's formulation of the evaluation problem, or the problem of causal inference, labeled the Rubin Causal Model (RCM) by Holland (1986), is by now standard in both the statistics and econometrics literature. One of the attractions of the potential outcomes setup is that from the outset it allows for general heterogeneity in the effects of the treatment. Such heterogeneity is important in practice, and it is important theoretically as it is often the motivation for the endogeneity problems that concern economists. One additional advantage of the potential outcome set up is that the parameters of interest can be defined, and the assumptions stated, without reference to particular statistical models.

Of particular importance in Rubin's approach is the relationship between treatment assignment and the potential outcomes. The simplest case for analysis is when assignment to treatment is randomized and, thus, independent of covariates as well as the potential outcomes. In such classical randomized experiments, it is straightforward to obtain estimators for the average effect of the treatment with attractive properties under repeated sampling, e.g., the difference in means by treatment status. Randomized experiments have been used in some areas in economics. In the 1970s, negative income tax experiments received widespread attention. In the late 1980s, following an influential paper by LaLonde (1986) that concluded econometric methods were unable to replicate experimental results, more emphasis was put on experimental evaluations of labor

market programs, although more recently this emphasis seems to have weakened a bit. In the last couple of years, some of the most interesting experiments have been conducted in development economics (e.g., Edward Miguel and Michael Kremer 2004; Esther Duflo 2001; Angrist, Eric Bettinger, and Kremer 2006; Abhijit V. Banerjee et al. 2007) and behavioral economics (e.g., Marianne Bertrand and Sendhil Mullainathan 2004). Nevertheless, experimental evaluations remain relatively rare in economics. More common is the case where economists analyze data from observational studies. Observational data generally create challenges in estimating causal effects but, in one important special case, variously referred to as unconfoundedness, exogeneity, ignorability, or selection on observables, questions regarding identification and estimation of the policy effects are fairly well understood. All these labels refer to some form of the assumption that adjusting treatment and control groups for differences in observed covariates, or pretreatment variables, remove all biases in comparisons between treated and control units. This case is of great practical relevance, with many studies relying on some form of this assumption. The semiparametric efficiency bound has been calculated for this case (Jinyong Hahn 1998) and various semiparametric estimators have been proposed (Hahn 1998; Heckman, Hidehiko Ichimura, and Petra E. Todd 1998; Keisuke Hirano, Imbens, and Geert Ridder 2003; Xiaohong Chen, Han Hong, and Alessandro Tarozzi 2008; Imbens, Whitney K. Newey, and Ridder 2005; Alberto Abadie and Imbens 2006). We discuss the current state of this literature, and the practical recommendations coming out of it, in detail in this review.

Without unconfoundedness, there is no general approach to estimating treatment effects. Various methods have been proposed for special cases and, in this review, we

will discuss several of them. One approach (Rosenbaum and Rubin 1983b; Rosenbaum 1995) consists of sensitivity analyses, where robustness of estimates to specific limited departures from unconfoundedness are investigated. A second approach, developed by Manski (1990, 2003, 2007), consists of bounds analyses, where ranges of estimands consistent with the data and the limited assumptions the researcher is willing to make, are derived and estimated. A third approach, instrumental variables, relies on the presence of additional treatments, the so-called instruments, that satisfy specific exogeneity and exclusion restrictions. The formulation of this method in the context of the potential outcomes framework is presented in Imbens and Angrist (1994) and Angrist, Imbens, and Rubin (1996). A fourth approach applies to settings where, in its pure form, overlap is completely absent because the assignment is a deterministic function of covariates, but comparisons can be made exploiting continuity of average outcomes as a function of covariates. This setting, known as the regression discontinuity design, has a long tradition in statistics (see William R. Shadish, Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell 2002 and Cook 2008 for historical perspectives), but has recently been revived in the economics literature through work by Wilbert van der Klaauw (2002), Hahn, Todd, and van der Klaauw (2001), David S. Lee (2001), and Jack R. Porter (2003). Finally, a fifth approach, referred to as difference-in-differences, relies on the presence of additional data in the form of samples of treated and control units before and after the treatment. An early application is Ashenfelter and Card (1985). Recent theoretical work includes Abadie (2005), Bertrand, Duflo, and Mullainathan (2004), Stephen G. Donald and Kevin Lang (2007), and Susan Athey and Imbens (2006).

In this review, we will discuss in detail some of the new methods that have been developed in this literature. We will pay

particular attention to the practical issues raised by the implementation of these methods. At this stage, the literature has matured to the extent that it has much to offer the empirical researcher. Although the evaluation problem is one where identification problems are important, there is currently a much better understanding of which assumptions are most useful, as well as a better set of methods for inference given different sets of assumptions.

Most of this review will be limited to settings with binary treatments. This is in keeping with the literature, which has largely focused on binary treatment case. There are some extensions of these methods to multivalued, and even continuous, treatments (e.g., Imbens 2000; Michael Lechner 2001; Lechner and Ruth Miquel 2005; Richard D. Gill and James M. Robins 2001; Hirano and Imbens 2004), and some of these extensions will be discussed in the current review. But the work in this area is ongoing, and much remains to be done here.

The running example we will use throughout the paper is that of a job market training program. Such programs have been among the leading applications in the economics literature, starting with Ashenfelter (1978) and including LaLonde (1986) as a particularly influential study. In such settings, a number of individuals do, or do not enroll in a training program, with labor market outcomes, such as yearly earnings or employment status, as the main outcome of interest. An individual not participating in the program may have chosen not to do so, or may have been ineligible for various reasons. Understanding the choices made, and constraints faced, by the potential participants, is a crucial component of any analysis. In addition to observing participation status and outcome measures, we typically observe individual background characteristics, such as education levels and age, as well as information regarding prior labor market histories, such as earnings at various

levels of aggregation (e.g., yearly, quarterly, or monthly). In addition, we may observe some of the constraints faced by the individuals, including measures used to determine eligibility, as well as measures of general labor market conditions in the local labor markets faced by potential participants.

## 2. The Rubin Causal Model: Potential Outcomes, the Assignment Mechanism, and Interactions

In this section, we describe the essential elements of the modern approach to program evaluation, based on the work by Rubin. Suppose we wish to analyze a job training program using observations on  $N$  individuals, indexed by  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Some of these individuals were enrolled in the training program. Others were not enrolled, either because they were ineligible or chose not to enroll. We use the indicator  $W_i$  to indicate whether individual  $i$  enrolled in the training program, with  $W_i = 0$  if individual  $i$  did not, and  $W_i = 1$  if individual  $i$  did, enroll in the program. We use  $\mathbf{W}$  to denote the  $N$ -vector with  $i$ -th element equal to  $W_i$ , and  $N_0$  and  $N_1$  to denote the number of control and treated units, respectively. For each unit, we also observe a  $K$ -dimensional column vector of covariates or pretreatment variables,  $X_i$ , with  $\mathbf{X}$  denoting the  $N \times K$  matrix with  $i$ -th row equal to  $X_i'$ .

### 2.1 Potential Outcomes

The first element of the RCM is the notion of potential outcomes. For individual  $i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , we postulate the existence of two potential outcomes, denoted by  $Y_i(0)$  and  $Y_i(1)$ . The first,  $Y_i(0)$ , denotes the outcome that would be realized by individual  $i$  if he or she did not participate in the program. Similarly,  $Y_i(1)$  denotes the outcome that would be realized by individual  $i$  if he or she did participate in the program. Individual  $i$  can either participate or not participate in the program,

but not both, and thus only one of these two potential outcomes can be realized. Prior to the assignment being determined, both are potentially observable, hence the label potential outcomes. If individual  $i$  participates in the program,  $Y_i(1)$  will be realized and  $Y_i(0)$  will ex post be a counterfactual outcome. If, on the other hand individual  $i$  does not participate in the program,  $Y_i(0)$  will be realized and  $Y_i(1)$  will be the ex post counterfactual. We will denote the realized outcome by  $Y_i$ , with  $Y$  the  $N$ -vector with  $i$ -th element equal to  $Y_i$ . The preceding discussion implies that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &= Y_i(W_i) = Y_i(0) (1 - W_i) + Y_i(1) W_i \\ &= \begin{cases} Y_i(0) & \text{if } W_i = 0, \\ Y_i(1) & \text{if } W_i = 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The potential outcomes are tied to the specific manipulation that would have made one of them the realized outcome. The more precise the specification of the manipulation, the more well-defined the potential outcomes are.

This distinction between the pair of potential outcomes  $(Y_i(0), Y_i(1))$  and the realized outcome  $Y_i$  is the hallmark of modern statistical and econometric analyses of treatment effects. We offer some comments on it. The potential outcomes framework has important precursors in a variety of other settings. Most directly, in the context of randomized experiments, the potential outcome framework was introduced by Splawa-Neyman (1990) to derive the properties of estimators and confidence intervals under repeated sampling.

The potential outcomes framework also has important antecedents in econometrics. Specifically, it is interesting to compare the distinction between potential outcomes  $Y_i(0)$  and  $Y_i(1)$  and the realized outcome  $Y_i$  in Rubin's approach to Trygve Haavelmo's (1943) work on simultaneous equations models (SEMs). Haavelmo discusses identification of



supply and demand models. He makes a distinction between “any imaginable price  $\pi$ ” as the argument in the demand and supply functions,  $q^d(\pi)$  and  $q^s(\pi)$ , and the “actual price  $p$ ,” which is the observed equilibrium price satisfying  $q^s(p) = q^d(p)$ . The supply and demand functions play the same role as the potential outcomes in Rubin’s approach, with the equilibrium price similar to the realized outcome. Curiously, Haavelmo’s notational distinction between equilibrium and potential prices has gotten blurred in many textbook discussions of simultaneous equations. In such discussions, the starting point is often the general formulation  $\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{\Gamma} + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{U}$  for  $N \times M$  vectors of realized outcomes  $\mathbf{Y}$ ,  $N \times L$  matrices of exogenous covariates  $\mathbf{X}$ , and an  $N \times M$  matrix of unobserved components  $\mathbf{U}$ . A nontrivial byproduct of the potential outcomes approach is that it forces users of SEMs to articulate what the potential outcomes are, thereby leading to better applications of SEMs. A related point is made in Pearl (2000).

Another area where potential outcomes are used explicitly is in the econometric analyses of production functions. Similar to the potential outcomes framework, a production function  $g(x, \varepsilon)$  describes production levels that would be achieved for each value of a vector of inputs, some observed ( $x$ ) and some unobserved ( $\varepsilon$ ). Observed inputs may be chosen partly as a function of (expected) values of unobserved inputs. Only for the level of inputs actually chosen do we observe the level of the output. Potential outcomes are also used explicitly in labor market settings by A. D. Roy (1951). Roy models individuals choosing from a set of occupations. Individuals know what their earnings would be in each of these occupations and choose the occupation (treatment) that maximizes their earnings. Here we see the explicit use of the potential outcomes, combined with a specific selection/assignment mechanism, namely, choosing the treatment with the highest potential outcome.

The potential outcomes framework has a number of advantages over a framework based directly on realized outcomes. The first advantage of the potential outcome framework is that it allows us to define causal effects before specifying the assignment mechanism, and without making functional form or distributional assumptions. The most common definition of the causal effect at the unit level is as the difference  $Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$ , but we may wish to look at ratios  $Y_i(1)/Y_i(0)$ , or other functions. Such definitions do not require us to take a stand on whether the effect is constant or varies across the population. Further, defining individual-specific treatment effects using potential outcomes does not require us to assume endogeneity or exogeneity of the assignment mechanism. By contrast, the causal effects are more difficult to define in terms of the realized outcomes. Often, researchers write down a regression function  $Y_i = \alpha + \tau \cdot W_i + \varepsilon_i$ . This regression function is then interpreted as a structural equation, with  $\tau$  as the causal effect. Left unclear is whether the causal effect is constant or not, and what the properties of the unobserved component,  $\varepsilon_i$ , are. The potential outcomes approach separates these issues, and allows the researcher to first define the causal effect of interest without considering probabilistic properties of the outcomes or assignment.

The second advantage of the potential outcome approach is that it links the analysis of causal effects to explicit manipulations. Considering the two potential outcomes forces the researcher to think about scenarios under which each outcome could be observed, that is, to consider the kinds of experiments that could reveal the causal effects. Doing so clarifies the interpretation of causal effects. For illustration, consider a couple of recent examples from the economics literature. First, consider the causal effects of gender or ethnicity on outcomes of job applications. Simple comparisons of

economic outcomes by ethnicity are difficult to interpret. Are they the result of discrimination by employers, or are they the result of differences between applicants, possibly arising from discrimination at an earlier stage of life? Now, one can obtain unambiguous causal interpretations by linking comparisons to specific manipulations. A recent example is the study by Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004), who compare callback rates for job applications submitted with names that suggest African-American or Caucasian ethnicity. Their study has a clear manipulation—a name change—and therefore a clear causal effect. As a second example, consider some recent economic studies that have focused on causal effects of individual characteristics such as beauty (e.g., Daniel S. Hamermesh and Jeff E. Biddle 1994) or height. Do the differences in earnings by ratings on a beauty scale represent causal effects? One possible interpretation is that they represent causal effects of plastic surgery. Such a manipulation would make differences causal, but it appears unclear whether cross-sectional correlations between beauty and earnings in a survey from the general population represent causal effects of plastic surgery.

A third advantage of the potential outcome approach is that it separates the modeling of the potential outcomes from that of the assignment mechanism. Modeling the realized outcome is complicated by the fact that it combines the potential outcomes and the assignment mechanism. The researcher may have very different sources of information to bear on each. For example, in the labor market program example we can consider the outcome, say, earnings, in the absence of the program:  $Y_i(0)$ . We can model this in terms of individual characteristics and labor market histories. Similarly, we can model the outcome given enrollment in the program, again conditional on individual characteristics and labor market histories. Then finally we can

model the probability of enrolling in the program given the earnings in both treatment arms conditional on individual characteristics. This sequential modeling will lead to a model for the realized outcome, but it may be easier than directly specifying a model for the realized outcome.

A fourth advantage of the potential outcomes approach is that it allows us to formulate probabilistic assumptions in terms of potentially observable variables, rather than in terms of unobserved components. In this approach, many of the critical assumptions will be formulated as (conditional) independence assumptions involving the potential outcomes. Assessing their validity requires the researcher to consider the dependence structure if all potential outcomes were observed. By contrast, models in terms of realized outcomes often formulate the critical assumptions in terms of errors in regression functions. To be specific, consider again the regression function  $Y_i = \alpha + \tau \cdot W_i + \varepsilon_i$ . Typically (conditional independence) assumptions are made on the relationship between  $\varepsilon_i$  and  $W_i$ . Such assumptions implicitly bundle a number of assumptions, including functional-form assumptions and substantive exogeneity assumptions. This bundling makes the plausibility of these assumptions more difficult to assess.

A fifth advantage of the potential outcome approach is that it clarifies where the uncertainty in the estimators comes from. Even if we observe the entire (finite) population (as is increasingly common with the growing availability of administrative data sets)—so we can estimate population averages with no uncertainty—causal effects will be uncertain because for each unit at most one of the two potential outcomes is observed. One may still use super population arguments to justify approximations to the finite sample distributions, but such arguments are not required to motivate the existence of uncertainty about the causal effect.

## 2.2 The Assignment Mechanism

The second ingredient of the RCM is the assignment mechanism. This is defined as the conditional probability of receiving the treatment, as a function of potential outcomes and observed covariates. We distinguish three classes of assignment mechanisms, in order of increasing complexity of the required analysis.

The first class of assignment mechanisms is that of randomized experiments. In randomized experiments, the probability of assignment to treatment does not vary with potential outcomes, and is a known function of covariates. The leading case is that of a completely randomized experiment where, in a population of  $N$  units,  $N_1 < N$  randomly chosen units are assigned to the treatment and the remaining  $N_0 = N - N_1$  units are in the control group. There are important variations on this example, such as pairwise randomization, where initially units are matched in pairs, and in a second stage one unit in each pair is randomly assigned to the treatment. Another variant is a general stratified experiment, where randomization takes place within a finite number of strata. In any case, there are in practice few experiments in economics, and most of those are of the completely randomized experiment variety, so we shall limit our discussion to this type of experiment. It should be noted though that if one has the opportunity to design a randomized experiment, and if pretreatment variables are available, stratified experiments are at least as good as completely randomized experiments, and typically better, in terms of expected mean squared error, even in finite samples. See Imbens et al. (2008) for more details. The use of formal randomization has become more widespread in the social sciences in recent years, sometimes as a formal design for an evaluation and sometimes as an acceptable way of allocating scarce resources. The analysis of such experiments is often straightforward. In practice, however, researchers have typically limited themselves

to simple mean differences by assignment. Such analyses are valid, but often they are not the most powerful tools available to exploit the randomization. We discuss the analysis of randomized experiments, including more powerful randomization-based methods for inference, in section 4.

The second class of assignment mechanisms maintains the restriction that the assignment probabilities do not depend on the potential outcomes, or

$$W_i \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y_i(0), Y_i(1)) | X_i,$$

where  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B | C$  denotes conditional independence of  $A$  and  $B$  given  $C$ . However, in contrast to randomized experiments, the assignment probabilities are no longer assumed to be a known function of the covariates. The precise form of this critical assumption, not tied to functional form or distributional assumptions, was first presented in Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983b). Following Rubin (1990) we refer to this assignment mechanism as unconfounded assignment. Somewhat confusingly, this assumption, or variations on it, are in the literature also referred to by various other labels. These include selection on observables,<sup>2</sup> exogeneity,<sup>3</sup> and conditional

<sup>2</sup>Although Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd (1997, page 611) write that “In the language of Heckman and Robb (1985), matching assumes that selection is *on observables*” (their italics), the original definition in Heckman and Robb (1985, page 163) is not equivalent to unconfoundedness. In the context of a single cross-section version of their two equation selection model,  $Y = X_i'\beta + W_i\alpha + \varepsilon_i$  and  $W_i = 1(Z_i'\gamma + \nu_i > 0)$ , they define selection bias to refer to the case where  $E[\varepsilon_i W_i] \neq 0$ , and selection-on-observables to the case where selection bias is present and caused by correlation between  $\varepsilon_i$  and  $Z_i$ , rather than by correlation between  $\varepsilon_i$  and  $\nu_i$ .

<sup>3</sup>Although  $X_i$  is not exogenous for  $E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)]$ , according to the definitions in Robert F. Engle, David F. Hendry and Jean-Francois Richard (1983), because knowledge of its marginal distribution contains information about  $E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)]$ , standard usage of the term “exogenous” does appear to capture the notion of unconfoundedness, e.g., Manski et al. (1992), and Imbens (2004).



independence<sup>4</sup>. Although the analysis of data with such assignment mechanisms is not as straightforward as that of randomized experiments, there are now many practical methods available for this case. We review them in section 5.

The third class of assignment mechanisms contains all remaining assignment mechanisms with some dependence on potential outcomes.<sup>5</sup> Many of these create substantive problems for the analysis, for which there is no general solution. There are a number of special cases that are by now relatively well understood, and we discuss these in section 6. The most prominent of these cases are instrumental variables, regression discontinuity, and differences-in-differences. In addition, we discuss two general methods that also relax the unconfoundedness assumption but do not replace it with additional assumptions. The first relaxes the unconfoundedness assumption in a limited way and investigates the sensitivity of the estimates to such violations. The second drops the unconfoundedness assumption entirely and establishes bounds on estimands of interest. The latter is associated with the work by Manski (1990, 1995, 2007).

### 2.3 *Interactions and General Equilibrium Effects*

In most of the literature, it is assumed that treatments received by one unit do not affect

outcomes for another unit. Only the level of the treatment applied to the specific individual is assumed to potentially affect outcomes for that particular individual. In the statistics literature, this assumption is referred to as the Stable-Unit-Treatment-Value-Assumption (Rubin 1978). In this paper, we mainly focus on settings where this assumption is maintained. In the current section, we discuss some of the literature motivated by concerns about this assumption.

This lack-of-interaction assumption is very plausible in many biomedical applications. Whether one individual receives or does not receive a new treatment for a stroke or not is unlikely to have a substantial impact on health outcomes for any other individual. However, there are also many cases in which such interactions are a major concern and the assumption is not plausible. Even in the early experimental literature, with applications to the effect of various fertilizers on crop yields, researchers were cognizant of potential problems with this assumption. In order to minimize leaking of fertilizer applied to one plot into an adjacent plot experimenters used guard rows to physically separate the plots that were assigned different fertilizers. A different concern arises in epidemiological applications when the focus is on treatments such as vaccines for contagious diseases. In that case, it is clear that the vaccination of one unit can affect the outcomes of others in their proximity, and such effects are a large part of the focus of the evaluation.

In economic applications, interactions between individuals are also a serious concern. It is clear that a labor market program that affects the labor market outcomes for one individual potentially has an effect on the labor market outcomes for others. In a world with a fixed number of jobs, a training program could only redistribute the jobs, and ignoring this constraint on the number of jobs by using a partial, instead of a general, equilibrium analysis could lead one to

<sup>4</sup>E.g., Lechner 2001; A. Colin Cameron and Pravin K. Trivedi 2005.

<sup>5</sup>This includes some mechanisms where the dependence on potential outcomes does not create any problems in the analyses. Most prominent in this category are sequential assignment mechanisms. For example, one could randomly assign the first ten units to the treatment or control group with probability 1/2. From then on one could skew the assignment probability to the treatment with the most favorable outcomes so far. For example, if the active treatment looks better than the control treatment based on the first  $N$  units, then the  $(N + 1)$ th unit is assigned to the active treatment with probability 0.8 and vice versa. Such assignment mechanisms are not very common in economics settings, and we ignore them in this discussion.

erroneously conclude that extending the program to the entire population would raise aggregate employment. Such concerns have rarely been addressed in the recent program evaluation literature. Exceptions include Heckman, Lance Lochner, and Christopher Taber (1999) who provide some simulation evidence for the potential biases that may result from ignoring these issues.

In practice these general equilibrium effects may, or may not, be a serious problem. The indirect effect on one individual of exposure to the treatment of a few other units is likely to be much smaller than the direct effect of the exposure of the first unit itself. Hence, with most labor market programs both small in scope and with limited effects on the individual outcomes, it appears unlikely that general equilibrium effects are substantial and they can probably be ignored for most purposes.

One general solution to these problems is to redefine the unit of interest. If the interactions between individuals are at an intermediate level, say a local labor market, or a classroom, rather than global, one can analyze the data using the local labor market or classroom as the unit and changing the no-interaction assumption to require the absence of interactions among local labor markets or classrooms. Such aggregation is likely to make the no-interaction assumption more plausible, albeit at the expense of reduced precision.

An alternative solution is to directly model the interactions. This involves specifying which individuals interact with each other, and possibly relative magnitudes of these interactions. In some cases it may be plausible to assume that interactions are limited to individuals within well-defined, possibly overlapping groups, with the intensity of the interactions equal within this group. This would be the case in a world with a fixed number of jobs in a local labor market. Alternatively, it may be that interactions occur in broader groups but decline in importance

depending on some distance metric, either geographical distance or proximity in some economic metric.

The most interesting literature in this area views the interactions not as a nuisance but as the primary object of interest. This literature, which includes models of social interactions and peer effects, has been growing rapidly in the last decade, following the early work by Manski (1993). See Manski (2000a) and William Brock and Steven N. Durlauf (2000) for recent surveys. Empirical work includes Jeffrey R. Kling, Jeffrey B. Liebman, and Katz (2007), who look at the effect of households moving to neighborhoods with higher average socioeconomic status; Bruce I. Sacerdote (2001), who studies the effect of college roommate behavior on a student's grades; Edward L. Glaeser, Sacerdote, and Jose A. Scheinkman (1996), who study social interactions in criminal behavior; Anne C. Case and Lawrence F. Katz (1991), who look at neighborhood effects on disadvantaged youths; Bryan S. Graham (2008), who infers interactions from the effect of class size on the variation in grades; and Angrist and Lang (2004), who study the effect of desegregation programs on students' grades. Many identification and inferential questions remain unanswered in this literature.

### 3. *What Are We Interested In? Estimands and Hypotheses*

In this section, we discuss some of the questions that researchers have asked in this literature. A key feature of the current literature, and one that makes it more important to be precise about the questions of interest, is the accommodation of general heterogeneity in treatment effects. In contrast, in many early studies it was assumed that the effect of a treatment was constant, implying that the effect of various policies could be captured by a single parameter. The essentially unlimited heterogeneity in the effects of the

treatment allowed for in the current literature implies that it is generally not possible to capture the effects of all policies of interest in terms of a few summary statistics. In practice researchers have reported estimates of the effects of a few focal policies. In this section we describe some of these estimands. Most of these estimands are average treatment effects, either for the entire population or for some subpopulation, although some correspond to other features of the joint distribution of potential outcomes.

Most of the empirical literature has focused on estimation. Much less attention has been devoted to testing hypotheses regarding the properties or presence of treatment effects. Here we discuss null and alternative hypotheses that may be of interest in settings with heterogeneous effects. Finally, we discuss some of the recent literature on decision-theoretic approaches to program evaluation that ties estimands more closely to optimal policies.

### 3.1 *Average Treatment Effects*

The econometric literature has largely focused on average effects of the treatment. The two most prominent average effects are defined over an underlying population. In cases where the entire population can be sampled, population treatment effects rely on the notion of a superpopulation, where the current population that is available is viewed as just one of many possibilities. In either case, the the sample of size  $N$  is viewed as a random sample from a large (super-)population, and interest is in the average effect in the superpopulation.<sup>6</sup> The most popular treatment effect is the Population Average Treatment Effect (PATE), the population

expectation of the unit-level causal effect,  $Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$ :

$$\tau_{\text{PATE}} = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)].$$

If the policy under consideration would expose all units to the treatment or none at all, this is the most relevant quantity. Another popular estimand is the Population Average Treatment effect on the Treated (PATT), the average over the subpopulation of treated units:

$$\tau_{\text{PATT}} = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | W_i = 1].$$

In many observational studies,  $\tau_{\text{PATT}}$  is a more interesting estimand than the overall average effect. As an example, consider the case where a well defined population was exposed to a treatment, say a job training program. There may be various possibilities for a comparison group, including subjects drawn from public use data sets. In that case, it is generally not interesting to consider the effect of the program for the comparison group: for many members of the comparison group (e.g., individuals with stable, high-wage jobs) it is difficult and uninteresting to imagine their being enrolled in the labor market program. (Of course, the problem of averaging across units that are unlikely to receive future treatments can be mitigated by more carefully constructing the comparison group to be more like the treatment group, making  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  a more meaningful parameter. See the discussion below.) A second case where  $\tau_{\text{PATT}}$  is the estimand of most interest is in the setting of a voluntary program where those not enrolled will never be required to participate in the program. A specific example is the effect of serving in the military where an interesting question concerns the foregone earnings for those who served (Angrist 1998).

In practice, there is typically little motivation presented for the focus on the overall

<sup>6</sup>For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to random sampling. Some data sets are obtained by stratified sampling. Most of the estimators we consider can be adjusted for stratified sampling. See, for example, Wooldridge (1999, 2007) on inverse probability weighting of averages and objective functions.

average effect or the average effect for the treated. Take a job training program. The overall average effect would be the parameter of interest if the policy under consideration is a mandatory exposure to the treatment versus complete elimination. It is rare that these are the alternatives, with more typically exemptions granted to various subpopulations. Similarly the average effect for the treated would be informative about the effect of entirely eliminating the current program. More plausible regime changes would correspond to a modest extension of the program to other jurisdictions, or a contraction to a more narrow population.

A somewhat subtle issue is that we may wish to separate the extrapolation from the sample to the superpopulation from the problem of inference for the sample at hand. This suggests that, rather than focusing on PATE or PATT, we might first focus on the average causal effect conditional on the covariates in the sample,

$$\tau_{\text{CATE}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | X_i],$$

and, similarly, the average over the subsample of treated units:

$$\tau_{\text{CATT}} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i|W_i=1} E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | X_i].$$

If the effect of the treatment or intervention is constant ( $Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) = \tau$  for some constant  $\tau$ ), all four estimands,  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ ,  $\tau_{\text{PATT}}$ ,  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$ , and  $\tau_{\text{CATT}}$ , are obviously identical. However, if there is heterogeneity in the effect of the treatment, the estimands may all be different. The difference between  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  and  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$  (and between  $\tau_{\text{PATT}}$  and  $\tau_{\text{CATT}}$ ) is relatively subtle. Most estimators that are attractive for the population treatment effect are also attractive for the corresponding conditional average treatment effect, and vice versa. Therefore, we do not

have to be particularly concerned with the distinction between the two estimands at the estimation stage. However, there is an important difference between the population and conditional estimands at the inference stage. If there is heterogeneity in the effect of the treatment, we can estimate the sample average treatment effect  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$  more precisely than the population average treatment effect  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ . When one estimates the variance of an estimator  $\hat{\tau}$ —which can serve as an estimate for  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  or  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$ —one therefore needs to be explicit about whether one is interested in the variance relative to the population or to the conditional average treatment effect. We will return to this issue in section 5.

A more general class of estimands includes average causal effects for subpopulations and weighted average causal effects. Let  $\mathbb{A}$  be a subset of the covariate space  $\mathbb{X}$ , and let  $\tau_{\text{CATE}, \mathbb{A}}$  denote the conditional average causal effect for the subpopulation with  $X_i \in \mathbb{A}$ :

$$\tau_{\text{CATE}, \mathbb{A}} = \frac{1}{N_{\mathbb{A}}} \sum_{i: X_i \in \mathbb{A}} E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | X_i],$$

where  $N_{\mathbb{A}}$  is the number of units with  $X_i \in \mathbb{A}$ . Richard K. Crump et al. (2009) argue for considering such estimands. Their argument is not based on the intrinsic interest of these subpopulations. Rather, they show that such estimands may be much easier to estimate than  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$  (or  $\tau_{\text{CATT}}$ ). Instead of solely reporting an imprecisely estimated average effect for the overall population, they suggest it may be informative to also report a precise estimate for the average effect of some subpopulation. They then propose a particular set  $\mathbb{A}$  for which the average effect is most easily estimable. See section 5.10.2 for more details. The Crump et al. estimates would not necessarily have as much external validity as estimates for the overall population, but they may be much more informative for the sample at hand. In any case, in many instances the larger policy questions concern

extensions of the interventions or treatments to other populations, so that external validity may be elusive irrespective of the estimand.

In settings with selection on unobservables the enumeration of the estimands of interest becomes more complicated. A leading case is instrumental variables. In the presence of heterogeneity in the effect of the treatment one can typically not identify the average effect of the treatment even in the presence of valid instruments. There are two new approaches in the recent literature. One is to focus on bounds for well-defined estimands such as the average effect  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  or  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$ . Manski (1990, 2003) developed this approach in a series of papers. An alternative is to focus on estimands that can be identified under weaker conditions than those required for the average treatment effect. Imbens and Angrist (1994) show that one can, under much weaker conditions than required for identification of  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ , identify the average effect for the subpopulation of units whose treatment status is affected by the instrument. They refer to this subpopulation as the compliers. This does not directly fit into the classification above since the subpopulation is not defined solely in terms of covariates. We discuss this estimand in more detail in section 6.3.

### 3.2 *Quantile and Distributional Treatment Effects and Other Estimands*

An alternative class of estimands consists of quantile treatment effects. These have only recently been studied and applied in the economics literature, although they were introduced in the statistics literature in the 1970s. Kjell Doksum (1974) and Erich L. Lehmann (1974) define

$$(1) \quad \tau_q = F_{Y(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y(0)}^{-1}(q),$$

as the  $q$ -th quantile treatment effect. There are some important issues in interpreting these quantile treatment effects. First, note that these quantiles effects are defined as

differences between quantiles of the two marginal potential outcome distributions, and not as quantiles of the unit level effect,

$$(2) \quad \tilde{\tau}_q = F_{Y(1)-Y(0)}^{-1}(q).$$

In general, the quantile of the difference,  $\tilde{\tau}_q$ , differs from the difference in the quantiles,  $\tau_q$ , unless there is perfect rank correlation between the potential outcomes  $Y_i(0)$  and  $Y_i(1)$  (the leading case of this is the constant additive treatment effect). The quantile treatment effects,  $\tau_q$ , have received much more attention, and in our view rightly so, than the quantiles of the treatment effect,  $\tilde{\tau}_q$ . There are two issues regarding the choice between a focus on the difference in quantiles versus quantiles of the difference. The first issue is substantial. Suppose a policy maker is faced with the choice of assigning all members of a subpopulation, homogenous in covariates  $X_i$ , to the treatment group, or assigning all of them to the control group. The resulting outcome distribution is either  $f_{Y(0)}(y)$  or  $f_{Y(1)}(y)$ , assuming the subpopulation is large. Hence the choice should be governed by preferences of the policymaker over these distributions (which can often be summarized by differences in the quantiles), and not depend on aspects of the joint distribution  $f_{Y(0),Y(1)}(y,z)$  that do not affect the two marginal distributions. (See Heckman and Smith 1997 for a somewhat different view.) The second issue is statistical. In general the  $\tilde{\tau}_q$  are not (point-)identified without assumptions on the rank correlation between the potential outcomes, even with data from a randomized experiment. In a randomized experiment, one can identify  $f_{Y(0)}(y)$  and  $f_{Y(1)}(y)$  (and any functional thereof) but not the joint distribution  $f_{Y(0),Y(1)}(y,z)$ . Note that this issue does not arise if we look at average effects because the mean of the difference is equal to the difference of the means:  $E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)] = E[Y_i(1)] - E[Y_i(0)]$ .



A complication facing researchers interested in quantile treatment effects is that the difference in a marginal quantile,  $\tau_q$ , is in general not equal to the average difference in the conditional quantiles, where the latter are defined as

$$\tau_q(x) = F_{Y(1)|X}^{-1}(q|x) - F_{Y(0)|X}^{-1}(q|x).$$

In other words, even if we succeed in estimating  $\tau_q(x)$ , we cannot simply average  $\tau_q(X_i)$  across  $i$  to consistently estimate  $\tau_q$ . Marianne Bitler, Jonah Gelbach, and Hilary Hoynes (2006) estimate quantile treatment effects in a randomized evaluation of a job training program. Sergio Firpo (2007) develops methods for estimating  $\tau_q$  in observational studies given unconfoundedness. Abadie, Angrist, and Imbens (2002) and Victor Chernozhukov and Christian B. Hansen (2005) study quantile treatment effects in instrumental variables settings.

### 3.3 Testing

The literature on hypothesis testing in program evaluation is relatively limited. Most of the testing in applied work has focused on the null hypothesis that the average effect of interest is zero. Because many of the commonly used estimators for average treatment effects are asymptotically normally distributed with zero asymptotic bias, it follows that standard confidence intervals (the point estimate plus or minus a constant times the standard error) can be used for testing such hypotheses. However, there are other interesting hypotheses to consider.

One question of interest is whether there is any effect of the program, that is whether the distribution of  $Y_i(1)$  differs from that of  $Y_i(0)$ . This is equivalent to the hypothesis that not just the mean, but all moments, are identical in the two treatment groups. Abadie (2002) studies such tests in the settings with randomized experiments as well as settings with instrumental variables

using Kolmogorov-Smirnov type testing procedures.

A second set of questions concerns treatment effect heterogeneity. Even if the average effect is zero, it may be important to establish whether a targeted implementation of the intervention, with only those who can expect to benefit from the intervention assigned to it, could improve average outcomes. In addition, in cases where there is not sufficient information to obtain precise inferences for the average causal effect  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ , it may still be possible to establish whether there are any subpopulations with an average effect positive or different from zero, or whether there are subpopulations with an average effect exceeding some threshold. It may also be interesting to test whether there is any evidence of heterogeneity in the treatment effect by observable characteristics. This bears heavily on the question whether the estimands are useful for extrapolation to other populations which may differ in terms of some observable characteristics. Crump et al. (2008) study these questions in settings with unconfounded treatment assignment.

### 3.4 Decision-Theoretic Questions

Recently, a small but innovative literature has started to move away from the focus on summary statistics of the distribution of treatment effects or potential outcomes to directly address policies of interest. This is very much a literature in progress. Manski (2000b, 2001, 2002, 2004), Rajeev H. Dehejia (2005b), and Hirano and Porter (2008) study the problem faced by program administrators who can assign individuals to the active treatment or to the control group. These administrators have available two pieces of information. First, covariate information for these individuals, and second, information about the efficacy of the treatment based on a finite sample of other individuals for whom both outcome and covariate information is available. The administrator may care about

the entire distribution of outcomes, or solely about average outcomes, and may also take into account costs associated with participation. If the administrator knew exactly the conditional distribution of the potential outcomes given the covariate information this would be a simple problem: the administrator would simply compare the expected welfare for different rules and choose the one with the highest value. However, the administrator does not have this knowledge and needs to make a decision given uncertainty about these distributions. In these settings, it is clearly important that the statistical model allows for heterogeneity in the treatment effects.

Graham, Imbens, and Ridder (2006) extend the type of problems studied in this literature by incorporating resource constraints. They focus on problems that include as a special case the problem of allocating a fixed number of slots in a program to a set of individuals on the basis of observable characteristics of these individuals given a random sample of individuals for whom outcome and covariate information is available.

#### 4. *Randomized Experiments*

Experimental evaluations have traditionally been rare in economics. In many cases ethical considerations, as well as the reluctance of administrators to deny services to randomly selected individuals after they have been deemed eligible, have made it difficult to get approval for, and implement, randomized evaluations. Nevertheless, the few experiments that have been conducted, including some of the labor market training programs, have generally been influential, sometimes extremely so. More recently, many exciting and thought-provoking experiments have been conducted in development economics, raising new issues of design and analysis (see Duflo, Rachel Glennerster, and Kremer 2008 for a review).

With experimental data the statistical analysis is generally straightforward. Differencing average outcomes by treatment status or, equivalently, regressing the outcome on an intercept and an indicator for the treatment, leads to an unbiased estimator for the average effect of the treatment. Adding covariates to the regression function typically improves precision without jeopardizing consistency because the randomization implies that in large samples the treatment indicator and the covariates are independent. In practice, researchers have rarely gone beyond basic regression methods. In principle, however, there are additional methods that can be useful in these settings. In section 4.2, we review one important experimental technique, randomization-based inference, including Fisher's method for calculating exact  $p$ -values, that deserves wider usage in social sciences. See Rosenbaum (1995) for a textbook discussion.

##### 4.1 *Randomized Experiments in Economics*

Randomized experiments have a long tradition in biostatistics. In this literature they are often viewed as the only credible approach to establishing causality. For example, the United States Food and Drug Administration typically requires evidence from randomized experiments in order to approve new drugs and medical procedures. A first comment concerns the fact that even randomized experiments rely to some extent on substantive knowledge. It is only once the researcher is willing to limit interactions between units that randomization can establish causal effects. In settings with potentially unrestricted interactions between units, randomization by itself cannot solve the identification problems required for establishing causality. In biomedical settings, where such interaction effects are often arguably absent, randomized experiments are therefore particularly attractive. Moreover, in biomedical settings it is often possible to

keep the units ignorant of their treatment status, further enhancing the interpretation of the estimated effects as causal effects of the treatment, and thus improving the external validity.

In the economics literature randomization has played a much less prominent role. At various times social experiments have been conducted, but they have rarely been viewed as the sole method for establishing causality, and in fact they have sometimes been regarded with some suspicion concerning the relevance of the results for policy purposes (e.g., Heckman and Smith 1995; see Gary Burtless 1995 for a more positive view of experiments in social sciences). Part of this may be due to the fact that for the treatments of interest to economists, e.g., education and labor market programs, it is generally impossible to do blind or double-blind experiments, creating the possibility of placebo effects that compromise the internal validity of the estimates. Nevertheless, this suspicion often downplays the fact that many of the concerns that have been raised in the context of randomized experiments, including those related to missing data, and external validity, are often equally present in observational studies.

Among the early social experiments in economics were the negative income tax experiments in Seattle and Denver in the early 1970s, formally referred to as the Seattle and Denver Income Maintenance Experiments (SIME and DIME). In the 1980s, a number of papers called into question the reliability of econometric and statistical methods for estimating causal effects in observational studies. In particular, LaLonde (1986) and Fraker and Maynard (1987), using data from the National Supported Work (NSW) programs, suggested that widely used econometric methods were unable to replicate the results from experimental evaluations. These influential conclusions encouraged government agencies to insist on the inclusion of experimental evaluation components in job training programs.

Examples of such programs include the Greater Avenues to Independence (GAIN) programs (e.g., James Riccio and Daniel Friedlander 1992, the WIN programs (e.g., Judith M. Gueron and Edward Pauly 1991; Friedlander and Gueron 1992; Friedlander and Philip K. Robins 1995), the Self Sufficiency Project in Canada (Card and Dean R. Hyslop 2005, and Card and Robins 1996), and the Statistical Assistance for Programme Selection in Switzerland (Stefanie Behncke, Markus Frölich, and Lechner 2006). Like the NSW evaluation, these experiments have been useful not merely in establishing the effects of particular programs but also in providing fertile testing grounds for new statistical evaluations methods.

Recently there has been a large number of exciting and innovative experiments, mainly in development economics but also in others areas, including public finance (Duflo and Emmanuel Saez 2003; Duflo et al. 2006; Raj Chetty, Adam Looney, and Kory Kroft forthcoming). The experiments in development economics include many educational experiments (e.g., T. Paul Schultz 2001; Orazio Attanasio, Costas Meghir, and Ana Santiago 2005; Duflo and Rema Hanna 2005; Banerjee et al. 2007; Duflo 2001; Miguel and Kremer 2004). Others study topics as wide-ranging as corruption (Benjamin A. Olken 2007; Claudio Ferraz and Frederico Finan 2008) or gender issues in politics (Raghavendra Chattopadhyay and Duflo 2004). In a number of these experiments, economists have been involved from the beginning in the design of the evaluations, leading to closer connections between the substantive economic questions and the design of the experiments, thus improving the ability of these studies to lead to conclusive answers to interesting questions. These experiments have also led to renewed interest in questions of optimal design. Some of these issues are discussed in Duflo, Glennerster, and Kremer (2008), Miriam

Bruhn and David McKenzie (2008), and Imbens et al. (2008).

#### 4.2 Randomization-Based Inference and Fisher's Exact $P$ -Values

Fisher (1935) was interested in calculating  $p$ -values for hypotheses regarding the effect of treatments. The aim is to provide exact inferences for a finite population of size  $N$ . This finite population may be a random sample from a large superpopulation, but that is not exploited in the analysis. The inference is non-parametric in that it does not make functional form assumptions regarding the effects; it is exact in that it does not rely on large sample approximations. In other words, the  $p$ -values coming out of this analysis are exact and valid irrespective of the sample size.

The most common null hypothesis in Fisher's framework is that of no effect of the treatment for any unit in this population, against the alternative that, at least for some units, there is a non-zero effect:

$$H_0: Y_i(0) = Y_i(1), \forall i = 1, \dots, N,$$

against  $H_a: \exists i$  such that  $Y_i(0) \neq Y_i(1)$ .

It is not important that the null hypothesis is that the effects are all zero. What is essential is that the null hypothesis is sharp, that is, the null hypothesis specifies the value of all unobserved potential outcomes for each unit. A more general null hypothesis could be that  $Y_i(0) = Y_i(1) + c$  for some prespecified  $c$ , or that  $Y_i(0) = Y_i(1) + c_i$  for some set of prespecified  $c_i$ . Importantly, this framework cannot accommodate null hypotheses such as the average effect of the treatment is zero, against the alternative hypothesis of a non-zero average effect, or

$$H'_0: \frac{1}{N} \sum_i Y_i((1) - Y_i(0)) = 0,$$

against  $H'_a: \frac{1}{N} \sum_i Y_i((1) - Y_i(0)) \neq 0$ .

Whether the null of no effect for any unit versus the null of no effect on average is more interesting was the subject of a testy exchange between Fisher (who focused on the first) and Neyman (who thought the latter was the interesting hypothesis, and who stated that the first was only of academic interest) in Splawa-Neyman (1990). Putting the argument about its ultimate relevance aside, Fisher's test is a powerful tool for establishing whether a treatment has any effect. It is not essential in this framework that the probabilities of assignment to the treatment group are equal for all units. It is crucial, however, that the probability of any particular assignment vector is known. These probabilities may differ by unit provided the probabilities are known.

The implication of Fisher's framework is that, under the null hypothesis, we know the exact value of all the missing potential outcomes. Thus there are no nuisance parameters under the null hypothesis. As a result, we can deduce the distribution of any statistic, that is, any function of the realized values of  $(Y_i, W_i)_{i=1}^N$ , generated by the randomization. For example, suppose the statistic is the average difference between treated and control outcomes,  $T(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y}) = \bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0$ , where  $\bar{Y}_w = \sum_{i: W_i=w} Y_i / N_w$ , for  $w = 0, 1$ . Now suppose we had assigned a different set of units to the treatment. Denote the vector of alternative treatment assignments by  $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ . Under the null hypothesis we know all the potential outcomes and thus we can deduce what the value of the statistic would have been under that alternative assignment, namely  $T(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}, \mathbf{Y})$ . We can infer the value of the statistic for all possible values of the assignment vector  $\mathbf{W}$ , and since we know the distribution of  $\mathbf{W}$  we can deduce the distribution of  $T(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y})$ . The distribution generated by the randomization of the treatment assignment is referred to as the randomization distribution. The  $p$ -value of the statistic is then calculated as the probability of a value for the statistic that is at

least as large, in absolute value, as that of the observed statistic,  $T(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y})$ .

In moderately large samples, it is typically not feasible to calculate the exact  $p$ -values for these tests. In that case, one can approximate the  $p$ -value by basing it on a large number of draws from the randomization distribution. Here the approximation error is of a very different nature than that in typical large sample approximations: it is controlled by the researcher, and if more precision is desired one can simply increase the number of draws from the randomization distribution.

In the form described above, with the statistic equal to the difference in averages by treatment status, the results are typically not that different from those using Wald tests based on large sample normal approximations to the sampling distribution to the difference in means  $\bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0$ , as long as the sample size is moderately large. The Fisher approach to calculating  $p$ -values is much more interesting with other choices for the statistic. For example, as advocated by Rosenbaum in a series of papers (Rosenbaum 1984a, 1995), a generally attractive choice is the difference in average ranks by treatment status. First the outcome is converted into ranks (typically with, in case of ties, all possible rank orderings averaged), and then the test is applied using the average difference in ranks by treatment status as the statistic. The test is still exact, with its exact distribution under the null hypothesis known as the Wilcoxon distribution. Naturally, the test based on ranks is less sensitive to outliers than the test based on the difference in means.

If the focus is on establishing whether the treatment has some effect on the outcomes, rather than on estimating the average size of the effect, such rank tests are much more likely to provide informative conclusions than standard Wald tests based differences in averages by treatment status. To illustrate

this point, we took data from eight randomized evaluations of labor market programs. Four of the programs are from the WIN demonstration programs. The four evaluations took place in Arkansas, Baltimore, San Diego, and Virginia. See Gueron and Pauly (1991), Friedlander and Gueron (1992), David Greenberg and Michael Wiseman (1992), and Friedlander and Robins (1995) for more detailed discussions of each of these evaluations. The second set of four programs is from the GAIN programs in California. The four locations are Alameda, Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Diego. See Riccio and Friedlander (1992), Riccio, Friedlander, and Freedman (1994), and Dehejia (2003) for more details on these programs and their evaluations. In each location, we take as the outcome total earnings for the first (GAIN) or second (WIN) year following the program, and we focus on the subsample of individuals who had positive earnings at some point prior to the program. We calculate three  $p$ -values for each location. The first  $p$ -value is based on the normal approximation to the  $t$ -statistic calculated as the difference in average outcomes for treated and control individuals divided by the estimated standard error. The second  $p$ -value is based on randomization inference using the difference in average outcomes by treatment status. And the third  $p$ -value is based on the randomization distribution using the difference in average ranks by treatment status as the statistic. The results are in table 1.

In all eight cases, the  $p$ -values based on the  $t$ -test are very similar to those based on randomization inference. This outcome is not surprising given the reasonably large sample sizes, ranging from 71 (Arkansas, WIN) to 4,779 (San Diego, GAIN). However, in a number of cases, the  $p$ -value for the rank test is fairly different from that based on the level difference. In both sets of four locations there is one location where the rank test suggests a clear rejection at the



TABLE 1  
P-VALUES FOR FISHER EXACT TESTS: RANKS VERSUS LEVELS

Program	Location	Sample Size		<i>p</i> -values		
		Controls	Treated	<i>t</i> -test	FET (levels)	FET (ranks)
GAIN	Alameda	601	597	0.835	0.836	0.890
GAIN	Los Angeles	1400	2995	0.544	0.531	0.561
GAIN	Riverside	1040	4405	0.000	0.000	0.000
GAIN	San Diego	1154	6978	0.057	0.068	0.018
WIN	Arkansas	37	34	0.750	0.753	0.805
WIN	Baltimore	260	222	0.339	0.339	0.286
WIN	San Diego	257	264	0.136	0.137	0.024
WIN	Virginia	154	331	0.960	0.957	0.249

5 percent level whereas the level-based test would suggest that the null hypothesis of no effect should not be rejected at the 5 percent level. In the WIN (San Diego) evaluation, the *p*-value goes from 0.068 (levels) to 0.024 (ranks), and in the GAIN (San Diego) evaluation, the *p*-value goes from 0.136 (levels) to 0.018 (ranks). It is not surprising that the tests give different results. Earnings data are very skewed. A large proportion of the populations participating in these programs have zero earnings even after conditioning on positive past earnings, and the earnings distribution for those with positive earnings is skewed. In those cases, a rank-based test is likely to have more power against alternatives that shift the distribution toward higher earnings than tests based on the difference in means.

As a general matter it would be useful in randomized experiments to include such results for rank-based *p*-values, as a generally applicable way of establishing whether the treatment has any effect. As with all omnibus tests, one should use caution in interpreting a rejection, as the test can pick up interesting changes in the distribution (such as a mean or median effect) but also less interesting changes (such as higher moments about the mean).

## 5. Estimation and Inference under Unconfoundedness

Methods for estimation of average treatment effects under unconfoundedness are the most widely used in this literature. The central paper in this literature, which introduces the key assumptions, is Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983b), although the literature goes further back (e.g., William G. Cochran 1968; Cochran and Rubin 1973; Rubin 1977). Often the unconfoundedness assumption, which requires that conditional on observed covariates there are no unobserved factors that are associated both with the assignment and with the potential outcomes, is controversial. Nevertheless, in practice, where often data have been collected in order to make this assumption more plausible, there are many cases where there is no clearly superior alternative, and the only alternative is to abandon the attempt to get precise inferences. In this section, we discuss some of these methods and the issues related to them. A general theme of this literature is that the concern is more with biases than with efficiency.

Among the many recent economic applications relying on assumptions of this type are Blundell et al. (2001), Angrist (1998), Card and Hyslop (2005), Card and Brian P.

McCall (1996), V. Joseph Hotz, Imbens, and Jacob A. Klerman (2006), Card and Phillip B. Levine (1994), Card, Carlos Dobkin, and Nicole Maestas (2004), Hotz, Imbens, and Julie H. Mortimer (2005), Lechner (2002a), Abadie and Javier Gardeazabal (2003), and Bloom (2005).

This setting is closely related to that underlying standard multiple regression analysis with a rich set of controls. See, for example, Burt S. Barnow, Glend G. Cain, and Arthur S. Goldberger (1980). Unconfoundedness implies that we have a sufficiently rich set of predictors for the treatment indicator, contained in the vector of covariates  $X_i$ , such that adjusting for differences in these covariates leads to valid estimates of causal effects. Combined with linearity assumptions of the conditional expectations of the potential outcomes given covariates, the unconfoundedness assumption justifies linear regression. But in the last fifteen years the literature has moved away from the earlier emphasis on regression methods. The main reason is that, although locally linearity of the regression functions may be a reasonable approximation, in many cases the estimated average treatment effects based on regression methods can be severely biased if the linear approximation is not accurate globally. To assess the potential problems with (global) regression methods, it is useful to report summary statistics of the covariates by treatment status. In particular, one may wish to report, for each covariate, the difference in averages by treatment status, scaled by the square root of the sum of the variances, as a scale-free measure of the difference in distributions. To be specific, one may wish to report the normalized difference

$$(3) \quad \Delta_X = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_0}{\sqrt{S_0^2 + S_1^2}},$$

where for  $w = 0, 1$ ,  $S_w^2 = \sum_{i:W_i=w} (X_i - \bar{X}_w)^2 / (N_w - 1)$ , the sample variance of  $X_i$

in the subsample with treatment  $W_i = w$ . Imbens and Rubin (forthcoming) suggest as a rule of thumb that with a normalized difference exceeding one quarter, linear regression methods tend to be sensitive to the specification. Note the difference with the often reported  $t$ -statistic for the null hypothesis of equal means,

$$(4) \quad T = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_0}{\sqrt{S_0^2/N_0 + S_1^2/N_1}}.$$

The reason for focusing on the normalized difference, (3), rather than on the  $t$ -statistic, (4), as a measure of the degree of difficulty in the statistical problem of adjusting for differences in covariates, comes from their relation to the sample size. Clearly, simply increasing the sample size does not make the problem of inference for the average treatment effect inherently more difficult. However, quadrupling the sample size leads, in expectation, to a doubling of the  $t$ -statistic. In contrast, increasing the sample size does not systematically affect the normalized difference. In the landmark LaLonde (1986) paper the normalized difference in mean exceeds unity for many of the covariates, immediately showing that standard regression methods are unlikely to lead to credible results for those data, even if one views unconfoundedness as a reasonable assumption.

As a result of the concerns with the sensitivity of results based on linear regression methods to seemingly minor changes in specification, the literature has moved to more sophisticated methods for adjusting for differences in covariates. Some of these more sophisticated methods use the propensity score—the conditional probability of receiving the treatment—in various ways. Others rely on pairwise matching of treated units to control units, using values of the covariates to match. Although these estimators appear at first sight to be quite different, many (including

nonparametric versions of the regression estimators) in fact achieve the semiparametric efficiency bound; thus, they would tend to be similar in large samples. Choices among them typically rely on small sample arguments, which are rarely formalized, and which do not uniformly favor one estimator over another. Most estimators currently in use can be written as the difference of a weighted average of the treated and control outcomes, with the weights in both groups adding up to one:

$$\hat{\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \cdot Y_i, \quad \text{with } \sum_{i:W_i=1} \lambda_i = 1, \\ \sum_{i:W_i=0} \lambda_i = -1.$$

The estimators differ in the way the weights  $\lambda_i$  depend on the full vector of assignments and matrix of covariates (including those of other units). For example, some estimators implicitly allow the weights to be negative for the treated units and positive for controls units, whereas others do not. In addition, some depend on essentially all other units whereas others depend only on units with similar covariate values. Nevertheless, despite the commonalities of the estimators and large sample equivalence results, in practice the performance of the estimators can be quite different, particularly in terms of robustness and bias. Little is known about finite sample properties. The few simulation studies include Zhong Zhao (2004), Frölich (2004a), and Matias Busso, John DiNardo, and Justin McCrary (2008). On a more positive note, some understanding has been reached regarding the sensitivity of specific estimators to particular configurations of the data, such as limited overlap in covariate distributions. Currently, the best practice is to combine linear regression with either propensity score or matching methods in ways that explicitly rely on local, rather than global, linear approximations to the regression functions.

An ongoing discussion concerns the role of the propensity score,  $e(x) = \text{pr}(W_i = 1 | X_i = x)$ , introduced by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983b), and indeed whether there is any role for this concept. See for recent contributions to this discussion Hahn (1998), Imbens (2004), Angrist and Hahn (2004), Peter C. Austin (2008a, 2008b), Dehejia (2005a), Smith and Todd (2001, 2005), Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd (1998), Frölich (2004a, 2004b), B. B. Hansen (2008), Jennifer Hill (2008), Robins and Ya'acov Ritov (1997), Rubin (1997, 2006), and Elizabeth A. Stuart (2008).

In this section, we first discuss the key assumptions underlying an analysis based on unconfoundedness. We then review some of the efficiency bound results for average treatment effects. Next, in sections 5.3 to 5.5, we briefly review the basic methods relying on regression, propensity score methods, and matching. Although still fairly widely used, we do not recommend these methods in practice. In sections 5.6 to 5.8, we discuss three of the combination methods that we view as more attractive and recommend in practice. We discuss estimating variances in section 5.9. Next we discuss implications of lack of overlap in the covariate distributions. In particular, we discuss two general methods for constructing samples with improved covariate balance, both relying heavily on the propensity score. In section 5.11, we describe methods that can be used to assess the plausibility of the unconfoundedness assumption, even though this assumption is not directly testable. We discuss methods for testing for the presence of average treatment effects and for the presence of treatment effect heterogeneity under unconfoundedness in section 5.12.

### 5.1 Identification

The key assumption is unconfoundedness, introduced by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983b),

*Assumption 1* (Unconfoundedness)

$$W_i \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y_i(0), Y_i(1)) \mid X_i.$$

The unconfoundedness assumption is often controversial, as it assumes that beyond the observed covariates  $X_i$  there are no (unobserved) characteristics of the individual associated both with the potential outcomes and the treatment.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, this kind of assumption is used routinely in multiple regression analysis. In fact, suppose we assume that the treatment effect,  $\tau$ , is constant, so that, for each random draw  $i$ ,  $\tau = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$ . Further, assume that  $Y_i(0) = \alpha + \beta' X_i + \varepsilon_i$ , where  $\varepsilon_i = Y_i(0) - E[Y_i(0) \mid X_i]$  is the residual capturing the unobservables affecting the response in the absence of treatment. Then, with the observed outcome defined as  $Y_i = (1 - W_i) \cdot Y_i(0) + W_i \cdot Y_i(1)$ , we can write

$$Y_i = \alpha + \tau \cdot W_i + \beta' X_i + \varepsilon_i,$$

and unconfoundedness is equivalent to independence of  $\varepsilon_i$  and of  $W_i$ , conditional on  $X_i$ . Imbens (2004) discusses some economic models that imply unconfoundedness. These models assume agents choose to participate in a program if the benefits, equal to the difference in potential outcomes, exceed the costs associated with participation. It is important here that there is a distinction between the objective of the participant (net benefits), and the outcome that is the focus of the researcher (gross benefits). (See Athey and Scott Stern 1998 for some discussion.) Unconfoundedness is implied by independence of the costs and benefits, conditional on observed covariates.

<sup>7</sup>Unconfoundedness generally fails if the covariates themselves are affected by treatment. Wooldridge (2005) provides a simple example where treatment is randomized with respect to the counterfactual outcomes but not with respect to the covariates. Unconfoundedness is easily shown to fail.

The second assumption used to identify treatment effects is that for all possible values of the covariates, there are both treated and control units.

*Assumption 2* (Overlap)

$$0 < \text{pr}(W_i = 1 \mid X_i = x) < 1, \quad \text{for all } x.$$

We call this the overlap assumption as it implies that the support of the conditional distribution of  $X_i$  given  $W_i = 0$  overlaps completely with that of the conditional distribution of  $X_i$  given  $W_i = 1$ .

With a random sample  $(W_i, X_i)_{i=1}^N$  we can estimate the propensity score  $e(x) = \text{pr}(W_i = 1 \mid X_i = x)$ , and this can provide some guidance for determining whether the overlap assumption holds. Of course common parametric models, such as probit and logit, ensure that all estimated probabilities are strictly between zero and one, and so examining the fitted probabilities from such models can be misleading. We discuss approaches for improving overlap in 5.10.

The combination of unconfoundedness and overlap was referred to by Rosenbaum and Rubin's (1983b) as strong ignorability. There are various ways to establish identification of various average treatment effects under strong ignorability. Perhaps the easiest is to note that  $\tau(x) \equiv E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) \mid X_i = x]$  is identified for  $x$  in the support of the covariates:

$$\begin{aligned} (5) \quad \tau(x) &= E[Y_i(1) \mid X_i = x] - E[Y_i(0) \mid X_i = x] \\ &= E[Y_i(1) \mid W_i = 1, X_i = x] \\ &\quad - E[Y_i(0) \mid W_i = 0, X_i = x] \\ &= E[Y_i \mid W_i = 1, X_i = x] \\ &\quad - E[Y_i \mid W_i = 0, X_i = x], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows by unconfoundedness:  $E[Y_i(w) | W_i = w, X_i]$  does not depend on  $w$ . By the overlap assumption, we can estimate both terms in the last line, and therefore we can identify  $\tau(x)$ . Given that we can identify  $\tau(x)$  for all  $x$ , we can identify the expected value across the population distribution of the covariates,

$$(6) \quad \tau_{\text{PATE}} = E[\tau(X_i)],$$

as well as  $\tau_{\text{PATT}}$  and other estimands.

## 5.2 Efficiency Bounds

Before discussing specific estimation methods, it is useful to see what we can learn about the parameters of interest, given just the strong ignorability of treatment assignment assumption, without functional form or distributional assumptions. In order to do so, we need some additional notation. Let  $\sigma_0^2(x) = \mathbb{V}(Y_i(0) | X_i = x)$  and  $\sigma_1^2(x) = \mathbb{V}(Y_i(1) | X_i = x)$  denote the conditional variances of the potential outcomes given the covariates. Hahn (1998) derives the lower bounds for asymptotic variances of  $\sqrt{N}$ -consistent estimators for  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  as

$$(7) \quad \mathbb{V}_{\text{PATE}} = E \left[ \frac{\sigma_1^2(X_i)}{e(X_i)} + \frac{\sigma_0^2(X_i)}{1 - e(X_i)} + (\tau(X_i) - \tau)^2 \right],$$

where  $p = E[e(X_i)]$  is the unconditional treatment probability. Interestingly, this lower bound holds irrespective of whether the propensity score is known or not. The form of this variance bound is informative. It is no surprise that  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  is more difficult to estimate the larger are the variances  $\sigma_0^2(x)$  and  $\sigma_1^2(x)$ . However, as shown by the presence of the third term, it is also more difficult to estimate  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ , the more variation there is in the average treatment effect conditional on the covariates. If we focus instead on estimating  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$ , the conditional average treatment

effect, the third term drops out, and the variance bound for  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$  is

$$(8) \quad \mathbb{V}_{\text{CATE}} = E \left[ \frac{\sigma_1^2(X_i)}{e(X_i)} + \frac{\sigma_0^2(X_i)}{1 - e(X_i)} \right].$$

Still, the role of heterogeneity in the treatment effect is potentially important. Suppose we actually had prior knowledge that the average treatment effect conditional on the covariates is constant, or  $\tau(x) = \tau_{\text{PATE}}$  for all  $x$ . Given this assumption, the model is closely related to the partial linear model (Peter M. Robinson 1988; James H. Stock 1989). Given this prior knowledge, the variance bound is

$$(9) \quad \mathbb{V}_{\text{const}} = \left( E \left[ \left( \frac{\sigma_1^2(X_i)}{e(X_i)} + \frac{\sigma_0^2(X_i)}{1 - e(X_i)} \right)^{-1} \right] \right)^{-1}.$$

This variance bound can be much lower than (8) if there is variation in the propensity score. Knowledge of lack of variation in the treatment effect can be very valuable, or, conversely, allowing for general heterogeneity in the treatment effect can be expensive in terms of precision.

In addition to the conditional variances of the counterfactual outcomes, a third important determinant of the efficiency bound is the propensity score. Because it enters into (7) in the denominator, the presence of units with the propensity score close to zero or one will make it difficult to obtain precise estimates of the average effect of the treatment. One approach to address this problem, developed by Crump et al. (2009) and discussed in more detail in section 5.10, is to drop observations with the propensity score close to zero and one, and focus on the average effect of the treatment in the subpopulation with propensity scores away from zero. Suppose we focus on  $\tau_{\text{CATE}, \mathbb{A}}$ , the average of  $\tau(X_i)$  for  $X_i \in \mathbb{A}$ . Then the variance bound is



$$(10) \quad \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{A}} = \frac{1}{\text{pr}(X_i \in \mathbb{A})} \\ \times E \left[ \frac{\sigma_1^2(X_i)}{e(X_i)} + \frac{\sigma_0^2(X_i)}{1 - e(X_i)} \mid (X_i) \in \mathbb{A} \right],$$

By excluding from the set  $\mathbb{A}$  subsets of the covariate space where the propensity score is close to zero or one, we may be able to estimate  $\tau_{\text{CATE}, \mathbb{A}}$  more precisely than  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$ . (If we are instead interested in  $\tau_{\text{CATT}}$ , we only need to worry about covariate values where  $e(x)$  is close to one.)

Having displayed these lower bounds on variances for the average treatment effects, a natural question is: Are there estimators that achieve these lower bounds that do not require parametric models or functional form restrictions on either the conditional means or the propensity score?<sup>9</sup> The answer in general is yes, and we now consider different classes of estimators in turn.

### 5.3 Regression Methods

To describe the general approach to regression methods for estimating average treatment effects, define  $\mu_0(x)$  and  $\mu_1(x)$  to be the two regression functions for the potential outcomes:

$$\mu_0(x) = E[Y_i(0) \mid X_i = x]$$

and

$$\mu_1(x) = E[Y_i(1) \mid X_i = x].$$

By definition, the average treatment effect conditional on  $X = x$  is  $\tau(x) = \mu_1(x) - \mu_0(x)$ . As we discussed in the identification subsection, under the unconfoundedness assumption,  $\mu_0(x) = E[Y_i \mid W_i = 0, X_i = x]$  and  $\mu_1(x) = E[Y_i \mid W_i = 1, X_i = x]$ , which means we can estimate  $\mu_0(\cdot)$  using regression methods for the untreated subsample and  $\mu_1(\cdot)$  using the treated subsample. Given consistent estimators  $\hat{\mu}_0(\cdot)$  and  $\hat{\mu}_1(\cdot)$ , a consistent estimator for either  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  or  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$  is

$$(11) \quad \hat{\tau}_{\text{reg}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{\mu}_1(X_i) - \hat{\mu}_0(X_i)).$$

Given parametric models for  $\mu_0(\cdot)$  and  $\mu_1(\cdot)$ , estimation and inference are straightforward.<sup>8</sup> In the simplest case, we assume each conditional mean can be expressed as functions linear in parameters, say

$$(12) \quad \mu_0(x) = \alpha_0 + \beta'_0(x - \psi_X),$$

$$\mu_1(x) = \alpha_1 + \beta'_1(x - \psi_X),$$

where we take deviations from the overall population covariate mean  $\psi_X$  so that the treatment effect is the difference in intercepts. (Naturally, as in any regression context, we can replace  $x$  with general functions of  $x$ .) Of course, we rarely know the population mean of the covariates, so in estimation we replace  $\psi_X$  with the sample average across all units,  $\bar{X}$ . Then  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{reg}}$  is simply

$$(13) \quad \hat{\tau}_{\text{reg}} = \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_0.$$

This estimator is also obtained from the coefficient on the treatment indicator  $W_i$  in the regression  $Y_i$  on 1,  $W_i$ ,  $X_i$ ,  $W_i \cdot (X_i - \bar{X})$ . Standard errors can be obtained from standard least square regression output. (As we show below, in the case of estimating  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ , the usual standard error, whether or not it is made robust to heteroskedasticity, ignores the estimation error in  $\bar{X}$  as an estimator of  $\psi_X$ ; technically, the conventional

<sup>8</sup>There is a somewhat subtle issue in estimating treatment effects from stratified samples or samples with missing values of the covariates. If the missingness or stratification are determined by outcomes on the covariates,  $X_i$ , and the conditional means are correctly specified, then the missing data or stratification can be ignored for the purposes of estimating the regression parameters; see, for example, Wooldridge (1999, 2007). However, sample selection or stratification based on  $X_i$  cannot be ignored in estimating, say,  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ , because  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  equals the expected difference in regression functions across the population distribution of  $X_i$ . Therefore, consistent estimation of  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  requires applying inverse probability weights or sampling weights to the average in (11).

standard error is only valid for  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$  and not for  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ .)

A different representation of  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{reg}}$  is useful in order to illustrate some of the concerns with regression estimators in this setting. Suppose we do use the linear model in (12). It can be shown that

$$(14) \quad \hat{\tau}_{\text{reg}} = \bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0 - \left( \frac{N_0}{N_0 + N_1} \cdot \hat{\beta}_1 + \frac{N_1}{N_0 + N_1} \cdot \hat{\beta}_0 \right) (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_0).$$

To adjust for differences in covariates between treated and control units, the simple difference in average outcomes,  $\bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0$ , is adjusted by the difference in average covariates,  $\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_0$ , multiplied by the weighted average of the regression coefficients  $\hat{\beta}_0$  and  $\hat{\beta}_1$  in the two treatment regimes. This is a useful representation. It shows that if the averages of the covariates in the two treatment arms are very different, then the adjustment to the simple mean difference can be large. We can see that even more clearly by inspecting the predicted outcome for the treated units had they been subject to the control treatments:

$$\hat{E}[Y_i(1) | W_i = 0] = \bar{Y}_0 + \hat{\beta}_0' (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_0).$$

The regression parameter  $\hat{\beta}_0$  is estimated on the control sample, where the average of the covariates is equal to  $\bar{X}_0$ . It therefore likely provides a good approximation to the conditional mean function around that value. However, this estimated regression function is then used to predict outcomes in the treated sample, where the average of the covariates is equal to  $\bar{X}_1$ . If these covariate averages are very different, and thus the regression model is used to predict outcomes far away from where the parameters were estimated, the results can be sensitive to minor changes in the specification. Unless the

linear approximation to the regression function is globally accurate, regression may lead to severe biases. Another way of interpreting this problem is as a multicollinearity problem. If the averages of the covariates in the two treatment arms are very different, the correlation between the covariates and the treatment indicator is relatively high. Although conventional least squares standard errors take the degree of multicollinearity into account, they do so conditional on the specification of the regression function. Here the concern is that any misspecification may be exacerbated by the collinearity problem. As noted in the introduction to section 5, an easy way to establish the severity of this problem is to inspect the normalized differences  $(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_0) / \sqrt{S_0^2 + S_1^2}$ .

In the case of the standard regression estimator it is straightforward to derive and to estimate the variance when we view the estimator as an estimator of  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$ . Assuming the linear regression model is correctly specified, we have

$$(15) \quad \sqrt{N}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{reg}} - \tau_{\text{CATE}}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, V_0 + V_1),$$

$$\text{where } V_w = N \cdot E[(\hat{\alpha}_w - \alpha_w)^2],$$

which can be obtained directly from standard regression output. Estimating the variance when we view the estimator as an estimator of  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  requires adding a term capturing the variation in the treatment effect conditional on the covariates. The form is then

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{reg}} - \tau_{\text{CATE}}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, V_0 + V_1 + V_\tau),$$

where the third term in the normalized variance is

$$V_\tau = (\beta_1 - \beta_0)'$$

$$E[(X_i - E[X_i])(X_i - E[X_i])](\beta_1 - \beta_0),$$

which can be estimated as

$$\hat{V}_\tau = (\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_0)' \\ \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \bar{X})(X_i - \bar{X})(\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_0).$$

In practice, this additional term is rarely incorporated, and researcher instead report the variance corresponding to  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$ . In cases where the slope coefficients do not differ substantially across the two regimes—equivalently, the coefficients on the interaction terms  $W_i \cdot (X_i - \bar{X})$  are “small”—this last term is likely to be swamped by the variances in (15).

In many cases, researchers have sought to go beyond simple parametric models for the regression functions. Two general directions have been explored. The first relies on local smoothing, and the second on increasingly flexible global approximations. We discuss both in turn.

Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd (1997) and Heckman et al. (1998) consider local smoothing methods to estimate the two regression functions. The first method they consider is kernel regression. Given a kernel  $K(\cdot)$ , and a bandwidth  $h$ , the kernel estimator for  $\mu_w(x)$  is

$$\hat{\mu}_w(x) = \sum_{i:W_i=w} Y_i \cdot \lambda_i, \text{ with weight} \\ \lambda_i = K\left(\frac{X_i - x}{h}\right) / \sum_{i:W_i=w} K\left(\frac{X_i - x}{h}\right).$$

Although the rate of convergence of the kernel estimator to the regression function is slower than the conventional parametric rate  $N^{-1/2}$ , the rate of convergence of the implied estimator for the average treatment effect,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{reg}}$  in (11), is the regular parametric rate under regularity conditions. These conditions include smoothness of the regression functions and require the use of higher order kernels (with the order of the kernel depending on the dimension of the covariates). In

practice, researchers have not used higher order kernels and, with positive kernels, the bias for kernel estimators is a more severe problem than for the matching estimators discussed in section 5.5.

Kernel regression of this type can be interpreted as locally fitting a constant regression function. A general alternative is to fit locally a polynomial regression function. The leading case of this is local linear regression (J. Fan and I. Gijbels 1996), applied to estimation of average treatment effects by Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd (1997) and Heckman et al. (1998). Define  $\hat{\alpha}(x)$  and  $\hat{\beta}(x)$  as the local least squares estimates, based on locally fitting a linear regression function:

$$(\hat{\alpha}(x), \hat{\beta}(x)) = \arg \min_{\alpha, \beta} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \\ \times (Y_i - \alpha - \beta'(X_i - x))^2,$$

with the same weights  $\lambda_i$  as in the standard kernel estimator. The regression function at  $x$  is then estimated as  $\hat{\mu}(x) = \hat{\alpha}(x)$ . In order to achieve convergence at the best possible rate for  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{reg}}$ , one needs to use higher order kernels, although the order required is less than that for the standard kernel estimator.

For both the standard kernel estimator and the local linear estimator an important choice is that of the bandwidth  $h$ . In practice, researchers have used ad hoc methods for bandwidth selection. Formal results on bandwidth selection from the literature on nonparametric regression are not directly applicable. Those results are based on minimizing a global criterion such as the expected value of the squared difference between the estimated and true regression function, with the expectation taken with respect to the marginal distribution of the covariates. Thus, they focus on estimating the regression function well everywhere. Here the focus is on a particular scalar functional of the regression function, and it is not clear whether the

conventional methods for bandwidth choices have good properties.

Although formal results are given for the case with continuous regressors, modifications have been developed that allows for both continuous and discrete covariates (Jeffrey S. Racine and Qi Li 2004). All such methods require choosing the degree of smoothing (often known as bandwidths), and there has not been much work on choosing bandwidths for the particular problem of estimating average treatment effects where the parameter of interest is effectively the average of a regression function, and not the entire function. See Imbens (2004) for more discussion. Although the estimators based on local smoothing have not been shown to attain the variance efficiency bound, it is likely that they can be constructed to do so under sufficient smoothness conditions.

An alternative to local smoothing methods are global smoothing methods, such as series or sieve estimators. Such estimators are parametric for a given sample size, with the number of parameters and the flexibility of the model increasing with the sample size. One attraction of such methods is that often estimation and inference can proceed as if the model is completely parametric. The amount of smoothing is determined by the number of terms in the series, and the large-sample analysis is carried out with the number of terms growing as a function of the sample size. Again, little is known about how to choose the number of terms when interest lies in average treatment effects. For the average treatment case, Hahn (1998), Imbens, Newey, and Ridder (2005), Andrea Rotnitzky and Robins (1995), and Chen, Hong, and Tarozi (2008) have developed estimators of this type. Hahn shows that estimators in this class can achieve the variance lower bounds for estimating  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ . For a simple version of such an estimator, suppose that  $X_i$  is a scalar. Then we can approximate  $\mu_w(x)$  by a  $K$ -th order polynomial

$$\mu_{w,K}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^K \beta_{w,k} \cdot x^k.$$

We then estimate  $\beta_{w,k}$  by least squares regression, and estimate the average treatment effect using (11). This is a special case of the estimator discussed in Imbens, Newey, and Ridder (2005) and Chen, Hong, and Tarozi (2008), with formal results presented for the case with general  $X_i$ . Imbens, Newey, and Ridder (2005) also discuss methods for choosing the number of terms in the series based on expected squared error for the average treatment effect.

If the outcome is binary or more generally of a limited dependent variable form, a linear series approximation to the regression function is not necessarily attractive. It is likely that one can use increasingly flexible approximations based on models that exploit the structure of the outcome data. For the case with binary outcomes, Hirano, Imbens, and Ridder (2003) show how using a polynomial approximation to the log odds ratio leads to an attractive estimator for the conditional mean. See Chen (2007) for general discussion of such models. One can imagine that, in cases with nonnegative response variables, exponential regression functions, or those derived from specific models, such as Tobit (when the response can pile up at zero), combined with polynomial approximations in the linear index function, might be useful.

Generally, methods based on global approximations suffer from the same drawbacks as linear regression. If the covariate distributions are substantially different in both treatment groups, estimates based on such methods rely, perhaps more than is desired, on extrapolation. Using these methods in cases with substantial differences in covariate distributions is therefore not recommended (except possibly in cases where the sample has been trimmed so that the covariates across the two treatment regimes have considerable overlap).

Before we turn to propensity score methods, we should comment on estimating the average treatment effects on the treated,  $\tau_{\text{PATT}}$  and  $\tau_{\text{CATT}}$ . In this case,  $\hat{\tau}(X_i)$  gets averaged across observations with  $W_i = 1$ , rather than across the entire sample as in (11). Because  $\hat{\mu}_1(x)$  is estimated on the treated subsample, in estimating PATT or CATT there is no problem if  $\mu_1(x)$  is poorly estimated at covariate values that are common in the control group but scarce in the treatment group. But we must have a good estimate of  $\mu_0(x)$  at covariate values common in the treatment group, and this is not ensured because we can only use the control group to obtain  $\hat{\mu}_0(x)$ . Nevertheless, in many settings  $\mu_0(x)$  can be estimated well over the entire range of the covariates because the control group often includes units that are similar to those in the treatment group. By contrast, often there are numerous control group units—for example, high-income workers in the context of a job training program—that are quite different from any units in the treatment group, making the ATE parameters considerably more difficult to estimate than ATT parameters. (Further, the ATT parameters are more interesting from a policy perspective in such cases, unless one redefines the population to exclude some units that are unlikely to ever be in the treatment group.)

#### 5.4 Methods Based on the Propensity Score

The first set of alternatives to regression estimators relies on estimates of the propensity score. These methods were introduced in Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983b). An early economic discussion is in Card and Sullivan (1988). Rosenbaum and Rubin show that, under unconfoundedness, independence of potential outcomes and treatment indicators also holds after conditioning solely on the propensity score,  $e(x) = \text{pr}(W_i = 1 | X_i = x)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} W_i &\perp\!\!\!\perp (Y_i(0), Y_i(1)) | X_i \\ \Rightarrow W_i &\perp\!\!\!\perp (Y_i(0), Y_i(1)) | e(X_i). \end{aligned}$$

The basic insight is that for any binary variable  $W_i$ , and any random vector  $X_i$ , it is true (without assuming unconfoundedness) that

$$W_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_i | e(X_i).$$

Hence, within subpopulations with the same value for the propensity score, covariates are independent of the treatment indicator and thus cannot lead to biases (the same way in a regression framework omitted variables that are uncorrelated with included covariates do not introduce bias). Since under unconfoundedness all biases can be removed by adjusting for differences in covariates, this means that within subpopulations homogenous in the propensity score there are no biases in comparisons between treated and control units.

Given the Rosenbaum–Rubin result, it is sufficient, under the maintained assumption of unconfoundedness, to adjust solely for differences in the propensity score between treated and control units. This result can be exploited in a number of ways. Here we discuss three of these that have been used in practice. The first two of these methods exploit the fact that the propensity score can be viewed as a covariate that is sufficient to remove biases in estimation of average treatment effects. For this purpose, any one-to-one function of the propensity score could also be used. The third method further uses the fact that the propensity score is the conditional probability of receiving the treatment.

The first method simply uses the propensity score in place of the covariates in regression analysis. Define  $\nu_w(e) = E[Y_i | W_i = w, e(X_i) = e]$ . Unconfoundedness in combination with the Rosenbaum–Rubin result implies that  $\nu_w(e) = E[Y_i(w) | e(X_i) = e]$ . Then we can estimate  $\nu_w(e)$  very generally using kernel or series estimation on the propensity score, something which is greatly simplified by the fact that the propensity score is a scalar. Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd (1998) consider local smoothers and Hahn (1998)



considers a series estimator. In either case we have the consistent estimator

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{regprop}} = \frac{1}{N} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{\nu}_1(e(X_i)) - \hat{\nu}_0(e(X_i))),$$

which is simply the average of the differences in predicted values for the treated and untreated outcomes. Interestingly, Hahn shows that, unlike when we use regression to adjust for the full set of covariates, the series regression estimator based on adjusting for the known propensity score does not achieve the efficiency bound.

Although methods of this type have been used in practice, probably because of their simplicity, regression on simple functions of the propensity score is not recommended. Because the propensity score does not have a substantive meaning, it is difficult to motivate a low order polynomial as a good approximation to the conditional expectation. For example, a linear model in the propensity score is unlikely to provide a good approximation to the conditional expectation: individuals with propensity scores of 0.45 and 0.50 are likely to be much more similar than individuals with propensity scores equal to 0.01 and 0.06. Moreover, no formal asymptotic properties have been derived for the case with the propensity score unknown.

The second method, variously referred to as blocking, subclassification, or stratification, also adjusts for differences in the propensity score in a way that can be interpreted as regression, but in a more flexible manner. Originally suggested by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983b), the idea is to partition the sample into strata by (discretized) values of the propensity score, and then analyze the data within each stratum as if the propensity score were constant and the data could be interpreted as coming from a completely randomized experiment. This can be interpreted as approximating the conditional mean of the potential outcomes by a step function. To be more precise, let  $0 = c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_J$

$= 1$  be boundary values. Then define  $B_{ij}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , and  $j = 1, \dots, J - 1$ , as the indicators

$$B_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c_{j-1} \leq e(X_i) < c_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{and } B_{iJ} = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{J-1} B_{ij}.$$

Now estimate within stratum  $j$  the average treatment effect  $\tau_j = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | B_{ij} = 1]$  as

$$\hat{\tau}_j = \bar{Y}_{j1} - \bar{Y}_{j0}$$

where

$$\bar{Y}_{jw} = \frac{1}{N_{jw}} \sum_{i: W_i=w} B_{ij} \times Y_i,$$

and

$$N_{jw} = \sum_{i: W_i=w} B_{ij}.$$

If  $J$  is sufficiently large and the differences  $c_j - c_{j-1}$  small, there is little variation in the propensity score within a stratum or block, and one can analyze the data as if the propensity score is constant, and thus as if the data within a block were generated by a completely randomized experiment (with the assignment probabilities constant within a stratum, but varying between strata). The average treatment effect is then estimated as the weighted average of the within-stratum estimates:

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{block}} = \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{\tau}_j \cdot \left( \frac{N_{j0} + N_{j1}}{N} \right).$$

With  $J$  large, the implicit step function approximation to the regression functions  $\nu_w(e)$  will be accurate. Cochran (1968) shows in a Gaussian example that with five equal-sized blocks the remaining bias is less than 5 percent of the bias in the simple difference between average outcomes among treated and controls. Motivated by Cochran's

calculations, researchers have often used five strata, although depending on the sample size and the joint distribution of the data, fewer or more blocks will generally lead to a lower expected mean squared error.

The variance for this estimator is typically calculated conditional on the strata indicators, and assuming random assignment within the strata. That is, for stratum  $j$ , the estimator is  $\hat{\tau}_j$  and its variance is estimated as  $\hat{V}_j = \hat{V}_{j0} + \hat{V}_{j1}$ , where

$$\hat{V}_{jw} = \frac{S_{jw}^2}{N_{jw}}, \text{ where}$$

$$S_{jw}^2 = \frac{1}{N_{jw}} \sum_{i: B_{ij}=1, W_i=w} (Y_i - \bar{Y}_{jw})^2$$

The overall variance is then estimated as

$$\hat{V}(\hat{\tau}_{\text{block}}) = \sum_{j=1}^J (\hat{V}_{0j} + \hat{V}_{1j}) \cdot \left( \frac{N_{j0} + N_{j1}}{N} \right)^2.$$

This variance estimator is appropriate for  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$ , although it ignores biases arising from variation in the propensity score within strata.

The third method exploiting the propensity score is based on weighting. Recall that  $\tau_{\text{PATE}} = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)] = E[Y_i(1)] - E[Y_i(0)]$ . We consider the two terms separately. Because  $W_i \cdot Y_i = W_i \cdot Y_i(1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\frac{W_i \cdot Y_i}{e(X_i)}\right] &= E\left[\frac{W_i \cdot Y_i(1)}{e(X_i)}\right] \\ &= E\left[E\left[\frac{W_i \cdot Y_i(1)}{e(X_i)} \middle| X_i\right]\right] \\ &= E\left[\frac{E(W_i | X_i) \cdot E(Y_i(1) | X_i)}{e(X_i)}\right] \\ &= E\left[\frac{e(X_i) \cdot E(Y_i(1) | X_i)}{e(X_i)}\right] \\ &= E[E(Y_i(1) | X_i)] = E[Y_i(1)], \end{aligned}$$

where the second and final inequalities follow by iterated expectations and the third equality holds by unconfoundedness. The implication is that weighting the treated population by the inverse of the propensity score recovers the expectation of the unconditional response under treatment. A similar calculation shows  $E[\{(1 - W_i)Y_i\}/(1 - e(X_i))] = E[Y_i(0)]$ , and together these imply

$$(16) \quad \tau_{\text{PATE}} = E\left[\frac{W_i \cdot Y_i}{e(X_i)} - \frac{(1 - W_i) \cdot Y_i}{1 - e(X_i)}\right].$$

Equation (16) suggests an obvious estimator of  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ :

$$(17) \quad \hat{\tau}_{\text{weight}} = \frac{1}{N} \times \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{W_i \cdot Y_i}{e(X_i)} - \frac{(1 - W_i) \cdot Y_i}{1 - e(X_i)} \right],$$

which, as a sample average from a random sample, is consistent for  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  and  $\sqrt{N}$  asymptotically normally distributed. The estimator in (17) is essentially due to D. G. Horvitz and D. J. Thompson (1952).<sup>9</sup>

In practice, (17) is not a feasible estimator because it depends on the propensity score function  $e(\cdot)$ , which is rarely known. A surprising result is that, even if we know the propensity score,  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{weight}}$  does not achieve the efficiency bound given in (7). It turns out to be better, in terms of large sample efficiency, to weight using the estimated rather than the true propensity score. Hirano, Imbens, and Ridder (2003) establish conditions under which replacing  $e(\cdot)$  with a logistic sieve estimator results in a weighted propensity score estimator that achieves the variance bound. The estimator is practically simple to compute, as estimation of the propensity score involves a straightforward logit estimation

<sup>9</sup>Because the Horvitz–Thompson estimator is based on sample averages, adjustments for stratified sampling are straightforward if one is provided sampling weights.

involving flexible functions of the covariates. Theoretically, the number of terms in the approximation should increase with the sample size. In the second step, given the estimated propensity score  $\hat{e}(x)$ , one estimates

$$(18) \quad \hat{\tau}_{\text{IPW}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{W_i \cdot Y_i}{\hat{e}(X_i)}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{W_i}{\hat{e}(X_i)}} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(1 - W_i) \cdot Y_i}{1 - \hat{e}(X_i)}}{\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{W_i}{1 - \hat{e}(X_i)}}.$$

We refer to this as the inverse probability weighting (IPW) estimator. See Hirano, Imbens, and Ridder (2003) for intuition as to why estimating the propensity score leads to a more efficient estimator, asymptotically, than knowing the propensity score.

Ichimura and Oliver Linton (2005) studied  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{IPW}}$  when  $\hat{e}(\cdot)$  is obtained via kernel regression, and they consider the problem of optimal bandwidth choice when the object of interest is  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ . More recently, Li, Racine, and Wooldridge (forthcoming) consider kernel estimation for discrete as well as continuous covariates. The estimator proposed by Li, Racine, and Wooldridge achieves the variance lower bound. See Hirano, Imbens, and Ridder (2003) and Wooldridge (2007) for methods for estimating the variance for these estimators.

Note that the blocking estimator can also be interpreted as a weighting estimator. Consider observations in block  $j$ . Within the block, the  $N_{j1}$  treated observations all get equal weight  $1/N_{j1}$ . In the estimator for the overall average treatment effect, this block gets weight  $(N_{j0} + N_{j1})/N$ , so we can write  $\hat{\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \cdot Y_i$ , where for treated observations in block  $j$  the weight normalized by  $N$  is  $N \cdot \lambda_i = (N_{j0} + N_{j1})/N_{j1}$ , and for control observations it is  $N \cdot \lambda_i = (N_{j0} + N_{j1})/N_{j0}$ . Implicitly this estimator is based on an estimate of the propensity score in block  $j$  equal to  $N_{j1}/(N_{j0} + N_{j1})$ . Compared to the IPW estimator, the propensity score is smoothed within

the block. This has the advantage of avoiding particularly large weights, but comes at the expense of introducing bias if the propensity score is correctly specified.

A particular concern with IPW estimators arises again when the covariate distributions are substantially different for the two treatment groups. That implies that the propensity score gets close to zero or one for some values of the covariates. Small or large values of the propensity score raises a number of issues. One concern is that alternative parametric models for the binary data, such as probit and logit models that can provide similar approximations in terms of estimated probabilities over the middle ranges of their arguments, tend to be more different when the probabilities are close to zero or one. Thus the choice of model and specification becomes more important, and it is often difficult to make well motivated choices in treatment effect settings. A second concern is that for units with propensity scores close to zero or one, the weights can be large, making those units particularly influential in the estimates of the average treatment effects, and thus making the estimator imprecise. These concerns are less serious than those regarding regression estimators because at least the IPW estimates will accurately reflect uncertainty. Still, these concerns make the simple IPW estimators less attractive. (As for regression cases, the problem can be less severe for the ATT parameters because propensity score values close to zero play no role. Problems for estimating ATT arise when some units, as described by their observed covariates, are almost certain to receive treatment.)

## 5.5 Matching

Matching estimators impute the missing potential outcomes using only the outcomes of a few nearest neighbors of the opposite treatment group. In that sense, matching is similar to nonparametric kernel regression, with the number of neighbors playing the role of the bandwidth in the kernel regression. A

formal difference with kernel methods is that the asymptotic distribution for matching estimators is derived conditional on the implicit bandwidth, that is, the number of neighbors, often fixed at a small number, e.g., one. Using such asymptotics, the implicit estimate  $\hat{\mu}_w(x)$  is (close to) unbiased, but not consistent, for  $\mu_w(x)$ . In contrast, the kernel regression estimators discussed in the previous section implied consistency of  $\hat{\mu}_w(x)$ .

Matching estimators have the attractive feature that the smoothing parameters are easily interpretable. Given the matching metric, the researcher only has to choose the number of matches. Using only a single match leads to the most credible inference with the least bias, at the cost of sacrificing some precision. This sits well with the focus in the literature on reducing bias rather than variance. It also can make the matching estimator easier to use than those estimators that require more complex choices of smoothing parameters, and this may be another explanation for its popularity.

Matching estimators have been widely studied in practice and theory (e.g., X. Gu and Rosenbaum 1993; Rosenbaum 1989, 1995, 2002; Rubin 1973b, 1979; Rubin and Neal Thomas 1992a, 1992b, 1996, 2000; Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd 1998; Dehejia and Sadek Wahba 1999; Abadie and Imbens 2006; Alexis Diamond and Jasjeet S. Sekhon 2008; Sekhon forthcoming; Sekhon and Richard Grieve 2008; Rosenbaum and Rubin 1985; Stefano M. Iacus, Gary King, and Giuseppe Porro 2008). Most often they have been applied in settings where, (1) the interest is in the average treatment effect for the treated, and (2) there is a large reservoir of potential controls, although recent work (Abadie and Imbens 2006) shows that matching estimators can be modified to estimate the overall average effect. The setting with many potential controls allows the researcher to match each treated unit to one or more distinct controls, hence the label “matching without

replacement.” Given the matched pairs, the treatment effect within a pair is estimated as the difference in outcomes, and the overall average as the average of the within-pair difference. Exploiting the representation of the estimator as a difference in two sample means, inference is based on standard methods for differences in means or methods for paired randomized experiments, ignoring any remaining bias. Fully efficient matching algorithms that take into account the effect of a particular choice of match for treated unit  $i$  on the pool of potential matches for unit  $j$  are computationally cumbersome. In practice, researchers use greedy algorithms that sequentially match units. Most commonly the units are ordered by the value of the propensity score with the highest propensity score units matched first. See Gu and Rosenbaum (1993) and Rosenbaum (1995) for discussions.

Abadie and Imbens (2006) study formal asymptotic properties of matching estimators in a different setting, where both treated and control units are (potentially) matched and matching is done with replacement. Code for the Abadie–Imbens estimator is available in Matlab and Stata (see Abadie et al. 2004).<sup>10</sup> Formally, given a sample,  $\{(Y_i, X_i, W_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , let  $\ell_1(i)$  be the nearest neighbor to  $i$ , that is,  $\ell_1(i)$  is equal to the nonnegative integer  $j$ , for  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , if  $W_j \neq W_i$ , and

$$\|X_j - X_i\| = \min_{k: W_k \neq W_i} \|X_k - X_i\|.$$

More generally, let  $\ell_m(i)$  be the index that satisfies  $W_{\ell_m(i)} \neq W_i$  and that is the  $m$ -th closest to unit  $i$ :

$$\sum_{l: W_l \neq W_i} 1 \{ \|X_l - X_i\| \leq \|X_{\ell_m(i)} - X_i\| \} = m,$$

<sup>10</sup>See Sascha O. Becker and Andrea Ichino (2002) and Edwin Leuven and Barbara Sianesi (2003) for alternative Stata implementations of matching estimators.

where  $1\{\cdot\}$  is the indicator function, equal to one if the expression in brackets is true and zero otherwise. In other words,  $\ell_m(i)$  is the index of the unit in the opposite treatment group that is the  $m$ -th closest to unit  $i$  in terms of the distance measure based on the norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Let  $\mathcal{J}_M(i) \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$  denote the set of indices for the first  $M$  matches for unit  $i$ :  $\mathcal{J}_M(i) = \{\ell_1(i), \dots, \ell_M(i)\}$ . Now impute the missing potential outcomes as the average of the outcomes for the matches, by defining  $\hat{Y}_i(0)$  and  $\hat{Y}_i(1)$  as

$$\hat{Y}_i(0) = \begin{cases} Y_i & \text{if } W_i = 0, \\ 1/M \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_M(i)} Y_j & \text{if } W_i = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\hat{Y}_i(1) = \begin{cases} 1/M \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_M(i)} Y_j & \text{if } W_i = 0, \\ Y_i & \text{if } W_i = 1, \end{cases}$$

The simple matching estimator discussed in Abadie and Imbens is then

$$(19) \quad \hat{\tau}_{\text{match}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\hat{Y}_i(1) - \hat{Y}_i(0)).$$

Abadie and Imbens show that the bias of this estimator is of order  $O(N^{-1/K})$ , where  $K$  is the dimension of the covariates. Hence, if one studies the asymptotic distribution of the estimator by normalizing by  $\sqrt{N}$  (as can be justified by the fact that the variance of the estimator is of order  $O(1/N)$ ), the bias does not disappear if the dimension of the covariates is equal to two, and will dominate the large sample variance if  $K$  is at least three. To put this result in perspective, it is useful to relate it to bias properties of estimators based on kernel regression. Kernel estimators can be viewed as matching estimators where all observations within some bandwidth  $h_N$  receive some weight. As the sample size  $N$  increases, the bandwidth  $h_N$  shrinks, but sufficiently slow in order to ensure that the number of units receiving non-zero weights diverges. If all the weights are positive, the bias for kernel estimators would generally be worse. In order to achieve root- $N$  consistency,

it is therefore critical that some weights are negative through the device of higher order kernels, with the exact order required dependent on the dimension of the covariates (see, e.g., Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd 1998). In practice, however, researchers have not used higher order kernels, and so bias concerns for nearest-neighbor matching estimators are even more relevant for kernel matching methods.

There are three caveats to the Abadie–Imbens bias result. First, it is only the continuous covariates that should be counted in the dimension of the covariates. With discrete covariates the matching will be exact in large samples, and as a result such covariates do not contribute to the order of the bias. Second, if one matches only the treated, and the number of potential controls is much larger than the number of treated units, one can justify ignoring the bias by appealing to an asymptotic sequence where the number of potential controls increases faster with the sample size than the number of treated units. Specifically, if the number of controls,  $N_0$ , and the number of treated,  $N_1$ , satisfy  $N_1/N_0^{4/K} \rightarrow 0$ , then the bias disappears in large samples after normalization by  $\sqrt{N_1}$ . Third, even though the order of the bias may be high, the actual bias may still be small if the coefficients in the leading term are small. This is possible if the biases for different units are at least partially offsetting. For example, the leading term in the bias relies on the regression function being nonlinear, and the density of the covariates having a nonzero slope. If either the regression function is well approximated by a linear function, or the density is approximately flat, the bias may be fairly limited.

Abadie and Imbens (2006) also show that matching estimators are generally not efficient. Even in the case where the bias is of low enough order to be dominated by the variance, the estimators do not reach the efficiency bound given a fixed number



of matches. To reach the bound the number of matches would need to increase with the sample size. If  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $M/N \rightarrow 0$ , then the matching estimator is essentially like a nonparametric regression estimator. However, it is not clear that using an approximation based on a sequence with an increasing number of matches improves the accuracy of the approximation. Given that in an actual data set one uses a specific number of matches,  $M$ , it would appear appropriate to calculate the asymptotic variance conditional on that number, rather than approximate the distribution as if this number is large. Calculations in Abadie and Imbens show that the efficiency loss from even a very small number of matches is quite modest, and so the concerns about the inefficiency of matching estimators may not be very relevant in practice. Little is known about the optimal number of matches, or about data-dependent ways of choosing it.

All of the distance metrics used in practice standardize the covariates in some manner. Abadie and Imbens use a diagonal matrix with each diagonal element equal to the inverse of the corresponding covariate variance. The most common metric is the Mahalanobis metric, which is based on the inverse of the full covariance matrix. Zhao (2004), in an interesting discussion of the choice of metrics, suggests some alternatives that depend on the correlation between covariates, treatment assignment, and outcomes. So far there is little experience with any metrics beyond inverse-of-the-variances and the Mahalanobis metrics. Zhao (2004) reports the results of some simulations using his proposed metrics, finding no clear winner given his specific design.

### 5.6 *Combining Regression and Propensity Score Weighting*

In sections 5.3 and 5.4, we describe methods for estimating average causal effects based on two strategies: the first is based

on estimating  $\mu_w(x) = E[Y_i(w)|X_i = x]$  for  $w = 0, 1$  and averaging the difference as in (11), and the second is based on estimating the propensity score  $e(x) = \text{pr}(W_i = 1 | X_i = x)$  and using that to weight the outcomes as in (18). For each approach, we have discussed estimators that achieve the asymptotic efficiency bound. If we have large sample sizes, relative to the dimension of  $X_i$ , we might think our nonparametric estimators of the conditional means or propensity score are sufficiently accurate to invoke the asymptotic efficiency results described above.

In other cases, however, we might choose flexible parametric models without being confident that they necessarily approximate the means or propensity score well. As we discussed earlier, one reason for viewing estimators of conditional means or propensity scores as flexible parametric models is that it greatly simplifies standard error calculations for treatment effect estimates. In such cases, one might want to adopt a strategy that combines regression and propensity score methods in order to achieve some robustness to misspecification of the parametric models. It may be helpful to think about the analogy to omitted variable bias. Suppose we are interested in the coefficient on  $W_i$  in the (long) linear regression of  $Y_i$  on a constant,  $W_i$  and  $X_i$ . Suppose we omit  $X_i$  from the long regression, and just run the short regression of  $Y_i$  on a constant and  $W_i$ . The bias in the estimate from the short regression is equal to the product of the coefficient on  $X_i$  in the long regression, and the coefficient on  $X_i$  in a regression of  $W_i$  on a constant and  $X_i$ . Weighting can be interpreted as removing the correlation between  $W_i$  and  $X_i$ , and regression as removing the direct effect of  $X_i$ . Weighting therefore removes the bias from omitting  $X_i$  from the regression. As a result, combining regression and weighting can lead to additional robustness by both removing the correlation between the omitted covariates, and by reducing the correlation between

the omitted and included variables. This is the idea behind the doubly-robust estimators developed in Robins and Rotnitzky (1995), Robins, Rotnitzky and Lue Ping Zhao (1995), and Mark J. van der Laan and Robins (2003).

Suppose we model the two regression functions as  $\mu_w(x) = \alpha_w + \beta'_w(x - \bar{X})$ , for  $w = 0, 1$  (where we abuse notation a bit and insert the sample averages of the covariates for their population means). More generally, we may use a nonlinear model for the conditional expectation, or just a more flexible linear approximation. Suppose we model the propensity score as  $e(x) = p(x; \gamma)$ , for example as  $p(x; \gamma) = \exp(\gamma_0 + x'\gamma_1)/(1 + \exp(\gamma_0 + x'\gamma_1))$ . In the first step, we estimate  $\gamma$  by maximum likelihood and obtain the estimated propensity scores as  $\hat{e}(X_i) = p(x; \hat{\gamma})$ . In the second step, we use linear regression, where we weight the objective function by the inverse probability of treatment or non-treatment. Specifically, to estimate  $(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$  and  $(\alpha_1, \beta_1)$ , we would solve the weighted least squares problems

$$(20) \quad \min_{\alpha_0, \beta_0} \sum_{i: W_i=0} \frac{(Y_i - \alpha_0 - \beta'_0(X_i - \bar{X}))^2}{p(X_i; \hat{\gamma})},$$

and

$$\min_{\alpha_1, \beta_1} \sum_{i: W_i=1} \frac{(Y_i - \alpha_1 - \beta'_1(X_i - \bar{X}))^2}{1 - p(X_i; \hat{\gamma})},$$

Given the estimated conditional mean functions, we estimate  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ , using the expression for  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{reg}} = \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_0$  as in equation (13). But what is the motivation for weighting by the inverse propensity score when we did not use such weighting in section 5.3? The motivation is the double robustness result due to Robins and Rotnitzky (1995); see also Daniel O. Scharfstein, Rotnitzky, and Robins (1999).

First, suppose that the conditional expectation is indeed linear, or  $E[Y_i(w)|X_i = x] = \alpha_w + \beta'_w(x - \bar{X})$ . Then, as discussed in the treatment effect context by Wooldridge

(2007), weighting the objective function by any nonnegative function of  $X_i$  does not affect consistency of least squares.<sup>11</sup> As a result, even if the logit model for the propensity score is misspecified, the binary response MLE  $\hat{\gamma}$  still has a well-defined probability limit, say  $\gamma^*$ , and the IPW estimator that uses weights  $1/p(X_i; \hat{\gamma})$  for treated observations and  $1/(1 - p(X_i; \hat{\gamma}))$  for control observations is asymptotically equivalent to the estimator that uses weights based on  $\gamma^*$ .<sup>12</sup> It does not matter that for some  $x$ ,  $e(x) \neq p(x; \gamma^*)$ . This is the first part of the double robustness result: if the parametric conditional means for  $E[Y(w)|X = x]$  are correctly specified, the model for the propensity score can be arbitrarily misspecified for the true propensity score. Equation (20) still leads to a consistent estimator for  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ .

When the conditional means are correctly specified, weighting will generally hurt in terms of asymptotic efficiency. The optimal weight is the inverse of the variance, and in general there is no reason to expect that weighting the inverse of (one minus) the propensity score gives a good approximation to that. Specifically, under homoskedasticity of  $Y_i(w)$  so that  $\sigma_w^2 = \sigma_w^2(x)$ , in the context of least squares—the IPW estimator of  $(\alpha_w, \beta_w)$  is less efficient than the unweighted estimator; see Wooldridge (2007). The motivation for propensity score weighting is different: it offers a robustness advantage for estimating  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ .

The second part of the double robustness result assumes that the logit model (or an alternative binary response model) is correctly specified for the propensity score, so that  $e(x) = p(x; \gamma^*)$ , but allows the conditional mean functions to be misspecified.

<sup>11</sup> More generally, it does not affect the consistency of any quasi-likelihood method that is robust for estimating the parameters of the conditional mean. These are likelihoods in the linear exponential family, as described in C. Gouriéroux, A. Monfort, and A. Trognon (1984a, 1984b).

<sup>12</sup> See Wooldridge (2007).

The result is that in that case  $\hat{\alpha}_w \rightarrow E[Y_i(w)]$ , and thus  $\hat{\tau} = \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_0 \rightarrow E[Y_i(1)] - E[Y_i(0)] = \tau_{\text{PATE}}$  and the estimator is still consistent. Let the weight for control observations be  $\lambda_i = (1 - p(X_i; \gamma^*))^{-1} / \sum_{j: W_j=0} (1 - p(X_j; \gamma^*))^{-1}$ . Then the least squares estimator for  $\hat{\alpha}_0$  is

$$(21) \quad \hat{\alpha}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - W_i) \lambda_i \times (Y_i - \hat{\beta}'_0 (X_i - \bar{X})).$$

The weights imply that  $E[(1 - W_i)\lambda_i Y_i] = E[Y_i(0)]$  and  $E[(1 - W_i)\lambda_i (X_i - \bar{X})] = E[X_i - \bar{X}] = 0$ , and as a result  $\hat{\alpha}_0 \rightarrow E[Y_i(0)]$ . Similarly, the average of the predicted values for  $Y_i(1)$  converges to  $E[Y_i(1)]$ , and so the resulting estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{IPW}} = \hat{\alpha}_1 - \hat{\alpha}_0$  is consistent for  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  and  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$  irrespective of the shape of the regression functions. This is the second part of the double robustness part, at least for linear regression.

For certain kinds of responses, including binary responses, fractional responses, and count responses, linearity of  $E[Y_i(w) | X_i = x]$  is a poor assumption. Using linear conditional expectations for limited dependent variables effectively abdicates the first part of the double robustness result. Instead, we should use coherent models of the conditional means, as well as a sensible model for the propensity score, with the hope that the mean functions, propensity score, or both are correctly specified. Beyond specifying logically coherent for  $E[Y_i(w) | X_i = x]$  so that the first part of double robustness has a chance, for the second part we need to choose functional forms and estimators with the following property: even when the mean functions are misspecified,  $E[Y_i(w)] = E[\mu(X_i, \delta_w^*)]$ , where  $\delta_w^*$  is the probability limit of  $\hat{\delta}_w$ . Fortunately, for the common kinds of limited dependent variables used in applications, such functional forms and estimators exist; see Wooldridge (2007) for further discussion.

Once we estimate  $\tau$  based on (20), how should we obtain a standard error? The normalized variance still has the form  $V_0 + V_1$ , where  $V_w = E[(\hat{\alpha}_w - \mu_w)^2]$ . One option is to exploit the representation of  $\hat{\alpha}_0$  as a weighted average of  $Y_i + \hat{\beta}'_0 (X_i - \bar{X})$ , and use the naive variance estimator based on weighted least squares with known weights:

$$(22) \quad \hat{V}_0 = \sum_{i: W_i=0} \lambda_i^2 \cdot (Y_i + \hat{\beta}'_0 (X_i - \bar{X}) - \hat{\alpha}_0)^2,$$

and similar for  $V_1$ . In general, we may again want to adjust for the estimation of the parameters in  $\gamma$ . See Wooldridge (2007) for details.

Although combining weighting and regression is more attractive than either weighting or regression on their own, it still requires at least one of the two specifications to be accurate globally. It has been used regularly in the epidemiology literature, partly through the efforts of Robins and his coauthors, but has not been widely used in the economics literature.

## 5.7 Subclassification and Regression

We can also combine subclassification with regression. The advantage relative to weighting and regression is that we do not use global approximations to the regression function. The idea is that within stratum  $j$ , we estimate the average treatment effect by regressing the outcome on a constant, an indicator for the treatment, and the covariates, instead of simply taking the difference in averages by treatment status as in section 5.4. The latter can be viewed as a regression estimate based on a regression with only an intercept and the treatment indicator. The further regression adjustment simply adds (some of) the covariates to that regression. The key difference with using regression in the full sample is that, within a stratum, the propensity score varies relatively little. As a

result, the covariate distributions are similar, and the regression function is not used to extrapolate far out of sample.

To be precise, we estimate on the observations with  $B_{ij} = 1$ , the regression function

$$Y_i = \alpha_j + \tau_j \cdot W_i + \beta'_j X_i + \varepsilon_i,$$

by least squares, obtaining the estimates  $\hat{\tau}_j$  and estimated variances  $\hat{V}_j$ . Dropping  $X_i$  from this regression leads to  $\hat{\tau}_j = \bar{Y}_{j1} - \bar{Y}_{j0}$ , which is the blocking estimator we discussed in section 5.4. We average the estimated stratum-specific average treatment effects, weighted by the relative stratum size:

$$\hat{\tau} = \sum_{j=1}^J \left( \frac{N_{j0} + N_{j1}}{N} \right) \cdot \hat{\tau}_j,$$

with estimated variance

$$\hat{V} = \sum_{j=1}^J \left( \frac{N_{j0} + N_{j1}}{N} \right)^2 \cdot \hat{V}_j.$$

With a modest number of strata, this already leads to an estimator that is considerably more flexible and robust than either subclassification alone, or regression alone. It is probably one of the more attractive estimators in practice. Imbens and Rubin (forthcoming) suggest data-dependent methods for choosing the number of strata.

## 5.8 Matching and Regression

Once we have the  $N$  pairs  $(\hat{Y}_i(0), \hat{Y}_i(1))$ , the simple matching estimator given in (19) averages the difference. This estimator may still be biased due to discrepancies between the covariates of the matched observations and their matches. One can attempt to reduce this bias by using regression methods. This use of regression is very different from using regression methods on the full sample. Here the covariate distributions are likely to be similar in the matched sample, and so

regression is not used to extrapolate far out of sample.

The idea behind the regression adjustment is to replace  $\hat{Y}_i(0)$  and  $\hat{Y}_i(1)$  by

$$\hat{Y}_i(0) = \begin{cases} Y_i & \text{if } W_i = 0, \\ \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_M(i)} (Y_j + \beta'_0(X_i - X_j)) & \text{if } W_i = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\hat{Y}_i(1) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_M(i)} (Y_j + \beta'_1(X_i - X_j)) & \text{if } W_i = 0, \\ Y_i & \text{if } W_i = 1, \end{cases}$$

where the average of the matched outcomes is adjusted by the difference in covariates relative to the matched observation. The only question left is how to estimate the regression coefficients  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$ . For various methods, see D. Quade (1982), Rubin (1979), and Abadie and Imbens (2006). The methods differ in whether the difference in outcomes is modeled as linear in the difference in covariates, or the original conditional outcome distributions are approximated by linear regression functions, and on what sample the regression functions are estimated.

Here is one simple regression adjustment. To be clear, it is useful to introduce some additional notation. Given the set of matching indices  $\mathcal{J}_M(i)$ , define

$$\hat{X}_i(0) = \begin{cases} X_i & \text{if } W_i = 0, \\ \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_M(i)} X_j & \text{if } W_i = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\hat{X}_i(1) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_M(i)} X_j & \text{if } W_i = 0, \\ X_i & \text{if } W_i = 1, \end{cases}$$

and let  $\hat{\beta}_w$  be based on a regression of  $\hat{Y}_i(w)$  on a constant and  $\hat{X}_i(w)$ :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\alpha}_w \\ \hat{\beta}_w \end{pmatrix} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \hat{X}_i(w)' \\ \hat{X}_i(w) & \hat{X}_i(w) \hat{X}_i(w)' \end{pmatrix} \right)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{Y}_i(w) \\ \hat{X}_i(w) \hat{Y}_i(w) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Like the combination of subclassification and regression, this leads to relatively robust estimators. Abadie and Imbens (2008a) find that the method works well in simulations based on the LaLonde data.

### 5.9 A General Method for Estimating Variances

For some of the estimators discussed in the previous sections, particular variance estimators have been used. Assuming that a particular parametric model is valid, one can typically use standard methods based on likelihood theory or generalized method of moments theory. Often, these methods rely on consistent estimation of components of the variance. Here we discuss two general methods for estimating variances that apply to all estimators.

The first approach is to use bootstrapping (Bradley Efron and Robert J. Tibshirani 1993; A. C. Davison and D. V. Hinkley 1997; Joel L. Horowitz 2001). Bootstrapping has been widely used in the treatment effects literature, as it is straightforward to implement. It has rarely been formally justified, although in many cases it is likely to be valid given that many of the estimators are asymptotically linear. However, in some cases it is known that bootstrapping is not valid. Abadie and Imbens (2008a) show that, for a fixed number of matches, bootstrapping is not valid for matching estimators. It is likely that the problems that invalidate the bootstrap disappear if the number of matches increases with the sample size (thus, the bootstrap might be valid for kernel estimators). Nevertheless, because in practice researchers often use a small number of matches, or nonnegative kernels, it is not clear whether the bootstrap is an effective method for obtaining standard errors and constructing confidence intervals. In cases where bootstrapping is not valid, often subsampling (Dimitris N. Politis, Joseph P. Romano, and Michael Wolf 1999) remains valid, but this has not been applied in practice.

There is an alternative, general, method for estimating variances of treatment effect estimators, developed by Abadie and Imbens (2006), that does not require additional non-parametric estimation. First, recall that most estimators are of the form

$$\hat{\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \cdot Y_i, \text{ with } \sum_{i:W_i=1} \lambda_i = 1, \sum_{i:W_i=0} \lambda_i = -1,$$

with the weights  $\lambda_i$  generally functions of all covariates and all treatment indicators. Conditional on the covariates and the treatment indicators (and thus relative to  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$ ), the variance of such an estimator is

$$\mathbb{V}(\hat{\tau} | X_1, \dots, X_N, W_1, \dots, W_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^2 \cdot \sigma_{W_i}^2(X_i).$$

In order to use this representation, we need estimates of  $\sigma_{W_i}^2(X_i)$ , for all  $i$ . Fortunately, these need not be consistent estimates, as long as the estimation errors are not too highly correlated so that the weighted average of the estimates is consistent for the weighted average of the variances. This is similar in the way robust (Huber-Eicker-White) standard errors allow for general forms of heteroskedasticity without having to consistently estimate the conditional variance function.

Abadie and Imbens (2006) suggested using a matching estimator for  $\sigma_{W_i}^2(X_i)$ . The idea behind this matching variance estimator is that if we can find two treated units with  $X_i = x$ , we can estimate  $\sigma_1^2(x)$  as  $\hat{\sigma}_1^2(x) = (Y_i - Y_j)^2/2$ . In general, it is difficult to find exact matches, but, again, this is not necessary. Instead, one uses the closest match within the set of units with the same treatment status. Let  $\nu(i)$  be the unit closest to  $i$ , with the same treatment indicator ( $W_{\nu(i)} = W_i$ ), so that

$$\|X_{\nu(i)} - X_i\| = \min_{j:W_j=i} \|X_j - X_i\|.$$

Then we can estimate  $\sigma_{W_i}^2(X_i)$  as



$$\hat{\sigma}_{W_i}^2(X_i) = (Y_i - Y_{\nu(i)})^2/2.$$

This way we can estimate  $\sigma_{W_i}^2(X_i)$  for all units. Note that these are not consistent estimators of the conditional variances. As the sample size increases, the bias of these estimators will disappear, just as we saw that the bias of the matching estimator for the average treatment effect disappears under similar conditions.

We then use these estimates of the conditional variance to estimate the variance of the estimator:

$$\hat{V}(\hat{\tau}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i^2 \cdot \hat{\sigma}_{W_i}^2(X_i).$$

An extension to allow for clustering has been developed by Samuel Hanson and Adi Sunderam (2008).

### 5.10 *Overlap in Covariate Distributions*

In practice, a major concern in applying methods under the assumption of unconfoundedness is lack of overlap in the covariate distributions. In fact, once one is committed to the unconfoundedness assumption, this may well be the main problem facing the analyst. The overlap issue was highlighted in papers by Dehejia and Wahba (1999) and Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd (1998). Dehejia and Wahba reanalyzed data on a job training program originally analyzed by LaLonde (1986). LaLonde (1986) had attempted to replicate results from an experimental evaluation of a job training program, the National Supported Work (NSW) program, using a comparison group constructed from two public use data sets, the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) and the Current Population Survey (CPS). The NSW program targeted individuals who were disadvantaged with very poor labor market histories. As a result, they were very different from the raw comparison groups constructed by LaLonde from the CPS and PSID. LaLonde partially addressed this problem by limiting his raw comparison samples based on single covariate criteria (e.g.,

limiting it to individuals with zero earnings in the year prior to the program). Dehejia and Wahba looked at this problem more systematically and found that a major concern is the lack of overlap in the covariate distributions.

Traditionally, overlap in the covariate distributions was assessed by looking at summary statistics of the covariate distributions by treatment status. As discussed before in the introduction to section 5, it is particularly useful to report differences in average covariates normalized by the square root of the sum of the within-treatment group variances. In table 2, we report, for the LaLonde data, averages and standard deviations of the basic covariates, and the normalized difference. For four out of the ten covariates the means are more than a standard deviation apart. This immediately suggests that the technical task of adjusting for differences in the covariates is a challenging one. Although reporting normalized differences in covariates by treatment status is a sensible starting point, inspecting differences one covariate at a time is not generally sufficient. Even if all these differences are small, there may still be areas with limited overlap. Formally, we are concerned with regions in the covariate space where the density of covariates in one treatment group is zero and the density in the other treatment group is not. This corresponds to the propensity score being equal to zero or one. Therefore, a more direct way of assessing the overlap in covariate distributions is to inspect histograms of the estimated propensity score by treatment status.

Once it has been established that overlap is a concern, several strategies can be used. We briefly discuss two of the earlier specific suggestions, and then describe in more detail two general methods. In practice, researchers have often simply dropped observations with propensity score close to zero or one, with the actual cutoff value chosen in an ad hoc fashion. Dehejia and Wahba (1999) focus on the average effect for the treated. After estimating the propensity score, they find the smallest

TABLE 2  
BALANCE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE LALONDE DATA (DEHEJIA–WAHBA SAMPLE)

Covariate	CPS Controls		NSW Treated		Normalized Difference Treated-Controls			
	(15992)		185		All	$\hat{e}(X_i) \geq \underline{e}^1$	P-score	Maha
	mean	(s.d.)	mean	(s.d.)	(16177)	(6286)	(370)	(370)
Age	33.23	(11.05)	25.82	(7.16)	−0.56	−0.25	−0.08	−0.16
Education	12.03	(2.87)	10.35	(2.01)	−0.48	−0.30	−0.02	−0.09
Married	0.71	(0.45)	0.19	(0.39)	−0.87	−0.46	−0.01	−0.20
Nodegree	0.30	(0.46)	0.71	(0.46)	0.64	0.42	0.08	0.18
Black	0.07	(0.26)	0.84	(0.36)	1.72	1.45	−0.02	0.00
Hispanic	0.07	(0.26)	0.06	(0.24)	−0.04	−0.22	−0.02	0.00
Earn '74	14.02	(9.57)	2.10	(4.89)	−1.11	−0.40	−0.07	0.00
Earn '74 positive	0.88	(0.32)	0.29	(0.46)	−1.05	−0.72	−0.07	0.00
Earn '75	13.65	(9.27)	1.53	(3.22)	−1.23	−0.35	−0.02	−0.01
Earn '75 positive	0.89	(0.31)	0.40	(0.49)	−0.84	−0.54	−0.09	0.00

value of the estimated propensity score among the treated units,  $\underline{e}_1 = \min_{i, W_i=1} \hat{e}(X_i)$ . They then drop all control units with an estimated propensity score lower than this threshold  $\underline{e}_1$ . The idea behind this suggestion is that control units with very low values for the propensity score may be so different from treated units that including them in the analysis is likely to be counterproductive. (In effect, the population over which the treatment effects are calculated is redefined.) A concern is that the results may be sensitive to the choice of specific threshold  $\underline{e}_1$ . If, for example, one used as the threshold the  $K$ -th order statistic of the estimated propensity score among the treated (Lechner 2002a, 2002b), the results might change considerably. In the sixth column of table 2, we report the normalized difference (normalized using the same denominator equal to the square root of the sum of the within treatment group sample variances) after removing 9,891 (out of a total 16,177) control observations whose estimated propensity score was smaller than the smallest value of the estimated propensity score among the treated,  $\underline{e}_1 = 0.00051$ .

This improves the covariate balance, but many of the normalized differences are still substantial.

Heckman, Ichimura, and Todd (1997) and Heckman et al. (1998) develop a different method. They focus on estimation of the set where the density of the propensity score conditional on the treatment is bounded away from zero for both treatment regimes. Specifically, they first estimate the density functions  $f(e|W = w)$ , for  $w = 0, 1$ , nonparametrically. They then evaluate the estimated density  $\hat{f}(\hat{e}(X_i)|W_i = 0)$  for all  $N$  values  $X_i$ , and the same for the estimated density  $\hat{f}(\hat{e}(X_i)|W_i = 1)$  for all  $N$  values  $X_i$ . Given these  $2N$  values they calculate the  $2N \cdot q$  order statistic of these  $2N$  estimated densities. Denote this order statistic by  $\hat{f}_q$ . Then, for each unit  $i$ , they compare the estimated density  $\hat{f}(\hat{e}(X_i)|W_i = 0)$  to  $\hat{f}_q$ , and  $\hat{f}(\hat{e}(X_i)|W_i = 1)$  to  $\hat{f}_q$ . If either of those estimated densities is below the order statistic, the observation gets dropped from the analysis. Smith and Todd (2005) implement this method with  $q = 0.02$ , but provide no motivation for the choice of the threshold.

### 5.10.1 *Matching to Improve Overlap in Covariate Distributions*

A systematic method for dropping control units who are different from the treated units is to construct a matched sample. This approach has been pushed by Rubin in a series of studies, see Rubin (2006). It is designed for settings where the interest is in the average effect for the treated (e.g., as in the LaLonde application). It relies on the control sample being larger than the treated sample, and works especially well when the control sample is much larger.

First, the treated observations are ordered, typically by decreasing values of the estimated propensity score, since treated observations with high values of the propensity score are generally more difficult to match. Then the first treated unit (e.g., the one with the highest value for the estimated propensity score) is matched to the nearest control unit. Next, the second treated unit is matched to the nearest control unit, excluding the control unit that was used as a match for the first treated unit. Matching without replacement all treated units in this manner leads to a sample of  $2 \times N_1$  units, (where  $N_1$  is the size of the original treated subsample), half of them treated and half of them control units. Note that the matching is not necessarily used here as the final analysis. We do not propose to estimate the average treatment effect for the treated by averaging the differences within the pairs. Instead, this is intended as a preliminary analysis, with the goal being the construction of a sample with more overlap. Given a more balanced sample, one can use any of the previously discussed methods for estimating the average effect of the treatment, including regression, propensity score methods, or matching. Using those methods on the balanced sample is likely to reduce bias relative to using the simple difference in averages by treatment status.

The last two columns in table 2 report the balance in the ten covariates after

constructing a matched sample in this fashion. In both cases the treated units were matched in reverse order of the estimated propensity score. The seventh column is based on matching on the estimated propensity score, and the last column is based on matching on all the covariates, using the Mahalanobis metric (the inverse of the covariance matrix of the covariates). Matching, either on the estimated propensity score or on the full set of covariates dramatically improves the balance. Whereas before some of the covariates differed by as much as 1.7 times a standard deviation, now the normalized differences are all less than one tenth of a standard deviation. The remaining differences are not negligible, however. For example, average differences in 1974 earnings are still on the order of \$700, which, given the experimental estimate from the LaLonde (1986) paper of about \$2,000, is substantial. As a result, simple estimators such as the average of the within-matched-pair differences are not likely to lead to credible estimates. Nevertheless, maintaining unconfoundedness, this matched sample is sufficiently well balanced that one may be able to obtain credible and robust estimates from it in a way that the original sample would not allow.

### 5.10.2 *Trimming to Improve Overlap in Covariate Distributions*

Matching with replacement does not work if the estimand of interest is the overall average treatment effect. For that case Crump et al. (2009) suggest an easily implementable way of selecting the subpopulation with overlap, consistent with the current practice of dropping observations with propensity score values close to zero or one. Their method is generally applicable and in particular does not require that the control sample is larger than the treated sample. They consider estimation of the average treatment effect for the subpopulation with  $X_i \in \mathbb{A}$ . They suggest choosing the set  $\mathbb{A}$  from the set of all subsets of the

covariate space to minimize the asymptotic variance of the efficient estimator of the average treatment effect for that set. Under some conditions (in particular homoskedasticity), they show that the optimal set  $\mathbb{A}^*$  depends only on the value of the propensity score. This method suggests discarding observations with a propensity score less than  $\alpha$  away from the two extremes, zero and one:

$$\mathbb{A}^* = \{x \in \mathbb{X} | \alpha \leq e(x) \leq 1 - \alpha\},$$

where  $\alpha$  satisfies a condition based on the marginal distribution of the propensity score:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\alpha \cdot (1 - \alpha)} \\ &= 2 \cdot E \left[ \frac{1}{e(X) \cdot (1 - e(X))} \middle| \frac{1}{e(X) \cdot (1 - e(X))} \right. \\ & \quad \left. < \frac{1}{\alpha \cdot (1 - \alpha)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Based on empirical examples and numerical calculations with beta distributions for the propensity score, Crump et al. (2009) suggest that the rule-of-thumb fixing  $\alpha$  at 0.10 gives good results.

To illustrate this method, table 3 presents summary statistics for data from Imbens, Rubin and Sacerdote (2001) on lottery players, including “winners” who won big prizes, and “losers” who did not. Even though winning the lottery is obviously random, variation in the number of tickets bought, and nonresponse, creates imbalances in the covariate distributions. In the full sample (sample size  $N = 496$ ), some of the covariates differ by as much as 0.64 standard deviations. Following the Crump et al. calculations leads to a bound of 0.0914. Discarding the observations with an estimated propensity score outside the interval  $[0.0914, 0.9086]$  leads to a sample size 388. In this subsample, the largest normalized difference is 0.35, about

half of what it is in the full sample, with this improvement obtained by dropping approximately 20 percent of the original sample.

A potentially controversial feature of all these methods is that they change what is being estimated. Instead of estimating  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ , the Crump et al. (2009) approach estimates  $\tau_{\text{CATE}, \mathbb{A}^*}$ . This results in reduced external validity, but it is likely to improve internal validity.

### 5.11 *Assessing the Unconfoundedness Assumption*

The unconfoundedness assumption used in section 5 is not testable. It states that the conditional distribution of the outcome under the control given receipt of the active treatment and covariates, is identical to the distribution of the control outcome conditional on being in the control and covariates. A similar assumption is made for the distribution of the treatment outcome. Yet since the data are completely uninformative about the distribution of  $Y_i(0)$  for those who received the active treatment and of  $Y_i(1)$  for those receiving the control, the data can never reject the unconfoundedness assumption. Nevertheless, there are often indirect ways of assessing this assumption. The most important of these were developed in Rosenbaum (1987) and Heckman and Hotz (1989). Both methods rely on testing the null hypothesis that an average causal effect is zero, where the particular average causal effect is known to equal zero. If the testing procedure rejects the null hypothesis, this is interpreted as weakening the support for the unconfoundedness assumption. These tests can be divided into two groups.

The first set of tests focuses on estimating the causal effect of a treatment that is known not to have an effect. It relies on the presence of two or more control groups (Rosenbaum 1987). Suppose one has two potential control groups, for example eligible nonparticipants and ineligible, as in Heckman, Ichimura and

TABLE 3  
BALANCE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE LOTTERY DATA

Covariate	Losers		Winners		Normalized Difference Treated-Controls	
	(259)		(237)		All	$0.0914 \leq \hat{e}(X_i) \leq 0.9086$
	mean	(s.d.)	mean	(s.d.)	(496)	(388)
Year Won	1996.4	(1.0)	1996.1	(1.3)	−0.19	−0.13
Tickets Bought	2.19	(1.77)	4.57	(3.28)	0.64	0.33
Age	53.2	(12.9)	47.0	(13.8)	−0.33	−0.19
Male	0.67	(0.47)	0.58	(0.49)	−0.13	−0.09
Years of Schooling	14.4	(2.0)	13.0	(2.2)	−0.50	−0.35
Working Then	0.77	(0.42)	0.80	(0.40)	0.06	−0.02
Earnings Year −6	15.6	(14.5)	12.0	(11.8)	−0.19	−0.10
Earnings Year −5	16.0	(15.0)	12.1	(12.0)	−0.20	−0.12
Earnings Year −4	16.2	(15.4)	12.0	(12.1)	−0.21	−0.15
Earnings Year −3	16.6	(16.3)	12.8	(12.7)	−0.18	−0.14
Earnings Year −2	17.6	(16.9)	13.5	(13.0)	−0.19	−0.15
Earnings Year −1	18.0	(17.2)	14.5	(13.6)	−0.16	−0.14
Pos Earnings Year −6	0.69	(0.46)	0.70	(0.46)	0.02	0.05
Pos Earnings Year −5	0.68	(0.47)	0.74	(0.44)	0.10	0.07
Pos Earnings Year −4	0.69	(0.46)	0.73	(0.44)	0.07	0.02
Pos Earnings Year −3	0.68	(0.47)	0.73	(0.44)	0.09	0.02
Pos Earnings Year −2	0.68	(0.47)	0.74	(0.44)	0.10	0.04
Pos Earnings Year −1	0.69	(0.46)	0.74	(0.44)	0.07	0.02

Todd (1997). One can estimate a “pseudo” average treatment effect by analyzing the data from these two control groups as if one of them is the treatment group. In that case, the treatment effect is known to be zero and statistical evidence of a non-zero effect implies that at least one of the control groups is invalid. Again, not rejecting the test does not imply the unconfoundedness assumption is valid (as both control groups could suffer the same bias), but nonrejection in the case where the two control groups could potentially have different biases makes it more plausible that the unconfoundedness assumption holds. The key for the power of this test is to have available control groups that are likely to have different biases, if they have any at all. Comparing ineligible and eligible

nonparticipants as in Heckman, Ichimura and Todd (1997) is a particularly attractive comparison. Alternatively one may use geographically distinct comparison groups, for example from areas bordering on different sides of the treatment group.

To be more specific, let  $G_i$  be an indicator variable denoting the membership of the group, taking on three values,  $G_i \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ . For units with  $G_i = -1$  or 0, the treatment indicator  $W_i$  is equal to 0:

$$W_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } G_i = -1, 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } G_i = 1. \end{cases}$$

Unconfoundedness only requires that

$$(23) \quad Y_i(0), Y_i(1) \perp\!\!\!\perp W_i \mid X_i,$$



and this is not testable. Instead we focus on testing an implication of the stronger conditional independence relation

$$(24) \quad Y_i(0), Y_i(1) \perp\!\!\!\perp G_i \mid X_i.$$

This independence condition implies (23), but in contrast to that assumption, it also implies testable restrictions. In particular, we focus on the implication that

$$(25) \quad Y_i(0) \perp\!\!\!\perp G_i \mid X_i, G_i \in \{-1, 0\}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow Y_i \perp\!\!\!\perp G_i \mid X_i, G_i \in \{-1, 0\},$$

because  $G_i \in \{-1, 0\}$  implies that  $Y_i = Y_i(0)$ .

Because condition (24) is slightly stronger than unconfoundedness, the question is whether there are interesting settings where the weaker condition of unconfoundedness holds, but not the stronger condition. To discuss this question, it is useful to consider two alternative conditional independence conditions, both of which are implied by (24):

$$(26) \quad (Y_i(0), Y_i(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp W_i \mid X_i, G_i \in \{-1, 1\},$$

and

$$(27) \quad (Y_i(0), Y_i(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp W_i \mid X_i, G_i \in \{0, 1\}.$$

If (26) holds, then we can estimate the average causal effect by invoking the unconfoundedness assumption using only the first control group. Similarly, if (27) holds, then we can estimate the average causal effect by invoking the unconfoundedness assumption using only the second control group. The point is that it is difficult to envision a situation where unconfoundedness based on the two comparison groups holds—that is, (23) holds—but it does not hold using only one of the two comparison groups at the time. In practice, it seems likely that if unconfoundedness holds then so would the stronger condition (24), and we have the testable implication (25).

Next, we turn to implementation of the tests. We can simply test whether there is a difference in average values of  $Y_i$  between the two control groups, after adjusting for differences in  $X_i$ . That is, we effectively test whether

$$E[E[Y_i \mid G_i = -1, X_i] - E[Y_i \mid G_i = 0, X_i]] = 0.$$

More generally we may wish to test

$$E[E[Y_i \mid G_i = -1, X_i = x] - E[Y_i \mid G_i = 0, X_i = x]] = 0$$

for all  $x$  in the support of  $X_i$  using the methods discussed in Crump et al. (2008b). We can also include transformations of the basic outcomes in the procedure to test for difference in other aspects of the conditional distributions.

A second set of tests of unconfoundedness focuses on estimating the causal effect of the treatment on a variable known to be unaffected by it, typically because its value is determined prior to the treatment itself. Such a variable can be time-invariant, but the most interesting case is in considering the treatment effect on a lagged outcome. If it is not zero, this implies that the treated observations are distinct from the controls; namely that the distribution of  $Y_i(0)$  for the treated units is not comparable to the distribution of  $Y_i(0)$  for the controls. If the treatment is instead zero, it is more plausible that the unconfoundedness assumption holds. Of course this does not directly test the unconfoundedness assumption; in this setting, being able to reject the null of no effect does not directly reflect on the hypothesis of interest, unconfoundedness. Nevertheless, if the variables used in this proxy test are closely related to the outcome of interest, the test arguably has more power. For these tests it is clearly helpful to have a number of lagged outcomes.

First partition the vector of covariates  $X_i$  into two parts, a (scalar) pseudo outcome, denoted by  $X_i^p$ , and the remainder, denoted by  $X_i^r$ , so that  $X_i = (X_i^p, X_i^r)'$ . Now we will assess whether the following conditional independence relation holds:

$$(28) \quad X_i^p \perp\!\!\!\perp W_i \mid X_i^r.$$

The two issues are, first, the interpretation of this condition and its relationship to the unconfoundedness assumption, and second, the implementation of the test.

The first issue concerns the link between the conditional independence relation in (28) and original unconfoundedness. This link, by necessity, is indirect, as unconfoundedness cannot be tested directly. Here we lay out the arguments for the connection. First consider a related condition:

$$(29) \quad Y_i(0), Y_i(1) \perp\!\!\!\perp W_i \mid X_i^r.$$

If this modified unconfoundedness condition were to hold, one could use the adjustment methods using only the subset of covariates  $X_i^r$ . In practice, though not necessarily, this is a stronger condition than the original unconfoundedness condition which requires conditioning on the full vector  $X_i$ . One has to be careful here, because it is theoretically possible that conditional on a subset of the covariates unconfoundedness holds, but at the same time unconfoundedness does not hold conditional on the full set of covariates. In practice this situation is rare though. For example, it is difficult to imagine in an evaluation of a labor market program that unconfoundedness would hold given age and the level of education, but not if one additionally conditions on gender. Generally making subpopulations more homogenous in pretreatment variables tends to improve the plausibility of unconfoundedness.

The modified unconfoundedness condition (29) is not testable for the same reasons the

original unconfoundedness assumption is not testable. Nevertheless, if one has a proxy for either of the potential outcomes, and in particular a proxy that is observed irrespective of the treatment status, one can test independence for that proxy variable. We use the pseudo outcome  $X_i^p$  as such a proxy variable. That is, we view  $X_i^p$  as a proxy for, say,  $Y_i(0)$ , and assess (29) by testing (28).

The most convincing applications of these assessments are settings where the two links are plausible. One of the leading examples is where  $X_i$  contains multiple lagged measures of the outcome. For example, in the evaluation of the effect of a labor market program on annual earnings, one might have observations on earnings for, say, six years prior to the program. Denote these lagged outcomes by  $Y_{i,-1}, \dots, Y_{i,-6}$ , where  $Y_{i,-1}$  is the most recent and  $Y_{i,-6}$  is the most distant preprogram earnings measure. One could implement the above ideas using earnings for the most recent preprogram year  $Y_{i,-1}$  as the pseudo outcome  $X_i^p$ , so that the vector of remaining pretreatment variables  $X_i^r$  would still include the five prior years of preprogram earnings  $Y_{i,-2}, \dots, Y_{i,-6}$  (ignoring additional pre-treatment variables). In that case one might reasonably argue that if unconfoundedness holds given six years of preprogram earnings, it is plausible that it would also hold given only five years of preprogram earnings. Moreover, under unconfoundedness  $Y_i(c)$  is independent of  $W_i$  given  $Y_{i,-1}, \dots, Y_{i,-6}$ , which would suggest that it is plausible that  $Y_{i,-1}$  is independent of  $W_i$  given  $Y_{i,-2}, \dots, Y_{i,-6}$ . Given those arguments, one can plausibly assess unconfoundedness by testing whether

$$Y_{i,-1} \perp\!\!\!\perp W_i \mid Y_{i,-2}, \dots, Y_{i,-6}.$$

The implementation of the tests is the same as in the first set of tests for assessing unconfoundedness. We can simply test whether estimates of the average difference between

the groups adjusted for differences in  $X_i^r$  are zero, or test whether the average difference is zero for all values of the covariates (e.g., Crump et al. 2008).

### 5.12 Testing

Most of the focus in the evaluation literature has been on estimating average treatment effects. Testing has largely been limited to the null hypothesis that the average effect is zero. In that case testing is straightforward since many estimators exist for the average treatment effect that are approximately normally distributed in large samples with zero asymptotic bias. In addition there is some testing based on the Fisher approach using the randomization distribution. In many cases, however, there are other null hypotheses of interest. Crump et al. (2008) develop tests of the null hypotheses of zero average effects conditional on the covariates, and of a constant average effect conditional on the covariates. Formally, in the first case the null hypothesis

$$(30) \quad H_0: \tau(x) = 0, \quad \forall x,$$

against the alternative hypothesis

$$H_a: \tau(x) \neq 0, \quad \text{for some } x.$$

Recall that  $\tau(x) = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | X_i = x]$  is the average effect for the subpopulation with covariate value  $x$ . The second hypothesis studied by Crump et al. (2008) is

$$(31) \quad H_0: \tau(x) = \tau_{\text{PATE}}, \quad \forall x,$$

against the alternative hypothesis

$$H_a: \tau(x) \neq \tau_{\text{PATE}}, \quad \text{for some } x.$$

Part of their motivation is that in many cases there is substantive interest in whether the program is beneficial for some groups, even

if on average it does not affect outcomes.<sup>13</sup> They show that in some data sets they reject the null hypothesis (30) even though they cannot reject the null hypothesis of a zero average effect.

Taking the motivation in Crump et al. (2008) one step further, one may also be interested in testing the null hypothesis that the conditional distribution of  $Y_i(0)$  given  $X_i = x$  is the same as the conditional distribution of  $Y_i(1)$  given  $X_i = x$ . Under the maintained hypothesis of unconfoundedness, this is equivalent to testing the null hypothesis that

$$H_0: Y_i \perp\!\!\!\perp W_i | X_i,$$

against the alternative hypothesis that  $Y_i$  is not independent of  $W_i$  given  $X_i$ . Tests of this type can be implemented using the methods of Linton and Pedro Gozalo (2003). There have been no applications of these tests in the program evaluation literature.

### 5.13 Selection of Covariates

A very important set of decisions in implementing all of the methods described in this section involves the choice of covariates to be included in the regression functions or the propensity score. Except for warnings about including covariates that are themselves influenced by the treatment (for example, Heckman and Salvador Navarro-Lozano 2004; Wooldridge 2005), the literature has not been very helpful. Consequently, researchers have just included all covariates linearly, without much systematic effort to find more compelling specifications. Most of the technical results using nonparametric methods include rates at which the smoothing

<sup>13</sup>A second motivation is that it may be impossible to obtain precise estimates for  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  even in cases where one can convincingly reject some of the hypotheses regarding  $\tau(x)$ .

parameters should change with the sample size. For example, using regression estimators, one would have to choose the bandwidth if using kernel estimators, or the number of terms in the series if using series estimators. The program evaluation literature does not provide much guidance as to how to choose these smoothing parameters in practice. More generally, the nonparametric estimation literature has little to offer in this regard. Most of the results in this literature offer optimal choices for smoothing parameters if the criterion is integrated squared error. In the current setting the interest is in a scalar parameter, and the choice of smoothing parameter that is optimal for the regression function itself need not be close to optimal for the average treatment effect.

Hirano and Imbens (2001) consider an estimator that combines weighting with the propensity score and regression. In their application they have a large number of covariates, and they suggest deciding which ones to include on the basis of  $t$ -statistics. They find that the results are fairly insensitive to the actual cutoff point if they use the weight/regression estimator, but find more sensitivity if they only use weighting or regression. They do not provide formal properties for these choices.

Ichimura and Linton (2005) consider inverse probability weighting estimators and analyze the formal problem of bandwidth selection with the focus on the average treatment effect. Imbens, Newey and Ridder (2005) look at series regression estimators and analyze the choice of the number of terms to be included, again with the objective being the average treatment effect. Imbens and Rubin (forthcoming) discuss some step-wise covariate selection methods for finding a specification for the propensity score.

It is clear that more work needs to be done in this area, both for the case where the choice is which covariates to include from a large set of potential covariates, and in the case where the choice concerns

functional form and functions of a small set of covariates.

## 6. *Selection on Unobservables*

In this section we discuss a number of methods that relax the pair of assumptions made in section 5. Unlike in the setting under unconfoundedness, there is not a unified set of methods for this case. In a number of special cases there are well-understood methods, but there are many cases without clear recommendations. We will highlight some of the controversies and different approaches. First we discuss some methods that simply drop the unconfoundedness assumption. Next, in section 6.2, we discuss sensitivity analyses that relax the unconfoundedness assumption in a more limited manner. In section 6.3, we discuss instrumental variables methods. Then, in section 6.4 we discuss regression discontinuity designs, and in section 6.5 we discuss difference-in-differences methods.

### 6.1 *Bounds*

In a series of papers and books, Manski (1990, 1995, 2003, 2005, 2007) has developed a general framework for inference in settings where the parameters of interest are not identified. Manski's key insight is that even if in large samples one cannot infer the exact value of the parameter, one may be able to rule out some values that one could not rule out a priori. Prior to Manski's work, researchers had typically dismissed models that are not point-identified as not useful in practice. This framework is not restricted to causal settings, and the reader is referred to Manski (2007) for a general discussion of the approach. Here we limit the discussion to program evaluation settings.

We start by discussing Manski's perspective in a very simple case. Suppose we have no covariates and a binary outcome  $Y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Let the goal be inference for the

average effect in the population,  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ . We can decompose the population average treatment effect as

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{\text{PATE}} = & E[Y_i(1) | W_i = 1] \cdot \text{pr}(W_i = 1) \\ & + E[Y_i(1) | W_i = 0] \cdot \text{pr}(W_i = 0) \\ & - E[Y_i(0) | W_i = 1] \cdot \text{pr}(W_i = 1) \\ & + E[Y_i(0) | W_i = 0] \cdot \text{pr}(W_i = 0).\end{aligned}$$

Of the eight components of this expression, we can estimate six. The data contain no information about the remaining two,  $E[Y_i(1) | W_i = 0]$  and  $E[Y_i(0) | W_i = 1]$ . Because the outcome is binary, and before seeing any data, we can deduce that these two conditional expectations must lie inside the interval  $[0, 1]$ , but we cannot say any more without additional assumptions. This implies that without additional assumptions we can be sure that

$$\tau_{\text{PATE}} \in [\tau_l, \tau_u],$$

where we can express the lower and upper bound in terms of estimable quantities,

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_l = & E[Y_i(1) | W_i = 1] \cdot \text{pr}(W_i = 1) \\ & - \text{pr}(W_i = 1) - E[Y_i(0) | W_i = 0] \\ & \times \text{pr}(W_i = 0),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_u = & E[Y_i(1) | W_i = 1] \cdot \text{pr}(W_i = 1) \\ & + \text{pr}(W_i = 0) - E[Y_i(0) | W_i = 0] \\ & \times \text{pr}(W_i = 0),\end{aligned}$$

In other words, we can bound the average treatment effect. In this example the bounds are tight, meaning that without additional

assumptions we cannot rule out any value inside the bounds. See Manski et al. (1992) for an empirical example of these particular bounds.

In this specific case the bounds are not particularly informative. The width of the bounds, the difference in  $\tau_u - \tau_l$ , with  $\tau_l$  and  $\tau_u$  given above, is always equal to one, implying we can never rule out a zero average treatment effect. (In some sense this is obvious: if we refrain from making any assumptions regarding the treatment effects we cannot rule out that the treatment effect is zero for any unit.) In general, however, we can add some assumptions, short of making the type of assumption as strong as unconfoundedness that gets us back to the point-identified case. With such weaker assumptions we may be able to tighten the bounds and obtain informative results, without making the strong assumptions that strain credibility. The presence of covariates increases the scope for additional assumptions that may tighten the bounds. Examples of such assumptions include those in the spirit of instrumental variables, where some covariates are known not to affect the potential outcomes (e.g., Manski 2007), or monotonicity assumptions where expected outcomes are monotonically related to covariates or treatments (e.g., Manski and John V. Pepper 2000). For an application of these methods, see Hotz, Charles H. Mullin, and Seth G. Sanders (1997). We return to some of these settings in section 6.3.

This discussion has focused on identification and demonstrated what can be learned in large samples. In practice these bounds need to be estimated, which leads to additional uncertainty regarding the estimands. A fast developing literature (e.g., Horowitz and Manski 2000; Imbens and Manski 2004; Chernozhukov, Hong, and Elie Tamer 2007; Arie Beresteanu and Francesca Molinari 2006; Romano and Azeem M. Shaikh 2006a, 2006b; Ariel Pakes et al. 2006; Adam M. Rosen 2006; Donald W. K. Andrews and



Gustavo Soares 2007; Ivan A. Canay 2007; and Jörg Stoye 2007) discusses construction of confidence intervals in general settings with partial identification. One point of contention in this literature has been whether the focus should be on confidence intervals for the parameter of interest ( $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  in this case), or for the identified set. Imbens and Manski (2004) develop confidence sets for the parameter. In large samples, and at a 95 percent confidence level, the Imbens–Manski confidence intervals amount to taking the lower bound minus 1.645 times the standard error of the lower bound and the upper bound plus 1.645 times its standard error. The reason for using 1.645 rather than 1.96 is to take account of the fact that, even in the limit, the width of the confidence set will not shrink to zero, and therefore one only needs to be concerned with one-sided errors. Chernozhukov, Hong, and Tamer (2007) focus on confidence sets that include the entire partially identified set itself with fixed probability. For a given confidence level, the latter approach generally leads to larger confidence sets than the Imbens–Manski approach. See also Romano and Shaikh (2006a, 2006b) for subsampling approaches to inference in these settings.

## 6.2 *Sensitivity Analysis*

Unconfoundedness has traditionally been seen as an all or nothing assumption: either it is satisfied and one proceeds accordingly using the methods appropriate under unconfoundedness, such as matching, or the assumption is deemed implausible and one considers alternative methods. The latter include the bounds approach discussed in section 6.1, as well as approaches relying on alternative assumptions, such as instrumental variables, which will be discussed in section 6.3. However, there is an important alternative that has received much less attention in the economics literature. Instead of

completely relaxing the unconfoundedness assumption, the idea is to relax it slightly. More specifically, violations of unconfoundedness are interpreted as evidence of the presence of unobserved covariates that are correlated, both with the potential outcomes and with the treatment indicator. The size of bias these violations of unconfoundedness can induce depends on the strength of these correlations. Sensitivity analyses investigate whether results obtained under the maintained assumption of unconfoundedness can be changed substantially, or even overturned entirely, by modest violations of the unconfoundedness assumption.

To be specific, consider a job training program with voluntary enrollment. Suppose that we have monthly labor market histories for a two year period prior to the program. We may be concerned that individuals choosing to enroll in the program are more motivated to find a job than those that choose not to enroll in the program. This unobserved motivation may be related to subsequent earnings both in the presence and in the absence of training. Conditioning on the recent labor market histories of individuals may limit the bias associated with this unobserved motivation, but it need not eliminate it entirely. However, we may be willing to limit how highly correlated unobserved motivation is with the enrollment decision and the earnings outcomes in the two regimes, conditional on the labor market histories. For example, if we compare two individuals with the same labor market history for the last two years, e.g., not employed the last six months and working the eighteen months before, and both with one two-year old child, it may be reasonable to assume that these cannot differ radically in their unobserved motivation given that their recent labor market outcomes have been so similar. The sensitivity analyses developed by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983a) formalize this idea and provides a

tool for making such assessments. Imbens (2003) applies this sensitivity analysis to data from labor market training programs. The second approach is associated with work by Rosenbaum (1995). Similar to the Rosenbaum–Rubin approach Rosenbaum’s method relies on an unobserved covariate that generates the deviations from unconfoundedness. The analysis differs in that sensitivity is measured using only the relation between the unobserved covariate and the treatment assignment, with the focus on the correlation required to overturn, or change substantially,  $p$ -values of statistical tests of no effect of the treatment.

### 6.2.1 *The Rosenbaum–Rubin Approach to Sensitivity Analysis*

The starting point is that unconfoundedness is satisfied only conditional on the observed covariates  $X_i$  and an unobserved scalar covariate  $U_i$ :

$$Y_i(0), Y_i(1) \perp\!\!\!\perp W_i \mid X_i, U_i.$$

This set up in itself is not restrictive, although once parametric assumptions are made the assumption of a scalar unobserved covariate  $U_i$  is restrictive.

Now consider both the conditional distribution of the potential outcomes given observed and unobserved covariates and the conditional probability of assignment given observed and unobserved covariates. Rather than attempting to estimate both these conditional distributions, the idea behind the sensitivity analysis is to specify the form and the amount of dependence of these conditional distributions on the unobserved covariate, and estimate only the dependence on the observed covariate. Conditional on the specification of the first part estimation of the latter is typically straightforward. The idea is then to vary the amount of dependence of the conditional distributions on the unobserved covariate and assess how much

this changes the point estimate of the average treatment effect.

Typically the sensitivity analysis is done in fully parametric settings, although since the models can be arbitrarily flexible, this is not particularly restrictive. Following Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983b), we illustrate this approach in a setting with binary outcomes. See Imbens (2003) and Lee (2005b) for examples in economics. Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983a) fix the marginal distribution of the unobserved covariate to be binomial with  $p = \text{pr}(U_i = 1)$ , and assume independence of  $U_i$  and  $X_i$ . They specify a logistic distribution for the treatment assignment:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr}(W_i = 1 \mid X_i = x, U_i = u) \\ = \frac{\exp(\alpha_0 + \alpha'_1 x + \alpha_2 \cdot u)}{1 + \exp(\alpha_0 + \alpha'_1 x + \alpha_2 \cdot u)}. \end{aligned}$$

They also specify logistic regression functions for the two potential outcomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr}(Y_i(w) = 1 \mid X_i = x, U_i = u) = \\ \frac{\exp(\beta_{w0} + \beta'_{w1} x + \beta_{w2} \cdot u)}{1 + \exp(\beta_{w0} + \beta'_{w1} x + \beta_{w2} \cdot u)}. \end{aligned}$$

For the subpopulation with  $X_i = x$  and  $U_i = u$ , the average treatment effect is

$$\begin{aligned} E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) \mid X_i = x, U_i = u] = \\ \frac{\exp(\beta_{10} + \beta'_{11} x + \beta_{12} \cdot u)}{1 + \exp(\beta_{10} + \beta'_{11} x + \beta_{12} \cdot u)} \\ - \frac{\exp(\beta_{00} + \beta'_{01} x + \beta_{02} \cdot u)}{1 + \exp(\beta_{00} + \beta'_{01} x + \beta_{02} \cdot u)}. \end{aligned}$$

The average treatment effect  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$  can be expressed in terms of the parameters of this model and the distribution of the observable covariates by averaging over  $X_i$ , and integrating out the unobserved covariate  $U$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tau_{\text{CATE}} &\equiv \tau(p, \alpha_2, \beta_{02}, \beta_{12}, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_{00}, \\
 &\quad \beta_{01}, \beta_{10}, \beta_{11}) \\
 &= \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N p \left( \frac{\exp(\beta_{10} + \beta'_{11} X_i + \beta_{12})}{1 + \exp(\beta_{10} + \beta'_{11} X_i + \beta_{12})} \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{\exp(\beta_{00} + \beta'_{01} X_i + \beta_{02})}{1 + \exp(\beta_{00} + \beta'_{01} X_i + \beta_{02})} \right) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + (1 - p) \left( \frac{\exp(\beta_{10} + \beta'_{11} X_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta_{10} + \beta'_{11} X_i)} \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{\exp(\beta_{00} + \beta'_{01} X_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta_{00} + \beta'_{01} X_i)} \right) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We do not know the values of the parameters  $(p, \alpha, \beta)$ , but the data are somewhat informative about them. One conventional approach would be to attempt to estimate all parameters, and then use those estimates to obtain an estimate for the average treatment effect. Given the specific parametric model this may be possible, although in general this would be difficult given the inclusion of unobserved covariates in the basic model. A second approach, as discussed in section 6.1, is to derive bounds on  $\tau$  given the model and the data. A sensitivity analysis offers a third approach.

The Rosenbaum–Rubin sensitivity analysis proceeds by dividing the parameters into two sets. The first set includes the parameters that would be set to boundary values under unconfoundedness,  $(\alpha_2, \beta_{02}, \beta_{12})$ , plus the parameter  $p$  capturing the marginal distribution of the unobserved covariate  $U_i$ . Together we refer to these as the sensitivity parameters,  $\theta_{\text{sens}} = (p, \alpha_2, \beta_{02}, \beta_{12})$ . The second set consists of the remaining parameters,  $\theta_{\text{other}} = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_{00}, \beta_{01}, \beta_{10}, \beta_{11})$ . The idea is that  $\theta_{\text{sens}}$  is difficult to estimate. Estimates of the other parameters under unconfoundedness could be obtained by fixing  $\alpha_2 = \beta_{02} = \beta_{12} = 0$  and  $p$  at an arbitrary value. The data are not directly informative about the effect of an unobserved covariate in the absence of

functional form assumptions, and so attempts to estimate  $\theta_{\text{sens}}$  are therefore unlikely to be effective. Given  $\theta_{\text{sens}}$ , however, estimating the remaining parameters is considerably easier. In the second step the plan is therefore to fix the first set of parameters and estimate the others by maximum likelihood, and then translate this into an estimate for  $\tau$ . Thus, for fixed  $\theta_{\text{sens}}$ , we first estimate the remaining parameters through maximum likelihood:

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{other}}(\theta_{\text{sens}}) = \arg \max_{\theta_{\text{other}}} L(\theta_{\text{other}} | \theta_{\text{sens}}),$$

where  $L(\cdot)$  is the logarithm of the likelihood function. Then we consider the function

$$\tau(\theta_{\text{sens}}) = \tau(\theta_{\text{sens}}, \hat{\theta}_{\text{other}}(\theta_{\text{sens}})),$$

Finally, in the third step, we consider the range of values of the function  $\tau(\theta_{\text{sens}})$  for a reasonable set of values for the sensitivity parameters  $(\theta_{\text{sens}})$ , and obtain a set of values for  $\tau_{\text{CATE}}$ .

The key question is how to choose the set of reasonable values for the sensitivity parameters. If we do not wish to restrict this set at all, we end up with unrestricted bounds along the lines of section 6.1. The power from the sensitivity approach comes from the researcher's willingness to put real limits on the values of the sensitivity parameters  $(p, \alpha_2, \beta_{02}, \beta_{12})$ . Among these parameters it is difficult to put real limits on  $p$ , and typically it is fixed at 1/2, with little sensitivity to its choice. The more interesting parameters are  $(\alpha_2, \beta_{02}, \beta_{12})$ . Let us assume that the effect of the unobserved covariate is the same in both treatment arms,  $\beta_2 \equiv \beta_{02} = \beta_{12}$ , so that there are only two parameters left to fix,  $\alpha_2$  and  $\beta_2$ . Imbens (2003) suggests linking the parameters to the effects of the observed covariates on assignment and potential outcomes. Specifically he suggests to calculate the partial correlations between observed covariates and the treatment and potential outcomes, and then as a benchmark look at the sensitivity to an unobserved

covariate that has partial correlations with treatment and potential outcomes as high as any of the observed covariates. For example, Imbens considers, in the labor market training example, what the effect would be of omitting unobserved motivation, if in fact motivation had as much explanatory power for future earnings and for treatment choice as did earnings in the year prior to the training program. A bounds analysis, in contrast, would implicitly allow unobserved motivation to completely determine both selection into the program and future earnings. Even though putting hard limits on the effect of motivation on earnings and treatment choice may be difficult, it may be reasonable to put some limits on it, and the Rosenbaum–Rubin sensitivity analysis provides a useful framework for doing so.

### 6.2.2 *Rosenbaum's Method for Sensitivity Analysis*

Rosenbaum (1995) developed a slightly different approach. The advantage of his approach is that it requires fewer tuning parameters than the Rosenbaum–Rubin approach. Specifically, it only requires the researcher to consider the effect unobserved confounders may have on the probability of treatment assignment. Rosenbaum's focus is on the effect the presence of unobserved covariates could have on the  $p$ -value for the test of no effect of the treatment based on the unconfoundedness assumption, in contrast to the Rosenbaum–Rubin focus on point estimates for average treatment effects. Consider two units  $i$  and  $j$  with the same value for the covariates,  $x_i = x_j$ . If the unconfoundedness assumption conditional on  $X_i$  holds, both units must have the same probability of assignment to the treatment,  $e(x_i) = e(x_j)$ . Now suppose unconfoundedness only holds conditional on both  $X_i$  and a binary unobserved covariate  $U_i$ . In that case the assignment probabilities for these two units may differ. Rosenbaum

suggests bounding the ratio of the odds ratios  $e(x_i)/(1 - e(x_i))$  and  $e(x_j)/(1 - e(x_j))$ :

$$1/\Gamma \leq \frac{e(x_i) \cdot (1 - e(x_j))}{(1 - e(x_i)) \cdot e(x_j)} \leq \Gamma.$$

If  $\Gamma = 1$ , we are back in the setting with unconfoundedness. If we allow  $\Gamma = \infty$ , we are not restricting the association between the treatment indicator and the potential outcomes. Rosenbaum investigates how much the odds would have to be different in order to substantially change the  $p$ -value. Or, starting from the other side, he investigates for fixed values of  $\Gamma$  what the implication is on the  $p$ -value.

For example, suppose that a test of the null hypothesis of no effect has a  $p$ -value of 0.0001 under the assumption of unconfoundedness. If the data suggest it would take the presence of an unobserved covariate that changes the odds of participation by a factor ten in order to increase that  $p$ -value to 0.05, then one would likely consider the result to be very robust. If instead a small change in the odds of participation, say with a value of  $\Gamma = 1.5$ , would be sufficient for a change of the  $p$ -value to 0.05, the study would be much less robust.

### 6.3 *Instrumental Variables*

In this section, we review the recent literature on instrumental variables. We focus on the part of the literature concerned with heterogeneous effects. In the current section, we limit the discussion to the case with a binary endogenous variable. The early literature focused on identification of the population average treatment effect and the average effect on the treated. Identification of these estimands ran into serious problems once researchers wished to allow for unrestricted heterogeneity in the effect of the treatment. In an important early result, Bloom (1984) showed that if eligibility for the program is used as an instrument, then one

can identify the average effect of the treatment for those who received the treatment. Key for the Bloom result is that the instrument changes the probability of receiving the treatment to zero. In order to identify the average effect on the overall population, the instrument would also need to shift the probability of receiving the treatment to one. This type of identification is sometimes referred to as identification at infinity (Gary Chamberlain 1986; Heckman 1990) in settings with a continuous instrument. The practical usefulness of such identification results is fairly limited outside of cases where eligibility is randomized. Finding a credible instrument is typically difficult enough, without also requiring that the instrument shifts the probability of the treatment close to zero and one. In fact, the focus of the current literature on instruments that can credibly be expected to satisfy exclusion restrictions makes it even more difficult to find instruments that even approximately satisfy these support conditions. Imbens and Angrist (1994) got around this problem by changing the focus to average effects for the subpopulation that is affected by the instrument.

Initially we focus on the case with a binary instrument. This case provides some of the clearest insight into the identification problems. In that case the identification at infinity arguments are obviously not satisfied and so one cannot (point-)identify the population average treatment effect.

### 6.3.1 A Binary Instrument

Imbens and Angrist adopt a potential outcome notation for the receipt of the treatment, as well as for the outcome itself. Let  $Z_i$  denote the value of the instrument for individual  $i$ . Let  $W_i(0)$  and  $W_i(1)$  denote the level of the treatment received if the instrument takes on the values 0 and 1 respectively. As before, let  $Y_i(0)$  and  $Y_i(1)$  denote the potential values for the outcome of interest. The observed treatment is, analogously to the relation between

the observed outcome  $Y_i$  and the potential outcomes  $Y_i(0)$  and  $Y_i(1)$ , is

$$W_i = W_i(0) \cdot (1 - Z_i) + W_i(1) \cdot Z_i = \begin{cases} W_i(0) & \text{if } Z_i = 0 \\ W_i(1) & \text{if } Z_i = 1 \end{cases}$$

Exogeneity of the instrument is captured by the assumption that all potential outcomes are independent of the instrument, or

$$(Y_i(0), Y_i(1), W_i(0), W_i(1)) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z_i.$$

Formulating exogeneity in this way is attractive compared to conventional residual-based definitions, as it does not require the researcher to specify a regression function in order to define the residuals. This assumption captures two properties of the instrument. First, it captures random assignment of the instrument so that causal effects of the instrument on the outcome and treatment received can be estimated consistently. This part of the assumption, which is implied by explicitly randomization of the instrument, as for example in the seminal draft lottery study by Angrist (1990), is not sufficient for causal interpretations of instrumental variables methods. The second part of the assumption captures an exclusion restriction that there is no direct effect of the instrument on the outcome. This second part is captured by the absence of  $z$  in the definition of the potential outcome  $Y_i(w)$ . This part of the assumption is not implied by randomization of the instrument and it has to be argued on a case by case basis. See Angrist, Imbens, and Rubin (1996) for more discussion on the distinction between these two assumptions, and for a formulation that separates them.

Imbens and Angrist introduce a new concept, the compliance type of an individual. The type of an individual describes the level of the treatment that an individual would receive given each value of the instrument.



In other words, it is captured by the pair of values  $(W_i(0), W_i(1))$ . With both the treatment and instrument binary, there are four types of responses for the potential treatment. It is useful to define the compliance types explicitly:

$$T_i = \begin{cases} \text{never-taker} & \text{if } W_i(0) = W_i(1) = 0 \\ \text{complier} & \text{if } W_i(0) = 0, W_i(1) = 1 \\ \text{defier} & \text{if } W_i(0) = 1, W_i(1) = 0 \\ \text{always-taker} & \text{if } W_i(0) = W_i(1) = 1 \end{cases}$$

The labels never-taker, complier, defier, and always-taker (e.g., Angrist, Imbens, and Rubin 1996) refer to the setting of a randomized experiment with noncompliance, where the instrument is the (random) assignment to the treatment and the endogenous regressor is an indicator for the actual receipt of the treatment. Compliers are in that case individuals who (always) comply with their assignment, that is, take the treatment if assigned to it and not take it if assigned to the control group. One cannot infer from the observed data  $(Z_i, W_i, Y_i)$  whether a particular individual is a complier or not. It is important not to confuse compliers (who comply with their actual assignment and would have complied with the alternative assignment) with individuals who are observed to comply with their actual assignment: that is, individuals who complied with the assignment they actually received,  $Z_i = W_i$ . For such individuals we do not know what they would have done had their assignment been different, that is we do not know the value of  $W_i(1 - Z_i)$ .

Imbens and Angrist then invoke an additional assumption they refer to as *monotonicity*. Monotonicity requires that  $W_i(1) \geq W_i(0)$  for all individuals, or that increasing the level of the instrument does not decrease the level of the treatment. This assumption is equivalent to ruling out the presence of defiers, and it is therefore sometimes referred to as the “no-defiance” assumption (Alexander Balke and Pearl 1994; Pearl 2000). Note that in the

Bloom set up with one-sided noncompliance both always-takers and defiers are absent by assumption.

Under these two assumptions, independence of all four potential outcomes  $(Y_i(0), Y_i(1), W_i(0), W_i(1))$  and the instrument  $Z_i$ , and monotonicity, Imbens and Angrist show that one can identify the average effect of the treatment for the subpopulation of compliers. Before going through their argument, it is useful to see why we cannot generally identify the average effect of the treatment for others subpopulations. Clearly, one cannot identify the average effect of the treatment for never-takers because they are never observed receiving the treatment, and so  $E[Y_i(1)|T_i = n]$  is not identified. Thus, only compliers are observed in both treatment groups, so only for this group is there any chance of identifying the average treatment effect. In order to understand the positive component of the Imbens–Angrist result, that we can identify the average effect for compliers, it is useful to consider the subpopulations defined by instrument and treatment. Table 4 shows the information we have about the individual’s type given the monotonicity assumption. Consider individuals with  $(Z_i = 1, W_i = 0)$ . Because of monotonicity such individuals can only be never-takers. Similarly, individuals  $(Z_i = 0, W_i = 1)$  can only be always-takers. However, consider individuals with  $(Z_i = 0, W_i = 0)$ . Such individuals can be either compliers or never-takers. We cannot infer the type of such individuals from the observed data alone. Similarly, individuals with  $(Z_i = 1, W_i = 1)$  can be either compliers or always-takers.

The intuition for the identification result is as follows. The first step is to see that we can infer the population proportions of the three remaining subpopulations, never-takers, always-takers and compliers (using the fact that the monotonicity assumption rules out the presence of defiers). Call these

TABLE 4  
TYPE BY OBSERVED VARIABLES

	$Z_i$		
	0		1
	0	Nevertaker/Complier	Nevertaker
$W_i$	1	Always taker	Always taker/Complier

population shares  $P_t = \text{pr}(T_i = t)$ , for  $t \in \{n, a, c\}$ . Consider the subpopulation with  $Z_i = 0$ . Within this subpopulation we observe  $W_i = 1$  only for always-takers. Hence the conditional probability of  $W_i = 1$  given  $Z_i = 0$  is equal to the population share of always-takers:  $P_a = \text{pr}(W_i = 1 | Z_i = 0)$ . Similarly, in the subpopulation with  $Z_i = 1$  we observe  $W_i = 0$  only for never-takers. Hence the population share of never-takers is equal to the conditional probability of  $W_i = 0$  given  $Z_i = 1$ :  $P_n = \text{pr}(W_i = 0 | Z_i = 1)$ . The population share of compliers is then obtained by subtracting the population shares of never-takers and always-takers from one:  $P_c = 1 - P_n - P_a$ . The second step uses the distribution of  $Y_i$  given  $(Z_i, W_i)$ . We can infer the distribution of  $Y_i | W_i = 0, T_i = n$  from the subpopulation with  $(Z_i, W_i) = (1, 0)$  since all these individuals are known to be never-takers. Then we use the distribution of  $Y_i | Z_i = 0, W_i = 0$ . This is a mixture of the distribution of  $Y_i | W_i = 0, T_i = n$  and the distribution of  $Y_i | W_i = 0, T_i = c$ , with mixture probabilities equal to the relative population shares,  $P_n / (P_c + P_n)$  and  $P_c / (P_c + P_n)$ , respectively. Since we already inferred the population shares of the never-takers and compliers as well as the distribution of  $Y_i | W_i = 0, T_i = n$ , we can back out of the conditional distribution of  $Y_i | W_i = 0, T_i = c$ . Similarly we can infer the conditional distribution of  $Y_i | W_i = 1, T_i = c$ . The difference between the means of these two conditional distributions is the Local Average Treatment Effect (LATE), (Imbens and Angrist, 1994):

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\text{LATE}} &= E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | W_i(0) = 0, \\ &\quad W_i(1) = 1] \\ &= E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | T_i = \text{complier}]. \end{aligned}$$

In practice one need not estimate the local average treatment effect by decomposing the mixture distributions directly. Imbens and Angrist show that LATE equals the standard instrumental variables estimand, the ratio of the covariance of  $Y_i$  and  $Z_i$  and the covariance of  $W_i$  and  $Z_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\text{LATE}} &= \frac{E[Y_i | Z_i = 1] - E[Y_i | Z_i = 0]}{E[W_i | Z_i = 1] - E[W_i | Z_i = 0]} \\ &= \frac{E[Y_i \cdot (Z_i - E[Z_i])]}{E[W_i \cdot (Z_i - E[Z_i])]}, \end{aligned}$$

which can be estimated using two-stage-least-squares. For applications using parametric models with covariate, see Hirano et al. (2000) and Fabrizia Mealli et al. (2004).

Earlier we argued that one cannot consistently estimate the average effect for either never-takers or always-takers in this setting. Nevertheless, we can still use the bounds approach from Manski (1990, 1995) to bound the average effect for the full population. To understand the nature of the bound, it is useful to decompose the average effect  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  by compliance type (maintaining monotonicity, so there are no defiers):

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{\text{PATE}} &= P_n \cdot E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | T_i = n] \\ &\quad + P_a \cdot E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | T_i = a] \\ &\quad + P_c \cdot E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | T_i = c].\end{aligned}$$

The only quantities not consistently estimable are the average effects for never-takers and always-takers. Even for those we have some information. For example, we can write  $E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | T_i = n] = E[Y_i(1) | T_i = n] - E[Y_i(0) | T_i = n]$ . The second term we can estimate, and the data are completely uninformative about the first term. Hence, if there are natural bounds on  $Y_i(1)$  (for example, if the outcome is binary), we can use that to bound  $E[Y_i(1) | T_i = n]$ , and then in turn use that to bound  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$ . These bounds are tight. See Manski (1990), Toru Kitagawa (2008), and Balke and Pearl (1994).

### 6.3.2 Multivalued Instruments and Weighted Local Average Treatment Effects

The previous discussion was in terms of a single binary instrument. In that case there is no other average effect of the treatment that can be estimated consistently other than the local average treatment effect,  $\tau_{\text{LATE}}$ . With a multivalued instrument, or with multiple binary instruments (still maintaining the setting of a binary treatment—see for extensions of the local average treatment effect concept to the multiple treatment case Angrist and Imbens (1995) and Card (2001), we can estimate a variety of local average treatment effects. Let  $\mathbb{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_K\}$  denote the set of values for the instruments. Initially we take the set of values to be finite. Then for each pair  $(z_k, z_l)$  with  $\text{pr}(W_i = 1 | Z_i = z_k) > \text{pr}(W_i = 1 | Z_i = z_l)$  one can define a local average treatment effect:

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{\text{LATE}}(z_k, z_l) &= \\ E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | W_i(z_l) = 0, W_i(z_k) = 1].\end{aligned}$$

We can combine these to estimate any weighted average of these local average treatment effects:

$$\tau_{\text{LATE}, \lambda} = \sum_{k,l} \lambda_{k,l} \cdot \tau_{\text{LATE}}(z_k, z_l).$$

Imbens and Angrist show that the standard instrumental variables estimand, using  $g(Z_i)$  as an instrument for  $W_i$ , is equal to a particular weighted average:

$$\frac{E[Y_i \cdot (g(Z_i) - E[g(Z_i)])]}{E[W_i \cdot (g(Z_i) - E[g(Z_i)])]} = \tau_{\text{LATE}, \lambda},$$

for a particular set of nonnegative weights as long as  $E[W_i | g(Z_i) = g]$  increases in  $g$ .

Heckman and Vytlačil (2006) and Heckman, Sergio Urzua, and Vytlačil (2006) study the case with a continuous instrument. They use an additive latent single index setup where the treatment received is equal to

$$W_i = 1\{h(Z_i) + V_i \geq 0\},$$

where  $h(\cdot)$  is strictly monotonic, and the latent type  $V_i$  is independent of  $Z_i$ . In general, in the presence of multiple instruments, this latent single index framework imposes substantive restrictions.<sup>14</sup> Without loss of generality we can take the marginal distribution of  $V_i$  to be uniform. Given this framework, Heckman, Urzua, and Vytlačil (2006) define the marginal treatment effect as a function of the latent type  $v$  of an individual,

$$\tau_{\text{MTE}}(v) = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | V_i = v].$$

In the single continuous instrument case,  $\tau_{\text{MTE}}(v)$  is, under some differentiability and invertibility conditions, equal to a limit of local average treatment effects:

<sup>14</sup>See Vytlačil (2002) for a discussion in the case with binary instruments, where the latent index set up implies no loss of generality.

$$\tau_{\text{MTE}}(v) = \lim_{z \downarrow h^{-1}(v)} \tau_{\text{LATE}}(h^{-1}(v), z).$$

A parametric version of this concept goes back to work by Anders Björklund and Robert Moffitt (1987). All average treatment effects, including the overall average effect, the average effect for the treated, and any local average treatment effect can now be expressed in terms of integrals of this marginal treatment effect, as shown in Heckman and Vytlačil (2005). For example,  $\tau_{\text{PATE}} = \int_0^1 \tau_{\text{MTE}}(v) dv$ . A complication in practice is that not necessarily all the marginal treatment effects can be estimated. For example, if the instrument is binary,  $Z_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , then for individuals with  $V_i < \min(-h(0), -h(1))$ , it follows that  $W_i = 0$ , and for these never-takers we cannot estimate  $\tau_{\text{MTE}}(v)$ . Any average effect that requires averaging over such values of  $v$  is therefore also not point-identified. Moreover, average effects that can be expressed as integrals of  $\tau_{\text{MTE}}(v)$  may be identified even if some of the  $\tau_{\text{MTE}}(v)$  that are being integrated over are not identified. Again, in a binary instrument example with  $\text{pr}(W_i = 1 | Z_i = 1) = 1$ , and  $\text{pr}(W_i = 1 | Z_i = 0) = 0$ , the average treatment effect  $\tau_{\text{PATE}}$  is identified, but  $\tau_{\text{MTE}}(v)$  is not identified for any value of  $v$ .

#### 6.4 Regression Discontinuity Designs

Regression discontinuity (RD) methods have been around for a long time in the psychology and applied statistics literature, going back to the early 1960s. For discussions and references from this literature, see Donald L. Thistlethwaite and Campbell (1960), William M. K. Trochim (2001), Shadish, Cook, and Campbell (2002), and Cook (2008). Except for some important foundational work by Goldberger (1972a, 1972b), it is only recently that these methods have attracted much attention in the economics literature. For some of the recent applications, see Van Der Klaauw (2002, 2008a), Lee (2008), Angrist and Victor Lavy (1999), DiNardo and Lee (2004),

Kenneth Y. Chay and Michael Greenstone (2005), Card, Alexandre Mas, and Jesse Rothstein (2007), Lee, Enrico Moretti, and Matthew J. Butler (2004), Jens Ludwig and Douglas L. Miller (2007), Patrick J. McEwan and Joseph S. Shapiro (2008), Sandra E. Black (1999), Susan Chen and van der Klaauw (2008), Ginger Zhe Jin and Phillip Leslie (2003), Thomas Lemieux and Kevin Milligan (2008), Per Pettersson-Lidbom (2007, 2008), and Pettersson-Lidbom and Björn Tyrefors (2007). Key theoretical and conceptual contributions include the interpretation of estimates for fuzzy regression discontinuity designs allowing for general heterogeneity of treatment effects (Hahn, Todd, and van der Klaauw 2001), adaptive estimation methods (Yixiao Sun 2005), methods for bandwidth selection tailored to the RD setting, (Ludwig and Miller 2005; Imbens and Karthik Kalyanaraman 2008) and various tests for discontinuities in means and distributions of nonaffected variables (Lee 2008; McCrary 2008) and for misspecification (Lee and Card 2008). For recent reviews in the economics literature, see van der Klaauw (2008b), Imbens and Lemieux (2008), and Lee and Lemieux (2008).

The basic idea behind the RD design is that assignment to the treatment is determined, either completely or partly, by the value of a predictor (the forcing variable  $X_i$ ) being on either side of a common threshold. This generates a discontinuity, sometimes of size one, in the conditional probability of receiving the treatment as a function of this particular predictor. The forcing variable is often itself associated with the potential outcomes, but this association is assumed to be smooth. As a result any discontinuity of the conditional distribution of the outcome as a function of this covariate at the threshold is interpreted as evidence of a causal effect of the treatment. The design often arises from administrative decisions, where the incentives for individuals to participate in a program are rationed

for reasons of resource constraints, and clear transparent rules, rather than discretion, by administrators are used for the allocation of these incentives.

It is useful to distinguish between two general settings, the sharp and the fuzzy regression discontinuity designs (e.g., Trochim 1984, 2001; Hahn, Todd, and van der Klaauw 2001; Imbens and Lemieux 2008; van der Klaauw 2008b; Lee and Lemieux 2008).

#### 6.4.1 *The Sharp Regression Discontinuity Design*

In the sharp regression discontinuity (SRD) design, the assignment  $W_i$  is a deterministic function of one of the covariates, the forcing (or treatment-determining) variable  $X_i$ :

$$W_i = 1[X_i \geq c],$$

where  $1[\cdot]$  is the indicator function, equal to one if the even in brackets is true and zero otherwise. All units with a covariate value of at least  $c$  are in the treatment group (and participation is mandatory for these individuals), and all units with a covariate value less than  $c$  are in the control group (members of this group are not eligible for the treatment). In the SRD design, we focus on estimation of

$$(32) \quad \tau_{\text{SRD}} = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | X_i = c].$$

(Naturally, if the treatment effect is constant, then  $\tau_{\text{SRD}} = \tau_{\text{PATE}}$ .) Writing this expression as  $E[Y_i(1) | X_i = c] - E[Y_i(0) | X_i = c]$ , we focus on identification of the two terms separately. By design there are no units with  $X_i = c$  for whom we observe  $Y_i(0)$ . To estimate  $E[Y_i(w) | X_i = c]$  without making functional form assumptions, we exploit the possibility of observing units with covariate values arbitrarily close to  $c$ .<sup>15</sup> In order to justify this

averaging we make a smoothness assumption that the two conditional expectations  $E[Y_i(w) | X_i = x]$ , for  $w = 0, 1$ , are continuous in  $x$ . Under this assumption,  $E[Y_i(0) | X_i = c] = \lim_{x \uparrow c} E[Y_i(0) | X_i = x] = \lim_{x \uparrow c} E[Y_i | X_i = x]$ , implying that

$$\tau_{\text{SRD}} = \lim_{x \downarrow c} E[Y_i | X_i = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} E[Y_i | X_i = x],$$

where this expression uses the fact that  $W_i$  is a deterministic function of  $X_i$  (a key feature of the SRD). The statistical problem becomes one of estimating a regression function non-parametrically at a boundary point. We discuss the statistical problem in more detail in section 6.4.4.

#### 6.4.2 *The Fuzzy Regression Discontinuity Design*

In the fuzzy regression discontinuity (FRD) design, the probability of receiving the treatment need not change from zero to one at the threshold. Instead the design only requires a discontinuity in the probability of assignment to the treatment at the threshold:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{x \downarrow c} \text{pr}(W_i = 1 | X_i = x) \\ & \neq \lim_{x \uparrow c} \text{pr}(W_i = 1 | X_i = x). \end{aligned}$$

In practice, the discontinuity needs to be sufficiently large that typically it can be seen easily in simple graphical analyses. These discontinuities can arise if incentives to participate in a program change discontinuously at a threshold, without these incentives being powerful enough to move all units from non-participation to participation.

In this design we look at the ratio of the jump in the regression of the outcome on the covariate to the jump in the regression of the treatment indicator on the covariate

<sup>15</sup>Although in principle the first term in the difference in (32) would be straightforward to estimate if we actually observe individuals with  $X_i = x$ , with continuous covariates

we also need to estimate this term by averaging over units with covariate values close to  $c$ .



as an average causal effect of the treatment. Formally, the functional of interest is

$$\tau_{\text{FRD}} = \frac{\lim_{x \downarrow c} E[Y_i | X_i = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} E[Y_i | X_i = x]}{\lim_{x \downarrow c} E[W_i | X_i = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} E[W_i | X_i = x]}.$$

Hahn, Todd, and van der Klaauw (2001) exploit the instrumental variables connection to interpret the fuzzy regression discontinuity design when the effect of the treatment varies by unit. They define complier to be units whose participation is affected by the cutoff point. That is, a complier is someone with a value of the forcing variable  $X_i$  close to  $c$ , and who would participate if  $c$  were chosen to be just below  $X_i$ , and not participate if  $c$  were chosen to be just above  $X_i$ . Hahn, Todd, and van der Klaauw then exploit that structure to show that in combination with a monotonicity assumption,

$$\tau_{\text{FRD}} = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | \text{unit } i \text{ is a complier and } X_i = c].$$

The estimand  $\tau_{\text{FRD}}$  is an average effect of the treatment, but only averaged for units with  $X_i = c$  (by regression discontinuity), and only for compliers (people who are affected by the threshold). Clearly the analysis generally does not have much external validity. It is only valid for the subpopulation who is complier at the threshold, and it is only valid for the subpopulation with  $X_i = c$ . Nevertheless, the FRD analysis may do well in terms of internal validity.

It is useful to compare the RD method in this setting with standard methods based on unconfoundedness. In contrast to the SRD case, an unconfoundedness-based analysis is possible in the FRD setting because some treated observations will have  $X_i \leq c$ , and some control observations will have  $X_i \geq c$ . Ignoring the FRD setting—that is, ignoring the discontinuity in  $E[W_i | X_i = x]$  at  $x$

$= c$ —and acting as if unconfoundedness holds, would lead to estimating the average treatment effect at  $X_i = c$  based on the expression

$$\tau_{\text{unconf}} = E[Y_i | X_i = c, W_i = 1] - E[Y_i | X_i = c, W_i = 0],$$

which equals  $E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | X_i = c]$  under unconfoundedness. In fact, under unconfoundedness one can estimate the average effect  $E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | X_i = x]$  at values of  $x$  different from  $c$ . However, an interesting result is that if unconfoundedness holds, the FRD also estimates  $E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | X_i = c]$ , as long as the potential outcomes have smooth expectations as a function of the forcing variable around  $x = c$ . A special case of this is discussed in Hahn, Todd, and van der Klaauw (2001), who assume only that treatment is unconfounded with respect to the individual-specific gain. Therefore, in principle, there are situations where even if one believes that unconfoundedness holds, one may wish to use the FRD approach. In particular, even if we maintain unconfoundedness, a standard analysis based on  $\tau_{\text{unconf}}$  can be problematic because the potential discontinuities in the regression functions (at  $x = c$ ) under the FRD design invalidate the usual statistical methods that treat the regression functions as continuous at  $x = c$ .

Although unconfoundedness in the FRD setting is possible, its failure makes it difficult to interpret  $\tau_{\text{unconf}}$ . By contrast, provided monotonicity holds, the FRD parameter,  $\tau_{\text{FRD}}$ , identifies the average treatment effect for compliers at  $x = c$ . In other words, approaches that exploit the FRD nature of the design identify an (arguably) interesting parameter both when unconfoundedness holds and in a leading case (monotonicity) when unconfoundedness fails.

### 6.4.3 Graphical Methods

Graphical analyses are typically an integral part of any RD analysis. RD designs suggest that the effect of the treatment of interest can be measured by the value of the discontinuity in the conditional expectation of the outcome as a function of the forcing variable at a particular point. Inspecting the estimated version of this conditional expectation is a simple yet powerful way to visualize the identification strategy. Moreover, to assess the credibility of the RD strategy, it can be useful to inspect additional graphs, as discussed below in section 6.4.5. For strikingly clear examples of such plots, see Lee, Moretti, and Butler (2004), Rafael Lalive (2008), and Lee (2008).

The main plot in a SRD setting is a histogram-type estimate of the average value of the outcome by the forcing variable. For some binwidth  $h$ , and for some number of bins  $K_0$  and  $K_1$  to the left and right of the cutoff value, respectively, construct bins  $(b_k, b_{k+1}]$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, K = K_0 + K_1$ , where  $b_k = c - (K_0 - k + 1) \cdot h$ . Then calculate the number of observations in each bin, and the average outcome in the bin:

$$N_k = \sum_{i=1}^N 1[b_k \leq X_i \leq b_{k+1}],$$

$$\bar{Y}_k = \frac{1}{N_k} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i \cdot 1[b_k \leq X_i \leq b_{k+1}].$$

The key plot is that of the  $\bar{Y}_k$ , for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  against the mid point of the bins,  $\tilde{b}_k = (b_k + b_{k+1})/2$ . The question is whether around the threshold  $c$  (by construction on the edge of one of the bins) there is any evidence of a jump in the conditional mean of the outcome. The formal statistical analyses discussed below are essentially just sophisticated versions of this, and if the basic plot does not show any evidence of a discontinuity, there is relatively little chance that the more sophisticated analyses will lead to robust

and credible estimates with statistically and substantially significant magnitudes.

In addition to inspecting whether there is a jump at this value of the covariate, one should inspect the graph to see whether there are any other jumps in the conditional expectation of  $Y_i$  given  $X_i$  that are comparable in size to, or larger than, the discontinuity at the cutoff value. If so, and if one cannot explain such jumps on substantive grounds, it would call into question the interpretation of the jump at the threshold as the causal effect of the treatment.

In order to optimize the visual clarity it is recommended to calculate averages that are not smoothed across the cutoff point  $c$ . In addition, it is recommended not to artificially smooth on either side of the threshold in a way that implies that the only discontinuity in the estimated regression function is at  $c$ . One should therefore use nonsmooth methods such as the histogram type estimators described above rather than smooth methods such as kernel estimators.

In a FRD setting, one should also calculate

$$\bar{W}_k = \frac{1}{N_k} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i \cdot 1[b_k \leq X_i \leq b_{k+1}],$$

and plot the  $\bar{W}_k$  against the bin centers  $\tilde{b}_k$ , in the same way as described above.

### 6.4.4 Estimation and Inference

The object of interest in regression discontinuity designs is a difference in two regression functions at a particular point (in the SRD case), and the ratio of two differences of regression functions (in the FRD case). These estimands are identified without functional form assumptions, and in general one might therefore like to use nonparametric regression methods that allow for flexible functional forms. Because we are interested in the behavior of the regression functions around a single value of the covariate, it is attractive

to use local smoothing methods such as kernel regression rather than global smoothing methods such as sieves or series regression because the latter will generally be sensitive to behavior of the regression function away from the threshold. Local smoothing methods are generally well understood (e.g., Charles J. Stone 1977; Herman J. Bierens 1987; Härdle 1990; Adrian Pagan and Aman Ullah 1999). For a particular choice of the kernel,  $K(\cdot)$ , e.g., a rectangular kernel  $K(z) = 1[-h \leq z \leq h]$ , or a Gaussian kernel  $K(z) = \exp(-z^2/2)/\sqrt{(2\pi)}$ , the regression function at  $x$ ,  $m(x) = E[Y_i | X_i = x]$  is estimated as

$$\hat{m}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i \cdot \lambda_i,$$

$$\text{with weights } \lambda_i = \frac{K\left(\frac{X_i - x}{h}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^N K\left(\frac{X_i - x}{h}\right)}.$$

An important difference with the primary focus in the nonparametric regression literature is that in the RD setting we are interested in the value of the regression functions at boundary points. Standard kernel regression methods do not work well in such cases. More attractive methods for this case are local linear regression (Fan and Gijbels 1996; Porter 2003; Burkhardt Seifert and Theo Gasser 1996, 2000; Ichimura and Todd 2007), where locally a linear regression function, rather than a constant regression function, is fitted. This leads to an estimator for the regression function at  $x$  equal to

$$\hat{m}(x) = \hat{\alpha}, \text{ where } (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta})$$

$$= \arg \min_{\alpha, \beta} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \cdot (Y_i - \alpha - \beta \cdot (X_i - x))^2,$$

with the same weights  $\lambda_i$  as before. In that case the main remaining choice concerns the bandwidth, denoted by  $h$ . Suppose one uses a rectangular kernel,  $K(z) = 1[-h \leq z \leq h]$  (and typically the results are relatively robust with respect to the choice of the ker-

nel). The choice of bandwidth then amounts to dropping all observations such that  $X_i \notin [c - h, c + h]$ . The question becomes how to choose the bandwidth  $h$ .

Most standard methods for choosing bandwidths in nonparametric regression, including both cross-validation and plug-in methods, are based on criteria that integrate the squared error over the entire distribution of the covariates:  $\int_{\mathcal{Z}} (\hat{m}(z) - m(z))^2 f_X(z) dz$ . For our purposes this criterion does not reflect the object of interest. We are specifically interested in the regression function at a single point, moreover, this point is always a boundary point. Thus we would like to choose  $h$  to minimize  $E[(\hat{m}(c) - m(c))^2]$  (using the data with  $X_i \leq c$  only, or using the data with  $X_i \geq c$  only). If the density of the forcing variable is high at the threshold, a bandwidth selection procedure based on global criteria may lead to a bandwidth that is much larger than is appropriate.

There are few attempts to formalize to standardize the choice of a bandwidth for such cases. Ludwig and Miller (2005) and Imbens and Lemieux (2008) discuss some cross-validation methods that target more directly the object of interest in RD designs. Assuming the density of  $X_i$  is continuous at  $c$ , and that the conditional variance of  $Y_i$  given  $X_i$  is continuous and equal to  $\sigma^2$  at  $X_i = c$ , Imbens and Kalyanaraman (2009) show that the optimal bandwidth depends on the second derivatives of the regression functions at the threshold and has the form

$$h_{\text{opt}} = N^{-1/5} \cdot C_K \cdot \sigma^2$$

$$\times \left( \frac{\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{1-p}}{\lim_{x \downarrow c} (\frac{\partial^2 m}{\partial x^2}(x))^2 + \lim_{x \uparrow c} (\frac{\partial^2 m}{\partial x^2}(x))^2} \right)^{1/5},$$

where  $p$  is the fraction of observations with  $X_i \geq c$ , and  $C_K$  is a constant that depends on the kernel. For a rectangular kernel  $K(z) = 1_{-h \leq z \leq h}$ , the constant equals  $C_K = 2.70$ .

Imbens and Kalyanaram propose and implement a plug in method for the bandwidth.<sup>16</sup>

If one uses a rectangular kernel, and given a choice for the bandwidth, estimation for the SRD and FRD designs can be based on ordinary least squares and two stage least squares, respectively. If the bandwidth goes to zero sufficiently fast, so that the asymptotic bias can be ignored, one can also base inference on these methods. (See HTV and Imbens and Lemieux 2008.)

#### 6.4.5 *Specification Checks*

There are two important concerns in the application of RD designs, be they sharp or fuzzy. These concerns can sometimes be assuaged by investigating various implications of the identification argument underlying the regression discontinuity design.

A first concern about RD designs is the possibility of other changes at the same threshold value of the covariate. For example, the same age limit may affect eligibility for multiple programs. If all the programs whose eligibility changes at the same cutoff value affect the outcome of interest, an RD analysis may mistakenly attribute the combined effect to the treatment of interest. The second concern is that of manipulation by the individuals of the covariate value that underlies the assignment mechanism. The latter is less of a concern when the forcing variable is a fixed, immutable characteristic of an individual such as age. It is a particular concern when eligibility criteria are known to potential participants and are based on variables that are affected by individual choices. For example, if eligibility for financial aid depends on test scores that are graded by teachers who know the cutoff values, there may be a tendency to push grades high enough to make students eligible. Alternatively if thresholds are known to students they may take the test multiple

times in an attempt to raise their score above the threshold.

There are two sets of specification checks that researchers can typically perform to at least partly assess the empirical relevance of these concerns. Although the proposed procedures do not directly test null hypotheses that are required for the RD approach to be valid, it is typically difficult to argue for the validity of the approach when these null hypotheses do not hold. First, one may look for discontinuities in average value of the covariates around the threshold. In most cases, the reason for the discontinuity in the probability of the treatment does not suggest a discontinuity in the average value of covariates. Finding a discontinuity in other covariates typically casts doubt on the assumptions underlying the RD design. Specifically, for covariates  $Z_i$ , the test would look at the difference

$$\tau_Z = \lim_{x \downarrow c} E[Z_i | X_i = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} E[Z_i | X_i = x].$$

Second, McCrary (2008) suggests testing the null hypothesis of continuity of the density of the covariate that underlies the assignment at the threshold, against the alternative of a jump in the density function at that point. A discontinuity in the density of this covariate at the particular point where the discontinuity in the conditional expectation occurs is suggestive of violations of the no-manipulation assumption. Here the focus is on the difference

$$\tau_{f(x)} = \lim_{x \downarrow c} f_X(x) - \lim_{x \uparrow c} f_X(x).$$

In both cases a substantially and statistically significant difference in the left and right limits suggest that there may be problems with the RD approach. In practice, more useful than formal statistical tests are graphical analyses of the type discussed in section 6.4.3 where histogram-type estimates of the conditional expectation of  $E[Z_i | X_i = x]$  and of the marginal density  $f_X(x)$  are graphed.

<sup>16</sup>Code in Matlab and Stata for calculating the optimal bandwidth is available on their website.

## 6.5 Difference-in-Differences Methods

Since the seminal work by Ashenfelter (1978) and Ashenfelter and Card (1985), the use of Difference-In-Differences (DID) methods has become widespread in empirical economics. Influential applications include Philip J. Cook and George Tauchen (1982, 1984), Card (1990), Bruce D. Meyer, W. Kip Viscusi, and David L. Durbin (1995), Card and Krueger (1993, 1994), Nada Eissa and Liebman (1996), Blundell, Alan Duncan, and Meghir (1998), and many others. The DID approach is often associated with so-called “natural experiments,” where policy changes can be used to effectively define control and treatment groups. See Angrist and Krueger (1999), Angrist and Pischke (2009), and Blundell and Thomas MaCurdy (1999) for textbook discussions.

The simplest setting is one where outcomes are observed for units observed in one of two groups, in one of two time periods. Only units in one of the two groups, in the second time period, are exposed to a treatment. There are no units exposed to the treatment in the first period, and units from the control group are never observed to be exposed to the treatment. The average gain over time in the non-exposed (control) group is subtracted from the gain over time in the exposed (treatment) group. This double differencing removes biases in second period comparisons between the treatment and control group that could be the result from permanent differences between those groups, as well as biases from comparisons over time in the treatment group that could be the result of time trends unrelated to the treatment. In general this allows for the endogenous adoption of the new treatment (see Timothy Besley and Case 2000 and Athey and Imbens 2006). We discuss here the conventional set up, and recent work on inference (Bertrand, Duflo, and Mullainathan 2004; Hansen 2007a, 2007b;

Donald and Lang 2007), as well as the recent extensions by Athey and Imbens (2006) who develop a functional form-free version of the difference-in-differences methodology, and Abadie, Diamond, and Jens Hainmueller (2007), who develop a method for constructing an artificial control group from multiple nonexposed groups.

### 6.5.1 Repeated Cross Sections

The standard model for the DID approach is as follows. Individual  $i$  belongs to a group,  $G_i \in \{0, 1\}$  (where group 1 is the treatment group), and is observed in time period  $T_i \in \{0, 1\}$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , a random sample from the population, individual  $i$ 's group identity and time period can be treated as random variables. In the standard DID model, we can write the outcome for individual  $i$  in the absence of the intervention,  $Y_i(0)$  as

$$(33) \quad Y_i(0) = \alpha + \beta \cdot T_i + \gamma \cdot G_i + \varepsilon_i,$$

with unknown parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$ . We ignore the potential presence of other covariates, which introduce no special complications. The second coefficient in this specification,  $\beta$ , represents the time component common to both groups. The third coefficient,  $\gamma$ , represents a group-specific, time-invariant component. The fourth term,  $\varepsilon_i$ , represents unobservable characteristics of the individual. This term is assumed to be independent of the group indicator and have the same distribution over time, i.e.,  $\varepsilon_i \perp (G_i, T_i)$ , and is normalized to have mean zero.

An alternative set up leading to the same estimator allows for a time-invariant individual-specific fixed effect,  $\gamma_i$ , potentially correlated with  $G_i$ , and models  $Y_i(0)$  as

$$(34) \quad Y_i(0) = \alpha + \beta \cdot T_i + \gamma_i + \varepsilon_i.$$

(See, e.g., Angrist and Krueger 1999.) This generalization of the standard model does



not affect the standard DID estimand, and it will be subsumed as a special case of the model we propose.

The equation for the outcome without the treatment is combined with an equation for the outcome given the treatment:  $Y_i(1) = Y_i(0) + \tau_{\text{DID}}$ . The standard DID estimand is under this model equal to

$$\begin{aligned} (35) \quad \tau_{\text{DID}} &= E[Y_i(1)] - E[Y_i(0)] \\ &= (E[Y_i | G_i = 1, T_i = 1] \\ &\quad - E[Y_i | G_i = 1, T_i = 0]) \\ &\quad - (E[Y_i | G_i = 0, T_i = 1] \\ &\quad - E[Y_i | G_i = 0, T_i = 0]). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the population average difference over time in the control group ( $G_i = 0$ ) is subtracted from the population average difference over time in the treatment group ( $G_i = 1$ ) to remove biases associated with a common time trend unrelated to the intervention.

We can estimate  $\tau_{\text{DID}}$  simply using least squares methods on the regression function for the observed outcome,

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \cdot T_i + \gamma_1 \cdot G_i + \tau_{\text{DID}} \cdot W_i + \varepsilon_i,$$

where the treatment indicator  $W_i$  is equal to the interaction of the group and time indicators,  $I_i = T_i \cdot G_i$ . Thus the treatment effect is estimated through the coefficient on the interaction between the indicators for the second time period and the treatment group. This leads to

$$\hat{\tau}_{\text{DID}} = (\bar{Y}_{11} - \bar{Y}_{10}) - (\bar{Y}_{01} - \bar{Y}_{00}),$$

where  $\bar{Y}_{gt} = \sum_{i|G_i=g, T_i=t} Y_i / N_{gt}$  is the average outcome among units in group  $g$  and time period  $t$ .

### 6.5.2 Multiple Groups and Multiple Periods

With multiple time periods and multiple groups we can use a natural extension of the two-group two-time-period model for the outcome in the absence of the intervention. Let  $T$  and  $G$  denote the number of time periods and groups respectively. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} (36) \quad Y_i(0) &= \alpha + \sum_{t=1}^T \beta_t \cdot 1[T_i = t] \\ &\quad + \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g \cdot 1[G_i = g] + \varepsilon_i \end{aligned}$$

with separate parameters for each group and time period,  $\gamma_g$  and  $\beta_t$ , for  $g = 1, \dots, G$  and  $t = 1, \dots, T$ , where the initial time period coefficient and first group coefficient have implicitly been normalized to zero. This model is then combined with the additive model for the treatment effect,  $Y_i(1) = Y_i(0) + \tau_{\text{DID}}$ , implying that the parameters of this model can still be estimated by ordinary least squares based on the regression function

$$\begin{aligned} (37) \quad Y_i &= \alpha + \sum_{t=1}^T \beta_t \cdot 1[T_i = t] \\ &\quad + \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g \cdot 1[G_i = g] + \tau_{\text{DID}} \cdot I_i + \varepsilon_i, \end{aligned}$$

where  $I_i$  is now an indicator for unit  $i$  being in a group and time period that was exposed to the treatment.

This model with more than two time periods, or more than two groups, or both, imposes testable restrictions on the data. For example, if group  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are both not exposed to the treatment in periods  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , under this model the double difference

$$(\bar{Y}_{g_2, t_2} - \bar{Y}_{g_2, t_1}) - (\bar{Y}_{g_1, t_2} - \bar{Y}_{g_1, t_1}),$$

should estimate zero, which can be tested using conventional methods—this possibility is exploited in the next subsection. In the two-period, two-group setting there are no

testable restrictions on the four group/period means.

### 6.5.3 Standard Errors in the Multiple Group and Multiple Period Case

Recently there has been attention called to the concern that ordinary least square standard errors for the DID estimator may not be accurate in the presence of correlations between outcomes within groups and between time periods. This is a particular case of clustering where the regressor of interest does not vary within clusters. See Brent R. Moulton (1990), Moulton and William C. Randolph (1989), and Wooldridge (2002) for a general discussion. The specific problem has been analyzed recently by Donald and Lang (2007), Bertrand, Duflo, and Mullainathan (2004), and Hansen (2007a, 2007b).

The starting point of these analyses is a particular structure on the error term  $\varepsilon_i$ :

$$\varepsilon_i = \eta_{G_i, T_i} + \nu_i,$$

where  $\nu_i$  is an individual-level idiosyncratic error term, and  $\eta_{gt}$  is a group/time specific component. The unit level error term  $\nu_i$  is independent across all units,  $E[\nu_i \cdot \nu_j] = 0$  if  $i \neq j$  and  $E[\nu_i^2] = \sigma_\nu^2$ . Now suppose we also assume that  $\eta_{gt} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\eta^2)$ , and all the  $\eta_{gt}$  are independent. Let us focus initially on the two-group, two-time-period case. With a large number of units in each group and time period,  $\bar{Y}_{gt} \rightarrow \alpha + \beta_t + \gamma_g + 1_{g=1, t=1} \cdot \tau_{\text{DID}} + \eta_{gt}$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\tau}_{\text{DID}} &= (\bar{Y}_{11} - \bar{Y}_{10}) - (\bar{Y}_{01} - \bar{Y}_{00}) \rightarrow \tau_{\text{DID}} \\ &+ (\eta_{11} - \eta_{10}) - (\eta_{01} - \eta_{00}) \sim \mathcal{N}(\tau_{\text{DID}}, 4 \cdot \sigma_\eta^2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in this case with two groups and two time periods, the conventional DID estimator is not consistent. In fact, no consistent estimator exists because there is no way to eliminate the influence of the four

unobserved components  $\eta_{gt}$ . In this two-group, two-time-period case the problem is even worse than the absence of a consistent estimator, because one cannot even establish whether there is a clustering problem: the data are not informative about the value of  $\sigma_\eta^2$ . If we have data from more than two groups or from more than two time periods, we can typically estimate  $\sigma_\eta^2$ , and thus, at least under the normality and independence assumptions for  $\eta_{gt}$ , construct confidence intervals for  $\tau_{\text{DID}}$ . Consider, for example, the case with three groups, and two time periods. If groups  $G_i = 0, 1$  are both not treated in the second period, then  $(\bar{Y}_{11} - \bar{Y}_{10}) - (\bar{Y}_{01} - \bar{Y}_{00}) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 4 \cdot \sigma_\eta^2)$ , which can be used to obtain an unbiased estimator for  $\sigma_\eta^2$ . See Donald and Lang (2007) for details.

Bertrand, Duflo, and Mullainathan (2004) and Hansen (2007a, 2007b) focus on the case with multiple (more than two) time periods. In that case we may wish to relax the assumption that the  $\eta_{gt}$  are independent over time. Note that with data from only two time periods there is no information in the data that allows one to establish the absence of independence over time. The typical generalization is to allow for an autoregressive structure on the  $\eta_{gt}$ , for example,

$$\eta_{gt} = \alpha \cdot \eta_{gt-1} + \omega_{gt},$$

with a serially uncorrelated  $\omega_{gt}$ . More generally, with  $T$  time periods, one can allow for an autoregressive process of order  $T - 2$ . Using simulations and real data calculations based on data for fifty states and multiple time periods, Bertrand, Duflo, and Mullainathan (2004) show that corrections to the conventional standard errors taking into account the clustering and autoregressive structure make a substantial difference. Hansen (2007a, 2007b) provides additional large sample results under sequences where the number of time periods increases with the sample size.

### 6.5.4 Panel Data

Now suppose we have panel data, in the two period, two group case. Here we have  $N$  individuals, indexed  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , for whom we observe  $(G_i, Y_{i0}, Y_{i1}, X_{i0}, X_{i1})$ , where  $G_i$  is, as before, group membership,  $X_{it}$  is the covariate value for unit  $i$  at time  $t$ , and  $Y_{it}$  is the outcome for unit  $i$  at time  $t$ .

One option is to proceed with estimation exactly as before, essentially ignoring the fact that the observations in different time periods come from the same unit. We can now interpret the estimator as the ordinary least squares estimator based on the regression function for the difference outcomes:

$$Y_{i1} - Y_{i0} = \beta + \tau_{\text{DID}} \cdot G_i + \varepsilon_i,$$

which leads to the double difference as the estimator for  $\tau_{\text{DID}}$ :  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DID}} = (\bar{Y}_{11} - \bar{Y}_{10}) - (\bar{Y}_{01} - \bar{Y}_{00})$ . This estimator is identical to that discussed in the context of repeated cross-sections, and so does not exploit directly the panel nature of the data.

A second, and very different, approach with panel data, which does exploit the specific features of the panel data, would be to assume unconfoundedness given lagged outcomes. Let us look at the differences between these two approaches in a simple setting, without covariates, and assuming linearity. In that case the DID approach suggests the regression of  $Y_{i1} - Y_{i0}$  on the group indicator, leading to  $\hat{\tau}_{\text{DID}}$ . The unconfoundedness assumption would suggest the regression of the difference  $Y_{i1} - Y_{i0}$  on the group indicator and the lagged outcome  $Y_{i0}$ :

$$Y_{i1} - Y_{i0} = \beta + \tau_{\text{unconf}} \cdot G_i + \delta \cdot Y_{i0} + \varepsilon_i.$$

While it appears that the analysis based on unconfoundedness is necessarily less restrictive because it allows a free coefficient in  $Y_{i0}$ , this is not the case. The DID assumption implies that adjusting for lagged

outcomes actually compromises the comparison because  $Y_{i0}$  may in fact be correlated with  $\varepsilon_i$ . In the end, the two approaches make fundamentally different assumptions. One needs to choose between them based on substantive knowledge. When the estimated coefficient on the lagged outcome is close to zero, obviously there will be little difference between the point estimates. In addition, using the formula for omitted variable bias in least squares estimation, the results will be very similar if the average outcomes in the treatment and control groups are similar in the first period. Finally, note that in the repeated cross-section case the choice between the DID and unconfoundedness approaches did not arise because the unconfoundedness approach is not feasible: it is not possible to adjust for lagged outcomes when we do not have the same units available in both periods.

As a practical matter, the DID approach appears less attractive than the unconfoundedness-based approach in the context of panel data. It is difficult to see how making treated and control units comparable on lagged outcomes will make the causal interpretation of their difference less credible, as suggested by the DID assumptions.

### 6.5.5 The Changes-in-Changes Model

Now we return to the setting with two groups, two time periods, and repeated cross-sections. Athey and Imbens (2006) generalize the standard model in several ways. They relax the additive linear model by assuming that, in the absence of the intervention, the outcomes satisfy

$$(38) \quad Y_i(0) = h_0(U_i, T_i),$$

with  $h_0(u, t)$  increasing in  $u$ . The random variable  $U_i$  represents all unobservable characteristics of individual  $i$ , and (38) incorporates the idea that the outcome of an individual with  $U_i = u$  will be the same in a given time

period, irrespective of the group membership. The distribution of  $U_i$  is allowed to vary across groups, but not over time within groups, so that  $U_i \perp\!\!\!\perp T_i | G_i$ . Athey and Imbens call the resulting model the changes-in-changes (CIC) model.

The standard DID model in (33) adds three additional assumptions to the CIC model, namely

$$(39) \quad U_i - E[U_i | G_i] \perp\!\!\!\perp G_i \text{ (additivity)}$$

$$(40) \quad h_0(u, t) = \phi(u + \delta \cdot t), \\ \text{(single index model)}$$

for a strictly increasing function  $\phi(\cdot)$ , and

$$(41) \quad \phi(\cdot) \text{ is the identity function.} \\ \text{(identity transformation).}$$

In the CIC extension, the treatment group's distribution of unobservables may be different from that of the control group in arbitrary ways. In the absence of treatment, all differences between the two groups can be interpreted as coming from differences in the conditional distribution of  $U$  given  $G$ . The model further requires that the changes over time in the distribution of each group's outcome (in the absence of treatment) arise solely from the fact that  $h_0(u, 0)$  differs from  $h_0(u, 1)$ , that is, the relation between unobservables and outcomes changes over time. Like the standard model, the Athey–Imbens approach does not rely on tracking individuals over time. Although the distribution of  $U_i$  is assumed not to change over time within groups, the model does not make any assumptions about whether a particular individual has the same realization  $U_i$  in each period. Thus, the estimators derived by Athey and Imbens will be the same whether one observes a panel of individuals over time or a repeated cross section. Just as in the standard DID approach, if one only wishes to estimate the effect of the intervention on

the treatment group, no assumptions are required about how the intervention affects outcomes.

The average effect of the treatment for the second period treatment group is  $\tau_{\text{cic}} = E[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | G_i = 1, T_i = 1]$ . Because the first term of this expression is equal to  $E[Y_i(1) | G_i = 1, T_i = 1] = E[Y_i | G_i = 1, T_i = 1]$ , it can be estimated directly from the data. The difficulty is in estimating the second term. Under the assumptions of monotonicity of  $h_0(u, t)$  in  $u$ , and conditional independence of  $T_i$  and  $U_i$  given  $G_i$ , Athey and Imbens show that in fact the full distribution of  $Y(0)$  given  $G_i = T_i = 1$  is identified through the equality

$$(42) \quad F_{Y_{11}}(y) = F_{Y_{10}}(F_{Y_{00}}^{-1}(F_{Y_{01}}(y))),$$

where  $F_{Y_{gt}}(y)$  denotes the distribution function of  $Y_i$  given  $G_i = g$  and  $T_i = t$ . The expected outcome for the second period treatment group under the control treatment is

$$E[Y_i(0) | G_i = 1, T_i = 1] = E[F_{01}^{-1}(F_{00}(Y_{10}))].$$

To analyze the counterfactual effect of the intervention on the control group, Athey and Imbens assume that, in the presence of the intervention,

$$Y_i(1) = h_1(U_i, T_i)$$

for some function  $h_1(u, t)$  that is increasing in  $u$ . That is, the effect of the treatment at a given time is the same for individuals with the same  $U_i = u$ , irrespective of the group. No further assumptions are required on the functional form of  $h_1$ , so the treatment effect, equal to  $h_1(u, 1) - h_0(u, 1)$  for individuals with unobserved component  $u$ , can differ across individuals. Because the distribution of the unobserved component  $U$  can vary across groups, the average return to the policy intervention can vary across groups as well.

### 6.5.6 *The Abadie–Diamond–Hainmueller Artificial Control Group Approach*

Abadie, Diamond, and Hainmueller (2007) develop a very interesting alternative approach to the setting with multiple control groups. See also Abadie and Gardeazabal (2003). Here we discuss a simple version of their approach, with  $T + 1$  time periods, and  $G + 1$  groups, one treated in the final period, and  $G$  not treated in either period. The Abadie–Diamond–Hainmueller idea is to construct an artificial control group that is more similar to the treatment group in the initial period than any of the control groups on their own. Let  $G_i = G$  denote the treated group, and  $G_i = 0, \dots, G - 1$  denote the  $G$  control groups. The outcome for the final period treatment group in the absence of the treatment will be estimated as a weighted average of period  $T$  outcomes in the  $G$  control groups,

$$\hat{E}[Y_i(0) | T_i = T, G_i = G] = \sum_{g=0}^{G-1} \lambda_g \cdot \bar{Y}_{gT},$$

with weights  $\lambda_g$  satisfying  $\sum_{g=0}^{G-1} \lambda_g = 1$ , and  $\lambda_g \geq 0$ . The weights are chosen to make the weighted control group resemble the treatment group prior to the treatment. That is, the weights  $\lambda_g$  are chosen to minimize the difference between the treatment group and the weighted average of the control groups prior to the treatment, namely,

$$\left\| \begin{array}{c} \bar{Y}_{G0} - \sum_{g=0}^{G-1} \lambda_g \cdot \bar{Y}_{g0} \\ \vdots \\ \bar{Y}_{G,T-1} - \sum_{g=0}^{G-1} \lambda_g \cdot \bar{Y}_{g,T-1} \end{array} \right\|,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes a measure of distance. One can also add group level covariates to the criterion to determine the weights. These

group-level covariates may be averages of individual level covariates, or quantiles of the distribution of within group covariates. The idea is that the future path of the artificial control group, consisting of the  $\lambda$ -weighted average of all the control groups, mimics the path that would have been observed in the treatment group in the absence of the treatment. Applications in Abadie, Diamond, and Hainmueller (2007) to estimation of the effect of smoking legislation in California and the effect of reunification on West Germany are very promising.

## 7. *Multivalued and Continuous Treatments*

Most of the recent econometric program evaluation literature has focused on the case with a binary treatment. As a result this case is now understood much better than it was a decade or two ago. However, much less is known about settings with multivalued, discrete or continuous treatments. Such cases are common in practice. Social programs are rarely homogenous. Typically individuals are assigned to various activities and regimes, often sequentially, and tailored to their specific circumstances and characteristics.

To provide some insight into the issues arising in settings with multivalued treatments we discuss in this review five separate cases. First, the simplest setting where the treatment is discrete and one is willing to assume unconfoundedness of the treatment assignment. In that case straightforward extensions of the binary treatment case can be used to obtain estimates and inferences for causal effects. Second, we look at the case with a continuous treatment under unconfoundedness. In that case, the definition of the propensity score requires some modification but many of the insights from the binary treatment case still carry over. Third, we look at the case where units can be exposed to a sequence of binary treatments.



For example, an individual may remain in a training program for a number of periods. In each period the assignment to the program is assumed to be unconfounded, given permanent characteristics and outcomes up to that point. In the last two cases we briefly discuss multivalued endogenous treatments. In the fourth case, we look at settings with a discrete multivalued treatment in the presence of endogeneity. We allow the treatment to be continuous in the final case. The last two cases tie in closely with the simultaneous equations literature, where, somewhat separately from the program evaluation literature, there has been much recent work on nonparametric identification and estimation. Especially in the discrete case, many of the results in this literature are negative in the sense that, without unattractive restrictions on heterogeneity or functional form, few objects of interest are point-identified. Some of the literature has turned toward establishing bounds. This is an area with much ongoing work and considerable scope for further research.

### 7.1 *Multivalued Discrete Treatments with Unconfounded Treatment Assignment*

If there are a few different levels of the treatment, rather than just two, essentially all of the methods discussed before go through in the unconfoundedness case. Suppose, for example, that the treatment can be one of three levels, say  $W_i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ . In order to estimate the effect of treatment level 2 relative to treatment level 1, one can simply put aside the data for units exposed to treatment level 0 if one is willing to assume unconfoundedness. More specifically, one can estimate the average outcome for each treatment level conditional on the covariates,  $E[Y_i(w) | X_i = x]$ , using data on units exposed to treatment level  $w$ , and average these over the (estimated) marginal distribution of the covariates,  $\hat{F}_X(x)$ . In practice, the overlap assumption may more likely to be violated with more than two treatments. For

example, with three treatments, it may be that no units are exposed to treatment level 2 if  $X_i$  is in some subset of the covariate space. The insights from the binary case directly extend to this multiple (but few) treatment case. If the number of treatments is relatively large, one may wish to smooth across treatment levels in order to improve precision of the inferences.

### 7.2 *Continuous Treatments with Unconfounded Treatment Assignment*

In the case where the treatment taking on many values, Imbens (2000), Lechner (2001, 2004), Hirano and Imbens (2004), and Carlos A. Flores (2005) extended some of the propensity score methodology under unconfoundedness. The key maintained assumption is that adjusting for pre-treatment differences removes all biases, and thus solves the problem of drawing causal inferences. This is formalized by using the concept of weak unconfoundedness, introduced by Imbens (2000). Assignment to treatment  $W_i$  is weakly unconfounded, given pre-treatment variables  $X_i$ , if

$$W_i \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_i(w) | X_i,$$

for all  $w$ . Compare this to the stronger assumption made by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983b) in the binary case:

$$W_i \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y_i(0), Y_i(1)) | X_i,$$

which requires the treatment  $W_i$  to be independent of the entire set of potential outcomes. Instead, weak unconfoundedness requires only pairwise independence of the treatment with each of the potential outcomes. A similar assumption is used in Robins and Rotnitzky (1995). The definition of weak unconfoundedness is also similar to that of “missing at random” (Rubin 1976, 1987; Roderick J. A. Little and Rubin 1987) in the missing data literature.

Although in substantive terms the weak unconfoundedness assumption is not very different from the assumption used by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983b), it is important that one does not need the stronger assumption to validate estimation of the expected value of  $Y_i(w)$  by adjusting for  $X_i$ : under weak unconfoundedness, we have  $E[Y_i(w) | X_i] = E[Y_i(w) | W_i = w, X_i] = E[Y_i | W_i = w, X_i]$ , and expected outcomes can then be estimated by averaging these conditional means:  $E[Y_i(w)] = E[E[Y_i(w) | X_i]]$ . In practice, it can be difficult to estimate  $E[Y_i(w)]$  in this manner when the dimension of  $X_i$  is large, or if  $w$  takes on many values, because the first step requires estimation of the expectation of  $Y_i(w)$  given the treatment level and all pretreatment variables. It was this difficulty that motivated Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983b) to develop the propensity score methodology.

Imbens (2000) introduces the generalized propensity score for the multiple treatment case. It is the conditional probability of receiving a particular level of the treatment given the pretreatment variables:

$$r(w, x) \equiv \text{pr}(W_i = w | X_i = x).$$

In the continuous case, where, say,  $W_i$  takes values in the unit interval,  $r(w, x) = F_{W_i|X_i}(w | x)$ . Suppose assignment to treatment  $W_i$  is weakly unconfounded given pretreatment variables  $X_i$ . Then, by the same argument as in the binary treatment case, assignment is weakly unconfounded given the generalized propensity score, as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$1\{w - \delta \leq W_i \leq w + \delta\} \perp\!\!\!\perp Y_i(w) | r(w, X_i),$$

for all  $w$ . This is the point where using the weak form of the unconfoundedness assumption is important. There is, in general, no scalar function of the covariates such that the level of the treatment  $W_i$  is independent of the set of potential outcomes  $\{Y_i(w)\}_{w \in [0,1]}$ , unless additional structure is imposed on

the assignment mechanism; see for example, Marshall M. Joffe and Rosenbaum (1999).

Because weak unconfoundedness given all pretreatment variables implies weak unconfoundedness given the generalized propensity score, one can estimate average outcomes by conditioning solely on the generalized propensity score. If assignment to treatment is weakly unconfounded given pretreatment variables  $X$ , then two results follow. First, for all  $w$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(w, r) &\equiv E[Y_i(w) | r(w, X_i) = r] \\ &= E[Y_i | W_i = w, r(W_i, X_i) = r], \end{aligned}$$

which can be estimated using data on  $Y_i$ ,  $W_i$ , and  $r(W_i, X_i)$ . Second, the average outcome given a particular level of the treatment,  $E[Y_i(w)]$ , can be estimated by appropriately averaging  $\beta(w, r)$ :

$$E[Y_i(w)] = E[\beta(w, r(w, X_i))].$$

As with the implementation of the binary treatment propensity score methodology, the implementation of the generalized propensity score method consists of three steps. In the first step the score  $r(w, x)$  is estimated. With a binary treatment the standard approach (Rosenbaum and Rubin 1984; Rosenbaum 1995) is to estimate the propensity score using a logistic regression. More generally, if the treatments correspond to ordered levels of a treatment, such as the dose of a drug or the time over which a treatment is applied, one may wish to impose smoothness of the score in  $w$ . For continuous  $W_i$ , Hirano and Imbens (2004) use a lognormal distribution. In the second step, the conditional expectation  $\beta(w, r) = E[Y_i | W_i = w, r(W_i, X_i) = r]$  is estimated. Again, the implementation may be different in the case where the levels of the treatment are qualitatively distinct than in the case where smoothness of the conditional expectation function in  $w$  is appropriate.

Here, some form of linear or nonlinear regression may be used. In the third step the average response at treatment level  $w$  is estimated as the average of the estimated conditional expectation,  $\hat{\beta}(w, r(w, X_i))$ , averaged over the distribution of the pretreatment variables,  $X_1, \dots, X_N$ . Note that to get the average  $E[Y_i(w)]$ , the second argument in the conditional expectation  $\beta(w, r)$  is evaluated at  $r(w, X_i)$ , not at  $r(W_i, X_i)$ .

### 7.2.1 *Dynamic Treatments with Unconfounded Treatment Assignment*

Multiple-valued treatments can arise because at any point in time individuals can be assigned to multiple different treatment arms, or because they can be assigned sequentially to different treatments. Gill and Robins (2001) analyze this case, where they assume that at any point in time an unconfoundedness assumption holds. Lechner and Miquel (2005) (see also Lechner 1999, and Lechner, Miquel, and Conny Wunsch 2004) study a related case, where again a sequential unconfoundedness assumption is maintained to identify the average effects of interest. Abbring and Gerard J. van den Berg (2003) study settings with duration data. These methods hold great promise but, until now, there have been few substantive applications.

### 7.3 *Multivalued Discrete Endogenous Treatments*

In settings with general heterogeneity in the effects of the treatment, the case with more than two treatment levels is considerably more challenging than the binary case. There are few studies investigating identification in these settings. Angrist and Imbens (1995) and Angrist, Kathryn Graddy and Imbens (2000) study the interpretation of the standard instrumental variable estimand, the ratio of the covariances of outcome and instrument and treatment and instrument. They show that in general, with a valid

instrument, the instrumental variables estimand can still be interpreted as an average causal effect, but with a complicated weighting scheme. There are essentially two levels of averaging going on. First, at each level of the treatment we can only get the average effect of a unit increase in the treatment for compliers at that level. In addition, there is averaging over all levels of the treatment, with the weights equal to the proportion of compliers at that level.

Imbens (2007) studies, in more detail, the case where the endogenous treatment takes on three values and shows the limits to identification in the case with heterogeneous treatment effects.

### 7.4 *Continuous Endogenous Treatments*

Perhaps surprisingly, there are many more results for the case with continuous endogenous treatments than for the discrete case that do not impose restrictive assumptions. Much of the focus has been on triangular systems, with a single unobserved component of the equation determining the treatment:

$$W_i = h(Z_i, \eta_i),$$

where  $\eta_i$  is scalar, and an essentially unrestricted outcome equation:

$$Y_i = g(W_i, \varepsilon_i),$$

where  $\varepsilon_i$  may be a vector. Blundell and James L. Powell (2003, 2004), Chernozhukov and Hansen (2005), Imbens and Newey (forthcoming), and Andrew Chesher (2003) study various versions of this setup. Imbens and Newey (forthcoming) show that if  $h(z, \eta)$  is strictly monotone in  $\eta$ , then one can identify average effects of the treatment subject to support conditions on the instrument. They suggest a control function approach to estimation. First  $\eta$  is normalized to have a uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$  (e.g., Rosa L. Matzkin 2003). Then  $\eta_i$  is estimated

as  $\hat{\eta}_i = \hat{F}_{W|Z}(W_i|Z_i)$ . In the second stage,  $Y_i$  is regressed nonparametrically on  $X_i$  and  $\hat{\eta}_i$ . Chesher (2003) studies local versions of this problem.

When the treatment equation has an additive form, say  $W_i = h_1(Z_i) + \eta_i$ , where  $\eta_i$  is independent of  $Z_i$ , Blundell and Powell (2003, 2004) derive nonparametric control function methods for estimating the average structural function,  $E[g(w, \varepsilon_i)]$ . The general idea is to first obtain residuals,  $\hat{\eta}_i = W_i - \hat{h}_1(Z_i)$  from a nonparametric regression. Next, a nonparametric regression of  $Y_i$  on  $W_i$  and  $\hat{\eta}_i$  is used to recover  $m(w, \eta) = E(Y_i|W_i = w, \eta_i = \eta)$ . Blundell and Powell show that the average structural function is generally identified as  $E[m(w, \eta_i)]$ , which is easily estimated by averaging out  $\hat{\eta}_i$  across the sample.

## 8. Conclusion

Over the last two decades, there has been a proliferation of the literature on program evaluation. This includes theoretical econometrics work, as well as empirical work. Important features of the modern literature are the convergence of the statistical and econometric literatures, with the Rubin potential outcomes framework now the dominant framework. The modern literature has stressed the importance of relaxing functional form and distributional assumptions, and has allowed for general heterogeneity in the effects of the treatment. This has led to renewed interest in identification questions, leading to unusual and controversial estimands such as the local average treatment effect (Imbens and Angrist 1994), as well as to the literature on partial identification (Manski 1990). It has also borrowed heavily from the semiparametric literature, using both efficiency bound results (Hahn 1998) and methods for inference based on series and kernel estimation (Newey 1994a, 1994b). It has by now matured to the point that it is of great use for practitioners.

## REFERENCES

- Abadie, Alberto. 2002. "Bootstrap Tests of Distributional Treatment Effects in Instrumental Variable Models." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97(457): 284–92.
- Abadie, Alberto. 2003. "Semiparametric Instrumental Variable Estimation of Treatment Response Models." *Journal of Econometrics*, 113(2): 231–63.
- Abadie, Alberto. 2005. "Semiparametric Difference-in-Differences Estimators." *Review of Economic Studies*, 72(1): 1–19.
- Abadie, Alberto, Joshua D. Angrist, and Guido W. Imbens. 2002. "Instrumental Variables Estimates of the Effect of Subsidized Training on the Quantiles of Trainee Earnings." *Econometrica*, 70(1): 91–117.
- Abadie, Alberto, Alexis Diamond, and Jens Hainmueller. 2007. "Synthetic Control Methods for Comparative Case Studies: Estimating the Effect of California's Tobacco Control Program." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 12831.
- Abadie, Alberto, David Drukker, Jane Leber Herr, and Guido W. Imbens. 2004. "Implementing Matching Estimators for Average Treatment Effects in Stata." *Stata Journal*, 4(3): 290–311.
- Abadie, Alberto, and Javier Gardeazabal. 2003. "The Economic Costs of Conflict: A Case Study of the Basque Country." *American Economic Review*, 93(1): 113–32.
- Abadie, Alberto, and Guido W. Imbens. 2006. "Large Sample Properties of Matching Estimators for Average Treatment Effects." *Econometrica*, 74(1): 235–67.
- Abadie, Alberto, and Guido W. Imbens. 2008a. "Bias Corrected Matching Estimators for Average Treatment Effects." Unpublished.
- Abadie, Alberto, and Guido W. Imbens. Forthcoming. "Estimation of the Conditional Variance in Paired Experiments." *Annales d'Economie et de Statistique*.
- Abadie, Alberto, and Guido W. Imbens. 2008b. "On the Failure of the Bootstrap for Matching Estimators." *Econometrica*, 76(6): 1537–57.
- Abbring, Jaap H., and James J. Heckman. 2007. "Econometric Evaluation of Social Programs, Part III: Distributional Treatment Effects, Dynamic Treatment Effects, Dynamic Discrete Choice, and General Equilibrium Policy Evaluation." In *Handbook of Econometrics, Volume 6B*, ed. James J. Heckman and Edward E. Leamer, 5145–5303. Amsterdam; New York and Oxford: Elsevier Science, North-Holland.
- Abbring, Jaap H., and Gerard J. van den Berg. 2003. "The Nonparametric Identification of Treatment Effects in Duration Models." *Econometrica*, 71(5): 1491–1517.
- Andrews, Donald W. K., and Gustavo Soares. 2007. "Inference for Parameters Defined By Moment Inequalities Using Generalized Moment Selection." Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper 1631.
- Angrist, Joshua D. 1990. "Lifetime Earnings and the Vietnam Era Draft Lottery: Evidence from Social

- Security Administrative Records." *American Economic Review*, 80(3): 313–36.
- Angrist, Joshua D. 1998. "Estimating the Labor Market Impact of Voluntary Military Service Using Social Security Data on Military Applicants." *Econometrica*, 66(2): 249–88.
- Angrist, Joshua D. 2004. "Treatment Effect Heterogeneity in Theory and Practice." *Economic Journal*, 114(494): C52–83.
- Angrist, Joshua D., Eric Bettinger, and Michael Kremer. 2006. "Long-Term Educational Consequences of Secondary School Vouchers: Evidence from Administrative Records in Colombia." *American Economic Review*, 96(3): 847–62.
- Angrist, Joshua D., Kathryn Graddy, and Guido W. Imbens. 2000. "The Interpretation of Instrumental Variables Estimators in Simultaneous Equations Models with an Application to the Demand for Fish." *Review of Economic Studies*, 67(3): 499–527.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Jinyong Hahn. 2004. "When to Control for Covariates? Panel Asymptotics for Estimates of Treatment Effects." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1): 58–72.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Guido W. Imbens. 1995. "Two-Stage Least Squares Estimation of Average Causal Effects in Models with Variable Treatment Intensity." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(430): 431–42.
- Angrist, Joshua D., Guido W. Imbens, and Donald B. Rubin. 1996. "Identification of Causal Effects Using Instrumental Variables." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91(434): 444–55.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Alan B. Krueger. 1999. "Empirical Strategies in Labor Economics." In *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Volume 3A, ed. Orley Ashenfelter and David Card, 1277–1366. Amsterdam; New York and Oxford: Elsevier Science, North-Holland.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Kevin Lang. 2004. "Does School Integration Generate Peer Effects? Evidence from Boston's Metco Program." *American Economic Review*, 94(5): 1613–34.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Victor Lavy. 1999. "Using Maimonides' Rule to Estimate the Effect of Class Size on Scholastic Achievement." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114(2): 533–75.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2009. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ashenfelter, Orley. 1978. "Estimating the Effect of Training Programs on Earnings." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 6(1): 47–57.
- Ashenfelter, Orley, and David Card. 1985. "Using the Longitudinal Structure of Earnings to Estimate the Effect of Training Programs." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 67(4): 648–60.
- Athey, Susan, and Guido W. Imbens. 2006. "Identification and Inference in Nonlinear Difference-in-Differences Models." *Econometrica*, 74(2): 431–97.
- Athey, Susan, and Scott Stern. 1998. "An Empirical Framework for Testing Theories About Complementarity in Organizational Design." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 6600.
- Attanasio, Orazio, Costas Meghir, and Ana Santiago. 2005. "Education Choices in Mexico: Using a Structural Model and a Randomized Experiment to Evaluate Progreso." Institute for Fiscal Studies Centre for the Evaluation of Development Policies Working Paper EWP05/01.
- Austin, Peter C. 2008a. "A Critical Appraisal of Propensity-Score Matching in the Medical Literature between 1996 and 2003." *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(12): 2037–49.
- Austin, Peter C. 2008b. "Discussion of 'A Critical Appraisal of Propensity-Score Matching in the Medical Literature between 1996 and 2003': Rejoinder." *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(12): 2066–69.
- Balke, Alexander, and Judea Pearl. 1994. "Nonparametric Bounds of Causal Effects from Partial Compliance Data." University of California Los Angeles Cognitive Systems Laboratory Technical Report R-199.
- Banerjee, Abhijit V., Shawn Cole, Esther Duflo, and Leigh Linden. 2007. "Remedying Education: Evidence from Two Randomized Experiments in India." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(3): 1235–64.
- Barnow, Burt S., Glend G. Cain, and Arthur S. Goldberger. 1980. "Issues in the Analysis of Selectivity Bias." In *Evaluation Studies*, Volume 5, ed. Ernst W. Stromsdorfer and George Farkas, 43–59. San Francisco: Sage.
- Becker, Sascha O., and Andrea Ichino. 2002. "Estimation of Average Treatment Effects Based on Propensity Scores." *Stata Journal*, 2(4): 358–77.
- Behncke, Stefanie, Markus Frölich, and Michael Lechner. 2006. "Statistical Assistance for Programme Selection—For a Better Targeting of Active Labour Market Policies in Switzerland." University of St. Gallen Department of Economics Discussion Paper 2006-09.
- Beresteanu, Arie, and Francesca Molinari. 2006. "Asymptotic Properties for a Class of Partially Identified Models." Institute for Fiscal Studies Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice Working Paper CWP1%6.
- Bertrand, Marianne, Esther Duflo, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "How Much Should We Trust Differences-in-Differences Estimates?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(1): 249–75.
- Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination." *American Economic Review*, 94(4): 991–1013.
- Besley, Timothy, and Anne C. Case. 2000. "Unnatural Experiments? Estimating the Incidence of Endogenous Policies." *Economic Journal*, 110(467): F672–94.
- Bierens, Herman J. 1987. "Kernel Estimators of Regression Functions." In *Advances in Econometrics: Fifth World Congress*, Volume 1, ed. Truman F. Bewley, 99–144. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.



- Bitler, Marianne, Jonah Gelbach, and Hilary Hoynes. 2006. "What Mean Impacts Miss: Distributional Effects of Welfare Reform Experiments." *American Economic Review*, 96(4): 988–1012.
- Björklund, Anders, and Robert Moffitt. 1987. "The Estimation of Wage Gains and Welfare Gains in Self-Selection." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 69(1): 42–49.
- Black, Sandra E. 1999. "Do Better Schools Matter? Parental Valuation of Elementary Education." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114(2): 577–99.
- Bloom, Howard S. 1984. "Accounting for No-Shows in Experimental Evaluation Designs." *Evaluation Review*, 8(2): 225–46.
- Bloom, Howard S., ed. 2005. *Learning More from Social Experiments: Evolving Analytic Approaches*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Blundell, Richard, and Monica Costa Dias. 2002. "Alternative Approaches to Evaluation in Empirical Microeconomics." Institute for Fiscal Studies Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice Working Paper CWP1%2.
- Blundell, Richard, Monica Costa Dias, Costas Meghir, and John Van Reenen. 2001. "Evaluating the Employment Impact of a Mandatory Job Search Assistance Program." Institute for Fiscal Studies Working Paper WP0%20.
- Blundell, Richard, Alan Duncan, and Costas Meghir. 1998. "Estimating Labor Supply Responses Using Tax Reforms." *Econometrica*, 66(4): 827–61.
- Blundell, Richard, Amanda Gosling, Hidehiko Ichimura, and Costas Meghir. 2004. "Changes in the Distribution of Male and Female Wages Accounting for Employment Composition Using Bounds." Institute for Fiscal Studies Working Paper W04/25.
- Blundell, Richard, and Thomas MaCurdy. 1999. "Labor Supply: A Review of Alternative Approaches." In *Handbook of Labor Economics, Volume 3A*, ed. Orley Ashenfelter and David Card, 1559–1695. Amsterdam; New York and Oxford: Elsevier Science, North-Holland.
- Blundell, Richard, and James L. Powell. 2003. "Endogeneity in Nonparametric and Semiparametric Regression Models." In *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Theory and Applications, Eighth World Congress, Volume 2*, ed. Mathias Dewatripont, Lars Peter Hansen, and Stephen J. Turnovsky, 312–57. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blundell, Richard, and James L. Powell. 2004. "Endogeneity in Semiparametric Binary Response Models." *Review of Economic Studies*, 71(3): 655–79.
- Brock, William, and Steven N. Durlauf. 2000. "Interactions-Based Models." National Bureau of Economic Research Technical Working Paper 258.
- Bruhn, Miriam, and David McKenzie. 2008. "In Pursuit of Balance: Randomization in Practice in Development Field Experiments." World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4752.
- Burtless, Gary. 1995. "The Case for Randomized Field Trials in Economic and Policy Research." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(2): 63–84.
- Busso, Matias, John DiNardo, and Justin McCrary. 2008. "Finite Sample Properties of Semiparametric Estimators of Average Treatment Effects." Unpublished.
- Caliendo, Marco. 2006. *Microeconomic Evaluation of Labour Market Policies*. Heidelberg: Springer, Physica-Verlag.
- Cameron, A. Colin, and Pravin K. Trivedi. 2005. *Microeconometrics: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Canay, Ivan A. 2007. "EL Inference for Partially Identified Models: Large Deviations Optimally and Bootstrap Validity." Unpublished.
- Card, David. 1990. "The Impact of the Mariel Boatlift on the Miami Labor Market." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 43(2): 245–57.
- Card, David. 2001. "Estimating the Return to Schooling: Progress on Some Persistent Econometric Problems." *Econometrica*, 69(5): 1127–60.
- Card, David, Carlos Dobkin, and Nicole Maestas. 2004. "The Impact of Nearly Universal Insurance Coverage on Health Care Utilization and Health: Evidence from Medicare." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 10365.
- Card, David, and Dean R. Hyslop. 2005. "Estimating the Effects of a Time-Limited Earnings Subsidy for Welfare-Leavers." *Econometrica*, 73(6): 1723–70.
- Card, David, and Alan B. Krueger. 1993. "Trends in Relative Black–White Earnings Revisited." *American Economic Review*, 83(2): 85–91.
- Card, David, and Alan B. Krueger. 1994. "Minimum Wages and Employment: A Case Study of the Fast-Food Industry in New Jersey and Pennsylvania." *American Economic Review*, 84(4): 772–93.
- Card, David, and Phillip B. Levine. 1994. "Unemployment Insurance Taxes and the Cyclical and Seasonal Properties of Unemployment." *Journal of Public Economics*, 53(1): 1–29.
- Card, David, Alexandre Mas, and Jesse Rothstein. 2007. "Tipping and the Dynamics of Segregation." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13052.
- Card, David, and Brian P. McCall. 1996. "Is Workers' Compensation Covering Uninsured Medical Costs? Evidence from the 'Monday Effect.'" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 49(4): 690–706.
- Card, David, and Philip K. Robins. 1996. "Do Financial Incentives Encourage Welfare Recipients to Work? Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation of the Self-Sufficiency Project." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 5701.
- Card, David, and Daniel G. Sullivan. 1988. "Measuring the Effect of Subsidized Training Programs on Movements In and Out of Employment." *Econometrica*, 56(3): 497–530.
- Case, Anne C., and Lawrence F. Katz. 1991. "The Company You Keep: The Effects of Family and Neighborhood on Disadvantaged Youths." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 3705.

- Chamberlain, Gary. 1986. "Asymptotic Efficiency in Semi-parametric Models with Censoring." *Journal of Econometrics*, 32(2): 189–218.
- Chattopadhyay, Raghavendra, and Esther Duflo. 2004. "Women as Policy Makers: Evidence from a Randomized Policy Experiment in India." *Econometrica*, 72(5): 1409–43.
- Chay, Kenneth Y., and Michael Greenstone. 2005. "Does Air Quality Matter? Evidence from the Housing Market." *Journal of Political Economy*, 113(2): 376–424.
- Chen, Susan, and Wilbert van der Klaauw. 2008. "The Work Disincentive Effects of the Disability Insurance Program in the 1990s." *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(2): 757–84.
- Chen, Xiaohong. 2007. "Large Sample Sieve Estimation of Semi-nonparametric Models." In *Handbook of Econometrics, Volume 6B*, ed. James J. Heckman and Edward E. Leamer, 5549–5632. Amsterdam and Oxford: Elsevier, North-Holland.
- Chen, Xiaohong, Han Hong, and Alessandro Tarozi. 2008. "Semiparametric Efficiency in GMM Models with Auxiliary Data." *Annals of Statistics*, 36(2): 808–43.
- Chernozhukov, Victor, and Christian B. Hansen. 2005. "An IV Model of Quantile Treatment Effects." *Econometrica*, 73(1): 245–61.
- Chernozhukov, Victor, Han Hong, and Elie Tamer. 2007. "Estimation and Confidence Regions for Parameter Sets in Econometric Models." *Econometrica*, 75(5): 1243–84.
- Chesher, Andrew. 2003. "Identification in Nonseparable Models." *Econometrica*, 71(5): 1405–41.
- Chetty, Raj, Adam Looney, and Kory Kroft. Forthcoming. "Salience and Taxation: Theory and Evidence." *American Economic Review*.
- Cochran, William G. 1968. "The Effectiveness of Adjustment by Subclassification in Removing Bias in Observational Studies." *Biometrics*, 24(2): 295–314.
- Cochran, William G., and Donald B. Rubin. 1973. "Controlling Bias in Observational Studies: A Review." *Sankhya*, 35(4): 417–46.
- Cook, Thomas D. 2008. "'Waiting for Life to Arrive': A History of the Regression–Discontinuity Design in Psychology, Statistics and Economics." *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(2): 636–54.
- Cook, Philip J., and George Tauchen. 1982. "The Effect of Liquor Taxes on Heavy Drinking." *Bell Journal of Economics*, 13(2): 379–90.
- Cook, Philip J., and George Tauchen. 1984. "The Effect of Minimum Drinking Age Legislation on Youthful Auto Fatalities, 1970–1977." *Journal of Legal Studies*, 13(1): 169–90.
- Crump, Richard K., V. Joseph Hotz, Guido W. Imbens, and Oscar A. Mitnik. 2009. "Dealing with Limited Overlap in Estimation of Average Treatment Effects." *Biometrika*, 96:187–99.
- Crump, Richard K., V. Joseph Hotz, Guido W. Imbens, and Oscar A. Mitnik. 2008. "Nonparametric Tests for Treatment Effect Heterogeneity." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(3): 389–405.
- Davison, A. C., and D. V. Hinkley. 1997. *Bootstrap Methods and Their Application*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dehejia, Rajeev H. 2003. "Was There a Riverside Miracle? A Hierarchical Framework for Evaluating Programs with Grouped Data." *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 21(1): 1–11.
- Dehejia, Rajeev H. 2005a. "Practical Propensity Score Matching: A Reply to Smith and Todd." *Journal of Econometrics*, 125(1–2): 355–64.
- Dehejia, Rajeev H. 2005b. "Program Evaluation as a Decision Problem." *Journal of Econometrics*, 125(1–2): 141–73.
- Dehejia, Rajeev H., and Sadek Wahba. 1999. "Causal Effects in Nonexperimental Studies: Reevaluating the Evaluation of Training Programs." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448): 1053–62.
- Diamond, Alexis, and Jasjeet S. Sekhon. 2008. "Genetic Matching for Estimating Causal Effects: A General Multivariate Matching Method for Achieving Balance in Observational Studies." Unpublished.
- DiNardo, John, and David S. Lee. 2004. "Economic Impacts of New Unionization on Private Sector Employers: 1984–2001." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(4): 1383–1441.
- Doksum, Kjell. 1974. "Empirical Probability Plots and Statistical Inference for Nonlinear Models in the Two-Sample Case." *Annals of Statistics*, 2(2): 267–77.
- Donald, Stephen G., and Kevin Lang. 2007. "Inference with Difference-in-Differences and Other Panel Data." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89(2): 221–33.
- Duflo, Esther. 2001. "Schooling and Labor Market Consequences of School Construction in Indonesia: Evidence from an Unusual Policy Experiment." *American Economic Review*, 91(4): 795–813.
- Duflo, Esther, William Gale, Jeffrey B. Liebman, Peter Orszag, and Emmanuel Saez. 2006. "Saving Incentives for Low- and Middle-Income Families: Evidence from a Field Experiment with H&R Block." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(4): 1311–46.
- Duflo, Esther, Rachel Glennerster, and Michael Kremer. 2008. "Using Randomization in Development Economics Research: A Toolkit." In *Handbook of Development Economics, Volume 4*, ed. T. Paul Schultz and John Strauss, 3895–3962. Amsterdam and Oxford: Elsevier, North-Holland.
- Duflo, Esther, and Rema Hanna. 2005. "Monitoring Works: Getting Teachers to Come to School." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 11880.
- Duflo, Esther, and Emmanuel Saez. 2003. "The Role of Information and Social Interactions in Retirement Plan Decisions: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(3): 815–42.
- Efron, Bradley, and Robert J. Tibshirani. 1993. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. New York and London: Chapman and Hall.

- Eissa, Nada, and Jeffrey B. Liebman. 1996. "Labor Supply Response to the Earned Income Tax Credit." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111(2): 605–37.
- Engle, Robert F., David F. Hendry, and Jean-Francois Richard. 1983. "Exogeneity." *Econometrica*, 51(2): 277–304.
- Fan, J., and I. Gijbels. 1996. *Local Polynomial Modelling and Its Applications*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Ferraz, Claudio, and Frederico Finan. 2008. "Exposing Corrupt Politicians: The Effects of Brazil's Publicly Released Audits on Electoral Outcomes." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(2): 703–45.
- Firpo, Sergio. 2007. "Efficient Semiparametric Estimation of Quantile Treatment Effects." *Econometrica*, 75(1): 259–76.
- Fisher, Ronald A. 1935. *The Design of Experiments*, First edition. London: Oliver and Boyd.
- Flores, Carlos A. 2005. "Estimation of Dose-Response Functions and Optimal Doses with a Continuous Treatment." Unpublished.
- Fraker, Thomas, and Rebecca Maynard. 1987. "The Adequacy of Comparison Group Designs for Evaluations of Employment-Related Programs." *Journal of Human Resources*, 22(2): 194–227.
- Friedlander, Daniel, and Judith M. Gueron. 1992. "Are High-Cost Services More Effective than Low-Cost Services?" In *Evaluating Welfare Training Programs*, ed. Charles F. Manski and Irwin Garfinkel, 143–98. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Friedlander, Daniel, and Philip K. Robins. 1995. "Evaluating Program Evaluations: New Evidence on Commonly Used Nonexperimental Methods." *American Economic Review*, 85(4): 923–37.
- Frölich, Markus. 2004a. "Finite-Sample Properties of Propensity-Score Matching and Weighting Estimators." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1): 77–90.
- Frölich, Markus. 2004b. "A Note on the Role of the Propensity Score for Estimating Average Treatment Effects." *Econometric Reviews*, 23(2): 167–74.
- Gill, Richard D., and James M. Robins. 2001. "Causal Inference for Complex Longitudinal Data: The Continuous Case." *Annals of Statistics*, 29(6): 1785–1811.
- Glaeser, Edward L., Bruce Sacerdote, and Jose A. Scheinkman. 1996. "Crime and Social Interactions." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111(2): 507–48.
- Goldberger, Arthur S. 1972a. "Selection Bias in Evaluating Treatment Effects: Some Formal Illustrations." Unpublished.
- Goldberger, Arthur S. 1972b. "Selection Bias in Evaluating Treatment Effects: The Case of Interaction." Unpublished.
- Gourieroux, C., A. Monfort, and A. Trognon. 1984a. "Pseudo Maximum Likelihood Methods: Applications to Poisson Models." *Econometrica*, 52(3): 701–20.
- Gourieroux, C., A. Monfort, and A. Trognon. 1984b. "Pseudo Maximum Likelihood Methods: Theory." *Econometrica*, 52(3): 681–700.
- Graham, Bryan S. 2008. "Identifying Social Interactions through Conditional Variance Restrictions." *Econometrica*, 76(3): 643–60.
- Graham, Bryan S., Guido W. Imbens, and Geert Ridder. 2006. "Complementarity and Aggregate Implications of Assortative Matching: A Nonparametric Analysis." Unpublished.
- Greenberg, David, and Michael Wiseman. 1992. "What Did the OBRA Demonstrations Do?" In *Evaluating Welfare and Training Programs*, ed. Charles F. Manski and Irwin Garfinkel, 25–75. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Gu, X., and Paul R. Rosenbaum. 1993. "Comparison of Multivariate Matching Methods: Structures, Distances and Algorithms." *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 2(4): 405–20.
- Gueron, Judith M., and Edward Pauly. 1991. *From Welfare to Work*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Haavelmo, Trygve. 1943. "The Statistical Implications of a System of Simultaneous Equations." *Econometrica*, 11(1): 1–12.
- Hahn, Jinyong. 1998. "On the Role of the Propensity Score in Efficient Semiparametric Estimation of Average Treatment Effects." *Econometrica*, 66(2): 315–31.
- Hahn, Jinyong, Petra E. Todd, and Wilbert van der Klaauw. 2001. "Identification and Estimation of Treatment Effects with a Regression-Discontinuity Design." *Econometrica*, 69(1): 201–09.
- Ham, John C., and Robert J. LaLonde. 1996. "The Effect of Sample Selection and Initial Conditions in Duration Models: Evidence from Experimental Data on Training." *Econometrica*, 64(1): 175–205.
- Hamermesh, Daniel S., and Jeff E. Biddle. 1994. "Beauty and the Labor Market." *American Economic Review*, 84(5): 1174–94.
- Hansen, B. B. 2008. "The Essential Role of Balance Tests in Propensity-Matched Observational Studies: Comments on 'A Critical Appraisal of Propensity-Score Matching in the Medical Literature between 1996 and 2003' by Peter Austin." *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(12): 2050–54.
- Hansen, Christian B. 2007a. "Asymptotic Properties of a Robust Variance Matrix Estimator for Panel Data When T Is Large." *Journal of Econometrics*, 141(2): 597–620.
- Hansen, Christian B. 2007b. "Generalized Least Squares Inference in Panel and Multilevel Models with Serial Correlation and Fixed Effects." *Journal of Econometrics*, 140(2): 670–94.
- Hanson, Samuel, and Adi Sunderam. 2008. "The Variance of Average Treatment Effect Estimators in the Presence of Clustering." Unpublished.
- Hardle, Wolfgang. 1990. *Applied Nonparametric Regression*. Cambridge; New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Heckman, James J. 1990. "Varieties of Selection Bias." *American Economic Review*, 80(2): 313–18.
- Heckman, James J., and V. Joseph Hotz. 1989. "Choosing among Alternative Nonexperimental

- Methods for Estimating the Impact of Social Programs: The Case of Manpower Training." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(408): 862–74.
- Heckman, James J., Hidehiko Ichimura, Jeffrey A. Smith, and Petra E. Todd. 1998. "Characterizing Selection Bias Using Experimental Data." *Econometrica*, 66(5): 1017–98.
- Heckman, James J., Hidehiko Ichimura, and Petra E. Todd. 1997. "Matching as an Econometric Evaluation Estimator: Evidence from Evaluating a Job Training Programme." *Review of Economic Studies*, 64(4): 605–54.
- Heckman, James J., Hidehiko Ichimura, and Petra E. Todd. 1998. "Matching as an Econometric Evaluation Estimator." *Review of Economic Studies*, 65(2): 261–94.
- Heckman, James J., Robert J. Lalonde, and Jeffrey A. Smith. 1999. "The Economics and Econometrics of Active Labor Market Programs." In *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Volume 3A, ed. Orley Ashenfelter and David Card, 1865–2097. Amsterdam; New York and Oxford: Elsevier Science, North-Holland.
- Heckman, James J., Lance Lochner, and Christopher Taber. 1999. "Human Capital Formation and General Equilibrium Treatment Effects: A Study of Tax and Tuition Policy." *Fiscal Studies*, 20(1): 25–40.
- Heckman, James J., and Salvador Navarro-Lozano. 2004. "Using Matching, Instrumental Variables, and Control Functions to Estimate Economic Choice Models." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1): 30–57.
- Heckman, James J., and Richard Robb Jr. 1985. "Alternative Methods for Evaluating the Impact of Interventions." In *Longitudinal Analysis of Labor Market Data*, ed. James J. Heckman and Burton Singer, 156–245. Cambridge; New York and Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- Heckman, James J., and Jeffrey A. Smith. 1995. "Assessing the Case for Social Experiments." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(2): 85–110.
- Heckman, James J., and Jeffrey A. Smith. 1997. "Making the Most Out of Programme Evaluations and Social Experiments: Accounting for Heterogeneity in Programme Impacts." *Review of Economic Studies*, 64(4): 487–535.
- Heckman, James J., Sergio Urzua, and Edward Vytlacil. 2006. "Understanding Instrumental Variables in Models with Essential Heterogeneity." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 88(3): 389–432.
- Heckman, James J., and Edward Vytlacil. 2005. "Structural Equations, Treatment Effects, and Econometric Policy Evaluation." *Econometrica*, 73(3): 669–738.
- Heckman, James J., and Edward Vytlacil. 2007a. "Econometric Evaluation of Social Programs, Part I: Causal Models, Structural Models and Econometric Policy Evaluation." In *Handbook of Econometrics*, Volume 6B, ed. James J. Heckman and Edward E. Leamer, 4779–4874. Amsterdam and Oxford: Elsevier, North-Holland.
- Heckman, James J., and Edward Vytlacil. 2007b. "Econometric Evaluation of Social Programs, Part II: Using the Marginal Treatment Effect to Organize Alternative Econometric Estimators to Evaluate Social Programs, and to Forecast Their Effects in New Environments." In *Handbook of Econometrics*, Volume 6B, ed. James J. Heckman and Edward E. Leamer, 4875–5143. Amsterdam and Oxford: Elsevier, North-Holland.
- Hill, Jennifer. 2008. "Discussion of Research Using Propensity-Score Matching: Comments on 'A Critical Appraisal of Propensity-Score Matching in the Medical Literature between 1996 and 2003' by Peter Austin." *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(12): 2055–61.
- Hirano, Keisuke, and Guido W. Imbens. 2001. "Estimation of Causal Effects Using Propensity Score Weighting: An Application to Data on Right Heart Catheterization." *Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology*, 2(3–4): 259–78.
- Hirano, Keisuke, and Guido W. Imbens. 2004. "The Propensity Score with Continuous Treatments." In *Applied Bayesian Modeling and Causal Inference from Incomplete-Data Perspectives*, ed. Andrew Gelman and Xiao-Li Meng, 73–84. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
- Hirano, Keisuke, Guido W. Imbens, and Geert Ridder. 2003. "Efficient Estimation of Average Treatment Effects Using the Estimated Propensity Score." *Econometrica*, 71(4): 1161–89.
- Hirano, Keisuke, Guido W. Imbens, Donald B. Rubin, and Xiao-Hua Zhou. 2000. "Assessing the Effect of an Influenza Vaccine in an Encouragement Design." *Biostatistics*, 1(1): 69–88.
- Hirano, Keisuke, and Jack R. Porter. 2008. "Asymptotics for Statistical Treatment Rules." [http://www.u.arizona.edu/~hirano/hp3\\_2008\\_08\\_10.pdf](http://www.u.arizona.edu/~hirano/hp3_2008_08_10.pdf).
- Holland, Paul W. 1986. "Statistics and Causal Inference." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(396): 945–60.
- Horowitz, Joel L. 2001. "The Bootstrap." In *Handbook of Econometrics*, Volume 5, ed. James J. Heckman and Edward Leamer, 3159–3228. Amsterdam; London and New York: Elsevier Science, North-Holland.
- Horowitz, Joel L., and Charles F. Manski. 2000. "Nonparametric Analysis of Randomized Experiments with Missing Covariate and Outcome Data." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(449): 77–84.
- Horvitz, D. G., and D. J. Thompson. 1952. "A Generalization of Sampling without Replacement from a Finite Universe." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 47(260): 663–85.
- Hotz, V. Joseph, Guido W. Imbens, and Jacob A. Klerman. 2006. "Evaluating the Differential Effects of Alternative Welfare-to-Work Training Components: A Reanalysis of the California GAIN Program." *Journal of Labor Economics*, 24(3): 521–66.
- Hotz, V. Joseph, Guido W. Imbens, and Julie H. Mortimer. 2005. "Predicting the Efficacy of Future Training Programs Using Past Experiences at Other



- Locations." *Journal of Econometrics*, 125(1–2): 241–70.
- Hotz, V. Joseph, Charles H. Mullin, and Seth G. Sanders. 1997. "Bounding Causal Effects Using Data from a Contaminated Natural Experiment: Analysing the Effects of Teenage Childbearing." *Review of Economic Studies*, 64(4): 575–603.
- Iacus, Stefano M., Gary King, and Giuseppe Porro. 2008. "Matching for Causal Inference without Balance Checking." Unpublished.
- Ichimura, Hidehiko, and Oliver Linton. 2005. "Asymptotic Expansions for Some Semiparametric Program Evaluation Estimators." In *Identification and Inference for Econometric Models: Essays in Honor of Thomas Rothenberg*, ed. Donald W. K. Andrews and James H. Stock, 149–70. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ichimura, Hidehiko, and Petra E. Todd. 2007. "Implementing Nonparametric and Semiparametric Estimators." In *Handbook of Econometrics, Volume 6B*, ed. James J. Heckman and Edward E. Leamer, 5369–5468. Amsterdam and Oxford: Elsevier, North-Holland.
- Imbens, Guido W. 2000. "The Role of the Propensity Score in Estimating Dose-Response Functions." *Biometrika*, 87(3): 706–10.
- Imbens, Guido W. 2003. "Sensitivity to Exogeneity Assumptions in Program Evaluation." *American Economic Review*, 93(2): 126–32.
- Imbens, Guido W. 2004. "Nonparametric Estimation of Average Treatment Effects under Exogeneity: A Review." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1): 4–29.
- Imbens, Guido W. 2007. "Non-additive Models with Endogenous Regressors." In *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Theory and Applications, Ninth World Congress, Volume 3*, ed. Richard Blundell, Whitney K. Newey, and Torsten Persson, 17–46. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Imbens, Guido W., and Joshua D. Angrist. 1994. "Identification and Estimation of Local Average Treatment Effects." *Econometrica*, 62(2): 467–75.
- Imbens, Guido W., and Karthik Kalyanaraman. 2009. "Optimal Bandwidth Choice for the Regression Discontinuity Estimator." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 14726.
- Imbens, Guido W., Gary King, David McKenzie, and Geert Ridder. 2008. "On the Benefits of Stratification in Randomized Experiments." Unpublished.
- Imbens, Guido W., and Thomas Lemieux. 2008. "Regression Discontinuity Designs: A Guide to Practice." *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(2): 615–35.
- Imbens, Guido W., and Charles F. Manski. 2004. "Confidence Intervals for Partially Identified Parameters." *Econometrica*, 72(6): 1845–57.
- Imbens, Guido W., and Whitney K. Newey. Forthcoming. "Identification and Estimation of Triangular Simultaneous Equations Models without Additivity." National Bureau of Economic Research Technical *Econometrica*.
- Imbens, Guido W., Whitney K. Newey, and Geert Ridder. 2005. "Mean-Squared-Error Calculations for Average Treatment Effects." Unpublished.
- Imbens, Guido W., and Donald B. Rubin. 1997a. "Bayesian Inference for Causal Effects in Randomized Experiments with Noncompliance." *Annals of Statistics*, 25(1): 305–27.
- Imbens, Guido W., and Donald B. Rubin. 1997b. "Estimating Outcome Distributions for Compliers in Instrumental Variables Models." *Review of Economic Studies*, 64(4): 555–74.
- Imbens, Guido W., and Donald B. Rubin. Forthcoming. *Causal Inference in Statistics and the Social Sciences*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Imbens, Guido W., Donald B. Rubin, and Bruce I. Sacerdote. 2001. "Estimating the Effect of Unearned Income on Labor Earnings, Savings, and Consumption: Evidence from a Survey of Lottery Players." *American Economic Review*, 91(4): 778–94.
- Jin, Ginger Zhe, and Phillip Leslie. 2003. "The Effect of Information on Product Quality: Evidence from Restaurant Hygiene Grade Cards." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(2): 409–51.
- Joffe, Marshall M., and Paul R. Rosenbaum. 1999. "Invited Commentary: Propensity Scores." *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 150(4): 327–33.
- Kitagawa, Toru. 2008. "Identification Bounds for the Local Average Treatment Effect." Unpublished.
- Kling, Jeffrey R., Jeffrey B. Liebman, and Lawrence F. Katz. 2007. "Experimental Analysis of Neighborhood Effects." *Econometrica*, 75(1): 83–119.
- Lalive, Rafael. 2008. "How Do Extended Benefits Affect Unemployment Duration? A Regression Discontinuity Approach." *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(2): 785–806.
- LaLonde, Robert J. 1986. "Evaluating the Econometric Evaluations of Training Programs with Experimental Data." *American Economic Review*, 76(4): 604–20.
- Lechner, Michael. 1999. "Earnings and Employment Effects of Continuous Off-the-Job Training in East Germany after Unification." *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 17(1): 74–90.
- Lechner, Michael. 2001. "Identification and Estimation of Causal Effects of Multiple Treatments under the Conditional Independence Assumption." In *Econometric Evaluation of Labour Market Policies*, ed. Michael Lechner and Friedhelm Pfeiffer, 43–58. Heidelberg and New York: Physica; Mannheim: Centre for European Economic Research.
- Lechner, Michael. 2002a. "Program Heterogeneity and Propensity Score Matching: An Application to the Evaluation of Active Labor Market Policies." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 84(2): 205–20.
- Lechner, Michael. 2002b. "Some Practical Issues in the Evaluation of Heterogeneous Labour Market Programmes by Matching Methods." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 165(1): 59–82.
- Lechner, Michael. 2004. "Sequential Matching



- Estimation of Dynamic Causal Models." University of St. Gallen Department of Economics Discussion Paper 2004-06.
- Lechner, Michael, and Ruth Miquel. 2005. "Identification of the Effects of Dynamic Treatments By Sequential Conditional Independence Assumptions." University of St. Gallen Department of Economics Discussion Paper 2005-17.
- Lechner, Michael, Ruth Miquel, and Conny Wunsch. 2004. "Long-Run Effects of Public Sector Sponsored Training in West Germany." Institute for the Study of Labor Discussion Paper 1443.
- Lee, David S. 2001. "The Electoral Advantage to Incumbency and the Voters' Valuation of Politicians' Experience: A Regression Discontinuity Analysis of Elections to the U.S. . . ." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 8441.
- Lee, David S. 2008. "Randomized Experiments from Non-random Selection in U.S. House Elections." *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(2): 675–97.
- Lee, David S., and David Card. 2008. "Regression Discontinuity Inference with Specification Error." *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(2): 655–74.
- Lee, David S., and Thomas Lemieux. 2008. "Regression Discontinuity Designs in Economics." Unpublished.
- Lee, David S., Enrico Moretti, and Matthew J. Butler. 2004. "Do Voters Affect or Elect Policies? Evidence from the U.S. House." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(3): 807–59.
- Lee, Myoung-Jae. 2005a. *Micro-Econometrics for Policy, Program, and Treatment Effects*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, Myoung-Jae. 2005b. "Treatment Effect and Sensitivity Analysis for Self-Selected Treatment and Selectively Observed Response." Unpublished.
- Lehmann, Erich L. 1974. *Nonparametrics: Statistical Methods Based on Ranks*. San Francisco: Holden-Day.
- Lemieux, Thomas, and Kevin Milligan. 2008. "Incentive Effects of Social Assistance: A Regression Discontinuity Approach." *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(2): 807–28.
- Leuven, Edwin, and Barbara Sianesi. 2003. "PSMATCH2: Stata Module to Perform Full Mahalanobis and Propensity Score Matching, Common Support Graphing, and Covariate Imbalance Testing." <http://ideas.repec.org/c/boc/bocode/s432001.html>.
- Li, Qi, Jeffrey S. Racine, and Jeffrey M. Wooldridge. Forthcoming. "Efficient Estimation of Average Treatment Effects with Mixed Categorical and Continuous Data." *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*.
- Linton, Oliver, and Pedro Gozalo. 2003. "Conditional Independence Restrictions: Testing and Estimation." Unpublished.
- Little, Roderick J. A., and Donald B. Rubin. 1987. *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*. New York: Wiley.
- Ludwig, Jens, and Douglas L. Miller. 2005. "Does Head Start Improve Children's Life Chances? Evidence from a Regression Discontinuity Design." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 11702.
- Ludwig, Jens, and Douglas L. Miller. 2007. "Does Head Start Improve Children's Life Chances? Evidence from a Regression Discontinuity Design." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(1): 159–208.
- Manski, Charles F. 1990. "Nonparametric Bounds on Treatment Effects." *American Economic Review*, 80(2): 319–23.
- Manski, Charles F. 1993. "Identification of Endogenous Social Effects: The Reflection Problem." *Review of Economic Studies*, 60(3): 531–42.
- Manski, Charles F. 1995. *Identification Problems in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Manski, Charles F. 2000a. "Economic Analysis of Social Interactions." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(3): 115–36.
- Manski, Charles F. 2000b. "Identification Problems and Decisions under Ambiguity: Empirical Analysis of Treatment Response and Normative Analysis of Treatment Choice." *Journal of Econometrics*, 95(2): 415–42.
- Manski, Charles F. 2001. "Designing Programs for Heterogeneous Populations: The Value of Covariate Information." *American Economic Review*, 91(2): 103–06.
- Manski, Charles F. 2002. "Treatment Choice under Ambiguity Induced By Inferential Problems." *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 105(1): 67–82.
- Manski, Charles F. 2003. *Partial Identification of Probabilities Distributions*. New York and Heidelberg: Springer.
- Manski, Charles F. 2004. "Statistical Treatment Rules for Heterogeneous Populations." *Econometrica*, 72(4): 1221–46.
- Manski, Charles F. 2005. *Social Choice with Partial Knowledge of Treatment Response*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Manski, Charles F. 2007. *Identification for Prediction and Decision*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Manski, Charles F., and John V. Pepper. 2000. "Monotone Instrumental Variables: With an Application to the Returns to Schooling." *Econometrica*, 68(4): 997–1010.
- Manski, Charles F., Gary D. Sandefur, Sara McLanahan, and Daniel Powers. 1992. "Alternative Estimates of the Effect of Family Structure during Adolescence on High School Graduation." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87(417): 25–37.
- Matzkin, Rosa L. 2003. "Nonparametric Estimation of Nonadditive Random Functions." *Econometrica*, 71(5): 1339–75.
- McCrary, Justin. 2008. "Manipulation of the Running Variable in the Regression Discontinuity Design: A Density Test." *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(2): 698–714.

- McEwan, Patrick J., and Joseph S. Shapiro. 2008. "The Benefits of Delayed Primary School Enrollment: Discontinuity Estimates Using Exact Birth Dates." *Journal of Human Resources*, 43(1): 1–29.
- Mealli, Fabrizia, Guido W. Imbens, Salvatore Ferro, and Annibale Biggeri. 2004. "Analyzing a Randomized Trial on Breast Self-Examination with Noncompliance and Missing Outcomes." *Biostatistics*, 5(2): 207–22.
- Meyer, Bruce D., W. Kip Viscusi, and David L. Durbin. 1995. "Workers' Compensation and Injury Duration: Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *American Economic Review*, 85(3): 322–40.
- Miguel, Edward, and Michael Kremer. 2004. "Worms: Identifying Impacts on Education and Health in the Presence of Treatment Externalities." *Econometrica*, 72(1): 159–217.
- Morgan, Stephen L., and Christopher Winship. 2007. *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Moulton, Brent R. 1990. "An Illustration of a Pitfall in Estimating the Effects of Aggregate Variables on Micro Unit." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 72(2): 334–38.
- Moulton, Brent R., and William C. Randolph. 1989. "Alternative Tests of the Error Components Model." *Econometrica*, 57(3): 685–93.
- Newey, Whitney K. 1994a. "Kernel Estimation of Partial Means and a General Variance Estimator." *Econometric Theory*, 10(2): 233–53.
- Newey, Whitney K. 1994b. "Series Estimation of Regression Functionals." *Econometric Theory*, 10(1): 1–28.
- Olken, Benjamin A. 2007. "Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia." *Journal of Political Economy*, 115(2): 200–249.
- Pagan, Adrian, and Aman Ullah. 1999. *Nonparametric Econometrics*. Cambridge; New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Pakes, Ariel, Jack R. Porter, Kate Ho, and Joy Ishii. 2006. "Moment Inequalities and Their Application." Institute for Fiscal Studies Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice Working Paper CWP16/07.
- Pearl, Judea. 2000. *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*. Cambridge; New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Pettersson-Lidbom, Per. 2007. "The Policy Consequences of Direct versus Representative Democracy: A Regression-Discontinuity Approach." Unpublished.
- Pettersson-Lidbom, Per. 2008. "Does the Size of the Legislature Affect the Size of Government? Evidence from Two Natural Experiments." Unpublished.
- Pettersson-Lidbom, Per, and Björn Tyrefors. 2007. "Do Parties Matter for Economic Outcomes? A Regression-Discontinuity Approach." Unpublished.
- Politis, Dimitris N., Joseph P. Romano, and Michael Wolf. 1999. *Subsampling*. New York: Springer, Verlag.
- Porter, Jack R. 2003. "Estimation in the Regression Discontinuity Model." Unpublished.
- Quade, D. 1982. "Nonparametric Analysis of Covariance By Matching." *Biometrics*, 38(3): 597–611.
- Racine, Jeffrey S., and Qi Li. 2004. "Nonparametric Estimation of Regression Functions with Both Categorical and Continuous Data." *Journal of Econometrics*, 119(1): 99–130.
- Riccio, James, and Daniel Friedlander. 1992. *GAIN: Program Strategies, Participation Patterns, and First-Year Impacts in Six Countries*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Riccio, James, Daniel Friedlander, and Stephen Freedman. 1994. *GAIN: Benefits, Costs, and Three-Year Impacts of a Welfare-to-Work Program*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Robins, James M., and Ya'acov Ritov. 1997. "Toward a Curse of Dimensionality Appropriate (CODA) Asymptotic Theory for Semi-parametric Models." *Statistics in Medicine*, 16(3): 285–319.
- Robins, James M., and Andrea Rotnitzky. 1995. "Semi-parametric Efficiency in Multivariate Regression Models with Missing Data." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(429): 122–29.
- Robins, James M., Andrea Rotnitzky, and Lue Ping Zhao. 1995. "Analysis of Semiparametric Regression Models for Repeated Outcomes in the Presence of Missing Data." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(429): 106–21.
- Robinson, Peter M. 1988. "Root-N-Consistent Semi-parametric Regression." *Econometrica*, 56(4): 931–54.
- Romano, Joseph P., and Azeem M. Shaikh. 2006a. "Inference for Identifiable Parameters in Partially Identified Econometric Models." Stanford University Department of Statistics Technical Report 2006-9.
- Romano, Joseph P., and Azeem M. Shaikh. 2006b. "Inference for the Identified Set in Partially Identified Econometric Models." Unpublished.
- Rosen, Adam M. 2006. "Confidence Sets for Partially Identified Parameters That Satisfy a Finite Number of Moment Inequalities." Institute for Fiscal Studies Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice Working Paper CWP25/06.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. 1984a. "Conditional Permutation Tests and the Propensity Score in Observational Studies." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 79(387): 565–74.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. 1984b. "The Consequences of Adjustment for a Concomitant Variable That Has Been Affected By the Treatment." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 147(5): 656–66.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. 1987. "The Role of a Second Control Group in an Observational Study." *Statistical Science*, 2(3): 292–306.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. 1989. "Optimal Matching for Observational Studies." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(408): 1024–32.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. 1995. *Observational Studies*. New York; Heidelberg and London: Springer.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. 2002. "Covariance Adjustment in Randomized Experiments and Observational

- Studies." *Statistical Science*, 17(3): 286–327.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R., and Donald B. Rubin. 1983a. "Assessing Sensitivity to an Unobserved Binary Covariate in an Observational Study with Binary Outcome." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 45(2): 212–18.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R., and Donald B. Rubin. 1983b. "The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects." *Biometrika*, 70(1): 41–55.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R., and Donald B. Rubin. 1984. "Reducing Bias in Observational Studies Using Subclassification on the Propensity Score." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 79(387): 516–24.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R., and Donald B. Rubin. 1985. "Constructing a Control Group Using Multivariate Matched Sampling Methods That Incorporate the Propensity Score." *American Statistician*, 39(1): 33–38.
- Rotnitzky, Andrea, and James M. Robins. 1995. "Semiparametric Regression Estimation in the Presence of Dependent Censoring." *Biometrika*, 82(4): 805–20.
- Roy, A. D. 1951. "Some Thoughts on the Distribution of Earnings." *Oxford Economic Papers*, 3(2): 135–46.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1973a. "Matching to Remove Bias in Observational Studies." *Biometrics*, 29(1): 159–83.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1973b. "The Use of Matched Sampling and Regression Adjustment to Remove Bias in Observational Studies." *Biometrics*, 29(1): 184–203.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1974. "Estimating Causal Effects of Treatments in Randomized and Nonrandomized Studies." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66(5): 688–701.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1976. "Inference and Missing Data." *Biometrika*, 63(3): 581–92.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1977. "Assignment to Treatment Group on the Basis of a Covariate." *Journal of Educational Statistics*, 2(1): 1–26.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1978. "Bayesian Inference for Causal Effects: The Role of Randomization." *Annals of Statistics*, 6(1): 34–58.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1979. "Using Multivariate Matched Sampling and Regression Adjustment to Control Bias in Observational Studies." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74(366): 318–28.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1987. *Multiple Imputation for Non-response in Surveys*. New York: Wiley.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1990. "Formal Mode of Statistical Inference for Causal Effects." *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 25(3): 279–92.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1997. "Estimating Causal Effects from Large Data Sets Using Propensity Scores." *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 127(5 Part 2): 757–63.
- Rubin, Donald B. 2006. *Matched Sampling for Causal Effects*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubin, Donald B., and Neal Thomas. 1992a. "Affinely Invariant Matching Methods with Ellipsoidal Distributions." *Annals of Statistics*, 20(2): 1079–93.
- Rubin, Donald B., and Neal Thomas. 1992b. "Characterizing the Effect of Matching Using Linear Propensity Score Methods with Normal Distributions." *Biometrika*, 79(4): 797–809.
- Rubin, Donald B., and Neal Thomas. 1996. "Matching Using Estimated Propensity Scores: Relating Theory to Practice." *Biometrics*, 52(1): 249–64.
- Rubin, Donald B., and Neal Thomas. 2000. "Combining Propensity Score Matching with Additional Adjustments for Prognostic Covariates." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(450): 573–85.
- Sacerdote, Bruce. 2001. "Peer Effects with Random Assignment: Results for Dartmouth Roommates." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(2): 681–704.
- Scharfstein, Daniel O., Andrea Rotnitzky, and James M. Robins. 1999. "Adjusting for Nonignorable Drop-Out Using Semiparametric Nonresponse Models." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(448): 1096–1120.
- Schultz, T. Paul. 2001. "School Subsidies for the Poor: Evaluating the Mexican Progreso Poverty Program." Yale University Economic Growth Center Discussion Paper 834.
- Seifert, Burkhardt, and Theo Gasser. 1996. "Finite-Sample Variance of Local Polynomials: Analysis and Solutions." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91(433): 267–75.
- Seifert, Burkhardt, and Theo Gasser. 2000. "Data Adaptive Ridging in Local Polynomial Regression." *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 9(2): 338–60.
- Sekhon, Jasjeet S. Forthcoming. "Multivariate and Propensity Score Matching Software with Automated Balance Optimization: The Matching Package for R." *Journal of Statistical Software*.
- Sekhon, Jasjeet S., and Richard Grieve. 2008. "A New Non-parametric Matching Method for Bias Adjustment with Applications to Economic Evaluations." [http://sekhon.berkeley.edu/papers/GeneticMatching\\_SekhonGrieve.pdf](http://sekhon.berkeley.edu/papers/GeneticMatching_SekhonGrieve.pdf).
- Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, and Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Smith, Jeffrey A., and Petra E. Todd. 2001. "Reconciling Conflicting Evidence on the Performance of Propensity-Score Matching Methods." *American Economic Review*, 91(2): 112–18.
- Smith, Jeffrey A., and Petra E. Todd. 2005. "Does Matching Overcome Lalonde's Critique of Nonexperimental Estimators?" *Journal of Econometrics*, 125(1–2): 305–53.
- Splawa-Neyman, Jerzy. 1990. "On the Application of Probability Theory to Agricultural Experiments. Essays on Principles. Section 9." *Statistical Science*, 5(4): 465–72. (Orig. pub. 1923.)
- Stock, James H. 1989. "Nonparametric Policy Analysis." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(406): 567–75.
- Stone, Charles J. 1977. "Consistent Nonparametric Regression." *Annals of Statistics*, 5(4): 595–620.
- Stoye, Jörg. 2007. "More on Confidence Intervals for

- Partially Identified Parameters." Unpublished.
- Stuart, Elizabeth A. 2008. "Developing Practical Recommendations for the Use of Propensity Scores: Discussion of 'A Critical Appraisal of Propensity Score Matching in the Medical Literature between 1996 and 2003' by Peter Austin." *Statistics in Medicine*, 27(12): 2062–65.
- Sun, Yixiao. 2005. "Adaptive Estimation of the Regression Discontinuity Model." Unpublished.
- Thistlethwaite, Donald L., and Donald T. Campbell. 1960. "Regression-Discontinuity Analysis: An Alternative to the Ex Post Facto Experiment." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 51(6): 309–17.
- Trochim, William M. K. 1984. *Research Design for Program Evaluation: The Regression-Discontinuity Approach*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Trochim, William M. K. 2001. "Regression-Discontinuity Design." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 20, ed. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, 12940–45. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Van der Klaauw, Wilbert. 2002. "Estimating the Effect of Financial Aid Offers on College Enrollment: A Regression-Discontinuity Approach." *International Economic Review*, 43(4): 1249–87.
- Van der Klaauw, Wilbert. 2008a. "Breaking the Link between Poverty and Low Student Achievement: An Evaluation of Title I." *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(2): 731–56.
- Van der Klaauw, Wilbert. 2008b. "Regression-Discontinuity Analysis: A Survey of Recent Developments in Economics." *Labour*, 22(2): 219–45.
- Van der Laan, Mark J., and James M. Robins. 2003. *Unified Methods for Censored Longitudinal Data and Causality*. New York: Springer, Physica-Verlag.
- Vytlačil, Edward. 2002. "Independence, Monotonicity, and Latent Index Models: An Equivalence Result." *Econometrica*, 70(1): 331–41.
- Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 1999. "Asymptotic Properties of Weighted M-Estimators for Variable Probability Samples." *Econometrica*, 67(6): 1385–1406.
- Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2002. *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. Cambridge and London: MIT Press.
- Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2005. "Violating Ignorability of Treatment By Controlling for Too Many Factors." *Econometric Theory*, 21(5): 1026–28.
- Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2007. "Inverse Probability Weighted Estimation for General Missing Data Problems." *Journal of Econometrics*, 141(2): 1281–1301.
- Zhao, Zhong. 2004. "Using Matching to Estimate Treatment Effects: Data Requirements, Matching Metrics, and Monte Carlo Evidence." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1): 91–107.

**This article has been cited by:**

1. Helge C.N. Littke, Matias Ossandon Busch. 2021. Banks fearing the drought? Liquidity hoarding as a response to idiosyncratic interbank funding dry-ups. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **119**, 102474. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Hong-Xing Wen, Zi-Rui Chen, Pu-Yan Nie. 2021. Environmental and economic performance of China's ETS pilots: New evidence from an expanded synthetic control method. *Energy Reports* **7**, 2999-3010. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Justice A. Tambo, Oliver K. Kirui. 2021. Yield effects of conservation farming practices under fall armyworm stress: The case of Zambia. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* **321**, 107618. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Ryan N. Banerjee, Leonardo Gambacorta, Enrico Sette. 2021. The real effects of relationship lending#. *Journal of Financial Intermediation* **48**, 100923. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Ivan Petrov, Lisa Ryan. 2021. The landlord-tenant problem and energy efficiency in the residential rental market. *Energy Policy* **157**, 112458. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Ryo Takahashi. 2021. Who is attracted to purchase green products through information provision: A nationwide social experiment to promote eco-friendly coffee. *Environmental Science & Policy* **124**, 593-603. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Siamak Javadi, Mohsen Mollagholamali, Ali Nejadmalayeri, Saud Al-Thaqeb. 2021. Corporate cash holdings, agency problems, and economic policy uncertainty. *International Review of Financial Analysis* **77**, 101859. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Lutz Depenbusch, Pepijn Schreinemachers, Ralph Roothaert, Sylvia Namazzi, Charles Onyango, Sophia Bongole, James Mutebi. 2021. Impact of home garden interventions in East Africa: Results of three randomized controlled trials. *Food Policy* **104**, 102140. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Kendra L. Walker. 2021. Effect of land tenure on forest cover and the paradox of private titling in Panama. *Land Use Policy* **109**, 105632. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Ny Boret, Kishore Gawande, Daniel P. Kobb. 2021. Can decentralization lower poverty? Cambodia's Commune and Sangkat Fund. *World Development* **146**, 105548. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Asresu Yitayew, Awudu Abdulai, Yigezu A. Yigezu, Tilaye T. Deneke, Girma T. Kassie. 2021. Impact of agricultural extension services on the adoption of improved wheat variety in Ethiopia: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *World Development* **146**, 105605. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Jordan Blekking, Nicolas Gatti, Kurt Waldman, Tom Evans, Kathy Baylis. 2021. The benefits and limitations of agricultural input cooperatives in Zambia. *World Development* **146**, 105616. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Justice A. Tambo, Mathews Matimelo, Mathias Ndhlovu, Fredrick Mbugua, Noah Phiri. 2021. Gender-differentiated impacts of plant clinics on maize productivity and food security: Evidence from Zambia. *World Development* **145**, 105519. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Julián Caballero. 2021. Corporate dollar debt and depreciations: All's well that ends well?. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **130**, 106185. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Ilayda Nemlioglu, Sushanta Mallick. 2021. Effective innovation via better management of firms: The role of leverage in times of crisis. *Research Policy* **50**:7, 104259. [[Crossref](#)]
16. I. Avgeri, Y. Dendramis, H. Louri. 2021. The Single Supervisory Mechanism and its implications for the profitability of European banks. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money* **74**, 101382. [[Crossref](#)]



17. Tamara Bischof, Boris Kaiser. 2021. Who cares when you close down? The effects of primary care practice closures on patients. *Health Economics* **30**:9, 2004-2025. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Tim Winke. 2021. Housing affordability sets us apart: The effect of rising housing prices on relocation behaviour. *Urban Studies* **58**:12, 2389-2404. [[Crossref](#)]
19. Martin Paul Jr. Tabe-Ojong, Emmanuel Nshakira-Rukundo. 2021. Religiosity and parental educational aspirations for children in Kenya. *World Development Perspectives* **23**, 100349. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Tom Swiderski, Douglas Lee Lauen, Sarah Crittenden Fuller, Fatih Unlu. 2021. A path towards citizenship: The effects of early college high schools on criminal convictions and voting. *Social Science Research* **99**, 102584. [[Crossref](#)]
21. Sujuan Li, Jiaguo Liu, Yudan Kong. 2021. Pilot free trade zones and Chinese port-listed companies performance: An empirical research based on quasi-natural experiment. *Transport Policy* **111**, 125-137. [[Crossref](#)]
22. Ahmed Elsayed, Soiliou Daw Namoro, Rania Roushdy. 2021. Empowering women in conservative settings: evidence from an intervention in rural Egypt. *Review of Economics of the Household* **27**. . [[Crossref](#)]
23. Jill L. Caviglia-Harris. 2021. Community is key: estimating the impact of living learning communities on college retention and GPA. *Education Economics* **93**, 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
24. Fangfang Hou, Elisabetta Magnani, Xinpeng Xu. 2021. International capital markets and domestic employment: Evidence from worldwide publicly listed large firms. *The World Economy* **108**. . [[Crossref](#)]
25. Kyoo il Kim, Suyong Song. 2021. Control variables approach to estimate semiparametric models of mismeasured endogenous regressors with an application to U.K. twin data. *Econometric Reviews* **84**, 1-36. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Maria Nannini, Mario Biggeri, Giovanni Putoto. 2021. Financial protection and coping strategies in rural Uganda: an impact evaluation of community-based zero-interest healthcare loans. *Health Policy and Planning* **36**:7, 1090-1102. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Oladele Akogun, Andrew Dillon, Jed Friedman, Ashesh Prasann, Pieter Serneels. 2021. Productivity and Health: Physical Activity as a Measure of Effort. *The World Bank Economic Review* **35**:3, 652-680. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Trine Bille, Hanna Nyborg Storm. 2021. Local development policy: do new culture houses have an impact on migration? The case of Norway. *European Planning Studies* **29**:8, 1556-1577. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Lili Kang, Fei Peng, Yu Zhu. 2021. Returns to higher education subjects and tiers in China: evidence from the China Family Panel Studies. *Studies in Higher Education* **46**:8, 1682-1695. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Ryo Takahashi. 2021. How to stimulate environmentally friendly consumption: Evidence from a nationwide social experiment in Japan to promote eco-friendly coffee. *Ecological Economics* **186**, 107082. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Jules NGANGO, Seungjee HONG. 2021. Adoption of small-scale irrigation technologies and its impact on land productivity: Evidence from Rwanda. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture* **20**:8, 2302-2312. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Luiz G. S. Ribas, Robert L. Pressey, Luis M. Bini. 2021. Estimating counterfactuals for evaluation of ecological and conservation impact: an introduction to matching methods. *Biological Reviews* **96**:4, 1186-1204. [[Crossref](#)]

33. Emma Gorman, Colm Harmon, Silvia Mendolia, Anita Staneva, Ian Walker. 2021. Adolescent School Bullying Victimization and Later Life Outcomes. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **83**:4, 1048-1076. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Yongnam Kim, Peter M. Steiner. 2021. Gain Scores Revisited: A Graphical Models Perspective. *Sociological Methods & Research* **50**:3, 1353-1375. [[Crossref](#)]
35. Mark Olfson, Melanie M. Wall, Colleen L. Barry, Christine Mauro, C. Jean Choi, Ramin Mojtabai. 2021. Effects of the ACA on Health Care Coverage for Adults With Substance Use Disorders. *Psychiatric Services* **72**:8, 905-911. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Deqiu Chen, Huasheng Gao, Yujing Ma. 2021. Human Capital-Driven Acquisition: Evidence from the Inevitable Disclosure Doctrine. *Management Science* **67**:8, 4643-4664. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Firmin Doko Tchatoka, Vanessa Varvaris. 2021. Neighbourhood, school zoning and the housing market: Evidence from New South Wales. *Journal of Housing Economics* **100**, 101790. [[Crossref](#)]
38. Bruno Ferman. 2021. Matching estimators with few treated and many control observations. *Journal of Econometrics* **105**. . [[Crossref](#)]
39. Jean C. Digitale, Kristefer Stojanovski, Charles E. McCulloch, Margaret A. Handley. 2021. Study Designs to Assess Real-World Interventions to Prevent COVID-19. *Frontiers in Public Health* **9**. . [[Crossref](#)]
40. Alexander Kupfer, Julia Oberndorfer, Felix Kunz. 2021. Why do corporate cash holdings differ within reunified Germany?. *Journal of Business Economics* **16**. . [[Crossref](#)]
41. Viviana Celli. 2021. Causal mediation analysis in economics: Objectives, assumptions, models. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **105**. . [[Crossref](#)]
42. William Becker, Paolo Paruolo, Andrea Saltelli. 2021. Variable Selection in Regression Models Using Global Sensitivity Analysis. *Journal of Time Series Econometrics* **13**:2, 187-233. [[Crossref](#)]
43. Christian Langpap. 2021. Interest Groups, Litigation, and Agency Decisions: Evidence from the Endangered Species Act. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* . [[Crossref](#)]
44. Zainab Oyetunde-Usman, Oyinlola Rafiat Ogunpaimo, Kehinde Oluseyi Olagunju, Omotuyole Isiaka Ambali, Waheed Mobolaji Ashagidigbi. 2021. Welfare Impact of Organic Fertilizer Adoption: Empirical Evidence From Nigeria. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems* **5**. . [[Crossref](#)]
45. Christian Buerger, Riley M. Sandel, Vincent Reitano, Michelle L. Lofton, Peter Jones. 2021. Extending differences-in-differences frameworks to Granger equations: evidence from cutback management during three recessions. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* **ahead-of-print**:ahead-of-print. . [[Crossref](#)]
46. Pedro H. C. Sant'Anna. 2021. Nonparametric Tests for Treatment Effect Heterogeneity With Duration Outcomes. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **39**:3, 816-832. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Ibrahima Bocoum, Lota D. Tamini, Ghislain Auger. 2021. Logiques d'acteurs et qualité des partenariats multisectoriels Nord-Sud: le cas d'un projet de microfinance agricole au Burkina Faso. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement* **42**:3, 371-393. [[Crossref](#)]
48. Keith Kranker, Laura Blue, Lauren Vollmer Forrow. 2021. Improving Effect Estimates by Limiting the Variability in Inverse Propensity Score Weights. *The American Statistician* **75**:3, 276-287. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Dimitra M. Salmanidou, Ayao Ehara, Rozana Himaz, Mohammad Heidarzadeh, Serge Guillas. 2021. Impact of future tsunamis from the Java trench on household welfare: Merging geophysics and

- economics through catastrophe modelling. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **61**, 102291. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Elena Carletti, Filippo De Marco, Vasso Ioannidou, Enrico Sette. 2021. Banks as patient lenders: Evidence from a tax reform. *Journal of Financial Economics* **141**:1, 6-26. [[Crossref](#)]
  51. Luisa Carpinelli, Matteo Crosignani. 2021. The design and transmission of central bank liquidity provisions. *Journal of Financial Economics* **141**:1, 27-47. [[Crossref](#)]
  52. Richard Dorsett, Lucy Stokes. 2021. Pre-apprenticeship training for young people: Estimating the marginal and average treatment effects. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* **5**. . [[Crossref](#)]
  53. ISAAC Bonuedi, Nicolas Gerber, Lukas Kornher. 2021. Intervening in Cash Crop Value Chains for Improved Nutrition: Evidence from Rural Sierra Leone. *The Journal of Development Studies* **47**, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
  54. Yigezu A. Yigezu, Tamer El-Shater. 2021. Socio-economic impacts of zero and reduced tillage in wheat fields of the Moroccan drylands. *Agricultural Economics* **52**:4, 645-663. [[Crossref](#)]
  55. Kimie Harada, Tatsuyoshi Okimoto. 2021. The BOJ's ETF purchases and its effects on Nikkei 225 stocks. *International Review of Financial Analysis* **9**, 101826. [[Crossref](#)]
  56. Francesca Caselli, Philippe Wingender. 2021. Heterogeneous effects of fiscal rules: The Maastricht fiscal criterion and the counterfactual distribution of government deficits#. *European Economic Review* **136**, 103748. [[Crossref](#)]
  57. Robert Wiedmer, Zachary S. Rogers, Mikaella Polyviou, Carlos Mena, Sangho Chae. 2021. The Dark and Bright Sides of Complexity: A Dual Perspective on Supply Network Resilience. *Journal of Business Logistics* **42**:3, 336-359. [[Crossref](#)]
  58. Niranjala Hulugalla, Kyohei Yamada, Makoto Kakinaka. 2021. Personal social capital and voluntary participation in the Village Development Programme in rural Sri Lanka. *Journal of International Development* **33**:5, 803-825. [[Crossref](#)]
  59. Ricardo Correa, Horacio Sapriza, Andrei Zlate. 2021. Wholesale funding runs, global banks' supply of liquidity insurance, and corporate investment. *Journal of International Economics* **68**, 103519. [[Crossref](#)]
  60. Marshall Fisher, Santiago Gallino, Serguei Netessine. 2021. Does Online Training Work in Retail?. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* **23**:4, 876-894. [[Crossref](#)]
  61. Robin M. Gubela, Stefan Lessmann. 2021. Uplift modeling with value-driven evaluation metrics. *Decision Support Systems* **55**, 113648. [[Crossref](#)]
  62. Sivaram Cheruvu, Joshua C. Fjelstul. 2021. Improving the efficiency of pretrial bargaining in disputes over noncompliance with international law: encouraging evidence from the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy* **112**, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
  63. Donatella Baiardi, Valeria Gattai, Piergiiovanna Natale. 2021. Estimating the ex-ante and the ex-post effects of Chinese outward FDI. *The World Economy* **12**. . [[Crossref](#)]
  64. Baah Aye Kusi, Elikplimi Komla Agbloyor, Asongu Anutechia Simplice, Joshua Abor. 2021. Foreign bank and banking stability in Africa: Does strong and weak corporate governance systems under different regulatory regimes matter?. *Journal of Financial Economic Policy* **ahead-of-print**:ahead-of-print. . [[Crossref](#)]
  65. Daniel J Graham, Ramandeep Singh. 2021. Model-based adjustment for conditional benchmarking. *IMA Journal of Management Mathematics* **3**. . [[Crossref](#)]

66. Stefano Iandolo, Anna Ferragina. 2021. International activities and innovation: Evidence from Italy with a special regressor approach. *The World Economy* **10**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
67. Eran Rubin, Amir Rubin. 2021. On the economic effects of the text completion interface: empirical analysis of financial markets. *Electronic Markets* **18**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
68. Mario Davide Parrilli, Dragana Radicic. 2021. Cooperation for innovation in liberal market economies: STI and DUI innovation modes in SMEs in the United Kingdom. *European Planning Studies* **88**, 1-24. [\[Crossref\]](#)
69. Olga Kondratjeva, Stephen P. Roll, Mathieu Despard, Michal Grinstein-Weiss. 2021. The impact of state earned income tax credit increases on material and medical hardship. *Journal of Consumer Affairs* **23**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
70. Felix Otto, Tim Pawlowski, Sonja Utz. 2021. Trust in fairness, doping, and the demand for sports: a study on international track and field events. *European Sport Management Quarterly* **90**, 1-17. [\[Crossref\]](#)
71. Pattanapong Tiwasing. 2021. Social media business networks and SME performance: A rural–urban comparative analysis. *Growth and Change* **83**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
72. Esteban F Klor, Sebastian Saiegh, Shanker Satyanath. 2021. Cronyism in State Violence: Evidence from Labor Repression During Argentina's Last Dictatorship. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **19**:3, 1439-1487. [\[Crossref\]](#)
73. Gideon Danso-Abbeam, Lloyd J. S. Baiyegunhi, Mark D. Laing, Hussein Shimelis. 2021. Productivity and Welfare Impacts of Dual-Purpose Sweetpotato Varieties' Adoption Among Smallholder Farmers in Rwanda. *The European Journal of Development Research* **47**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
74. Abhin Shah, Kartik Ahuja, Karthikeyan Shanmugam, Dennis Wei, Kush R. Varshney, Amit Dhurandhar. Treatment Effect Estimation Using Invariant Risk Minimization 5005-5009. [\[Crossref\]](#)
75. Brantly Callaway. 2021. Bounds on distributional treatment effect parameters using panel data with an application on job displacement. *Journal of Econometrics* **222**:2, 861-881. [\[Crossref\]](#)
76. Júlia Sbroglio Rizzotto, Marco Túlio Aniceto França. 2021. Does Bullying Affect the School Performance of Brazilian Students? An Analysis Using Pisa 2015. *Child Indicators Research* **14**:3, 1027-1053. [\[Crossref\]](#)
77. Cristian Mardones. 2021. Ex-post evaluation of residential insulation program in the city of Temuco, Chile. *Energy for Sustainable Development* **62**, 126-135. [\[Crossref\]](#)
78. Kee-Hong Bae, Sadok El Ghouli, Omrane Guedhami, Xiaolan Zheng. 2021. Board Reforms and Dividend Policy: International Evidence. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **56**:4, 1296-1320. [\[Crossref\]](#)
79. Rong Chen, Peter Riley Bahr. 2021. How Does Undergraduate Debt Affect Graduate School Application and Enrollment?. *Research in Higher Education* **62**:4, 528-555. [\[Crossref\]](#)
80. Nebojša Stojčić. 2021. Social and private outcomes of green innovation incentives in European advancing economies. *Technovation* **104**, 102270. [\[Crossref\]](#)
81. Marianna Battaglia, Bastien Chabé-Ferret, Lara Lebedinski. 2021. Segregation, fertility, and son preference: the case of the Roma in Serbia. *Journal of Demographic Economics* **87**:2, 233-260. [\[Crossref\]](#)
82. Yue Liu, Pierre Failler, Liming Chen. 2021. Can Mandatory Disclosure Policies Promote Corporate Environmental Responsibility?—Quasi-Natural Experimental Research on China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **18**:11, 6033. [\[Crossref\]](#)

83. Jennifer M. Alix-Garcia, Katharine R.E. Sims, Laura Costica. 2021. Better to be indirect? Testing the accuracy and cost-savings of indirect surveys. *World Development* **142**, 105419. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Daniela A. Miteva, Subhrendu K. Pattanayak. 2021. The effectiveness of protected areas in the context of decentralization. *World Development* **142**, 105446. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Sirui Li, Jing Su, Ying Liu, Michael D. Lepech, Jie Wang. 2021. How “Belt and Road” initiative implementation has influenced R&D outcomes of Chinese enterprises: asset-exploitation or knowledge transfer?. *R&D Management* **51**:3, 273-292. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Shenglan Chen, Bingxuan Lin, Rui Lu, Hui Ma. 2021. Stock market openness and analyst forecast bias. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy* **5**, 106874. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Jun Cai, Kai Xin, YaHong Zhou. 2021. A dynamic panel data approach and HCW's method: Assessing the effect of China (Shanghai) Free Trade Zone on local GDP. *Journal of Management Science and Engineering* **72**. . [[Crossref](#)]
88. Gideon Danso-Abbeam, Temitope O. Ojo, Lloyd J.S. Baiyegunhi, Abiodun A. Ogundeji. 2021. Climate change adaptation strategies by smallholder farmers in Nigeria: does non-farm employment play any role?. *Heliyon* **7**:6, e07162. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Akanksha Negi, Jeffrey M. Wooldridge. 2021. Revisiting regression adjustment in experiments with heterogeneous treatment effects. *Econometric Reviews* **40**:5, 504-534. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Andrew Hanson, Shawn Rohlin. 2021. A toolkit for evaluating spatially targeted urban redevelopment incentives: Methods, lessons, and best practices. *Journal of Urban Affairs* **43**:5, 618-639. [[Crossref](#)]
91. Taylor K. Odle. 2021. Free to Spend? Institutional Autonomy and Expenditures on Executive Compensation, Faculty Salaries, and Research Activities. *Research in Higher Education* **105**. . [[Crossref](#)]
92. Antti Kauhanen. 2021. The effects of an education-leave program on educational attainment and labor-market outcomes. *Education Economics* **3**, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
93. Niwen Zhou, Xu Guo, Lixing Zhu. 2021. The Role of Propensity Score Structure in Asymptotic Efficiency of Estimated Conditional Quantile Treatment Effect. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* . [[Crossref](#)]
94. Santiago Carbó-Valverde, Pedro J. Cuadros-Solas, Francisco Rodríguez-Fernández. 2021. The effects of negative interest rates: a literature review and additional evidence on the performance of the European banking sector. *The European Journal of Finance* **19**, 1-31. [[Crossref](#)]
95. Laura Cyron, Rahul Mehrotra. 2021. Deeper crisis, higher skills demand? Impact of the European financial crisis on demand for German language skills. *Education Economics* **16**, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Alexandre Gori Maia, Jennifer Anne Burney, José Daniel Morales Martínez, Daniele Cesano. 2021. Improving production and quality of life for smallholder farmers through a climate resilience program: An experience in the Brazilian Sertão. *PLOS ONE* **16**:5, e0251531. [[Crossref](#)]
97. Michael Koetter, Alexander Popov. 2021. Political Cycles in Bank Lending to the Government. *The Review of Financial Studies* **34**:6, 3138-3180. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Igor Ostapchuk, Taras Gagalyuk, Jarmila Curtiss. 2021. Post-acquisition integration and growth of farms: the case of Ukrainian agroholdings. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review* **24**:4, 615-636. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Konan Alain N'Ghauran, Corinne Autant-Bernard. 2021. Assessing the collaboration and network additionality of innovation policies: a counterfactual approach to the French cluster policy. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **59**. . [[Crossref](#)]



100. Marcel Fafchamps, Asad Islam, Abdul Malek, Debayan Pakrashi. 2021. Mobilizing P2P Diffusion for New Agricultural Practices: Experimental Evidence from Bangladesh. *The World Bank Economic Review* **99**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
101. Ben Jann, Barbara Zimmermann, Andreas Diekmann. 2021. Lohngerechtigkeit und Geschlechternormen: Erhalten Männer eine Heiratsprämie?. *KZfSS Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* **3**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
102. Susan Athey, Mohsen Bayati, Nikolay Doudchenko, Guido Imbens, Khashayar Khosravi. 2021. Matrix Completion Methods for Causal Panel Data Models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **59**, 1-15. [\[Crossref\]](#)
103. Modou Mar, Nadine Massard. 2021. Animate the cluster or subsidize collaborative R&D? A multiple overlapping treatments approach to assess the impacts of the French cluster policy. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **25**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
104. Nicola Cetorelli, Michael G. Jacobides, Samuel Stern. 2021. Mapping a sector's scope transformation and the value of following the evolving core. *Strategic Management Journal* **20**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
105. Bienvenue Belinga, Colas Chervier, Guillaume Lescuyer. 2021. Impact of a Media Campaign on Consumers' Purchasing Intentions of Legal Timber in Cameroon. *Society & Natural Resources* **34**:5, 603-620. [\[Crossref\]](#)
106. Ziyang Chen, Yue Cheng, David DeRemer, Vakaramoko Diaby. 2021. Cost-effectiveness and drug wastage of immunotherapeutic agents for hematologic malignancies: a systematic review. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes Research* **7**, 1-19. [\[Crossref\]](#)
107. Guigonan S. Adjognon, Daan Soest, Jonas Guthoff. 2021. Reducing Hunger with Payments for Environmental Services ( PES ): Experimental Evidence from Burkina Faso. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **103**:3, 831-857. [\[Crossref\]](#)
108. Loren Collingwood, Sean Long. 2021. Can States Promote Minority Representation? Assessing the Effects of the California Voting Rights Act. *Urban Affairs Review* **57**:3, 731-762. [\[Crossref\]](#)
109. Paul McNamee, Silvia Mendolia, Oleg Yerokhin. 2021. Social media use and emotional and behavioural outcomes in adolescence: Evidence from British longitudinal data. *Economics & Human Biology* **41**, 100992. [\[Crossref\]](#)
110. Norbert Maier, Julie Runge Jørgensen, Asger Lunde, Otto Toivanen. 2021. Ex-post Analysis of the TeliaSonera-Chess 2005 Merger. *De Economist* **169**:2, 141-178. [\[Crossref\]](#)
111. Carolina Thalya da Silva Paulino, Marislei Nishijima, Flavia Mori Sarti. 2021. Association of Iron Supplementation Programs with Iron-Deficiency Anemia Outcomes among Children in Brazil. *Nutrients* **13**:5, 1524. [\[Crossref\]](#)
112. Yuen Lam Bavik, Bo Shao, Alexander Newman, Gary Schwarz. 2021. Crisis leadership: A review and future research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly* **59**, 101518. [\[Crossref\]](#)
113. John Mullahy. 2021. Discovering treatment effectiveness via median treatment effects—Applications to COVID-19 clinical trials. *Health Economics* **30**:5, 1050-1069. [\[Crossref\]](#)
114. Solomon Y Deku, Alper Kara, Kay Smith, Mengxue Xia. 2021. Ethnic minorities' access to mortgages in the UK: The undesirable impact of the Great Financial Crisis. *Finance Research Letters* **5**, 102183. [\[Crossref\]](#)

115. Marin Elisabeth Skidmore, Fanny Moffette, Lisa Rausch, Matthew Christie, Jacob Munger, Holly K. Gibbs. 2021. Cattle ranchers and deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon: Production, location, and policies. *Global Environmental Change* **68**, 102280. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Sébastien Mary. 2021. A replication note on humanitarian aid and violence. *Empirical Economics* **82**. . [[Crossref](#)]
117. Amélie Barbier-Gauchard, Kea Baret, Alexandru Minea. 2021. National fiscal rules and fiscal discipline in the European Union. *Applied Economics* **53**:20, 2337-2359. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Per Engzell, Arun Frey, Mark D. Verhagen. 2021. Learning loss due to school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118**:17, e2022376118. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Hailey Ballew, Michael Iselin, Allison Nicoletti. 2021. Accounting-based thresholds and growth decisions in the banking industry. *Review of Accounting Studies* **28**. . [[Crossref](#)]
120. Hongyun Zheng, Wanglin Ma. 2021. Smartphone-based information acquisition and wheat farm performance: insights from a doubly robust IPWRA estimator. *Electronic Commerce Research* **6**. . [[Crossref](#)]
121. Marie-Charlotte Buisson, Soumya Balasubramanya, David Stifel. 2021. Electric Pumps, Groundwater, Agriculture and Water Buyers: Evidence from West Bengal. *The Journal of Development Studies* **2**, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Yong Chen, David J. Lewis, Bruce Weber. 2021. Natural amenities and skill sorting in rural communities: a case study of land conservation policy. *The Annals of Regional Science* **44**. . [[Crossref](#)]
123. Abdul-Hanan Abdallah, Awal Abdul-Rahaman, Gazali Issahaku. 2021. Sustainable agricultural practices, farm income and food security among rural households in Africa. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* **3**. . [[Crossref](#)]
124. Edward Martey. 2021. Modes of solid waste management and household health outcomes. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* **46**, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Pratheesh O. Sudhakaran, Gavino Puggioni, Hirotsugu Uchida, James Opaluch. 2021. Do oyster farms actually reduce the property values? Empirical evidence from Rhode Island. *Aquaculture Economics & Management* **25**:2, 202-222. [[Crossref](#)]
126. Rosalia Castellano, Gaetano Musella, Gennaro Punzo. 2021. Wage dynamics in light of the structural changes in the labour market across four more economically developed countries of Europe. *Review of Social Economy* **79**:2, 222-260. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Paul Lanier, Gerard Chung, Roderick Rose. 2021. A Quasi-Experimental Study of Intensive Alternative Family Treatment to Prevent Entry of Youth to Psychiatric Residential Treatment. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal* **20**. . [[Crossref](#)]
128. Moussa P Blimpo, Pedro Carneiro, Pamela Jervis, Todd Pugatch. 2021. Improving Access and Quality in Early Childhood Development Programs: Experimental Evidence from The Gambia. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* . [[Crossref](#)]
129. Yigezu A. Yigezu, Enas Abbas, Atef Swelam, Sami R.S. Sabry, Moustafa A. Moustafa, Habib Halila. 2021. Socioeconomic, biophysical, and environmental impacts of raised beds in irrigated wheat: A case study from Egypt. *Agricultural Water Management* **249**, 106802. [[Crossref](#)]
130. Backson Mwangi, Ibrahim Macharia, Eric Bett. 2021. Ex-post Impact Evaluation of Improved Sorghum Varieties on Poverty Reduction in Kenya: A Counterfactual Analysis. *Social Indicators Research* **154**:2, 447-467. [[Crossref](#)]

131. Pallab Ghosh, Kevin Grier, Jaeho Kim. 2021. Heterogeneous endogeneity. *Statistical Papers* **62**:2, 847-886. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Zuheir Desai, Alexander Lee. 2021. Technology and protest: the political effects of electronic voting in India. *Political Science Research and Methods* **9**:2, 398-413. [[Crossref](#)]
133. Denise Hörner, Meike Wollni. 2021. Integrated soil fertility management and household welfare in Ethiopia. *Food Policy* **100**, 102022. [[Crossref](#)]
134. Filippo Pietrantonio, Giovanni Fucà, Daniele Rossini, Hans-Joachim Schmoll, Johanna C. Bendell, Federica Morano, Carlotta Antoniotti, Salvatore Corallo, Beatrice Borelli, Alessandra Raimondi, Federica Marmorino, Monica Niger, Alessandra Boccaccino, Gianluca Masi, Sara Lonardi, Luca Boni, Filippo Braud, Maria Di Bartolomeo, Alfredo Falcone, Chiara Cremolini. 2021. FOLFOXIRI-Bevacizumab or FOLFOX-Panitumumab in Patients with Left-Sided RAS / BRAF Wild-Type Metastatic Colorectal Cancer: A Propensity Score-Based Analysis. *The Oncologist* **26**:4, 302-309. [[Crossref](#)]
135. Stephen P. Ferris, Sushil Sainani. 2021. Do CFOs matter? Evidence from the M&A process. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **67**, 101856. [[Crossref](#)]
136. Chris Florackis, Sushil Sainani. 2021. Can CFOs resist undue pressure from CEOs to manage earnings?. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **67**, 101859. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Jon Durrant, James Jianxin Gong, Jennifer Howard. 2021. In the Nick of Time: Performance-Based Compensation and Proactive Responses to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. *Journal of Management Accounting Research* **33**:1, 53-74. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Yan Li, Liang Li. 2021. Propensity score analysis methods with balancing constraints: A Monte Carlo study. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* **30**:4, 1119-1142. [[Crossref](#)]
139. David Suárez, Begoña García-Mariñoso. 2021. Does ad blocking have an effect on online shopping?. *Telecommunications Policy* **45**:3, 102089. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Mei Chen, Peijie Ni, Torger Reve, Jing Huang, Ren Lu. 2021. Sales growth or employment growth? Exporting conundrum for new ventures. *Review of International Business and Strategy ahead-of-print*:ahead-of-print. . [[Crossref](#)]
141. Hirotake Ito, Keiko Kasai, Hiromu Nishiuchi, Makiko Nakamuro. 2021. Does Computer-Aided Instruction Improve Children's Cognitive and Noncognitive Skills?. *Asian Development Review* **38**:1, 98-118. [[Crossref](#)]
142. Nguyen To-The, Tuan Nguyen-Anh. 2021. Market-oriented extension and farming efficiency in small-scale maize farmers: evidence from Northern Vietnam. *Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies* **11**:2, 194-218. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Michael C Knaus, Michael Lechner, Anthony Strittmatter. 2021. Machine learning estimation of heterogeneous causal effects: Empirical Monte Carlo evidence. *The Econometrics Journal* **24**:1, 134-161. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Zhiyuan Gao, Zhiling Guo, Qian Tang. 2021. How do monetary incentives influence giving? An empirical investigation of matching subsidies on kiva. *Information Systems and e-Business Management* **148**. . [[Crossref](#)]
145. Nattavudh Powdthavee. 2021. Education and pro-environmental attitudes and behaviours: A nonparametric regression discontinuity analysis of a major schooling reform in England and Wales. *Ecological Economics* **181**, 106931. [[Crossref](#)]

146. Narayan Das. 2021. Training the disadvantaged youth and labor market outcomes: Evidence from Bangladesh. *Journal of Development Economics* **149**, 102585. [[Crossref](#)]
147. Andrii Babii, Rohit Kumar. 2021. Isotonic regression discontinuity designs. *Journal of Econometrics* **10**. . [[Crossref](#)]
148. M. Mostak Ahamed, Shirley J. Ho, Sushanta K. Mallick, Roman Matousek. 2021. Inclusive banking, financial regulation and bank performance: Cross-country evidence. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **124**, 106055. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Souvik Banerjee, Anirban Basu. 2021. Estimating Endogenous Treatment Effects Using Latent Factor Models with and without Instrumental Variables. *Econometrics* **9**:1, 14. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Christina Weiland, Rebecca Unterman, Anna Shapiro. 2021. The Kindergarten Hotspot: Literacy Skill Convergence Between Boston Prekindergarten Enrollees and Nonenrollees. *Child Development* **92**:2, 600–608. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Xiaohu Deng, Christine Jiang, Danqing Young. 2021. Short selling constraints and politically motivated negative information suppression. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **38**, 101943. [[Crossref](#)]
152. Jonathan Daniel Gómez-Zapata, Luis César Herrero-Prieto, Beatriz Rodríguez-Prado. 2021. Does music soothe the soul? Evaluating the impact of a music education programme in Medellín, Colombia. *Journal of Cultural Economics* **45**:1, 63–104. [[Crossref](#)]
153. Heba Abou-El-Sood. 2021. Board gender diversity, power, and bank risk taking. *International Review of Financial Analysis* **94**, 101733. [[Crossref](#)]
154. Temitope O. Ojo, Lloyd J.S. Baiyegunhi, Adetoso A. Adetoro, Abiodun A. Ogundej. 2021. Adoption of soil and water conservation technology and its effect on the productivity of smallholder rice farmers in Southwest Nigeria. *Heliyon* **7**:3, e06433. [[Crossref](#)]
155. Federico Dell’Anna, Marta Bottero. 2021. Green premium in buildings: Evidence from the real estate market of Singapore. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **286**, 125327. [[Crossref](#)]
156. Wencong Lu, Kwabena Nyarko Addai, John N. Ng’ombe. 2021. Impact of improved rice varieties on household food security in Northern Ghana: A doubly robust analysis. *Journal of International Development* **4**. . [[Crossref](#)]
157. Stjepan Srhoj, Vanja Vitezić, Janette Walde. 2021. Do small public grants boost tourism firms’ performance?. *Tourism Economics* **3**, 135481662199443. [[Crossref](#)]
158. Emile Cammeraat, Egbert Jongen, Pierre Koning. 2021. Preventing NEETs during the Great Recession: the effects of mandatory activation programs for young welfare recipients. *Empirical Economics* **126**. . [[Crossref](#)]
159. David Mitre-Becerril, Aaron Chalfin. 2021. Testing public policy at the frontier: The effect of the \$15 minimum wage on public safety in Seattle. *Criminology & Public Policy* **84**. . [[Crossref](#)]
160. Jing Guan, J. D. Tena. 2021. Does Sport Affect Health and Well-Being or Is It the Other Way Around? A Note on Reverse-Causality in Empirical Applications. *Journal of Sports Economics* **22**:2, 218–226. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Samuel Verevis, Murat Üngör. 2021. What has New Zealand gained from The FTA with China?: Two counterfactual analyses †. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* **68**:1, 20–50. [[Crossref](#)]
162. George Mgendi, Shiping Mao, Fangbin Qiao. 2021. Is a Training Program Sufficient to Improve the Smallholder Farmers’ Productivity in Africa? Empirical Evidence from a Chinese Agricultural Technology Demonstration Center in Tanzania. *Sustainability* **13**:3, 1527. [[Crossref](#)]

163. Giuseppe Avignone, Yener Altunbas, Salvatore Polizzi, Alessio Reghezza. 2021. Centralised or decentralised banking supervision? Evidence from European banks. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **110**, 102264. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Fanny Moffette, Jennifer Alix-Garcia, Katherine Shea, Amy H. Pickens. 2021. The impact of near-real-time deforestation alerts across the tropics. *Nature Climate Change* **11**:2, 172-178. [[Crossref](#)]
165. L.B. Decker, A.A. Patel, C.A. Conway, S. Kim, J. Adnopo, J.L. Woolston. 2021. When parents and clinicians disagree: Consequences for high-risk youth receiving in-home family-based psychiatric treatment. *Children and Youth Services Review* **121**, 105913. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Awal Abdul-Rahaman, Gazali Issahaku, Yacob A. Zereyesus. 2021. Improved rice variety adoption and farm production efficiency: Accounting for unobservable selection bias and technology gaps among smallholder farmers in Ghana. *Technology in Society* **64**, 101471. [[Crossref](#)]
167. Manthos Delis, Emiliós Galariotis, Jerome Monne. 2021. Economic condition and financial cognition. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **123**, 106035. [[Crossref](#)]
168. Ulrike Muench, Christopher Whaley, Janet Coffman, Joanne Spetz. 2021. Scope-of-Practice for Nurse Practitioners and Adherence to Medications for Chronic Illness in Primary Care. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* **36**:2, 478-486. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Benedikt Heid, Mario Larch, Yoto V. Yotov. 2021. Estimating the effects of non-discriminatory trade policies within structural gravity models. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* **54**:1, 376-409. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Mario Davide Parrilli, Dragana Radicic. 2021. STI and DUI innovation modes in micro-, small-, medium- and large-sized firms: distinctive patterns across Europe and the U.S. *European Planning Studies* **29**:2, 346-368. [[Crossref](#)]
171. Kaitlin Anderson, Gema Zamarro, Jennifer Steele, Trey Miller. 2021. Comparing Performance of Methods to Deal With Differential Attrition in Randomized Experimental Evaluations. *Evaluation Review* **45**:1-2, 70-104. [[Crossref](#)]
172. Maocan Guo. 2021. Understanding the consequence of higher educational expansion in China: a double-treatment perspective. *Chinese Sociological Review* **35**, 1-26. [[Crossref](#)]
173. Nan Zhang, Daniel J. Graham, Daniel Hörcher, Prateek Bansal. 2021. A causal inference approach to measure the vulnerability of urban metro systems. *Transportation* **153**. . [[Crossref](#)]
174. Takis Venetoklis. 2021. Exogenous shocks and citizens' satisfaction with governmental policies: can empirical evidence from the 2008 financial crisis help us understand better the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic?. *Quality & Quantity* **39**. . [[Crossref](#)]
175. Pallavi Shukla, Hemant Kumar Pullabhotla, Mary Arends-Kuenning. 2021. Choosing Plan B Over Plan A: Risk Compensation Theory and Contraceptive Choice in India. *Demography* . [[Crossref](#)]
176. Johanna Sophie Quis, Anika Bela, Guido Heineck. 2021. Preschoolers' self-regulation and early mathematical skill differentials. *Education Economics* **7**, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Gowokani Chijere Chirwa, Boniface Dulani, Lonjezo Sithole, Joseph J. Chunga, Witness Alfonso, John Tengatenga. 2021. Malawi at the Crossroads: Does the Fear of Contracting COVID-19 Affect the Propensity to Vote?. *The European Journal of Development Research* **65**. . [[Crossref](#)]
178. Wallace Ao, Sebastian Calonico, Ying-Ying Lee. 2021. Multivalued Treatments and Decomposition Analysis: An Application to the WIA Program. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **39**:1, 358-371. [[Crossref](#)]



179. Alexandra Wicht, Beatrice Rammstedt, Clemens M. Lechner. 2021. Predictors of Literacy Development in Adulthood: Insights from a Large-scale, Two-wave Study. *Scientific Studies of Reading* **25**:1, 84-92. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Shuyang Peng, Jiahuan Lu. 2021. When Government is Late to Fulfill its End of the Bargain: The Relational Effects of Payment Delays on Nonprofit Organizations. *Public Performance & Management Review* **44**:1, 216-242. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Björn Högberg, Joakim Lindgren, Klara Johansson, Mattias Strandh, Solveig Petersen. 2021. Consequences of school grading systems on adolescent health: evidence from a Swedish school reform. *Journal of Education Policy* **36**:1, 84-106. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Augustino Ting Mayai. 2021. War and Schooling in South Sudan, 2013-2016. *Journal on Education in Emergencies* **8**:1, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
183. Mitsutsugu Hamamoto. Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program in Saitama Prefecture: Impact on CO2 Emissions in the First Compliance Period 117-127. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Jens Hölscher, Peter Howard-Jones. Brexit: The Lure of the Neoliberal Thought Collective 171-189. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Yating Li, Bin Li, Gang Wang, Shuai Yang. 2021. The effects of consumer animosity on demand for sharing-based accommodations: Evidence from Airbnb. *Decision Support Systems* **140**, 113430. [[Crossref](#)]
186. Jie Yang, Sara M. Moorman. 2021. Beyond the Individual: Evidence Linking Neighborhood Trust and Social Isolation Among Community-Dwelling Older Adults. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development* **92**:1, 22-39. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Alberto Alesina, Benedetta Brioschi, Eliana La Ferrara. 2021. Violence Against Women: A Cross-cultural Analysis for Africa. *Economica* **88**:349, 70-104. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Vivian Hoffmann, Vijayendra Rao, Vaishnavi Surendra, Upamanyu Datta. 2021. Relief from usury: Impact of a self-help group lending program in rural India. *Journal of Development Economics* **148**, 102567. [[Crossref](#)]
189. Richard T. Melstrom. 2021. The Effect of Land Use Restrictions Protecting Endangered Species on Agricultural Land Values. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **103**:1, 162-184. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Allen Blackman, Laura Villalobos. 2021. Use Forests or Lose Them? Regulated Timber Extraction and Tree Cover Loss in Mexico. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* **8**:1, 125-163. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Diego Winkelried, César Urquizo. 2021. The Economic Effects of International Administrations: The Cases of Kosovo and East Timor. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* **69**:2, 869-901. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Benjamin Clapham, Peter Gomber, Jens Lausen, Sven Panz. 2021. Liquidity provider incentives in fragmented securities markets. *Journal of Empirical Finance* **60**, 16-38. [[Crossref](#)]
193. Gerben de Jong, Rogier Lieshout. 2021. Disruption in the air: The impact of flight rerouting due to air traffic control strikes. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* **90**, 102665. [[Crossref](#)]
194. Stella Slučiaková. 2021. Effects of the unit-based pricing of waste in Slovakia: Spatial panel data models and matching approach. *Environmental Challenges* **2**, 100022. [[Crossref](#)]

195. Brian Lee, Hung-Hao Chang, Szu-Yung Wang. 2021. Can environmental disamenities increase land values? A case study of manufacturing factories on farmland. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **279**, 123432. [[Crossref](#)]
196. Andrew Boslett, Elaine Hill, Lala Ma, Lujia Zhang. 2021. Rural Light Pollution from Shale Gas Development and Associated Sleep and Subjective Well-Being. *Resource and Energy Economics* **85**, 101220. [[Crossref](#)]
197. Jiao Ji, Hongfeng Peng, Hanwen Sun, Haofeng Xu. 2021. Board tenure diversity, culture and firm risk: Cross-country evidence. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money* **70**, 101276. [[Crossref](#)]
198. Liang Ma, Daniel J. Graham, Marc E.J. Stettler. 2021. Air quality impacts of new public transport provision: A causal analysis of the Jubilee Line Extension in London. *Atmospheric Environment* **245**, 118025. [[Crossref](#)]
199. Jurate Jaraite, Oliwia Kurtyka, Hélène Ollivier. 2021. Take a Ride on the Green Side: How Do CDM Projects Affect Indian Manufacturing Firms' Environmental Performance?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **106**. . [[Crossref](#)]
200. Chenchuan (Mark) Li, Ulrich K. Müller. 2021. Linear regression with many controls of limited explanatory power. *Quantitative Economics* **12**:2, 405-442. [[Crossref](#)]
201. Finn Tarp, Sam Jones. 2021. Doing business while holding public office: Evidence from Mozambique's firm registry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **30**. . [[Crossref](#)]
202. Adetomiwa Kolapo, Adeyera James Kolapo. 2021. Welfare and productivity impact of adoption of biofortified cassava by smallholder farmers in Nigeria. *Cogent Food & Agriculture* **7**:1, 1886662. [[Crossref](#)]
203. Travis Campbell. 2021. Black Lives Matter's Effect on Police Lethal Use-of-Force. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
204. Haileslasie Gereziher Hailu, Gidey kidu Mezegebo. 2021. Estimating the impact of inorganic fertilizer adoption on sesame productivity: evidence from Humera, Tigray, Ethiopia. *Cogent Food & Agriculture* **7**:1, 1933798. [[Crossref](#)]
205. Hervé Cardot, Antonio Musolesi. Assessing Spillover Effects of Spatial Policies with Semiparametric Zero-Inflated Models and Random Forests 319-338. [[Crossref](#)]
206. Daniel J. Graham. Causal Inference for Ex Post Evaluation of Transport Interventions 283-290. [[Crossref](#)]
207. Ji Luo. The Influencing Factors of the Imbalance of Rural Long Tail Public Services 89-162. [[Crossref](#)]
208. Els Goetghebeur, Saskia le Cessie, Bianca De Stavola, Erica EM Moodie, Ingeborg Waernbaum. 2020. Formulating causal questions and principled statistical answers. *Statistics in Medicine* **39**:30, 4922-4948. [[Crossref](#)]
209. Yu Lin, Shuaishuai Zhang, Yingjie Shi. 2020. The impact of operational stickiness on product quality: product diversification moderation. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management* **ahead-of-print**:ahead-of-print. . [[Crossref](#)]
210. Başak AYDIN, Ozan ÖZTÜRK, Ferit ÇOBANOĞLU, Ulviye ÇEBİ, Erol ÖZKAN, Selçuk ÖZER. 2020. Damla Sulama Desteklemelerinin Silajlık Mısır Üretimi Üzerine Etkisi: Edirne İli Örneği. *Uluslararası Tarım ve Yaban Hayatı Bilimleri Dergisi* 495-505. [[Crossref](#)]

211. Niklas Amberg, Tor Jacobson, Erik von Schedvin, Robert Townsend. 2020. Curbing Shocks to Corporate Liquidity: The Role of Trade Credit. *Journal of Political Economy* 000-000. [[Crossref](#)]
212. Najam uz Zehra Gardezi. 2020. Public health insurance and birth outcomes: evidence from Punjab, Pakistan. *Health Policy and Planning* **28**. . [[Crossref](#)]
213. Chunrong Ai, Lukang Huang, Zheng Zhang. 2020. A Mann–Whitney test of distributional effects in a multivalued treatment. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **209**, 85-100. [[Crossref](#)]
214. Mickaël Buffart, Grégoire Croidieu, Phillip H. Kim, Ray Bowman. 2020. Even winners need to learn: How government entrepreneurship programs can support innovative ventures. *Research Policy* **49**:10, 104052. [[Crossref](#)]
215. Michael Ayeah Israel, Joseph Amikuzuno, Gideon Danso-Abbeam. 2020. Assessing farmers' contribution to greenhouse gas emission and the impact of adopting climate-smart agriculture on mitigation. *Ecological Processes* **9**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
216. Seemantini Pathak, Shih-Chi (Sana) Chiu. 2020. Firm-advisor ties and financial performance in the context of corporate divestiture. *Journal of Business Research* **121**, 315-328. [[Crossref](#)]
217. Xiaoran Ni, Wei Song, Jiaquan Yao. 2020. Stakeholder orientation and corporate payout policy: Insights from state legal shocks. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **121**, 105970. [[Crossref](#)]
218. Marek Giebel, Kornelius Kraft. 2020. Bank credit supply and firm innovation behavior in the financial crisis. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **121**, 105961. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Alfred Zhu Liu, Angela Xia Liu, Rui Wang, Sean Xin Xu. 2020. Too Much of a Good Thing? The Boomerang Effect of Firms' Investments on Corporate Social Responsibility during Product Recalls. *Journal of Management Studies* **57**:8, 1437-1472. [[Crossref](#)]
220. Anthony A. Braga, Lisa M. Barao, Gregory M. Zimmerman, Stephen Douglas, Keller Sheppard. 2020. Measuring the Direct and Spillover Effects of Body Worn Cameras on the Civility of Police–Citizen Encounters and Police Work Activities. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* **36**:4, 851-876. [[Crossref](#)]
221. Anja Rösner, Justus Haucap, Ulrich Heimeshoff. 2020. The impact of consumer protection in the digital age: Evidence from the European Union. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* **73**, 102585. [[Crossref](#)]
222. Eva Labro, Lorien Stice-Lawrence. 2020. Updating Accounting Systems: Longitudinal Evidence from the Healthcare Sector. *Management Science* **66**:12, 6042-6061. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Guido W. Imbens. 2020. Potential Outcome and Directed Acyclic Graph Approaches to Causality: Relevance for Empirical Practice in Economics. *Journal of Economic Literature* **58**:4, 1129-1179. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
224. Gilbert Dagunga, Micheal Ayamga, Gideon Danso-Abbeam. 2020. To what extent should farm households diversify? Implications on multidimensional poverty in Ghana. *World Development Perspectives* **20**, 100264. [[Crossref](#)]
225. Deborah S. Hasin, Efrat Aharonovich. 2020. Implications of Medical and Recreational Marijuana Laws for Neuroscience Research: a Review. *Current Behavioral Neuroscience Reports* **7**:4, 258-266. [[Crossref](#)]
226. Amirhossein Fard, Siamak Javadi, Incheol Kim. 2020. Environmental regulation and the cost of bank loans: International evidence. *Journal of Financial Stability* **51**, 100797. [[Crossref](#)]

227. Wenbo Zhang, Yinfei Xi, Satish V. Ukkusuri. 2020. Understanding Spatiotemporal Variations of Ridership by Multiple Taxi Services. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* **9**:12, 757. [[Crossref](#)]
228. Janice Ser Huay Lee, Daniela A Miteva, Kimberly M Carlson, Robert Heilmayr, Omar Saif. 2020. Does oil palm certification create trade-offs between environment and development in Indonesia?. *Environmental Research Letters* **15**:12, 124064. [[Crossref](#)]
229. Qing Liao Burke, Mengying Wang, Yijia Eddie Zhao. 2020. Nonfinancial Stakeholder Orientation and Conditional Accounting Conservatism. *Review of Pacific Basin Financial Markets and Policies* **23**:04, 2050031. [[Crossref](#)]
230. Serena Yu, Denzil G. Fiebig, Vanessa Scarf, Rosalie Viney, Hannah G. Dahlen, Caroline Homer. 2020. Birth models of care and intervention rates: The impact of birth centres. *Health Policy* **124**:12, 1395-1402. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Neal Hughes, Manannan Donoghoe, Linden Whittle. 2020. Farm Level Effects of On-Farm Irrigation Infrastructure Programs in the Southern Murray–Darling Basin. *Australian Economic Review* **53**:4, 494-516. [[Crossref](#)]
232. Shriniwas Gautam, Dil Bahadur Rahut, Olaf Erenstein, Dilli Bahadur KC. 2020. Direct and spillover impacts of community-based seed production: Quasi-experimental evidence from Nepal. *Experimental Agriculture* **56**:6, 884-900. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Yijun Zhang, Yi Song, Han Zou. 2020. Transformation of pollution control and green development: Evidence from China's chemical industry. *Journal of Environmental Management* **275**, 111246. [[Crossref](#)]
234. Nicolle Etchart, José Luis Freire, Margaret B. Holland, Kelly W. Jones, Lisa Naughton-Treves. 2020. What happens when the money runs out? Forest outcomes and equity concerns following Ecuador's suspension of conservation payments. *World Development* **136**, 105124. [[Crossref](#)]
235. Mohamed-Ali Akari, Ramzi Ben-Abdallah, Michèle Breton, Georges Dionne. 2020. The impact of central clearing on the market for single-name credit default swaps. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance* **18**, 101346. [[Crossref](#)]
236. Gina Waterfield, Martha Rogers, Philippe Grandjean, Maximilian Auffhammer, David Sunding. 2020. Reducing exposure to high levels of perfluorinated compounds in drinking water improves reproductive outcomes: evidence from an intervention in Minnesota. *Environmental Health* **19**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
237. Joseph B. Ajefu, Olukorede Abiona. 2020. The Mitigating Impact of Land Tenure Security on Drought-Induced Food Insecurity: Evidence from Rural Malawi. *The Journal of Development Studies* **56**:12, 2169-2193. [[Crossref](#)]
238. J. Terraube, J. Van doninck, P. Helle, M. Cabeza. 2020. Assessing the effectiveness of a national protected area network for carnivore conservation. *Nature Communications* **11**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
239. Raaz Dwivedi, Yan Shuo Tan, Briton Park, Mian Wei, Kevin Horgan, David Madigan, Bin Yu. 2020. Stable Discovery of Interpretable Subgroups via Calibration in Causal Studies. *International Statistical Review* **88**:S1. . [[Crossref](#)]
240. Kaja Fredriksen. 2020. Does occupational licensing impact incomes? A replication study for the German crafts case. *Journal for Labour Market Research* **54**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]

241. Md. Sadique Rahman, Mohammad Mizanul Haque Kazal, Shah Johir Rayhan. 2020. Adoption and impacts of improved mud crab fattening practices on the productivity and wellbeing of coastal farmers in Bangladesh. *Aquaculture International* **28**:6, 2207-2219. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Martin Huber, Henrika Langen. 2020. Timing matters: the impact of response measures on COVID-19-related hospitalization and death rates in Germany and Switzerland. *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics* **156**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
243. Carter Bloch. 2020. Heterogeneous impacts of research grant funding. *Research Evaluation* **49**. . [[Crossref](#)]
244. John Gardner. 2020. Identification and estimation of average causal effects when treatment status is ignorable within unobserved strata. *Econometric Reviews* **39**:10, 1014-1041. [[Crossref](#)]
245. Andreas C Drichoutis, Rodolfo M Nayga. 2020. Economic Rationality under Cognitive Load. *The Economic Journal* **130**:632, 2382-2409. [[Crossref](#)]
246. Selim Gulesci. 2020. Poverty Alleviation and Interhousehold Transfers: Evidence from BRAC's Graduation Program in Bangladesh. *The World Bank Economic Review* **102**. . [[Crossref](#)]
247. Hung-Hao Chang, Tzu-Chin Lin. 2020. Does a farmland zoning program impact farm income: empirical evidence from farm households in Taiwan. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **47**:5, 1621-1643. [[Crossref](#)]
248. Anders Bredahl Kock, David Preinerstorfer, Bezirgen Veliyev. 2020. Functional Sequential Treatment Allocation\*. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 1-36. [[Crossref](#)]
249. Michael C. Knaus. 2020. A double machine learning approach to estimate the effects of musical practice on student's skills. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* **5**. . [[Crossref](#)]
250. Henry Assael, Masakazu Ishihara, Baek Jung Kim. 2020. Accounting for Causality When Measuring Sales Lift from Television Advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research* JAR-2020-024. [[Crossref](#)]
251. Gang Lu, Runsheng Yin. 2020. Evaluating the Evaluated Socioeconomic Impacts of China's Sloping Land Conversion Program. *Ecological Economics* **177**, 106785. [[Crossref](#)]
252. Ilayda Nemlioglu, Sushanta Mallick. 2020. Does multilateral lending aid capital accumulation? Role of intellectual capital and institutional quality. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **108**, 102155. [[Crossref](#)]
253. Pedro H.C. Sant'Anna, Jun Zhao. 2020. Doubly robust difference-in-differences estimators. *Journal of Econometrics* **219**:1, 101-122. [[Crossref](#)]
254. Markku Maula, Wouter Stam. 2020. Enhancing Rigor in Quantitative Entrepreneurship Research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* **44**:6, 1059-1090. [[Crossref](#)]
255. Yanhong Feng, Shuanglian Chen, Pierre Failler. 2020. Productivity Effect Evaluation on Market-Type Environmental Regulation: A Case Study of SO2 Emission Trading Pilot in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **17**:21, 8027. [[Crossref](#)]
256. Jian Zhang, Ashok K. Mishra, Peixin Zhu, Xiaoshun Li. 2020. Land rental market and agricultural labor productivity in rural China: A mediation analysis. *World Development* **135**, 105089. [[Crossref](#)]
257. Felix Naschold, Christopher B. Barrett. 2020. A stochastic dominance approach to program evaluation with an application to child nutritional status in Kenya. *Agricultural Economics* **51**:6, 871-886. [[Crossref](#)]



258. Hao Dong, Daniel L. Millimet. 2020. Propensity Score Weighting with Mismeasured Covariates: An Application to Two Financial Literacy Interventions. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management* 13:11, 290. [[Crossref](#)]
259. Mohammad Mizanul Haque Kazal, Md. Sadique Rahman, Shah Johir Rayhan. 2020. Determinants and impact of the adoption of improved management practices: Case of freshwater prawn farming in Bangladesh. *Aquaculture Reports* 18, 100448. [[Crossref](#)]
260. Md Farhadur Rahman, Kamrul Islam. 2020. Effectiveness of protected areas in reducing deforestation and forest fragmentation in Bangladesh. *Journal of Environmental Management* 111711. [[Crossref](#)]
261. Gideon Danso-Abbeam, Gilbert Dagunga, Dennis Sedem Ehiakpor. 2020. Rural non-farm income diversification: implications on smallholder farmers' welfare and agricultural technology adoption in Ghana. *Heliyon* 6:11, e05393. [[Crossref](#)]
262. Diego Battiston, Jordi Blanes i Vidal, Tom Kirchmaier. 2020. Face-to-Face Communication in Organizations. *The Review of Economic Studies* 98. . [[Crossref](#)]
263. Gopesh Anand, Aravind Chandrasekaran, Luv Sharma. 2020. Sustainable process improvements: Evidence from intervention-based research. *Journal of Operations Management* 14. . [[Crossref](#)]
264. Jun Cai, Yahong Zhou. 2020. A simple dynamic panel data approach for macro policy assessment. *Applied Economics Letters* 1-7. [[Crossref](#)]
265. Guigonan Serge Adjognon, Lenis Saweda Liverpool-Tasie, Robert Shupp. 2020. Productivity Shocks and Repayment Behavior in Rural Credit Markets: A Framed Field Experiment. *The Journal of Development Studies* 56:10, 1909-1926. [[Crossref](#)]
266. Rainier Masa, Gina Chowa, Michael Sherraden. 2020. An Evaluation of a School-Based Savings Program and Its Effect on Sexual Risk Behaviors and Victimization Among Young Ghanaians. *Youth & Society* 52:7, 1083-1106. [[Crossref](#)]
267. Md Sadique Rahman, Mohammad Mizanul Haque Kazal, Shah Johir Rayhan. 2020. Impacts of the training of mud crab farmers: An adaptation strategy to cope with salinity intrusion in Bangladesh. *Marine Policy* 120, 104159. [[Crossref](#)]
268. Andrew J. Leidner, Harrell W. Chesson, Makram Tali. 2020. HPV vaccine status and sexual behavior among young sexually-active women in the US: evidence from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2007–2014. *Health Economics, Policy and Law* 15:4, 477-495. [[Crossref](#)]
269. Marco Caliendo, Stefan Tübbicke. 2020. New evidence on long-term effects of start-up subsidies: matching estimates and their robustness. *Empirical Economics* 59:4, 1605-1631. [[Crossref](#)]
270. Lulu Hao, Na Zhang, Hongchang Li, Jack Strauss, Xuejie Liu, Xuemeng Guo. 2020. The Influence of the Air Cargo Network on the Regional Economy under the Impact of High-Speed Rail in China. *Sustainability* 12:19, 8120. [[Crossref](#)]
271. Menghan Zhao, Yongai Jin. 2020. Migrant Workers in Beijing: How Hometown Ties Affect Economic Outcomes. *Work, Employment and Society* 34:5, 789-808. [[Crossref](#)]
272. Valerie Paelman, Philippe Van Cauwenberge, Heidi Vander Bauwhede. 2020. Effect of B Corp Certification on Short-Term Growth: European Evidence. *Sustainability* 12:20, 8459. [[Crossref](#)]
273. Annamaria Lusardi, Pierre-Carl Michaud, Olivia S. Mitchell. 2020. Assessing the impact of financial education programs: A quantitative model. *Economics of Education Review* 78, 101899. [[Crossref](#)]

274. Xiang Zhang, James D. Stamey, Maya B. Mathur. 2020. Assessing the impact of unmeasured confounders for credible and reliable real-world evidence. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* **29**:10, 1219-1227. [[Crossref](#)]
275. Daniel P. Bigelow, Todd Kuethe. 2020. A Tale of Two Borders: Use-Value Assessment, Land Development, and Irrigation Investment. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **102**:5, 1404-1424. [[Crossref](#)]
276. T. Kuusi, P. Martikainen, T. Valkonen. 2020. The influence of old-age retirement on health: Causal evidence from the Finnish register data. *The Journal of the Economics of Ageing* **17**, 100257. [[Crossref](#)]
277. Samuel D. Pimentel, Lauren Vollmer Forrow, Jonathan Gellar, Jiaqi Li. 2020. Optimal matching approaches in health policy evaluations under rolling enrolment. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* **183**:4, 1411-1435. [[Crossref](#)]
278. Kathleen T. Li. 2020. Statistical Inference for Average Treatment Effects Estimated by Synthetic Control Methods. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **115**:532, 2068-2083. [[Crossref](#)]
279. David S. Fink, Malki Stohl, Aaron L. Sarvet, Magdalena Cerda, Katherine M. Keyes, Deborah S. Hasin. 2020. Medical marijuana laws and driving under the influence of marijuana and alcohol. *Addiction* **115**:10, 1944-1953. [[Crossref](#)]
280. Liangxiong Huang, Shulin Liu, Yonghui Han, Keming Peng. 2020. The nature of state-owned enterprises and collection of pollutant discharge fees: A study based on Chinese industrial enterprises. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **271**, 122420. [[Crossref](#)]
281. Won Fy Lee, Clea A. McNeely, Janet E. Rosenbaum, Besufekad Alemu, Lynette M. Renner. 2020. Can Court Diversion Improve School Attendance among Elementary Students? Evidence from Five School Districts. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* **13**:4, 625-651. [[Crossref](#)]
282. Amin Malik, Marco d'Errico, Danvers Omolo, Benjamin Gichane. 2020. Building resilience in Somalia; evidence from field data collection. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* **12**:4, 323-340. [[Crossref](#)]
283. Lu Chen, Hongli Fan, Lanlan Chu. 2020. The Double-Burden Effect: Does the Combination of Informal Care and Work Cause Adverse Health Outcomes Among Females in China?. *Journal of Aging and Health* **32**:9, 1222-1232. [[Crossref](#)]
284. Rongxia Zhang, Suocheng Dong, Zehong Li. 2020. The economic and environmental effects of the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei Collaborative Development Strategy— taking Hebei Province as an example. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* **27**:28, 35692-35702. [[Crossref](#)]
285. German Blanco, Xuan Chen, Carlos A. Flores, Alfonso Flores-Lagunes. 2020. Bounds on Average and Quantile Treatment Effects on Duration Outcomes Under Censoring, Selection, and Noncompliance. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **38**:4, 901-920. [[Crossref](#)]
286. Tiziano Arduini, Eleonora Patacchini, Edoardo Rainone. 2020. Treatment Effects With Heterogeneous Externalities. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **38**:4, 826-838. [[Crossref](#)]
287. Qingliang Fan, Yu-Chin Hsu, Robert P. Lieli, Yichong Zhang. 2020. Estimation of Conditional Average Treatment Effects With High-Dimensional Data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **87**, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
288. Julius Manda, Makaiko G. Khonje, Arega D. Alene, Adane H Tufa, Tahirou Abdoulaye, Munyaradzi Mutenje, Peter Setimela, Victor Manyong. 2020. Does cooperative membership increase and accelerate

- agricultural technology adoption? Empirical evidence from Zambia. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **158**, 120160. [[Crossref](#)]
289. Lauana Rossetto Lazaretti, Marco Túlio Aniceto França. 2020. School competition and performance indicators: evidence from the creation of federal education institutions in Brazil. *International Journal of Educational Development* **77**, 102211. [[Crossref](#)]
  290. Oswald Koussihouèdé. 2020. Primary school size and learning achievement in Senegal: Testing the quantity–quality trade-off. *International Journal of Educational Development* **77**, 102225. [[Crossref](#)]
  291. Kelly W. Jones, Alex Mayer, Juan Von Thaden, Z. Carter Berry, Sergio López-Ramírez, Jacob Salcone, Robert H. Manson, Heidi Asbjornsen. 2020. Measuring the net benefits of payments for hydrological services programs in Mexico. *Ecological Economics* **175**, 106666. [[Crossref](#)]
  292. Øivind A. Nilsen, Arvid Raknerud, Diana-Cristina Iancu. 2020. Public R&D support and firm performance: A multivariate dose-response analysis. *Research Policy* **49**:7, 104067. [[Crossref](#)]
  293. Daniele Vignoli, Valentina Tocchioni, Alessandra Mattei. 2020. The impact of job uncertainty on first-birth postponement. *Advances in Life Course Research* **45**, 100308. [[Crossref](#)]
  294. Yuki Higuchi, Miyuki Sasaki, Makiko Nakamuro. 2020. Impacts of an Information and Communication Technology-Assisted Program on Attitudes and English Communication Abilities: An Experiment in a Japanese High School. *Asian Development Review* **37**:2, 100–133. [[Crossref](#)]
  295. Fabrice Defever, José-Daniel Reyes, Alejandro Riaño, Gonzalo Varela. 2020. All these worlds are yours, except india: The effectiveness of cash subsidies to export in nepal. *European Economic Review* **128**, 103494. [[Crossref](#)]
  296. Jagdish Tripathy. 2020. Cross-border effects of regulatory spillovers: Evidence from Mexico. *Journal of International Economics* **126**, 103350. [[Crossref](#)]
  297. Shenyang Guo, Mark Fraser, Qi Chen. 2020. Propensity Score Analysis: Recent Debate and Discussion. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research* **11**:3, 463–482. [[Crossref](#)]
  298. Lajos Baráth, Imre Fertő, Štefan Bojnec. 2020. The Effect of Investment, LFA and Agri-environmental Subsidies on the Components of Total Factor Productivity: The Case of Slovenian Farms. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **71**:3, 853–876. [[Crossref](#)]
  299. Lina Maria Ellegård. 2020. Effects of pay-for-performance on prescription of hypertension drugs among public and private primary care providers in Sweden. *International Journal of Health Economics and Management* **20**:3, 215–228. [[Crossref](#)]
  300. Christina Weiland, Rebecca Unterman, Anna Shapiro, Sara Staszak, Shana Rochester, Eleanor Martin. 2020. The Effects of Enrolling in Oversubscribed Prekindergarten Programs Through Third Grade. *Child Development* **91**:5, 1401–1422. [[Crossref](#)]
  301. Sang-Wook (Stanley) Cho. 2020. Quantifying the impact of nonpharmaceutical interventions during the COVID-19 outbreak: The case of Sweden. *The Econometrics Journal* **23**:3, 323–344. [[Crossref](#)]
  302. Mirella Damiani, Fabrizio Pompei, Andrea Ricci. 2020. Opting Out, Collective Contracts and Labour Flexibility: Firm-Level Evidence for The Italian Case. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* **58**:3, 558–586. [[Crossref](#)]
  303. Md. Jahir Uddin Palas, Fernando Moreira. 2020. The impact of government assistance on banks' efficiency. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* **1**. . [[Crossref](#)]

304. Huasheng Gao, Kai Li, Yujing Ma. 2020. Stakeholder Orientation and the Cost of Debt: Evidence from State-Level Adoption of Constituency Statutes. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 73, 1-37. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Opeyemi Olanrewaju, Romanus Osabohien, James Fasakin. 2020. The Anchor Borrowers Programme and youth rice farmers in Northern Nigeria. *Agricultural Finance Review* 81:2, 222-236. [[Crossref](#)]
306. Christopher Osiander. 2020. Lessons from mixed-method evaluations—An example from labor market research. *Research Evaluation* 15. . [[Crossref](#)]
307. Ervin Prifti, Silvio Daidone, Noemi Pace, Benjamin Davis. 2020. Heterogeneous impacts of cash transfers on farm profitability. Evidence from a randomised study in Lesotho. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 47:4, 1531-1558. [[Crossref](#)]
308. Cees van der Eijk, Jonathan Rose. 2020. Winner–loser effects in contentious constitutional referenda: Perceptions of procedural fairness and the Brexit referendum. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 136914812093285. [[Crossref](#)]
309. S.A. Wheeler, E. Carmody, R.Q. Grafton, R.T. Kingsford, A. Zuo. 2020. The rebound effect on water extraction from subsidising irrigation infrastructure in Australia. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 159, 104755. [[Crossref](#)]
310. Raymond Robertson. 2020. Lights On: How Transparency Increases Compliance in Cambodian Global Value Chains. *ILR Review* 73:4, 939-968. [[Crossref](#)]
311. Aseem Mahajan, S.P. Harish, Johannes Urpelainen. 2020. The behavioral impact of basic energy access: A randomized controlled trial with solar lanterns in rural India. *Energy for Sustainable Development* 57, 214-225. [[Crossref](#)]
312. Tobias Böhmelt. 2020. Environmental disasters and public-opinion formation: A natural experiment. *Environmental Research Communications* 2:8, 081002. [[Crossref](#)]
313. Paul Martin Dontsop Nguetzet, John Herbert Ainembabazi, Arega Alene, Tahirou Abdulaye, Shiferaw Feleke, Generose Nziguheba, Makaiko Khonje, Djana Mignouna, Christopher Okafor, Emmanuel Njukwe, Piet Van Asten, Sylvain Mapatano, Bernard Vanlauwe, Victor Manyong. 2020. Are farmers using cropping system intensification technologies experiencing poverty reduction in the Great Lakes Region of Africa?. *Food and Energy Security* 9:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
314. Paul Muller, Bas Klaauw, Arjan Heyma. 2020. Comparing econometric methods to empirically evaluate activation programs for job seekers. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 35:5, 526-547. [[Crossref](#)]
315. Yuning Gao, Meng Li, Jinjun Xue, Yu Liu. 2020. Evaluation of effectiveness of China's carbon emissions trading scheme in carbon mitigation. *Energy Economics* 90, 104872. [[Crossref](#)]
316. Brantly Callaway, Weige Huang. 2020. Distributional Effects of a Continuous Treatment with an Application on Intergenerational Mobility. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 82:4, 808-842. [[Crossref](#)]
317. Rozana Himaz. 2020. Sweet are the fruit of adversity? The impact of fathers' death on child non-cognitive outcomes in Ethiopia. *Economics & Human Biology* 38, 100890. [[Crossref](#)]
318. Marie Valentova, Adda Carla Justiniano Medina. 2020. Comparing Voluntary Activities Among Immigrant and Non-immigrant. Focus on Third Country Nationals. *Child Indicators Research* 13:4, 1257-1281. [[Crossref](#)]
319. Tongil "TI" Kim, Diwas KC. 2020. Can Viagra Advertising Make More Babies? Direct-to-Consumer Advertising on Public Health Outcomes. *Journal of Marketing Research* 57:4, 599-616. [[Crossref](#)]

320. Gabriel Schamberg, William Chapman, Shang-Ping Xie, Todd Coleman. 2020. Direct and Indirect Effects—An Information Theoretic Perspective. *Entropy* **22**:8, 854. [[Crossref](#)]
321. Giovanni Cerulli, Marco Corsino, Roberto Gabriele, Anna Giunta. 2020. A dose–response evaluation of a regional R&D subsidies policy. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* **25**, 1–18. [[Crossref](#)]
322. Alex Scott, Andrew Balthrop, Jason W. Miller. 2020. Unintended responses to IT-enabled monitoring: The case of the electronic logging device mandate. *Journal of Operations Management* **45**. . [[Crossref](#)]
323. Anna Garriga, Fulvia Pennoni. 2020. The Causal Effects of Parental Divorce and Parental Temporary Separation on Children’s Cognitive Abilities and Psychological Well-being According to Parental Relationship Quality. *Social Indicators Research* **55**. . [[Crossref](#)]
324. Sanjana Chakraborty, Vivekananda Mukherjee. 2020. Revisiting Economic Costs of Arsenicosis. *Ecology, Economy and Society—the INSEE Journal* **3**:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
325. Long Wang, Yang Yang. 2020. Political connections in the land market: Evidence from China’s state-owned enterprises. *Real Estate Economics* **88**. . [[Crossref](#)]
326. David Douglas, Dragana Radicic. 2020. Network additionality and policy mix of regional and national public support for innovation. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* **13**, 1–25. [[Crossref](#)]
327. Daniele Girardi, Walter Paternesi Meloni, Antonella Stirati. 2020. Reverse hysteresis? Persistent effects of autonomous demand expansions. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* **44**:4, 835–869. [[Crossref](#)]
328. Vladimir Atanasov, Bernard Black. 2020. The Trouble with Instruments: The Need for Pretreatment Balance in Shock-Based Instrumental Variable Designs. *Management Science* . [[Crossref](#)]
329. Albert T. Han, Lucie Laurian, Min Hee Go. 2020. Transforming incinerators into community amenities? The Seoul experience. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* **63**:8, 1427–1452. [[Crossref](#)]
330. Pablo Araya, Francisca Dussaillant. 2020. Does attending a selective secondary school improve student performance? Evidence from the Bicentenario schools in Chile. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* **31**:3, 426–444. [[Crossref](#)]
331. Martin Falk, Sigbjorn Landazuri Tveteraas. 2020. Modelling the wider effects of ski lift investments. *Empirical Economics* **59**:1, 259–274. [[Crossref](#)]
332. Andrea Albanese, Bart Cockx, Yannick Thuy. 2020. Working time reductions at the end of the career: Do they prolong the time spent in employment?. *Empirical Economics* **59**:1, 99–141. [[Crossref](#)]
333. Massimo Bordignon, Matteo Gamalerio, Gilberto Turati. 2020. Manager or professional politician? Local fiscal autonomy and the skills of elected officials. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **83**, 103529. [[Crossref](#)]
334. Luciana Cingolani, Mihály Fazekas. 2020. The role of agencification in achieving value-for-money in public spending. *Governance* **33**:3, 545–563. [[Crossref](#)]
335. Adewale M. Ogunmodede, Mary O. Ogunsanwo, Victor Manyong. 2020. Unlocking the Potential of Agribusiness in Africa through Youth Participation: An Impact Evaluation of N-Power Agro Empowerment Program in Nigeria. *Sustainability* **12**:14, 5737. [[Crossref](#)]
336. Michael Koetter, Felix Noth, Oliver Rehbein. 2020. Borrowers under water! Rare disasters, regional banks, and recovery lending. *Journal of Financial Intermediation* **43**, 100811. [[Crossref](#)]



337. Kelly W Jones, Nicolle Etchart, Margaret Holland, Lisa Naughton-Treves, Rodrigo Arriagada. 2020. The impact of paying for forest conservation on perceived tenure security in Ecuador. *Conservation Letters* 13:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
338. Tommaso Agasisti, Ekaterina Shibanova, Daria Platonova, Mikhail Lisyutkin. 2020. The Russian Excellence Initiative for higher education: a nonparametric evaluation of short-term results. *International Transactions in Operational Research* 27:4, 1911-1929. [[Crossref](#)]
339. S.A. Adekambi, J.J. Okello, P.E. Abidin, E. Carey. 2020. Effect of exposure to biofortified crops on smallholder farm household adoption decisions: The case of orange-fleshed sweetpotato in Ghana and Nigeria. *Scientific African* 8, e00362. [[Crossref](#)]
340. Catherine Ipsen, Steven Stern. 2020. The effect of ruralness on vocational rehabilitation applications. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation* 53:1, 89-104. [[Crossref](#)]
341. Yu-Chin Hsu, Kamhon Kan, Tsung-Chih Lai. 2020. Quantile structural treatment effects: application to smoking wage penalty and its determinants. *Econometric Reviews* 4, 1-20. [[Crossref](#)]
342. Cristian Mardones, Natalia Madrid Becerra. 2020. Ex-post evaluation of the R&D tax incentive law in Chile. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración* 33:3/4, 337-359. [[Crossref](#)]
343. Zheng Shen, Xiaodong Zheng, Hualei Yang. 2020. The fertility effects of public pension: Evidence from the new rural pension scheme in China. *PLOS ONE* 15:6, e0234657. [[Crossref](#)]
344. Henry Muli Mwololo, Jonathan Makau Nzuma, Cecilia Nyawira Ritho, Sylvester Ochieng Ogotu, Nassul Kabunga. 2020. Determinants of actual and potential adoption of improved indigenous chicken under asymmetrical exposure conditions in rural Kenya. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development* 12:4, 505-515. [[Crossref](#)]
345. Jason C. Lee, Erin B. Ciarimboli, Paul G. Rubin, Manuel S. González Canché. 2020. Borrowing Smarter or Borrowing More? Investigating the Effects of a Change in Federal Loan Policy. *The Journal of Higher Education* 91:4, 483-513. [[Crossref](#)]
346. Chunyan Wei, Shiyang Hu, Feng Chen. 2020. Do political connection disruptions increase labor costs in a government-dominated market? Evidence from publicly listed companies in China. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 62, 101554. [[Crossref](#)]
347. Andrew McEachin, Douglas Lee Lauen, Sarah Crittenden Fuller, Rachel M. Perera. 2020. Social returns to private choice? Effects of charter schools on behavioral outcomes, arrests, and civic participation. *Economics of Education Review* 76, 101983. [[Crossref](#)]
348. Luiz Guilherme dos Santos Ribas, Robert L. Pressey, Rafael Loyola, Luis Mauricio Bini. 2020. A global comparative analysis of impact evaluation methods in estimating the effectiveness of protected areas. *Biological Conservation* 246, 108595. [[Crossref](#)]
349. Kalu Ojah, Stella Muhanji, Odongo Kodongo. 2020. Insider trading laws and price informativeness in emerging stock markets: The South African case. *Emerging Markets Review* 43, 100690. [[Crossref](#)]
350. Mengqi Liu, Kira M. Villa. 2020. Solution or isolation: Is boarding school a good solution for left-behind children in rural China?. *China Economic Review* 61, 101456. [[Crossref](#)]
351. H. EVREN DAMAR, REINT GROPP, ADI MORDEL. 2020. Banks' Funding Stress, Lending Supply, and Consumption Expenditure. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 52:4, 685-720. [[Crossref](#)]

352. Deqiu Chen, Huasheng Gao, Jiang Luo, Yujing Ma. 2020. The effects of rural–urban migration on corporate innovation: Evidence from a natural experiment in China. *Financial Management* **49**:2, 521–545. [[Crossref](#)]
353. Yuehua Li, Zhentao Liu, Sha Pei. 2020. Does bank transparency benefit from the Volcker Rule?. *Accounting & Finance* **60**:2, 1471–1500. [[Crossref](#)]
354. Romaike S. Middendorp, Olivia Boever, Ximena Rueda, Eric F. Lambin. 2020. Improving smallholder livelihoods and ecosystems through direct trade relations: High-quality cocoa producers in Ecuador. *BUSINESS STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT* **3**:2, 165–184. [[Crossref](#)]
355. James Cust, Torfinn Harding. 2020. Institutions and the Location of Oil Exploration. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **18**:3, 1321–1350. [[Crossref](#)]
356. Martin Melecky, Anca Maria Podpiera. 2020. Financial sector strategies and financial sector outcomes: Do the strategies perform?. *Economic Systems* **44**:2, 100757. [[Crossref](#)]
357. Andrea Albanese, Giovanni Gallo. 2020. Buy flexible, pay more: The role of temporary contracts on wage inequality. *Labour Economics* **64**, 101814. [[Crossref](#)]
358. Judith Schleicher, Johanna Eklund, Megan D. Barnes, Jonas Geldmann, Johan A. Oldekop, Julia P. G. Jones. 2020. Statistical matching for conservation science. *Conservation Biology* **34**:3, 538–549. [[Crossref](#)]
359. Sylvester Ochieng Ogutu, Theda Gödecke, Matin Qaim. 2020. Agricultural Commercialisation and Nutrition in Smallholder Farm Households. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **71**:2, 534–555. [[Crossref](#)]
360. Mark Olfson, Melanie M. Wall, Colleen L. Barry, Christine Mauro, Tianshu Feng, Ramin Mojtabai. 2020. A National Survey of Trends in Health Insurance Coverage of Low-Income Adults Following Medicaid Expansion. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* **35**:6, 1911–1913. [[Crossref](#)]
361. Hong Zou, Bingjiang Luan, Xuemei Zheng, Junbing Huang. 2020. The effect of increasing block pricing on urban households' electricity consumption: Evidence from difference-in-differences models. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **257**, 120498. [[Crossref](#)]
362. Haithem Ben Hassine, Claude Mathieu. 2020. R&D crowding out or R&D leverage effects: An evaluation of the french cluster-oriented technology policy. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **155**, 120025. [[Crossref](#)]
363. Anjani Kumar, Hiroyuki Takeshima, Ganesh Thapa, Naveen Adhikari, Sunil Saroj, Madhab Karkee, P.K. Joshi. 2020. Adoption and diffusion of improved technologies and production practices in agriculture: Insights from a donor-led intervention in Nepal. *Land Use Policy* **95**, 104621. [[Crossref](#)]
364. Sheng-fang Tang. 2020. Some recent developments in modeling quantile treatment effects. *Applied Mathematics-A Journal of Chinese Universities* **35**:2, 220–243. [[Crossref](#)]
365. Sadat Reza, Hillbun Ho, Rich Ling, Hongyan Shi. 2020. Experience Effect in the Impact of Free Trial Promotions. *Management Science* **9**. . [[Crossref](#)]
366. Valerio Leone Sciabolazza, Raffaele Vacca, Christopher McCarty. 2020. Connecting the dots: implementing and evaluating a network intervention to foster scientific collaboration and productivity. *Social Networks* **61**, 181–195. [[Crossref](#)]
367. Degnet Abebaw, Assefa Admassie, Habtemariam Kassa, Christine Padoch. 2020. Can rural outmigration improve household food security? Empirical evidence from Ethiopia. *World Development* **129**, 104879. [[Crossref](#)]

368. Gazali Issahaku, Awudu Abdulai. 2020. Household welfare implications of sustainable land management practices among smallholder farmers in Ghana. *Land Use Policy* **94**, 104502. [[Crossref](#)]
369. Simon Cornée, Panu Kalmi, Ariane Szafarz. 2020. The Business Model of Social Banks. *Kyklos* **73**:2, 196-226. [[Crossref](#)]
370. Steven J. Dundas, David J. Lewis. 2020. Estimating Option Values and Spillover Damages for Coastal Protection: Evidence from Oregon's Planning Goal 18. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* **7**:3, 519-554. [[Crossref](#)]
371. Sander Ramboer, Jo Reynaerts. 2020. Indecent proposals: Estimating the impact of regional state aid through EU guideline compliance. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **82**, 103424. [[Crossref](#)]
372. Tymon Słoczyński. 2020. Average Gaps and Oaxaca-Blinder Decompositions: A Cautionary Tale about Regression Estimates of Racial Differences in Labor Market Outcomes. *ILR Review* **73**:3, 705-729. [[Crossref](#)]
373. Emily A. Gallagher, Radhakrishnan Gopalan, Michal Grinstein-Weiss, Jorge Sabat. 2020. Medicaid and household savings behavior: New evidence from tax refunds. *Journal of Financial Economics* **136**:2, 523-546. [[Crossref](#)]
374. Marislei Nishijima, Flavia Mori Sarti, Otaviano Canuto. 2020. Does the Brazilian policy for oil revenues distribution foster investment in human capital?. *Energy Economics* **88**, 104760. [[Crossref](#)]
375. Jiejing Wang, Anthony GO Yeh. 2020. Administrative restructuring and urban development in China: Effects of urban administrative level upgrading. *Urban Studies* **57**:6, 1201-1223. [[Crossref](#)]
376. John Cawley, David Frisvold, Anna Hill, David Jones. 2020. Oakland's sugar-sweetened beverage tax: Impacts on prices, purchases and consumption by adults and children. *Economics & Human Biology* **37**, 100865. [[Crossref](#)]
377. Rajeshwari Majumdar. 2020. On the Effect of a Binary Treatment in the Presence of a Control Covariate. *Calcutta Statistical Association Bulletin* **72**:1, 35-42. [[Crossref](#)]
378. Chao Wang, Arthur Sweetman. 2020. Delisting eye examinations from public health insurance: Empirical evidence from Canada regarding impacts on patients and providers. *Health Policy* **124**:5, 540-548. [[Crossref](#)]
379. Fuxiu Jiang, Xinni Cai, John R. Nofsinger, Xiaojia Zheng. 2020. Can reputation concern restrain bad news hoarding in family firms?. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **114**, 105808. [[Crossref](#)]
380. Nikolay Didenko. 2020. Modeling the global nickel market with a triangular simultaneous equations model. *International Journal of System Assurance Engineering and Management* **11**:S1, 119-129. [[Crossref](#)]
381. Alessandro Belmonte. 2020. Inter-Ethnic Dynamics in the Wake of Terrorist Attacks: Evidence from the 2015 Baga Massacre. *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy* **26**:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
382. Jonathan Kropko, Robert Kubinec. 2020. Interpretation and identification of within-unit and cross-sectional variation in panel data models. *PLOS ONE* **15**:4, e0231349. [[Crossref](#)]
383. David Prentice, Rosanna Scutella. 2020. What are the impacts of living in social housing? New evidence from Australia. *Housing Studies* **35**:4, 612-647. [[Crossref](#)]
384. Salvatore Bimonte, Antonella D'Agostino. 2020. Tourism development and residents' well-being: Comparing two seaside destinations in Italy. *Tourism Economics* **49**, 135481662091696. [[Crossref](#)]

385. Alejandro Ganimian, Felipe Barrera-Orsorio, María Loreto Biehl, María Ángela Cortelezzi. 2020. Hard Cash and Soft Skills: Experimental Evidence on Combining Scholarships and Mentoring in Argentina. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* **13**:2, 380-400. [[Crossref](#)]
386. Bryan S. Graham, Guido W. Imbens, Geert Ridder. 2020. Identification and Efficiency Bounds for the Average Match Function Under Conditionally Exogenous Matching. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **38**:2, 303-316. [[Crossref](#)]
387. Manila Bonciani, Sabina De Rosis, Milena Vainieri. 2020. A m-health intervention in the maternal care pathway: protocol for the impact evaluation of hAPPyMamma (Preprint). *JMIR Research Protocols* . [[Crossref](#)]
388. Komla D. Dzigbede. 2020. A framework for assessing the effectiveness of USAID's food security programme in a developing country. *Development in Practice* **30**:3, 369-382. [[Crossref](#)]
389. Zhi Jin, Liguang Zhang, Qingquan Xin. 2020. Transportation infrastructure and resource allocation of capital market: evidence from high-speed rail opening and company going public. *China Journal of Accounting Studies* **8**:2, 272-297. [[Crossref](#)]
390. Thomas Kick, Michael Koetter, Manuela Storz. 2020. Cross-border transmission of emergency liquidity. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **113**, 105300. [[Crossref](#)]
391. Daniel Aghanya, Vineet Agarwal, Sunil Poshakwale. 2020. Market in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID), stock price informativeness and liquidity. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **113**, 105730. [[Crossref](#)]
392. Florian Szücs. 2020. Do research subsidies crowd out private R&D of large firms? Evidence from European Framework Programmes. *Research Policy* **49**:3, 103923. [[Crossref](#)]
393. Francesco Drago, Friederike Mengel, Christian Traxler. 2020. Compliance Behavior in Networks: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **12**:2, 96-133. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
394. Vladimír Baláž, Eduard Nežinský, Tomáš Jeck, Richard Filčák. 2020. Energy and Emission Efficiency of the Slovak Regions. *Sustainability* **12**:7, 2611. [[Crossref](#)]
395. Robert Ugochukwu Onyeneke, Chukwuemeka Chinonso Emenekwe, Nneka Maris Chidiebere-Mark, Jane Onuabuchi Munonye, Jonathan Ogbeni Aligbe, Clementina Kanu, Chibuzo Uzoma Izuogu, Chukwudi Loveday Njoku, Uwazie Iyke Uwazie, Christian Obioma Uwadoka, Gillian Chidozie Azuamairo. 2020. Impact of Poultry Farmers' Participation in Modern Food Retail Markets on Household Dietary Diversity: Lessons from Southeast Nigeria. *Animals* **10**:4, 611. [[Crossref](#)]
396. Sonali Parbhoo, Mario Wieser, Aleksander Wiecezorek, Volker Roth. 2020. Information Bottleneck for Estimating Treatment Effects with Systematically Missing Covariates. *Entropy* **22**:4, 389. [[Crossref](#)]
397. Lasme Mathieu N'dri, Makoto Kakinaka. 2020. Financial inclusion, mobile money, and individual welfare: The case of Burkina Faso. *Telecommunications Policy* **44**:3, 101926. [[Crossref](#)]
398. Audinga Baltrunaite. 2020. Political Contributions and Public Procurement: Evidence from Lithuania. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **18**:2, 541-582. [[Crossref](#)]
399. Christian Ahlin, Selim Gulesci, Andreas Madestam, Miri Stryjan. 2020. Loan contract structure and adverse selection: Survey evidence from Uganda. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **172**, 180-195. [[Crossref](#)]

400. Joachim Vandecastelen, Mekdim Dereje, Bart Minten, Alemayehu Taffesse. 2020. From Agricultural Experiment Station to Farm: The Impact of the Promotion of a New Technology on Farmers' Yields in Ethiopia. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 68:3, 965-1007. [[Crossref](#)]
401. Umar Musa, Wen Jun. 2020. Does inflation targeting cause financial instability?: An empirical test of paradox of credibility hypothesis. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance* 52, 101164. [[Crossref](#)]
402. Fredrik Carlsson, Marcela Jaime, Clara Villegas. 2020. Behavioral spillover effects from a social information campaign. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 102325. [[Crossref](#)]
403. Pathric Hägglund, Per Johansson, Lisa Laun. 2020. The Impact of CBT on Sick Leave and Health. *Evaluation Review* 44:2-3, 185-217. [[Crossref](#)]
404. Aparna Howlader, Amy W. Ando. 2020. Consequences of Protected Areas for Household Forest Extraction, Time Use, and Consumption: Evidence from Nepal. *Environmental and Resource Economics* 75:4, 769-808. [[Crossref](#)]
405. A. Qunito Romani. 2020. Parental behaviour and children's sports participation: evidence from a Danish longitudinal school study. *Sport, Education and Society* 25:3, 332-347. [[Crossref](#)]
406. Theis Theisen, Anne Wenche Emblem. 2020. The Road to Higher Prices: Will Improved Road Standards Lead to Higher Housing Prices?. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* 42. . [[Crossref](#)]
407. Mitsutsugu Hamamoto. 2020. Impact of the Saitama Prefecture Target-Setting Emissions Trading Program on the adoption of low-carbon technology. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 48. . [[Crossref](#)]
408. Nguyen To-The, Tuan Nguyen-Anh. 2020. Impact of government intervention to maize efficiency at farmer's level across time: a robust evidence in Northern Vietnam. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 48. . [[Crossref](#)]
409. Peter Stanley Federman. 2020. Police Performance As Symbolic Politics? Public Recognition and the Value of Awards. *Public Performance & Management Review* 43:2, 363-387. [[Crossref](#)]
410. Federico Inchausti-Sintes, Augusto Voltes-Dorta. 2020. The economic impact of the tourism moratoria in the Canary Islands 2003–2017. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 28:3, 394-413. [[Crossref](#)]
411. Devon Meadowcroft, Brian Whitacre. 2020. Are Rural Opioid Treatment Program (OTP) Facilities Associated with Lower Deaths?. *Substance Use & Misuse* 55:5, 828-838. [[Crossref](#)]
412. Katia Marchesano, Marco Musella. 2020. Does volunteer work affect life satisfaction of participants with chronic functional limitations? An empirical investigation. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences* 69, 100708. [[Crossref](#)]
413. Huasheng Gao, Po-Hsuan Hsu, Kai Li, Jin Zhang. 2020. The Real Effect of Smoking Bans: Evidence from Corporate Innovation. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 55:2, 387-427. [[Crossref](#)]
414. Sarah Walker. 2020. Historical legacies in savings: Evidence from Romania. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 48:1, 76-99. [[Crossref](#)]
415. Wanli Li, Jingting Zhou, Ziqiao Yan, He Zhang. 2020. Controlling shareholder share pledging and firm cash dividends. *Emerging Markets Review* 42, 100671. [[Crossref](#)]
416. Ádám Banai, Péter Lang, Gábor Nagy, Martin Stancics. 2020. Waste of money or growth opportunity: The causal effect of EU subsidies on Hungarian SMEs. *Economic Systems* 44:1, 100742. [[Crossref](#)]



417. Kadir Atalay, Garry F. Barrett, Anita Staneva. 2020. The effect of retirement on home production: evidence from Australia. *Review of Economics of the Household* **18**:1, 117-139. [[Crossref](#)]
418. Ana Carolina Oliveira Fiorini, Conner Mullally, Marilyn Swisher, Francis E. Putz. 2020. Forest cover effects of payments for ecosystem services: Evidence from an impact evaluation in Brazil. *Ecological Economics* **169**, 106522. [[Crossref](#)]
419. Sunil Poshakwale, Daniel Aghanya, Vineet Agarwal. 2020. The impact of regulations on compliance costs, risk-taking, and reporting quality of the EU banks. *International Review of Financial Analysis* **68**, 101431. [[Crossref](#)]
420. Marianna Battaglia, Nina Pallarés. 2020. Family Planning and Child Health Care: Effect of the Peruvian Programa de Salud Reproductiva y Planificación Familiar , 1996–2000. *Population and Development Review* **46**:1, 33-64. [[Crossref](#)]
421. Lorraine Balaine, Emma J. Dillon, Doris Läßle, John Lynch. 2020. Can technology help achieve sustainable intensification? Evidence from milk recording on Irish dairy farms. *Land Use Policy* **92**, 104437. [[Crossref](#)]
422. Daniel Da Mata, Guilherme Resende. 2020. Changing the climate for banking: The economic effects of credit in a climate-vulnerable area. *Journal of Development Economics* 102459. [[Crossref](#)]
423. Javier Escobal, Carmen Ponce. 2020. Challenges in using RCTs for evaluation of large-scale public programs with complex designs: Lessons from Peru. *World Development* **127**, 104798. [[Crossref](#)]
424. Zhaohua Wang, Wenhui Zhao, Nana Deng, Bin Zhang, Bo Wang. 2020. Mixed data-driven decision-making in demand response management: An empirical evidence from dynamic time-warping based nonparametric-matching DID. *Omega* 102233. [[Crossref](#)]
425. Ze-qin Liu, Zong-wu Cai, Ying Fang, Ming Lin. 2020. Statistical Analysis and Evaluation of Macroeconomic Policies: A Selective Review. *Applied Mathematics-A Journal of Chinese Universities* **35**:1, 57-83. [[Crossref](#)]
426. Hervé Cardot, Antonio Musolesi. 2020. Modeling temporal treatment effects with zero inflated semi-parametric regression models: The case of local development policies in France. *Econometric Reviews* **39**:2, 135-157. [[Crossref](#)]
427. Z. Burivalova, D. Miteva, N. Salafsky, R.A. Butler, D.S. Wilcove. 2020. Reply to Mupepele and Dormann 'Evidence Ranking Needs to Reflect Causality'. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **35**:2, 95-96. [[Crossref](#)]
428. Kourosh Shafi, Ali Mohammadi, Sofia A. Johan. 2020. Investment Ties Gone Awry. *Academy of Management Journal* **63**:1, 295-327. [[Crossref](#)]
429. Hartmut Egger, Elke Jahn, Stefan Kornitzky. 2020. Reassessing the foreign ownership wage premium in Germany. *The World Economy* **43**:2, 302-325. [[Crossref](#)]
430. Jost Sieweke, Simone Santoni. 2020. Natural experiments in leadership research: An introduction, review, and guidelines. *The Leadership Quarterly* **31**:1, 101338. [[Crossref](#)]
431. Hanna Hottenrott, Robert Richstein. 2020. Start-up subsidies: Does the policy instrument matter?. *Research Policy* **49**:1, 103888. [[Crossref](#)]
432. Amanda B. Gilman, Sarah C. Walker. 2020. Evaluating the Effects of an Adolescent Family Violence Intervention Program on Recidivism among Court-Involved Youth. *Journal of Family Violence* **35**:2, 95-106. [[Crossref](#)]

433. Tafesse Kefyalew Estifanos, Maksym Polyakov, Ram Pandit, Atakelty Hailu, Michael Burton. 2020. The impact of protected areas on the rural households' incomes in Ethiopia. *Land Use Policy* **91**, 104349. [[Crossref](#)]
434. Martin Huber. 2020. Kausalanalyse mit maschinellem Lernen. *HMD Praxis der Wirtschaftsinformatik* **57**:1, 106-116. [[Crossref](#)]
435. Trey Malone, Richard T. Melstrom. 2020. Where's the beef? Cattle producers' response to endangered species listings. *Food Policy* **91**, 101814. [[Crossref](#)]
436. Gueorgui Kambourov, Iouri Manovskii, Miana Plesca. 2020. Occupational mobility and the returns to training. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie* **53**:1, 174-211. [[Crossref](#)]
437. Emerson M Wickwire, Aparna Vadlamani, Sarah E Tom, Abree M Johnson, Steven M Scharf, Jennifer S Albrecht. 2020. Economic aspects of insomnia medication treatment among Medicare beneficiaries. *Sleep* **43**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
438. Enock Warinda, Dickson M. Nyariki, Stephen Wambua, Reuben Muasya. 2020. Impact of smallholder farmers' welfare through participation in on-farm regional projects in East Africa. *Agrekon* **59**:1, 16-29. [[Crossref](#)]
439. Hugo Bodory, Lorenzo Camponovo, Martin Huber, Michael Lechner. 2020. The Finite Sample Performance of Inference Methods for Propensity Score Matching and Weighting Estimators. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **38**:1, 183-200. [[Crossref](#)]
440. Ildephonse Musafiri. The Role of Mobile Phones Use on Agricultural Output and Household Income in Rural Rwanda 618-629. [[Crossref](#)]
441. Nebojša Stojčić, Stjepan Srhoj, Alex Coad. 2020. Innovation procurement as capability-building: Evaluating innovation policies in eight Central and Eastern European countries. *European Economic Review* **121**, 103330. [[Crossref](#)]
442. Oriana Bandiera, Niklas Buehren, Robin Burgess, Markus Goldstein, Selim Gulesci, Imran Rasul, Munshi Sulaiman. 2020. Women's Empowerment in Action: Evidence from a Randomized Control Trial in Africa. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **12**:1, 210-259. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
443. Yonatan Eyal. 2020. Self-Assessment Variables as a Source of Information in the Evaluation of Intervention Programs: A Theoretical and Methodological Framework. *SAGE Open* **10**:1, 215824401989881. [[Crossref](#)]
444. Alfredo R. Paloyo. Peer effects in education: recent empirical evidence 291-305. [[Crossref](#)]
445. Arnd Kölling. 2020. Employment in family managed firms: Less but safe? Analysing labour demand of German family managed firms with a treatment model for panel data. *Bulletin of Economic Research* **72**:1, 14-32. [[Crossref](#)]
446. Victor Motta. 2020. Lack of access to external finance and SME labor productivity: does project quality matter?. *Small Business Economics* **54**:1, 119-134. [[Crossref](#)]
447. Sara Rellstab, Pieter Bakx, Pilar García-Gómez, Eddy van Doorslaer. 2020. The kids are alright - labour market effects of unexpected parental hospitalisations in the Netherlands. *Journal of Health Economics* **69**, 102275. [[Crossref](#)]
448. Marynia Kolak, Luc Anselin. 2020. A Spatial Perspective on the Econometrics of Program Evaluation. *International Regional Science Review* **43**:1-2, 128-153. [[Crossref](#)]

449. Stijn Kelchtermans, Daniel Neicu, Peter Teirlinck. 2020. The role of peer effects in firms' usage of R&D tax exemptions. *Journal of Business Research* **108**, 74-91. [[Crossref](#)]
450. Nestor O. Raneses, Nelson G. Cainghog, Mili-Ann M. Tamayao, Kristine Mae C. Gotera. Consequences of Kaizen Practices in MSMEs in the Philippines: The Case of the Manufacturing Productivity Extension Program (MPEX) 293-316. [[Crossref](#)]
451. Xunan Feng, Kam C. Chan, Yung Ling Lo. 2020. Are venture capitalist-backed IPOs more innovative? Evidence from an emerging market. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance* **51**, 100839. [[Crossref](#)]
452. Mohammad Mizanul Haque Kazal, Md. Sadique Rahman. Impacts and Determinants of Adoption in River-Based Tilapia Cage Culture 87-95. [[Crossref](#)]
453. Md. Sadique Rahman. Finding Significant Determinants and Impacts of Farm-Level Integrated Pest Management Practices Using Statistical Tools 321-332. [[Crossref](#)]
454. Victor Chernozhukov, Iván Fernández-Val, Whitney Newey, Sami Stouli, Francis Vella. 2020. Semiparametric estimation of structural functions in nonseparable triangular models. *Quantitative Economics* **11**:2, 503-533. [[Crossref](#)]
455. Bruno Guimarães, Béda Barkokébas Junior, Laura Martins. Labour Production of Persons with Disabilities in the Construction Industry in Brazil 657-666. [[Crossref](#)]
456. Gerard J. Tellis, Ashish Sood, Nitish Sood. 2020. Price of Delay in Covid-19 Lockdowns: Delays Spike Total Cases, Natural Experiments Reveal. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
457. Giampaolo Viglia, Sara Dolnicar. 2020. A review of experiments in tourism and hospitality. *Annals of Tourism Research* **80**, 102858. [[Crossref](#)]
458. Ivan Korolev. 2020. What Does the Case Fatality Ratio Really Measure?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
459. . References 239-261. [[Crossref](#)]
460. Dongmin Kong, Bohui Zhang, Jian Zhang. 2020. Higher Education and Corporate Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
461. Dierk Bauknecht, Thore Sören Bischoff, Kilian Bizer, Martin Führ, Peter Gailhofer, Dirk Arne Heyen, Till Proeger, Kaja von der Leyen. 2020. Exploring the pathways: Regulatory experiments for sustainable development – An interdisciplinary approach. *Journal of Governance and Regulation* **9**:3, 49-71. [[Crossref](#)]
462. Margherita Bottero, Camelia Minoiu, Jose-Luis Peydro, Andrea Polo, Andrea Presbitero, Enrico Sette. 2020. Expansionary Yet Different: Credit Supply and Real Effects of Negative Interest Rate Policy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
463. Umit Gurun, Jordan Nickerson, David H. Solomon. 2020. The Perils of Private Provision of Public Goods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
464. Erasmo Giambona, Rafael Matta, Jose-Luis Peydro, Ye Wang. 2020. Quantitative Easing, Investment, and Safe Assets: The Corporate-Bond Lending Channel. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
465. Tim Friehe, Markus Pannenberg. 2020. Time preferences and political regimes: evidence from reunified Germany. *Journal of Population Economics* **33**:1, 349-387. [[Crossref](#)]
466. Anja Lambrecht, Catherine E. Tucker, Xu Zhang. 2020. Does TV Advertising Increase Online Sales: The Role of Inter-temporal Substitution. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

467. Matthew Johnson, Daniel Schwab, Patrick Koval. 2020. Legal Protection Against Retaliatory Firing Improves Workplace Safety. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
468. Xudong Rao, Yuehua Zhang. 2020. Livestock insurance, moral hazard, and farmers' decisions: a field experiment among hog farms in China. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance - Issues and Practice* 45:1, 134-156. [[Crossref](#)]
469. Bryan S. Graham. Network data 111-218. [[Crossref](#)]
470. Francesca Molinari. Microeconometrics with partial identification 355-486. [[Crossref](#)]
471. Antonia Delius, Olivier Sterck. 2020. Cash Transfers and Micro-Enterprise Performance: Theory and Quasi-Experimental Evidence from Kenya. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
472. Matthew O. Jackson, Zhongjian Lin, Ning Neil Yu. 2020. Adjusting for Peer-Influence in Propensity Scoring When Estimating Treatment Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
473. Yiwei Fang, Iftekhar Hasan, Woon Sau Leung, Jiong Sun. 2020. Corporate Tax Changes and Supply-Chain Partners' Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
474. Johan Maharjan, Thomas C. Omer, Yijiang Zhao. 2020. Short-Selling Threats and Corporate Tax Policy: Evidence from Regulation SHO. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
475. Gabriel Jimenez, David Martinez-Miera, Jose-Luis Peydro. 2020. Who Truly Bears (Bank) Taxes? Evidence from Only Shifting Statutory Incidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
476. Heath Henderson. 2020. The Normative Foundations of Impact Evaluation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
477. Kyosuke Kikuta. 2020. The Drowning-out Effect: Voter Turnout, Uncertainty, and Protests. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
478. Han Hong, Michael P Leung, Jessie Li. 2020. Inference on finite-population treatment effects under limited overlap. *The Econometrics Journal* 23:1, 32-47. [[Crossref](#)]
479. Hyungil Kye. 2020. Machine Learning from the COVID-19 Pandemic About the Value of the NYSE Floor in Market Closing Time. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
480. Kyunghye Lee, Kunsoo Han, Byungtae Lee. 2020. Impact of Digital Distribution in the Publishing Market: A Synthetic Control Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 105. . [[Crossref](#)]
481. Elías Cisneros. 2020. Impacts of Conservation Incentives in Protected Areas: The Case of Bolsa Floresta, Brazil. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 6. . [[Crossref](#)]
482. Mohsen Mollagholamali, Siamak Javadi, Saud Al-Thaqeb. 2020. Corporate Cash Holding, Twin Agency Problems and Policy Uncertainty. *SSRN Electronic Journal* 118. . [[Crossref](#)]
483. Joseph V. Terza. 2019. Regression-Based Causal Analysis from the Potential Outcomes Perspective. *Journal of Econometric Methods* 9:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
484. Curtis Miller. 2019. Marginal probabilities and point estimation for conditionally specified logistic regression. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation* 28, 1-26. [[Crossref](#)]
485. Kelvin Mashisia Shikuku, Julius Juma Okello, Stella Wambugu, Kirimi Sindi, Jan W. Low, Margaret McEwan. 2019. Nutrition and food security impacts of quality seeds of biofortified orange-fleshed sweetpotato: Quasi-experimental evidence from Tanzania. *World Development* 124, 104646. [[Crossref](#)]
486. Craig A. Rolling, Yuhong Yang, Dagmar Velez. 2019. COMBINING ESTIMATES OF CONDITIONAL TREATMENT EFFECTS. *Econometric Theory* 35:6, 1089-1110. [[Crossref](#)]

487. Qing He, Cai Fang. 2019. Regulatory sanctions and stock pricing efficiency: Evidence from the Chinese stock market. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* **58**, 101241. [[Crossref](#)]
488. AHMET BURAK ÇETİN. 2019. The Effect of Economic and Political Institutions on Economic Growth: The Case of Developed Countries and Emerging Market Economies. *Bulletin of Economic Theory and Analysis* **4**:2, 1-31. [[Crossref](#)]
489. Maurizio Canavari, Andreas C Drichoutis, Jayson L Lusk, Rodolfo M Nayga. 2019. How to run an experimental auction: a review of recent advances. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **46**:5, 862-922. [[Crossref](#)]
490. Petri Böckerman, Mika Haapanen, Christopher Jepsen. 2019. Back to school: Labor-market returns to higher vocational schooling. *Labour Economics* **61**, 101758. [[Crossref](#)]
491. Chaoping Xie, Jason H. Grant, Kathryn A. Boys. 2019. Do state-owned enterprises benefit more from China's cereal grain tariff-rate quota regime?. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics/Revue canadienne d'agroeconomie* **67**:4, 397-416. [[Crossref](#)]
492. Karen Geurts, Johannes Van Biesebroeck. 2019. Employment growth following takeovers. *The RAND Journal of Economics* **50**:4, 916-950. [[Crossref](#)]
493. Johanna Forstner, Cornelia Straßner, Aline Kunz, Lorenz Uhlmann, Tobias Freund, Frank Peters-Klimm, Michel Wensing, Stephanie Kümmel, Nadja El-Kurd, Ronja Rück, Bärbel Handlos, Joachim Szecsenyi. 2019. Improving continuity of patient care across sectors: study protocol of a quasi-experimental multi-centre study regarding an admission and discharge model in Germany (VESPEERA). *BMC Health Services Research* **19**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
494. Katrin Hussinger, Abdul-Basit Issah. 2019. Firm Acquisitions by Family Firms: A Mixed Gamble Approach. *Family Business Review* **32**:4, 354-377. [[Crossref](#)]
495. Andreas Ekström, Fredrik Eng-Larsson, Olov Isaksson, Lisa Kurland, Martin Nordberg. 2019. The effect of a terrorist attack on emergency department inflow: an observation study using difference-in-differences methodology. *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine* **27**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
496. Alan Zarychta, Krister P. Andersson, Elisabeth D. Root, Jane Menken, Tara Grillos. 2019. Assessing the impacts of governance reforms on health services delivery: a quasi-experimental, multi-method, and participatory approach. *Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology* **19**:4, 241-258. [[Crossref](#)]
497. Franklin Simtowe, Paswel Marennya, Emily Amondo, Mosisa Worku, Dil Bahadur Rahut, Olaf Erenstein. 2019. Heterogeneous seed access and information exposure: implications for the adoption of drought-tolerant maize varieties in Uganda. *Agricultural and Food Economics* **7**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
498. Stefanie Thönnnes. 2019. Ex-post moral hazard in the health insurance market: empirical evidence from German data. *The European Journal of Health Economics* **20**:9, 1317-1333. [[Crossref](#)]
499. Sarfraz Khan. 2019. CFO Outside Directorship and Financial Misstatements. *Accounting Horizons* **33**:4, 59-75. [[Crossref](#)]
500. Yigezu A. Yigezu, Tamer El-Shater, Mohamed Boughlala, Zewdie Bishaw, Abdul Aziz Niane, Fouad Maalouf, Wuletaw Tadesse Degu, Jacques Wery, Mohamed Boutfiras, Aden Aw-Hassan. 2019. Legume-based rotations have clear economic advantages over cereal monocropping in dry areas. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* **39**:6. . [[Crossref](#)]



501. James Gaughan, Nils Gutacker, Katja Grašič, Noemi Kreif, Luigi Siciliani, Andrew Street. 2019. Paying for efficiency: Incentivising same-day discharges in the English NHS. *Journal of Health Economics* **68**, 102226. [[Crossref](#)]
502. Elena Revilla, Beatriz Rodriguez-Prado, Cristina Simón. 2019. The influence of organizational context on the managerial turnover–performance relationship. *Human Resource Management* **94**. . [[Crossref](#)]
503. Roderick A Rose, Natasha K Bowen. 2019. Difference-in-Differences as an Alternative to Pretest–Posttest Regression for Social Work Intervention Evaluation and Research. *Social Work Research* **43**:4, 247–258. [[Crossref](#)]
504. Michael Neureiter. 2019. Evaluating the effects of immigrant integration policies in Western Europe using a difference-in-differences approach. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* **45**:15, 2779–2800. [[Crossref](#)]
505. Albert T. Han. 2019. The implication of regional and local growth management policies on sprawl: A case of the Calgary Metropolitan Area. *Journal of Urban Affairs* **41**:8, 1103–1122. [[Crossref](#)]
506. Hsiao-Tang Hsu, Sarfraz Khan. 2019. Chief accounting officers and audit efficiency. *Asian Review of Accounting* **27**:4, 614–638. [[Crossref](#)]
507. Daniel E. Ho, Zoe C. Ashwood, Cassandra Handan-Nader. 2019. New Evidence on Information Disclosure through Restaurant Hygiene Grading. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **11**:4, 404–428. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
508. Bernhard Boockmann, Tobias Brändle. 2019. Coaching, Counseling, Case-Working: Do They Help the Older Unemployed Out of Benefit Receipt and Back Into the Labor Market?. *German Economic Review* **20**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
509. Lorenz Thomschke. 2019. Regional Impact of the German Rent Brake. *German Economic Review* **20**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
510. Dennis S. Ehiakpor, Gideon Danso-Abbeam, Gilbert Dagunga, Sylvester N. Ayambila. 2019. Impact of Zai technology on farmers' welfare: Evidence from northern Ghana. *Technology in Society* **59**, 101189. [[Crossref](#)]
511. Ramaele Moshoeshe, Cally Ardington, Patrizio Piraino. 2019. The Effect of the Free Primary Education Policy on School Enrolment and Relative Grade Attainment in Lesotho†. *Journal of African Economies* **28**:5, 511–532. [[Crossref](#)]
512. Melissa Whatley. 2019. Study Abroad Participation: An Unintended Consequence of State Merit-Aid Programs?. *Research in Higher Education* **60**:7, 905–930. [[Crossref](#)]
513. Naureen Fatema. 2019. Can land title reduce low-intensity interhousehold conflict incidences and associated damages in eastern DRC?. *World Development* **123**, 104612. [[Crossref](#)]
514. Shen, Zheng, Tan. 2019. The Spillover Effects of Spousal Chronic Diseases on Married Couples' Labour Supply: Evidence from China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **16**:21, 4214. [[Crossref](#)]
515. Arno Parolini, Wei Wu Tan, Aron Shlonsky. 2019. Decision-based models of the implementation of interventions in systems of healthcare: Implementation outcomes and intervention effectiveness in complex service environments. *PLOS ONE* **14**:10, e0223129. [[Crossref](#)]
516. Stephen Reder. Developmental Trajectories of Adult Education Students 429–450. [[Crossref](#)]
517. German Blanco, Michela Bia. 2019. Inference for treatment effects of job training on wages: using bounds to compute Fisher's exact p -value. *Applied Economics Letters* **26**:17, 1424–1428. [[Crossref](#)]

518. Qing L. Burke, Tim V. Eaton, Mengying Wang. 2019. Trade liberalization and conditional accounting conservatism: evidence from import competition. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting* 53:3, 811-844. [[Crossref](#)]
519. Xiaoyong Dai, Fang Wang. 2019. Does the high- and new-technology enterprise program promote innovative performance? Evidence from Chinese firms. *China Economic Review* 57, 101330. [[Crossref](#)]
520. Philip Molyneux, Alessio Reghezza, Ru Xie. 2019. Bank margins and profits in a world of negative rates. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 107, 105613. [[Crossref](#)]
521. Frédéric Closset, Daniel Urban. 2019. The balance of power between creditors and the firm: Evidence from German insolvency law. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 58, 454-477. [[Crossref](#)]
522. Philip Yang, Jan Riepe, Katharina Moser, Kerstin Pull, Siri Terjesen. 2019. Women directors, firm performance, and firm risk: A causal perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly* 30:5, 101297. [[Crossref](#)]
523. Phuong Thanh Le, Charles Harvie, Amir Arjomandi, James Borthwick. 2019. Financial liberalisation, bank ownership type and performance in a transition economy: The case of Vietnam. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 57, 101182. [[Crossref](#)]
524. Chandan Singha. 2019. Impact of the adoption of vegetative soil conservation measures on farm profit, revenue and variable cost in Darjeeling district, India. *Environment and Development Economics* 24:5, 529-553. [[Crossref](#)]
525. Farzana A. Misha, Wameq A. Raza, Jinnat Ara, Ellen van de Poel. 2019. How Far Does a Big Push Really Push? Long-Term Effects of an Asset Transfer Program on Employment Trajectories. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 68:1, 41-62. [[Crossref](#)]
526. Dragana Radicic. 2019. Effectiveness of public procurement of innovation versus supply-side innovation measures in manufacturing and service sectors. *Science and Public Policy* 46:5, 732-746. [[Crossref](#)]
527. Michael R. Smith, Matthew Petrocelli. 2019. The Effect of Concealed Handgun Carry Deregulation in Arizona on Crime in Tucson. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 30:8, 1186-1203. [[Crossref](#)]
528. Alex Bryson, Michael White. 2019. Migrants and Low-Paid Employment in British Workplaces. *Work, Employment and Society* 33:5, 759-776. [[Crossref](#)]
529. Karthik Krishnan, Pinshuo Wang. 2019. The Cost of Financing Education: Can Student Debt Hinder Entrepreneurship?. *Management Science* 65:10, 4522-4554. [[Crossref](#)]
530. Allen Blackman, Laura Villalobos. 2019. Clear, but don't invest: protected areas discourage some land uses more than others. *Environmental Research Letters* 14:10, 104002. [[Crossref](#)]
531. Aleksander Wieczorek, Volker Roth. 2019. Information Theoretic Causal Effect Quantification. *Entropy* 21:10, 975. [[Crossref](#)]
532. Megan B. Cole, Omar Galárraga, Ira B. Wilson. 2019. The Impact of Rhode Island's Multipayer Patient-centered Medical Home Program on Utilization and Cost of Care. *Medical Care* 57:10, 801-808. [[Crossref](#)]
533. Andrea Albanese, Lorenzo Cappellari, Marco Leonardi. 2019. The effects of youth labour market reforms: evidence from Italian apprenticeships. *Oxford Economic Papers* 52. . [[Crossref](#)]
534. Kokou E. Adabe, Abbevi G. Abbey, Irene S. Egyir, John K.M. Kuwornu, Henry Anim-Somuah. 2019. Impact of contract farming on product quality upgrading: the case of rice in Togo. *Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies* 9:4, 314-332. [[Crossref](#)]

535. Stephan Lindner, K. John McConnell. 2019. Difference-in-differences and matching on outcomes: a tale of two unobservables. *Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology* 19:2-3, 127-144. [[Crossref](#)]
536. Steffen Eriksen, Rasmus Wiese. 2019. Policy induced increases in private healthcare financing provide short-term relief of total healthcare expenditure growth: Evidence from OECD countries. *European Journal of Political Economy* 59, 71-82. [[Crossref](#)]
537. Gishan Dissanaikie, Wolfgang Drobetz, Paul P. Momtaz. 2019. Competition policy and the profitability of corporate acquisitions. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 101510. [[Crossref](#)]
538. Achmad Tohari, Christopher Parsons, Anu Rammohan. 2019. Targeting poverty under complementarities: Evidence from Indonesia's unified targeting system. *Journal of Development Economics* 140, 127-144. [[Crossref](#)]
539. Manfred Antoni, Ernst Maug, Stefan Obernberger. 2019. Private equity and human capital risk. *Journal of Financial Economics* 133:3, 634-657. [[Crossref](#)]
540. Cinzia Di Novi, Massimiliano Piacenza, Silvana Robone, Gilberto Turati. 2019. Does fiscal decentralization affect regional disparities in health? Quasi-experimental evidence from Italy. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 78, 103465. [[Crossref](#)]
541. Domenico Depalo. 2019. The side effects on health of a recovery plan in Italy: A nonparametric bounding approach. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 78, 103466. [[Crossref](#)]
542. Mihály Fazekas, Lawrence Peter King. 2019. Perils of development funding? The tale of EU Funds and grand corruption in Central and Eastern Europe. *Regulation & Governance* 13:3, 405-430. [[Crossref](#)]
543. Lauren Duquette-Rury, Zhenxiang Chen. 2019. Does International Migration Affect Political Participation? Evidence from Multiple Data Sources across Mexican Municipalities, 1990–2013. *International Migration Review* 53:3, 798-830. [[Crossref](#)]
544. Albert T. Han. 2019. Effects of Relaxing the Urban Growth Management Policy: Greenbelt Policy of Seoul Metropolitan Area, South Korea. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 39:3, 300-314. [[Crossref](#)]
545. Mathieu Ouédraogo, Prosper Houessionon, Robert B. Zougmore, Samuel Tetteh Partey. 2019. Uptake of Climate-Smart Agricultural Technologies and Practices: Actual and Potential Adoption Rates in the Climate-Smart Village Site of Mali. *Sustainability* 11:17, 4710. [[Crossref](#)]
546. Antonis Adam, Sofia Tsarsitalidou. 2019. Do sanctions lead to a decline in civil liberties?. *Public Choice* 180:3-4, 191-215. [[Crossref](#)]
547. John Cawley, David Frisvold, Anna Hill, David Jones. 2019. The impact of the Philadelphia beverage tax on purchases and consumption by adults and children. *Journal of Health Economics* 67, 102225. [[Crossref](#)]
548. Yixin Lu, Alok Gupta, Wolfgang Ketter, Eric van Heck. 2019. Information Transparency in Business-to-Business Auction Markets: The Role of Winner Identity Disclosure. *Management Science* 65:9, 4261-4279. [[Crossref](#)]
549. Xiaolu Hu, Haozhi Huang, Zheyao Pan, Jing Shi. 2019. Information asymmetry and credit rating: A quasi-natural experiment from China. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 106, 132-152. [[Crossref](#)]
550. Dan Amiram, Andrew M. Bauer, Mary Margaret Frank. 2019. Tax Avoidance at Public Corporations Driven by Shareholder Taxes: Evidence from Changes in Dividend Tax Policy. *The Accounting Review* 94:5, 27-55. [[Crossref](#)]

551. Daniel Burkhard, Christian P. R. Schmid, Kaspar Wüthrich. 2019. Financial incentives and physician prescription behavior: Evidence from dispensing regulations. *Health Economics* **28**:9, 1114-1129. [[Crossref](#)]
552. Arun Advani, Toru Kitagawa, Tymon Słoczyński. 2019. Mostly harmless simulations? Using Monte Carlo studies for estimator selection. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **34**:6, 893-910. [[Crossref](#)]
553. Katsunori Ogawa. 2019. Attrition and Income in a Panel Survey: A Comparative Analysis with Cross-sectional Surveys. *The Annual Review of Sociology* **2019**:32, 73-83. [[Crossref](#)]
554. Justice A. Tambo, Caroline Aliamo, Tamsin Davis, Idah Mugambi, Dannie Romney, David O. Onyango, Monica Kansiime, Christine Alokot, Stephen T. Byantwale. 2019. The impact of ICT-enabled extension campaign on farmers' knowledge and management of fall armyworm in Uganda. *PLOS ONE* **14**:8, e0220844. [[Crossref](#)]
555. Dragana Radicic, Khurshid Djalilov. 2019. The impact of technological and non-technological innovations on export intensity in SMEs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* **26**:4, 612-638. [[Crossref](#)]
556. Susan Athey, Guido W. Imbens. 2019. Machine Learning Methods That Economists Should Know About. *Annual Review of Economics* **11**:1, 685-725. [[Crossref](#)]
557. Bac Van Ho, Teruaki Nanseki, Yosuke Chomei. 2019. Profit efficiency of tea farmers: case study of safe and conventional farms in Northern Vietnam. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* **21**:4, 1695-1713. [[Crossref](#)]
558. Harold D. Chiang, Yu-Chin Hsu, Yuya Sasaki. 2019. Robust uniform inference for quantile treatment effects in regression discontinuity designs. *Journal of Econometrics* **211**:2, 589-618. [[Crossref](#)]
559. Andrew Boslett, Elaine Hill. 2019. Shale gas transmission and housing prices. *Resource and Energy Economics* **57**, 36-50. [[Crossref](#)]
560. Michela Carlana. 2019. Implicit Stereotypes: Evidence from Teachers' Gender Bias\*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **134**:3, 1163-1224. [[Crossref](#)]
561. Huzhang Mao, Liang Li, Tom Greene. 2019. Propensity score weighting analysis and treatment effect discovery. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* **28**:8, 2439-2454. [[Crossref](#)]
562. Chen, Wang, Wang, Luo. 2019. Sibling Rivalry vs. Brothers in Arms: The Contingency Effects of Involvement of Multiple Offsprings on Risk Taking in Family Firms. *Sustainability* **11**:16, 4447. [[Crossref](#)]
563. Laura Pohlman. 2019. Unemployment and social exclusion. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **164**, 273-299. [[Crossref](#)]
564. Xia Wang, Wei Feng, Weiguang Cai, Hong Ren, Chao Ding, Nan Zhou. 2019. Do residential building energy efficiency standards reduce energy consumption in China? – A data-driven method to validate the actual performance of building energy efficiency standards. *Energy Policy* **131**, 82-98. [[Crossref](#)]
565. Sea-Jin Chang. 2019. When to go it alone: Examining post-conversion performance of international joint ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies* **50**:6, 998-1020. [[Crossref](#)]
566. Jérôme Ronchetti, Anthony Terriau. 2019. Impact of unemployment on self-perceived health. *The European Journal of Health Economics* **20**:6, 879-889. [[Crossref](#)]
567. Pantelis Samartsidis, Shaun R. Seaman, Anne M. Presanis, Matthew Hickman, Daniela De Angelis. 2019. Assessing the Causal Effect of Binary Interventions from Observational Panel Data with Few Treated Units. *Statistical Science* **34**:3. . [[Crossref](#)]

568. Diego Herrera, Alexander Pfaff, Juan Robalino. 2019. Impacts of protected areas vary with the level of government: Comparing avoided deforestation across agencies in the Brazilian Amazon. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**:30, 14916-14925. [[Crossref](#)]
569. Jeremy M. Kahn, Billie S. Davis, Jonathan G. Yabes, Chung-Chou H. Chang, David H. Chong, Tina Batra Hershey, Grant R. Martsolf, Derek C. Angus. 2019. Association Between State-Mandated Protocolized Sepsis Care and In-hospital Mortality Among Adults With Sepsis. *JAMA* **322**:3, 240. [[Crossref](#)]
570. David Schimmelpfennig. 2019. Improvements in on-farm resource stewardship with profitable information technologies in rice production. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* **8**:3, 250-267. [[Crossref](#)]
571. Franklin Allen, Meijun Qian, Jing Xie. 2019. Understanding informal financing. *Journal of Financial Intermediation* **39**, 19-33. [[Crossref](#)]
572. Elliott Fan, Hsienming Lien, Ching-to Albert Ma. 2019. Uterus at a price: Disability insurance and hysterectomy. *Journal of Health Economics* **66**, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
573. Z. Burivalova, D. Miteva, N. Salafsky, R.A. Butler, D.S. Wilcove. 2019. Evidence Types and Trends in Tropical Forest Conservation Literature. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **34**:7, 669-679. [[Crossref](#)]
574. Bram Hogendoorn, Iryna Rud, Wim Groot, Henriëtte Brink. 2019. THE EFFECTS OF HUMAN CAPITAL INTERVENTIONS ON ENTREPRENEURIAL PERFORMANCE IN INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **33**:3, 798-826. [[Crossref](#)]
575. Anthony A. Braga, Greg Zimmerman, Lisa Barao, Chelsea Farrell, Rod K. Brunson, Andrew V. Papachristos. 2019. Street Gangs, Gun Violence, and Focused Deterrence: Comparing Place-based and Group-based Evaluation Methods to Estimate Direct and Spillover Deterrent Effects. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* **56**:4, 524-562. [[Crossref](#)]
576. Robert Kelchen, Kelly Ochs Rosinger, Justin C. Ortagus. 2019. How to Create and Use State-Level Policy Data Sets in Education Research. *AERA Open* **5**:3, 233285841987361. [[Crossref](#)]
577. Ann Mitchell, Jimena Macció, Diego Mariño Fages. 2019. The Effects of Emergency Housing on Wellbeing: Evidence from Argentina's Informal Settlements. *The European Journal of Development Research* **31**:3, 504-529. [[Crossref](#)]
578. Ashley E. Larsen, Kyle Meng, Bruce E. Kendall. 2019. Causal analysis in control-impact ecological studies with observational data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **10**:7, 924-934. [[Crossref](#)]
579. Eva-Marie Meemken, Jorge Sellare, Christophe N. Kouame, Martin Qaim. 2019. Effects of Fairtrade on the livelihoods of poor rural workers. *Nature Sustainability* **2**:7, 635-642. [[Crossref](#)]
580. Silvia Mendolia, Alfredo Paloyo, Ian Walker. 2019. Intrinsic Religiosity, Personality Traits, and Adolescent Risky Behaviors. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* **19**:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
581. Yong-Woo Lee, Yong-Ju Lee. 2019. The Effects of Copayments on Healthcare Utilization in Korea's Medical Aid Program. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* **19**:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
582. Laura Dague, Joanna N Lahey. 2019. Causal Inference Methods: Lessons from Applied Microeconomics. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* **29**:3, 511-529. [[Crossref](#)]
583. Edward Martey, Alexander N. Wiredu, Prince M. Etwire, John K.M. Kuwornu. 2019. The impact of credit on the technical efficiency of maize-producing households in Northern Ghana. *Agricultural Finance Review* **79**:3, 304-322. [[Crossref](#)]



584. Jia Wu, Xiangdong Wei, Hongliang Zhang, Xiang Zhou. 2019. Elite schools, magnet classes, and academic performances: Regression-discontinuity evidence from China. *China Economic Review* **55**, 143-167. [[Crossref](#)]
585. Lili Yue, Gaorong Li, Heng Lian, Xiang Wan. 2019. Regression adjustment for treatment effect with multicollinearity in high dimensions. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **134**, 17-35. [[Crossref](#)]
586. Nicolas Koch, Houdou Basse Mama. 2019. Does the EU Emissions Trading System induce investment leakage? Evidence from German multinational firms. *Energy Economics* **81**, 479-492. [[Crossref](#)]
587. Andrea Zaghini. 2019. The CSPP at work: Yield heterogeneity and the portfolio rebalancing channel. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **56**, 282-297. [[Crossref](#)]
588. Woon Sau Leung, Wei Song, Jie Chen. 2019. Does bank stakeholder orientation enhance financial stability?. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **56**, 38-63. [[Crossref](#)]
589. Pedro H.C. Sant'Anna, Xiaojun Song. 2019. Specification tests for the propensity score. *Journal of Econometrics* **210**:2, 379-404. [[Crossref](#)]
590. Harold D. Chiang, Yuya Sasaki. 2019. Causal inference by quantile regression kink designs. *Journal of Econometrics* **210**:2, 405-433. [[Crossref](#)]
591. Alexandra Boyle Stanczyk. 2019. Does Paid Family Leave Improve Household Economic Security Following a Birth? Evidence from California. *Social Service Review* **93**:2, 262-304. [[Crossref](#)]
592. Giuseppe Cappelletti, Giovanni Guazzarotti, Pietro Tommasino. 2019. Tax Deferral and Mutual Fund Inflows: Evidence from a Quasi-Natural Experiment. *Fiscal Studies* **40**:2, 211-237. [[Crossref](#)]
593. László Tóké. 2019. The effect of foreign direct investment on firm labor productivity: Does the country of origin of the FDI matter?. *Society and Economy* **41**:2, 227-243. [[Crossref](#)]
594. Md. Sadique Rahman, George W. Norton. 2019. Adoption and Impacts of Integrated Pest Management in Bangladesh: Evidence from Smallholder Bitter Gourd Growers. *Horticulturae* **5**:2, 32. [[Crossref](#)]
595. Nemera Mamo, Sambit Bhattacharyya, Alexander Moradi. 2019. Intensive and extensive margins of mining and development: Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Development Economics* **139**, 28-49. [[Crossref](#)]
596. Suh-Ruu Ou, Irma Arteaga, Arthur J. Reynolds. 2019. Dosage Effects in the Child-Parent Center PreK-to-3rd Grade Program: A Re-analysis in the Chicago Longitudinal Study. *Children and Youth Services Review* **101**, 285-298. [[Crossref](#)]
597. Morten Sall Jensen, Kim Rose Olsen, Lars Morsø, Jens Søndergaard, Berit Schiøttz-Christensen. 2019. Does changed referral options affect the use of MRI for patients with low back pain? Evidence from a natural experiment using nationwide data. *BMJ Open* **9**:6, e025921. [[Crossref](#)]
598. Eugenia Andreasen, Martin Schindler, Patricio Valenzuela. 2019. Capital Controls and the Cost of Debt. *IMF Economic Review* **67**:2, 288-314. [[Crossref](#)]
599. Martin O'Brien, Scott Burrows. 2019. Assessing the Effectiveness of Regional Policy Responses to Mass Redundancies: The Case of the Illawarra Region, Australia. *Economic Papers: A journal of applied economics and policy* **38**:2, 144-155. [[Crossref](#)]
600. Edward Martey, John K.M. Kuwornu, Joseph Adjebeng-Danquah. 2019. Estimating the effect of mineral fertilizer use on Land productivity and income: Evidence from Ghana. *Land Use Policy* **85**, 463-475. [[Crossref](#)]

601. Paul Fenton Villar, Hugh Waddington. 2019. Within study comparisons and risk of bias in international development: Systematic review and critical appraisal. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 15:1-2. . [[Crossref](#)]
602. Ricardo Mora, Iliana Reggio. 2019. Alternative diff-in-diffs estimators with several pretreatment periods. *Econometric Reviews* 38:5, 465-486. [[Crossref](#)]
603. Emma Persson, Sofie Persson, Ulf-G. Gerdtham, Katarina Steen Carlsson. 2019. Effect of type 1 diabetes on school performance in a dynamic world: new analysis exploring Swedish register data. *Applied Economics* 51:24, 2606-2622. [[Crossref](#)]
604. Daniela A. Miteva, Peter W. Ellis, Edward A. Ellis, Bronson W. Griscom. 2019. The role of property rights in shaping the effectiveness of protected areas and resisting forest loss in the Yucatan Peninsula. *PLOS ONE* 14:5, e0215820. [[Crossref](#)]
605. Ningyu Qian. 2019. How does anti-corruption affect firm labour inputs? Evidence from a quasi-natural experiment in China. *Applied Economics Letters* 26:8, 707-711. [[Crossref](#)]
606. Walter L. Leite, Laura M. Stapleton, Elizabeth F. Bettini. 2019. Propensity Score Analysis of Complex Survey Data with Structural Equation Modeling: A Tutorial with Mplus. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 26:3, 448-469. [[Crossref](#)]
607. Guillaume Chevillard, Julien Mousquès, Véronique Lucas-Gabrielli, Stéphane Rican. 2019. Has the diffusion of primary care teams in France improved attraction and retention of general practitioners in rural areas?. *Health Policy* 123:5, 508-515. [[Crossref](#)]
608. Nauro F. Campos, Fabrizio Coricelli, Luigi Moretti. 2019. Institutional integration and economic growth in Europe. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 103, 88-104. [[Crossref](#)]
609. Felicitas R. Eckebrecht. 2019. Fueling investments - The effect of the Agreement on Basic Telecommunications. *Telecommunications Policy* 43:4, 361-379. [[Crossref](#)]
610. Alwyn Young. 2019. Channeling Fisher: Randomization Tests and the Statistical Insignificance of Seemingly Significant Experimental Results\*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 134:2, 557-598. [[Crossref](#)]
611. Christina Zhu. 2019. Big Data as a Governance Mechanism. *The Review of Financial Studies* 32:5, 2021-2061. [[Crossref](#)]
612. Silda Nikaj, P. Kay Lund. 2019. The Impact of Individual Mentored Career Development (K) Awards on the Research Trajectories of Early-Career Scientists. *Academic Medicine* 94:5, 708-714. [[Crossref](#)]
613. W. Dana Flanders, Michael D. Garber. 2019. Is the Smog Lifting?. *Epidemiology* 30:3, 317-320. [[Crossref](#)]
614. César Salazar, Marcela Jaime, Cristián Pinto, Andrés Acuña. 2019. Interaction between crop insurance and technology adoption decisions: The case of wheat farmers in Chile. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 4. . [[Crossref](#)]
615. Alessandra Righi. 2019. Assessing migration through social media: a review. *Mathematical Population Studies* 26:2, 80-91. [[Crossref](#)]
616. Myo Min Kyi Win, Makoto Kakinaka. 2019. Firm performance and backward and forward linkages: the case of the garment sector in Myanmar. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting & Economics* 3, 1-24. [[Crossref](#)]

617. Massimo Filippini, Lin Zhang. 2019. Impacts of heat metering and efficiency retrofit policy on residential energy consumption in China. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* 21:2, 203-216. [[Crossref](#)]
618. Christian A. Oberst, Hendrik Schmitz, Reinhard Madlener. 2019. Are Prosumer Households That Much Different? Evidence From Stated Residential Energy Consumption in Germany. *Ecological Economics* 158, 101-115. [[Crossref](#)]
619. Jianhong Zhang, Jiangang Jiang, Niels Noorderhaven. 2019. Is certification an effective legitimacy strategy for foreign firms in emerging markets?. *International Business Review* 28:2, 252-267. [[Crossref](#)]
620. Sara A. Wong. 2019. Minimum wage impacts on wages and hours worked of low-income workers in Ecuador. *World Development* 116, 77-99. [[Crossref](#)]
621. Christopher Wright, John M. Halstead, Ju-Chin Huang. 2019. Estimating Treatment Effects of Unit-Based Pricing of Household Solid Waste Disposal. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review* 48:1, 21-43. [[Crossref](#)]
622. Zoltán Bakucs, Imre Fertő, Zsófia Benedek. 2019. Success or Waste of Taxpayer Money? Impact Assessment of Rural Development Programs in Hungary. *Sustainability* 11:7, 2158. [[Crossref](#)]
623. Nicolas Koch, Erasmus K.H.J. Ermgassen, Johanna Wehkamp, Francisco J.B. Oliveira Filho, Gregor Schwerhoff. 2019. Agricultural Productivity and Forest Conservation: Evidence from the Brazilian Amazon. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 101:3, 919-940. [[Crossref](#)]
624. Marup Hossain, Mohammad Abdul Malek, Md. Amzad Hossain, Md. Hasib Reza, Md. Shakil Ahmed. 2019. Agricultural Microcredit for Tenant Farmers: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Bangladesh. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 101:3, 692-709. [[Crossref](#)]
625. Gary R. Pike, Kirsten Robbins. 2019. Expanding the Pipeline: the Effect of Participating in Project Lead the Way on Majoring in a STEM Discipline. *Journal for STEM Education Research* 2:1, 14-34. [[Crossref](#)]
626. Renzo Giudice, Jan Börner, Sven Wunder, Elias Cisneros. 2019. Selection biases and spillovers from collective conservation incentives in the Peruvian Amazon. *Environmental Research Letters* 14:4, 045004. [[Crossref](#)]
627. Jonathan Hammond, Thomas Mason, Matt Sutton, Alex Hall, Nicholas Mays, Anna Coleman, Pauline Allen, Lynsey Warwick-Giles, Kath Checkland. 2019. Exploring the impacts of the 2012 Health and Social Care Act reforms to commissioning on clinical activity in the English NHS: a mixed methods study of cervical screening. *BMJ Open* 9:4, e024156. [[Crossref](#)]
628. Nikolaj Malchow-Møller, Jakob Roland Munch, Jan Rose Skaksen. 2019. Do Foreign Experts Increase the Productivity of Domestic Firms?. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 121:2, 517-546. [[Crossref](#)]
629. Dov H. Levin. 2019. A Vote for Freedom? The Effects of Partisan Electoral Interventions on Regime Type. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 63:4, 839-868. [[Crossref](#)]
630. Emily A. Gallagher, Radhakrishnan Gopalan, Michal Grinstein-Weiss. 2019. The effect of health insurance on home payment delinquency: Evidence from ACA Marketplace subsidies. *Journal of Public Economics* 172, 67-83. [[Crossref](#)]
631. Laura Grant, Christian Langpap. 2019. Private provision of public goods by environmental groups. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116:12, 5334-5340. [[Crossref](#)]

632. A. Cawley, C. O'Donoghue, K. Heanue, R. Hilliard, M. Sheehan. 2019. The impact of agricultural knowledge transfer resources on farm level profitability during the economic recession – a quantitative study. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension* 25:2, 161-177. [[Crossref](#)]
633. Obbey Elamin, Reham Rizk, John Adams. 2019. Private tutoring and parents decision to work more: evidence from Egypt. *Education Economics* 27:2, 132-154. [[Crossref](#)]
634. Sankar Mukhopadhyay. 2019. Legal status and immigrants' educational investment decisions. *Review of Economics of the Household* 17:1, 1-29. [[Crossref](#)]
635. Isak Öhrlund, Mårten Schultzberg, Cajsa Bartusch. 2019. Identifying and estimating the effects of a mandatory billing demand charge. *Applied Energy* 237, 885-895. [[Crossref](#)]
636. Nils aus dem Moore, Philipp Großkurth, Michael Themann. 2019. Multinational corporations and the EU Emissions Trading System: The specter of asset erosion and creeping deindustrialization. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 94, 1-26. [[Crossref](#)]
637. M. Agovino, M. Casaccia, A. Crociata, P.L. Sacco. 2019. European Regional Development Fund and pro-environmental behaviour. The case of Italian separate waste collection. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences* 65, 36-50. [[Crossref](#)]
638. Kelvin Mashisia Shikuku. 2019. Information exchange links, knowledge exposure, and adoption of agricultural technologies in northern Uganda. *World Development* 115, 94-106. [[Crossref](#)]
639. Donal Khosrowi. 2019. TRADE-OFFS BETWEEN EPISTEMIC AND MORAL VALUES IN EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY. *Economics and Philosophy* 35:1, 49-78. [[Crossref](#)]
640. Serena Yu, David Peetz. 2019. Non-Standard Time Wage Premiums and Employment Effects: Evidence from an Australian Natural Experiment. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 57:1, 33-61. [[Crossref](#)]
641. Marek Giebel, Kornelius Kraft. 2019. External Financing Constraints and Firm Innovation. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* 67:1, 91-126. [[Crossref](#)]
642. Tiago Cavalcanti, Daniel Da Mata, Frederik Toscani. 2019. Winning the oil lottery: the impact of natural resource extraction on growth. *Journal of Economic Growth* 24:1, 79-115. [[Crossref](#)]
643. Jonathan Yin hao Huang, Farhan Majid, Mark Daku. 2019. Estimating effects of Uber ride-sharing service on road traffic-related deaths in South Africa: a quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 73:3, 263-271. [[Crossref](#)]
644. Haiying Lin. 2019. Government-Business Partnerships for Radical Eco-Innovation. *Business & Society* 58:3, 533-573. [[Crossref](#)]
645. Cristian Mardones, Rocio Bienzobas. 2019. Ex-post evaluation of clean production agreements in the Chilean industrial sectors. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 213, 808-818. [[Crossref](#)]
646. Ross Hickey, Bradley Minaker, A Abigail Payne. 2019. The Sensitivity of Charitable Giving to the Timing and Salience of Tax Credits. *National Tax Journal* 72:1, 79-110. [[Crossref](#)]
647. Brett R. Gordon, Florian Zettelmeyer, Neha Bhargava, Dan Chapsky. 2019. A Comparison of Approaches to Advertising Measurement: Evidence from Big Field Experiments at Facebook. *Marketing Science* 38:2, 193-225. [[Crossref](#)]
648. Abdul-Hanan Abdallah, Micheal Ayamga, Joseph A. Awuni. 2019. Impact of agricultural credit on farm income under the Savanna and Transitional zones of Ghana. *Agricultural Finance Review* 79:1, 60-84. [[Crossref](#)]

649. Leonardo Rosa, Marcelo Martins, Martin Carnoy. 2019. Achievement gains from reconfiguring early schooling: The case of Brazil's primary education reform. *Economics of Education Review* **68**, 1-12. [[Crossref](#)]
650. Davide Del Prete, Léopold Ghins, Emiliano Magrini, Karl Pauw. 2019. Land consolidation, specialization and household diets: Evidence from Rwanda. *Food Policy* **83**, 139-149. [[Crossref](#)]
651. Aine Seitz McCarthy. 2019. Intimate partner violence and family planning decisions: Experimental evidence from rural Tanzania. *World Development* **114**, 156-174. [[Crossref](#)]
652. Steven Glover, Sam Jones. 2019. Can commercial farming promote rural dynamism in sub-Saharan Africa? Evidence from Mozambique. *World Development* **114**, 110-121. [[Crossref](#)]
653. Daron Acemoglu, Suresh Naidu, Pascual Restrepo, James A. Robinson. 2019. Democracy Does Cause Growth. *Journal of Political Economy* **127**:1, 47-100. [[Crossref](#)]
654. Brian Robert Ssebunya, Ulrich B Morawetz, Christian Schader, Matthias Stolze, Erwin Schmid. 2019. Group membership and certification effects on incomes of coffee farmers in Uganda. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **46**:1, 109-132. [[Crossref](#)]
655. Konrad B Burchardi, Selim Gulesci, Benedetta Lerva, Munshi Sulaiman. 2019. Moral Hazard: Experimental Evidence from Tenancy Contracts\*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **134**:1, 281-347. [[Crossref](#)]
656. Ulrich Schüwer, Claudia Lambert, Felix Noth. 2019. How Do Banks React to Catastrophic Events? Evidence from Hurricane Katrina\*. *Review of Finance* **23**:1, 75-116. [[Crossref](#)]
657. Christelle Dumas, Arnaud Lefranc. 2019. "Sex in Marriage Is a Divine Gift"? Evidence on the Quantity-Quality Trade-off from the Manila Contraceptive Ban. *The World Bank Economic Review* **33**:1, 259-285. [[Crossref](#)]
658. Doris Läpple, Fiona Thorne. 2019. The Role of Innovation in Farm Economic Sustainability: Generalised Propensity Score Evidence from Irish Dairy Farms. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **70**:1, 178-197. [[Crossref](#)]
659. José R. Guardado, Nicolas R. Ziebarth. 2019. WORKER INVESTMENTS IN SAFETY, WORKPLACE ACCIDENTS, AND COMPENSATING WAGE DIFFERENTIALS. *International Economic Review* **60**:1, 133-155. [[Crossref](#)]
660. Melvin Vooren, Carla Haelermans, Wim Groot, Henriëtte Maassen van den Brink. 2019. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ACTIVE LABOR MARKET POLICIES: A META-ANALYSIS. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **33**:1, 125-149. [[Crossref](#)]
661. Qian Wang, Cuiyun Gao, Shuanping Dai. 2019. Effect of the Emissions Trading Scheme on CO2 Abatement in China. *Sustainability* **11**:4, 1055. [[Crossref](#)]
662. Kelvin Mashisia Shikuku, Julius Juma Okello, Kirimi Sindi, Jan W. Low, Margaret Mcewan. 2019. Effect of Farmers' Multidimensional Beliefs on Adoption of Biofortified Crops: Evidence from Sweetpotato Farmers in Tanzania. *The Journal of Development Studies* **55**:2, 227-242. [[Crossref](#)]
663. JESSICA GOTTLIEB, KATRINA KOSEC. 2019. The Countervailing Effects of Competition on Public Goods Provision: When Bargaining Inefficiencies Lead to Bad Outcomes. *American Political Science Review* **113**:1, 88-107. [[Crossref](#)]
664. Kelly W. Jones, Sophie Avila Foucat, Erin C. Pischke, Jacob Salcone, David Torrez, Theresa Selfa, Kathleen E. Halvorsen. 2019. Exploring the connections between participation in and benefits from



payments for hydrological services programs in Veracruz State, Mexico. *Ecosystem Services* **35**, 32–42. [[Crossref](#)]

665. Timothy Simcoe, Maryaline Catillon, Paul Gertler. 2019. Who benefits most in disease management programs: Improving target efficiency. *Health Economics* **28**:2, 189–203. [[Crossref](#)]
666. Johan Blomquist, Valerio Bartolino, Staffan Waldo. 2019. Price premiums for eco-labelled seafood: effects of the MSC certification suspension in the Baltic Sea cod fishery. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **71**. . [[Crossref](#)]
667. Susan P. Sparkes, Rifat Arun, Till Bärnighausen. 2019. The impact of the Family Medicine Model on patient satisfaction in Turkey: Panel analysis with province fixed effects. *PLOS ONE* **14**:1, e0210563. [[Crossref](#)]
668. Yu-Chin Hsu, Martin Huber, Tsung-Chih Lai. 2019. Nonparametric estimation of natural direct and indirect effects based on inverse probability weighting. *Journal of Econometric Methods* **8**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
669. Martin Huber, Kaspar Wüthrich. 2019. Local Average and Quantile Treatment Effects Under Endogeneity: A Review. *Journal of Econometric Methods* **8**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
670. Vijesh V. Krishna, Lagesh M. Aravalath, Surjit Vikraman. 2019. Does caste determine farmer access to quality information?. *PLOS ONE* **14**:1, e0210721. [[Crossref](#)]
671. Mira Johri, Marie-Pierre Sylvestre, Georges Karna Koné, Dinesh Chandra, S. V. Subramanian. 2019. Effects of improved drinking water quality on early childhood growth in rural Uttar Pradesh, India: A propensity-score analysis. *PLOS ONE* **14**:1, e0209054. [[Crossref](#)]
672. Diana Lopez-Avila. 2019. Child discipline and social programs: evidence from Colombia. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* **11**:1, 15–42. [[Crossref](#)]
673. Martin Falk, Eva Hagsten. 2019. Short-run impact of the flight departure tax on air travel. *International Journal of Tourism Research* **21**:1, 37–44. [[Crossref](#)]
674. Luigi Grossi, Sven Heim, Kai Hüschelrath, Michael Waterson. Electricity Market Integration and the Impact of Unilateral Policy Reforms 97–122. [[Crossref](#)]
675. Melissa Jonson-Reid, Chien-Jen Chiang. Problems in Understanding Program Efficacy in Child Welfare 349–377. [[Crossref](#)]
676. Stephen Taylor. How Can Learning Inequalities be Reduced? Lessons Learnt from Experimental Research in South Africa 321–336. [[Crossref](#)]
677. Aminou Arouna, Aristide K. A. Akpa. Water Management Technology for Adaptation to Climate Change in Rice Production: Evidence of Smart-Valley Approach in West Africa 211–227. [[Crossref](#)]
678. Rudy Douven, Laura van Geest, Sander Gerritsen, Egbert Jongen, Arjan Lejour. Microdata and Policy Evaluation at CPB 203–219. [[Crossref](#)]
679. Geraint Johnes, Jill Johnes. Panel Data in Educational Research 467–493. [[Crossref](#)]
680. Taotao Deng, Yukun Hu, Mulan Ma. 2019. Regional policy and tourism: A quasi-natural experiment. *Annals of Tourism Research* **74**, 1–16. [[Crossref](#)]
681. Markus O. Kukkonen, Ilpo Tammi. 2019. Systematic reassessment of Laos' protected area network. *Biological Conservation* **229**, 142–151. [[Crossref](#)]
682. Nicholas Faulkner, Bradley Jorgensen, Georgina Koufariotis. 2019. Can behavioural interventions increase citizens' use of e-government? Evidence from a quasi-experimental trial. *Government Information Quarterly* **36**:1, 61–68. [[Crossref](#)]

683. Marcelo Bianconi, Chih Ming Tan. 2019. Evaluating the instantaneous and medium-run impact of mergers and acquisitions on firm values. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **59**, 71-87. [[Crossref](#)]
684. Wen-Chi Liao, Daxuan Zhao. 2019. The selection and quantile treatment effects on the economic returns of green buildings. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **74**, 38-48. [[Crossref](#)]
685. Bryan Dufour. 2019. Social impact measurement: What can impact investment practices and the policy evaluation paradigm learn from each other?. *Research in International Business and Finance* **47**, 18-30. [[Crossref](#)]
686. WONKYU SHIN, DUKGEUN AHN. 2019. Trade Gains from Legal Rulings in the WTO Dispute Settlement System. *World Trade Review* **18**:1, 1-31. [[Crossref](#)]
687. Stefano M. Iacus, Gary King, Giuseppe Porro. 2019. A Theory of Statistical Inference for Matching Methods in Causal Research. *Political Analysis* **27**:1, 46-68. [[Crossref](#)]
688. Alexander Bohnert, Albrecht Fritzsche, Shirley Gregor. 2019. Digital agendas in the insurance industry: the importance of comprehensive approaches†. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance - Issues and Practice* **44**:1, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
689. Shaun Larcom, Luca A. Panzone, Timothy Swanson. 2019. Follow the Leader? Testing for the Internalization of Law. *The Journal of Legal Studies* **48**:1, 217-244. [[Crossref](#)]
690. Michael C. Knaus, Steffen Otterbach. 2019. WORK HOUR MISMATCH AND JOB MOBILITY: ADJUSTMENT CHANNELS AND RESOLUTION RATES. *Economic Inquiry* **57**:1, 227-242. [[Crossref](#)]
691. David Derichs, Teemu Malmi, Christian Schnieder. 2019. The Effect of Dialogue and Relative Performance Reports on Professionals' Productivity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
692. Ross D. Hickey, Bradley Minaker, A. Abigail Payne. 2019. The Sensitivity of Charitable Giving to the Timing and Salience of Tax Credits. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
693. Francesca Volo, Alessandra Drigo, Bruna Zolin, Domenico Sartore. 2019. European Social Fund's Lifelong Learning and Regional Development: A Case Study. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
694. Senakpon F. A. Dedehouanou, Luca Tiberti, Hilaire Houeninvo, Djohodo In&egrave;s Monwanou. 2019. Working while Studying: Employment Premium or Penalty for Youth in Benin?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
695. Ashesh Rambachan, Neil Shephard. 2019. A Nonparametric Dynamic Causal Model for Macroeconometrics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
696. Anup Karan, Ajay Mahal. 2019. The Impact of Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana on Female Labour Force Participation in India: A Matched Difference-in-Differences Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
697. Zach Raff, Andrew Meyer. 2019. CAFOs and Surface Water Quality: Evidence from the Proliferation of Large Farms in Wisconsin. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
698. Alessandra Garbero, Bezawit Beyene Chichaibelu. 2019. IFAD Impact Assessment – Participatory Small Irrigation Development Programme I (Pasidp I): Results From a High Frequency Data Collection – Ethiopia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
699. Gustav Agneman. 2019. Economic Rationales for Secession: The Role of Regional Redistribution in Moderating Independence Aspirations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

700. Hwa-Young Lee, Jongho Heo, Hyeonseok Koh. 2019. Effect of a comprehensive program on maternal and child healthcare service in Battambang, Cambodia: A multivariate difference-in-difference analysis. *Journal of Global Health Science* 1. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
701. Gabriela Simonet, Julie Subervie, Driss Ezzine-de-Blas, Marina Cromberg, Amy E. Duchelle. 2019. Effectiveness of a REDD+ Project in Reducing Deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 101:1, 211-229. [\[Crossref\]](#)
702. Sven Neelsen, Supon Limwattananon, Owen O'Donnell, Eddy van Doorslaer. 2019. Universal health coverage: A (social insurance) job half done?. *World Development* 113, 246-258. [\[Crossref\]](#)
703. Roy Y. Chan. 2019. How Does the 15 to Finish Initiative Affect Academic Outcomes of Low-Income, First-Generation Students? Evidence from a College Promise Program in Indiana. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
704. 2019. OUP accepted manuscript. *Journal Of Refugee Studies* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
705. Nicolaj Mühlbach. 2019. Tree-Based Methods: Consequences of Moving the US Embassy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
706. . References 271-292. [\[Crossref\]](#)
707. Laura Panattoni, Tracy A. Lieu, Jinani Jayasekera, Suzanne O'Neill, Jeanne S. Mandelblatt, Ruth Etzioni, Charles E. Phelps, Scott D. Ramsey. 2019. The impact of gene expression profile testing on confidence in chemotherapy decisions and prognostic expectations. *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment* 173:2, 417-427. [\[Crossref\]](#)
708. J. L. Jiménez, J. Perdiguerro. Difference-in-Difference 551-555. [\[Crossref\]](#)
709. Pingping Wang, Wendong Zhang, Minghao Li, Yijun Han. 2019. Does Fertilizer Education Program Increase the Technical Efficiency of Chemical Fertilizer Use? Evidence from Wheat Production in China. *Sustainability* 11:2, 543. [\[Crossref\]](#)
710. Retsef Levi, Manoj Rajan, Somya Singhvi, Yanchong Zheng. 2019. Improving Farmers' Income on Online Agri-Platforms: Theory and Field Implementation of a Two-Stage Auction. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
711. Jiang Cheng, Travis Chow, Tzuting Lin, Jeffrey Ng. 2019. The Effect of Corporate Taxation on Loss Provisioning of Property-Casualty Insurers: Evidence from the Adoption of SSAP 101. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
712. Chunrong Ai, Lukang Huang, Zheng Zhang. 2019. Efficient Estimation of Counterfactual Distributions and Testing Distributional Treatment Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
713. Andrii Babii, Rohit Kumar. 2019. Isotonic Regression Discontinuity Designs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
714. Diego Escobari, Gary A. Hoover. 2019. Evo Morales and Electoral Fraud in Bolivia: A Natural Experiment Estimate. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
715. Amirhossein Fard, Siamak Javadi, Incheol Kim. 2019. Environmental Regulation and the Cost of Bank Loans: International Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [\[Crossref\]](#)
716. Hongli Fan, Qingyue Yan, Peter C. Coyte, Wenguang Yu. 2019. Does Public Health Insurance Coverage Lead to Better Health Outcomes? Evidence From Chinese Adults. *INQUIRY: The Journal of Health Care Organization, Provision, and Financing* 56, 004695801984200. [\[Crossref\]](#)

717. Mario Sanò, Patrizia Dutto, Stefano D'Anna, Carla Rognoni. 2019. Can a Different Formulation of Vitamin D3 Allow Savings? An Analysis From an Italian Regional Perspective. *Health Services Research and Managerial Epidemiology* **6**, 233339281986188. [[Crossref](#)]
718. Manuela Deidda, Claudia Geue, Noemi Kreif, Ruth Dundas, Emma McIntosh. 2019. A framework for conducting economic evaluations alongside natural experiments. *Social Science & Medicine* **220**, 353-361. [[Crossref](#)]
719. Domenico Rossignoli, Federico Trombetta. 2019. Ora et Guberna. The Economic Impact of Benedict's Rule in Medieval England. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
720. Marcel Olbert. 2019. Loss or Lost? Economic Consequences of Internal Capital Markets in Business Groups. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
721. Malka Guillot. 2019. Who Paid the French 75% Tax on Millionaires? Effects on Top Wage Earners and Their Employers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
722. Getaw Tadesse, Tadiwos Zewdie. 2019. Grants vs. credits for improving the livelihoods of ultra-poor: Evidence from Ethiopia. *World Development* **113**, 320-329. [[Crossref](#)]
723. Damian Clarke. 2019. A convenient omitted variable bias formula for treatment effect models. *Economics Letters* **174**, 84-88. [[Crossref](#)]
724. Joshua D. Rauh, Ryan Shyu. 2019. Behavioral Response to State Income Taxation of High Earners: Evidence from California. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
725. Arthur Petit-Romec. 2019. Stakeholder Orientation and Managerial Incentives: Evidence From a Natural Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **19** . [[Crossref](#)]
726. Kraig Delana, Sarang Deo, Kamalini Ramdas, Ganesh Babu, Thulasiraj Ravilla. 2019. Multichannel Delivery in Healthcare: The Impact of Telemedicine Centers in Southern India. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **369** . [[Crossref](#)]
727. Nicholas J. Marantz, Huixin Zheng. 2018. Exclusionary Zoning and the Limits of Judicial Impact. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* **110**, 0739456X1881492. [[Crossref](#)]
728. George S. Ford. 2018. Regulation and investment in the U.S. telecommunications industry. *Applied Economics* **50**:56, 6073-6084. [[Crossref](#)]
729. Daniel Morales Martínez, Alexandre Gori Maia. 2018. The Impacts of Cash Transfers on Subjective Wellbeing and Poverty: The Case of Colombia. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* **39**:4, 616-633. [[Crossref](#)]
730. Huasheng Gao, Huai Zhang, Jin Zhang. 2018. Employee turnover likelihood and earnings management: evidence from the inevitable disclosure doctrine. *Review of Accounting Studies* **23**:4, 1424-1470. [[Crossref](#)]
731. Melissa A. Romaine, Maria L. Alva, Allison E. Witman, Joseph K. Acquah, Thomas J. Hoerger. 2018. Impact of Financial Incentives on Service Use, Spending, and Health in Medicaid. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* **55**:6, 875-886. [[Crossref](#)]
732. Muhammad Asali, Norberto Pignatti, Sophiko Skhirtladze. 2018. Employment discrimination in a former Soviet Union Republic: Evidence from a field experiment. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **46**:4, 1294-1309. [[Crossref](#)]
733. Maria Ferreira, Andries de Grip, Rolf van der Velden. 2018. Does informal learning at work differ between temporary and permanent workers? Evidence from 20 OECD countries. *Labour Economics* **55**, 18-40. [[Crossref](#)]

734. Nebojša Stojčić, Perica Vojinić, Zoran Aralica. 2018. Trade liberalization and export transformation in new EU member states. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* **47**, 114-126. [[Crossref](#)]
735. Vincenzo Bove, Leandro Elia. 2018. Economic Development in Peacekeeping Host Countries. *CESifo Economic Studies* **64**:4, 712-728. [[Crossref](#)]
736. In-Mu Haw, Bingbing Hu, Donghui Wu, Xu Zhang. 2018. Having a Finger in the Pie: Labor Power and Corporate Payout Policy. *Financial Management* **47**:4, 993-1027. [[Crossref](#)]
737. Eric J. Brunner, Mark D. Robbins, Bill Simonsen. 2018. Information, Tax Salience, and Support for School Bond Referenda. *Public Budgeting & Finance* **38**:4, 52-73. [[Crossref](#)]
738. Haina Shi, Xin Zhang, Jing Zhou. 2018. Cross-listing and CSR performance: evidence from AH shares. *Frontiers of Business Research in China* **12**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
739. Fuxiu Jiang, Xiaojia Zheng, Wei Tang. 2018. Non-family chair and corporate performance. *Frontiers of Business Research in China* **12**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
740. Laura Ravazzini. 2018. Childcare and maternal part-time employment: a natural experiment using Swiss cantons. *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics* **154**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
741. George Ford. 2018. A Counterfactual Impact Analysis of Fair Use Policy on Copyright Related Industries in Singapore: A Critical Review. *Laws* **7**:4, 34. [[Crossref](#)]
742. Francis Petterini, Diogo Signor, Pedro Santos. 2018. O limitrofe do horário de verão: análises quase-experimentais do consumo de energia elétrica na Bahia e no Tocantins. *Nova Economia* **28**:3, 943-964. [[Crossref](#)]
743. B Alexander Simmons, Kerrie A Wilson, Raymundo Marcos-Martinez, Brett A Bryan, Oakes Holland, Elizabeth A Law. 2018. Effectiveness of regulatory policy in curbing deforestation in a biodiversity hotspot. *Environmental Research Letters* **13**:12, 124003. [[Crossref](#)]
744. Anthony Cawley, Cathal O'Donoghue, Kevin Heanue, Rachel Hilliard, Maura Sheehan, Spiro Stefanou. 2018. The Impact of Extension Services on Farm-level Income: An Instrumental Variable Approach to Combat Endogeneity Concerns. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* **40**:4, 585-612. [[Crossref](#)]
745. Amanda R. Markovitz, Eirin B. Haug, Julie Horn, Abigail Fraser, Corrie Macdonald-Wallis, Kate Tilling, Eric B. Rimm, Stacey A. Missmer, Paige L. Williams, Pål R. Romundstad, Bjørn O. Åsvold, Janet W. Rich-Edwards. 2018. Does pregnancy alter life-course lipid trajectories? Evidence from the HUNT Study in Norway. *Journal of Lipid Research* **59**:12, 2403-2412. [[Crossref](#)]
746. Peng Ding, Luke Keele. 2018. Rank tests in unmatched clustered randomized trials applied to a study of teacher training. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **12**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
747. Annette N. Brown, Benjamin Douglas Kuflick Wood. 2018. Which tests not witch hunts: a diagnostic approach for conducting replication research. *Economics* **12**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
748. Nikolay Angelov, Marcus Eliason. 2018. Wage subsidies targeted to jobseekers with disabilities: subsequent employment and disability retirement. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy* **7**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
749. Rüdiger Wapler, Daniel Werner, Katja Wolf. 2018. Active labour market policies in Germany: do regional labour markets benefit?. *Applied Economics* **50**:51, 5561-5578. [[Crossref](#)]
750. Priscilla Wainaina, Songporne Tongruksawattana, Matin Qaim. 2018. Synergies between Different Types of Agricultural Technologies in the Kenyan Small Farm Sector. *The Journal of Development Studies* **54**:11, 1974-1990. [[Crossref](#)]



751. Stephen G. West. 2018. Opportunities and Issues in Modeling Intensive Longitudinal Data: Learning from the COGITO Project. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* **53**:6, 777-781. [[Crossref](#)]
752. Manuel C. Voelkle, Christian Gische, Charles C. Driver, Ulman Lindenberger. 2018. The Role of Time in the Quest for Understanding Psychological Mechanisms. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* **53**:6, 782-805. [[Crossref](#)]
753. Yan Song, Douglas Barthold. 2018. The effects of state-level pharmacist regulations on generic substitution of prescription drugs. *Health Economics* **27**:11, 1717-1737. [[Crossref](#)]
754. Guy David, Philip Saynisch, Spencer Luster, Aaron Smith-McLallen, Ravi Chawla. 2018. The impact of patient-centered medical homes on medication adherence?. *Health Economics* **27**:11, 1805-1820. [[Crossref](#)]
755. Robert Huber, Martha Bakker, Alfons Balmann, Thomas Berger, Mike Bithell, Calum Brown, Adrienne Grêt-Regamey, Hang Xiong, Quang Bao Le, Gabriele Mack, Patrick Meyfroidt, James Millington, Birgit Müller, J. Gareth Polhill, Zhanli Sun, Roman Seidl, Christian Troost, Robert Finger. 2018. Representation of decision-making in European agricultural agent-based models. *Agricultural Systems* **167**, 143-160. [[Crossref](#)]
756. Allen Blackman, Peter Veit. 2018. Titled Amazon Indigenous Communities Cut Forest Carbon Emissions. *Ecological Economics* **153**, 56-67. [[Crossref](#)]
757. Patrick Fleming, Erik Lichtenberg, David A. Newburn. 2018. Evaluating impacts of agricultural cost sharing on water quality: Additionality, crowding In, and slippage. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **92**, 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
758. J. Tyler Leverty, Martin F. Grace. 2018. Do elections delay regulatory action?. *Journal of Financial Economics* **130**:2, 409-427. [[Crossref](#)]
759. Wameq A. Raza, Ellen Van de Poel, Tom Van Ourti. 2018. Impact and spill-over effects of an asset transfer program on child undernutrition: Evidence from a randomized control trial in Bangladesh. *Journal of Health Economics* **62**, 105-120. [[Crossref](#)]
760. Philipp Meinen, Horst Raff. 2018. International trade and retail market performance and structure: Theory and empirical evidence. *Journal of International Economics* **115**, 99-114. [[Crossref](#)]
761. Zan Zhang, Lin Liu, Hao Wang, Jiuyong Li, Daning Hu, Jiaqi Yan, Rene Algesheimer, Markus Meierer. 2018. Collective behavior learning by differentiating personal preference from peer influence. *Knowledge-Based Systems* **159**, 233-243. [[Crossref](#)]
762. R. Launois, J.-B. Trouiller, E. Cabout. 2018. Comment mesurer l'efficacité en vie réelle ?. *Annales Pharmaceutiques Françaises* **76**:6, 421-435. [[Crossref](#)]
763. Elena Revilla, Beatriz Rodríguez-Prado. 2018. Bulding ambidexterity through creativity mechanisms: Contextual drivers of innovation success. *Research Policy* **47**:9, 1611-1625. [[Crossref](#)]
764. Martin Gustafsson, Stephen Taylor. 2018. Treating Schools to a New Administration: Evidence of the Impact of Better Practices in the System-Level Administration of Schools. *Journal of African Economies* **27**:5, 515-537. [[Crossref](#)]
765. Hiroshi Kanasugi, Koichi Ushijima. 2018. The impact of a high-speed railway on residential land prices. *Papers in Regional Science* **97**:4, 1305-1335. [[Crossref](#)]
766. Jeong-ha Cath Oh, Zhiqiang Eric Zheng, Indranil R. Bardhan. 2018. Sooner or Later? Health Information Technology, Length of Stay, and Readmission Risk. *Production and Operations Management* **27**:11, 2038-2053. [[Crossref](#)]

767. Eduardo Cavallo, Gabriel Sánchez, Patricio Valenzuela. 2018. Gone with the wind: Demographic transitions and domestic saving. *Review of Development Economics* **22**:4, 1744-1764. [[Crossref](#)]
768. Tobias Brändle, Laszlo Goerke. 2018. The one constant: a causal effect of collective bargaining on employment growth? Evidence from German linked-employer-employee data. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* **65**:5, 445-478. [[Crossref](#)]
769. Mathieu Despard, Michal Grinstein-Weiss, Anna deRuyter, Shenyang Guo, Jane E. Oliphant, Terri Friedline. 2018. Effects of a Randomized Tax-Time Savings Intervention on Savings Account Ownership Among Low- and Moderate-Income Households. *Journal of Financial Counseling and Planning* **29**:2, 219-233. [[Crossref](#)]
770. Jianxin Guo, Songqing Jin, Lei Chen, Jichun Zhao. 2018. Impacts of Distance Education on Agricultural Performance and Household Income: Micro-Evidence from Peri-Urban Districts in Beijing. *Sustainability* **10**:11, 3945. [[Crossref](#)]
771. Riccardo D'Alberto, Matteo Zavalloni, Meri Raggi, Davide Viaggi. 2018. AES Impact Evaluation With Integrated Farm Data: Combining Statistical Matching and Propensity Score Matching. *Sustainability* **10**:11, 4320. [[Crossref](#)]
772. Umberto Filotto, Caterina Lucarelli, Nicoletta Marinelli. 2018. Nudge of shared information responsibilities: a meso-economic perspective of the Italian consumer credit reform. *Mind & Society* **17**:1-2, 1-14. [[Crossref](#)]
773. Md. Sadique Rahman, George W. Norton, M. Harun-Ar Rashid. 2018. Economic impacts of integrated pest management on vegetables production in Bangladesh. *Crop Protection* **113**, 6-14. [[Crossref](#)]
774. Mónica M. Jaime Torres, Fredrik Carlsson. 2018. Direct and spillover effects of a social information campaign on residential water-savings. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **92**, 222-243. [[Crossref](#)]
775. Suhyun Jung, Stephen Polasky. 2018. Partnerships to prevent deforestation in the Amazon. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **92**, 498-516. [[Crossref](#)]
776. Julius Manda, Cornelis Gardebroek, Elias Kuntashula, Arega D. Alene. 2018. Impact of improved maize varieties on food security in Eastern Zambia: A doubly robust analysis. *Review of Development Economics* **22**:4, 1709-1728. [[Crossref](#)]
777. Carlos L. Muñoz Brenes, Kelly W. Jones, Peter Schlesinger, Juan Robalino, Lee Vierling. 2018. The impact of protected area governance and management capacity on ecosystem function in Central America. *PLOS ONE* **13**:10, e0205964. [[Crossref](#)]
778. Stephan Stahlschmidt, Sybille Hinze. 2018. The Dynamically Changing Publication Universe as a Reference Point in National Impact Evaluation: A Counterfactual Case Study on the Chinese Publication Growth. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics* **3**. . [[Crossref](#)]
779. Shirley Pereira de Mesquita, Wallace Patrick Santos de Farias Souza. 2018. Child labor and family structure: the role of divorce. *International Journal of Social Economics* **45**:10, 1453-1468. [[Crossref](#)]
780. Sebastien Pouliot, H. Holly Wang. 2018. Information, Incentives, and Government Intervention for Food Safety. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* **10**:1, 83-103. [[Crossref](#)]
781. Thiagu Ranganathan, Ram Ranjan, Deepa Pradhan. 2018. Water scarcity and livelihoods in Bihar and West Bengal, India. *Oxford Development Studies* **46**:4, 497-518. [[Crossref](#)]

782. Bethany Shockley. 2018. Competence and Electability: Exploring the Limitations on Female Candidates in Qatar. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 39:4, 467-489. [[Crossref](#)]
783. Tao Chen, Yuanyuan Ji, Yahong Zhou, Pingfang Zhu. 2018. Testing Conditional Mean Independence Under Symmetry. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 36:4, 615-627. [[Crossref](#)]
784. Ashok K. Mishra, Anjani Kumar, Pramod K. Joshi, Alwin D'Souza. 2018. Cooperatives, contract farming, and farm size: The case of tomato producers in Nepal. *Agribusiness* 34:4, 865-886. [[Crossref](#)]
785. Per G. Fredriksson, Jim R. Wollscheid. 2018. Legal origins and environmental policies: evidence from OECD and developing countries. *Letters in Spatial and Resource Sciences* 11:3, 369-375. [[Crossref](#)]
786. Felipe Barrera-Osorio, Sandra García, Catherine Rodríguez, Fabio Sánchez, Mateo Arbeláez. 2018. Concentrating efforts on low-performing schools: Impact estimates from a quasi-experimental design. *Economics of Education Review* 66, 73-91. [[Crossref](#)]
787. Rachel Ong, Toan Nguyen, Garth Kendall. 2018. The impact of intergenerational financial transfers on health and wellbeing outcomes: A longitudinal study. *Social Science & Medicine* 214, 179-186. [[Crossref](#)]
788. George S. Ford. 2018. Is faster better? Quantifying the relationship between broadband speed and economic growth. *Telecommunications Policy* 42:9, 766-777. [[Crossref](#)]
789. Gadam Djal Gadam, Armand Mboutchouang Kountchou, Abdelkrim Araar. 2018. The impact of oil revenues on wellbeing in Chad. *Environment and Development Economics* 23:5, 591-613. [[Crossref](#)]
790. Juergen Jung, Vinish Shrestha. 2018. THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND COLLEGE ENROLLMENT DECISIONS. *Economic Inquiry* 56:4, 1980-2009. [[Crossref](#)]
791. Mark Olfson, Melanie Wall, Colleen L. Barry, Christine Mauro, Ramin Mojtabai. 2018. Effects of the Affordable Care Act on Private Insurance Coverage and Treatment of Behavioral Health Conditions in Young Adults. *American Journal of Public Health* 108:10, 1352-1354. [[Crossref](#)]
792. Chris Florackis, Sushil Sainani. 2018. How do chief financial officers influence corporate cash policies?. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 52, 168-191. [[Crossref](#)]
793. Guy Stecklov, Alexander Weinreb, Calogero Carletto. 2018. Can incentives improve survey data quality in developing countries?: results from a field experiment in India. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 181:4, 1033-1056. [[Crossref](#)]
794. George S. Ford. 2018. Net Neutrality and Investment in the US: A Review of Evidence from the 2018 Restoring Internet Freedom Order. *Review of Network Economics* 17:3, 175-205. [[Crossref](#)]
795. Jorge H.N. Viana, Antonio Vinicius Barbosa, Breno Sampaio. 2018. Does the World Cup get the economic ball rolling? Evidence from a synthetic control approach. *Economia* 19:3, 330-349. [[Crossref](#)]
796. José I. Castillo-Manzano, Lourdes López-Valpuesta, Antonio Sánchez-Braza. 2018. When the mall is in the airport: Measuring the effect of the airport mall on passengers' consumer behavior. *Journal of Air Transport Management* 72, 32-38. [[Crossref](#)]
797. John Mullahy. 2018. Individual results may vary: Inequality-probability bounds for some health-outcome treatment effects. *Journal of Health Economics* 61, 151-162. [[Crossref](#)]
798. Florian Szücs. 2018. Research subsidies, industry-university cooperation and innovation. *Research Policy* 47:7, 1256-1266. [[Crossref](#)]
799. Majid Abdi, Preet S. Aulakh. 2018. Internationalization and performance: Degree, duration, and scale of operations. *Journal of International Business Studies* 49:7, 832-857. [[Crossref](#)]

800. Musah Khalid, John Serieux. 2018. Uptake of voluntary health insurance and its impact on health care utilization in Ghana. *Health Policy and Planning* **33**:7, 861-869. [[Crossref](#)]
801. Wanglin Ma, Alan Renwick, Kathryn Bicknell. 2018. Higher Intensity, Higher Profit? Empirical Evidence from Dairy Farming in New Zealand. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **69**:3, 739-755. [[Crossref](#)]
802. Lutz Bellmann, Marco Caliendo, Stefan Tübbicke. 2018. The Post-Reform Effectiveness of the New German Start-Up Subsidy for the Unemployed. *LABOUR* **32**:3, 293-319. [[Crossref](#)]
803. Irina Heimbach, Oliver Hinz. 2018. The Impact of Sharing Mechanism Design on Content Sharing in Online Social Networks. *Information Systems Research* **29**:3, 592-611. [[Crossref](#)]
804. Adam C. Landon, Richard T. Woodward, Gerard T. Kyle, Ronald A. Kaiser. 2018. Evaluating the efficacy of an information-based residential outdoor water conservation program. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **195**, 56-65. [[Crossref](#)]
805. Rui Li, Jia Xu, Mingshan Zhou, Tianyu Wang. 2018. Advance or face. *Chinese Management Studies* **12**:3, 620-633. [[Crossref](#)]
806. Alberto Abadie, Matias D. Cattaneo. 2018. Econometric Methods for Program Evaluation. *Annual Review of Economics* **10**:1, 465-503. [[Crossref](#)]
807. Ryo Takahashi, Yasuyuki Todo, Yukihiko Funaki. 2018. How Can We Motivate Consumers to Purchase Certified Forest Coffee? Evidence From a Laboratory Randomized Experiment Using Eye-trackers. *Ecological Economics* **150**, 107-121. [[Crossref](#)]
808. Anderson G. Froehlich, Andrea S.S.A. Melo, Breno Sampaio. 2018. Comparing the Profitability of Organic and Conventional Production in Family Farming: Empirical Evidence From Brazil. *Ecological Economics* **150**, 307-314. [[Crossref](#)]
809. Nicolas Grau, Daniel Hojman, Alejandra Mizala. 2018. School closure and educational attainment: Evidence from a market-based system. *Economics of Education Review* **65**, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
810. Allison Nicoletti. 2018. The effects of bank regulators and external auditors on loan loss provisions. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **66**:1, 244-265. [[Crossref](#)]
811. Michael H.R. Erkens, Ying Gan, B. Burcin Yurtoglu. 2018. Not all clawbacks are the same: Consequences of strong versus weak clawback provisions. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **66**:1, 291-317. [[Crossref](#)]
812. Zhaozhao He. 2018. Money held for moving stars: Talent competition and corporate cash holdings. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **51**, 210-234. [[Crossref](#)]
813. Emilia Garcia-Appendini. 2018. Financial distress and competitors' investment. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **51**, 182-209. [[Crossref](#)]
814. Lukas Fervers. 2018. Can public employment schemes break the negative spiral of long-term unemployment, social exclusion and loss of skills? Evidence from Germany. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **67**, 18-33. [[Crossref](#)]
815. Ian Walker, Yu Zhu. 2018. University selectivity and the relative returns to higher education: Evidence from the UK. *Labour Economics* **53**, 230-249. [[Crossref](#)]
816. Andrea Filippetti, Giovanni Cerulli. 2018. Are local public services better delivered in more autonomous regions? Evidence from European regions using a dose-response approach. *Papers in Regional Science* **97**:3, 801-826. [[Crossref](#)]

817. Juan M. Villa. 2018. The continuous treatment effect of an antipoverty program on children's educational attainment: Colombia's Familias en Accion. *Review of Development Economics* **22**:3, 1239-1262. [[Crossref](#)]
818. Mark Olfson, Melanie Wall, Colleen L. Barry, Christine Mauro, Ramin Mojtabai. 2018. Impact Of Medicaid Expansion On Coverage And Treatment Of Low-Income Adults With Substance Use Disorders. *Health Affairs* **37**:8, 1208-1215. [[Crossref](#)]
819. Alexandra Peralta, Scott Swinton, Songqing Jin. 2018. The Secret to Getting Ahead Is Getting Started: Early Impacts of a Rural Development Project. *Sustainability* **10**:8, 2644. [[Crossref](#)]
820. John Herbert Ainembabazi, Tahirou Abdoulaye, Shiferaw Feleke, Arega Alene, Paul M. Dontsop-Nguezet, Pierre Celestin Ndoyisaba, Cyrille Hicintuka, Sylvain Mapatano, Victor Manyong. 2018. Who benefits from which agricultural research-for-development technologies? Evidence from farm household poverty analysis in Central Africa. *World Development* **108**, 28-46. [[Crossref](#)]
821. Angus Deaton, Nancy Cartwright. 2018. Understanding and misunderstanding randomized controlled trials. *Social Science & Medicine* **210**, 2-21. [[Crossref](#)]
822. Bruno Guimarães, Béda Barkokébas Junior, Laura Martins. 2018. Absenteeism of people with disabilities in the construction industry in Brazil. *Work* **60**:3, 411-419. [[Crossref](#)]
823. Massimiliano Agovino, Antonio Garofalo, Angela Mariani. 2018. Institutional quality effects on separate waste collection: some evidence from Italian provinces. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* **61**:9, 1487-1510. [[Crossref](#)]
824. Jason Ansel, Han Hong, and Jessie Li. 2018. OLS and 2SLS in Randomized and Conditionally Randomized Experiments. *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* **238**:3-4, 243-293. [[Crossref](#)]
825. Weihua An, Ying Ding. 2018. The Landscape of Causal Inference: Perspective From Citation Network Analysis. *The American Statistician* **72**:3, 265-277. [[Crossref](#)]
826. Magdalena Smyk, Joanna Tyrowicz, Lucas van der Velde. 2018. A Cautionary Note on the Reliability of the Online Survey Data. *Sociological Methods & Research* **25**, 004912411878253. [[Crossref](#)]
827. Marco Mariani, Fabrizia Mealli. 2018. The Effects of R&D Subsidies to Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises. Evidence from a Regional Program. *Italian Economic Journal* **4**:2, 249-281. [[Crossref](#)]
828. Beth Barto, Jessica Dym Bartlett, Adam Von Ende, Ruth Bodian, Carmen Rosa Noroña, Jessica Griffin, Jenifer Goldman Fraser, Kristine Kinniburgh, Joseph Spinazzola, Crystallina Montagna, Marybeth Todd. 2018. The impact of a statewide trauma-informed child welfare initiative on children's permanency and maltreatment outcomes. *Child Abuse & Neglect* **81**, 149-160. [[Crossref](#)]
829. Zhaoyang Liu, Andreas Kontoleon. 2018. Meta-Analysis of Livelihood Impacts of Payments for Environmental Services Programmes in Developing Countries. *Ecological Economics* **149**, 48-61. [[Crossref](#)]
830. Laure Kuhfuss, Julie Subervie. 2018. Do European Agri-environment Measures Help Reduce Herbicide Use? Evidence From Viticulture in France. *Ecological Economics* **149**, 202-211. [[Crossref](#)]
831. Ben Zou. 2018. The Local Economic Impacts of Military Personnel. *Journal of Labor Economics* **36**:3, 589-621. [[Crossref](#)]
832. Luigi Grossi, Sven Heim, Kai Hüschelrath, Michael Waterson. 2018. Electricity market integration and the impact of unilateral policy reforms. *Oxford Economic Papers* **70**:3, 799-820. [[Crossref](#)]



833. Derek Bruggeman, Patrick Meyfroidt, Eric F. Lambin. 2018. Impact of land-use zoning for forest protection and production on forest cover changes in Bhutan. *Applied Geography* **96**, 153-165. [[Crossref](#)]
834. Donald E. Nichols, Susan G. Haber, Melissa A. Romaine, Suzanne G. Wensky. 2018. Changes in Utilization and Expenditures for Medicare Beneficiaries in Patient-centered Medical Homes. *Medical Care* **1**. [[Crossref](#)]
835. Christine Benesch, Monika Bütler, Katharina E. Hofer. 2018. Transparency in parliamentary voting. *Journal of Public Economics* **163**, 60-76. [[Crossref](#)]
836. Ferit Çobanoğlu, Hakan İmamoğlu. 2018. Balıkesir İlinde Tarımsal Danışmanlık Hizmetinin Etkisinin Değerlendirilmesi. *Harran Tarım ve Gıda Bilimleri Dergisi* **263-274**. [[Crossref](#)]
837. Zoltán Bakucs, Imre Fertő, Ágnes Varga, Zsófia Benedek. 2018. Impact of European Union development subsidies on Hungarian regions. *European Planning Studies* **26:6**, 1121-1136. [[Crossref](#)]
838. Philip Verwimp, Juan Carlos Muñoz-Mora. 2018. Returning Home after Civil War: Food Security and Nutrition among Burundian Households. *The Journal of Development Studies* **54:6**, 1019-1040. [[Crossref](#)]
839. Marco Gui, Andrea Parma, Simona Comi. 2018. Does Public Investment in ICTs Improve Learning Performance? Evidence From Italy. *Policy & Internet* **10:2**, 141-163. [[Crossref](#)]
840. Jana Stoever, John P. Weche. 2018. Environmental Regulation and Sustainable Competitiveness: Evaluating the Role of Firm-Level Green Investments in the Context of the Porter Hypothesis. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **70:2**, 429-455. [[Crossref](#)]
841. Kelly W. Jones, Carlos L. Muñoz Brenes, Xoco A. Shinbrot, Walter López-Báez, Andrómeda Rivera-Castañeda. 2018. The influence of cash and technical assistance on household-level outcomes in payments for hydrological services programs in Chiapas, Mexico. *Ecosystem Services* **31**, 208-218. [[Crossref](#)]
842. Saibal Ghosh. 2018. Banker directors and firm performance: Are family firms different?. *Future Business Journal* **4:1**, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
843. Jéfferson A. Colombo, João F. Caldeira. 2018. The role of taxes and the interdependence among corporate financial policies: Evidence from a natural experiment. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **50**, 402-423. [[Crossref](#)]
844. Larry Fauver, Michael B. McDonald, Alvaro G. Taboada. 2018. Does it pay to treat employees well? International evidence on the value of employee-friendly culture. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **50**, 84-108. [[Crossref](#)]
845. Ying-Ying Lee. 2018. Efficient propensity score regression estimators of multivalued treatment effects for the treated. *Journal of Econometrics* **204:2**, 207-222. [[Crossref](#)]
846. Marcello Bofondi, Luisa Carpinelli, Enrico Sette. 2018. Credit Supply During a Sovereign Debt Crisis. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **16:3**, 696-729. [[Crossref](#)]
847. Samuel Bentolila, Marcel Jansen, Gabriel Jiménez. 2018. When Credit Dries Up: Job Losses in the Great Recession. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **16:3**, 650-695. [[Crossref](#)]
848. Aaron L. Sarvet, Melanie M. Wall, David S. Fink, Emily Greene, Aline Le, Anne E. Boustead, Rosalie Liccardo Pacula, Katherine M. Keyes, Magdalena Cerdá, Sandro Galea, Deborah S. Hasin. 2018. Medical marijuana laws and adolescent marijuana use in the United States: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Addiction* **113:6**, 1003-1016. [[Crossref](#)]

849. Katharina Fellnhöfer. 2018. Narratives boost entrepreneurial attitudes: Making an entrepreneurial career attractive?. *European Journal of Education* 53:2, 218-237. [[Crossref](#)]
850. Wing Wah Tham, Elvira Sojli, Johannes A. Skjeltorp. 2018. Cross-Sided Liquidity Externalities. *Management Science* 64:6, 2901-2929. [[Crossref](#)]
851. Hummy Song, Anita L. Tucker, Karen L. Murrell, David R. Vinson. 2018. Closing the Productivity Gap: Improving Worker Productivity Through Public Relative Performance Feedback and Validation of Best Practices. *Management Science* 64:6, 2628-2649. [[Crossref](#)]
852. Mark A. Andor, Katja M. Fels. 2018. Behavioral Economics and Energy Conservation – A Systematic Review of Non-price Interventions and Their Causal Effects. *Ecological Economics* 148, 178-210. [[Crossref](#)]
853. Kelly Hallberg, Ryan Williams, Andrew Swanlund, Jared Eno. 2018. Short Comparative Interrupted Time Series Using Aggregate School-Level Data in Education Research. *Educational Researcher* 47:5, 295-306. [[Crossref](#)]
854. James H. Derzon. 2018. Challenges, Opportunities, and Methods for Large-Scale Evaluations. *Evaluation & the Health Professions* 41:2, 321-345. [[Crossref](#)]
855. Nicolas R. Ziebarth. Social Insurance and Health 57-84. [[Crossref](#)]
856. Alfred DeMaris. 2018. Marriage Advantage in Subjective Well-Being: Causal Effect or Unmeasured Heterogeneity?. *Marriage & Family Review* 54:4, 335-350. [[Crossref](#)]
857. Gustavo Canavire-Bacarreza, Julian Eduardo Diaz-Gutierrez, Merlin M. Hanauer. 2018. Unintended consequences of conservation: Estimating the impact of protected areas on violence in Colombia. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 89, 46-70. [[Crossref](#)]
858. Deepa Wani, Manoj Malhotra. 2018. Does the meaningful use of electronic health records improve patient outcomes?. *Journal of Operations Management* 60:1, 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
859. Igna Bonfrer, Ellen Van de Poel, Emily Gustafsson-Wright, Eddy van Doorslaer. 2018. Voluntary health insurance in Nigeria: Effects on takers and non-takers. *Social Science & Medicine* 205, 55-63. [[Crossref](#)]
860. Jeremy Jelliffe, Boris Bravo-Ureta, C. Deom, David Okello. 2018. Adoption of High-Yielding Groundnut Varieties: The Sustainability of a Farmer-Led Multiplication-Dissemination Program in Eastern Uganda. *Sustainability* 10:5, 1597. [[Crossref](#)]
861. Pauline Givord, Simon Quantin, Corentin Trevien. 2018. A long-term evaluation of the first generation of French urban enterprise zones. *Journal of Urban Economics* 105, 149-161. [[Crossref](#)]
862. Fabio Bertoni, Stefano Lugo. 2018. Detecting abnormal changes in credit default swap spreads using matching-portfolio models. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 90, 146-158. [[Crossref](#)]
863. Tim Pawlowski, Ute Schüttoff, Paul Downward, Michael Lechner. 2018. Can Sport Really Help to Meet the Millennium Development Goals? Evidence From Children in Peru. *Journal of Sports Economics* 19:4, 498-521. [[Crossref](#)]
864. Allen Blackman, Leonard Goff, Marisol Rivera Planter. 2018. Does eco-certification stem tropical deforestation? Forest Stewardship Council certification in Mexico. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 89, 306-333. [[Crossref](#)]
865. Sara Capacci, Mario Mazzocchi, Sergio Brasini. 2018. Estimation of unobservable selection effects in on-line surveys through propensity score matching: An application to public acceptance of healthy eating policies. *PLOS ONE* 13:4, e0196020. [[Crossref](#)]

866. Irene Bayiyana, Aloyce Hepelwa, Elizaphan J. O. Rao, Kenneth Mdadila. 2018. Do Dairy Market Hubs improve smallholder farmers' income? The case of dairy farmers in the Tanga and Morogoro regions of Tanzania. *Agrekon* 57:2, 121-136. [[Crossref](#)]
867. Chan Hang Saing. 2018. Rural electrification in Cambodia: does it improve the welfare of households?. *Oxford Development Studies* 46:2, 147-163. [[Crossref](#)]
868. Domenico Depalo. 2018. Identification issues in the public/private wage gap, with an application to Italy. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 33:3, 435-456. [[Crossref](#)]
869. Xiang Zhang, Douglas E. Faries, Hu Li, James D. Stamey, Guido W. Imbens. 2018. Addressing unmeasured confounding in comparative observational research. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 27:4, 373-382. [[Crossref](#)]
870. Matias D. Cattaneo, Michael Jansson, Whitney K. Newey. 2018. ALTERNATIVE ASYMPTOTICS AND THE PARTIALLY LINEAR MODEL WITH MANY REGRESSORS. *Econometric Theory* 34:2, 277-301. [[Crossref](#)]
871. Daniel Arnold, Tobias Brändle, Laszlo Goerke. 2018. Sickness Absence and Works Councils: Evidence from German Individual and Linked Employer-Employee Data. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* 57:2, 260-295. [[Crossref](#)]
872. David R. Bell, Santiago Gallino, Antonio Moreno. 2018. Offline Showrooms in Omnichannel Retail: Demand and Operational Benefits. *Management Science* 64:4, 1629-1651. [[Crossref](#)]
873. José Cansino, Antonio Sánchez-Braza, Nereyda Espinoza. 2018. Evaluating the Impact of an Active Labour Market Policy on Employment: Short- and Long-Term Perspectives. *Social Sciences* 7:4, 58. [[Crossref](#)]
874. J. Daniel Kim. 2018. Is there a startup wage premium? Evidence from MIT graduates. *Research Policy* 47:3, 637-649. [[Crossref](#)]
875. Madina Kurmangaliyeva. 2018. Missing Rich Offenders: Traffic Accidents and the Impartiality of Justice. *Review of Law & Economics* 14:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
876. Mathieu R. Despard, Samuel Taylor, Chunhui Ren, Blair Russell, Michal Grinstein-Weiss, Ramesh Raghavan. 2018. Effects of a Tax-Time Savings Experiment on Material and Health Care Hardship among Low-Income Filers. *Journal of Poverty* 22:2, 156-178. [[Crossref](#)]
877. Luca Aguzzoni, Benno Buehler, Luca Di Martile, Ron Kemp, Anton Schwarz. 2018. Ex-post Analysis of Mobile Telecom Mergers: The Case of Austria and The Netherlands. *De Economist* 166:1, 63-87. [[Crossref](#)]
878. Hsin-Lu Chang, Yen-Chun Chou, Dai-Yu Wu, Sou-Chein Wu. 2018. Will firm's marketing efforts on owned social media payoff? A quasi-experimental analysis of tourism products. *Decision Support Systems* 107, 13-25. [[Crossref](#)]
879. Timothy Brathwaite, Joan L. Walker. 2018. Causal inference in travel demand modeling (and the lack thereof). *Journal of Choice Modelling* 26, 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
880. Katrin Hussinger, Johannes M.H. Dick, Dirk Czarnitzki. 2018. Ownership concentration and innovativeness of corporate ventures. *Research Policy* 47:2, 527-541. [[Crossref](#)]
881. David Dean, Robert Schmidt, John Pepper, Steven Stern. 2018. The Effects of Vocational Rehabilitation for People with Physical Disabilities. *Journal of Human Capital* 12:1, 1-37. [[Crossref](#)]

882. YINGHUA LI, YUPENG LIN, LIANDONG ZHANG. 2018. Trade Secrets Law and Corporate Disclosure: Causal Evidence on the Proprietary Cost Hypothesis. *Journal of Accounting Research* **56**:1, 265-308. [[Crossref](#)]
883. Anh Ngo, Kai-Wen Cheng, Ce Shang, Jidong Huang, Frank Chaloupka. 2018. Global Evidence on the Association between Cigarette Graphic Warning Labels and Cigarette Smoking Prevalence and Consumption. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **15**:3, 421. [[Crossref](#)]
884. Shaun M. Dougherty. 2018. The Effect of Career and Technical Education on Human Capital Accumulation: Causal Evidence from Massachusetts. *Education Finance and Policy* **13**:2, 119-148. [[Crossref](#)]
885. Jakob Munch, Georg Schaur. 2018. The Effect of Export Promotion on Firm-Level Performance. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **10**:1, 357-387. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
886. Laura Pazzagli, Marie Linder, Mingliang Zhang, Emese Vago, Paul Stang, David Myers, Morten Andersen, Shahram Bahmanyar. 2018. Methods for time-varying exposure related problems in pharmacoepidemiology: An overview. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* **27**:2, 148-160. [[Crossref](#)]
887. Juan Luis Jiménez, Carmen García. 2018. Does local public corruption generate partisan effects on polls?. *Crime, Law and Social Change* **69**:1, 3-23. [[Crossref](#)]
888. Arya Ansari, Robert C. Pianta. 2018. The role of elementary school quality in the persistence of preschool effects. *Children and Youth Services Review* **86**, 120-127. [[Crossref](#)]
889. Zhaoyang Liu, Yazhen Gong, Andreas Kontoleon. 2018. How do Payments for Environmental Services Affect Land Tenure? Theory and Evidence From China. *Ecological Economics* **144**, 195-213. [[Crossref](#)]
890. Rodrigo Arriagada, Adrián Villaseñor, Eliana Rubiano, David Cotacachi, Judith Morrison. 2018. Analysing the impacts of PES programmes beyond economic rationale: Perceptions of ecosystem services provision associated to the Mexican case. *Ecosystem Services* **29**, 116-127. [[Crossref](#)]
891. Johan Blomquist, Staffan Waldo. 2018. Scrapping programmes and ITQs: Labour market outcomes and spill-over effects on non-targeted fisheries in Sweden. *Marine Policy* **88**, 41-47. [[Crossref](#)]
892. DAVID SCHIMMELPFENNIG. 2018. CROP PRODUCTION COSTS, PROFITS, AND ECOSYSTEM STEWARDSHIP WITH PRECISION AGRICULTURE. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* **50**:1, 81-103. [[Crossref](#)]
893. Ggombe Kasim Munyegera, Tomoya Matsumoto. 2018. ICT for financial access: Mobile money and the financial behavior of rural households in Uganda. *Review of Development Economics* **22**:1, 45-66. [[Crossref](#)]
894. Enid M. Katungi, Catherine Larochelle, Josephat R. Mugabo, Robin Buruchara. 2018. The effect of climbing bean adoption on the welfare of smallholder common bean growers in Rwanda. *Food Security* **10**:1, 61-79. [[Crossref](#)]
895. Meg Elkins, Simon Feeny, David Prentice. 2018. Are Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers Associated with Reductions in Poverty and Improvements in Well-being?. *The Journal of Development Studies* **54**:2, 377-393. [[Crossref](#)]
896. Magdalena Cerdá, Aaron L. Sarvet, Melanie Wall, Tianshu Feng, Katherine M. Keyes, Sandro Galea, Deborah S. Hasin. 2018. Medical marijuana laws and adolescent use of marijuana and other substances:

Alcohol, cigarettes, prescription drugs, and other illicit drugs. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* **183**, 62–68. [[Crossref](#)]

897. Kimberly M. Carlson, Robert Heilmayr, Holly K. Gibbs, Praveen Noojipady, David N. Burns, Douglas C. Morton, Nathalie F. Walker, Gary D. Paoli, Claire Kremen. 2018. Effect of oil palm sustainability certification on deforestation and fire in Indonesia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**:1, 121–126. [[Crossref](#)]
898. Fan Li, Kari Lock Morgan, Alan M. Zaslavsky. 2018. Balancing Covariates via Propensity Score Weighting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **113**:521, 390–400. [[Crossref](#)]
899. Ashis Das, Jed Friedman, Eeshani Kandpal. 2018. Does involvement of local NGOs enhance public service delivery? Cautionary evidence from a malaria-prevention program in India. *Health Economics* **27**:1, 172–188. [[Crossref](#)]
900. Samuel Benin, Ephraim Nkonya, Geresom Okecho, José Randriamamonjy, Edward Kato, Geoffrey Lubade, Miriam Kyotalimye. Micro-econometric and Micro-Macro Linked Models: Impact of the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) Program of Uganda—Considering Different Levels of Likely Contamination with the Treatment 85–95. [[Crossref](#)]
901. Carlos A. Flores, Xuan Chen. Econometric Framework 7–12. [[Crossref](#)]
902. Felipe Resende Oliveira, Tatiane Almeida de Menezes, Guilherme Irffi, Guilherme Resende Oliveira. 2018. Bullying effect on student's performance. *Economía* **19**:1, 57–73. [[Crossref](#)]
903. Joscha Märkle-Huß, Stefan Feuerriegel, Dirk Neumann. 2018. Contract durations in the electricity market: Causal impact of 15 min trading on the EPEX SPOT market. *Energy Economics* **69**, 367–378. [[Crossref](#)]
904. Matthew G. Burgess, Michaela Clemence, Grant R. McDermott, Christopher Costello, Steven D. Gaines. 2018. Five rules for pragmatic blue growth. *Marine Policy* **87**, 331–339. [[Crossref](#)]
905. Deborah S Hasin. 2018. US Epidemiology of Cannabis Use and Associated Problems. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **43**:1, 195–212. [[Crossref](#)]
906. Michael J. Peel. 2018. Addressing Unobserved Selection Bias in Accounting Studies: The Bias Minimization Method. *European Accounting Review* **27**:1, 173–183. [[Crossref](#)]
907. Omar Galárraga, Jane Harries, Brendan Maughan-Brown, Diane Cooper, Susan E Short, Mark N Lurie, Abigail Harrison. 2018. The Empower Nudge lottery to increase dual protection use: a proof-of-concept randomised pilot trial in South Africa. *Reproductive Health Matters* **26**:52, 67–80. [[Crossref](#)]
908. Jordi Jofre-Monseny, Maria Sánchez-Vidal, Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal. 2018. Big plant closures and local employment. *Journal of Economic Geography* **18**:1, 163–186. [[Crossref](#)]
909. Lajos Baráth, Imre Fertő, Štefan Bojnec. 2018. Are farms in less favored areas less efficient?. *Agricultural Economics* **49**:1, 3–12. [[Crossref](#)]
910. Alex Krumer, Michael Lechner. 2018. MIDWEEK EFFECT ON SOCCER PERFORMANCE: EVIDENCE FROM THE GERMAN BUNDESLIGA. *Economic Inquiry* **56**:1, 193–207. [[Crossref](#)]
911. Kurt E. Schnier, Robert M. Merion, Nicole Turgeon, David Howard. 2018. SUBSIDIZING ALTRUISM IN LIVING ORGAN DONATION. *Economic Inquiry* **56**:1, 398–423. [[Crossref](#)]
912. Marc H. Meyer, Oleksiy Osiyevskyy, Dirk Libaers, Marcel van Hugten. 2018. Does Product Platforming Pay Off?. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* **35**:1, 66–87. [[Crossref](#)]



913. Daniele Girardi, Walter Meloni, Antonella Stirati. 2018. Persistent Effects of Autonomous Demand Expansions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
914. Han Hong, Michael Leung, Jessie Li. 2018. Inference on Finite Population Treatment Effects Under Limited Overlap. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
915. Martin Olsson, Joacim TTTg. 2018. What is the Cost of Privatization for Workers?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
916. Christina Zhu. 2018. Big Data as a Governance Mechanism. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
917. Alessandro Sola. 2018. The 2015 Refugee Crisis in Germany: Concerns About Immigration and Populism. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
918. Mohamed-Ali Akari, Ramzi Ben-Abdallah, Michhle Breton, Georges Dionne. 2018. The Impact of Central Clearing on the Market for Single-Name Credit Default Swaps. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
919. Sebastian Camarero Garcia. 2018. Inequality of Educational Opportunities and the Role of Learning Intensity: Evidence from a Quasi-Experiment in Germany. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
920. Marie Albertine Djuikom, Guy Lacroix. 2018. Dynamic Causal Effects of Post-Migration Schooling on Labour Market Transitions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
921. Sara Rellstab, Pieter Bakx, Pilar Garcia Gomez, Eddy van Doorslaer. 2018. The Kids are Alright - Labour Market Effects of Unexpected Parental Hospitalisations in the Netherlands. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
922. Frddric Closset, Daniel Urban. 2018. The Balance of Power between Creditors and the Firm: Evidence from German Insolvency Law. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
923. Akos Lada, Diego Aparicio, Michael Bailey. 2018. Predicting Heterogeneous Treatment Effects in Ranking Systems. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
924. Laura Pohlan. 2018. Unemployment and Social Exclusion. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
925. Joshua R Bruce, John M. de Figueiredo, Brian S. Silverman. 2018. Public Contracting for Private Innovation: Government Expertise, Decision Rights, and Performance Outcomes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
926. Felix Larry Essilfie. 2018. Cocoa Agroforestry Technology Adoption and Productivity: An Application of Regression Based Models that Estimate Binary Treatment Effects Under CIA Assumption. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
927. Suleiman Namara, Felix Larry Essilfie, Christabel E Dadzie. 2018. Impact of Labour Intensive Public Works on Youth Employment and Seasonal Migration: Evidence from Ghana. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
928. Oivind Anti Nilsen, Arvid Raknerud, DianaaCristina Iancu. 2018. Public R&D Support and Firmss Performance -- A Panel Data Study. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
929. Felix Larry Essilfie. 2018. Evaluation of Agricultural Technology Interventions: An Application of Propensity Score-Based Stratification and Weighting Approaches. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
930. Massimo Filippini, Lin Zhang. 2018. Impacts of Heat Metering and Efficiency Retrofit Policy on Residential Energy Consumption in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

931. Nils aus dem Moore, Philipp Grosskurth, Michael Themann. 2018. Multinational Corporations and the EU Emissions Trading System: Asset Erosion and Creeping Deindustrialization?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
932. Yingying Fan, Jinchi Lv, Jingbo Wang. 2018. DNN: A Two-Scale Distributional Tale of Heterogeneous Treatment Effect Inference. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
933. John Cawley, David E. Frisvold, Anna Hill, David Jones. 2018. The Impact of the Philadelphia Beverage Tax on Purchases and Consumption by Adults and Children. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
934. Olukorede Abiona, Martin Foureaux Koppensteiner. 2018. Financial Inclusion, Shocks and Poverty: Evidence from the Expansion of Mobile Money in Tanzania. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
935. Anna Grodecka, Seán Kenny, Anders Ögren. 2018. Predictors of Bank Distress: The 1907 Crisis in Sweden. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
936. Tommaso Agasisti, Ekaterina Shibanova, Daria Platonova, Mikhail Lisyutkin. 2018. The Russian Excellence Initiative for Higher Education: An Econometric Evaluation of Short-term Results. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
937. Fernando Eguren Martin, Matias Ossandon Busch, Dennis Reinhardt. 2018. FX Funding Shocks and Cross-Border Lending: Fragmentation Matters. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
938. Daniel Da Mata, Guilherme Resende. 2018. Changing the Climate for Banking: The Economic Effects of Credit in a Climate-Vulnerable Area. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
939. Laura Dague, Joanna Lahey. 2018. Causal Inference Methods: Lessons from Applied Microeconomics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
940. Bernhard Schmidpeter. 2018. The Long-Term Labor Market Effects of Parental Unemployment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
941. Stefano F. Verde. 2018. The Impact of the EU Emissions Trading System on Competitiveness and Carbon Leakage. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
942. Martine Audibert, Jacky Mathonnat, Aurore Pélissier, Xiao Xian Huang. The Impact of the New Rural Cooperative Medical Scheme on Township Hospitals' Utilization and Income Structure in Weifang Prefecture, China 109-121. [[Crossref](#)]
943. Francesca Caselli, Philippe Wingender. 2018. Bunching at 3 Percent: The Maastricht Fiscal Criterion and Government Deficits. *IMF Working Papers* **18**:182, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
944. Zhangfan Cao. 2018. Does Trade Secrets Protection Affect Labor Investment Strategy?: Evidence From the Inevitable Disclosure Doctrine. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
945. Brantly Callaway, Pedro H. C. Sant'Anna. 2018. Difference-in-Differences With Multiple Time Periods and an Application on the Minimum Wage and Employment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
946. Huasheng Gao, Jun Huang. 2018. Employee Firing Costs and Accounting Conservatism: Evidence From Wrongful Discharge Laws. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
947. Dionissi Aliprantis, Mark E. Schweitzer. 2018. Opioids and the Labor Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
948. Aleksandra Peeva. 2018. Did Sanctions Help Putin?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

949. Roy Allen, John Rehbeck. 2018. Latent Complementarity in Bundles Models. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
950. Pedro H. C. Sant'Anna, Jun B. Zhao. 2018. Doubly Robust Difference-in-Differences Estimators. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
951. Matias D. Cattaneo. Multi-valued Treatment Effects 9208-9210. [[Crossref](#)]
952. Carolina Arteaga. 2018. The effect of human capital on earnings: Evidence from a reform at Colombia's top university. *Journal of Public Economics* **157**, 212-225. [[Crossref](#)]
953. John S. Earle, Álmós Telegdy, Gábor Antal. 2018. Foreign Ownership and Wages: Evidence from Hungary, 1986–2008. *ILR Review* **71**:2, 458. [[Crossref](#)]
954. Shamsudeen Abdulai, Abraham Zakariah, Samuel Arkoh Donkoh, Fatih Yildiz. 2018. Adoption of rice cultivation technologies and its effect on technical efficiency in Sagnarigu District of Ghana. *Cogent Food & Agriculture* **4**:1, 1424296. [[Crossref](#)]
955. Marcel Olbert, Peter Severin. 2018. Private Equity and Taxes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
956. Yinchu Zhu, Jelena Bradic. 2018. Significance testing in non-sparse high-dimensional linear models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **12**:2, 3312-3364. [[Crossref](#)]
957. Nikolaos Karampatsas, Tung Duy Nguyen, Dimitris Petmezas. 2018. Terrorism and Corporate Acquisitions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
958. Gyozo Gyongyosi, Emil Verner. 2018. Financial Crisis, Creditor-Debtor Conflict, and Political Extremism. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
959. Karyn Tabor, Kelly W. Jones, Jennifer Hewson, Andriambolantsoa Rasolohery, Andoniaina Rambeloson, Tokihenintsoa Andrianjohaninarivo, Celia A. Harvey. 2017. Evaluating the effectiveness of conservation and development investments in reducing deforestation and fires in Ankeniheny-Zahemena Corridor, Madagascar. *PLOS ONE* **12**:12, e0190119. [[Crossref](#)]
960. Federica Bertamino, Raffaello Bronzini, Marco De Maggio, Davide Revelli. 2017. Regional policies for innovation: the case of technology districts in Italy. *Regional Studies* **51**:12, 1826-1839. [[Crossref](#)]
961. Luca Berchicci, Glen Dowell, Andrew A. King. 2017. Environmental Performance and the Market for Corporate Assets. *Strategic Management Journal* **38**:12, 2444-2464. [[Crossref](#)]
962. Boris Kaiser. 2017. Gender-specific practice styles and ambulatory health care expenditures. *The European Journal of Health Economics* **18**:9, 1157-1179. [[Crossref](#)]
963. Wondwossen Tsegaye, Roberto LaRovere, Germano Mwabu, Girma T. Kassie. 2017. Adoption and farm-level impact of conservation agriculture in Central Ethiopia. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* **19**:6, 2517-2533. [[Crossref](#)]
964. Begoña Cueto, Matías Mayor, Patricia Suárez. 2017. Evaluation of the Spanish flat rate for young self-employed workers. *Small Business Economics* **49**:4, 937-951. [[Crossref](#)]
965. Ruth T. Chepchirchir, Ibrahim Macharia, Alice W. Murage, Charles A. O. Midega, Zeyaur R. Khan. 2017. Impact assessment of push-pull pest management on incomes, productivity and poverty among smallholder households in Eastern Uganda. *Food Security* **9**:6, 1359-1372. [[Crossref](#)]
966. Stefanie P. Herber, Johanna Sophie Quis, Guido Heineck. 2017. Does the transition into daylight saving time affect students' performance?. *Economics of Education Review* **61**, 130-139. [[Crossref](#)]
967. Andy Feng, Georg Graetz. 2017. A question of degree: The effects of degree class on labor market outcomes. *Economics of Education Review* **61**, 140-161. [[Crossref](#)]

968. Naoko Okuyama, Yoji Inaba. 2017. Influence of natural disasters on social engagement and post-disaster well-being: The case of the Great East Japan Earthquake. *Japan and the World Economy* **44**, 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
969. Martina Celidoni, Chiara Dal Bianco, Guglielmo Weber. 2017. Retirement and cognitive decline. A longitudinal analysis using SHARE data. *Journal of Health Economics* **56**, 113-125. [[Crossref](#)]
970. Dimitrios Nikolaou. 2017. Does cyberbullying impact youth suicidal behaviors?. *Journal of Health Economics* **56**, 30-46. [[Crossref](#)]
971. Teresa Briz, Andreas C. Drichoutis, Rodolfo M. Nayga. 2017. Randomization to treatment failure in experimental auctions: The value of data from training rounds. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics* **71**, 56-66. [[Crossref](#)]
972. Anna Minasyan, Peter Nunnenkamp, Katharina Richert. 2017. Does Aid Effectiveness Depend on the Quality of Donors?. *World Development* **100**, 16-30. [[Crossref](#)]
973. Anh Ngo, Kai-Wen Cheng, Frank J. Chaloupka, Ce Shang. 2017. The effect of MPOWER scores on cigarette smoking prevalence and consumption. *Preventive Medicine* **105**, S10-S14. [[Crossref](#)]
974. Martin Lange, Friedhelm Pfeiffer, Gerard J. van den Berg. 2017. Integrating young male refugees: initial evidence from an inclusive soccer project. *Journal for Labour Market Research* **51**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
975. Yannan Hu, Frank J. van Lenthe, Rasmus Hoffmann, Karen van Hedel, Johan P. Mackenbach. 2017. Assessing the impact of natural policy experiments on socioeconomic inequalities in health: how to apply commonly used quantitative analytical methods?. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* **17**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
976. Marie Steele-Adjonon, Dave Weatherspoon. 2017. Double Up Food Bucks program effects on SNAP recipients' fruit and vegetable purchases. *BMC Public Health* **17**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
977. Laura Panattoni, Lily Hurlimann, Caroline Wilson, Meg Durbin, Ming Tai-Seale. 2017. Workflow standardization of a novel team care model to improve chronic care: a quasi-experimental study. *BMC Health Services Research* **17**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
978. Piia Pekola, Ismo Linnosmaa, Hennamari Mikkola. 2017. Assessing the effects of price regulation and freedom of choice on quality: evidence from the physiotherapy market. *Health Economics Review* **7**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
979. Musa Hasen Ahmed, Hiwot Mekonnen Mesfin. 2017. The impact of agricultural cooperatives membership on the wellbeing of smallholder farmers: empirical evidence from eastern Ethiopia. *Agricultural and Food Economics* **5**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
980. Mudit Kapoor, Shamika Ravi. 2017. Elasticity of Intertemporal Substitution in Consumption in the Presence of Inertia: Empirical Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *Management Science* **63**:12, 4188-4200. [[Crossref](#)]
981. Žaneta Rylková, Karel Stelmach, Petr Vlček. 2017. Overall Equipment Effectiveness within Counterfactual Impact Evaluation Concept. *Scientific Annals of Economics and Business* **64**:s1, 29-40. [[Crossref](#)]
982. Jonathan W. Koma, Julie M. Donohue, Colleen L. Barry, Haiden A. Huskamp, Marian Jarlenski. 2017. Medicaid Coverage Expansions and Cigarette Smoking Cessation Among Low-income Adults. *Medical Care* **55**:12, 1023-1029. [[Crossref](#)]
983. Angela Daley. 2017. Income and the mental health of Canadian mothers: Evidence from the Universal Child Care Benefit. *SSM - Population Health* **3**, 674-683. [[Crossref](#)]

984. Peter M. Aronow, Cyrus Samii. 2017. Estimating average causal effects under general interference, with application to a social network experiment. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 11:4. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
985. Lutz Bellmann, Mario Bossler, Hans-Dieter Gerner, Olaf Hübler. 2017. Training and minimum wages: first evidence from the introduction of the minimum wage in Germany. *IZA Journal of Labor Economics* 6:1. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
986. Oleksiy Ivaschenko, Darian Naidoo, David Newhouse, Sonya Sultan. 2017. Can public works programs reduce youth crime? Evidence from Papua New Guinea's Urban Youth Employment Project. *IZA Journal of Development and Migration* 7:1. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
987. Zheng Shen, Marie Parker, Derek Brown, Xiangming Fang. 2017. Effects of public health insurance on labor supply in rural China. *China Agricultural Economic Review* 9:4, 623-642. [\[Crossref\]](#)
988. Marina Tkalec, Ivan Zilic, Vedran Recher. 2017. The effect of film industry on tourism: Game of Thrones and Dubrovnik. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 19:6, 705-714. [\[Crossref\]](#)
989. Marco Di Cintio, Emanuele Grassi. 2017. International mobility and wages: an analysis of Italian Ph.D. graduates. *The Annals of Regional Science* 59:3, 759-791. [\[Crossref\]](#)
990. Dionissi Aliprantis. 2017. Human capital in the inner city. *Empirical Economics* 53:3, 1125-1169. [\[Crossref\]](#)
991. Melissa Jonson-Reid, Brett Drake, Patricia Kohl, Shenyang Guo, Derek Brown, Timothy McBride, Hyunil Kim, Ericka Lewis. 2017. What do we really know about usual care child protective services?. *Children and Youth Services Review* 82, 222-229. [\[Crossref\]](#)
992. Markus Frölich, Martin Huber, Manuel Wiesenfarth. 2017. The finite sample performance of semi- and non-parametric estimators for treatment effects and policy evaluation. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 115, 91-102. [\[Crossref\]](#)
993. Ariel Ben Yishay, Andrew Fraker, Raymond Guiteras, Giordano Palloni, Neil Buddy Shah, Stuart Shirrell, Paul Wang. 2017. Microcredit and willingness to pay for environmental quality: Evidence from a randomized-controlled trial of finance for sanitation in rural Cambodia. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 86, 121-140. [\[Crossref\]](#)
994. Thierry Mayer, Corentin Trevien. 2017. The impact of urban public transportation evidence from the Paris region. *Journal of Urban Economics* 102, 1-21. [\[Crossref\]](#)
995. Carlianne Patrick, Christopher Mothorpe. 2017. Demand for new cities: Property value capitalization of municipal incorporation. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 67, 78-89. [\[Crossref\]](#)
996. Olivier Allais, Pascale Bazoche, Sabrina Teyssier. 2017. Getting more people on the stairs: The impact of point-of-decision prompts. *Social Science & Medicine* 192, 18-27. [\[Crossref\]](#)
997. Hannah Carliner, Qiana L. Brown, Aaron L. Sarvet, Deborah S. Hasin. 2017. Cannabis use, attitudes, and legal status in the U.S.: A review. *Preventive Medicine* 104, 13-23. [\[Crossref\]](#)
998. Seshadri Tirunillai, Gerard J. Tellis. 2017. Does Offline TV Advertising Affect Online Chatter? Quasi-Experimental Analysis Using Synthetic Control. *Marketing Science* 36:6, 862-878. [\[Crossref\]](#)
999. Alex Krumer, Michael Lechner. 2017. First in first win: Evidence on schedule effects in round-robin tournaments in mega-events. *European Economic Review* 100, 412-427. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1000. Catherine L. Kling, Raymond W. Arritt, Gray Calhoun, David A. Keiser. 2017. Integrated Assessment Models of the Food, Energy, and Water Nexus: A Review and an Outline of Research Needs. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 9:1, 143-163. [\[Crossref\]](#)

1001. Julius Manda, Makaiko G. Khonje, Arega D. Alene, Therese Gondwe. 2017. Welfare impacts of improved groundnut varieties in eastern Zambia: A heterogeneous treatment effects approach. *Agrekon* **56**:4, 313-329. [[Crossref](#)]
1002. Lukas Kauer. 2017. Long-term Effects of Managed Care. *Health Economics* **26**:10, 1210-1223. [[Crossref](#)]
1003. Elisabetta Gotor, Alejandro Bellon, Vivian Polar, Francesco Caracciolo. 2017. Assessing the Benefits of Andean Crop Diversity on Farmers' Livelihood: Insights from a Development Programme in Bolivia and Peru. *Journal of International Development* **29**:7, 877-898. [[Crossref](#)]
1004. S. Fischer, K. A. Kapinos, A. Mulcahy, L. Pinto, O. Hayden, R. Barron. 2017. Estimating the long-term functional burden of osteoporosis-related fractures. *Osteoporosis International* **28**:10, 2843-2851. [[Crossref](#)]
1005. Mohcine Bakhat, Xavier Labandeira, José M. Labeaga, Xiral López-Otero. 2017. Elasticities of transport fuels at times of economic crisis: An empirical analysis for Spain. *Energy Economics* **68**, 66-80. [[Crossref](#)]
1006. Jing Lan, Runsheng Yin. 2017. Research trends: Policy impact evaluation: Future contributions from economics. *Forest Policy and Economics* **83**, 142-145. [[Crossref](#)]
1007. Colas Chervier, Sébastien Costedoat. 2017. Heterogeneous Impact of a Collective Payment for Environmental Services Scheme on Reducing Deforestation in Cambodia. *World Development* **98**, 148-159. [[Crossref](#)]
1008. David C Chu, Allan J Walkey. 2017. Reply to Schuetz and Wahl. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **65**:7, 1246-1247. [[Crossref](#)]
1009. Sonia Bhalotra, Martin Karlsson, Therese Nilsson. 2017. Infant Health and Longevity: Evidence from A Historical Intervention in Sweden. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **15**:5, 1101-1157. [[Crossref](#)]
1010. Tim Kaiser, Lukas Menkhoff. 2017. Does Financial Education Impact Financial Literacy and Financial Behavior, and If So, When?. *The World Bank Economic Review* **31**:3, 611-630. [[Crossref](#)]
1011. E. G. Kebebe. 2017. Household nutrition and income impacts of using dairy technologies in mixed crop-livestock production systems. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* **61**:4, 626-644. [[Crossref](#)]
1012. Martin Olsson. 2017. Direct and Cross Effects of Employment Protection: The Case of Parental Childcare. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* **119**:4, 1105-1128. [[Crossref](#)]
1013. Teck-Hua Ho, Noah Lim, Sadat Reza, Xiaoyu Xia. 2017. OM Forum—Causal Inference Models in Operations Management. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* **19**:4, 509-525. [[Crossref](#)]
1014. Maya Papineau. 2017. Energy Efficiency Premiums in Unlabeled Office Buildings. *The Energy Journal* **38**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
1015. Silvia De Poli, Niklas Jakobsson, Simone Schüller. 2017. The drowning-refugee effect: media salience and xenophobic attitudes. *Applied Economics Letters* **24**:16, 1167-1172. [[Crossref](#)]
1016. Abdurrahman B. Aydemir, Murat G. Kırdar. 2017. Quasi-experimental impact estimates of immigrant labor supply shocks: The role of treatment and comparison group matching and relative skill composition. *European Economic Review* **98**, 282-315. [[Crossref](#)]



1017. Hugh Waddington, Ariel M. Aloe, Betsy Jane Becker, Eric W. Djimeu, Jorge Garcia Hombrados, Peter Tugwell, George Wells, Barney Reeves. 2017. Quasi-experimental study designs series—paper 6: risk of bias assessment. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **89**, 43-52. [[Crossref](#)]
1018. Till Bärnighausen, Catherine Oldenburg, Peter Tugwell, Christian Bommer, Cara Ebert, Mauricio Barreto, Eric Djimeu, Noah Haber, Hugh Waddington, Peter Rockers, Barbara Sianesi, Jacob Bor, Günther Fink, Jeffrey Valentine, Jeffrey Tanner, Tom Stanley, Eduardo Sierra, Eric Tchetgen Tchetgen, Rifat Atun, Sebastian Vollmer. 2017. Quasi-experimental study designs series—paper 7: assessing the assumptions. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **89**, 53-66. [[Crossref](#)]
1019. Alfredo Burlando, Andrea Canidio. 2017. Does group inclusion hurt financial inclusion? Evidence from ultra-poor members of Ugandan savings groups. *Journal of Development Economics* **128**, 24-48. [[Crossref](#)]
1020. Tamara L. Sheldon, J.R. DeShazo. 2017. How does the presence of HOV lanes affect plug-in electric vehicle adoption in California? A generalized propensity score approach. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **85**, 146-170. [[Crossref](#)]
1021. Erin Strumpf, Mehdi Ammi, Mamadou Diop, Julie Fiset-Laniel, Pierre Tousignant. 2017. The impact of team-based primary care on health care services utilization and costs: Quebec's family medicine groups. *Journal of Health Economics* **55**, 76-94. [[Crossref](#)]
1022. Alessandro Saia. 2017. Choosing the open sea: The cost to the UK of staying out of the euro. *Journal of International Economics* **108**, 82-98. [[Crossref](#)]
1023. Tesfamichael Wossen, Tahirou Abdoulaye, Arega Alene, Shiferaw Feleke, Jacob Ricker-Gilbert, Victor Manyong, Bola Amoke Awotide. 2017. Productivity and Welfare Effects of Nigeria's e-Voucher-Based Input Subsidy Program. *World Development* **97**, 251-265. [[Crossref](#)]
1024. Jane Greve, Vera Schattan Ruas Pereira Coelho. 2017. Evaluating the impact of contracting out basic health care services in the state of São Paulo, Brazil. *Health Policy and Planning* **32**:7, 923-933. [[Crossref](#)]
1025. Mario Bossler. 2017. Employment expectations and uncertainties ahead of the new German minimum wage. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* **64**:4, 327-348. [[Crossref](#)]
1026. Huasheng Gao, Wei Zhang. 2017. Employment Nondiscrimination Acts and Corporate Innovation. *Management Science* **63**:9, 2982-2999. [[Crossref](#)]
1027. Ralf Dewenter,, Ulrich Heimeshoff,, Hendrik Lüth. 2017. Less Pain at the Pump? The Effects of Regulatory Interventions in Retail Gasoline Markets. *Applied Economics Quarterly* **63**:3, 259-274. [[Crossref](#)]
1028. Mark W. Nichols, Mehmet Serkan Tosun. 2017. The impact of legalized casino gambling on crime. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **66**, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
1029. Xuanzhe Liu, Wei Ai, Huoran Li, Jian Tang, Gang Huang, Feng Feng, Qiaozhu Mei. 2017. Deriving User Preferences of Mobile Apps from Their Management Activities. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* **35**:4, 1-32. [[Crossref](#)]
1030. Kristen Capogrossi, Wen You. 2017. The Influence of School Nutrition Programs on the Weight of Low-Income Children: A Treatment Effect Analysis. *Health Economics* **26**:8, 980-1000. [[Crossref](#)]
1031. Thushyanthan Baskaran. 2017. Local fiscal policy after a bailout: austerity or soft budget constraints?. *Economics of Governance* **18**:3, 209-238. [[Crossref](#)]

1032. Tesfamicheal Wossen, Tahirou Abdoulaye, Arega Alene, Mekbib G. Haile, Shiferaw Feleke, Adetunji Olanrewaju, Victor Manyong. 2017. Impacts of extension access and cooperative membership on technology adoption and household welfare. *Journal of Rural Studies* **54**, 223-233. [[Crossref](#)]
1033. Eva Christine Erhardt. 2017. Microfinance beyond self-employment: Evidence for firms in Bulgaria. *Labour Economics* **47**, 75-95. [[Crossref](#)]
1034. Manhong Shen, Yongliang Yang. 2017. The Water Pollution Policy Regime Shift and Boundary Pollution: Evidence from the Change of Water Pollution Levels in China. *Sustainability* **9**:8, 1469. [[Crossref](#)]
1035. Luigi Grossi, Sven Heim, Michael Waterson. 2017. The impact of the German response to the Fukushima earthquake. *Energy Economics* **66**, 450-465. [[Crossref](#)]
1036. Paul R. Smokowski, Roderick A. Rose, Caroline B. R. Evans, James Barbee, Katie L. Cotter, Meredith Bower. 2017. The Impact of Teen Court on Rural Adolescents: Improved Social Relationships, Psychological Functioning, and School Experiences. *The Journal of Primary Prevention* **38**:4, 447-464. [[Crossref](#)]
1037. Clemens Noelke, Jason Beckfield. 2017. Job security provisions and work hours. *Acta Sociologica* **60**:3, 246-261. [[Crossref](#)]
1038. ROSS L. MATSUEDA. 2017. TOWARD AN ANALYTICAL CRIMINOLOGY: THE MICRO-MACRO PROBLEM, CAUSAL MECHANISMS, AND PUBLIC POLICY. *Criminology* **55**:3, 493-519. [[Crossref](#)]
1039. Delia Baldassarri, Maria Abascal. 2017. Field Experiments Across the Social Sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology* **43**:1, 41-73. [[Crossref](#)]
1040. Ashok K. Mishra, Aditya R. Khanal. Assessing Food Security in Rural Bangladesh: The Role of a Nonfarm Economy 241-257. [[Crossref](#)]
1041. Emma Persson, Ingeborg Waernbaum, Torbjörn Lind. 2017. Estimating marginal causal effects in a secondary analysis of case-control data. *Statistics in Medicine* **36**:15, 2404-2419. [[Crossref](#)]
1042. Jeffery H. Marshall, Seng Bunly. 2017. School grants and school performance in rural Cambodia. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* **9**:3, 305-328. [[Crossref](#)]
1043. Meng-Wen Wu, Chung-Hua Shen, Ting-Hsuan Chen. 2017. Application of multi-level matching between financial performance and corporate social responsibility in the banking industry. *Review of Quantitative Finance and Accounting* **49**:1, 29-63. [[Crossref](#)]
1044. Larry Fauver, Mingyi Hung, Xi Li, Alvaro G. Taboada. 2017. Board reforms and firm value: Worldwide evidence. *Journal of Financial Economics* **125**:1, 120-142. [[Crossref](#)]
1045. Gabriel Heller-Sahlgren. 2017. Retirement blues. *Journal of Health Economics* **54**, 66-78. [[Crossref](#)]
1046. Annette Broocks, Johannes Van Biesebroeck. 2017. The impact of export promotion on export market entry. *Journal of International Economics* **107**, 19-33. [[Crossref](#)]
1047. Martin Olsson, Joacim Tåg. 2017. Private Equity, Layoffs, and Job Polarization. *Journal of Labor Economics* **35**:3, 697-754. [[Crossref](#)]
1048. James Bisbee, Rajeev Dehejia, Cristian Pop-Eleches, Cyrus Samii. 2017. Local Instruments, Global Extrapolation: External Validity of the Labor Supply-Fertility Local Average Treatment Effect. *Journal of Labor Economics* **35**:S1, S99-S147. [[Crossref](#)]

1049. Sebastian Calónico, Jeffrey Smith. 2017. The Women of the National Supported Work Demonstration. *Journal of Labor Economics* 35:S1, S65-S97. [[Crossref](#)]
1050. Daniel Westreich. 2017. From Patients to Policy. *Epidemiology* 28:4, 525-528. [[Crossref](#)]
1051. Pilar Beatriz Alvarez Franco, Ana Melisa Muñoz Murillo, Diego Alexander Restrepo Tobón. 2017. Programas de Educación Financiera en Colombia: Retos para Evaluar su Efectividad. *Cuadernos de Administración* 30:54. . [[Crossref](#)]
1052. Thomas Mason, Cheryl Jones, Matt Sutton, Evgenia Konstantakopoulou, David F Edgar, Robert A Harper, Stephen Birch, John G Lawrenson. 2017. Retrospective economic analysis of the transfer of services from hospitals to the community: an application to an enhanced eye care service. *BMJ Open* 7:7, e014089. [[Crossref](#)]
1053. Vibe Bolvig Hyldgård, Karin Rosenkilde Laursen, Johan Poulsen, Rikke Søgaard. 2017. Robot-assisted surgery in a broader healthcare perspective: a difference-in-difference-based cost analysis of a national prostatectomy cohort. *BMJ Open* 7:7, e015580. [[Crossref](#)]
1054. Quang Vuong, Haiqing Xu. 2017. Counterfactual mapping and individual treatment effects in nonseparable models with binary endogeneity. *Quantitative Economics* 8:2, 589-610. [[Crossref](#)]
1055. Emiliano Magrini, Pierluigi Montalbano, Silvia Nenci, Luca Salvatici. 2017. Agricultural (Dis)Incentives and Food Security: Is There a Link?. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 99:4, 847-871. [[Crossref](#)]
1056. Astrid B Bos, Amy E Duchelle, Arild Angelsen, Valerio Avitabile, Veronique De Sy, Martin Herold, Shijo Joseph, Claudio de Sassi, Erin O Sills, William D Sunderlin, Sven Wunder. 2017. Comparing methods for assessing the effectiveness of subnational REDD+ initiatives. *Environmental Research Letters* 12:7, 074007. [[Crossref](#)]
1057. Helmut Rainer, Anita Fichtl, Timo Hener. 2017. Familienpolitik in Deutschland: Kausale Evaluationsstudien und ausgewählte Ergebnisse. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* 18:2, 117-131. [[Crossref](#)]
1058. Christian Dudel, Jan Marvin Garbuszus, Notburga Ott, Martin Werding. 2017. Matching as Non-Parametric Preprocessing for the Estimation of Equivalence Scales. *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* 237:2, 115-141. [[Crossref](#)]
1059. Prakarsh Singh. 2017. Learning and Behavioural Spillovers of Nutritional Information. *The Journal of Development Studies* 53:6, 911-931. [[Crossref](#)]
1060. RaeHyuck Lee, JongSerl Chun, Ick-Joong Chung, Hyunah Kang, Choong Rai Nho, Seokjin Woo. 2017. Kinship Foster Care and School Adjustment: Evidence from a Nationally Representative Sample of Children in Out-of-Home Care in South Korea. *Child & Youth Care Forum* 46:3, 335-356. [[Crossref](#)]
1061. Nan L. Maxwell, Dana Rotz. 2017. Potential Assistance for Disadvantaged Workers: Employment Social Enterprises. *Journal of Labor Research* 38:2, 145-168. [[Crossref](#)]
1062. Marco Caliendo, Robert Mahlstedt, Oscar A. Mitnik. 2017. Unobservable, but unimportant? The relevance of usually unobserved variables for the evaluation of labor market policies. *Labour Economics* 46, 14-25. [[Crossref](#)]
1063. Toshifumi Kuroda, Maria del Pilar Baquero Forero. 2017. The effects of spectrum allocation mechanisms on market outcomes: Auctions vs beauty contests. *Telecommunications Policy* 41:5-6, 341-354. [[Crossref](#)]

1064. Bart H. H. Golsteyn, Anders Stenberg. 2017. Earnings over the Life Course: General versus Vocational Education. *Journal of Human Capital* **11**:2, 167-212. [[Crossref](#)]
1065. Gani Aldashev, Georg Kirchsteiger, Alexander Sebald. 2017. Assignment Procedure Biases In Randomised Policy Experiments. *The Economic Journal* **127**:602, 873-895. [[Crossref](#)]
1066. Vicky Chemutai, Hubert Escaith. 2017. Measuring World Trade Organization (WTO) Accession Commitments and their Economic Effects. *Journal of International Commerce, Economics and Policy* **08**:02, 1750007. [[Crossref](#)]
1067. R Gutman, DB Rubin. 2017. Estimation of causal effects of binary treatments in unconfounded studies with one continuous covariate. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* **26**:3, 1199-1215. [[Crossref](#)]
1068. Barbara Hofmann, Michaela Kreyenfeld, Arne Uhlenдорff. 2017. Job Displacement and First Birth Over the Business Cycle. *Demography* **54**:3, 933-959. [[Crossref](#)]
1069. Philip S.J. Leonard. 2017. Do School Junk Food Bans Improve Student Health? Evidence from Canada. *Canadian Public Policy* **43**:2, 105-119. [[Crossref](#)]
1070. J. DAVID BROWN, JOHN S. EARLE. 2017. Finance and Growth at the Firm Level: Evidence from SBA Loans. *The Journal of Finance* **72**:3, 1039-1080. [[Crossref](#)]
1071. Shahriar Kibriya, Zhicheng Phil Xu, Yu Zhang. 2017. The negative consequences of school bullying on academic performance and mitigation through female teacher participation: evidence from Ghana. *Applied Economics* **49**:25, 2480-2490. [[Crossref](#)]
1072. Wilfried Ehrenfeld, Frieder Kropfhäuser. 2017. Plant-based bioeconomy in Central Germany – a mapping of actors, industries and places. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* **29**:5, 514-527. [[Crossref](#)]
1073. Sebastian Galiani, Patrick J. McEwan, Brian Quistorff. External and Internal Validity of a Geographic Quasi-Experiment Embedded in a Cluster-Randomized Experiment 195-236. [[Crossref](#)]
1074. Qihui Chen, Jingqin Xu, Jiaqi Zhao, Bo Zhang. 2017. Endogenous schooling, school proximity and returns to rural schooling in Northwestern China. *China Agricultural Economic Review* **9**:2, 270-286. [[Crossref](#)]
1075. Susan Athey, Guido W. Imbens. 2017. The State of Applied Econometrics: Causality and Policy Evaluation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **31**:2, 3-32. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
1076. Sung-Hee Jeon. 2017. The Long-Term Effects of Cancer on Employment and Earnings. *Health Economics* **26**:5, 671-684. [[Crossref](#)]
1077. Wenhua Di, Daniel L. Millimet. 2017. Introduction. *Empirical Economics* **52**:3, 895-900. [[Crossref](#)]
1078. Maya Papineau. 2017. Setting the standard? A framework for evaluating the cost-effectiveness of building energy standards. *Energy Economics* **64**, 63-76. [[Crossref](#)]
1079. Margaret B. Holland, Kelly W. Jones, Lisa Naughton-Treves, José-Luis Freire, Manuel Morales, Luis Suárez. 2017. Titling land to conserve forests: The case of Cuyabeno Reserve in Ecuador. *Global Environmental Change* **44**, 27-38. [[Crossref](#)]
1080. Manuel Adelino, W. Scott Frame, Kristopher Gerardi. 2017. The effect of large investors on asset quality: Evidence from subprime mortgage securities. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **87**, 34-51. [[Crossref](#)]

1081. Anup Karan, Winnie Yip, Ajay Mahal. 2017. Extending health insurance to the poor in India: An impact evaluation of Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana on out of pocket spending for healthcare. *Social Science & Medicine* **181**, 83-92. [[Crossref](#)]
1082. Richard B. Ellison, Adrian B. Ellison, Stephen P. Greaves, Breno Sampaio. 2017. Electronic ticketing systems as a mechanism for travel behaviour change? Evidence from Sydney's Opal card. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **99**, 80-93. [[Crossref](#)]
1083. Roberto Esposti. 2017. The heterogeneous farm-level impact of the 2005 CAP-first pillar reform: A multivalued treatment effect estimation. *Agricultural Economics* **48**:3, 373-386. [[Crossref](#)]
1084. Oriana Bandiera, Robin Burgess, Narayan Das, Selim Gulesci, Imran Rasul, Munshi Sulaiman. 2017. Labor Markets and Poverty in Village Economies\*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **132**:2, 811-870. [[Crossref](#)]
1085. Christina M. Locke, Van Butsic, Adena R. Rissman. 2017. Zoning effects on housing change vary with income, based on a four-decade panel model after propensity score matching. *Land Use Policy* **64**, 353-362. [[Crossref](#)]
1086. Hiroyuki Takeshima. 2017. Custom-hired tractor services and returns to scale in smallholder agriculture: a production function approach. *Agricultural Economics* **48**:3, 363-372. [[Crossref](#)]
1087. Nneji Ifeyinwa Umeokeke, Victor Olusegun Okoruwa, Temitayo Adenike Adeyemo. 2017. Impact of electronic-wallet system on farmer's welfare in Oyo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Economics* **44**:4, 474-490. [[Crossref](#)]
1088. Ruyi Ge, Juan Feng, Bin Gu, Pengzhu Zhang. 2017. Predicting and Deterring Default with Social Media Information in Peer-to-Peer Lending. *Journal of Management Information Systems* **34**:2, 401-424. [[Crossref](#)]
1089. Jennifer I. Manuel. 2017. The Grand Challenge of Reducing Gender and Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Service Access and Needs Among Adults with Alcohol Misuse. *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions* **17**:1-2, 10-35. [[Crossref](#)]
1090. Jody C. DiGiacomo, L. D. George Angus, Edward Coffield. 2017. Adrenal Injuries: Historical Facts and Modern Truths. *World Journal of Surgery* **41**:4, 975-979. [[Crossref](#)]
1091. Massimiliano Agovino, Mariaconcetta Casaccia, Alessandro Crociata. 2017. Effectiveness and efficiency of European Regional Development Fund on separate waste collection: evidence from Italian regions by a stochastic frontier approach. *Economia Politica* **34**:1, 105-137. [[Crossref](#)]
1092. Prakarsh Singh, Sandip Mitra. 2017. Incentives, information and malnutrition: Evidence from an experiment in India. *European Economic Review* **93**, 24-46. [[Crossref](#)]
1093. Michael Iselin, Allison Nicoletti. 2017. The effects of SFAS 157 disclosures on investment decisions. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **63**:2-3, 404-427. [[Crossref](#)]
1094. Xun Lu, Liangjun Su, Halbert White. 2017. GRANGER CAUSALITY AND STRUCTURAL CAUSALITY IN CROSS-SECTION AND PANEL DATA. *Econometric Theory* **33**:2, 263-291. [[Crossref](#)]
1095. Omar Isaac Asensio, Magali A. Delmas. 2017. The effectiveness of US energy efficiency building labels. *Nature Energy* **2**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
1096. Julian Bergler, Sven Heim, Kai Hüschelrath. 2017. Strategic capacity withholding through failures in the German-Austrian electricity market. *Energy Policy* **102**, 210-221. [[Crossref](#)]

1097. Hanna Hottenrott, Cornelia Lawson. 2017. Fishing for complementarities: Research grants and research productivity. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* **51**, 1-38. [[Crossref](#)]
1098. Jordi McKenzie. 2017. Graduated response policies to digital piracy: Do they increase box office revenues of movies?. *Information Economics and Policy* **38**, 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
1099. Christian Almer, Ralph Winkler. 2017. Analyzing the effectiveness of international environmental policies: The case of the Kyoto Protocol. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **82**, 125-151. [[Crossref](#)]
1100. Christian Krekel, Alexander Zerrahn. 2017. Does the presence of wind turbines have negative externalities for people in their surroundings? Evidence from well-being data. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **82**, 221-238. [[Crossref](#)]
1101. Jong-Seon Lee, Ji-Hoon Park, Zong-Tae Bae. 2017. The effects of licensing-in on innovative performance in different technological regimes. *Research Policy* **46**:2, 485-496. [[Crossref](#)]
1102. KELLY W. JONES, MARGARET B. HOLLAND, LISA NAUGHTON-TREVES, MANUEL MORALES, LUIS SUAREZ, KAYLA KEENAN. 2017. Forest conservation incentives and deforestation in the Ecuadorian Amazon. *Environmental Conservation* **44**:1, 56-65. [[Crossref](#)]
1103. Paul J. Ferraro, Juan José Miranda. 2017. Panel Data Designs and Estimators as Substitutes for Randomized Controlled Trials in the Evaluation of Public Programs. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* **4**:1, 281-317. [[Crossref](#)]
1104. JONATHON ADAMS-KANE, JULIÁN A. CABALLERO, JAMUS JEROME LIM. 2017. Foreign Bank Behavior during Financial Crises. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* **49**:2-3, 351-392. [[Crossref](#)]
1105. John A. Maluccio, Fan Wu, Redwan B. Rokon, Rahul Rawat, Suneetha Kadiyala. 2017. Assessing the Impact of Food Assistance on Stigma Among People Living with HIV in Uganda Using the HIV/AIDS Stigma Instrument-PLWA (HASI-P). *AIDS and Behavior* **21**:3, 766-782. [[Crossref](#)]
1106. Sebastian Galiani, Stephen Knack, Lixin Colin Xu, Ben Zou. 2017. The effect of aid on growth: evidence from a Quasi-experiment. *Journal of Economic Growth* **22**:1, 1-33. [[Crossref](#)]
1107. Rachael A. Spencer, Kelli A. Komro. 2017. Family Economic Security Policies and Child and Family Health. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* **20**:1, 45-63. [[Crossref](#)]
1108. Erin O. Sills, Claudio de Sassi, Pamela Jagger, Kathleen Lawlor, Daniela A. Miteva, Subhrendu K. Pattanayak, William D. Sunderlin. 2017. Building the evidence base for REDD+: Study design and methods for evaluating the impacts of conservation interventions on local well-being. *Global Environmental Change* **43**, 148-160. [[Crossref](#)]
1109. Noam Wasserman. 2017. The throne vs. the kingdom: Founder control and value creation in startups. *Strategic Management Journal* **38**:2, 255-277. [[Crossref](#)]
1110. Florens Focke, Ernst Maug, Alexandra Niessen-Ruenzi. 2017. The impact of firm prestige on executive compensation. *Journal of Financial Economics* **123**:2, 313-336. [[Crossref](#)]
1111. M. Mostak Ahamed, Sushanta Mallick. 2017. Does regulatory forbearance matter for bank stability? Evidence from creditors' perspective. *Journal of Financial Stability* **28**, 163-180. [[Crossref](#)]
1112. Krzysztof Szczygielski, Wojciech Grabowski, Mehmet Teoman Pamukcu, Vedat Sinan Tandogan. 2017. Does government support for private innovation matter? Firm-level evidence from two catching-up countries. *Research Policy* **46**:1, 219-237. [[Crossref](#)]



1113. Benjamin Balsmeier. 2017. Unions, collective relations laws and R&D investment in emerging and developing countries. *Research Policy* 46:1, 292-304. [[Crossref](#)]
1114. Nicole M. Mason, Ayala Wineman, Lilian Kirimi, David Mather. 2017. The Effects of Kenya's 'Smarter' Input Subsidy Programme on Smallholder Behaviour and Incomes: Do Different Quasi-experimental Approaches Lead to the Same Conclusions?. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 68:1, 45-69. [[Crossref](#)]
1115. MEGAN DENVER, GARIMA SIWACH, SHAWN D. BUSHWAY. 2017. A NEW LOOK AT THE EMPLOYMENT AND RECIDIVISM RELATIONSHIP THROUGH THE LENS OF A CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK\*. *Criminology* 55:1, 174-204. [[Crossref](#)]
1116. Yu-Chin Hsu. 2017. Consistent tests for conditional treatment effects. *The Econometrics Journal* 20:1, 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]
1117. SAMULI KNÜPFER, ELIAS RANTAPUSKA, MATTI SARVIMÄKI. 2017. Formative Experiences and Portfolio Choice: Evidence from the Finnish Great Depression. *The Journal of Finance* 72:1, 133-166. [[Crossref](#)]
1118. RYO TAKAHASHI. 2017. CLIMATE, CRIME, AND SUICIDE: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM JAPAN. *Climate Change Economics* 08:01, 1750003. [[Crossref](#)]
1119. Winston Lin, Scott D Halpern, Meeta Prasad Kerlin, Dylan S Small. 2017. A "placement of death" approach for studies of treatment effects on ICU length of stay. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 26:1, 292-311. [[Crossref](#)]
1120. Michael Lechner, Paul Downward. 2017. Heterogeneous sports participation and labour market outcomes in England. *Applied Economics* 49:4, 335-348. [[Crossref](#)]
1121. Sandra Ruiz, Paulo Arvate, Wlamir Xavier. 2017. Superior economic performance in developed and developing countries. *International Journal of Emerging Markets* 12:1, 93-107. [[Crossref](#)]
1122. Tim Winke. 2017. The impact of aircraft noise on apartment prices: a differences-in-differences hedonic approach for Frankfurt, Germany. *Journal of Economic Geography* 69, lbw040. [[Crossref](#)]
1123. Leanne Giordono, Todd Pugatch. 2017. Non-tuition Costs, School Access and Student Performance: Evidence from the Gambia. *Journal of African Economies* 7. . [[Crossref](#)]
1124. Adam Gendźwiłł, Tomasz Żóltak. 2017. How single-member districts are reinforcing local independents and strengthening mayors: on the electoral reform in Polish local government. *Local Government Studies* 43:1, 110-131. [[Crossref](#)]
1125. Vladimír Baláž, Allan M Williams. 2017. Experimental Research Methods in Migration: From Natural to True Experiments. *Population, Space and Place* 23:1, e1974. [[Crossref](#)]
1126. J. L. Jiménez, J. Perdiguerro. Difference-In-Difference 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
1127. Carlianne Patrick, Amanda Ross, Heather Stephens. Designing Policies to Spur Economic Growth: How Regional Scientists Can Contribute to Future Policy Development and Evaluation 119-133. [[Crossref](#)]
1128. Jean-Michel Josselin, Benoît Le Maux. Quasi-experiments 489-531. [[Crossref](#)]
1129. Randolph L. Bruno, Nauro F. Campos, Saul Estrin, Meng Tian. Foreign Direct Investment and the Relationship Between the United Kingdom and the European Union 139-173. [[Crossref](#)]
1130. Romain Aeberhardt, Élise Coudin, Roland Rathelot. 2017. The heterogeneity of ethnic employment gaps. *Journal of Population Economics* 30:1, 307-337. [[Crossref](#)]

1131. Catherine Pollak. 2017. The impact of a sick pay waiting period on sick leave patterns. *The European Journal of Health Economics* **18**:1, 13-31. [[Crossref](#)]
1132. Alex Coad, Kristian Nielsen, Bram Timmermans. 2017. My first employee: an empirical investigation. *Small Business Economics* **48**:1, 25-45. [[Crossref](#)]
1133. Emma Persson, Jenny Häggström, Ingeborg Waernbaum, Xavier de Luna. 2017. Data-driven algorithms for dimension reduction in causal inference. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **105**, 280-292. [[Crossref](#)]
1134. Xavier de Luna, Philip Fowler, Per Johansson. 2017. Proxy variables and nonparametric identification of causal effects. *Economics Letters* **150**, 152-154. [[Crossref](#)]
1135. Marika Carboni, Franco Fiordelisi, Ornella Ricci, Francesco Saverio Stentella Lopes. 2017. Surprised or not surprised? The investors' reaction to the comprehensive assessment preceding the launch of the banking union. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **74**, 122-132. [[Crossref](#)]
1136. Claudia Lambert, Felix Noth, Ulrich Schüwer. 2017. How do insured deposits affect bank risk? Evidence from the 2008 Emergency Economic Stabilization Act. *Journal of Financial Intermediation* **29**, 81-102. [[Crossref](#)]
1137. Miao Yu, Mingshuai He, Fangtao Liu. 2017. Impact of Emissions Trading System on Renewable Energy Output. *Procedia Computer Science* **122**, 221-228. [[Crossref](#)]
1138. Nicolai Kristensen, Christophe Kolodziejczyk, Iben Bolvig, Kurt Houllberg. 2017. The Efficiency Potential in Social Programs: Accounting for Heterogeneity in Benefit-Cost Analysis. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* **8**:1, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
1139. Terry-Ann Craigie. 2017. Ban the Box, Convictions, and Public Sector Employment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1140. Ying-Ying Lee. 2017. Efficient Propensity Score Regression Estimators of Multivalued Treatment Effects for the Treated. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1141. Chan Hang Saing, Colin Cannonier. 2017. Arsenic Exposure and School Participation in Cambodia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1142. Paul Muller, Arjan Heyma. 2017. Comparing Econometric Methods to Empirically Evaluate Job-Search Assistance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1143. Hubert Escaith, Vicky Chemutai. 2017. An Empirical Assessment of the Economic Effects of WTO Accession and Its Commitments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1144. Mohcine Bakhat, J. Maria Labeaga Azcona, Xira LLpez-Otero. 2017. Elasticities of Car Fuels at Times of Economic Crisis: An Empirical Analysis for Spain. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1145. Martin Lange. 2017. Integrating Young Male Refugees: Initial Evidence from an Inclusive Soccer Project. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1146. Yixin Lu, Alok Gupta, Wolfgang Ketter, E. van Heck. 2017. Information Transparency in B2B Auction Markets: The Role of Winner Identity Disclosure. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1147. Bernhard Schmidpeter. 2017. Does Stress Shorten Your Life? Evidence from Parental Bereavement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1148. Heonsoo Kim, Byung-Uk Chong, In-Deok Hwang. 2017. ##### ##### ##### ##### #### ## (Credit Rating and Volatility of Corporate Debt Financing: Empirical Analysis of Listed Firms in Korea). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

1149. Simona Comi, Mara Grasseni, Federica Origo, Laura Pagani. 2017. Where Women Make the Difference. The Effects of Corporate Board Gender Quotas on Firms' Performance across Europe. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1150. Allison Nicoletti. 2017. The Effects of Bank Regulators and External Auditors on Loan Loss Provisions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1151. Emerson Fernandes Marral, Ronan Cunha, Giovanni Tondin Merlin, Oscar Rodrigues Simoes. 2017. The Aftermath of 2008 Turmoil on Brazilian Economy: Tsunami or 'Marolinha'?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1152. Ming He, Bin Peng. 2017. Optimal Budget Allocation to Social Treatment Programs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1153. Brett R. Gordon, Florian Zettelmeyer, Neha Bhargava, Dan Chapsky. 2017. A Comparison of Approaches to Advertising Measurement: Evidence from Big Field Experiments at Facebook. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1154. Andrea Albanese, Lorenzo Cappellari, Marco Leonardi. 2017. The Effects of Youth Labor Market Reforms: Evidence from Italian Apprenticeships. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1155. Bernhard Schmidpeter. 2017. Involuntary Unemployment and the Labor Market Returns to Interim Jobs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1156. Emily Gallagher, Radhakrishnan Gopalan, Jorge Sabat. 2017. Medicaid and Household Savings Behavior: New Evidence from Tax Refunds. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1157. Karen Geurts, Johannes Van Biesebroeck. 2017. Employment Growth Following Takeovers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1158. Leslie A. Martin, Sam Thornton. 2017. Can Road Charges Alleviate Congestion?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1159. Andrew McEachin, Thurston Domina, Andrew M. Penner. 2017. Understanding the Effects of Middle School Algebra: A Regression Discontinuity Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1160. Darwin Ugarte Ontiveros, Gustavo J. Canavire Bacarreza, Luis Castro Penarrieta. 2017. Outliers in Semi-Parametric Estimation of Treatment Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1161. Brantly Callaway, Weige Huang. 2017. Intergenerational Income Mobility: Counterfactual Distributions with a Continuous Treatment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1162. Marek Giebel, Kornelius Kraft. 2017. External Financing Constraints and Firm's Innovative Activities During the Financial Crisis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1163. Young Jun Choi. 2017. (Dip) (The Effect of the Dip on the Business Performances of Rehabilitated Corporates). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1164. Michael Iselin, Jung Koo Kang, Joshua M. Madsen. 2017. Regulatory Treatment of Changes in Fair Value and the Composition of Banks' Investment Portfolios. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1165. Emily mname Gallagher, Stephen mname Roll, Rourke mname O'Brien, Michal mname Grinstein-Weiss. 2017. Health Insurance and the Earnings Stability of Low-Income Households. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1166. Sara A. Wong. 2017. Minimum Wage Impacts on Wages and Hours Worked of Low-Income Workers in Ecuador. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

1167. Abdoulaye Diagne, Frannois Joseph Cabral. 2017. Agricultural Transformation in Senegal: Impacts of an Integrated Program. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1168. Djal-Gadom Gadom, Armand Kountchou Mboutchouang, Gbetoton Nadege Djossou, Kane Gilles Quentin, Abdelkrim Araar. 2017. The Impact of Oil Exploitation on Wellbeing in Chad. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1169. Jan Ruffner, Michael Siegenthaler. 2017. From Labor to Cash Flow? The Abolition of Immigration Restrictions and the Performance of Swiss Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1170. Andrew Hanson, Shawn Rohlin. 2017. Do Spatially Targeted Redevelopment Incentives Work? The Answer Depends on How You Ask the Question. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1171. Christian Krekel. 2017. Can Raising Instructional Time Crowd Out Student Pro-Social Behaviour? Evidence from Germany. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1172. Kotchikpa Gabriel Lawin, Lota D. Tamini, Ibrahima Bocoum. 2017. What Should We Expect of the Impact of Microcredit on Farms' Performances?: A Literature Review of Experimental Studies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1173. Yoon Sun Hur, Jisun Jeong, Juyoung Lee, Aila Yoo, Sangchul Yoon, Jongwook Lee. 2017. ODA ## ## #####: ##### (Impact Evaluation and the Implication for Korea's ODA Evaluation System). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1174. Martine Audibert, Jacky Mathonnat, Aurore Pélissier, Xiao Xian Huang. 2017. The Impact of the New Rural Cooperative Medical Scheme on Township Hospitals' Utilization and Income Structure in Weifang Prefecture, China. *International Journal of Applied Behavioral Economics* 6:1, 23-33. [[Crossref](#)]
1175. Frederik Toscani. 2017. The Impact of Natural Resource Discoveries in Latin America and the Caribbean: A Closer Look at the Case of Bolivia. *IMF Working Papers* 17:27, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
1176. Eugenia Andreasen, Martin Schindler, Patricio Valenzuela. 2017. Capital Controls and the Cost of Debt. *IMF Working Papers* 17:135, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
1177. Tongil 'TI' Kim. 2017. Can Viagra Advertising Make More Babies?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1178. Massimo Bordignon, Matteo Gamalerio, Gilberto Turati. 2017. Manager or Politician? The Effect of Local Fiscal Autonomy on Political Selection. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1179. Brantly Callaway. 2017. Job Displacement during the Great Recession: Tight Bounds on Distributional Treatment Effect Parameters Using Panel Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1180. Jonathan Kropko, Robert Kubinec. 2017. Analyzing Variation in the Cross-Section and Over Time: A Reassessment of Fixed Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1181. Long Wang, Yang Zoe Yang. 2017. The Privilege of Power and Wealth: Evidence from China's Urban Land Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1182. Diego Battiston, Jordi Blanes i Vidal, Tom Kirchmaier. 2017. Face-to-Face Communication in Organisations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1183. Hailey B Ballew, Michael Iselin, Allison Nicoletti. 2017. Regulatory Asset Thresholds and Real Activities in the Banking Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1184. Benjamin Clapham, Peter Gomber, Jens Lausen, Sven Panz. 2017. Liquidity Provider Incentives in Fragmented Securities Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

1185. June Ahn, Andrew McEachin. 2017. Student Enrollment Patterns and Achievement in Ohio's Online Charter Schools. *Educational Researcher* 46:1, 44-57. [[Crossref](#)]
1186. Dina Pomeranz. 2017. Impact Evaluation Methods in Public Economics. *Public Finance Review* 45:1, 10-43. [[Crossref](#)]
1187. Vidhi Chhaochharia, Suman Ghosh, Alexandra Niessen-Ruenzi, Christoph Schneider. 2017. Child Care Provision and Women's Careers in Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1188. Ashley D. Holland. 2017. Penalized spline estimation in the partially linear model. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 153, 211-235. [[Crossref](#)]
1189. Michelle C. Kondo, SeungHoon Han, Geoffrey H. Donovan, John M. MacDonald. 2017. The association between urban trees and crime: Evidence from the spread of the emerald ash borer in Cincinnati. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 157, 193-199. [[Crossref](#)]
1190. Judith A. Dempsey, Andrew J. Plantinga, Jeffrey D. Kline, Joshua J. Lawler, Sebastian Martinuzzi, Volker C. Radeloff, Daniel P. Bigelow. 2017. Effects of local land-use planning on development and disturbance in riparian areas. *Land Use Policy* 60, 16-25. [[Crossref](#)]
1191. Vidhan K. Goyal, Daniel Urban, Wenting Zhao. 2017. Index Membership and Capital Structure: International Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1192. Jochen Kluge, Susana Puerto, David Robalino, Jose Manuel Romero, Friederike Rother, Jonathan Stöterau, Felix Weidenkaff, Marc Witte. 2017. Interventions to improve the labour market outcomes of youth: A systematic review of training, entrepreneurship promotion, employment services and subsidized employment interventions. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 13:1, 1-288. [[Crossref](#)]
1193. Lora Iannotti, Sherlie Jean-Louis Dulience, Saminetha Joseph, Charmayne Cooley, Teresa Tufte, Katherine Cox, Jacob Eaton, Jacques Raymond Delnatus, Patricia B. Wolff. 2016. Fortified Snack Reduced Anemia in Rural School-Aged Children of Haiti: A Cluster-Randomized, Controlled Trial. *PLOS ONE* 11:12, e0168121. [[Crossref](#)]
1194. Mark E McGovern, Kobus Herbst, Frank Tanser, Tinofa Mutevedzi, David Canning, Dickman Gareta, Deenan Pillay, Till Bärnighausen. 2016. Do gifts increase consent to home-based HIV testing? A difference-in-differences study in rural KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 368, dyw122. [[Crossref](#)]
1195. Roberto Esposti. 2016. The empirics of decoupling: Alternative estimation approaches of the farm-level production response. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 2. . [[Crossref](#)]
1196. Heli Wang, Shan Zhao, Jinyu He. 2016. Increase in takeover protection and firm knowledge accumulation strategy. *Strategic Management Journal* 37:12, 2393-2412. [[Crossref](#)]
1197. Daniel Kuehnle, Christoph Wunder. 2016. Using the Life Satisfaction Approach to Value Daylight Savings Time Transitions: Evidence from Britain and Germany. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 17:6, 2293-2323. [[Crossref](#)]
1198. Elenka Brenna, Cinzia Di Novi. 2016. Is caring for older parents detrimental to women's mental health? The role of the European North-South gradient. *Review of Economics of the Household* 14:4, 745-778. [[Crossref](#)]
1199. Bernd Fitzenberger, Annabelle Doerr. 2016. Konzeptionelle Lehren aus der ersten Evaluationsrunde der Branchenmindestlöhne in Deutschland. *Journal for Labour Market Research* 49:4, 329-347. [[Crossref](#)]

1200. Ian M. McCarthy. 2016. Eliminating composite bias in treatment effects estimates: Applications to quality of life assessment. *Journal of Health Economics* **50**, 47-58. [[Crossref](#)]
1201. Michal Grinstein-Weiss, Mathieu Despard, Shenyang Guo, Blair Russell, Clinton Key, Ramesh Raghavan. 2016. Do Tax-Time Savings Deposits Reduce Hardship Among Low-Income Filers? A Propensity Score Analysis. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research* **7**:4, 707-728. [[Crossref](#)]
1202. Liesbeth Colen, Sergio Gomez y Paloma, Uwe Latacz-Lohmann, Marianne Lefebvre, Raphaële Préget, Sophie Thoyer. 2016. Economic Experiments as a Tool for Agricultural Policy Evaluation: Insights from the European CAP. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics/Revue canadienne d'agroeconomie* **64**:4, 667-694. [[Crossref](#)]
1203. Runsheng Yin, Leo Zulu, Jiaguo Qi, Mark Freudenberger, Matthew Sommerville. 2016. Empirical linkages between devolved tenure systems and forest conditions: Challenges, findings, and recommendations. *Forest Policy and Economics* **73**, 294-299. [[Crossref](#)]
1204. Ruyi Ge, Juan Feng, Bin Gu. 2016. Borrower's default and self-disclosure of social media information in P2P lending. *Financial Innovation* **2**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
1205. David M. Drukker. 2016. A Generalized Regression-adjustment Estimator for Average Treatment Effects from Panel Data. *The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata* **16**:4, 826-836. [[Crossref](#)]
1206. Matthew D. Webb, Arthur Sweetman, Casey Warman. 2016. Targeting Tax Relief at Youth Employment. *Canadian Public Policy* **42**:4, 415-430. [[Crossref](#)]
1207. Jeffrey H. Silber, Paul R. Rosenbaum, Richard N. Ross, Justin M. Ludwig, Wei Wang, Bijan A. Niknam, Alexander S. Hill, Orit Even-Shoshan, Rachel R. Kelz, Lee A. Fleisher. 2016. Indirect Standardization Matching: Assessing Specific Advantage and Risk Synergy. *Health Services Research* **51**:6, 2330-2357. [[Crossref](#)]
1208. Cuong Viet Nguyen, Thai Pham Minh. 2016. Are migrants in large cities underpaid? Evidence from Vietnam. *IZA Journal of Migration* **5**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
1209. Stefan Wager, Wenfei Du, Jonathan Taylor, Robert J. Tibshirani. 2016. High-dimensional regression adjustments in randomized experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**:45, 12673-12678. [[Crossref](#)]
1210. Stefan Boes, Michael Gerfin. 2016. Does Full Insurance Increase the Demand for Health Care?. *Health Economics* **25**:11, 1483-1496. [[Crossref](#)]
1211. Arthur Lewbel, Thomas Tao Yang. 2016. Identifying the average treatment effect in ordered treatment models without unconfoundedness. *Journal of Econometrics* **195**:1, 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]
1212. Briggs Depew, Ozkan Eren. 2016. Born on the wrong day? School entry age and juvenile crime. *Journal of Urban Economics* **96**, 73-90. [[Crossref](#)]
1213. Michael S. Delgado, Todd Guilfoos, Andrew Boslett. 2016. The cost of unconventional gas extraction: A hedonic analysis. *Resource and Energy Economics* **46**, 1-22. [[Crossref](#)]
1214. Yunrong Li, Ricardo Mora. 2016. Re-assessing the Impact of the Grandparent's Income on the Infant Mortality Rate: An Evaluation of the Old Age Allowance Program in Nepal. *World Development* **87**, 333-348. [[Crossref](#)]
1215. Simone Schüller. 2016. The Effects of 9/11 on Attitudes toward Immigration and the Moderating Role of Education. *Kyklos* **69**:4, 604-632. [[Crossref](#)]



1216. Valentina Barletta, Francesco Profili, Rosa Gini, Leonardo Grilli, Carla Rampichini, Daniela Matarrese, Paolo Francesconi. 2016. Impact of Chronic Care Model on diabetes care in Tuscany: a controlled before-after study. *The European Journal of Public Health* **22**(2), ckw189. [[Crossref](#)]
1217. Peter Murrell, Radu A. Păun. 2016. Caveat Venditor : The Conditional Effect of Relationship-Specific Investment on Contractual Behavior. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* **6**, eww011. [[Crossref](#)]
1218. Dragana Radicic, Geoffrey Pugh. 2016. R&D Programmes, Policy Mix, and the ‘European Paradox’: Evidence from European SMEs. *Science and Public Policy* **4**, scw077. [[Crossref](#)]
1219. Oliver Masakure. 2016. The effect of employee loyalty on wages. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **56**, 274-298. [[Crossref](#)]
1220. Lunyu Xie. 2016. Automobile usage and urban rail transit expansion: evidence from a natural experiment in Beijing, China. *Environment and Development Economics* **21**:5, 557-580. [[Crossref](#)]
1221. Rita A. Balaban, Donna B. Gilleskie, Uyen Tran. 2016. A quantitative evaluation of the flipped classroom in a large lecture principles of economics course. *The Journal of Economic Education* **47**:4, 269-287. [[Crossref](#)]
1222. Juan M. Villa. 2016. Social Transfers and Growth: Evidence from Luminosity Data. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* **65**:1, 39-61. [[Crossref](#)]
1223. Johannes Van Biesebroeck, Jozef Konings, Christian Volpe Martincus. 2016. Did export promotion help firms weather the crisis?. *Economic Policy* **31**:88, 653-702. [[Crossref](#)]
1224. Federico Cingano, Francesco Manaresi, Enrico Sette. 2016. Does Credit Crunch Investment Down? New Evidence on the Real Effects of the Bank-Lending Channel. *Review of Financial Studies* **29**:10, 2737-2773. [[Crossref](#)]
1225. Stefan Listl, Hendrik Jürges, Richard G. Watt. 2016. Causal inference from observational data. *Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology* **44**:5, 409-415. [[Crossref](#)]
1226. Youngwan Kim, Peter Nunnenkamp, Chandreyee Bagchi. 2016. The Indian Ocean tsunami and private donations to NGOs. *Disasters* **40**:4, 591-620. [[Crossref](#)]
1227. Carlianne Patrick. 2016. IDENTIFYING THE LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS OF MILLION DOLLAR FACILITIES. *Economic Inquiry* **54**:4, 1737-1762. [[Crossref](#)]
1228. Arthur Grimes, Nicholas Preval, Chris Young, Richard Arnold, Tim Denne, Philippa Howden-Chapman, Lucy Telfar-Barnard. 2016. Does Retrofitted Insulation Reduce Household Energy Use? Theory and Practice. *The Energy Journal* **37**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
1229. Jeremy Tasch, Weiwei C. Tasch. 2016. Redesigning Physical Geography 101: bringing students into the discussion. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* **40**:4, 565-584. [[Crossref](#)]
1230. Álmos Telegdy. 2016. Employment adjustment in the global crisis. *Economics of Transition* **24**:4, 683-703. [[Crossref](#)]
1231. Yu Liu, Stephen G. West. 2016. Weekly Cycles in Daily Report Data: An Overlooked Issue. *Journal of Personality* **84**:5, 560-579. [[Crossref](#)]
1232. Noémi Kreif, Susan Gruber, Rosalba Radice, Richard Grieve, Jasjeet S Sekhon. 2016. Evaluating treatment effectiveness under model misspecification: A comparison of targeted maximum likelihood estimation with bias-corrected matching. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* **25**:5, 2315-2336. [[Crossref](#)]

1233. David S. Knight, Katharine O. Strunk. 2016. Who Bears the Costs of District Funding Cuts? Reducing Inequality in the Distribution of Teacher Layoffs. *Educational Researcher* **45**:7, 395-406. [[Crossref](#)]
1234. Balázs Muraközy, Álmos Telegdy. 2016. Political incentives and state subsidy allocation: Evidence from Hungarian municipalities. *European Economic Review* **89**, 324-344. [[Crossref](#)]
1235. Pierpaolo Parrotta, Dario Pozzoli, Davide Sala. 2016. Ethnic diversity and firms' export behavior. *European Economic Review* **89**, 248-263. [[Crossref](#)]
1236. Daniel C. Hickman, Andrew G. Meyer. 2016. Does Eco-labeling of Services Matter? Evidence from Higher Education. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* **16**:4. . [[Crossref](#)]
1237. Cloé Garnache, Scott M. Swinton, Joseph A. Herriges, Frank Lupi, R. Jan Stevenson. 2016. Solving the Phosphorus Pollution Puzzle: Synthesis and Directions for Future Research. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **98**:5, 1334-1359. [[Crossref](#)]
1238. Munshi Sulaiman. CHAPTER 6: Does wealth increase affect school enrolment in ultra-poor households: evidence from an experiment in Bangladesh 67-84. [[Crossref](#)]
1239. Patrick Meyfroidt. 2016. Approaches and terminology for causal analysis in land systems science. *Journal of Land Use Science* **11**:5, 501-522. [[Crossref](#)]
1240. Leandro Rocco, Breno Sampaio. 2016. Are handheld cell phone and texting bans really effective in reducing fatalities?. *Empirical Economics* **51**:2, 853-876. [[Crossref](#)]
1241. Jessica Aschemann-Witzel, Tino Bech-Larsen, Sara Capacci. 2016. Do Target Groups Appreciate Being Targeted? An Exploration of Healthy Eating Policy Acceptance. *Journal of Consumer Policy* **39**:3, 285-306. [[Crossref](#)]
1242. Marcel Fratzscher, Philipp Johann König, Claudia Lambert. 2016. Credit provision and banking stability after the Great Financial Crisis: The role of bank regulation and the quality of governance. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **66**, 113-135. [[Crossref](#)]
1243. Jeremy G. Weber, Nigel Key, Erik O'Donoghue. 2016. Does Federal Crop Insurance Make Environmental Externalities from Agriculture Worse?. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* **3**:3, 707-742. [[Crossref](#)]
1244. Ashwini Agrawal, Prasanna Tambe. 2016. Private Equity and Workers' Career Paths: The Role of Technological Change. *Review of Financial Studies* **29**:9, 2455-2489. [[Crossref](#)]
1245. Vera Schattan P. Coelho, Jane Greve. 2016. As Organizações Sociais de Saúde e o Desempenho do SUS: Um Estudo sobre a Atenção Básica em São Paulo. *Dados* **59**:3, 867-901. [[Crossref](#)]
1246. Alex Coad, Julian S Frankish, Richard G Roberts, David J Storey. 2016. Why should banks provide entrepreneurship training seminars?. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship* **34**:6, 733-759. [[Crossref](#)]
1247. Bruno Arpino, Alessandra Mattei. 2016. Assessing the causal effects of financial aids to firms in Tuscany allowing for interference. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **10**:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
1248. Robert A. Hart, Mirko Moro, J. Elizabeth Roberts. 2016. Who gained from the introduction of free universal secondary education in England and Wales?. *Oxford Economic Papers* **10**, gpw039. [[Crossref](#)]
1249. Huiqiang Wang. 2016. Estimating the health impacts of food safety interventions: Optimal counterfactual selections via information criteria in small samples. *Food Policy* **63**, 44-52. [[Crossref](#)]
1250. Andaleeb Rahman. 2016. Universal food security program and nutritional intake: Evidence from the hunger prone KBK districts in Odisha. *Food Policy* **63**, 73-86. [[Crossref](#)]

1251. Jeffrey Smith, Arthur Sweetman. 2016. Viewpoint: Estimating the causal effects of policies and programs. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* **49**:3, 871-905. [[Crossref](#)]
1252. Jesse M. Pines, Mark Zocchi, Ali Moghtaderi, Bernard Black, Steven A. Farmer, Greg Hufstetler, Kevin Klauer, Randy Pilgrim. 2016. Medicaid Expansion In 2014 Did Not Increase Emergency Department Use But Did Change Insurance Payer Mix. *Health Affairs* **35**:8, 1480-1486. [[Crossref](#)]
1253. Abdul-Hanan Abdallah. 2016. Agricultural credit and technical efficiency in Ghana: is there a nexus?. *Agricultural Finance Review* **76**:2, 309-324. [[Crossref](#)]
1254. Xiaodong Gong, Maheshwar Rao. 2016. The economic impact of prolonged political instability: a case study of Fiji. *Policy Studies* **37**:4, 370-386. [[Crossref](#)]
1255. Leandro D'Aurizio, Domenico Depalo. 2016. An Evaluation of the Policies on Repayment of Government's Trade Debt in Italy. *Italian Economic Journal* **2**:2, 167-196. [[Crossref](#)]
1256. Hilma Forsman, Lars Brännström, Bo Vinnerljung, Anders Hjern. 2016. Does poor school performance cause later psychosocial problems among children in foster care? Evidence from national longitudinal registry data. *Child Abuse & Neglect* **57**, 61-71. [[Crossref](#)]
1257. M. Agovino, M. Casaccia, A. Crociata. 2016. The impact of European Regional Development Fund on separate waste collection: Evidence from Italian regions. *Environmental Science & Policy* **61**, 97-107. [[Crossref](#)]
1258. Ashok K. Mishra, Anjani Kumar, Pramod K. Joshi, Alwin D'souza. 2016. Impact of contracts in high yielding varieties seed production on profits and yield: The case of Nepal. *Food Policy* **62**, 110-121. [[Crossref](#)]
1259. Cyrus Samii. 2016. Causal Empiricism in Quantitative Research. *The Journal of Politics* **78**:3, 941-955. [[Crossref](#)]
1260. Laurent Gobillon, Thierry Magnac. 2016. Regional Policy Evaluation: Interactive Fixed Effects and Synthetic Controls. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **98**:3, 535-551. [[Crossref](#)]
1261. Peter Berck, Jacob Moe-Lange, Andrew Stevens, Sofia Villas-Boas. 2016. Measuring Consumer Responses to a Bottled Water Tax Policy. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **98**:4, 981-996. [[Crossref](#)]
1262. Michihito Ando, Reo Takaku. 2016. Affordable False Teeth: The Effects of Patient Cost Sharing on Denture Utilization and Subjective Chewing Ability. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* **16**:3, 1387-1438. [[Crossref](#)]
1263. Morag Henderson, Jonathan Scourfield, Sin Yi Cheung, Elaine Sharland, Luke Sloan. 2016. The Effects of Social Service Contact on Teenagers in England. *Research on Social Work Practice* **26**:4, 386-398. [[Crossref](#)]
1264. Morgan L. W. Hazelton, Jacob M. Montgomery, Brendan Nyhan. 2016. Does Public Financing Affect Judicial Behavior? Evidence From the North Carolina Supreme Court. *American Politics Research* **44**:4, 587-617. [[Crossref](#)]
1265. Morag Henderson, Sin Yi Cheung, Elaine Sharland, Jonathan Scourfield. 2016. The outcomes of educational welfare officer contact in England. *British Educational Research Journal* **42**:3, 399-416. [[Crossref](#)]
1266. Wameq A. Raza, Ellen van de Poel, Arjun Bedi, Frans Rutten. 2016. Impact of Community-based Health Insurance on Access and Financial Protection: Evidence from Three Randomized Control Trials in Rural India. *Health Economics* **25**:6, 675-687. [[Crossref](#)]

1267. Stephen O'Neill, Noémi Kreif, Richard Grieve, Matthew Sutton, Jasjeet S. Sekhon. 2016. Estimating causal effects: considering three alternatives to difference-in-differences estimation. *Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology* 16:1-2, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
1268. Benjamin Balsmeier, Maikel Pellens. 2016. How much does it cost to be a scientist?. *The Journal of Technology Transfer* 41:3, 469-505. [[Crossref](#)]
1269. Chung-Hua Shen, Meng-Wen Wu, Ting-Hsuan Chen, Hao Fang. 2016. To engage or not to engage in corporate social responsibility: Empirical evidence from global banking sector. *Economic Modelling* 55, 207-225. [[Crossref](#)]
1270. Kerstin Schöll, André Markemann, Bekele Megersa, Regina Birner, Anne Valle Zárate. 2016. Impact of projects initiating group marketing of smallholder farmers—A case study of pig producer marketing groups in Vietnam. *Journal of Co-operative Organization and Management* 4:1, 31-41. [[Crossref](#)]
1271. Raymond P. Guiteras, David I. Levine, Stephen P. Luby, Thomas H. Polley, Kaniz Khatun-e-Jannat, Leanne Unicomb. 2016. Disgust, Shame, and Soapy Water: Tests of Novel Interventions to Promote Safe Water and Hygiene. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 3:2, 321-359. [[Crossref](#)]
1272. Benjamin Furlan, Harald Oberhofer, Hannes Winner. 2016. A note on merger and acquisition evaluation. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 25:3, 447-455. [[Crossref](#)]
1273. Andinet Woldemichael, Eberechukwu Onukwugha, Brian Seal, Nader Hanna, C. Daniel Mullins. 2016. Sequential Therapies and the Cost-Effectiveness of Treating Metastatic Colon Cancer Patients. *Journal of Managed Care & Specialty Pharmacy* 22:6, 628-639. [[Crossref](#)]
1274. Dil Bahadur Rahut, Akhter Ali, Muhammad Imtiaz, Khondoker Abdul Mottaleb, Olaf Erenstein. 2016. Impact of irrigation water scarcity on rural household food security and income in Pakistan. *Water Supply* 16:3, 675-683. [[Crossref](#)]
1275. Bikki Jaggi, Wei Li, Steven Shuye Wang. 2016. Individual and Institutional Investors' Response to Earnings Reported by Conservative and Non-Conservative Firms: Evidence from Chinese Financial Markets. *Journal of International Financial Management & Accounting* 27:2, 158-207. [[Crossref](#)]
1276. Yong Chen, David J. Lewis, Bruce Weber. 2016. CONSERVATION LAND AMENITIES AND REGIONAL ECONOMIES: A POSTMATCHING DIFFERENCE-IN-DIFFERENCES ANALYSIS OF THE NORTHWEST FOREST PLAN. *Journal of Regional Science* 56:3, 373-394. [[Crossref](#)]
1277. Stephen H. Bell, Robert B. Olsen, Larry L. Orr, Elizabeth A. Stuart. 2016. Estimates of External Validity Bias When Impact Evaluations Select Sites Nonrandomly. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 38:2, 318-335. [[Crossref](#)]
1278. Mercy Maiwa Mwambi, Judith Oduol, Patience Mshenga, Mwanarusi Saidi. 2016. Does contract farming improve smallholder income? The case of avocado farmers in Kenya. *Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies* 6:1, 2-20. [[Crossref](#)]
1279. Boris Kaiser. 2016. Decomposing differences in arithmetic means: a doubly robust estimation approach. *Empirical Economics* 50:3, 873-899. [[Crossref](#)]
1280. Leandro S. Carvalho, Silvia Prina, Justin Sydnor. 2016. The effect of saving on risk attitudes and intertemporal choices. *Journal of Development Economics* 120, 41-52. [[Crossref](#)]

1281. Andrew Boslett, Todd Guilfoos, Corey Lang. 2016. Valuation of expectations: A hedonic study of shale gas development and New York's moratorium. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 77, 14-30. [[Crossref](#)]
1282. Alex Coad, Gabriele Pellegrino, Maria Savona. 2016. Barriers to innovation and firm productivity. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* 25:3, 321-334. [[Crossref](#)]
1283. Thomas Bossuoy, Clara Delavallade. 2016. Experiments, policy, and theory in development economics: a response to Glenn Harrison's 'field experiments and methodological intolerance'. *Journal of Economic Methodology* 23:2, 147-156. [[Crossref](#)]
1284. Sung Jae Jun, Yoonseok Lee, Youngki Shin. 2016. Treatment Effects With Unobserved Heterogeneity: A Set Identification Approach. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 34:2, 302-311. [[Crossref](#)]
1285. Robynn Cox, Sally Wallace. 2016. Identifying the Link Between Food Security and Incarceration. *Southern Economic Journal* 82:4, 1062-1077. [[Crossref](#)]
1286. Rani Hoitash, Udi Hoitash, Ahmet C. Kurt. 2016. Do accountants make better chief financial officers?. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 61:2-3, 414-432. [[Crossref](#)]
1287. Junichi Nishimura, Hiroyuki Okamuro. 2016. Knowledge and rent spillovers through government-sponsored R&D consortia. *Science and Public Policy* 43:2, 207-225. [[Crossref](#)]
1288. Markku Kaustia, Samuli Knüpfer, Sami Torstila. 2016. Stock Ownership and Political Behavior: Evidence from Demutualizations. *Management Science* 62:4, 945-963. [[Crossref](#)]
1289. Tao Chen, Kenneth A. Couch. 2016. Model specification tests and the estimation of treatment effects: An application with random and non-random administrative records. *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement* 41:1, 1-16. [[Crossref](#)]
1290. Loren W. Tauer. 2016. The effect of bovine somatotropin on the cost of producing milk: Estimates using propensity scores. *Journal of Dairy Science* 99:4, 2979-2985. [[Crossref](#)]
1291. Guillaume Chevillard, Julien Mousquès, Véronique Lucas-Gabrielli, Yann Bourgueil, Stéphane Rican, Gérard Salem. 2016. Dépeuplement rural et offre de soins de premiers recours : quelles réalités et quelles solutions ?. *Espace populations sociétés* :2015/3-2016/1. . [[Crossref](#)]
1292. Hong Zhang, Shuai Gao, Fei Yang. 2016. Impact of split share structure reform on capital structures: empirical evidence from China's listed companies. *Applied Economics* 48:13, 1172-1181. [[Crossref](#)]
1293. Or Levkovich, Jan Rouwendal, Ramona van Marwijk. 2016. The effects of highway development on housing prices. *Transportation* 43:2, 379-405. [[Crossref](#)]
1294. Gerald G. Gaes, William D. Bales, Samuel J. A. Scaggs. 2016. The effect of imprisonment on recommitment: an analysis using exact, coarsened exact, and radius matching with the propensity score. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 12:1, 143-158. [[Crossref](#)]
1295. J. Michael Oakes, Erika L. Fuchs, Allan D. Tate, Dylan L. Galos, Ifrah M. Biyoow. 2016. How Should We Improve Neighborhood Health? Evaluating Evidence from a Social Determinant Perspective. *Current Epidemiology Reports* 3:1, 106-112. [[Crossref](#)]
1296. Keith Kranker. 2016. Effects of Medicaid disease management programs on medical expenditures: Evidence from a natural experiment in Georgia. *Journal of Health Economics* 46, 52-69. [[Crossref](#)]
1297. Serena Yu. 2016. Retiree Welfare and the 2009 Pension Increase: Impacts from an Australian Experiment. *Economic Record* 92:296, 67-80. [[Crossref](#)]

1298. Matthew M. McConnachie, Brian W. van Wilgen, Paul J. Ferraro, Aurelia T. Forsyth, David M. Richardson, Mirijam Gaertner, Richard M. Cowling. 2016. Using counterfactuals to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of controlling biological invasions. *Ecological Applications* **26**:2, 475-483. [[Crossref](#)]
1299. Sung Jun, Joris Pinkse, Haiqing Xu, Neşe Yıldız. 2016. Multiple Discrete Endogenous Variables in Weakly-Separable Triangular Models. *Econometrics* **4**:1, 7. [[Crossref](#)]
1300. Sean R. McClellan, Laura Panattoni, Albert S. Chan, Ming Tai-Seale. 2016. Patient-initiated Electronic Messages and Quality of Care for Patients With Diabetes and Hypertension in a Large Fee-for-Service Medical Group. *Medical Care* **54**:3, 287-295. [[Crossref](#)]
1301. J. Scott Long, David M. Drukker. 2016. Regressions are Commonly Misinterpreted: Comments on the Article. *The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata* **16**:1, 25-29. [[Crossref](#)]
1302. David C. Hoaglin. 2016. Regressions are Commonly Misinterpreted: A Rejoinder. *The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata* **16**:1, 30-36. [[Crossref](#)]
1303. Ariel Linden, S. Derya Uysal, Andrew Ryan, John L. Adams. 2016. Estimating causal effects for multivalued treatments: a comparison of approaches. *Statistics in Medicine* **35**:4, 534-552. [[Crossref](#)]
1304. Rachel Carmenta, George Alan Blackburn, Gemma Davies, Claudio de Sassi, André Lima, Luke Parry, Wlodek Tych, Jos Barlow. 2016. Does the Establishment of Sustainable Use Reserves Affect Fire Management in the Humid Tropics?. *PLOS ONE* **11**:2, e0149292. [[Crossref](#)]
1305. Rodrigo A. Arriagada, Cristian M. Echeverria, Danisa E. Moya. 2016. Creating Protected Areas on Public Lands: Is There Room for Additional Conservation?. *PLOS ONE* **11**:2, e0148094. [[Crossref](#)]
1306. Jeffrey R. Vincent. 2016. Impact Evaluation of Forest Conservation Programs: Benefit-Cost Analysis, Without the Economics. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **63**:2, 395-408. [[Crossref](#)]
1307. Heidi Skovgaard Pedersen. 2016. Are PhDs winners or losers? Wage premiums for doctoral degrees in private sector employment. *Higher Education* **71**:2, 269-287. [[Crossref](#)]
1308. Inés Butler, Gabriela Galassi, Hernán Ruffo. 2016. Public funding for startups in Argentina: an impact evaluation. *Small Business Economics* **46**:2, 295-309. [[Crossref](#)]
1309. Bihong Huang, Yujun Lian, Wensu Li. 2016. How far is Chinese left-behind parents' health left behind?. *China Economic Review* **37**, 15-26. [[Crossref](#)]
1310. Sunil Chopra, Pei-Ju Wu. 2016. Eco-activities and operating performance in the computer and electronics industry. *European Journal of Operational Research* **248**:3, 971-981. [[Crossref](#)]
1311. Pablo Cuenca, Rodrigo Arriagada, Cristian Echeverría. 2016. How much deforestation do protected areas avoid in tropical Andean landscapes?. *Environmental Science & Policy* **56**, 56-66. [[Crossref](#)]
1312. Irina Murtazashvili, Jeffrey M. Wooldridge. 2016. A control function approach to estimating switching regression models with endogenous explanatory variables and endogenous switching. *Journal of Econometrics* **190**:2, 252-266. [[Crossref](#)]
1313. Yanhong Gong, Chen Yang, Xiaoxv Yin, Minmin Zhu, Huajie Yang, Yunxia Wang, Yongbin Li, Liqun Liu, Xiaoxin Dong, Shiyi Cao, Zuxun Lu. 2016. The effect of essential medicines programme on rational use of medicines in China. *Health Policy and Planning* **31**:1, 21-27. [[Crossref](#)]
1314. Manuela Chiavarini, Donatella Lanari, Liliana Minelli, Luca Pieroni, Luca Salmasi. 2016. Immigrant mothers and access to prenatal care: evidence from a regional population study in Italy. *BMJ Open* **6**:2, e008802. [[Crossref](#)]



1315. Juan José Miranda, Leonardo Corral, Allen Blackman, Gregory Asner, Eirivelthon Lima. 2016. Effects of Protected Areas on Forest Cover Change and Local Communities: Evidence from the Peruvian Amazon. *World Development* **78**, 288-307. [[Crossref](#)]
1316. Myoung-jae Lee. 2016. Generalized Difference in Differences With Panel Data and Least Squares Estimator. *Sociological Methods & Research* **45**:1, 134-157. [[Crossref](#)]
1317. Isaac Sitienei, Ashok K. Mishra, Aditya R. Khanal. Informal “Ganyu” Labor Supply, and Food Security: The Case of Malawi 159-175. [[Crossref](#)]
1318. Jan Pettersson, Johan Wikström\*. 2016. Human fertilizer and the productivity of farming households. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems* **40**:1, 48-68. [[Crossref](#)]
1319. Boris Kaiser, Christian Schmid. 2016. Does Physician Dispensing Increase Drug Expenditures? Empirical Evidence from Switzerland. *Health Economics* **25**:1, 71-90. [[Crossref](#)]
1320. Crystal D. Bishop, Patricia A. Snyder, James Algina, Walter Leite. Expanding Frontiers in Research Designs, Methods, and Measurement in Support of Evidence-Based Practice in Early Childhood Special Education 501-539. [[Crossref](#)]
1321. Karl R. Geisler, Mark W. Nichols. 2016. Riverboat casino gambling impacts on employment and income in host and surrounding counties. *The Annals of Regional Science* **56**:1, 101-123. [[Crossref](#)]
1322. B. McCall, J. Smith, C. Wunsch. Government-Sponsored Vocational Education for Adults 479-652. [[Crossref](#)]
1323. Xu Wang. 2016. Will the enterprise performance be enhanced by reduction of perks of executives of the state-owned enterprises?. *SHS Web of Conferences* **25**, 02011. [[Crossref](#)]
1324. Jonathan Glennie, Andy Sumner. Assessing Aid: Conceptual and Methodological Issues 31-47. [[Crossref](#)]
1325. Cyrus Samii, Laura Paler, Sarah Zukerman Daly. 2016. Retrospective Causal Inference with Machine Learning Ensembles: An Application to Anti-recidivism Policies in Colombia. *Political Analysis* **24**:4, 434-456. [[Crossref](#)]
1326. Ángela Rocío Vásquez-Urriago, Andrés Barge-Gil, Aurelia Modrego Rico. 2016. Which firms benefit more from being located in a Science and Technology Park? Empirical evidence for Spain. *Research Evaluation* **25**:1, 107-117. [[Crossref](#)]
1327. Peter M. Aronow, Cyrus Samii. 2016. Does Regression Produce Representative Estimates of Causal Effects?. *American Journal of Political Science* **60**:1, 250-267. [[Crossref](#)]
1328. Joseph Kangmennaang, Isaac Luginaah. 2016. The Influences of Health Insurance and Access to Information on Prostate Cancer Screening among Men in Dominican Republic. *Journal of Cancer Epidemiology* **2016**, 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
1329. Benjamin Guin. 2016. Culture and Household Saving. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1330. Thomas B. Astebro, Florian Hoos. 2016. The Effects of a Training Program to Encourage Social Entrepreneurship. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1331. Pedro H. C. Sant'Anna. 2016. Program Evaluation with Right-Censored Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1332. Tim Kaiser, Lukas Menkhoff. 2016. Does Financial Education Impact Financial Behavior, and If so, When?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

1333. Julian Bergler, Sven Heim, Kai HHschelrath. 2016. Strategic Capacity Withholding Through Failures in the German-Austrian Electricity Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1334. Federica Bertamino, Raffaello Bronzini, Marco De Maggio, Davide Revelli. 2016. Local Policies for Innovation: The Case of Technology Districts in Italy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1335. Zazy Khan. 2016. Activist Hedge Funds: Evidence from the Recent Financial Crisis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1336. Sebastian Bunnenberg, Steffen Meyer. 2016. On Size and Power in Difference-in-Differences Studies with Observational Data in Financial Economics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1337. Sebastian Galiani, Patrick J. McEwan, Brian Quistorff. 2016. External and Internal Validity of a Geographic Quasi-Experiment Embedded in a Cluster-Randomized Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1338. Diego Escobari, Nicholas G. Rupp, Joseph Meskey. 2016. Price Discrimination and Focal Points for Tacit Collusion: Evidence from the Airline Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1339. Huasheng Gao, Po-Hsuan Hsu, Kai Li, Jin Zhang. 2016. The Real Effect of Smoking Bans: Evidence from Corporate Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1340. Daniel Ruf. 2016. Agglomeration Effects and Liquidity Gradients in Local Rental Housing Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1341. Carlianne Patrick, Chris Mothorpe. 2016. Demand for New Cities: Property Value Capitalization of Municipal Incorporation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1342. Erin Strumpf, Julie Fiset-Laniel, Pierre Tousignant. 2016. The Impact of Team-Based Primary Care on Health Care Services Utilization and Costs: Quebec's Family Medicine Groups. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1343. Nathan M. Fong, Yuchi Zhang, Xueming Luo, Xiaoyi Wang. 2016. Targeted Promotions and Cross-Category Spillover Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1344. Ben Zou. 2016. The Local Economic Impacts of Military Personnel Contractions in the 1990s. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1345. Esteban F. Klor, Sebastian M. Saiegh, Shanker Satyanath. 2016. Crony Capitalism and the Targeting of Violence: Labor Repression During Argentina's Last Dictatorship. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1346. Laura Kawano, Caroline Weber. 2016. Estimating the Elasticity of Broad Income for High-Income Taxpayers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1347. Leandro D'Aurizio, Domenico Depalo. 2016. An Evaluation of the Policies on Repayment of Government's Trade Debt in Italy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1348. Gishan Dissanaik, Wolfgang Drobetz, Paul Peyman Momtaz. 2016. Does Competition Policy Affect Acquisition Efficiency? Evidence from the Reform of European Merger Control. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1349. Nicolas Koch. 2016. European Climate Policy and Industrial Relocation: Evidence from German Multinational Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1350. Pedro H. C. Sant'Anna, Xiaojun Song. 2016. Specification Tests for the Propensity Score. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

1351. Yoshihiro Sato. 2016. Does Assigning More Women to Managerial Positions Enhance Firm Productivity? Evidence from Sweden. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1352. Seshadri Tirunillai, Gerard J. Tellis. 2016. Does Offline TV Advertising Affect Online Chatter? Quasi-Experimental Analysis Using Synthetic Control. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1353. Verena Lauber, Johanna Storck. 2016. Helping with the Kids? How Family-Friendly Workplaces Affect Parental Well-Being and Behavior. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1354. Juergen Jung, Vinish Shrestha. 2016. The Affordable Care Act and College Enrollment Decisions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1355. Eduardo A. Cavallo, Gabriel Sanchez, Patricio Valenzuela. 2016. Gone with the Wind: Demographic Transitions and Domestic Saving. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1356. Marislei Nishijima, Randall P. Ellis, Regina Celia Cati. 2016. Evaluating the Impact of Brazil's Central Audit Program on Municipal Provision of Health Services. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1357. Christian Oberst, Hendrik Schmitz, Reinhard Madlener. 2016. Are Prosumer Households that Much Different? Evidence from Stated Residential Energy Consumption in Germany. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1358. Ruchir Agarwal, Julian Kolev. 2016. Strategic Corporate Layoffs. *IMF Working Papers* **16**:255, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
1359. Tiago Cavalcanti, Daniel Da Mata, Frederik Toscani. 2016. Winning the Oil Lottery: The Impact of Natural Resource Extraction on Growth. *IMF Working Papers* **16**:61, 1. [[Crossref](#)]
1360. Clément Malgouyres, Loriane Py. 2016. Les dispositifs d'exonérations géographiquement ciblées bénéficient-ils aux résidents de ces zones ?. *Revue économique* **67**:3, 581. [[Crossref](#)]
1361. Laurent Gobillon, Benjamin Vignolles. 2016. Évaluation de l'effet d'une politique spatialisée d'accès au logement. *Revue économique* **67**:3, 615. [[Crossref](#)]
1362. Patrice Bougette, Christophe Charlier. 2016. La difficile conciliation entre politique de concurrence et politique industrielle : le soutien aux énergies renouvelables. *Revue économique* **67**:HS1, 185. [[Crossref](#)]
1363. Laurent Gobillon, François-Charles Wolff. 2016. Evaluer l'effet local d'une innovation : une application au marché du poisson français. *Revue française d'économie* **XXXI**:1, 245. [[Crossref](#)]
1364. Pedro H. C. Sant'Anna. 2016. Nonparametric Tests for Treatment Effect Heterogeneity with Duration Outcomes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1365. Anning Hu, Sarah A Mustillo. 2016. Recent development of propensity score methods in observational studies: Multi-categorical treatment, causal mediation, and heterogeneity. *Current Sociology* **64**:1, 60-82. [[Crossref](#)]
1366. Ronnie Pingel, Ingeborg Waernbaum. 2015. Correlation and efficiency of propensity score-based estimators for average causal effects. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation* **84**, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
1367. Ani Rudra Silwal, Andy McKay. 2015. The Impact of Cooking with Firewood on Respiratory Health: Evidence from Indonesia. *The Journal of Development Studies* **51**:12, 1619-1633. [[Crossref](#)]
1368. Hannu Karhunen, Janne Huovari. 2015. R&D subsidies and productivity in SMEs. *Small Business Economics* **45**:4, 805-823. [[Crossref](#)]

1369. Bola Amoke Awotide, Arega D. Alene, Tahirou Abdoulaye, Victor M. Manyong. 2015. Impact of agricultural technology adoption on asset ownership: the case of improved cassava varieties in Nigeria. *Food Security* 7:6, 1239-1258. [[Crossref](#)]
1370. Valeria Gattai. 2015. Internationalisation and performance at the firm-level: what we learn from Italy. *Economia e Politica Industriale* 42:4, 475-509. [[Crossref](#)]
1371. C. Cozza, R. Rabellotti, M. Sanfilippo. 2015. The impact of outward FDI on the performance of Chinese firms. *China Economic Review* 36, 42-57. [[Crossref](#)]
1372. Michael S. Delgado, Raymond J.G.M. Florax. 2015. Difference-in-differences techniques for spatial data: Local autocorrelation and spatial interaction. *Economics Letters* 137, 123-126. [[Crossref](#)]
1373. Vincenzo Mauro, Mario Biggeri, Leonardo Grilli. 2015. Does Community-Based Rehabilitation Enhance the Multidimensional Well-Being of Deprived Persons With Disabilities? A Multilevel Impact Evaluation. *World Development* 76, 190-202. [[Crossref](#)]
1374. Simon C Kimenju, Ramona Rischke, Stephan Klasen, Martin Qaim. 2015. Do supermarkets contribute to the obesity pandemic in developing countries?. *Public Health Nutrition* 18:17, 3224-3233. [[Crossref](#)]
1375. James Macinko, Frederico C. Guanais. 2015. Population experiences of primary care in 11 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 27:6, 443-450. [[Crossref](#)]
1376. Yingying Dong, Arthur Lewbel. 2015. Identifying the Effect of Changing the Policy Threshold in Regression Discontinuity Models. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 97:5, 1081-1092. [[Crossref](#)]
1377. Rosamaría Dasso, Fernando Fernandez. 2015. The effects of electrification on employment in rural Peru. *IZA Journal of Labor & Development* 4:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
1378. Danilo Freire. 2015. Causal Inference, Shaolin Style: "Mastering 'Metrics". *Brazilian Political Science Review* 9:3, 178-185. [[Crossref](#)]
1379. Shenyang Guo, Qi Wu, Paul R. Smokowski, Martica Bacallao, Caroline B. R. Evans, Katie L. Cotter. 2015. A Longitudinal Evaluation of the Positive Action Program in a Low-Income, Racially Diverse, Rural County: Effects on Self-Esteem, School Hassles, Aggression, and Internalizing Symptoms. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 44:12, 2337-2358. [[Crossref](#)]
1380. Alain de Crombrughe, Marc Romainville. 2015. Cours interactif et performance académique d'étudiants de première année universitaire en économie. *Revue internationale de pédagogie de l'enseignement supérieur* 31:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
1381. Kandice A. Kapinos, John P. Caloyeras, Hangsheng Liu, Soeren Mattke. 2015. Does Targeting Higher Health Risk Employees or Increasing Intervention Intensity Yield Savings in a Workplace Wellness Program?. *Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine* 57:12, 1257-1261. [[Crossref](#)]
1382. Daniel Mejía, Pascual Restrepo, Sandra V. Rozo. 2015. On the Effects of Enforcement on Illegal Markets: Evidence from a Quasi-experiment in Colombia\*. *The World Bank Economic Review* 76, lhv051. [[Crossref](#)]
1383. Merlin M. Hanauer, Gustavo Canavire-Bacarreza. 2015. Implications of heterogeneous impacts of protected areas on deforestation and poverty. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 370:1681, 20140272. [[Crossref](#)]
1384. Anita Alves Pena. 2015. The effect of continuing education participation on outcomes of male and female agricultural workers in the USA. *Education Economics* 23:6, 751-776. [[Crossref](#)]

1385. Elena Denisova-Schmidt, Martin Huber, Yaroslav Prytula. 2015. An experimental evaluation of an anti-corruption intervention among Ukrainian university students. *Eurasian Geography and Economics* **56**:6, 713-734. [[Crossref](#)]
1386. Jennifer M. Alix-Garcia, Katharine R. E. Sims, Patricia Yañez-Pagans. 2015. Only One Tree from Each Seed? Environmental Effectiveness and Poverty Alleviation in Mexico's Payments for Ecosystem Services Program. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **7**:4, 1-40. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
1387. Xuequn Hu, Murat K. Munkin, Pravin K. Trivedi. 2015. Estimating Incentive and Selection Effects in the Medigap Insurance Market: An Application with Dirichlet Process Mixture Model. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **30**:7, 1115-1143. [[Crossref](#)]
1388. Mauricio Farías, María Paola Sevilla. 2015. Effectiveness of Vocational High Schools in Students' Access to and Persistence in Postsecondary Vocational Education. *Research in Higher Education* **56**:7, 693-718. [[Crossref](#)]
1389. Daniela A. Miteva, Brian C. Murray, Subhrendu K. Pattanayak. 2015. Do protected areas reduce blue carbon emissions? A quasi-experimental evaluation of mangroves in Indonesia. *Ecological Economics* **119**, 127-135. [[Crossref](#)]
1390. Annemarie Paul. 2015. After work shopping? Employment effects of a deregulation of shop opening hours in the German retail sector. *European Economic Review* **80**, 329-353. [[Crossref](#)]
1391. Max H. Farrell. 2015. Robust inference on average treatment effects with possibly more covariates than observations. *Journal of Econometrics* **189**:1, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
1392. Stefan Kirchweger, Jochen Kantelhardt. 2015. The dynamic effects of government-supported farm-investment activities on structural change in Austrian agriculture. *Land Use Policy* **48**, 73-93. [[Crossref](#)]
1393. Nga Pham, K.B. Oh, Richard Pech. 2015. Mergers and acquisitions: CEO duality, operating performance and stock returns in Vietnam. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* **35**, 298-316. [[Crossref](#)]
1394. Raoul Herrmann, Ulrike Grote. 2015. Large-scale Agro-Industrial Investments and Rural Poverty: Evidence from Sugarcane in Malawi. *Journal of African Economies* **24**:5, 645-676. [[Crossref](#)]
1395. Erin O. Sills, Jill L. Caviglia-Harris. 2015. Evaluating the long-term impacts of promoting "green" agriculture in the Amazon. *Agricultural Economics* **46**:S1, 83-102. [[Crossref](#)]
1396. Samuel Benin. 2015. Impact of Ghana's agricultural mechanization services center program. *Agricultural Economics* **46**:S1, 103-117. [[Crossref](#)]
1397. Johannes Van Biesebroeck, Emily Yu, Shenjie Chen. 2015. The impact of trade promotion services on Canadian exporter performance. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économie* **48**:4, 1481-1512. [[Crossref](#)]
1398. Richard Harris, John Moffat. 2015. The Impact of Exporting and Importing Goods and Services on Productivity in the UK. *The World Economy* **38**:11, 1781-1794. [[Crossref](#)]
1399. Mark W. Nichols, Mehmet Serkan Tosun, Jingjing Yang. 2015. The Fiscal Impact of Legalized Casino Gambling. *Public Finance Review* **43**:6, 739-761. [[Crossref](#)]
1400. Samuel Bazzi, Sudarno Sumarto, Asep Suryahadi. 2015. It's all in the timing: Cash transfers and consumption smoothing in a developing country. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **119**, 267-288. [[Crossref](#)]

1401. Paul C. Wang, Albert Mwangi, Sarah Moberley, Benjamin J. Brockman, Alison L. Connor, Penelope Kalesha-Masumbu, Simon Mutembo, Maximillian Bweupe, Pascalina Chanda-Kapata, Godfrey Biemba, Davidson H. Hamer, Benjamin Chibuye, Elizabeth McCarthy. 2015. A Cluster Randomised Trial on the Impact of Integrating Early Infant HIV Diagnosis with the Expanded Programme on Immunization on Immunization and HIV Testing Rates in Rural Health Facilities in Southern Zambia. *PLOS ONE* **10**:10, e0141455. [[Crossref](#)]
1402. Kelly W. Jones, David J. Lewis. 2015. Estimating the Counterfactual Impact of Conservation Programs on Land Cover Outcomes: The Role of Matching and Panel Regression Techniques. *PLOS ONE* **10**:10, e0141380. [[Crossref](#)]
1403. Alexey Bessudnov, Igor Guardiancich, Ramon Marimon. 2015. A statistical evaluation of the effects of a structured postdoctoral programme. *Studies in Higher Education* **40**:9, 1588-1604. [[Crossref](#)]
1404. Jason Abrevaya, Yu-Chin Hsu, Robert P. Lieli. 2015. Estimating Conditional Average Treatment Effects. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **33**:4, 485-505. [[Crossref](#)]
1405. Xun Lu. 2015. A Covariate Selection Criterion for Estimation of Treatment Effects. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **33**:4, 506-522. [[Crossref](#)]
1406. Sebastian Calonico, Matias D. Cattaneo, Rocío Titiunik. 2015. Optimal Data-Driven Regression Discontinuity Plots. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **110**:512, 1753-1769. [[Crossref](#)]
1407. Marco Caliendo, Steffen Künn. 2015. Getting back into the labor market: the effects of start-up subsidies for unemployed females. *Journal of Population Economics* **28**:4, 1005-1043. [[Crossref](#)]
1408. Jan Goebel, Christian Krekel, Tim Tiefenbach, Nicolas R. Ziebarth. 2015. How natural disasters can affect environmental concerns, risk aversion, and even politics: evidence from Fukushima and three European countries. *Journal of Population Economics* **28**:4, 1137-1180. [[Crossref](#)]
1409. Qi Wu, Kevin R. White, Kanisha L. Coleman. 2015. Effects of kinship care on behavioral problems by child age: A propensity score analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review* **57**, 1-8. [[Crossref](#)]
1410. Raquel Bernal. 2015. The impact of a vocational education program for childcare providers on children's well-being. *Economics of Education Review* **48**, 165-183. [[Crossref](#)]
1411. Simone Schüller. 2015. The 9/11 conservative shift. *Economics Letters* **135**, 80-84. [[Crossref](#)]
1412. San-Kuei Huang, Pen-Jen Wang, Wen-Fuh Tseng, Fei-Kai Syu, Miaw-Chwen Lee, Ru-Liang Shih, Mao-Ting Sheen, Michael S. Chen. 2015. NHI-PharmaCloud in Taiwan—A preliminary evaluation using the RE-AIM framework and lessons learned. *International Journal of Medical Informatics* **84**:10, 817-825. [[Crossref](#)]
1413. Tim Tiefenbach, Florian Kohlbacher. 2015. Disasters, donations, and tax law changes: Disentangling effects on subjective well-being by exploiting a natural experiment. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **50**, 94-112. [[Crossref](#)]
1414. Leon J.H. Bettendorf, Egbert L.W. Jongen, Paul Muller. 2015. Childcare subsidies and labour supply — Evidence from a large Dutch reform. *Labour Economics* **36**, 112-123. [[Crossref](#)]
1415. Hasan Bakhshi, John S. Edwards, Stephen Roper, Judy Scully, Duncan Shaw, Lorraine Morley, Nicola Rathbone. 2015. Assessing an experimental approach to industrial policy evaluation: Applying RCT + to the case of Creative Credits. *Research Policy* **44**:8, 1462-1472. [[Crossref](#)]
1416. Weizeng Sun, Siqi Zheng, Rui Wang. 2015. The capitalization of subway access in home value: A repeat-rentals model with supply constraints in Beijing. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **80**, 104-115. [[Crossref](#)]



1417. Rodrigo Oliveira, Klebson Moura, Jorge Viana, Robson Tigre, Breno Sampaio. 2015. Commute duration and health: Empirical evidence from Brazil. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **80**, 62-75. [[Crossref](#)]
1418. Laura Sudulich, Matthew Wall, Leonardo Baccini. 2015. Wired Voters: The Effects of Internet Use on Voters' Electoral Uncertainty. *British Journal of Political Science* **45**:4, 853-881. [[Crossref](#)]
1419. Azizjon Alimov. 2015. Labor market regulations and cross-border mergers and acquisitions. *Journal of International Business Studies* **46**:8, 984-1009. [[Crossref](#)]
1420. Aparna Sundaram, Fatima Juarez, Clement Ahiadeke, Akinrinola Bankole, Nakeisha Blades. 2015. The impact of Ghana's R3M programme on the provision of safe abortions and postabortion care. *Health Policy and Planning* **30**:8, 1017-1031. [[Crossref](#)]
1421. Minsu Chang, Sokbae Lee, Yoon-Jae Whang. 2015. Nonparametric tests of conditional treatment effects with an application to single-sex schooling on academic achievements. *The Econometrics Journal* **18**:3, 307-346. [[Crossref](#)]
1422. Rajshri Jayaraman, Dora Simroth. 2015. The Impact of School Lunches on Primary School Enrollment: Evidence from India's Midday Meal Scheme. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* **117**:4, 1176-1203. [[Crossref](#)]
1423. Juan Díaz, Tomás Rau, Jorge Rivera. 2015. A Matching Estimator Based on a Bilevel Optimization Problem. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **97**:4, 803-812. [[Crossref](#)]
1424. Sam Jones, Finn Tarp. 2015. Priorities for Boosting Employment in Sub-Saharan Africa: Evidence for Mozambique. *African Development Review* **27**:S1, 56-70. [[Crossref](#)]
1425. Timo Mitze, Alfredo R. Paloyo, Björn Alecke. 2015. Is There a Purchase Limit on Regional Growth? A Quasi-experimental Evaluation of Investment Grants Using Matching Techniques. *International Regional Science Review* **38**:4, 388-412. [[Crossref](#)]
1426. Raffaello Bronzini. 2015. The Effects of Extensive and Intensive Margins of FDI on Domestic Employment: Microeconomic Evidence from Italy. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* **15**:4, 2079-2109. [[Crossref](#)]
1427. Sea-Jin Chang, Jungwook Shim. 2015. When does transitioning from family to professional management improve firm performance?. *Strategic Management Journal* **36**:9, 1297-1316. [[Crossref](#)]
1428. Peter Ericson, Lennart Flood, Nizamul Islam. 2015. Taxes, wages and working hours. *Empirical Economics* **49**:2, 503-535. [[Crossref](#)]
1429. Nick Deschacht, Katie Goeman. 2015. The effect of blended learning on course persistence and performance of adult learners: A difference-in-differences analysis. *Computers & Education* **87**, 83-89. [[Crossref](#)]
1430. Timothy Powell-Jackson, Sumit Mazumdar, Anne Mills. 2015. Financial incentives in health: New evidence from India's Janani Suraksha Yojana. *Journal of Health Economics* **43**, 154-169. [[Crossref](#)]
1431. Maru Shete, Marcel Rutten. 2015. Impacts of large-scale farming on local communities' food security and income levels – Empirical evidence from Oromia Region, Ethiopia. *Land Use Policy* **47**, 282-292. [[Crossref](#)]
1432. Yangfei Xu, Qinghua Zhang, Siqi Zheng. 2015. The rising demand for subway after private driving restriction: Evidence from Beijing's housing market. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **54**, 28-37. [[Crossref](#)]

1433. Doris Läßle, Thia Hennessy. 2015. Assessing the Impact of Financial Incentives in Extension Programmes: Evidence From Ireland. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **66**:3, 781-795. [[Crossref](#)]
1434. Andy Sumner, Jonathan Glennie. 2015. Growth, Poverty and Development Assistance: When Does Foreign Aid Work?. *Global Policy* **6**:3, 201-211. [[Crossref](#)]
1435. Donal G. MCKILLOP, Barry QUINN. 2015. WEB ADOPTION BY IRISH CREDIT UNIONS: PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* **86**:3, 421-443. [[Crossref](#)]
1436. Francesca Sgobbi, Fátima Suleman. 2015. The Value of Transferable Skills. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* **62**:4, 378-399. [[Crossref](#)]
1437. Doris Läßle, Thia Hennessy. 2015. Exploring the Role of Incentives in Agricultural Extension Programs. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* **37**:3, 403-417. [[Crossref](#)]
1438. Kim P. Huynh, David T. Jacho-Chávez, James K. Self. 2015. The Distributional Efficacy of Collaborative Learning on Student Outcomes. *The American Economist* **60**:2, 98-119. [[Crossref](#)]
1439. John A. Maluccio, Tia Palermo, Suneetha Kadiyala, Rahul Rawat. 2015. Improving Health-Related Quality of Life among People Living with HIV: Results from an Impact Evaluation of a Food Assistance Program in Uganda. *PLOS ONE* **10**:8, e0135879. [[Crossref](#)]
1440. Martin Huber, Michael Lechner, Andreas Steinmayr. 2015. Radius matching on the propensity score with bias adjustment: tuning parameters and finite sample behaviour. *Empirical Economics* **49**:1, 1-31. [[Crossref](#)]
1441. Cinzia Di Novi, Rowena Jacobs, Matteo Migheli. 2015. The Quality of Life of Female Informal Caregivers: From Scandinavia to the Mediterranean Sea. *European Journal of Population* **31**:3, 309-333. [[Crossref](#)]
1442. Stefan Boes, Stephan Nüesch, Kaspar Wüthrich. 2015. Hedonic valuation of the perceived risks of nuclear power plants. *Economics Letters* **133**, 109-111. [[Crossref](#)]
1443. Marco Sanfilippo. 2015. FDI from emerging markets and the productivity gap—An analysis on affiliates of BRICS EMNEs in Europe. *International Business Review* **24**:4, 665-676. [[Crossref](#)]
1444. Christine G.K. Chege, Camilla I.M. Andersson, Matin Qaim. 2015. Impacts of Supermarkets on Farm Household Nutrition in Kenya. *World Development* **72**, 394-407. [[Crossref](#)]
1445. Jordi Blanes i Vidal, Clare Leaver. 2015. Bias in Open Peer-Review: Evidence from the English Superior Courts. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* **31**:3, 431-471. [[Crossref](#)]
1446. Paolo Pinotti. 2015. The Economic Costs of Organised Crime: Evidence from Southern Italy. *The Economic Journal* **125**:586, F203-F232. [[Crossref](#)]
1447. Tymon Słoczyński. 2015. The Oaxaca-Blinder Unexplained Component as a Treatment Effects Estimator. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **77**:4, 588-604. [[Crossref](#)]
1448. Tristan Kohl, Sofia Trojanowska. 2015. Heterogeneous trade agreements, WTO membership and international trade: an analysis using matching econometrics. *Applied Economics* **47**:33, 3499-3509. [[Crossref](#)]
1449. R. A. Arriagada, E. O. Sills, P. J. Ferraro, S. K. Pattanayak. 2015. Do Payments Pay Off? Evidence from Participation in Costa Rica's PES Program. *PLOS ONE* **10**:7, e0131544. [[Crossref](#)]

1450. Ronnie Pingel, Ingeborg Waernbaum. 2015. Effects of correlated covariates on the asymptotic efficiency of matching and inverse probability weighting estimators for causal inference. *Statistics* **49**:4, 795-814. [[Crossref](#)]
1451. Hanna Hottenrott, Sascha Rexhäuser. 2015. Policy-Induced Environmental Technology and Inventive Efforts: Is There a Crowding Out?. *Industry and Innovation* **22**:5, 375-401. [[Crossref](#)]
1452. Jane Greve, Eskil Heinesen. 2015. Evaluating the impact of a school-based health intervention using a randomized field experiment. *Economics & Human Biology* **18**, 41-56. [[Crossref](#)]
1453. Silvia Prina. 2015. Banking the poor via savings accounts: Evidence from a field experiment. *Journal of Development Economics* **115**, 16-31. [[Crossref](#)]
1454. Miquel-Àngel Garcia-López, Albert Solé-Ollé, Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal. 2015. Does zoning follow highways?. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **53**, 148-155. [[Crossref](#)]
1455. Johan Blomquist, Cecilia Hammarlund, Staffan Waldo. 2015. Time for Fishing: Bargaining Power in the Swedish Baltic Cod Fishery. *Marine Resource Economics* **30**:3, 315-329. [[Crossref](#)]
1456. Thomas Mason, Matthew Sutton, William Whittaker, Tim McSweeney, Tim Millar, Michael Donmall, Andrew Jones, Matthias Pierce. 2015. The impact of paying treatment providers for outcomes: difference-in-differences analysis of the 'payment by results for drugs recovery' pilot. *Addiction* **110**:7, 1120-1128. [[Crossref](#)]
1457. Daniela A. Miteva, Colby J. Loucks, Subhrendu K. Pattanayak. 2015. Social and Environmental Impacts of Forest Management Certification in Indonesia. *PLOS ONE* **10**:7, e0129675. [[Crossref](#)]
1458. Joachim Wagner, John P. Weche Gelübcke. 2015. Access to finance, foreign ownership and foreign takeovers in Germany. *Applied Economics* **47**:29, 3092-3112. [[Crossref](#)]
1459. Heli Koski, Mika Pajarinen. 2015. Subsidies, the Shadow of Death and Labor Productivity. *Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade* **15**:2, 189-204. [[Crossref](#)]
1460. Marco Caliendo, Jens Hogenacker, Steffen Künn, Frank Wießner. 2015. Subsidized start-ups out of unemployment: a comparison to regular business start-ups. *Small Business Economics* **45**:1, 165-190. [[Crossref](#)]
1461. Jens Dietrichson, Lina Maria Ellegård. 2015. Assist or desist? Conditional bailouts and fiscal discipline in local governments. *European Journal of Political Economy* **38**, 153-168. [[Crossref](#)]
1462. Mauricio Larrain. 2015. Capital Account Opening and Wage Inequality. *The Review of Financial Studies* **28**:6, 1555-1587. [[Crossref](#)]
1463. Amit Basole, Deepankar Basu, Rajesh Bhattacharya. 2015. Determinants and impacts of subcontracting: evidence from India's unorganized manufacturing sector. *International Review of Applied Economics* **29**:3, 374-402. [[Crossref](#)]
1464. Sebastian Koehler, Thomas König. 2015. Fiscal Governance in the Eurozone: How Effectively Does the Stability and Growth Pact Limit Governmental Debt in the Euro Countries?. *Political Science Research and Methods* **3**:2, 329-351. [[Crossref](#)]
1465. Youngwan Kim, Peter Nunnenkamp. 2015. Does It Pay for US-based NGOs to Go to War? Empirical Evidence for Afghanistan and Iraq. *Development and Change* **46**:3, 387-414. [[Crossref](#)]
1466. David Dean, John Pepper, Robert Schmidt, Steven Stern. 2015. THE EFFECTS OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION FOR PEOPLE WITH COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENTS. *International Economic Review* **56**:2, 399-426. [[Crossref](#)]

1467. Steven Sexton. 2015. Automatic Bill Payment and Salience Effects: Evidence from Electricity Consumption. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **97**:2, 229-241. [[Crossref](#)]
1468. Shenyang Guo. 2015. Shaping Social Work Science. *Research on Social Work Practice* **25**:3, 370-381. [[Crossref](#)]
1469. Paul R. Rosenbaum. 2015. How to See More in Observational Studies: Some New Quasi-Experimental Devices. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **2**:1, 21-48. [[Crossref](#)]
1470. John Moffat. 2015. Regional Selective Assistance (RSA) in Scotland: Does It Make a Difference to Plant Survival?. *Regional Studies* **49**:4, 568-581. [[Crossref](#)]
1471. Xiaoyong Dai, Liwei Cheng. 2015. Public selection and research and development effort of manufacturing enterprises in China: state owned enterprises versus non-state owned enterprises. *Innovation* **17**:2, 182-195. [[Crossref](#)]
1472. G. Pugh, J. Mangan, V. Blackburn, D. Radicic. 2015. School expenditure and school performance: evidence from New South Wales schools using a dynamic panel analysis. *British Educational Research Journal* **41**:2, 244-264. [[Crossref](#)]
1473. Allen Blackman. 2015. Strict versus mixed-use protected areas: Guatemala's Maya Biosphere Reserve. *Ecological Economics* **112**, 14-24. [[Crossref](#)]
1474. Prakarsh Singh. 2015. Performance pay and information: Reducing child undernutrition in India. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **112**, 141-163. [[Crossref](#)]
1475. Yang Wang, Binzhen Wu. 2015. Railways and the Local Economy: Evidence from Qingzang Railway. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* **63**:3, 551-588. [[Crossref](#)]
1476. Krishna Regmi. 2015. Extended Unemployment Insurance and Job Search: Evidence from Time Use Data. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* **15**:2, 653-683. [[Crossref](#)]
1477. Giorgia Giovannetti, Enrico Marvasi, Marco Sanfilippo. 2015. Supply chains and the internationalization of small firms. *Small Business Economics* **44**:4, 845-865. [[Crossref](#)]
1478. Sébastien Costedoat, Esteve Corbera, Driss Ezzine-de-Blas, Jordi Honey-Rosés, Kathy Baylis, Miguel Angel Castillo-Santiago. 2015. How Effective Are Biodiversity Conservation Payments in Mexico?. *PLOS ONE* **10**:3, e0119881. [[Crossref](#)]
1479. Myoung-Jae Lee. 2015. Reference parameters in Blinder-Oaxaca decomposition: Pooled-sample versus intercept-shift approaches. *The Journal of Economic Inequality* **13**:1, 69-82. [[Crossref](#)]
1480. Allen Blackman, Alexander Pfaff, Juan Robalino. 2015. Paper park performance: Mexico's natural protected areas in the 1990s. *Global Environmental Change* **31**, 50-61. [[Crossref](#)]
1481. Sylvain Chabé-Ferret. 2015. Analysis of the bias of Matching and Difference-in-Difference under alternative earnings and selection processes. *Journal of Econometrics* **185**:1, 110-123. [[Crossref](#)]
1482. Kelly J Wendland, Subhrendu K Pattanayak, Erin O Sills. 2015. National-level differences in the adoption of environmental health technologies: a cross-border comparison from Benin and Togo. *Health Policy and Planning* **30**:2, 145-154. [[Crossref](#)]
1483. Michael Bradley, Dong Chen. 2015. Does Board Independence Reduce the Cost of Debt?. *Financial Management* **44**:1, 15-47. [[Crossref](#)]
1484. Christian Brown. 2015. Returns to Postincarceration Education for Former Prisoners\*. *Social Science Quarterly* **96**:1, 161-175. [[Crossref](#)]

1485. Marco Caliendo, Deborah A. Cobb-Clark, Arne Uhlenndorff. 2015. Locus of Control and Job Search Strategies. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **97**:1, 88-103. [[Crossref](#)]
1486. Marco Giesselmann,, Carsten Schröder,, Johannes Giesecke,, John Haisken-DeNew,, Anika Rasner,, Jule Specht. 2015. Editorial: From Panel Data to Longitudinal Analytical Designs: a Note on Contemporary Research Based on Data from the Socio Economic Panel Study (SOEP). *Schmollers Jahrbuch* **135**:1, 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
1487. Alfonso Flores-Lagunes, Troy Timko. 2015. Does Participation in 4-H Improve Schooling Outcomes? Evidence from Florida. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **97**:2, 414-434. [[Crossref](#)]
1488. Patrick J. McEwan, Erin Murphy-Graham, David Torres Irribarra, Claudia Aguilar, Renán Rápalo. 2015. Improving Middle School Quality in Poor Countries. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* **37**:1, 113-137. [[Crossref](#)]
1489. John P. Weche Geluebcke. 2015. The impact of foreign takeovers: comparative evidence from foreign and domestic acquisitions in Germany. *Applied Economics* **47**:8, 739-755. [[Crossref](#)]
1490. Thomas Blondiau, Carole M. Billiet, Sandra Rousseau. 2015. Comparison of criminal and administrative penalties for environmental offenses. *European Journal of Law and Economics* **39**:1, 11-35. [[Crossref](#)]
1491. Adrian Hille, Jürgen Schupp. 2015. How learning a musical instrument affects the development of skills. *Economics of Education Review* **44**, 56-82. [[Crossref](#)]
1492. Kenneth Fortson, Philip Gleason, Emma Kopa, Natalya Verbitsky-Savitz. 2015. Horseshoes, hand grenades, and treatment effects? Reassessing whether nonexperimental estimators are biased. *Economics of Education Review* **44**, 100-113. [[Crossref](#)]
1493. Judea Pearl. 2015. TRYGVE HAAVELMO AND THE EMERGENCE OF CAUSAL CALCULUS. *Econometric Theory* **31**:1, 152-179. [[Crossref](#)]
1494. Azizjon Alimov. 2015. Labor Protection Laws and Bank Loan Contracting. *The Journal of Law and Economics* **58**:1, 37-74. [[Crossref](#)]
1495. H. Pamuk, E. Bulte, A. Adekunle, A. Diagne. 2015. Decentralised innovation systems and poverty reduction: experimental evidence from Central Africa. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **42**:1, 99-127. [[Crossref](#)]
1496. John Asker, Joan Farre-Mensa, Alexander Ljungqvist. 2015. Corporate Investment and Stock Market Listing: A Puzzle?. *Review of Financial Studies* **28**:2, 342-390. [[Crossref](#)]
1497. Ian M. McCarthy, Chessie Robinson, Sakib Huq, Martha Philastre, Robert L. Fine. 2015. Cost Savings from Palliative Care Teams and Guidance for a Financially Viable Palliative Care Program. *Health Services Research* **50**:1, 217-236. [[Crossref](#)]
1498. Benjamin Schünemann, Michael Lechner, Conny Wunsch. 2015. Do Long-Term Unemployed Workers Benefit from Targeted Wage Subsidies?. *German Economic Review* **16**:1, 43-64. [[Crossref](#)]
1499. Martin Huber, Giovanni Mellace. 2015. Sharp Bounds on Causal Effects under Sample Selection. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **77**:1, 129-151. [[Crossref](#)]
1500. Edward Coffield, Allison J. Nihiser, Bettylou Sherry, Christina D. Economos. 2015. Shape Up Somerville: Change in Parent Body Mass Indexes During a Child-Targeted, Community-Based Environmental Change Intervention. *American Journal of Public Health* **105**:2, e83-e89. [[Crossref](#)]

1501. Britt Østergaard Larsen, Helle Bendix Kleif, Christophe Kolodziejczyk. 2015. The volunteer programme 'Night Ravens': a difference-in-difference analysis of the effects on crime rates. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention* **16**:1, 2-24. [[Crossref](#)]
1502. Cassandra M. Guarino, Mark D. Reckase, Brian W. Stacy, Jeffrey M. Wooldridge. 2015. Evaluating Specification Tests in the Context of Value-Added Estimation. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* **8**:1, 35-59. [[Crossref](#)]
1503. Abid A. Burki. 2015. Group-based BDS matching grants and farm-level outcomes in Pakistan. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* **7**:1, 43-63. [[Crossref](#)]
1504. Muhamed Kudic. Further Research and Conclusions 323-328. [[Crossref](#)]
1505. Marc Scheufen. Academic Journal Publishing and the Open Access Movement 53-82. [[Crossref](#)]
1506. Richard Breen. Selection Bias, Statistics of 414-418. [[Crossref](#)]
1507. Carolyn J. Hill, William T. Gormley, Shirley Adelstein. 2015. Do the short-term effects of a high-quality preschool program persist?. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* **32**, 60-79. [[Crossref](#)]
1508. Michael M. Bechtel, Thomas Sattler. 2015. What Is Litigation in the World Trade Organization Worth?. *International Organization* **69**:2, 375-403. [[Crossref](#)]
1509. Rocío Titunik. 2015. Can Big Data Solve the Fundamental Problem of Causal Inference?. *PS: Political Science & Politics* **48**:01, 75-79. [[Crossref](#)]
1510. Jörg Peters, Maximiliane Sievert, Christoph Strupat. 2015. Impacts of a Micro-Enterprise Clustering Programme on Firm Performance in Ghana. *The European Journal of Development Research* **27**:1, 99-121. [[Crossref](#)]
1511. Christoph Moser, Dieter Urban, Beatrice Weder Di Mauro. 2015. ON THE HETEROGENEOUS EMPLOYMENT EFFECTS OF OFFSHORING: IDENTIFYING PRODUCTIVITY AND DOWNSIZING CHANNELS. *Economic Inquiry* **53**:1, 220-239. [[Crossref](#)]
1512. Kwaw Andam, Paul J. Ferraro, Merlin Mack Hanauer. 2015. The Effects of Protected Area Systems on Ecosystem Restoration: A Quasi-Experimental Design to Estimate the Impact of Costa Rica's Protected Area System on Forest Regrowth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1513. Paul J. Ferraro, Merlin Mack Hanauer, Daniela A. Miteva, Gustavo J. Canavire Bacarreza, Subhrendu K. Pattanayak, Katharine R. E. Sims. 2015. More Strictly Protected Areas are Not Necessarily More Protective: Evidence from Bolivia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, and Thailand. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1514. Marshall Fisher, Santiago Gallino, Joseph Jiaqi Xu. 2015. The Value of Rapid Delivery in Online Retailing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1515. Edward C. Jaenicke, Timothy W. Kelsey, Douglas H. Wrenn. 2015. Resident Versus Non-Resident Employment Impacts Associated with Marcellus Shale Development. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1516. Claudia Lambert, Felix Noth, Ulrich Schuewer. 2015. How Do Banks React to Catastrophic Events? Evidence from Hurricane Katrina. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1517. Karthik Krishnan, Pinshuo Wang. 2015. The Cost of Financing Education: Can Student Debt Hinder Entrepreneurship?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1518. Valeria Gattai. 2015. Foreign Exposure and Heterogeneous Performance of Italian Firms: A Survey of the Empirical Literature (1992-2014). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]



1519. Michihito Ando, Reo Takaku. 2015. Affordable False Teeth: The Effects of Patient Cost Sharing on Denture Utilization and Subjective Chewing Ability. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1520. Patrice Bougette, Christophe Charlier. 2015. La difficile conciliation entre politique de concurrence et politique industrielle: le soutien aux nergies renouvelables (The Difficult Conciliation between Competition Policy and Industrial Policy: Public Support for Renewable Energy). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1521. Sven Neelsen, Chulaporn Limwattananon, Owen O'Donnell, Eddy van Doorslaer. 2015. Economic Impact of Illness With Health Insurance But Without Income Insurance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1522. Viral V. Acharya, Tim Eisert, Christian Eufinger, Christian W. Hirsch. 2015. Real Effects of the Sovereign Debt Crisis in Europe: Evidence from Syndicated Loans. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1523. Jan Goebel, Christian Krekel, Tim Tiefenbach, Nicolas R. Ziebarth. 2015. How Natural Disasters Can Affect Environmental Concerns, Risk Aversion, and Even Politics: Evidence from Fukushima and Three European Countries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1524. Lars Thiel. 2015. Leave the Drama on the Stage: The Effect of Cultural Participation on Health. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1525. Anja Lambrecht, Catherine Tucker. 2015. Field Experiments in Marketing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1526. Chi Liao. 2015. Risk Taking Begets Risk Taking: Evidence from Casino Openings and Investor Portfolios. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1527. Christina Felfe, Michael Lechner, Petra Thiemann. 2015. After-School Care and Parentss Labor Supply. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1528. Allen Blackman, Leonard Thomas Goff, Marisol Rivera-Planter. 2015. Does Eco-Certification Stem Tropical Deforestation? Forest Stewardship Council Certification in Mexico. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1529. Woon Sau Leung, Wei Song, Jie Chen. 2015. The Impact of Stakeholder Orientation on Bank Risk-Taking: Evidence from Natural Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1530. Andrea Filippetti, Giovanni Cerulli. 2015. Are Decentralized Regions Ruled Better? Evidence from European Regions Using a Dose-Response Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1531. Anindya Ghose, Vilma Todri. 2015. Towards a Digital Attribution Model: Measuring the Impact of Display Advertising on Online Consumer Behavior. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1532. Daniel Hickman, Andrew Meyer. 2015. Does Eco-Labeling of Services Matter? Evidence from Higher Education. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1533. Pilar B Alvarez-Franco, Melisa Muuoz-Murillo, Diego A. Restrepo-Tobon. 2015. Financial Education Programs in Colombia: Challenges in Assessing Their Effectiveness. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1534. Adrian Hille. 2015. How a Universal Music Education Program Affects Time Use, Behavior, and School Attitude. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1535. Johannes Geyer, Thorben Korfhage. 2015. Long-Term Care Reform and the Labor Supply of Household Members Evidence from a Quasi-Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

1536. Annamaria Lusardi, Pierre-Carl Michaud, Olivia S. Mitchell. 2015. Using a Life Cycle Model to Evaluate Financial Literacy Program Effectiveness. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1537. Werner L. Hernani-Limarino, Gary Mena. 2015. Intended and Unintended Effects of Unconditional Cash Transfers: The Case of Bolivia's Renta Dignidad. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1538. Fabio Bertoni, Stefano Lugo. 2015. Detecting Abnormal Changes in Credit Default Swap Spread. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1539. Barbara Engels, Johannes Geyer, Peter Haan. 2015. Labor Supply and the Pension System - Evidence from a Regression Kink Design. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1540. William D. McBride, Catherine Greene, Linda Foreman, Mir Ali. 2015. The Profit Potential of Certified Organic Field Crop Production. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1541. Vladimir A. Atanasov, Bernard S. Black. 2015. The Trouble with Instruments: Re-Examining Shock-Based IV Designs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1542. Vanessa Valero. 2015. Les écarts de prix de l'eau en France entre les secteurs privé et public. *Revue économique* **66**:6, 1045. [[Crossref](#)]
1543. Marshall Fisher, Santiago Gallino, Serguei Netessine. 2015. Does Online Learning Work in Retail?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1544. Rajeev Dehejia. 2015. Experimental and Non-Experimental Methods in Development Economics: A Porous Dialectic. *Journal of Globalization and Development* **6**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
1545. Edoardo Masset, Lawrence Haddad. 2014. Does beneficiary farmer feedback improve project performance? An impact study of a participatory monitoring intervention in Mindanao, Philippines. *The Journal of Development Studies* **1**, 1-18. [[Crossref](#)]
1546. Jenny Häggström, Xavier de Luna. 2014. Targeted smoothing parameter selection for estimating average causal effects. *Computational Statistics* **29**:6, 1727-1748. [[Crossref](#)]
1547. Elizabeth A. Stuart, Haiden A. Huskamp, Kenneth Duckworth, Jeffrey Simmons, Zirui Song, Michael E. Chernew, Colleen L. Barry. 2014. Using propensity scores in difference-in-differences models to estimate the effects of a policy change. *Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology* **14**:4, 166-182. [[Crossref](#)]
1548. Vincenzo Bove, Roberto Nisticò. 2014. Coups d'état and defense spending: a counterfactual analysis. *Public Choice* **161**:3-4, 321-344. [[Crossref](#)]
1549. Melisso Boschi, Alessandro Girardi, Marco Ventura. 2014. Partial credit guarantees and SMEs financing. *Journal of Financial Stability* **15**, 182-194. [[Crossref](#)]
1550. Igna Bonfrer, Ellen Van de Poel, Eddy Van Doorslaer. 2014. The effects of performance incentives on the utilization and quality of maternal and child care in Burundi. *Social Science & Medicine* **123**, 96-104. [[Crossref](#)]
1551. Di Mo, Renfu Luo, Chengfang Liu, Huiping Zhang, Linxiu Zhang, Alexis Medina, Scott Rozelle. 2014. Text Messaging and its Impacts on the Health and Education of the Poor: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Rural China. *World Development* **64**, 766-780. [[Crossref](#)]
1552. Ashis Das, Jed Friedman, Eeshani Kandpal, Gandham N V Ramana, Rudra Kumar Das Gupta, Madan M Pradhan, Ramesh Govindaraj. 2014. Strengthening malaria service delivery through supportive supervision and community mobilization in an endemic Indian setting: an evaluation of nested delivery models. *Malaria Journal* **13**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]

1553. Federico R León, Rebecka Lundgren, Irit Sinai, Ragini Sinha, Victoria Jennings. 2014. Increasing literate and illiterate women's met need for contraception via empowerment: a quasi-experiment in rural India. *Reproductive Health* **11**:1. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
1554. Randall Juras. 2014. The effect of public employment on children's work and school attendance: evidence from a social protection program in Argentina. *IZA Journal of Labor & Development* **3**:1. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
1555. Nava Ashraf, Oriana Bandiera, B. Kelsey Jack. 2014. No margin, no mission? A field experiment on incentives for public service delivery. *Journal of Public Economics* **120**, 1-17. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1556. Sebastian Calonico, Matias D. Cattaneo, Rocio Titiunik. 2014. Robust Data-Driven Inference in the Regression-Discontinuity Design. *The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata* **14**:4, 909-946. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1557. Bernhard Boockmann, Claudia M. Buch, Monika Schnitzer. 2014. Evidenzbasierte Wirtschaftspolitik in Deutschland: Defizite und Potentiale. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* **15**:4, 307-323. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1558. David Dean, John V Pepper, Robert M Schmidt, Steven Stern. 2014. State vocational rehabilitation programs and federal disability insurance: an analysis of Virginia's vocational rehabilitation program. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy* **3**:1. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
1559. Vincenzo Carrieri, Cinzia Di Novi, Rowena Jacobs, Silvana Robone. Insecure, Sick and Unhappy? Well-Being Consequences of Temporary Employment Contracts 157-193. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1560. Benno Buehler, Gábor Koltay, Xavier Boutin, Massimo Motta. 2014. Recent Developments at DG Competition: 2013–2014. *Review of Industrial Organization* **53**. . [\[Crossref\]](#)
1561. Sylvain Friederich, Richard Payne. 2014. Trading anonymity and order anticipation. *Journal of Financial Markets* **21**, 1-24. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1562. Paul J. Ferraro, Juan José Miranda. 2014. The performance of non-experimental designs in the evaluation of environmental programs: A design-replication study using a large-scale randomized experiment as a benchmark. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **107**, 344-365. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1563. Leon J.H. Bettendorf, Kees Folmer, Egbert L.W. Jongen. 2014. The dog that did not bark: The EITC for single mothers in the Netherlands. *Journal of Public Economics* **119**, 49-60. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1564. Tim K. Loos, Manfred Zeller. 2014. Milk sales and dietary diversity among the Maasai. *Agricultural Economics* **45**:S1, 77-90. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1565. Nicolai V. Kuminoff, Jaren C. Pope. 2014. DO "CAPITALIZATION EFFECTS" FOR PUBLIC GOODS REVEAL THE PUBLIC'S WILLINGNESS TO PAY?. *International Economic Review* **55**:4, 1227-1250. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1566. Laura Rosendahl Huber, Randolph Sloof, Mirjam Van Praag. 2014. The effect of early entrepreneurship education: Evidence from a field experiment. *European Economic Review* **72**, 76-97. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1567. Paul J. Ferraro, Merlin M. Hanauer. 2014. Advances in Measuring the Environmental and Social Impacts of Environmental Programs. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* **39**:1, 495-517. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1568. Enoch M. Kikulwe, Elisabeth Fischer, Matin Qaim. 2014. Mobile Money, Smallholder Farmers, and Household Welfare in Kenya. *PLoS ONE* **9**:10, e109804. [\[Crossref\]](#)
1569. François Claveau, Luis Mireles-Flores. 2014. On the Meaning of Causal Generalisations in Policy-oriented Economic Research. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science* **28**:4, 397-416. [\[Crossref\]](#)

1570. Amr Hosny, Magda Kandil, Hamid Mohtadi. 2014. What does Egypt's Revolution Reveal about its Economy?. *International Economic Journal* **28**:4, 589-611. [[Crossref](#)]
1571. Paulo Bastos, Natália P. Monteiro, Odd Rune Straume. 2014. The effect of private versus public ownership on labour earnings. *Oxford Economic Papers* **66**:4, 983-1005. [[Crossref](#)]
1572. Dan Pan. 2014. The Impact of Agricultural Extension on Farmer Nutrient Management Behavior in Chinese Rice Production: A Household-Level Analysis. *Sustainability* **6**:10, 6644-6665. [[Crossref](#)]
1573. Annette Quinto Romani. 2014. Estimating the Peer Effect on Youth Overweight and Inactivity Using an Intervention Study. *Journal of School Health* **84**:10, 617-624. [[Crossref](#)]
1574. Myoung-Jae Lee, Young-Sook Kim. 2014. DIFFERENCE IN DIFFERENCES FOR STAYERS WITH A TIME-VARYING QUALIFICATION: HEALTH EXPENDITURE ELASTICITY OF THE ELDERLY. *Health Economics* **23**:9, 1134-1145. [[Crossref](#)]
1575. Ángela Rocío Vázquez-Urriago, Andrés Barge-Gil, Aurelia Modrego Rico, Evita Paraskevopoulou. 2014. The impact of science and technology parks on firms' product innovation: empirical evidence from Spain. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* **24**:4, 835-873. [[Crossref](#)]
1576. Minli Liao, Kevin R. White. 2014. Post-permanency service needs, service utilization, and placement discontinuity for kinship versus non-kinship families. *Children and Youth Services Review* **44**, 370-378. [[Crossref](#)]
1577. Xun Lu, Halbert White. 2014. Testing for separability in structural equations. *Journal of Econometrics* **182**:1, 14-26. [[Crossref](#)]
1578. Halbert White, Haiqing Xu, Karim Chalak. 2014. Causal discourse in a game of incomplete information. *Journal of Econometrics* **182**:1, 45-58. [[Crossref](#)]
1579. C. Viet Nguyen, A. Ngoc Tran. 2014. The role of crop land during economic development: evidence from rural Vietnam. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **41**:4, 561-582. [[Crossref](#)]
1580. S. R. Cotten, G. Ford, S. Ford, T. M. Hale. 2014. Internet Use and Depression Among Retired Older Adults in the United States: A Longitudinal Analysis. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* **69**:5, 763-771. [[Crossref](#)]
1581. Shawn Arita, Sumner La Croix, Christopher Edmonds. 2014. Effect of Approved Destination Status on Mainland Chinese Travel Abroad. *Asian Economic Journal* **28**:3, 217-237. [[Crossref](#)]
1582. Craig A. Rolling, Yuhong Yang. 2014. Model selection for estimating treatment effects. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **76**:4, 749-769. [[Crossref](#)]
1583. Lauro Carnicelli, Fernando Antonio Slaibe Postali. 2014. Royalties do petróleo e emprego público nos municípios Brasileiros. *Estudos Econômicos (São Paulo)* **44**:3, 469-495. [[Crossref](#)]
1584. Xavier de Luna, Per Johansson. 2014. Testing for the Unconfoundedness Assumption Using an Instrumental Assumption. *Journal of Causal Inference* **2**:2, 187-199. [[Crossref](#)]
1585. Haifang Huang, Brad R. Humphreys. 2014. NEW SPORTS FACILITIES AND RESIDENTIAL HOUSING MARKETS. *Journal of Regional Science* **54**:4, 629-663. [[Crossref](#)]
1586. Katharine O. Strunk, Andrew McEachin. 2014. More Than Sanctions. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* **36**:3, 281-306. [[Crossref](#)]
1587. John Moffat. 2014. Regional Selective Assistance in Scotland: Does it make a difference to plant productivity?. *Urban Studies* **51**:12, 2555-2571. [[Crossref](#)]

1588. Giovanni Cerulli. 2014. Ivtreatreg: A Command for Fitting Binary Treatment Models with Heterogeneous Response to Treatment and Unobservable Selection. *The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata* 14:3, 453-480. [[Crossref](#)]
1589. Michela Bia, Carlos A. Flores, Alfonso Flores-Lagunes, Alessandra Mattei. 2014. A Stata Package for the Application of Semiparametric Estimators of Dose-Response Functions. *The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata* 14:3, 580-604. [[Crossref](#)]
1590. Alfredo R. Paloyo. The Impact of Military Service on Future Labor-Market Outcomes 157-176. [[Crossref](#)]
1591. Solomon Asfaw, Benjamin Davis, Josh Dewbre, Sudhanshu Handa, Paul Winters. 2014. Cash Transfer Programme, Productive Activities and Labour Supply: Evidence from a Randomised Experiment in Kenya. *The Journal of Development Studies* 50:8, 1172-1196. [[Crossref](#)]
1592. Jesus Crespo Cuaresma, Harald Oberhofer, Gallina Andronova Vincelette. 2014. Firm growth and productivity in Belarus: New empirical evidence from the machine building industry. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 42:3, 726-738. [[Crossref](#)]
1593. Can Liu, Katrina Mullan, Hao Liu, Wenqing Zhu, Qingjiao Rong. 2014. The estimation of long term impacts of China's key priority forestry programs on rural household incomes. *Journal of Forest Economics* 20:3, 267-285. [[Crossref](#)]
1594. Haresh Sapra, Ajay Subramanian, Krishnamurthy V. Subramanian. 2014. Corporate Governance and Innovation: Theory and Evidence. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 49:4, 957-1003. [[Crossref](#)]
1595. Clemens Noelke, Daniel Horn. 2014. Social Transformation and the Transition from Vocational Education to Work in Hungary: A Differences-in-differences Approach. *European Sociological Review* 30:4, 431-443. [[Crossref](#)]
1596. Guido W. Imbens. 2014. Instrumental Variables: An Econometrician's Perspective. *Statistical Science* 29:3. . [[Crossref](#)]
1597. Dirk Czarnitzki, Cindy Lopes-Bento. 2014. Innovation Subsidies: Does the Funding Source Matter for Innovation Intensity and Performance? Empirical Evidence from Germany. *Industry and Innovation* 21:5, 380-409. [[Crossref](#)]
1598. Neda Trifković. 2014. Governance Strategies and Welfare Effects: Vertical Integration and Contracts in the Catfish Sector in Vietnam. *The Journal of Development Studies* 50:7, 949-961. [[Crossref](#)]
1599. Corey Lang, James J. Opaluch, George Sfinarolakis. 2014. The windy city: Property value impacts of wind turbines in an urban setting. *Energy Economics* 44, 413-421. [[Crossref](#)]
1600. Yongheng Deng, Daniel P. McMillen, Tien Foo Sing. 2014. Matching indices for thinly-traded commercial real estate in Singapore. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 47, 86-98. [[Crossref](#)]
1601. Hanna Hottenrott, Cindy Lopes-Bento. 2014. (International) R&D collaboration and SMEs: The effectiveness of targeted public R&D support schemes. *Research Policy* 43:6, 1055-1066. [[Crossref](#)]
1602. Cristina Connolly, H. Allen Klaiber. 2014. Does Organic Command a Premium When the Food is Already Local?. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 96:4, 1102-1116. [[Crossref](#)]
1603. Yasuyuki Sawada, Masahiro Shoji, Shinya Sugawara, Naoko Shinkai. 2014. The Role of Infrastructure in Mitigating Poverty Dynamics: The Case of an Irrigation Project in Sri Lanka. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* 14:3, 1117-1144. [[Crossref](#)]

1604. Alfredo R. Paloyo, Arndt R. Reichert, Holger Reinermann, Harald Tauchmann. 2014. THE CAUSAL LINK BETWEEN FINANCIAL INCENTIVES AND WEIGHT LOSS: AN EVIDENCE-BASED SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **28**:3, 401-420. [[Crossref](#)]
1605. Marco Caliendo, Steffen Künn. 2014. Regional Effect Heterogeneity of Start-up Subsidies for the Unemployed. *Regional Studies* **48**:6, 1108-1134. [[Crossref](#)]
1606. Katharine R. E. Sims. 2014. Do Protected Areas Reduce Forest Fragmentation? A Microlandscapes Approach. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **58**:2, 303-333. [[Crossref](#)]
1607. Lorenzo Escot, José Andrés Fernández-Cornejo, Carlos Poza. 2014. Fathers' Use of Childbirth Leave in Spain. The Effects of the 13-Day Paternity Leave. *Population Research and Policy Review* **33**:3, 419-453. [[Crossref](#)]
1608. Philomena Ogwuikie, Jonne Rodenburg, Aliou Diagne, Afiavi R. Agboh-Noameshie, Eyram Amovin-Assagba. 2014. Weed management in upland rice in sub-Saharan Africa: impact on labor and crop productivity. *Food Security* **6**:3, 327-337. [[Crossref](#)]
1609. Irma Arteaga, Sarah Humpage, Arthur J. Reynolds, Judy A. Temple. 2014. One year of preschool or two: Is it important for adult outcomes?. *Economics of Education Review* **40**, 221-237. [[Crossref](#)]
1610. Demosthenes Ioannou, Livio Stracca. 2014. Have the euro area and EU governance worked? Just the facts. *European Journal of Political Economy* **34**, 1-17. [[Crossref](#)]
1611. J. Rusike, N.M. Mahungu, S.S. Lukombo, T. Kendenga, S.M. Bidiaka, A. Alene, A. Lema, V.M. Manyong. 2014. Does a cassava research-for-development program have impact at the farm level? Evidence from the Democratic Republic of Congo. *Food Policy* **46**, 193-204. [[Crossref](#)]
1612. Taro Esaka. 2014. Are consistent pegs really more prone to currency crises?. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **44**, 136-163. [[Crossref](#)]
1613. Allen Blackman, María Angélica Naranjo, Juan Robalino, Francisco Alpizar, Jorge Rivera. 2014. Does Tourism Eco-Certification Pay? Costa Rica's Blue Flag Program. *World Development* **58**, 41-52. [[Crossref](#)]
1614. Arnstein Øvrum, Elling Bere. 2014. Evaluating free school fruit: results from a natural experiment in Norway with representative data. *Public Health Nutrition* **17**:6, 1224-1231. [[Crossref](#)]
1615. Katharine O. Strunk, Andrew McEachin, Theresa N. Westover. 2014. The Use and Efficacy of Capacity-Building Assistance for Low-Performing Districts: The Case of California's District Assistance and Intervention Teams. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* **33**:3, 719-751. [[Crossref](#)]
1616. Haeil Jung, Maureen A. Pirog. 2014. WHAT WORKS BEST AND WHEN: ACCOUNTING FOR MULTIPLE SOURCES OF PURESELECTION BIAS IN PROGRAM EVALUATIONS. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* **33**:3, 752-777. [[Crossref](#)]
1617. Franziska Kugler, Guido Schwerdt, Ludger Wößmann. 2014. Ökonometrische Methoden zur Evaluierung kausaler Effekte der Wirtschaftspolitik. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* **15**:2, 105-132. [[Crossref](#)]
1618. Sonali Senaratna Sellamuttu, Takeshi Aida, Ryuji Kasahara, Yasuyuki Sawada, Deeptha Wijerathna. 2014. How Access to Irrigation Influences Poverty and Livelihoods: A Case Study from Sri Lanka. *The Journal of Development Studies* **50**:5, 748-768. [[Crossref](#)]



1619. Vijesh V. Krishna, Prakashan C. Veettil. 2014. Productivity and efficiency impacts of conservation tillage in northwest Indo-Gangetic Plains. *Agricultural Systems* **127**, 126-138. [[Crossref](#)]
1620. Chong-En Bai, Binzhen Wu. 2014. Health insurance and consumption: Evidence from China's New Cooperative Medical Scheme. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **42**:2, 450-469. [[Crossref](#)]
1621. Brendan D. Dooley, Alan Seals, David Skarbek. 2014. The effect of prison gang membership on recidivism. *Journal of Criminal Justice* **42**:3, 267-275. [[Crossref](#)]
1622. Ellen Van de Poel, Gabriela Flores, Por Ir, Owen O'Donnell, Eddy Van Doorslaer. 2014. Can vouchers deliver? An evaluation of subsidies for maternal health care in Cambodia. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* **92**:5, 331-339. [[Crossref](#)]
1623. Rahul Rawat, Elizabeth Faust, John A. Maluccio, Suneetha Kadiyala. 2014. The Impact of a Food Assistance Program on Nutritional Status, Disease Progression, and Food Security Among People Living With HIV in Uganda. *JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes* **66**:1, e15-e22. [[Crossref](#)]
1624. Pajarita Charles, Anne Jones, Shenyang Guo. 2014. Treatment Effects of a Relationship-Strengthening Intervention for Economically Disadvantaged New Parents. *Research on Social Work Practice* **24**:3, 321-338. [[Crossref](#)]
1625. Michael P. Murray. 2014. Teaching About Heterogeneous Response Models. *The Journal of Economic Education* **45**:2, 110-120. [[Crossref](#)]
1626. Nassul S. Kabunga, Thomas Dubois, Matin Qaim. 2014. Impact of tissue culture banana technology on farm household income and food security in Kenya. *Food Policy* **45**, 25-34. [[Crossref](#)]
1627. Jasmin Kantarevic, Boris Kralj. 2014. Risk selection and cost shifting in a prospective physician payment system: Evidence from Ontario. *Health Policy* **115**:2-3, 249-257. [[Crossref](#)]
1628. Henrik Hansen, Neda Trifković. 2014. Food Standards are Good – For Middle-Class Farmers. *World Development* **56**, 226-242. [[Crossref](#)]
1629. Paulo Bastos, Natália P. Monteiro, Odd Rune Straume. 2014. The impact of private vs. public ownership on the level and structure of employment. *Economics of Transition* **22**:2, 247-280. [[Crossref](#)]
1630. Amr Sadek Hosny. 2014. When Do Currency Unions Increase Trade?. *Global Economy Journal* **14**:1, 113-125. [[Crossref](#)]
1631. Valeria Di Cosmo, Sean Lyons, Anne Nolan. 2014. Estimating the Impact of Time-of-Use Pricing on Irish Electricity Demand. *The Energy Journal* **35**:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
1632. Ryota Nakamura, Marc Suhrcke, Rachel Pechey, Marcello Morciano, Martin Roland, Theresa M. Marteau. 2014. Impact on alcohol purchasing of a ban on multi-buy promotions: a quasi-experimental evaluation comparing Scotland with England and Wales. *Addiction* **109**:4, 558-567. [[Crossref](#)]
1633. Samuel B. Bonsall. 2014. The impact of issuer-pay on corporate bond rating properties: Evidence from Moody's and S&P's initial adoptions. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **57**:2-3, 89-109. [[Crossref](#)]
1634. Nicolas R. Ziebarth, Martin Karlsson. 2014. THE EFFECTS OF EXPANDING THE GENEROSITY OF THE STATUTORY SICKNESS INSURANCE SYSTEM. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **29**:2, 208-230. [[Crossref](#)]
1635. Anthony A. Braga, David M. Hureau, Andrew V. Papachristos. 2014. Deterring Gang-Involved Gun Violence: Measuring the Impact of Boston's Operation Ceasefire on Street Gang Behavior. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* **30**:1, 113-139. [[Crossref](#)]

1636. John Herbert Ainembabazi, Arild Angelsen. 2014. Do commercial forest plantations reduce pressure on natural forests? Evidence from forest policy reforms in Uganda. *Forest Policy and Economics* **40**, 48-56. [[Crossref](#)]
1637. Martin Foureaux Koppensteiner. 2014. Automatic grade promotion and student performance: Evidence from Brazil. *Journal of Development Economics* **107**, 277-290. [[Crossref](#)]
1638. Elisa Iezzi, Matteo Lippi Bruni, Cristina Ugolini. 2014. The role of GP's compensation schemes in diabetes care: Evidence from panel data. *Journal of Health Economics* **34**, 104-120. [[Crossref](#)]
1639. John V. Duca, Anil Kumar. 2014. Financial literacy and mortgage equity withdrawals. *Journal of Urban Economics* **80**, 62-75. [[Crossref](#)]
1640. S. Michael Gaddis, Douglas Lee Lauen. 2014. School accountability and the black-white test score gap. *Social Science Research* **44**, 15-31. [[Crossref](#)]
1641. Claudio A. Agostini, Claudia Martínez A.. 2014. Response of Tax Credit Claims to Tax Enforcement: Evidence from a Quasi-Experiment in Chile. *Fiscal Studies* **35**:1, 41-65. [[Crossref](#)]
1642. Bryan S. Graham, Guido W. Imbens, Geert Ridder. 2014. Complementarity and aggregate implications of assortative matching: A nonparametric analysis. *Quantitative Economics* **5**:1, 29-66. [[Crossref](#)]
1643. Hang Gao, Johannes Van Biesebroeck. 2014. Effects of Deregulation and Vertical Unbundling on the Performance of China's Electricity Generation Sector. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* **62**:1, 41-76. [[Crossref](#)]
1644. Orazio P. Attanasio. 2014. Evidence on public policy: Methodological issues, political issues and examples. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health* **42**:13\_suppl, 28-40. [[Crossref](#)]
1645. James J. Heckman, Hedibert F. Lopes, Rémi Piatek. 2014. Treatment Effects: A Bayesian Perspective. *Econometric Reviews* **33**:1-4, 36-67. [[Crossref](#)]
1646. Daniel I. Rees, Joseph J. Sabia. 2014. The kid's speech: The effect of stuttering on human capital acquisition. *Economics of Education Review* **38**, 76-88. [[Crossref](#)]
1647. Yiwei Fang, Iftekhar Hasan, Katherin Marton. 2014. Institutional development and bank stability: Evidence from transition countries. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **39**, 160-176. [[Crossref](#)]
1648. William P. Warburton, Rebecca N. Warburton, Arthur Sweetman, Clyde Hertzman. 2014. The Impact of Placing Adolescent Males into Foster Care on Education, Income Assistance, and Convictions. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* **47**:1, 35-69. [[Crossref](#)]
1649. Breno Sampaio. 2014. Identifying peer states for transportation policy analysis with an application to New York's handheld cell phone ban. *Transportmetrica A: Transport Science* **10**:1, 1-14. [[Crossref](#)]
1650. Giulia Roli, Luisa Stracqualursi. A Propensity Score Matching Method to Study the Achievement of Students in Upper Secondary Schools 327-333. [[Crossref](#)]
1651. B. A. Awotide, T. T. Awoyemi, A. Diagne. Access to Subsidized Certified Improved Rice Seed and Poverty Reduction: Evidence from Rice Farming Households in Nigeria 251-266. [[Crossref](#)]
1652. B.H. Baltagi. Panel Data and Difference-in-Differences Estimation 425-433. [[Crossref](#)]
1653. Erik Ruzek, Margaret Burchinal, George Farkas, Greg J. Duncan. 2014. The quality of toddler child care and cognitive skills at 24 months: Propensity score analysis results from the ECLS-B. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* **29**:1, 12-21. [[Crossref](#)]

1654. Ryo Takahashi, Yasuyuki Todo. 2014. The impact of a shade coffee certification program on forest conservation using remote sensing and household data. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* **44**, 76-81. [[Crossref](#)]
1655. Stephen G. Donald, Yu-Chin Hsu. 2014. Estimation and inference for distribution functions and quantile functions in treatment effect models. *Journal of Econometrics* **178**, 383-397. [[Crossref](#)]
1656. Viral V. Acharya, Ramin P. Baghai, Krishnamurthy V. Subramanian. 2014. Wrongful Discharge Laws and Innovation. *Review of Financial Studies* **27**:1, 301-346. [[Crossref](#)]
1657. Chihiro Udagawa, Ian Hodge, Mark Reader. 2014. Farm Level Costs of Agri-environment Measures: The Impact of Entry Level Stewardship on Cereal Farm Incomes. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **65**:1, 212-233. [[Crossref](#)]
1658. Pierpaolo Parrotta, Dario Pozzoli, Davide Sala. 2014. Ethnic Diversity and Firms' Export Behavior. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1659. Mario Samano. 2014. Conditional Average Treatment Effects and Decision Making. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1660. Michael Bradley, Dong Chen. 2014. Does Board Independence Reduce the Cost of Debt?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1661. Benjamin Furlan, Harald Oberhofer, Hannes Winner. 2014. A Note on Merger and Acquisition Evaluation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1662. Miquel--ngel Garcia-LLpez, Albert Sole-Olle, Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal. 2014. Do Land Use Policies Follow Road Construction?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1663. Samuel Benin. 2014. Impact of Ghana's Agricultural Mechanization Services Center Program. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1664. Avi Goldfarb, Catherine Tucker. 2014. Conducting Research with Quasi-Experiments: A Guide for Marketers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1665. Giorgia Giovannetti, Enrico Marvasi, Marco Sanfilippo. 2014. Supply Chains and the Internalization of SMEs: Evidence from Italy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1666. Roberto E. Muuoz, Jorge A. Ortega. 2014. Tiene La Banda Ancha Y Las Tics Un Impacto Positivo Sobre El Rendimiento Escolar? Evidencia Para Chile (Does Technologies Information and Communications (TICs) and Funds for Broadband Have an Impact on School Performance? Evidence for Chile Technologies). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1667. Jeremy Glenn Weber, J. Wesley Burnett, Irene M. Xiarchos. 2014. Shale Gas Development and Housing Values over a Decade: Evidence from the Barnett Shale. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1668. Sylvain J. Friederich, Richard Payne. 2014. Trading Anonymity and Order Anticipation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1669. Albert Sole-Olle, Pilar Sorribas-Navarro. 2014. Does Corruption Erode Trust in Government? Evidence from a Recent Surge of Local Scandals in Spain. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1670. David S. Bieri, Carla Maria Kayanan. 2014. Improving TIF Transparency and Accountability: Towards a Consolidated View of TIF Activities in Michigan. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1671. Stefan Boes, Stephan NNeSch, Kaspar WWthrich. 2014. Hedonic Valuation of the Perceived Risks of Nuclear Power Plants. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

1672. Marco Caliendo, Robert Mahlstedt, Oscar A. Mitnik. 2014. Unobservable, But Unimportant? The Influence of Personality Traits (and Other Usually Unobserved Variables) for the Evaluation of Labor Market Policies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1673. Rosemarie Begin, Lota D. Tamini, Maurice Doyon. 2014. L'Effet Du Travail Hors-Ferme Sur L'Efficacite Technique Des Fermes Laitieres Quebecoises: Un Modele Integrant Les Biais De Selection Sur Les Observables Et Inobservables (The Effect of Off-Farm Work on the Technical Efficiency of Quebec Dairy Farms: A Model Incorporating Selection Bias on Observable and Unobservable). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1674. Ju Hyun Kim. 2014. Identifying the Distribution of Treatment Effects under Support Restrictions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1675. Daniel Arnold, Tobias Brindle, Laszlo Goerke. 2014. Sickness Absence and Works Councils: Evidence from German Individual and Linked Employer-Employee Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1676. Ju Hyun Kim. 2014. Partial Identification of Distributional Parameters in Triangular Systems. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1677. Jonathan Adams-Kane, Juliin Caballero, Jamus J Lim. 2014. Foreign Bank Behavior During Financial Crises. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1678. Juan Jose Miranda, Leonardo Corral, Allen Blackman, Gregory Asner, Eirivelthon Lima. 2014. Effects of Protected Areas on Forest Cover Change and Local Communities: Evidence from the Peruvian Amazon. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1679. Nils aus dem Moore. 2014. Corporate Taxation and Investment Evidence from the Belgian Ace Reform. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1680. Stephan Stahlschmidt, Matthias Eckardt, Wolfgang K. Hrdle. 2014. Expectile Treatment Effects: An Efficient Alternative to Compute the Distribution of Treatment Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1681. Paweł Strawiński. Propensity Score Matching. *Własności* . [[Crossref](#)]
1682. Anna Bottasso, Chiara Piccardo. 2014. Export activity and firm heterogeneity: a survey of the empirical evidence for Italy. *ECONOMIA E POLITICA INDUSTRIALE* :4, 27-61. [[Crossref](#)]
1683. Aurélie Lecocq, Mehdi Ammi, Élodie Bellarbre. 2014. Le score de propension : un guide méthodologique pour les recherches expérimentales et quasi expérimentales en éducation. *Mesure et évaluation en éducation* 37:2, 69-100. [[Crossref](#)]
1684. Kazushi Takahashi, Christopher B. Barrett. 2014. The System of Rice Intensification and its Impacts on Household Income and Child Schooling: Evidence from Rural Indonesia. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 96:1, 269-289. [[Crossref](#)]
1685. Sylvie Blasco, Barbara Pertold-Gebicka. 2014. L'effet de l'accompagnement sur les recrutements et performances des entreprises. *Revue française d'économie* XXIX:1, 99. [[Crossref](#)]
1686. William Rhodes. Parametric Sample Selection Models 3429-3440. [[Crossref](#)]
1687. Jochen Kluge, Susana Puerto, Jonathan Stoeterau, Felix Weidenkaff, Marc Witte, David Robalino, José Manuel Romero, Friederike Rother. 2014. PROTOCOL: Interventions to Improve Labour Market Outcomes of Youth: A Systematic Review of Active Labour Market Programmes. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 10:1, 1-109. [[Crossref](#)]

1688. Nicolai V. Kuminoff, V. Kerry Smith, Christopher Timmins. 2013. The New Economics of Equilibrium Sorting and Policy Evaluation Using Housing Markets. *Journal of Economic Literature* **51**:4, 1007-1062. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
1689. Jasmin Kantarevic, Boris Kralj. 2013. LINK BETWEEN PAY FOR PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES AND PHYSICIAN PAYMENT MECHANISMS: EVIDENCE FROM THE DIABETES MANAGEMENT INCENTIVE IN ONTARIO. *Health Economics* **22**:12, 1417-1439. [[Crossref](#)]
1690. Ulf Rinne, Arne Uhlenborff, Zhong Zhao. 2013. Vouchers and caseworkers in training programs for the unemployed. *Empirical Economics* **45**:3, 1089-1127. [[Crossref](#)]
1691. Noémi Kreif, Richard Grieve, Rosalba Radice, Jasjeet S. Sekhon. 2013. Regression-adjusted matching and double-robust methods for estimating average treatment effects in health economic evaluation. *Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology* **13**:2-4, 174-202. [[Crossref](#)]
1692. Sankar Mukhopadhyay, Jeanne Wendel. 2013. Evaluating an employee wellness program. *International Journal of Health Care Finance and Economics* **13**:3-4, 173-199. [[Crossref](#)]
1693. Patricia Apps, Silvia Mendolia, Ian Walker. 2013. The impact of pre-school on adolescents' outcomes: Evidence from a recent English cohort. *Economics of Education Review* **37**, 183-199. [[Crossref](#)]
1694. Abdulkali Bilgic, Steven T. Yen. 2013. Household food demand in Turkey: A two-step demand system approach. *Food Policy* **43**, 267-277. [[Crossref](#)]
1695. Lee Pinkowitz, Jason Sturgess, Rohan Williamson. 2013. Do cash stockpiles fuel cash acquisitions?. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **23**, 128-149. [[Crossref](#)]
1696. Eskin Heinesen, Christophe Kolodziejczyk. 2013. Effects of breast and colorectal cancer on labour market outcomes—Average effects and educational gradients. *Journal of Health Economics* **32**:6, 1028-1042. [[Crossref](#)]
1697. Ola Lotherington Vestad. 2013. Labour supply effects of early retirement provision. *Labour Economics* **25**, 98-109. [[Crossref](#)]
1698. Xiaohong Chen. 2013. Comment. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **108**:504, 1262-1264. [[Crossref](#)]
1699. Carlos A. Flores, Oscar A. Mitnik. 2013. Comparing Treatments across Labor Markets: An Assessment of Nonexperimental Multiple-Treatment Strategies. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **95**:5, 1691-1707. [[Crossref](#)]
1700. Dimitrios Rovithis. 2013. Do health economic evaluations using observational data provide reliable assessment of treatment effects?. *Health Economics Review* **3**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
1701. Robert E. Larzelere, Ronald B. Cox. 2013. Making Valid Causal Inferences About Corrective Actions by Parents From Longitudinal Data. *Journal of Family Theory & Review* **5**:4, 282-299. [[Crossref](#)]
1702. Tania Barham, Jacob Rowberry. 2013. Living longer: The effect of the Mexican conditional cash transfer program on elderly mortality. *Journal of Development Economics* **105**, 226-236. [[Crossref](#)]
1703. Ryo Takahashi, Yasuyuki Todo. 2013. The impact of a shade coffee certification program on forest conservation: A case study from a wild coffee forest in Ethiopia. *Journal of Environmental Management* **130**, 48-54. [[Crossref](#)]
1704. Yi Lu, Zhigang Tao, Yan Zhang. 2013. How do exporters respond to antidumping investigations?. *Journal of International Economics* **91**:2, 290-300. [[Crossref](#)]

1705. R. Forrest McCluer, Martha A. Starr. 2013. Using Difference in Differences to Estimate Damages in Healthcare Antitrust: A Case Study of Marshfield Clinic. *International Journal of the Economics of Business* **20**:3, 447-469. [[Crossref](#)]
1706. Viral V. Acharya, Ramin P. Baghai, Krishnamurthy V. Subramanian. 2013. Labor Laws and Innovation. *The Journal of Law and Economics* **56**:4, 997-1037. [[Crossref](#)]
1707. Bola Amoke Awotide, Aziz Karimov, Aliou Diagne, Tebila Nakelse. 2013. The impact of seed vouchers on poverty reduction among smallholder rice farmers in Nigeria. *Agricultural Economics* **44**:6, 647-658. [[Crossref](#)]
1708. Christina Weiland, Hirokazu Yoshikawa. 2013. Impacts of a Prekindergarten Program on Children's Mathematics, Language, Literacy, Executive Function, and Emotional Skills. *Child Development* **84**:6, 2112-2130. [[Crossref](#)]
1709. Inkyung Kim. 2013. Trade Union and Employment: The Korean Experience. *KDI Journal of Economic Policy* **35**:4, 95-136. [[Crossref](#)]
1710. Taro Esaka. 2013. Evaluating the effect of de facto pegs on currency crises. *Journal of Policy Modeling* **35**:6, 943-963. [[Crossref](#)]
1711. Brad R. Humphreys, Joseph Marchand. 2013. New casinos and local labor markets: Evidence from Canada. *Labour Economics* **24**, 151-160. [[Crossref](#)]
1712. Sea-Jin Chang, Jaiho Chung, Jon Jungbien Moon. 2013. When do foreign subsidiaries outperform local firms?. *Journal of International Business Studies* **44**:8, 853-860. [[Crossref](#)]
1713. Torsten Biemann, Nils Braakmann. 2013. The impact of international experience on objective and subjective career success in early careers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* **24**:18, 3438-3456. [[Crossref](#)]
1714. Luis Ayala, Magdalena Rodríguez. 2013. Evaluating social assistance reforms under programme heterogeneity and alternative measures of success. *International Journal of Social Welfare* **22**:4, 406-419. [[Crossref](#)]
1715. Paul Martin Dontsop Nguetzet, Aliou Diagne, Olusegun Victor Okoruwa, Vivian Ojehomon, Victor Manyong. 2013. Estimating the Actual and Potential Adoption Rates and Determinants of NERICA Rice Varieties in Nigeria. *Journal of Crop Improvement* **27**:5, 561-585. [[Crossref](#)]
1716. Gábor Kézdi, Gergely Csorba. 2013. Estimating Consumer Lock-In Effects from Firm-Level Data. *Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade* **13**:3, 431-452. [[Crossref](#)]
1717. Andreas Peichl, Nico Pestel, Sebastian Sieglösch. 2013. The politicians' wage gap: insights from German members of parliament. *Public Choice* **156**:3-4, 653-676. [[Crossref](#)]
1718. George Messinis. 2013. Returns to education and urban-migrant wage differentials in China: IV quantile treatment effects. *China Economic Review* **26**, 39-55. [[Crossref](#)]
1719. Allen Blackman. 2013. Evaluating forest conservation policies in developing countries using remote sensing data: An introduction and practical guide. *Forest Policy and Economics* **34**, 1-16. [[Crossref](#)]
1720. Byung-Seong Min. 2013. Evaluation of board reforms: An examination of the appointment of outside directors. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* **29**, 21-43. [[Crossref](#)]
1721. Paul J. Ferraro, Juan José Miranda. 2013. Heterogeneous treatment effects and mechanisms in information-based environmental policies: Evidence from a large-scale field experiment. *Resource and Energy Economics* **35**:3, 356-379. [[Crossref](#)]



1722. Luis Ayala, Magdalena Rodríguez. 2013. Health-related effects of welfare-to-work policies. *Social Science & Medicine* **93**, 103-112. [[Crossref](#)]
1723. Shephard Siziba, Kefasi Nyikahadzo, Joachim Binam Nyemeck, Aliou Diagne, Adekunle Adewale, Fatunbi Oluwole. 2013. Estimating the impact of innovation systems on maize yields: the case of IAR4D in southern Africa. *Agricon* **52**:3, 83-100. [[Crossref](#)]
1724. R. Esposti, F. Sotte. 2013. Evaluating the effectiveness of agricultural and rural policies: an introduction. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **40**:4, 535-539. [[Crossref](#)]
1725. Thomas K. Bauer, Sebastian Braun, Michael Kvasnicka. 2013. The Economic Integration of Forced Migrants: Evidence for Post-War Germany. *The Economic Journal* **123**:571, 998-1024. [[Crossref](#)]
1726. Benoit Dostie, Rajshri Jayaraman. 2013. Do Higher Costs Spur Process Innovations and Managerial Incentives? Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* **22**:3, 529-550. [[Crossref](#)]
1727. Matias D. Cattaneo, David M. Drukker, Ashley D. Holland. 2013. Estimation of Multivalued Treatment Effects under Conditional Independence. *The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata* **13**:3, 407-450. [[Crossref](#)]
1728. Henrik Hansen, Ninja Ritter Kleijnstrup, Ole Winckler Andersen. 2013. A Comparison of Model-Based and Design-Based Impact Evaluations of Interventions in Developing Countries. *American Journal of Evaluation* **34**:3, 320-338. [[Crossref](#)]
1729. Kazunobu Hayakawa, Toshiyuki Matsuura, Kazuyuki Motohashi, Ayako Obashi. 2013. Two-dimensional analysis of the impact of outward FDI on performance at home: Evidence from Japanese manufacturing firms. *Japan and the World Economy* **27**, 25-33. [[Crossref](#)]
1730. Alan R. Ellis, M. Alan Brookhart. 2013. Approaches to inverse-probability-of-treatment-weighted estimation with concurrent treatments. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **66**:8, S51-S56. [[Crossref](#)]
1731. A. Acharya, S. Vellakkal, F. Taylor, E. Masset, A. Satija, M. Burke, S. Ebrahim. 2013. The Impact of Health Insurance Schemes for the Informal Sector in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review. *The World Bank Research Observer* **28**:2, 236-266. [[Crossref](#)]
1732. Roberto Leombruni, Tiziano Razzolini, Francesco Serti. 2013. The pecuniary and non-pecuniary costs of job displacement—The risky job of being back to work. *European Economic Review* **61**, 205-216. [[Crossref](#)]
1733. Martin Huber, Michael Lechner, Conny Wunsch. 2013. The performance of estimators based on the propensity score. *Journal of Econometrics* **175**:1, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
1734. Fuxiu Jiang, Bing Zhu, Jicheng Huang. 2013. CEO's financial experience and earnings management. *Journal of Multinational Financial Management* **23**:3, 134-145. [[Crossref](#)]
1735. Fabiana Fontes Rocha, Marislei Nishijima, Sandro Garcia Duarte Peixoto. 2013. Primary health care policies: investigation on morbidity. *Applied Economics Letters* **20**:11, 1046-1051. [[Crossref](#)]
1736. C. Bontemps, Z. Bouamra-Mechemache, M. Simioni. 2013. Quality labels and firm survival: some first empirical evidence. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **40**:3, 413-439. [[Crossref](#)]
1737. Jennifer Alix-Garcia, Anne Bartlett, David Saah. 2013. The landscape of conflict: IDPs, aid and land-use change in Darfur. *Journal of Economic Geography* **13**:4, 589-617. [[Crossref](#)]
1738. G. von Graevenitz. 2013. Trade mark cluttering-evidence from EU enlargement. *Oxford Economic Papers* **65**:3, 721-745. [[Crossref](#)]

1739. Breno Sampaio, Gustavo Ramos Sampaio, Yony Sampaio. 2013. On Estimating the Effects of Immigrant Legalization: Do U.S. Agricultural Workers Really Benefit?. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **95**:4, 932-948. [[Crossref](#)]
1740. Annette Schminke, Johannes Van Biesebroeck. 2013. Using export market performance to evaluate regional preferential policies in China. *Review of World Economics* **149**:2, 343-367. [[Crossref](#)]
1741. Matias D. Cattaneo, Max H. Farrell. 2013. Optimal convergence rates, Bahadur representation, and asymptotic normality of partitioning estimators. *Journal of Econometrics* **174**:2, 127-143. [[Crossref](#)]
1742. Anika Sieber, Tobias Kuemmerle, Alexander V. Prishchepov, Kelly J. Wendland, Matthias Baumann, Volker C. Radeloff, Leonid M. Baskin, Patrick Hostert. 2013. Landsat-based mapping of post-Soviet land-use change to assess the effectiveness of the Oksky and Mordovsky protected areas in European Russia. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **133**, 38-51. [[Crossref](#)]
1743. Vibeke Myrup Jensen. 2013. Working longer makes students stronger? The effects of ninth grade classroom hours on ninth grade student performance. *Educational Research* **55**:2, 180-194. [[Crossref](#)]
1744. Farrukh Suvankulov. 2013. Internet recruitment and job performance: case of the US Army. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* **24**:11, 2237-2254. [[Crossref](#)]
1745. Doris Läßle, Thia Hennessy, Carol Newman. 2013. Quantifying the Economic Return to Participatory Extension Programmes in Ireland: an Endogenous Switching Regression Analysis. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* **64**:2, 467-482. [[Crossref](#)]
1746. Paul J Ferraro, Merlin M Hanauer, Daniela A Miteva, Gustavo Javier Canavire-Bacarreza, Subhrendu K Pattanayak, Katharine R E Sims. 2013. More strictly protected areas are not necessarily more protective: evidence from Bolivia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, and Thailand. *Environmental Research Letters* **8**:2, 025011. [[Crossref](#)]
1747. Richard Berk, Emil Pitkin, Lawrence Brown, Andreas Buja, Edward George, Linda Zhao. 2013. Covariance Adjustments for the Analysis of Randomized Field Experiments. *Evaluation Review* **37**:3-4, 170-196. [[Crossref](#)]
1748. Anthony A. Braga, Robert Apel, Brandon C. Welsh. 2013. The Spillover Effects of Focused Deterrence on Gang Violence. *Evaluation Review* **37**:3-4, 314-342. [[Crossref](#)]
1749. R. Gutman, D.B. Rubin. 2013. Robust estimation of causal effects of binary treatments in unconfounded studies with dichotomous outcomes. *Statistics in Medicine* **32**:11, 1795-1814. [[Crossref](#)]
1750. Harald Oberhofer. 2013. Employment Effects of Acquisitions: Evidence from Acquired European Firms. *Review of Industrial Organization* **42**:3, 345-363. [[Crossref](#)]
1751. Thomas G. Koch. 2013. Using RD design to understand heterogeneity in health insurance crowd-out. *Journal of Health Economics* **32**:3, 599-611. [[Crossref](#)]
1752. Bernadette M. Wanjala, Roldan Muradian. 2013. Can Big Push Interventions Take Small-Scale Farmers out of Poverty? Insights from the Sauri Millennium Village in Kenya. *World Development* **45**, 147-160. [[Crossref](#)]
1753. Nguyen Viet Cuong. 2013. Which covariates should be controlled in propensity score matching? Evidence from a simulation study. *Statistica Neerlandica* **67**:2, 169-180. [[Crossref](#)]
1754. Aki Jääskeläinen, Harri Laihonon. 2013. Overcoming the specific performance measurement challenges of knowledge-intensive organizations. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* **62**:4, 350-363. [[Crossref](#)]

1755. Noémi Kreif, Richard Grieve, M. Zia Sadique. 2013. STATISTICAL METHODS FOR COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSES THAT USE OBSERVATIONAL DATA: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL AND REVIEW OF CURRENT PRACTICE. *Health Economics* **22**:4, 486-500. [[Crossref](#)]
1756. Yu Xiao, Jun Wan, Geoffrey J. D. Hewings. 2013. Flooding and the Midwest economy: assessing the Midwest floods of 1993 and 2008. *GeoJournal* **78**:2, 245-258. [[Crossref](#)]
1757. Sanders Korenman, Kristin S. Abner, Robert Kaestner, Rachel A. Gordon. 2013. The Child and Adult Care Food Program and the nutrition of preschoolers. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* **28**:2, 325-336. [[Crossref](#)]
1758. Michael Lechner, Conny Wunsch. 2013. Sensitivity of matching-based program evaluations to the availability of control variables. *Labour Economics* **21**, 111-121. [[Crossref](#)]
1759. Gianluca Fiorentini, Matteo Lippi Bruni, Cristina Ugolini. 2013. GPs and hospital expenditures. Should we keep expenditure containment programs alive?. *Social Science & Medicine* **82**, 10-20. [[Crossref](#)]
1760. Per Pettersson-Lidbom, Peter Skogman Thoursie. 2013. Temporary Disability Insurance and Labor Supply: Evidence from a Natural Experiment\*. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* **115**:2, 485-507. [[Crossref](#)]
1761. Mingxiang Li. 2013. Using the Propensity Score Method to Estimate Causal Effects. *Organizational Research Methods* **16**:2, 188-226. [[Crossref](#)]
1762. Seung-Hyun Hong. 2013. MEASURING THE EFFECT OF NAPSTER ON RECORDED MUSIC SALES: DIFFERENCE-IN-DIFFERENCES ESTIMATES UNDER COMPOSITIONAL CHANGES. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **28**:2, 297-324. [[Crossref](#)]
1763. Sea-Jin Chang, Jaiho Chung, Jon Jungbien Moon. 2013. When do wholly owned subsidiaries perform better than joint ventures?. *Strategic Management Journal* **34**:3, 317-337. [[Crossref](#)]
1764. Jin Wang. 2013. The economic impact of Special Economic Zones: Evidence from Chinese municipalities. *Journal of Development Economics* **101**, 133-147. [[Crossref](#)]
1765. Joshua K. Abbott, H. Allen Klaiber. 2013. The value of water as an urban club good: A matching approach to community-provided lakes. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **65**:2, 208-224. [[Crossref](#)]
1766. Caterina Giannetti, Nicola Jentzsch. 2013. Credit reporting, financial intermediation and identification systems: International evidence. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **33**, 60-80. [[Crossref](#)]
1767. Richard Fabling, Lynda Sanderson. 2013. Exporting and firm performance: Market entry, investment and expansion. *Journal of International Economics* **89**:2, 422-431. [[Crossref](#)]
1768. Halbert White, Karim Chalak. 2013. Identification and Identification Failure for Treatment Effects Using Structural Systems. *Econometric Reviews* **32**:3, 273-317. [[Crossref](#)]
1769. Edoardo Masset, Marie Gaarder, Penelope Beynon, Christelle Chapoy. 2013. What is the impact of a policy brief? Results of an experiment in research dissemination. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* **5**:1, 50-63. [[Crossref](#)]
1770. RICHARD HARRIS, QIAN CHER LI, JOHN MOFFAT. 2013. THE IMPACT OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION-FIRM KNOWLEDGE LINKS ON ESTABLISHMENT-LEVEL PRODUCTIVITY IN BRITISH REGIONS\*. *The Manchester School* **81**:2, 143-162. [[Crossref](#)]

1771. Rahel Aichele, Gabriel Felbermayr. 2013. Estimating the Effects of Kyoto on Bilateral Trade Flows Using Matching Econometrics. *The World Economy* 36:3, 303-330. [[Crossref](#)]
1772. Winston Lin. 2013. Agnostic notes on regression adjustments to experimental data: Reexamining Freedman's critique. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 7:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
1773. Degnet Abebaw, Mekbib G. Haile. 2013. The impact of cooperatives on agricultural technology adoption: Empirical evidence from Ethiopia. *Food Policy* 38, 82-91. [[Crossref](#)]
1774. Dmitriy Muravyev, Neil D. Pearson, John Paul Broussard. 2013. Is there price discovery in equity options?. *Journal of Financial Economics* 107:2, 259-283. [[Crossref](#)]
1775. Dirk Czarnitzki, Cindy Lopes-Bento. 2013. Value for money? New microeconomic evidence on public R&D grants in Flanders. *Research Policy* 42:1, 76-89. [[Crossref](#)]
1776. Metin Akyol, Michael Neugart, Stefan Pichler. 2013. Were the Hartz Reforms Responsible for the Improved Performance of the German Labour Market?. *Economic Affairs* 33:1, 34-47. [[Crossref](#)]
1777. Taro Esaka, Shinji Takagi. 2013. Testing the Effectiveness of Market-Based Controls: Evidence From the Experience of Japan With Short-Term Capital Flows in the 1970s. *International Finance* 16:1, 45-69. [[Crossref](#)]
1778. Alan R. Ellis, Stacie B. Dusetzina, Richard A. Hansen, Bradley N. Gaynes, Joel F. Farley, Til Stürmer. 2013. Investigating differences in treatment effect estimates between propensity score matching and weighting: a demonstration using STAR\*D trial data. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 22:2, 138-144. [[Crossref](#)]
1779. Julia Koschinsky. 2013. The case for spatial analysis in evaluation to reduce health inequities. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 36:1, 172-176. [[Crossref](#)]
1780. Aliou Diagne, Soul-Kifouly Gnonna Midingoyi, Florent M. Kinkingninhoun-Medagbe. Impact of NERICA Adoption on Rice Yield: Evidence from West Africa 143-163. [[Crossref](#)]
1781. Richard Breen, Kristian Bernt Karlson. Counterfactual Causal Analysis and Nonlinear Probability Models 167-187. [[Crossref](#)]
1782. D.L. Millimet. Empirical Methods for Political Economy Analyses of Environmental Policy 250-260. [[Crossref](#)]
1783. Kishore Gawande, Hank Jenkins-Smith, May Yuan. 2013. The long-run impact of nuclear waste shipments on the property market: Evidence from a quasi-experiment. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 65:1, 56-73. [[Crossref](#)]
1784. Gábor Békés, Péter Harasztosi. 2013. Agglomeration premium and trading activity of firms. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 43:1, 51-64. [[Crossref](#)]
1785. Gustavo Canavire-Bacarreza, Merlin M. Hanauer. 2013. Estimating the Impacts of Bolivia's Protected Areas on Poverty. *World Development* 41, 265-285. [[Crossref](#)]
1786. Dennis K. Orthner, Hinckley Jones-Sanpei, Patrick Akos, Roderick A. Rose. 2013. Improving Middle School Student Engagement Through Career-Relevant Instruction in the Core Curriculum. *The Journal of Educational Research* 106:1, 27-38. [[Crossref](#)]
1787. Kwaw S. Andam, Paul J. Ferraro, Merlin M. Hanauer. 2013. The effects of protected area systems on ecosystem restoration: a quasi-experimental design to estimate the impact of Costa Rica's protected area system on forest regrowth. *Conservation Letters* 4, n/a-n/a. [[Crossref](#)]

1788. Dan Amiram, Andrew M. Bauer, Mary Margaret Frank. 2013. Manager-Shareholder Alignment, Shareholder Dividend Tax Policy, and Corporate Tax Avoidance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1789. Christian Almer, Stefan Boes, Stephan Nüesch. 2013. How Do Housing Prices Adjust after an Environmental Shock? Evidence from a State-Mandated Change in Aircraft Noise Exposure. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1790. Winfried Pohlmeier, Ruben R. Seiberlich, Selver Derya Uysal. 2013. A Simple and Successful Method to Shrink the Weight. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1791. Natalia Kapelko, Natalya Volchkova. 2013. Export Costs of Visa Restrictions: Evidence from Russia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1792. Samuli Knüpfer, Elias Henrikki Rantapuska, Matti Sarvimäki. 2013. Labor Market Experiences and Portfolio Choice: Evidence from the Finnish Great Depression. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1793. Ashwini K. Agrawal, Prasanna Tambe. 2013. Technological Investment and Labor Outcomes: Evidence from Private Equity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1794. Fernando Martel García. 2013. Definition and Diagnosis of Problematic Attrition in Randomized Controlled Experiments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1795. Hendrik Schmitz, Matthias Westphal. 2013. Short- and Medium-Term Effects of Informal Care Provision on Health. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1796. Anjana Susarla, Tridas Mukhopadhyay. 2013. Contracting for Innovation in Information Technology Outsourcing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1797. Max H. Farrell. 2013. Robust Inference on Average Treatment Effects with Possibly More Covariates than Observations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1798. J. Tyler Leverty, Martin F. Grace. 2013. Do Elections Delay Regulatory Action?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1799. Marco Sanfilippo. 2013. Investing Abroad from the Bottom of the Productivity Ladder BRICS Multinationals in Europe. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1800. Judea Pearl. 2013. Trygve Haavelmo and the Emergence of Causal Calculus. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1801. Luis Aranda. 2013. Doubling Up: A Gift or a Shame? Multigenerational Households and Parental Depression of Older Europeans. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1802. Rani Hoitash, Udi Hoitash, Ahmet C. Kurt. 2013. Do Accountants Make Better Chief Financial Officers?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1803. Claudia Lambert, Felix Noth, Ulrich Schuewer. 2013. How Do Insured Deposits Affect Bank Risk? Evidence from the 2008 Emergency Economic Stabilization Act. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1804. David R. Bell, Santiago Gallino, Antonio Moreno. 2013. Inventory Showrooms and Customer Migration in Omni-Channel Retail: The Effect of Product Information. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1805. Samuel Benin, Michael Johnson, Emmanuel Abokyi, Gerald Ahorbo, Kipo Jimah, Gamel Nasser, Victor Owusu, Joe Taabazuing, Albert Tenga. 2013. Revisiting Agricultural Input and Farm Support Subsidies in Africa: The Case of Ghana's Mechanization, Fertilizer, Block Farms, and Marketing Programs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

1806. Liu Hao, Katrina Mullan, Qingjiao Rong, Wenqing B. Zhu. 2013. Have the Key Priority Forestry Programs Really Impacted on China's Rural Household Income. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1807. Hanna Hottenrott, Sascha Rexhauser. 2013. Policy-Induced Environmental Technology and Inventive Efforts: Is There a Crowding Out?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1808. Giuseppe Cappelletti, Giovanni Guazzarotti, Pietro Tommasino. 2013. Tax Deferral and Mutual Fund Inflows: Evidence from a Quasi-Natural Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1809. Jens Dietrichson, Lina Maria Elleggrd. 2013. Assist or Desist? Conditional Bailouts and Fiscal Discipline in Local Governments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1810. Mohammad Muaz Jalil. 2013. Practical Guidelines for Conducting Research - Summarising Good Research Practice in Line with the DCED Standard. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1811. Lin Ligu. 2013. The Impacts of 'Land of Love, Water Cellar for Mothers' in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1812. Liang Li, Tom Greene. 2013. A Weighting Analogue to Pair Matching in Propensity Score Analysis. *The International Journal of Biostatistics* 9:2. . [[Crossref](#)]
1813. Cindy Yu, Jason Legg, Bin Liu. 2013. Estimating multiple treatment effects using two-phase semiparametric regression estimators. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 7:none. . [[Crossref](#)]
1814. Edward Feser. 2013. Isserman's Impact. *International Regional Science Review* 36:1, 44-68. [[Crossref](#)]
1815. Sophie Morlaix, Cathy Perret. 2013. L'évaluation du Plan Réussite en Licence : quelles actions pour quels effets ? Analyse sur les résultats des étudiants en première année universitaire. *Recherches en éducation* :15. . [[Crossref](#)]
1816. Hyun Ah Kim, Yong-seong Kim, Myoung-jae Lee. 2012. Treatment effect analysis of early reemployment bonus program: panel MLE and mode-based semiparametric estimator for interval truncation. *Portuguese Economic Journal* 11:3, 189-209. [[Crossref](#)]
1817. Martin Petrick, Patrick Zier. 2012. Common Agricultural Policy effects on dynamic labour use in agriculture. *Food Policy* 37:6, 671-678. [[Crossref](#)]
1818. Arne Feddersen, Wolfgang Maennig. 2012. Sectoral labour market effects of the 2006 FIFA World Cup. *Labour Economics* 19:6, 860-869. [[Crossref](#)]
1819. Rosario Crinò. 2012. Imported inputs and skill upgrading. *Labour Economics* 19:6, 957-969. [[Crossref](#)]
1820. François Claveau. 2012. The Russo-Williamson Theses in the social sciences: Causal inference drawing on two types of evidence. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 43:4, 806-813. [[Crossref](#)]
1821. Ichiro Iwasaki, Péter Csizmadia, Miklós Illéssy, Csaba Makó, Miklós Szanyi. 2012. The Nested Variable Model of FDI Spillover Effects: Estimation Using Hungarian Panel Data. *International Economic Journal* 26:4, 673-709. [[Crossref](#)]
1822. Malcolm Keswell, Justine Burns, Rebecca Thornton. 2012. Evaluating the Impact of Health Programmes on Productivity. *African Development Review* 24:4, 302-315. [[Crossref](#)]
1823. Robert Girtz. 2012. The Effects of Personality Traits on Wages: A Matching Approach. *LABOUR* 26:4, 455-471. [[Crossref](#)]
1824. Daniel P. McMillen. 2012. Repeat Sales as a Matching Estimator. *Real Estate Economics* 40:4, 745-773. [[Crossref](#)]



1825. Masataka Harada. 2012. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 and Strategic Policy Making in the South. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 12:4, 456-482. [[Crossref](#)]
1826. Harry J Holzer. 2012. Good workers for good jobs: improving education and workforce systems in the US. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy* 1:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
1827. Bruno Martorano, Marco Sanfilippo. 2012. INNOVATIVE FEATURES IN POVERTY REDUCTION PROGRAMMES: AN IMPACT EVALUATION OF CHILE SOLIDARIO ON HOUSEHOLDS AND CHILDREN. *Journal of International Development* 24:8, 1030-1041. [[Crossref](#)]
1828. Francisco Gallego, Borja Larrain. 2012. CEO compensation and large shareholders: Evidence from emerging markets. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 40:4, 621-642. [[Crossref](#)]
1829. David McKenzie. 2012. Beyond baseline and follow-up: The case for more T in experiments. *Journal of Development Economics* 99:2, 210-221. [[Crossref](#)]
1830. Noemi Kreif, Richard Grieve, Rosalba Radice, Zia Sadique, Roland Ramsahai, Jasjeet S. Sekhon. 2012. Methods for Estimating Subgroup Effects in Cost-Effectiveness Analyses That Use Observational Data. *Medical Decision Making* 32:6, 750-763. [[Crossref](#)]
1831. Yu Ye, Jason C. Bond, Laura A. Schmidt, Nina Mulia, Tammy W. Tam. 2012. Toward a better understanding of when to apply propensity scoring: a comparison with conventional regression in ethnic disparities research. *Annals of Epidemiology* 22:10, 691-697. [[Crossref](#)]
1832. José Miguel Benavente, Gustavo Crespi, Lucas Figal Garone, Alessandro Maffioli. 2012. The impact of national research funds: A regression discontinuity approach to the Chilean FONDECYT. *Research Policy* 41:8, 1461-1475. [[Crossref](#)]
1833. Hiroyuki Takeshima, Latha Nagarajan. 2012. Minor millets in Tamil Nadu, India: local market participation, on-farm diversity and farmer welfare. *Environment and Development Economics* 17:5, 603-632. [[Crossref](#)]
1834. James I. Stewart. 2012. Migration to U.S. frontier cities and job opportunity, 1860-1880. *Explorations in Economic History* 49:4, 528-542. [[Crossref](#)]
1835. Manuel Gomes, Richard Grieve, Richard Nixon, Edmond S.-W. Ng, James Carpenter, Simon G. Thompson. 2012. METHODS FOR COVARIATE ADJUSTMENT IN COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS THAT USE CLUSTER RANDOMISED TRIALS. *Health Economics* 21:9, 1101-1118. [[Crossref](#)]
1836. David T. Butry. 2012. Comparing the performance of residential fire sprinklers with other life-safety technologies. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 48, 480-494. [[Crossref](#)]
1837. Elisabetta Magnani, Rong Zhu. 2012. Gender wage differentials among rural-urban migrants in China. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 42:5, 779-793. [[Crossref](#)]
1838. Ephraim Nkonya, Dayo Phillip, Tewodaj Mogues, John Pender, Edward Kato. 2012. Impacts of Community-driven Development Programs on Income and Asset Acquisition in Africa: The Case of Nigeria. *World Development* 40:9, 1824-1838. [[Crossref](#)]
1839. Dirk Czarnitzki, Susanne Thorwarth. 2012. The Contribution of In-house and External Design Activities to Product Market Performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 29:5, 878-895. [[Crossref](#)]

1840. Nassul Ssentamu Kabunga, Thomas Dubois, Martin Qaim. 2012. Heterogeneous information exposure and technology adoption: the case of tissue culture bananas in Kenya. *Agricultural Economics* **43**:5, 473-486. [[Crossref](#)]
1841. Hung-Hao Chang. 2012. Does the use of eco-labels affect income distribution and income inequality of aquaculture producers in Taiwan?. *Ecological Economics* **80**, 101-108. [[Crossref](#)]
1842. Cristina Borra, Maria Iacovou, Almudena Sevilla. 2012. The effect of breastfeeding on children's cognitive and noncognitive development. *Labour Economics* **19**:4, 496-515. [[Crossref](#)]
1843. Ingeborg Waernbaum. 2012. Model misspecification and robustness in causal inference: comparing matching with doubly robust estimation. *Statistics in Medicine* **31**:15, 1572-1581. [[Crossref](#)]
1844. Christian Langpap, Joe Kerkvliet. 2012. Endangered species conservation on private land: Assessing the effectiveness of habitat conservation plans. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **64**:1, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
1845. Patrick J. Egan. 2012. Group Cohesion without Group Mobilization: The Case of Lesbians, Gays and Bisexuals. *British Journal of Political Science* **42**:3, 597-616. [[Crossref](#)]
1846. Sarah Kuck Jalbert, William Rhodes. 2012. Reduced caseloads improve probation outcomes. *Journal of Crime and Justice* **35**:2, 221-238. [[Crossref](#)]
1847. Jeffrey L. Furman, Fiona Murray, Scott Stern. 2012. Growing Stem Cells: The Impact of Federal Funding Policy on the U.S. Scientific Frontier. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* **31**:3, 661-705. [[Crossref](#)]
1848. Hiroki Uematsu, Ashok K. Mishra. 2012. Organic farmers or conventional farmers: Where's the money?. *Ecological Economics* **78**, 55-62. [[Crossref](#)]
1849. Patrick J. McEwan. 2012. Cost-effectiveness analysis of education and health interventions in developing countries. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* **4**:2, 189-213. [[Crossref](#)]
1850. Erling Barth, Bernt Bratsberg, Torbjørn Haegeland, Oddbjørn Raaum. 2012. Performance Pay, Union Bargaining and Within-Firm Wage Inequality\*. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **74**:3, 327-362. [[Crossref](#)]
1851. Martin Huber. 2012. Identification of Average Treatment Effects in Social Experiments Under Alternative Forms of Attrition. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics* **37**:3, 443-474. [[Crossref](#)]
1852. Daniel L. Millimet, Rusty Tchernis. 2012. Estimation of Treatment Effects without an Exclusion Restriction: with an Application to the Analysis of the School Breakfast Program. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **113**, n/a-n/a. [[Crossref](#)]
1853. Thomas K. Bauer, Stefan Bender, Alfredo R. Paloyo, Christoph M. Schmidt. 2012. Evaluating the labor-market effects of compulsory military service. *European Economic Review* **56**:4, 814-829. [[Crossref](#)]
1854. Yongheng Deng, Daniel P. McMillen, Tien Foo Sing. 2012. Private residential price indices in Singapore: A matching approach. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **42**:3, 485-494. [[Crossref](#)]
1855. T. Randolph Beard, George S. Ford, Richard P. Saba, Richard A. Seals. 2012. Internet use and job search. *Telecommunications Policy* **36**:4, 260-273. [[Crossref](#)]
1856. Luis H. B. Braidó, Pedro Olinto, Helena Perrone. 2012. Gender Bias in Intrahousehold Allocation: Evidence from an Unintentional Experiment. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **94**:2, 552-565. [[Crossref](#)]

1857. B Sampaio. 2012. To generalize or not to generalize? Comment on Robinson and Davies. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* **63**:4, 563-565. [[Crossref](#)]
1858. Barry T. Hirsch, Edward J. Schumacher. 2012. Underpaid or Overpaid? Wage Analysis for Nurses Using Job and Worker Attributes. *Southern Economic Journal* **78**:4, 1096-1119. [[Crossref](#)]
1859. Maria De Paola, Vincenzo Scoppa. 2012. The Effects of Managerial Turnover. *Journal of Sports Economics* **13**:2, 152-168. [[Crossref](#)]
1860. Astrid Kiil. 2012. Does employment-based private health insurance increase the use of covered health care services? A matching estimator approach. *International Journal of Health Care Finance and Economics* **12**:1, 1-38. [[Crossref](#)]
1861. Vijesh V. Krishna, Matin Qaim. 2012. Bt cotton and sustainability of pesticide reductions in India. *Agricultural Systems* **107**, 47-55. [[Crossref](#)]
1862. Shelia R. Cotten, George Ford, Sherry Ford, Timothy M. Hale. 2012. Internet use and depression among older adults. *Computers in Human Behavior* **28**:2, 496-499. [[Crossref](#)]
1863. Heiner Mikosch, Jan-Egbert Sturm. 2012. Has the EMU reduced wage growth and unemployment? Testing a model of trade union behavior. *European Journal of Political Economy* **28**:1, 27-37. [[Crossref](#)]
1864. Peter C. Rockers, Andrea B. Feigl, John-Arne Røttingen, Atle Fretheim, David de Ferranti, John N. Lavis, Hans Olav Melberg, Till Bärnighausen. 2012. Study-design selection criteria in systematic reviews of effectiveness of health systems interventions and reforms: A meta-review. *Health Policy* **104**:3, 206-214. [[Crossref](#)]
1865. Myoung-Jae Lee. 2012. Semiparametric Estimators for Limited Dependent Variable (LDV) Models with Endogenous Regressors. *Econometric Reviews* **31**:2, 171-214. [[Crossref](#)]
1866. Francisco Henríquez, Bernardo Lara, Alejandra Mizala, Andrea Repetto. 2012. Effective schools do exist: low-income children's academic performance in Chile. *Applied Economics Letters* **19**:5, 445-451. [[Crossref](#)]
1867. D. A. Miteva, S. K. Pattanayak, P. J. Ferraro. 2012. Evaluation of biodiversity policy instruments: what works and what doesn't?. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* **28**:1, 69-92. [[Crossref](#)]
1868. WILLIAM NILSSON. 2012. HETEROGENEITY OR TRUE STATE DEPENDENCE IN POVERTY: THE TALE TOLD BY TWINS. *Review of Income and Wealth* **58**:1, 1-23. [[Crossref](#)]
1869. Petra Moser,, Alessandra Voena. 2012. Compulsory Licensing: Evidence from the Trading with the Enemy Act. *American Economic Review* **102**:1, 396-427. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
1870. Sébastien Massoni, Jean-Christophe Vergnaud. 2012. How to improve pupils' literacy? A cost-effectiveness analysis of a French educational project. *Economics of Education Review* **31**:1, 84-91. [[Crossref](#)]
1871. Christian Volpe Martincus, Jerónimo Carballo, Pablo M. Garcia. 2012. Public programmes to promote firms' exports in developing countries: are there heterogeneous effects by size categories?. *Applied Economics* **44**:4, 471-491. [[Crossref](#)]
1872. Enrico Beretta, Silvia Del Prete. 2012. Bank Acquisitions and Decentralization Choices. *Economic Notes* **41**:1-2, 27-57. [[Crossref](#)]
1873. Carlos A. Flores, Alfonso Flores-Lagunes, Arturo Gonzalez, Todd C. Neumann. 2012. Estimating the Effects of Length of Exposure to Instruction in a Training Program: The Case of Job Corps. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **94**:1, 153-171. [[Crossref](#)]

1874. William Rhodes. 2012. Meta-Analysis. *Evaluation Review* 36:1, 24-71. [[Crossref](#)]
1875. C. N. Brinch, T. A. Galloway. 2012. Schooling in adolescence raises IQ scores. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109:2, 425-430. [[Crossref](#)]
1876. Tania Barham. 2012. Enhancing Cognitive Functioning: Medium-Term Effects of a Health and Family Planning Program in Matlab. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 4:1, 245-273. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
1877. Heide Fier, Andreas Pyka. Is It Worth All the Trouble? An Assessment of the Economic Value of Firm Patent Applications with Shared Intellectual Property Rights in the Biotechnology Industry 123-142. [[Crossref](#)]
1878. Hans Fricke, Susanne Koch, Peter Kupka. Evaluation von Arbeitsmarktpolitik – Methoden, Möglichkeiten, Grenzen 213-229. [[Crossref](#)]
1879. Timothy Powell-Jackson, Kara Hanson. 2012. Financial incentives for maternal health: Impact of a national programme in Nepal. *Journal of Health Economics* 31:1, 271-284. [[Crossref](#)]
1880. P. M. Dontsop Nguetzet, V. O. Okoruwa, A. I. Adeoti, K. O. Adenegan. 2012. Productivity Impact Differential of Improved Rice Technology Adoption Among Rice Farming Households in Nigeria. *Journal of Crop Improvement* 26:1, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
1881. Liangjun Su, Halbert L. White. Conditional Independence Specification Testing for Dependent Processes with Local Polynomial Quantile Regression 355-434. [[Crossref](#)]
1882. Mark B. Stewart. 2012. Quantile estimates of counterfactual distribution shifts and the effect of minimum wage increases on the wage distribution. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 175:1, 263-287. [[Crossref](#)]
1883. Marco Caliendo, Jens Hogenacker. 2012. The German labor market after the Great Recession: successful reforms and future challenges. *IZA Journal of European Labor Studies* 1:1, 3. [[Crossref](#)]
1884. Kim P. Huynh, David T. Jacho-Chávez, James K. Self. 2012. Who does Collaborative Learning Help? The Pedagogical Efficacy of Student Learning Through Collaborative Learning Sessions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1885. Viral V. Acharya, Krishnamurthy Subramanian, Ramin Baghai. 2012. Wrongful Discharge Laws and Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1886. John William Asker, Joan Farre-Mensa, Alexander Ljungqvist. 2012. Comparing the Investment Behavior of Public and Private Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1887. Christian Almer, Ralph Winkler. 2012. The Effect of Kyoto Emission Targets on Domestic CO2 Emissions: A Synthetic Control Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1888. Andrew Beath, Fotini Christia, Ruben Enikolopov. 2012. Winning Hearts and Minds through Development: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Afghanistan. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1889. Marius Dominik Osterfeld. 2012. The Effects of Local Major Offer on Major Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1890. John Pender, Alexander Marre, Richard Reeder. 2012. Rural Wealth Creation Concepts, Strategies, and Measures. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1891. Laura Rosendahl Huber, Randolph Sloof, Mirjam van Praag. 2012. The Effect of Early Entrepreneurship Education: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

1892. Yi Lu, Zhigang Tao, Yan Zhang. 2012. How Exporters Respond to Antidumping Investigations?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1893. Paolo Pinotti. 2012. The Economic Costs of Organized Crime: Evidence from Southern Italy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1894. Bo Zhao, Rosemarie Ham Ziedonis. 2012. State Governments as Financiers of Technology Startups: Implications for Firm Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1895. Ernst G. Maug, Alexandra Niessen-Ruenzi, Evgenia Zhivotova. 2012. Pride and Prestige: Why Some Firms Pay Their CEOs Less. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1896. Mauricio Larrain. 2012. Does Financial Liberalization Contribute to Wage Inequality? The Role of Capital-Skill Complementarity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1897. Laszlo Goerke, Markus Pannenberg. 2012. Trade Union Membership and Sickness Absence: Evidence from a Sick Pay Reform. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1898. Cristina Connolly, H. Allen Klaiber. 2012. Does Organic Command a Premium When the Food is Already Local?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1899. Carolyn Heinrich, John Hoddinott, Michael J. Samson. 2012. The Impact of South Africa's Child Support Grant on Schooling and Learning. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1900. Georg von Graevenitz. 2012. Trade Mark Cluttering - Evidence from EU Enlargement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1901. John S. Earle, Almos Telegdy, Gabor Antal. 2012. FDI and Wages: Evidence from Firm-Level and Linked Employer-Employee Data in Hungary, 1986-2008. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1902. Thomas Blondiau, Carole M. Billiet. 2012. Use of Matching to Evaluate Environmental Regulatory Enforcement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1903. Fernando Martel García. 2012. Small, Slow, and Diminishing: The Effect of Democracy on the Under-Five Mortality Rate. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1904. Marco Caliendo, Steffen Künn. 2012. Getting Back into the Labor Market: The Effects of Start-Up Subsidies for Unemployed Females. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1905. Dirk Czarnitzki, Cindy Lopes Bento. 2012. Value for Money? New Microeconomic Evidence on Public R&D Grants in Flanders. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1906. J. David Brown, John S. Earle. 2012. Do SBA Loans Create Jobs? Estimates from Universal Panel Data and Longitudinal Matching Methods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1907. Hanna Hottenrott, Cindy Lopes Bento. 2012. (International) R&D Collaboration and SMEs: The Effectiveness of Targeted Public R&D Support Schemes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1908. Markku Kaustia, Samuli Knüpfer, Sami Torstila. 2012. Stock Ownership and Political Behavior: Evidence from Demutualizations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1909. Benjamin Villena-Roldan, Cecilia Rios-Aguilar. 2012. Causal Effects of Maternal Time-Investment on Children's Cognitive Outcomes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1910. Yang Wang, Binzhen Wu. 2012. Railways and the Local Economy: Evidence from Qingzang Railway. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1911. Prakarsh Singh. 2012. Performance Pay in Public Health: Evidence from a Controlled Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

1912. Gina A. Chowa, Rainier D. Masa, Michael Sherraden. 2012. Wealth Effects of an Asset-Building Intervention Among Rural Households in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research* 3:4, 329-345. [[Crossref](#)]
1913. Samuel Benin, Ephraim Nkonya, Geresom Okecho, José Randriamamonjy, Edward Kato, Geoffrey Lubade, Miriam Kyotalimye. 2012. Impact of the National Agricultural Advisory Services (Naads) program of Uganda: Considering Different Levels of Likely Contamination with the Treatment. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 94:2, 386-392. [[Crossref](#)]
1914. Nicholas Bloom, Zack Cooper, Martin Gaynor, Stephen Gibbons, Simon Jones, Alistair McGuire, Rodrigo Moreno-Serra, Carol Propper, John Van Reenen, Stephan Seiler. 2011. In defence of our research on competition in England's National Health Service. *The Lancet* 378:9809, 2064-2065. [[Crossref](#)]
1915. Allyson Pollock, Azeem Majeed, Alison Macfarlane, Ian Greener, Graham Kirkwood, Howard Mellett, Sylvia Godden, Sean Boyle, Carol Morelli, Petra Brhlikova. 2011. In defence of our research on competition in England's National Health Service – Authors' reply. *The Lancet* 378:9809, 2065-2066. [[Crossref](#)]
1916. Tarjei Havnes, Magne Mogstad. 2011. Money for nothing? Universal child care and maternal employment. *Journal of Public Economics* 95:11-12, 1455-1465. [[Crossref](#)]
1917. MARIA DE PAOLA, VINCENZO SCOPPA. 2011. THE EFFECTS OF CLASS SIZE ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS\*. *The Manchester School* 79:6, 1061-1079. [[Crossref](#)]
1918. Anthony A. Braga, David M. Hureau, Andrew V. Papachristos. 2011. An Ex Post Facto Evaluation Framework for Place-Based Police Interventions. *Evaluation Review* 35:6, 592-626. [[Crossref](#)]
1919. Isabelle Martinez, Stéphanie Serve. 2011. The delisting decision: The case of buyout offer with squeeze-out (BOSO). *International Review of Law and Economics* 31:4, 228-239. [[Crossref](#)]
1920. Fabrizia Mealli, Barbara Pacini, Donald B. Rubin. Statistical Inference for Causal Effects 171-192. [[Crossref](#)]
1921. Thomas C. Buchmueller,, John DiNardo,, Robert G. Valletta. 2011. The Effect of an Employer Health Insurance Mandate on Health Insurance Coverage and the Demand for Labor: Evidence from Hawaii. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 3:4, 25-51. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
1922. Roland G. Fryer. 2011. Financial Incentives and Student Achievement: Evidence from Randomized Trials \*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126:4, 1755-1798. [[Crossref](#)]
1923. Beatrix Eugster, Rafael Lalive, Andreas Steinhauer, Josef Zweimüller. 2011. The Demand for Social Insurance: Does Culture Matter?. *The Economic Journal* 121:556, F413-F448. [[Crossref](#)]
1924. Hendrik Jürges, Kerstin Schneider. 2011. Why Young Boys Stumble: Early Tracking, Age and Gender Bias in the German School System. *German Economic Review* 12:4, 371-394. [[Crossref](#)]
1925. Halbert White, Xun Lu. 2011. Causal Diagrams for Treatment Effect Estimation with Application to Efficient Covariate Selection. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 93:4, 1453-1459. [[Crossref](#)]
1926. Mark W. Fraser, Shenyang Guo, Alan R. Ellis, Aaron M. Thompson, Traci L. Wike, Jilan Li. 2011. Outcome Studies of Social, Behavioral, and Educational Interventions. *Research on Social Work Practice* 21:6, 619-635. [[Crossref](#)]



1927. Annette Bergemann, Marco Caliendo, Gerard J. van den Berg, Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2011. The threat effect of participation in active labor market programs on job search behavior of migrants in Germany. *International Journal of Manpower* **32**:7, 777-795. [[Crossref](#)]
1928. B. Cantillon, A. De Ridder, E. Vanhaecht, G. Verbist. 2011. (Un)desirable effects of output funding for Flemish universities. *Economics of Education Review* **30**:5, 1059-1072. [[Crossref](#)]
1929. Hunt Allcott. 2011. Social norms and energy conservation. *Journal of Public Economics* **95**:9-10, 1082-1095. [[Crossref](#)]
1930. Marco Di Cintio, Emanuele Grassi. 2011. Internal migration and wages of Italian university graduates\*. *Papers in Regional Science* **23**, no-no. [[Crossref](#)]
1931. Yu Xiao. 2011. LOCAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF NATURAL DISASTERS\*. *Journal of Regional Science* **51**:4, 804-820. [[Crossref](#)]
1932. Kevin Gross, Jay A. Rosenheim. 2011. Quantifying secondary pest outbreaks in cotton and their monetary cost with causal-inference statistics. *Ecological Applications* **21**:7, 2770-2780. [[Crossref](#)]
1933. Taro Esaka. 2011. Do hard pegs avoid currency crises? An evaluation using matching estimators. *Economics Letters* **113**:1, 35-38. [[Crossref](#)]
1934. Bijan J. Borah, Marguerite E. Burns, Nilay D. Shah. 2011. Assessing the impact of high deductible health plans on health-care utilization and cost: a changes-in-changes approach. *Health Economics* **20**:9, 1025-1042. [[Crossref](#)]
1935. Laure B. de Preux. 2011. Anticipatory ex ante moral hazard and the effect of medicare on prevention. *Health Economics* **20**:9, 1056-1072. [[Crossref](#)]
1936. Olli Ropponen. 2011. Reconciling the evidence of Card and Krueger (1994) and Neumark and Wascher (2000). *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **26**:6, 1051-1057. [[Crossref](#)]
1937. Nikolaus Graf, Helmut Hofer, Rudolf Winter-Ebmer. 2011. Labor supply effects of a subsidized old-age part-time scheme in Austria. *Zeitschrift für ArbeitsmarktForschung* **44**:3, 217-229. [[Crossref](#)]
1938. Pao-Li Chang, Myoung-Jae Lee. 2011. The WTO trade effect. *Journal of International Economics* **85**:1, 53-71. [[Crossref](#)]
1939. François Claveau. 2011. Evidential variety as a source of credibility for causal inference: beyond sharp designs and structural models. *Journal of Economic Methodology* **18**:3, 233-253. [[Crossref](#)]
1940. Chad D. Meyerhoefer, Muzhe Yang. 2011. The Relationship between Food Assistance and Health: A Review of the Literature and Empirical Strategies for Identifying Program Effects. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* **33**:3, 304-344. [[Crossref](#)]
1941. John Gerring. 2011. How Good Is Good Enough? A Multidimensional, Best-Possible Standard for Research Design. *Political Research Quarterly* **64**:3, 625-636. [[Crossref](#)]
1942. P. J. Ferraro, M. M. Hanauer, K. R. E. Sims. 2011. Conditions associated with protected area success in conservation and poverty reduction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**:34, 13913-13918. [[Crossref](#)]
1943. Eeshani Kandpal. 2011. Beyond Average Treatment Effects: Distribution of Child Nutrition Outcomes and Program Placement in India's ICDS. *World Development* **39**:8, 1410-1421. [[Crossref](#)]
1944. B. Cunguara, K. Moder. 2011. Is Agricultural Extension Helping the Poor? Evidence from Rural Mozambique. *Journal of African Economies* **20**:4, 562-595. [[Crossref](#)]

1945. Shuhong Peng. Why does the government intervene the market? &#8212; An analysis of compulsory trading and compulsory non-trading phenomenon 6499-6502. [[Crossref](#)]
1946. Bert Scholtens. 2011. The sustainability of green funds. *Natural Resources Forum* 35:3, 223-232. [[Crossref](#)]
1947. Arthur J. Reynolds, Judy A. Temple, Suh-Ruu Ou, Irma A. Arteaga, Barry A. B. White. 2011. School-Based Early Childhood Education and Age-28 Well-Being: Effects by Timing, Dosage, and Subgroups. *Science* 333:6040, 360-364. [[Crossref](#)]
1948. Anirban Basu, Daniel Polsky, Willard G. Manning. 2011. Estimating treatment effects on healthcare costs under exogeneity: is there a 'magic bullet'?. *Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology* 11:1-2, 1-26. [[Crossref](#)]
1949. Oliviero A. Carboni. 2011. R&D subsidies and private R&D expenditures: evidence from Italian manufacturing data. *International Review of Applied Economics* 25:4, 419-439. [[Crossref](#)]
1950. José I. Castillo-Manzano, Antonio Sánchez-Braza. 2011. An Evaluation of the Establishment of a Taxi Flat Rate from City to Airport. *Urban Studies* 48:9, 1909-1924. [[Crossref](#)]
1951. Hilmar Schneider, Arne Uhlendorff, Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2011. Mit Workfare aus der Sozialhilfe? Lehren aus einem Modellprojekt. *Zeitschrift für ArbeitsmarktForschung* 44:1-2, 197-203. [[Crossref](#)]
1952. Benedito Cunguara, Ika Darnhofer. 2011. Assessing the impact of improved agricultural technologies on household income in rural Mozambique. *Food Policy* 36:3, 378-390. [[Crossref](#)]
1953. Bernardo Lara, Alejandra Mizala, Andrea Repetto. 2011. The Effectiveness of Private Voucher Education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 33:2, 119-137. [[Crossref](#)]
1954. Richard Berk. 2011. Evidence-Based Versus Junk-Based Evaluation Research. *Evaluation Review* 35:3, 191-203. [[Crossref](#)]
1955. Frank D. Bean, Mark A. Leach, Susan K. Brown, James D. Bachmeier, John R. Hipp. 2011. The Educational Legacy of Unauthorized Migration: Comparisons across U.S.-Immigrant Groups in how Parents' Status Affects Their Offspring. *International Migration Review* 45:2, 348-385. [[Crossref](#)]
1956. Jonathan R. Kesselman. 2011. Consumer Impacts of BC's Harmonized Sales Tax: Tax Grab or Pass-Through?. *Canadian Public Policy* 37:2, 139-162. [[Crossref](#)]
1957. Bryan S. Graham,, Keisuke Hirano. 2011. Robustness to Parametric Assumptions in Missing Data Models. *American Economic Review* 101:3, 538-543. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
1958. Tarjei Havnes,, Magne Mogstad. 2011. No Child Left Behind: Subsidized Child Care and Children's Long-Run Outcomes. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 3:2, 97-129. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
1959. Tove Faber Frandsen, Jeppe Nicolaisen. 2011. Praise the bridge that carries you over: Testing the flattery citation hypothesis. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 62:5, 807-818. [[Crossref](#)]
1960. Daniel J. Graham, Kurt Van Dender. 2011. Estimating the agglomeration benefits of transport investments: some tests for stability. *Transportation* 38:3, 409-426. [[Crossref](#)]
1961. E. Dettmann, C. Becker, C. Schmeißer. 2011. Distance functions for matching in small samples. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 55:5, 1942-1960. [[Crossref](#)]

1962. Lota D. Tamini. 2011. A nonparametric analysis of the impact of agri-environmental advisory activities on best management practice adoption: A case study of Québec. *Ecological Economics* **70**:7, 1363-1374. [[Crossref](#)]
1963. René Böheim, Andrea Weber. 2011. The Effects of Marginal Employment on Subsequent Labour Market Outcomes. *German Economic Review* **12**:2, 165-181. [[Crossref](#)]
1964. J. Nyemeck Binam, T. Abdoulaye, L. Olarinde, A. Kamara, A. Adekunle. 2011. Assessing the Potential Impact of Integrated Agricultural Research for Development (IAR4D) on Adoption of Improved Cereal-Legume Crop Varieties in the Sudan Savannah Zone of Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural & Food Information* **12**:2, 177-198. [[Crossref](#)]
1965. Martin Huber, Michael Lechner, Conny Wunsch. 2011. Does leaving welfare improve health? Evidence for Germany. *Health Economics* **20**:4, 484-504. [[Crossref](#)]
1966. Victor Owusu, Awudu Abdulai, Seini Abdul-Rahman. 2011. Non-farm work and food security among farm households in Northern Ghana. *Food Policy* **36**:2, 108-118. [[Crossref](#)]
1967. Marco Caliendo, Steffen Künn. 2011. Start-up subsidies for the unemployed: Long-term evidence and effect heterogeneity. *Journal of Public Economics* **95**:3-4, 311-331. [[Crossref](#)]
1968. Jay A. Rosenheim, Soroush Parsa, Andrew A. Forbes, William A. Krimmel, Yao Hua Law, Michal Segoli, Moran Segoli, Frances S. Sivakoff, Tania Zaviezo, Kevin Gross. 2011. Ecoinformatics for Integrated Pest Management: Expanding the Applied Insect Ecologist's Tool-Kit. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **104**:2, 331-342. [[Crossref](#)]
1969. William Rhodes. 2011. Predicting criminal recidivism: A research note. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* **7**:1, 57-71. [[Crossref](#)]
1970. Dirk Czarnitzki, Petr Hanel, Julio Miguel Rosa. 2011. Evaluating the impact of R&D tax credits on innovation: A microeconomic study on Canadian firms. *Research Policy* **40**:2, 217-229. [[Crossref](#)]
1971. Spencer Henson, Oliver Masakure, John Cranfield. 2011. Do Fresh Produce Exporters in Sub-Saharan Africa Benefit from GlobalGAP Certification?. *World Development* **39**:3, 375-386. [[Crossref](#)]
1972. Martin Petrick, Patrick Zier. 2011. Regional employment impacts of Common Agricultural Policy measures in Eastern Germany: a difference-in-differences approach. *Agricultural Economics* **42**:2, 183-193. [[Crossref](#)]
1973. Paul J. Ferraro, Merlin M. Hanauer. 2011. Protecting Ecosystems and Alleviating Poverty with Parks and Reserves: 'Win-Win' or Tradeoffs?. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **48**:2, 269-286. [[Crossref](#)]
1974. Gregory K. Leonard, G. Steven Olley. 2011. What Can Be Learned About the Competitive Effects of Mergers from "Natural Experiments"?. *International Journal of the Economics of Business* **18**:1, 103-107. [[Crossref](#)]
1975. Federico R. León, Rebecka Lundgren, Irit Sinai, Victoria Jennings. 2011. The Role of Need for Contraception in the Evaluation of Interventions to Improve Access to Family-Planning Methods. *Evaluation Review* **35**:1, 3-13. [[Crossref](#)]
1976. Luca De Benedictis, Luca Salvatici. Introduction 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
1977. Luca De Benedictis, Daria Taglioni. The Gravity Model in International Trade 55-89. [[Crossref](#)]
1978. Harald Oberhofer, Michael Pfaffermayr. Lohn- und Beschäftigungseffekte von europäischen Unternehmensfusionen 59-80. [[Crossref](#)]

1979. Robert B. Smith. Cause and Consequences 259-281. [[Crossref](#)]
1980. Robert B. Smith. Using Propensity Scores 331-380. [[Crossref](#)]
1981. Robert B. Smith. Stable Association and Potential Outcomes 35-58. [[Crossref](#)]
1982. A. Ahuja, M. Kremer, A.P. Zwane. Providing Clean Water: Evidence from Randomized Evaluations 67-77. [[Crossref](#)]
1983. Eric French, Christopher Taber. Identification of Models of the Labor Market 537-617. [[Crossref](#)]
1984. W. Bentley MacLeod. Great Expectations: Law, Employment Contracts, and Labor Market Performance 1591-1696. [[Crossref](#)]
1985. Michael Maier. 2011. Tests for distributional treatment effects under unconfoundedness. *Economics Letters* **110**:1, 49-51. [[Crossref](#)]
1986. David Newhouse, Daniel Suryadarma. 2011. The Value of Vocational Education: High School Type and Labor Market Outcomes in Indonesia. *The World Bank Economic Review* **25**:2, 296-322. [[Crossref](#)]
1987. David M. Drukker. Introduction ix-xiv. [[Crossref](#)]
1988. Daniel L. Millimet. The Elephant in the Corner: A Cautionary Tale about Measurement Error in Treatment Effects Models 1-39. [[Crossref](#)]
1989. Myoung-jae Lee, Sanghyeok Lee. Likelihood-Based Estimators for Endogenous or Truncated Samples in Standard Stratified Sampling 63-91. [[Crossref](#)]
1990. Matias D. Cattaneo, Max H. Farrell. Efficient Estimation of the Dose-Response Function Under Ignorability Using Subclassification on the Covariates 93-127. [[Crossref](#)]
1991. Ian M. McCarthy, Rusty Tchernis. On the Estimation of Selection Models when Participation is Endogenous and Misclassified 179-207. [[Crossref](#)]
1992. M Zia Sadique, Richard Grieve, David A Harrison, Brian H Cuthbertson, Kathryn M Rowan. 2011. Is Drotrecogin alfa (activated) for adults with severe sepsis, cost-effective in routine clinical practice?. *Critical Care* **15**:5, R228. [[Crossref](#)]
1993. Alberto Abadie, Guido W. Imbens. 2011. Bias-Corrected Matching Estimators for Average Treatment Effects. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* **29**:1, 1-11. [[Crossref](#)]
1994. Vladimir A. Atanasov, Bernard S. Black. 2011. Causal Inference Strategies in Corporate Governance Research. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1995. Krishnamurthy Subramanian, William L. Megginson. 2011. Employment Protection Laws and Privatization. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1996. Annette Bergemann, Erik Grönqvist, Soffia Gudbjörnsdóttir. 2011. The Effects of Job Displacement on the Onset and Progression of Diabetes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1997. Heiner F. Mikosch, Jan-Egbert Sturm. 2011. Has the EMU Reduced Wage Growth and Unemployment? Testing a Model of Trade Union Behaviour. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1998. Roberto Rocci, Giovanni Mellace. 2011. Principal Stratification in Sample Selection Problems with Non Normal Error Terms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
1999. Ola Løtherington Vestad. 2011. Who Pays for Occupational Pensions?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

2000. Chong-En Bai, Binzhen Wu. 2011. Health Insurance and Consumption: Evidence from China's New Cooperative Medical Scheme. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2001. Doug Johnson, Sushil Kumar. 2011. Do Health Camps Make People Healthier? Evidence from an RCT of Health Camps on Usage of RSBY. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2002. Caterina Giannetti, Nicola Jentzsch. 2011. Credit Reporting, Access to Finance and Identification Systems: International Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2003. Michael P. Murray. 2011. Avoiding the Pitfalls of Instrumental Variables Estimation with Few or Many Instruments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2004. Sebastian Till Braun, Thomas K. Bauer, Michael Kvasnicka. 2011. The Economic Integration of Forced Migrants - Evidence for Post-War Germany. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2005. Giovanni Mastrobuoni, Paolo Pinotti. 2011. Migration Restrictions and Criminal Behavior: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2006. Saurabh Singhal, Rahul Nilakantan. 2011. The Economic Costs of Naxalite Violence and the Economic Benefits of a Unique Robust Security Response. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2007. Jed Kolko. 2011. Employment Growth Around New Transit Stations in California. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2008. Ossi Korkeamäki. 2011. The Finnish Payroll Tax Cut Experiment Revisited. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2009. Timothy Powell-Jackson. 2011. Financial Incentives in Health: New Evidence from India's Janani Suraksha Yojana. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2010. Mehtabul Azam. 2011. The Impact of Indian Job Guarantee Scheme on Labor Market Outcomes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2011. Johannes Van Biesebroeck, Emily Yu, Shenjie Chen. 2011. The Impact of Trade Promotion Services on Canadian Exporter Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2012. Beatrix Brügger, Rafael Lalive, Andreas Steinhauer, Josef Zweimüller. 2011. The Demand for Social Insurance: Does Culture Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2013. Giovanni Mastrobuoni, Paolo Pinotti. 2011. Legal Status of Immigrants and Criminal Behavior: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2014. Alfredo R. Paloyo, Arndt Reichert, Harald Tauchmann, Holger Reinermann. 2011. The Causal Link between Financial Incentives and Weight Loss. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2015. Hang Gao, Johannes Van Biesebroeck. 2011. Effects of Deregulation and Vertical Unbundling on the Performance of China's Electricity Generation Sector. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2016. Michael M. Bechtel, Thomas Sattler. 2011. What Is Litigation in the World Trade Organization Worth?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2017. Hendrik Schmitz, Nicolas R. Ziebarth. 2011. In Absolute or Relative Terms? How Framing Prices Affects the Consumer Price Sensitivity of Health Plan Choice. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2018. Annette Schminke, Johannes Van Biesebroeck. 2011. Using Export Market Performance to Evaluate Regional Preferential Policies in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2019. Dirk Czarnitzki, Cindy Lopes Bento. 2011. Innovation Subsidies: Does the Funding Source Matter for Innovation Intensity and Performance? Empirical Evidence from Germany. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

2020. Rosario Crinò. 2011. Imported Inputs and Skill Upgrading. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2021. B. F. Arnold, R. S. Khush, P. Ramaswamy, A. G. London, P. Rajkumar, P. Ramaprabha, N. Durairaj, A. E. Hubbard, K. Balakrishnan, J. M. Colford. 2010. Causal inference methods to study nonrandomized, preexisting development interventions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **107**:52, 22605-22610. [[Crossref](#)]
2022. Arnab K. Acharya, Giulia Greco, Edoardo Masset. 2010. The economics approach to evaluation of health interventions in developing countries through randomised field trial. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* **2**:4, 401-420. [[Crossref](#)]
2023. Christopher S. Armstrong, Wayne R. Guay, Joseph P. Weber. 2010. The role of information and financial reporting in corporate governance and debt contracting. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **50**:2-3, 179-234. [[Crossref](#)]
2024. Nicolas R. Ziebarth, Martin Karlsson. 2010. A natural experiment on sick pay cuts, sickness absence, and labor costs. *Journal of Public Economics* **94**:11-12, 1108-1122. [[Crossref](#)]
2025. James Fenske. 2010. THE CAUSAL HISTORY OF AFRICA: A RESPONSE TO HOPKINS. *Economic History of Developing Regions* **25**:2, 177-212. [[Crossref](#)]
2026. Wang-Sheng Lee, Michael B. Coelli. 2010. The Labour Market Effects of Vocational Education and Training in Australia. *Australian Economic Review* **43**:4, 389-408. [[Crossref](#)]
2027. Christopher B. Barrett, Michael R. Carter. 2010. The Power and Pitfalls of Experiments in Development Economics: Some Non-random Reflections. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* **32**:4, 515-548. [[Crossref](#)]
2028. Yonatan Eyal. 2010. Examination of the Empirical Research Environment of Program Evaluation: Methodology and Application. *Evaluation Review* **34**:6, 455-486. [[Crossref](#)]
2029. Alain de Janvry, Elisabeth Sadoulet, Sofia Villas-Boas. 2010. Short on shots: Are calls for cooperative restraint effective in managing a flu vaccines shortage?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **76**:2, 209-224. [[Crossref](#)]
2030. Youngjoo Cha, Stephen L. Morgan. 2010. Structural earnings losses and between-industry mobility of displaced workers, 2003-2008. *Social Science Research* **39**:6, 1137-1152. [[Crossref](#)]
2031. David Card, Jochen Kluge, Andrea Weber. 2010. Active Labour Market Policy Evaluations: A Meta-Analysis. *The Economic Journal* **120**:548, F452-F477. [[Crossref](#)]
2032. ÁDÁM SZENTPÉTERI, ÁLMOS TELEGDY. 2010. POLITICAL SELECTION OF FIRMS INTO PRIVATIZATION PROGRAMS. EVIDENCE FROM ROMANIAN COMPREHENSIVE DATA. *Economics & Politics* **22**:3, 298-328. [[Crossref](#)]
2033. Zhehui Luo, Joseph C. Gardiner, Cathy J. Bradley. 2010. Applying Propensity Score Methods in Medical Research: Pitfalls and Prospects. *Medical Care Research and Review* **67**:5, 528-554. [[Crossref](#)]
2034. Roope Uusitalo, Jouko Verho. 2010. The effect of unemployment benefits on re-employment rates: Evidence from the Finnish unemployment insurance reform. *Labour Economics* **17**:4, 643-654. [[Crossref](#)]
2035. William Rhodes. 2010. Heterogeneous Treatment Effects: What Does a Regression Estimate?. *Evaluation Review* **34**:4, 334-361. [[Crossref](#)]
2036. Jenny C. Aker. 2010. Information from Markets Near and Far: Mobile Phones and Agricultural Markets in Niger. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **2**:3, 46-59. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]



2037. James J. Heckman. 2010. Building Bridges between Structural and Program Evaluation Approaches to Evaluating Policy. *Journal of Economic Literature* 48:2, 356-398. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
2038. Guido W. Imbens. 2010. Better LATE Than Nothing: Some Comments on Deaton (2009) and Heckman and Urzua (2009). *Journal of Economic Literature* 48:2, 399-423. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
2039. Tobias Wolbring. 2010. Weshalb die Separierung von Produktivitätseffekten und Diskriminierung bei der studentischen Lehrveranstaltungsbewertung misslingt. *KZfSS Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 62:2, 317-326. [[Crossref](#)]
2040. Markus Gangl. 2010. Causal Inference in Sociological Research. *Annual Review of Sociology* 36:1, 21-47. [[Crossref](#)]
2041. Shannon Donegan, John A. Maluccio, Caitlin K. Myers, Purnima Menon, Marie T. Ruel, Jean-Pierre Habicht. 2010. Two Food-Assisted Maternal and Child Health Nutrition Programs Helped Mitigate the Impact of Economic Hardship on Child Stunting in Haiti. *The Journal of Nutrition* 140:6, 1139-1145. [[Crossref](#)]
2042. Joshua D. Angrist, Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2010. The Credibility Revolution in Empirical Economics: How Better Research Design is Taking the Con out of Econometrics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 24:2, 3-30. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
2043. Fabio Veras Soares, Rafael Perez Ribas, Guilherme Issamu Hirata. 2010. Impact evaluation of a rural conditional cash transfer programme on outcomes beyond health and education. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* 2:1, 138-157. [[Crossref](#)]
2044. Matias D. Cattaneo. 2010. Efficient semiparametric estimation of multi-valued treatment effects under ignorability. *Journal of Econometrics* 155:2, 138-154. [[Crossref](#)]
2045. Sudhanshu Handa, John A. Maluccio. 2010. Matching the Gold Standard: Comparing Experimental and Nonexperimental Evaluation Techniques for a Geographically Targeted Program. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 58:3, 415-447. [[Crossref](#)]
2046. Peter Midmore, Mark D. Partridge, M. Rose Olfert, Kamar Ali. 2010. The Evaluation of Rural Development Policy: Macro and Micro Perspectives  
L'évaluation de la politique de développement rural: perspectives macro et microéconomiques  
Die Evaluation der Politik zur Entwicklung des ländlichen Raums: Mikro- und Makroperspekti.  
*EuroChoices* 9:1, 24-29. [[Crossref](#)]
2047. Runsheng Yin, Guiping Yin, Lanying Li. 2010. Assessing China's Ecological Restoration Programs: What's Been Done and What Remains to Be Done?. *Environmental Management* 45:3, 442-453. [[Crossref](#)]
2048. Franklin E. Zimring, Jeffrey Fagan, David T. Johnson. 2010. Executions, Deterrence, and Homicide: A Tale of Two Cities. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* 7:1, 1-29. [[Crossref](#)]
2049. Akhter Ali, Awudu Abdulai. 2010. The Adoption of Genetically Modified Cotton and Poverty Reduction in Pakistan. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 61:1, 175-192. [[Crossref](#)]
2050. Paul R. Rosenbaum. Dilemmas and Craftsmanship 3-20. [[Crossref](#)]
2051. Paul R. Rosenbaum. Two Simple Models for Observational Studies 65-94. [[Crossref](#)]
2052. Boris Hirsch. Spatial Monopsony and Regional Differences in the Gender Pay Gap 113-130. [[Crossref](#)]

2053. Steven Koch, Olufunke Alaba. 2010. On health insurance and household decisions: A treatment effect analysis. *Social Science & Medicine* **70**:2, 175-182. [[Crossref](#)]
2054. Matias D. Cattaneo. Multi-valued Treatment Effects 1-3. [[Crossref](#)]
2055. Paolo Verme. 2010. Stochastic Dominance, Poverty and the Treatment Effect Curve. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2056. Chris S. Armstrong, Wayne R. Guay, Joseph Peter Weber. 2010. The Role of Information and Financial Reporting in Corporate Governance and Debt Contracting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2057. Kara Hanson, Timothy Powell-Jackson. 2010. Financial Incentives for Maternal Health: Impact Evaluation of a National Programme in Nepal. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2058. Olli Tapani Ropponen. 2010. Minimum Wages and Employment: Replication of Card and Krueger (1994) Using the CIC Estimator. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2059. Johannes Van Biesebroeck, Emily Yu, Shenjie Chen. 2010. The Impact of Trade Promotion Services on Canadian Exporter Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2060. Marco Caliendo, Deborah A. Cobb-Clark, Arne Uhlenndorff. 2010. Locus of Control and Job Search Strategies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2061. Joshua D. Angrist, Jörn-Steffen Pischke. 2010. The Credibility Revolution in Empirical Economics: How Better Research Design is Taking the Con Out of Econometrics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2062. Eric French, Christopher R. Taber. 2010. Identification of Models of the Labor Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2063. John Henderson. 2010. Demobilizing a Generation: The Behavioral Effects of the Vietnam Draft Lottery. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2064. Mudit Kapoor, Shamika Ravi. 2010. Elasticity of Intertemporal Substitution in Consumption: Empirical Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2065. Alfredo R. Paloyo. 2010. Compulsory Military Service in Germany Revisited. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2066. Ian M. McCarthy, Rusty Tchernis. 2010. On the Estimation of Selection Models When Participation is Endogenous and Misclassified. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2067. Francisco A. Gallego, Borja Larrain. 2010. CEO Compensation Among Firms Controlled by Large Shareholders: Evidence from Emerging Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2068. Dirk Czarnitzki, Johannes Dick, Katrin Hussinger. 2010. The Contribution of Corporate Ventures to Radical Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2069. Dirk Czarnitzki, Cindy Lopes Bento. 2010. Evaluation of Public R&D Policies: A Cross-Country Comparison. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2070. Dirk Czarnitzki, Bernd Ebersberger. 2010. Do Direct R&D Subsidies Lead to The Monopolization of R&D in the Economy?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2071. Productivity Commission. 2010. Annual Report 2009-10. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2072. Marion Hainaut, Sébastien Massoni, Jean-Christophe Vergnaud. 2010. Apprendre à bien lire : une étude coût efficacité des Actions Lecture. *Revue d'économie politique* **120**:5, 823. [[Crossref](#)]

2073. Joseph Farrell, Paul A. Pautler, Michael G. Vita. 2009. Economics at the FTC: Retrospective Merger Analysis with a Focus on Hospitals. *Review of Industrial Organization* 35:4, 369-385. [[Crossref](#)]
2074. Andreas Kuhn, Rafael Lalive, Josef Zweimüller. 2009. The public health costs of job loss. *Journal of Health Economics* 28:6, 1099-1115. [[Crossref](#)]
2075. Onur Baser. 2009. Too Much Ado about Instrumental Variable Approach: Is the Cure Worse than the Disease?. *Value in Health* 12:8, 1201-1209. [[Crossref](#)]
2076. Torsten Biemann. 2009. Die Bedeutung internationaler Erfahrungen für den Karriereerfolg von Führungskräften. *German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift für Personalforschung* 23:4, 336-356. [[Crossref](#)]
2077. Ori Heffetz, Moses Shayo. 2009. How Large Are Non-Budget-Constraint Effects of Prices on Demand?. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 1:4, 170-199. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
2078. Jasjeet S. Sekhon, Richard Grieve. 2009. A New Non-Parametric Matching Method for Covariate Adjustment with Application to Economic Evaluation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2079. Petra Moser, Alessandra Voena. 2009. Compulsory Licensing: Evidence from the Trading with the Enemy Act. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2080. Viral V. Acharya, Ramin Baghai, Krishnamurthy Subramanian. 2009. Labor Laws and Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2081. Benoit Dostie, Rajshri Jayaraman. 2009. The Effect of Adversity on Process Innovations and Managerial Incentives. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2082. Franklin E. Zimring, Jeffrey Fagan, David T. Johnson. 2009. Executions, Deterrence and Homicide: A Tale of Two Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2083. Andreas Kuhn, Rafael Lalive, Josef Zweimüller. 2009. The Public Health Costs of Job Loss. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2084. Channing Arndt, Sam Jones, Finn Tarp. 2009. Aid and Growth: Have We Come Full Circle?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2085. Thomas K. Bauer, Stefan Bender, Alfredo R. Paloyo, Christoph M. Schmidt. 2009. Evaluating the Labor-Market Effects of Compulsory Military Service – A Regression-Discontinuity Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2086. Sokbae Lee, Yoon-Jae Whang. 2009. Nonparametric Tests of Conditional Treatment Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2087. Nicolas R. Ziebarth, Martin Karlsson. 2009. The Effects of Expanding the Generosity of the Statutory Sickness Insurance System. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2088. Dirk Czarnitzki, Suzanne Thorwarth. 2009. The Design Paradox: The Contribution of In-House and External Design Activities on Product Market Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2089. Marco Caliendo, Alexander S. Kritikos. 2009. 'I Want to, But I Also Need to' - Start-Ups Resulting from Opportunity and Necessity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
2090. Judea Pearl. 2009. Causal inference in statistics: An overview. *Statistics Surveys* 3:0, 96-146. [[Crossref](#)]