

Part II Quick Reference

All Causal Inference Variations - At a Glance

December 7, 2025

Method 1: Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs)

What She ASKED	What She COULD ASK
Check balance table - need controls? Design RCT for Airbnb photos Randomization level? Worried about take-up? Calculate ATE from means Why randomization works Perfect compliance assumed	Interpret p-values - threshold? Design for different context Individual vs cluster trade-offs Selection vs compliance vs spillover Calculate ATT and explain vs ATE When can ATE ATT? ITT vs TOT with non-compliance

Method 2: Matching Methods

What She ASKED	What She COULD ASK
Calculate ATE and ATT from table Assumptions needed Is PSM convincing for job training? Common support condition Conditional independence Direct matching on X Exact matching	Different weighting schemes Which assumptions testable? When PSM vs IV/RD? Violation consequences Unobserved confounders problem Propensity score - why useful? Nearest neighbor vs radius vs kernel

Method 3: Instrumental Variables (IV)

What She ASKED	What She COULD ASK
Relevance & independence Calculate IV from table Identify compliance types Why instrument needed? First stage: $\text{Cov}(Z, D) \neq 0$ IV estimates LATE Monotonicity rules out defiers	Add exclusion & monotonicity Calculate with regression output Which groups estimable? Weak instruments (F-stat) F-statistic rule of thumb Why not ATE? Explain simply What if monotonicity violated?

Method 4: Regression Discontinuity (RD)

Method 5: Difference-in-Differences (DiD)

What She ASKED	What She COULD ASK
Sharp vs fuzzy - which? Continuity & discontinuity Graph regions Running variable Local effect at cutoff Visual inspection Fuzzy RD uses IV	When prob jumps vs changes Why need continuity? Bandwidth selection trade-offs Manipulation test implications External validity concerns Formal discontinuity tests How fuzzy relates to IV
What She ASKED	What She COULD ASK
Calculate DiD from 2x2 table Draw graph with parallel trends Valid if both affected by tariffs? Parallel trends assumption Single treatment period Two-way fixed effects	Multiple time periods/groups Event study interpretation Triple-difference solution Test with pre-treatment data Staggered adoption issues Regression specification

Key Formulas by Method

CRITICAL FORMULAS

RCT:

- $ATE = E[Y|D = 1] - E[Y|D = 0] = \bar{Y}_1 - \bar{Y}_0$
- $ATT = E[Y(1) - Y(0)|D = 1]$ (equals ATE with randomization)

Matching:

- $ATE = \sum_j (\bar{Y}_{j1} - \bar{Y}_{j0}) \times \frac{N_j}{N}$
- $ATT = \sum_j (\bar{Y}_{j1} - \bar{Y}_{j0}) \times \frac{N_{j1}}{N_1}$

IV:

- $\hat{\beta}_{IV} = \frac{E[Y|Z=1] - E[Y|Z=0]}{E[D|Z=1] - E[D|Z=0]}$
- $LATE = E[Y(1) - Y(0)|D(1) > D(0)]$ (compliers only)

RD:

- $\tau = \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0^+} E[Y|Z = z] - \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0^-} E[Y|Z = z]$

DiD:

- $DiD = (\bar{Y}_{treat,after} - \bar{Y}_{treat,before}) - (\bar{Y}_{control,after} - \bar{Y}_{control,before})$

Critical Assumptions Comparison

Common Threats by Method

Method	Main Assumption	Testable?
RCT	Random assignment	YES - balance
Matching	Conditional independence	NO
	Common support	YES - overlap
IV	Relevance	YES - F-stat
	Exclusion restriction	NO
RD	Continuity	PARTIAL
	No manipulation	YES - McCrary
DiD	Parallel trends	PARTIAL

Method	Watch Out For...
RCT	Non-compliance • Attrition • Spillover • Hawthorne effects
Matching	Unobserved confounders • Common support violations • Model dependence
IV	Weak instruments ($F \downarrow 10$) • Exclusion violations • Estimating LATE not ATE
RD	Manipulation • Bandwidth sensitivity • Other discontinuities • Functional form
DiD	Parallel trends violations • Common shocks • Pre-existing trends

How to Use This Reference

For Each Scenario Question:

1. **Identify the method** - Which technique is being used?
2. **List the assumptions** - What must hold for validity?
3. **Check for violations** - Which assumptions threatened?
4. **Direction of bias** - Estimate too high or too low?
5. **Suggest improvements** - How to strengthen design?

Your Strengths (Keep Doing!):

- ✓ Strong conceptual understanding
- ✓ Good intuition about validity threats
- ✓ Able to identify appropriate methods

Areas to Sharpen:

- More precision on formulas
- Explicit statement of ALL assumptions
- Direction of bias

85/100 average → Target 95/100!

Master these variations and you'll ace it! ✓