

# Frontier Topics in Empirical Economics: Week 7

## Bartik Instruments

Zibin Huang <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Business, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics

October 28, 2024

# Introduction

- We have already learned some basic IV methods and their extensions
- Today we will investigate a particular type of IV
- Bartik instrument, or shift-share instrument (SSIV)
- It is widely used in different contexts
- Especially trade and migration (spatial economics)
- How should we use it? What is its regression assumption?

# Introduction

- We have already learned some basic IV methods and their extensions
- Today we will investigate a particular type of IV
- Bartik instrument, or shift-share instrument (SSIV)
- It is widely used in different contexts
- Especially trade and migration (spatial economics)
- How should we use it? What is its regression assumption?

# Introduction

- We have already learned some basic IV methods and their extensions
- Today we will investigate a particular type of IV
  - Bartik instrument, or shift-share instrument (SSIV)
  - It is widely used in different contexts
  - Especially trade and migration (spatial economics)
  - How should we use it? What is its regression assumption?

# Introduction

- We have already learned some basic IV methods and their extensions
- Today we will investigate a particular type of IV
- Bartik instrument, or shift-share instrument (SSIV)
  - It is widely used in different contexts
  - Especially trade and migration (spatial economics)
  - How should we use it? What is its regression assumption?

# Introduction

- We have already learned some basic IV methods and their extensions
- Today we will investigate a particular type of IV
- Bartik instrument, or shift-share instrument (SSIV)
- It is widely used in different contexts
  - Especially trade and migration (spatial economics)
  - How should we use it? What is its regression assumption?

# Introduction

- We have already learned some basic IV methods and their extensions
- Today we will investigate a particular type of IV
- Bartik instrument, or shift-share instrument (SSIV)
- It is widely used in different contexts
- Especially trade and migration (spatial economics)
- How should we use it? What is its regression assumption?

# Introduction

- We have already learned some basic IV methods and their extensions
- Today we will investigate a particular type of IV
- Bartik instrument, or shift-share instrument (SSIV)
- It is widely used in different contexts
- Especially trade and migration (spatial economics)
- How should we use it? What is its regression assumption?



# Introduction

- We will introduce two different frameworks of this instrument
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Song, and Swift (2020) consider share as IV, shift as weight
  - Angryst, Pischke, and Kolesár (2022) consider shift as IV, share as weight
- You can validate your regression by proving either set of assumptions are correct
- It depends on your context

- We will introduce two different frameworks of this instrument
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) consider share as IV, shift as weight
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) consider shift as IV, share as weight
- You can validate your regression by proving either set of assumptions are correct
- It depends on your context

# Introduction

- We will introduce two different frameworks of this instrument
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) consider share as IV, shift as weight
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) consider shift as IV, share as weight
- You can validate your regression by proving either set of assumptions are correct
- It depends on your context

# Introduction

- We will introduce two different frameworks of this instrument
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) consider share as IV, shift as weight
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) consider shift as IV, share as weight
- You can validate your regression by proving either set of assumptions are correct
- It depends on your context

# Introduction

- We will introduce two different frameworks of this instrument
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) consider share as IV, shift as weight
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) consider shift as IV, share as weight
- You can validate your regression by proving either set of assumptions are correct
- It depends on your context

# Introduction

- We will introduce two different frameworks of this instrument
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) consider share as IV, shift as weight
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) consider shift as IV, share as weight
- You can validate your regression by proving either set of assumptions are correct
- It depends on your context

## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's start with an example from Card (2009)
- What is the impact of immigrant ratio on native-immigrant wage gap?

$$y_l = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln x_l + \beta_2 C_l + \epsilon_l \quad (1)$$

- $l$  is location,  $y$  is log wage gap between immigrants and natives,  $x$  is ratio of immigrant labor to native labor,  $C$  is location-level control
- $x$  is endogenous: Some positive productivity local shock affects both  $x$  and  $y$

# Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's start with an example from Card (2009)
- What is the impact of immigrant ratio on native-immigrant wage gap?

$$y_l = \beta_0 + \beta \ln x_l + \beta_2 C_l + \epsilon_l \quad (1)$$

- $l$  is location,  $y$  is log wage gap between immigrants and natives,  $x$  is ratio of immigrant labor to native labor,  $C$  is location-level control
- $x$  is endogenous: Some positive productivity local shock affects both  $x$  and  $y$



## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's start with an example from Card (2009)
- What is the impact of immigrant ratio on native-immigrant wage gap?

$$y_l = \beta_0 + \beta \ln x_l + \beta_2 C_l + \epsilon_l \quad (1)$$

- $l$  is location,  $y$  is log wage gap between immigrants and natives,  $x$  is ratio of immigrant labor to native labor,  $C$  is location-level control
- $x$  is endogenous: Some positive productivity local shock affects both  $x$  and  $y$

## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's start with an example from Card (2009)
- What is the impact of immigrant ratio on native-immigrant wage gap?

$$y_l = \beta_0 + \beta \ln x_l + \beta_2 C_l + \epsilon_l \quad (1)$$

- $l$  is location,  $y$  is log wage gap between immigrants and natives,  $x$  is ratio of immigrant labor to native labor,  $C$  is location-level control
- $x$  is endogenous: Some positive productivity local shock affects both  $x$  and  $y$

## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's start with an example from Card (2009)
- What is the impact of immigrant ratio on native-immigrant wage gap?

$$y_l = \beta_0 + \beta \ln x_l + \beta_2 C_l + \epsilon_l \quad (1)$$

- $l$  is location,  $y$  is log wage gap between immigrants and natives,  $x$  is ratio of immigrant labor to native labor,  $C$  is location-level control
- $x$  is endogenous: Some positive productivity local shock affects both  $x$  and  $y$

## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's use an IV for  $x$
- We have data for 1980, 1990, and 2000
- We construct a shift-share IV  $B_l$  as follows:

$$B_l = \sum_k \underbrace{Z_{lk,1980}}_{\text{share}} * \underbrace{g_k}_{\text{shift}} \quad (2)$$

$$Z_{lk,1980} = N_{lk,1980} / N_{k,1980} \quad (3)$$

- $k$  is home country,  $N_{lk,1980}$  is the number of immigrants in  $l$  from  $k$  in 1980,  $P_{l,2000}$  is population in  $l$  in 2000
- $Z_{lk,1980}$  evaluates the base year share of immigrants from  $k$  in  $l$
- $g_k$  is the number of people arriving the US from 1990 to 2000 from  $k$

## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's use an IV for  $x$
- We have data for 1980, 1990, and 2000
- We construct a shift-share IV  $B_l$  as follows:

$$B_l = \sum_k \underbrace{Z_{lk,1980}}_{\text{share}} \cdot \underbrace{g_k}_{\text{shift}} \quad (2)$$

$$Z_{lk,1980} = N_{lk,1980} / N_{k,1980} \quad (3)$$

- $k$  is home country,  $N_{lk,1980}$  is the number of immigrants in  $l$  from  $k$  in 1980,  $P_{l,2000}$  is population in  $l$  in 2000
- $Z_{lk,1980}$  evaluates the base year share of immigrants from  $k$  in  $l$
- $g_k$  is the number of people arriving the US from 1990 to 2000 from  $k$

## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's use an IV for  $x$
- We have data for 1980, 1990, and 2000
- We construct a shift-share IV  $B_l$  as follows:

$$B_l = \sum_k \underbrace{Z_{lk,1980}}_{\text{share}} \cdot \underbrace{g_k}_{\text{shift}} \quad (2)$$

$$Z_{lk,1980} = N_{lk,1980} / N_{k,1980} \quad (3)$$

- $k$  is home country,  $N_{lk,1980}$  is the number of immigrants in  $l$  from  $k$  in 1980,  $P_{l,2000}$  is population in  $l$  in 2000
- $Z_{lk,1980}$  evaluates the base year share of immigrants from  $k$  in  $l$
- $g_k$  is the number of people arriving the US from 1990 to 2000 from  $k$

## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's use an IV for  $x$
- We have data for 1980, 1990, and 2000
- We construct a shift-share IV  $B_l$  as follows:

$$B_l = \sum_k \underbrace{Z_{lk,1980}}_{\text{share}} \cdot \underbrace{g_k}_{\text{shift}} \quad (2)$$

$$Z_{lk,1980} = N_{lk,1980} / N_{k,1980} \quad (3)$$

- $k$  is home country,  $N_{lk,1980}$  is the number of immigrants in  $l$  from  $k$  in 1980,  $P_{l,2000}$  is population in  $l$  in 2000
- $Z_{lk,1980}$  evaluates the base year share of immigrants from  $k$  in  $l$
- $g_k$  is the number of people arriving the US from 1990 to 2000 from  $k$

## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's use an IV for  $x$
- We have data for 1980, 1990, and 2000
- We construct a shift-share IV  $B_l$  as follows:

$$B_l = \sum_k \underbrace{Z_{lk,1980}}_{\text{share}} \cdot \underbrace{g_k}_{\text{shift}} \quad (2)$$

$$Z_{lk,1980} = N_{lk,1980} / N_{k,1980} \quad (3)$$

- $k$  is home country,  $N_{lk,1980}$  is the number of immigrants in  $l$  from  $k$  in 1980,  $P_{l,2000}$  is population in  $l$  in 2000
- $Z_{lk,1980}$  evaluates the base year share of immigrants from  $k$  in  $l$
- $g_k$  is the number of people arriving the US from 1990 to 2000 from  $k$



## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's use an IV for  $x$
- We have data for 1980, 1990, and 2000
- We construct a shift-share IV  $B_l$  as follows:

$$B_l = \sum_k \underbrace{Z_{lk,1980}}_{\text{share}} \cdot \underbrace{g_k}_{\text{shift}} \quad (2)$$

$$Z_{lk,1980} = N_{lk,1980} / N_{k,1980} \quad (3)$$

- $k$  is home country,  $N_{lk,1980}$  is the number of immigrants in  $l$  from  $k$  in 1980,  $P_{l,2000}$  is population in  $l$  in 2000
- $Z_{lk,1980}$  evaluates the base year share of immigrants from  $k$  in  $l$
- $g_k$  is the number of people arriving the US from 1990 to 2000 from  $k$

## Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- Let's use an IV for  $x$
- We have data for 1980, 1990, and 2000
- We construct a shift-share IV  $B_l$  as follows:

$$B_l = \sum_k \underbrace{Z_{lk,1980}}_{\text{share}} \cdot \underbrace{g_k}_{\text{shift}} \quad (2)$$

$$Z_{lk,1980} = N_{lk,1980} / N_{k,1980} \quad (3)$$

- $k$  is home country,  $N_{lk,1980}$  is the number of immigrants in  $l$  from  $k$  in 1980,  $P_{l,2000}$  is population in  $l$  in 2000
- $Z_{lk,1980}$  evaluates the base year share of immigrants from  $k$  in  $l$
- $g_k$  is the number of people arriving the US from 1990 to 2000 from  $k$

# Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- What is the basic idea of this IV?
  - (1) Relevance: Outflowing of immigrants from the same country (China in 2009)
  - (2) Exclusion: The local exposure of the national shock is not related to other local shocks
- It decomposes local immigrant into local-origin country
- This is an instrument with "Local Share"  $\times$  "National Growth"
- We call this shift-share/Bartik instrument

# Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- What is the basic idea of this IV?
  - (1) Relevance: Clustering of immigrants from the same country (Chinese in SF)
  - (2) Exclusion: The local exposure of the national shock is not related to other local shocks
- It decomposes local immigrant into local-origin country
- This is an instrument with "Local Share"  $\times$  "National Growth"
- We call this shift-share/Bartik instrument

# Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- What is the basic idea of this IV?
  - (1) Relevance: Clustering of immigrants from the same country (Chinese in SF)
  - (2) Exclusion: The local exposure of the national shock is not related to other local shocks
- It decomposes local immigrant into local-origin country
- This is an instrument with "Local Share"  $\times$  "National Growth"
- We call this shift-share/Bartik instrument

# Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- What is the basic idea of this IV?
  - (1) Relevance: Clustering of immigrants from the same country (Chinese in SF)
  - (2) Exclusion: The local exposure of the national shock is not related to other local shocks
- It decomposes local immigrant into local-origin country
- This is an instrument with "Local Share"  $\times$  "National Growth"
- We call this shift-share/Bartik instrument

# Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- What is the basic idea of this IV?
  - (1) Relevance: Clustering of immigrants from the same country (Chinese in SF)
  - (2) Exclusion: The local exposure of the national shock is not related to other local shocks
- It decomposes local immigrant into local-origin country
  - This is an instrument with "Local Share"  $\times$  "National Growth"
  - We call this shift-share/Bartik instrument

# Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- What is the basic idea of this IV?
  - (1) Relevance: Clustering of immigrants from the same country (Chinese in SF)
  - (2) Exclusion: The local exposure of the national shock is not related to other local shocks
- It decomposes local immigrant into local-origin country
- This is an instrument with "Local Share"  $\times$  "National Growth"
- We call this shift-share/Bartik instrument



# Motivating Example: Card (2009)

- What is the basic idea of this IV?
  - (1) Relevance: Clustering of immigrants from the same country (Chinese in SF)
  - (2) Exclusion: The local exposure of the national shock is not related to other local shocks
- It decomposes local immigrant into local-origin country
- This is an instrument with "Local Share"  $\times$  "National Growth"
- We call this shift-share/Bartik instrument

## Motivating Example: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- Another important example is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013) on China shock
- What is the impact of China's import on local labor market in the U.S.?
- They construct a shift-share variable as follows:

$$\Delta IPW_{it} = \sum_j \frac{L_{ijt}}{L_{jt} \cdot L_{it}} \Delta M_{jt}$$

- $i$  is region,  $j$  is industry,  $t$  is year
- $L_{ijt}$  is employment in region  $i$  industry  $j$
- $L_{jt}$  is total employment in industry  $j$  in the U.S.
- $L_{it}$  is total employment in region  $i$
- $\Delta M_{jt}$  is import growth from China to the U.S. in industry  $j$

# Motivating Example: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- Another important example is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013) on China shock
- What is the impact of China's import on local labor market in the U.S.?
- They construct a shift-share variable as follows:

$$\Delta IPW_{it} = \sum_j \frac{L_{ijt}}{L_{jt} \cdot L_{it}} \Delta M_{jt}$$

- $i$  is region,  $j$  is industry,  $t$  is year
- $L_{ijt}$  is employment in region  $i$  industry  $j$
- $L_{jt}$  is total employment in industry  $j$  in the U.S.
- $L_{it}$  is total employment in region  $i$
- $\Delta M_{jt}$  is import growth from China to the U.S. in industry  $j$

## Motivating Example: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- Another important example is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013) on China shock
- What is the impact of China's import on local labor market in the U.S.?
- They construct a shift-share variable as follows:

$$\Delta IPW_{it} = \sum_j \frac{L_{ijt}}{L_{jt} \cdot L_{it}} \Delta M_{jt}$$

- $i$  is region,  $j$  is industry,  $t$  is year
- $L_{ijt}$  is employment in region  $i$  industry  $j$
- $L_{jt}$  is total employment in industry  $j$  in the U.S.
- $L_{it}$  is total employment in region  $i$
- $\Delta M_{jt}$  is import growth from China to the U.S. in industry  $j$

## Motivating Example: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- Another important example is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013) on China shock
- What is the impact of China's import on local labor market in the U.S.?
- They construct a shift-share variable as follows:

$$\Delta IPW_{it} = \sum_j \frac{L_{ijt}}{L_{jt} \cdot L_{it}} \Delta M_{jt}$$

- $i$  is region,  $j$  is industry,  $t$  is year
- $L_{ijt}$  is employment in region  $i$  industry  $j$
- $L_{jt}$  is total employment in industry  $j$  in the U.S.
- $L_{it}$  is total employment in region  $i$
- $\Delta M_{jt}$  is import growth from China to the U.S. in industry  $j$

## Motivating Example: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- Another important example is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013) on China shock
- What is the impact of China's import on local labor market in the U.S.?
- They construct a shift-share variable as follows:

$$\Delta IPW_{it} = \sum_j \frac{L_{ijt}}{L_{jt} \cdot L_{it}} \Delta M_{jt}$$

- $i$  is region,  $j$  is industry,  $t$  is year
- $L_{ijt}$  is employment in region  $i$  industry  $j$
- $L_{jt}$  is total employment in industry  $j$  in the U.S.
- $L_{it}$  is total employment in region  $i$
- $\Delta M_{jt}$  is import growth from China to the U.S. in industry  $j$

## Motivating Example: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- Another important example is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013) on China shock
- What is the impact of China's import on local labor market in the U.S.?
- They construct a shift-share variable as follows:

$$\Delta IPW_{it} = \sum_j \frac{L_{ijt}}{L_{jt} \cdot L_{it}} \Delta M_{jt}$$

- $i$  is region,  $j$  is industry,  $t$  is year
- $L_{ijt}$  is employment in region  $i$  industry  $j$
- $L_{jt}$  is total employment in industry  $j$  in the U.S.
- $L_{it}$  is total employment in region  $i$
- $\Delta M_{jt}$  is import growth from China to the U.S. in industry  $j$

## Motivating Example: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- Another important example is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013) on China shock
- What is the impact of China's import on local labor market in the U.S.?
- They construct a shift-share variable as follows:

$$\Delta IPW_{it} = \sum_j \frac{L_{ijt}}{L_{jt} \cdot L_{it}} \Delta M_{jt}$$

- $i$  is region,  $j$  is industry,  $t$  is year
- $L_{ijt}$  is employment in region  $i$  industry  $j$
- $L_{jt}$  is total employment in industry  $j$  in the U.S.
- $L_{it}$  is total employment in region  $i$
- $\Delta M_{jt}$  is import growth from China to the U.S. in industry  $j$



## Motivating Example: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- Another important example is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013) on China shock
- What is the impact of China's import on local labor market in the U.S.?
- They construct a shift-share variable as follows:

$$\Delta IPW_{it} = \sum_j \frac{L_{ijt}}{L_{jt} \cdot L_{it}} \Delta M_{jt}$$

- $i$  is region,  $j$  is industry,  $t$  is year
- $L_{ijt}$  is employment in region  $i$  industry  $j$
- $L_{jt}$  is total employment in industry  $j$  in the U.S.
- $L_{it}$  is total employment in region  $i$
- $\Delta M_{jt}$  is import growth from China to the U.S. in industry  $j$

## Motivating Example: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- Another important example is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013) on China shock
- What is the impact of China's import on local labor market in the U.S.?
- They construct a shift-share variable as follows:

$$\Delta IPW_{it} = \sum_j \frac{L_{ijt}}{L_{jt} \cdot L_{it}} \Delta M_{jt}$$

- $i$  is region,  $j$  is industry,  $t$  is year
- $L_{ijt}$  is employment in region  $i$  industry  $j$
- $L_{jt}$  is total employment in industry  $j$  in the U.S.
- $L_{it}$  is total employment in region  $i$
- $\Delta M_{jt}$  is import growth from China to the U.S. in industry  $j$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Share as IV

- How to interpret this shift-share IV?
- Let's first investigate Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
- In this paper, we consider share as IV, shift as weight

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Share as IV

- How to interpret this shift-share IV?
- Let's first investigate Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
- In this paper, we consider share as IV, shift as weight

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Share as IV

- How to interpret this shift-share IV?
- Let's first investigate Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
- In this paper, we consider share as IV, shift as weight

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Share as IV

- How to interpret this shift-share IV?
- Let's first investigate Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
- In this paper, we consider share as IV, shift as weight

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Let's define Bartik IV generally
- We have the following equation

$$y_{lt} = D'_{lt}\rho + x_{lt}\beta_0 + \epsilon_{lt} \quad (4)$$

- $l$  is location;  $t$  is time;  $D$  are controls;  $\beta_0$  is parameter of interest
- $x_{lt}$  is some (employment) growth rate
- $y_{lt}$  is some (wage) outcome growth rate
- $x$  and  $y$  can also be level variables when location FE is controlled
- We assume that  $x_{lt} \perp \epsilon_{lt}$ , need an IV
- Bartik IV comes from two identities

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Let's define Bartik IV generally
- We have the following equation

$$y_{lt} = D'_{lt}\rho + x_{lt}\beta_0 + \epsilon_{lt} \quad (4)$$

- $l$  is location;  $t$  is time;  $D$  are controls;  $\beta_0$  is parameter of interest
- $x_{lt}$  is some (employment) growth rate
- $y_{lt}$  is some (wage) outcome growth rate
- $x$  and  $y$  can also be level variables when location FE is controlled
- We assume that  $x_{lt} \perp \epsilon_{lt}$ , need an IV
- Bartik IV comes from two identities



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Let's define Bartik IV generally
- We have the following equation

$$y_{lt} = D'_{lt}\rho + x_{lt}\beta_0 + \epsilon_{lt} \quad (4)$$

- $l$  is location;  $t$  is time;  $D$  are controls;  $\beta_0$  is parameter of interest
- $x_{lt}$  is some (employment) growth rate
- $y_{lt}$  is some (wage) outcome growth rate
- $x$  and  $y$  can also be level variables when location FE is controlled
- We assume that  $x_{lt} \not\perp \epsilon_{lt}$ , need an IV
- Bartik IV comes from two identities

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Let's define Bartik IV generally
- We have the following equation

$$y_{lt} = D'_{lt}\rho + x_{lt}\beta_0 + \epsilon_{lt} \quad (4)$$

- $l$  is location;  $t$  is time;  $D$  are controls;  $\beta_0$  is parameter of interest
- $x_{lt}$  is some (employment) growth rate
- $y_{lt}$  is some (wage) outcome growth rate
- $x$  and  $y$  can also be level variables when location FE is controlled
- We assume that  $x_{lt} \not\perp \epsilon_{lt}$ , need an IV
- Bartik IV comes from two identities

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Let's define Bartik IV generally
- We have the following equation

$$y_{lt} = D'_{lt}\rho + x_{lt}\beta_0 + \epsilon_{lt} \quad (4)$$

- $l$  is location;  $t$  is time;  $D$  are controls;  $\beta_0$  is parameter of interest
- $x_{lt}$  is some (employment) growth rate
- $y_{lt}$  is some (wage) outcome growth rate
- $x$  and  $y$  can also be level variables when location FE is controlled
- We assume that  $x_{lt} \perp \epsilon_{lt}$ , need an IV
- Bartik IV comes from two identities

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Let's define Bartik IV generally
- We have the following equation

$$y_{lt} = D'_{lt}\rho + x_{lt}\beta_0 + \epsilon_{lt} \quad (4)$$

- $l$  is location;  $t$  is time;  $D$  are controls;  $\beta_0$  is parameter of interest
- $x_{lt}$  is some (employment) growth rate
- $y_{lt}$  is some (wage) outcome growth rate
- $x$  and  $y$  can also be level variables when location FE is controlled
- We assume that  $x_{lt} \not\perp \epsilon_{lt}$ , need an IV
- Bartik IV comes from two identities

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Let's define Bartik IV generally
- We have the following equation

$$y_{lt} = D'_{lt}\rho + x_{lt}\beta_0 + \epsilon_{lt} \quad (4)$$

- $l$  is location;  $t$  is time;  $D$  are controls;  $\beta_0$  is parameter of interest
- $x_{lt}$  is some (employment) growth rate
- $y_{lt}$  is some (wage) outcome growth rate
- $x$  and  $y$  can also be level variables when location FE is controlled
- We assume that  $x_{lt} \not\perp \epsilon_{lt}$ , need an IV
- Bartik IV comes from two identities

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Let's define Bartik IV generally
- We have the following equation

$$y_{lt} = D'_{lt}\rho + x_{lt}\beta_0 + \epsilon_{lt} \quad (4)$$

- $l$  is location;  $t$  is time;  $D$  are controls;  $\beta_0$  is parameter of interest
- $x_{lt}$  is some (employment) growth rate
- $y_{lt}$  is some (wage) outcome growth rate
- $x$  and  $y$  can also be level variables when location FE is controlled
- We assume that  $x_{lt} \not\perp \epsilon_{lt}$ , need an IV
- Bartik IV comes from two identities

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Let's define Bartik IV generally
- We have the following equation

$$y_{lt} = D'_{lt}\rho + x_{lt}\beta_0 + \epsilon_{lt} \quad (4)$$

- $l$  is location;  $t$  is time;  $D$  are controls;  $\beta_0$  is parameter of interest
- $x_{lt}$  is some (employment) growth rate
- $y_{lt}$  is some (wage) outcome growth rate
- $x$  and  $y$  can also be level variables when location FE is controlled
- We assume that  $x_{lt} \not\perp \epsilon_{lt}$ , need an IV
- Bartik IV comes from two identities

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Identity 1: Decompose Location-level growth variable to location-industry-level variable and its growth
- Usually location-industry level, or in Card (2009), location-origin country level

$$x_{lt} = Z_{lt} G_{lt} = \sum_{k=1}^K z_{lkt} g_{lkt}$$

$z_{lkt}$  is the location-industry share at  $t$ ,  $g_{lkt}$  is the location-industry growth at  $t$

- Identity 2: Decompose location-industry growth into national and local components

$$g_{lkt} = g_{kt} + \tilde{g}_{lkt}$$

$g_{kt}$  is the national industry growth,  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  is the location-industry growth shock



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Identity 1: Decompose Location-level growth variable to location-industry-level variable and its growth
- Usually location-industry level, or in Card (2009), location-origin country level

$$x_{lt} = Z_{lt} G_{lt} = \sum_{k=1}^K z_{lkt} g_{lkt}$$

$z_{lkt}$  is the location-industry share at  $t$ ,  $g_{lkt}$  is the location-industry growth at  $t$

- Identity 2: Decompose location-industry growth into national and local components

$$g_{lkt} = g_{kt} + \tilde{g}_{lkt}$$

$g_{kt}$  is the national industry growth,  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  is the location-industry growth shock

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Identity 1: Decompose Location-level growth variable to location-industry-level variable and its growth
- Usually location-industry level, or in Card (2009), location-origin country level

$$x_{lt} = Z_{lt} G_{lt} = \sum_{k=1}^K z_{lkt} g_{lkt}$$

$z_{lkt}$  is the location-industry share at  $t$ ,  $g_{lkt}$  is the location-industry growth at  $t$

- Identity 2: Decompose location-industry growth into national and local components

$$g_{lkt} = g_{kt} + \tilde{g}_{lkt}$$

$g_{kt}$  is the national industry growth,  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  is the location-industry growth shock

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Identity 1: Decompose Location-level growth variable to location-industry-level variable and its growth
- Usually location-industry level, or in Card (2009), location-origin country level

$$x_{lt} = Z_{lt} G_{lt} = \sum_{k=1}^K z_{lkt} g_{lkt}$$

$z_{lkt}$  is the location-industry share at  $t$ ,  $g_{lkt}$  is the location-industry growth at  $t$

- Identity 2: Decompose location-industry growth into national and local components

$$g_{lkt} = g_{kt} + \tilde{g}_{lkt}$$

$g_{kt}$  is the national industry growth,  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  is the location-industry growth shock

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Assume that we have a baseline period 0
- We construct Bartik IV  $B_{lt}$  as:

$$B_{lt} = Z_{l0} G_t = \sum_k \underbrace{z_{lk0}}_{\text{Share}} \underbrace{\tilde{g}_{kt}}_{\text{Shift}} \quad (5)$$

- The first part is the initial share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- The second part is the national growth of industry  $k$
- Fix  $z$  at 0 and drop  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  from the identity  $\Rightarrow$  Bartik IV
- Before we formally establish the equivalence between Bartik IV and GMM
- Let's consider two special cases

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Assume that we have a baseline period 0
- We construct Bartik IV  $B_{lt}$  as:

$$B_{lt} = Z_{l0} G_t = \sum_k \underbrace{z_{lk0}}_{\text{Share}} \underbrace{\tilde{g}_{kt}}_{\text{Shift}} \quad (5)$$

- The first part is the initial share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- The second part is the national growth of industry  $k$
- Fix  $z$  at 0 and drop  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  from the identity  $\Rightarrow$  Bartik IV
- Before we formally establish the equivalence between Bartik IV and GMM
- Let's consider two special cases

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Assume that we have a baseline period 0
- We construct Bartik IV  $B_{lt}$  as:

$$B_{lt} = Z_{l0} G_t = \sum_k \underbrace{z_{lk0}}_{\text{Share}} \underbrace{g_{kt}}_{\text{Shift}} \quad (5)$$

- The first part is the initial share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- The second part is the national growth of industry  $k$
- Fix  $z$  at 0 and drop  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  from the identity  $\Rightarrow$  Bartik IV
- Before we formally establish the equivalence between Bartik IV and GMM
- Let's consider two special cases

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Assume that we have a baseline period 0
- We construct Bartik IV  $B_{lt}$  as:

$$B_{lt} = Z_{l0} G_t = \sum_k \underbrace{z_{lk0}}_{\text{Share}} \underbrace{g_{kt}}_{\text{Shift}} \quad (5)$$

- The first part is the initial share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- The second part is the national growth of industry  $k$
- Fix  $z$  at 0 and drop  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  from the identity  $\Rightarrow$  Bartik IV
- Before we formally establish the equivalence between Bartik IV and GMM
- Let's consider two special cases

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Assume that we have a baseline period 0
- We construct Bartik IV  $B_{lt}$  as:

$$B_{lt} = Z_{l0} G_t = \sum_k \underbrace{z_{lk0}}_{\text{Share}} \underbrace{g_{kt}}_{\text{Shift}} \quad (5)$$

- The first part is the initial share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- The second part is the national growth of industry  $k$
- Fix  $z$  at 0 and drop  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  from the identity  $\Rightarrow$  Bartik IV
- Before we formally establish the equivalence between Bartik IV and GMM
- Let's consider two special cases



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Assume that we have a baseline period 0
- We construct Bartik IV  $B_{lt}$  as:

$$B_{lt} = Z_{l0} G_t = \sum_k \underbrace{z_{lk0}}_{\text{Share}} \underbrace{g_{kt}}_{\text{Shift}} \quad (5)$$

- The first part is the initial share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- The second part is the national growth of industry  $k$
- Fix  $z$  at 0 and drop  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  from the identity  $\Rightarrow$  Bartik IV
- Before we formally establish the equivalence between Bartik IV and GMM
- Let's consider two special cases

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Assume that we have a baseline period 0
- We construct Bartik IV  $B_{lt}$  as:

$$B_{lt} = Z_{l0} G_t = \sum_k \underbrace{z_{lk0}}_{\text{Share}} \underbrace{g_{kt}}_{\text{Shift}} \quad (5)$$

- The first part is the initial share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- The second part is the national growth of industry  $k$
- Fix  $z$  at 0 and drop  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  from the identity  $\Rightarrow$  Bartik IV
- Before we formally establish the equivalence between Bartik IV and GMM
- Let's consider two special cases

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Definition of Bartik IV

- Assume that we have a baseline period 0
- We construct Bartik IV  $B_{lt}$  as:

$$B_{lt} = Z_{l0} G_t = \sum_k \underbrace{z_{lk0}}_{\text{Share}} \underbrace{g_{kt}}_{\text{Shift}} \quad (5)$$

- The first part is the initial share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- The second part is the national growth of industry  $k$
- Fix  $z$  at 0 and drop  $\tilde{g}_{lkt}$  from the identity  $\Rightarrow$  Bartik IV
- Before we formally establish the equivalence between Bartik IV and GMM
- Let's consider two special cases

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 1: Two industries and One period
- Shares sum to 1:  $z_{i2} = 1 - z_{i1}$

$$B_i = z_{i1}g_1 + z_{i2}g_2 = g_2 + (g_1 - g_2)z_{i1}$$

- We have the first stage:

$$x_i = \gamma_0 + \gamma B_i + \eta_i = \underbrace{(\gamma_0 + \gamma g_2)}_{\text{constant}} + \underbrace{\gamma(g_1 - g_2)}_{\text{coefficient}} z_{i1} + \eta_i$$

- Using Bartik in 2SLS is identical to using single IV,  $z_{i1}$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 1: Two industries and One period
- Shares sum to 1:  $z_{I2} = 1 - z_{I1}$

$$B_I = z_{I1}g_1 + z_{I2}g_2 = g_2 + (g_1 - g_2)z_{I1}$$

- We have the first stage:

$$x_I = \gamma_0 + \gamma B_I + \eta_I = \underbrace{(\gamma_0 + \gamma g_2)}_{\text{constant}} + \underbrace{\gamma(g_1 - g_2)}_{\text{coefficient}} z_{I1} + \eta_I$$

- Using Bartik in 2SLS is identical to using single IV,  $z_{I1}$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 1: Two industries and One period
- Shares sum to 1:  $z_{I2} = 1 - z_{I1}$

$$B_I = z_{I1}g_1 + z_{I2}g_2 = g_2 + (g_1 - g_2)z_{I1}$$

- We have the first stage:

$$x_I = \gamma_0 + \gamma B_I + \eta_I = \underbrace{(\gamma_0 + \gamma g_2)}_{\text{constant}} + \underbrace{\gamma(g_1 - g_2)}_{\text{coefficient}} z_{I1} + \eta_I$$

- Using Bartik in 2SLS is identical to using single IV,  $z_{I1}$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 1: Two industries and One period
- Shares sum to 1:  $z_{I2} = 1 - z_{I1}$

$$B_I = z_{I1}g_1 + z_{I2}g_2 = g_2 + (g_1 - g_2)z_{I1}$$

- We have the first stage:

$$x_I = \gamma_0 + \gamma B_I + \eta_I = \underbrace{(\gamma_0 + \gamma g_2)}_{\text{constant}} + \underbrace{\gamma(g_1 - g_2)}_{\text{coefficient}} z_{I1} + \eta_I$$

- Using Bartik in 2SLS is identical to using single IV,  $z_{I1}$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 1: Two industries and One period
- Shares sum to 1:  $z_{l2} = 1 - z_{l1}$

$$B_l = z_{l1}g_1 + z_{l2}g_2 = g_2 + (g_1 - g_2)z_{l1}$$

- We have the first stage:

$$x_l = \gamma_0 + \gamma B_l + \eta_l = \underbrace{(\gamma_0 + \gamma g_2)}_{\text{constant}} + \underbrace{\gamma(g_1 - g_2)}_{\text{coefficient}} z_{l1} + \eta_l$$

- Using Bartik in 2SLS is identical to using single IV,  $z_{l1}$



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 2: Two industries and Two periods

$$B_{it} = g_{1t}z_{i10} + g_{2t}z_{i20} = g_{2t} + (g_{1t} - g_{2t})z_{i10}$$

- Assume that we control for time FE, we have a first stage:

$$x_{it} = \tau_t + \gamma B_{it} + \eta_{it} = \underbrace{(\tau_t + g_{2t}\gamma)}_{\tilde{\tau}_t} + z_{i10}(g_{1t} - g_{2t})\gamma + \eta_{it}$$

- Now we cannot directly say only  $z_{i10}$  is the instrument
- Because with two periods,  $g_{1t} - g_{2t}$  is not a constant
- Let's further decompose the equation

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 2: Two industries and Two periods

$$B_{lt} = g_{1t}z_{l10} + g_{2t}z_{l20} = g_{2t} + (g_{1t} - g_{2t})z_{l10}$$

- Assume that we control for time FE, we have a first stage:

$$x_{lt} = \tau_t + \gamma B_{lt} + \eta_{lt} = \underbrace{(\tau_t + g_{2t}\gamma)}_{\tilde{\tau}_t} + z_{l10}(g_{1t} - g_{2t})\gamma + \eta_{lt}$$

- Now we cannot directly say only  $z_{l10}$  is the instrument
- Because with two periods,  $g_{1t} - g_{2t}$  is not a constant
- Let's further decompose the equation

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 2: Two industries and Two periods

$$B_{lt} = g_{1t}z_{l10} + g_{2t}z_{l20} = g_{2t} + (g_{1t} - g_{2t})z_{l10}$$

- Assume that we control for time FE, we have a first stage:

$$x_{lt} = \tau_t + \gamma B_{lt} + \eta_{lt} = \underbrace{(\tau_t + g_{2t}\gamma)}_{\tilde{\tau}_t} + z_{l10}(g_{1t} - g_{2t})\gamma + \eta_{lt}$$

- Now we cannot directly say only  $z_{l10}$  is the instrument
- Because with two periods,  $g_{1t} - g_{2t}$  is not a constant
- Let's further decompose the equation

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 2: Two industries and Two periods

$$B_{lt} = g_{1t}z_{l10} + g_{2t}z_{l20} = g_{2t} + (g_{1t} - g_{2t})z_{l10}$$

- Assume that we control for time FE, we have a first stage:

$$x_{lt} = \tau_t + \gamma B_{lt} + \eta_{lt} = \underbrace{(\tau_t + g_{2t}\gamma)}_{\tilde{\tau}_t} + z_{l10}(g_{1t} - g_{2t})\gamma + \eta_{lt}$$

- Now we cannot directly say only  $z_{l10}$  is the instrument
  - Because with two periods,  $g_{1t} - g_{2t}$  is not a constant
  - Let's further decompose the equation

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 2: Two industries and Two periods

$$B_{lt} = g_{1t}z_{l10} + g_{2t}z_{l20} = g_{2t} + (g_{1t} - g_{2t})z_{l10}$$

- Assume that we control for time FE, we have a first stage:

$$x_{lt} = \tau_t + \gamma B_{lt} + \eta_{lt} = \underbrace{(\tau_t + g_{2t}\gamma)}_{\tilde{\tau}_t} + z_{l10}(g_{1t} - g_{2t})\gamma + \eta_{lt}$$

- Now we cannot directly say only  $z_{l10}$  is the instrument
- Because with two periods,  $g_{1t} - g_{2t}$  is not a constant
- Let's further decompose the equation

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Case 2: Two industries and Two periods

$$B_{lt} = g_{1t}z_{l10} + g_{2t}z_{l20} = g_{2t} + (g_{1t} - g_{2t})z_{l10}$$

- Assume that we control for time FE, we have a first stage:

$$x_{lt} = \tau_t + \gamma B_{lt} + \eta_{lt} = \underbrace{(\tau_t + g_{2t}\gamma)}_{\tilde{\tau}_t} + z_{l10}(g_{1t} - g_{2t})\gamma + \eta_{lt}$$

- Now we cannot directly say only  $z_{l10}$  is the instrument
- Because with two periods,  $g_{1t} - g_{2t}$  is not a constant
- Let's further decompose the equation

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Denote indicator function as  $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ , we have:

$$g_{1t} - g_{2t} = \mathbf{1}(t = 1)(g_{11} - g_{21}) + \mathbf{1}(t = 2)(g_{12} - g_{22})$$

- Then first stage becomes:

$$x_{it} = \tilde{\tau}_t + z_{i10} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}(t = 1) (g_{11} - g_{21}) \gamma}_{\text{rescaled parameter } \tilde{\gamma}_1} + z_{i10} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}(t = 2) (g_{12} - g_{22}) \gamma}_{\text{rescaled parameter } \tilde{\gamma}_2}$$

- This is running  $x$  on the time FE and two interactions of  $z_{i10}$  and time dummies
- What is the underlying research design here?

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Denote indicator function as  $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ , we have:

$$g_{1t} - g_{2t} = \mathbf{1}(t = 1)(g_{11} - g_{21}) + \mathbf{1}(t = 2)(g_{12} - g_{22})$$

- Then first stage becomes:

$$x_{it} = \tilde{\tau}_t + z_{i10} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}(t = 1) (g_{11} - g_{21}) \gamma}_{\text{rescaled parameter } \tilde{\gamma}_1} + z_{i10} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}(t = 2) (g_{12} - g_{22}) \gamma}_{\text{rescaled parameter } \tilde{\gamma}_2}$$

- This is running  $x$  on the time FE and two interactions of  $z_{i10}$  and time dummies
- What is the underlying research design here?



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Denote indicator function as  $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ , we have:

$$g_{1t} - g_{2t} = \mathbf{1}(t = 1)(g_{11} - g_{21}) + \mathbf{1}(t = 2)(g_{12} - g_{22})$$

- Then first stage becomes:

$$x_{lt} = \tilde{\tau}_t + z_{l10} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}(t = 1) (g_{11} - g_{21}) \gamma}_{\text{rescaled parameter } \tilde{\gamma}_1} + z_{l10} \mathbf{1}(t = 2) \underbrace{(g_{12} - g_{22}) \gamma}_{\text{rescaled parameter } \tilde{\gamma}_2}$$

- This is running  $x$  on the time FE and two interactions of  $z_{l10}$  and time dummies
- What is the underlying research design here?

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Denote indicator function as  $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ , we have:

$$g_{1t} - g_{2t} = \mathbf{1}(t = 1)(g_{11} - g_{21}) + \mathbf{1}(t = 2)(g_{12} - g_{22})$$

- Then first stage becomes:

$$x_{lt} = \tilde{\tau}_t + z_{l10} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}(t = 1) (g_{11} - g_{21}) \gamma}_{\text{rescaled parameter } \tilde{\gamma}_1} + z_{l10} \mathbf{1}(t = 2) \underbrace{(g_{12} - g_{22}) \gamma}_{\text{rescaled parameter } \tilde{\gamma}_2}$$

- This is running  $x$  on the time FE and two interactions of  $z_{l10}$  and time dummies
- What is the underlying research design here?

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Denote indicator function as  $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ , we have:

$$g_{1t} - g_{2t} = \mathbf{1}(t = 1)(g_{11} - g_{21}) + \mathbf{1}(t = 2)(g_{12} - g_{22})$$

- Then first stage becomes:

$$x_{lt} = \tilde{\tau}_t + z_{l10} \underbrace{\mathbf{1}(t = 1) (g_{11} - g_{21}) \gamma}_{\text{rescaled parameter } \tilde{\gamma}_1} + z_{l10} \mathbf{1}(t = 2) \underbrace{(g_{12} - g_{22}) \gamma}_{\text{rescaled parameter } \tilde{\gamma}_2}$$

- This is running  $x$  on the time FE and two interactions of  $z_{l10}$  and time dummies
- What is the underlying research design here?

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Growth rate: policy effect size;
- Initial share: Exposure to some policy
- Whether locations with more industry 1, experience different changes in  $x$  following shocks whose effect depends on industry sizes
- More clear if we consider period 1 as some pre-period
- Then we can set  $g_{11} - g_{21} = 0$ : Before policy/after policy
- DID specification!  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = 0 \Rightarrow$  parallel pre-trend

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Growth rate: policy effect size;
- Initial share: Exposure to some policy
- Whether **locations with more industry 1**, experience **different changes in  $x$  following shocks** whose effect depends on industry sizes
- More clear if we consider period 1 as some pre-period
- Then we can set  $g_{11} - g_{21} = 0$ : Before policy/after policy
- DID specification!  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = 0 \Rightarrow$  parallel pre-trend

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Growth rate: policy effect size;
- Initial share: Exposure to some policy
- Whether **locations with more industry 1**, experience **different changes in  $x$  following shocks** whose effect depends on industry sizes
- More clear if we consider period 1 as some pre-period
- Then we can set  $g_{11} - g_{21} = 0$ : Before policy/after policy
- DID specification!  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = 0 \Rightarrow$  parallel pre-trend

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Growth rate: policy effect size;
- Initial share: Exposure to some policy
- Whether **locations with more industry 1**, experience **different changes in  $x$  following shocks** whose effect depends on industry sizes
- More clear if we consider period 1 as some pre-period
- Then we can set  $g_{11} - g_{21} = 0$ : Before policy/after policy
- DID specification!  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = 0 \Rightarrow$  parallel pre-trend

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Growth rate: policy effect size;
- Initial share: Exposure to some policy
- Whether **locations with more industry 1**, experience **different changes in  $x$  following shocks** whose effect depends on industry sizes
- More clear if we consider period 1 as some pre-period
- Then we can set  $g_{11} - g_{21} = 0$ : Before policy/after policy
- DID specification!  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = 0 \Rightarrow$  parallel pre-trend



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Growth rate: policy effect size;
- Initial share: Exposure to some policy
- Whether **locations with more industry 1**, experience **different changes in  $x$  following shocks** whose effect depends on industry sizes
- More clear if we consider period 1 as some pre-period
- Then we can set  $g_{11} - g_{21} = 0$ : Before policy/after policy
- DID specification!  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = 0 \Rightarrow$  parallel pre-trend

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Growth rate: policy effect size;
- Initial share: Exposure to some policy
- Whether **locations with more industry 1**, experience **different changes in  $x$  following shocks** whose effect depends on industry sizes
- More clear if we consider period 1 as some pre-period
- Then we can set  $g_{11} - g_{21} = 0$ : Before policy/after policy
- DID specification!  $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = 0 \Rightarrow$  parallel pre-trend

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Assume that we have  $K$  industries and one period, stack all variables to matrix
- Let  $M_D = I - D(D'D)^{-1}D'$  be the annihilator matrix,  $X^\perp = M_D X$
- $Z$  is share and  $G$  is shock

We define Bartik and GMM estimator using industry shares as instruments:

$$\hat{\beta}_{Bartik} = \frac{Z' M_D Y}{Z' M_D X} = \frac{Z' Y - \frac{Z' D D' Y}{D' D}}{Z' X - \frac{Z' D D' X}{D' D}}$$

We can also write

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Assume that we have  $K$  industries and one period, stack all variables to matrix
- Let  $M_D = I - D(D'D)^{-1}D'$  be the annihilator matrix,  $X^\perp = M_D X$
- $Z$  is share and  $G$  is shock

Proposition 1 in PSS(2020)

We define Bartik and GMM estimator using industry shares as instruments:

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} = \frac{B'Y^\perp}{B'X^\perp}, \hat{\beta}_{\text{GMM}} = \frac{X^{\perp'} ZWZ'Y^\perp}{X^{\perp'} ZWZ'X^\perp}$$

If  $W = GG'$ , then  $\hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} = \hat{\beta}_{\text{GMM}}$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Assume that we have  $K$  industries and one period, stack all variables to matrix
- Let  $M_D = I - D(D'D)^{-1}D'$  be the annihilator matrix,  $X^\perp = M_D X$
- $Z$  is share and  $G$  is shock

Proposition 1 in PSS(2020)

We define Bartik and GMM estimator using industry shares as instruments:

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} = \frac{B'Y^\perp}{B'X^\perp}, \hat{\beta}_{\text{GMM}} = \frac{X^{\perp'} ZWZ'Y^\perp}{X^{\perp'} ZWZ'X^\perp}$$

If  $W = GG'$ , then  $\hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} = \hat{\beta}_{\text{GMM}}$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Assume that we have  $K$  industries and one period, stack all variables to matrix
- Let  $M_D = I - D(D'D)^{-1}D'$  be the annihilator matrix,  $X^\perp = M_D X$
- $Z$  is share and  $G$  is shock

Proposition 1 in PSS(2020)

We define Bartik and GMM estimator using industry shares as instruments:

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} = \frac{B'Y^\perp}{B'X^\perp}, \hat{\beta}_{\text{GMM}} = \frac{X^{\perp'} ZWZ' Y^\perp}{X^{\perp'} ZWZ' X^\perp}$$

If  $W = GG'$ , then  $\hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} = \hat{\beta}_{\text{GMM}}$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Assume that we have  $K$  industries and one period, stack all variables to matrix
- Let  $M_D = I - D(D'D)^{-1}D'$  be the annihilator matrix,  $X^\perp = M_D X$
- $Z$  is share and  $G$  is shock

## Proposition 1 in PSS(2020)

We define Bartik and GMM estimator using industry shares as instruments:

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} = \frac{B'Y^\perp}{B'X^\perp}, \hat{\beta}_{\text{GMM}} = \frac{X^{\perp'}ZWZ'Y^\perp}{X^{\perp'}ZWZ'X^\perp}$$

If  $W = GG'$ , then  $\hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} = \hat{\beta}_{\text{GMM}}$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Bartik IV is equivalent to GMM estimator with local industry shares as instruments and national growth rate variance as weights
- Combined just-identified IV vs. Multiple over-identified IV
- The results can be extended to  $K$  industries and  $T$  periods case



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Bartik IV is equivalent to GMM estimator with **local industry shares as instruments** and **national growth rate variance as weights**
- Combined just-identified IV vs. Multiple over-identified IV
- The results can be extended to K industries and T periods case

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Bartik IV is equivalent to GMM estimator with **local industry shares as instruments** and **national growth rate variance as weights**
- Combined just-identified IV vs. Multiple over-identified IV
- The results can be extended to  $K$  industries and  $T$  periods case

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Bartik IV is equivalent to GMM estimator with **local industry shares as instruments** and **national growth rate variance as weights**
- Combined just-identified IV vs. Multiple over-identified IV
- The results can be extended to K industries and T periods case

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Asymptotic in location dimension:  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , with fixed  $T, K$
- Asymptotic in other dimensions (and different research designs) are discussed in the next paper
- Assumption 1: Relevance
- Assumption 2 (Strict Exogeneity):  $E[\epsilon_{it} z_{itk0} | D_{it}] = 0, \forall k$  with  $g_k \neq 0$

Given assumption 1 and 2,

$$E[\epsilon_{it} z_{itk0} | D_{it}] = 0$$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Asymptotic in location dimension:  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , with fixed  $T, K$
- Asymptotic in other dimensions (and different research designs) are discussed in the next paper
- Assumption 1: Relevance
- Assumption 2 (Strict Exogeneity):  $E[\epsilon_{lt}z_{lk0} | D_{lt}] = 0, \forall k$  with  $g_k \neq 0$

Proposition 2 in PSS(2020)

Given assumption 1 and 2,

$$\text{plim} \hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} - \beta_0 = 0$$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Asymptotic in location dimension:  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , with fixed  $T, K$
- Asymptotic in other dimensions (and different research designs) are discussed in the next paper
- Assumption 1: Relevance
- Assumption 2 (Strict Exogeneity):  $E[\epsilon_{lt}z_{lk0} | D_{lt}] = 0, \forall k$  with  $g_k \neq 0$

Proposition 2 in PSS(2020)

Given assumption 1 and 2,

$$\text{plim} \hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} - \beta_0 = 0$$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Asymptotic in location dimension:  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , with fixed  $T, K$
- Asymptotic in other dimensions (and different research designs) are discussed in the next paper
- Assumption 1: Relevance
- Assumption 2 (Strict Exogeneity):  $E[\epsilon_{lt}z_{lk0} | D_{lt}] = 0, \forall k$  with  $g_k \neq 0$

Proposition 2 in PSS(2020)

Given assumption 1 and 2,

$$\text{plim} \hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} - \beta_0 = 0$$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Asymptotic in location dimension:  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , with fixed  $T, K$
- Asymptotic in other dimensions (and different research designs) are discussed in the next paper
- Assumption 1: Relevance
- Assumption 2 (Strict Exogeneity):  $E[\epsilon_{lt}z_{lk0} | D_{lt}] = 0, \forall k$  with  $g_k \neq 0$

Proposition 2 in PSS(2020)

Given assumption 1 and 2,

$$\text{plim} \hat{\beta}_{\text{Bartik}} - \beta_0 = 0$$



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

- Asymptotic in location dimension:  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , with fixed  $T, K$
- Asymptotic in other dimensions (and different research designs) are discussed in the next paper
- Assumption 1: Relevance
- Assumption 2 (Strict Exogeneity):  $E[\epsilon_{lt}z_{lk0} | D_{lt}] = 0, \forall k$  with  $g_k \neq 0$

## Proposition 2 in PSS(2020)

Given assumption 1 and 2,

$$plim \hat{\beta}_{Bartik} - \beta_0 = 0$$

Generally, when is Assumption 2 plausible?

- Initial industry share is mean independent of shocks on outcome **levels**  
Wrong!
- Initial industry share is mean independent of shocks on outcome **changes**  
Plausible
- Keep in mind, when using Bartik IV  
Either control for location+time FE, or use growth variable as  $y$ !

Generally, when is Assumption 2 plausible?

- Initial industry share is mean independent of shocks on outcome **levels**  
Wrong!
- Initial industry share is mean independent of shocks on outcome **changes**  
Plausible
- Keep in mind, when using Bartik IV  
Either control for location+time FE, or use growth variable as  $y$ !

Generally, when is Assumption 2 plausible?

- Initial industry share is mean independent of shocks on outcome **levels**  
Wrong!
- Initial industry share is mean independent of shocks on outcome **changes**  
Plausible
- Keep in mind, when using Bartik IV  
Either control for location+time FE, or use growth variable as  $y$ !

Generally, when is Assumption 2 plausible?

- Initial industry share is mean independent of shocks on outcome **levels**  
Wrong!
- Initial industry share is mean independent of shocks on outcome **changes**  
Plausible
- Keep in mind, when using Bartik IV  
Either control for location+time FE, or use growth variable as  $y$ !

Generally, when is Assumption 2 plausible?

- Initial industry share is mean independent of shocks on outcome **levels**  
Wrong!
- Initial industry share is mean independent of shocks on outcome **changes**  
Plausible
- Keep in mind, when using Bartik IV  
**Either control for location+time FE, or use growth variable as  $y$ !**

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Bartik IV and GMM

When is Assumption 2 plausible?

- This is an "exposure design" (similar to DID)
- Different exposures of locations to national industry-level shocks affect outcomes only through changing  $x$
- There is no systematic difference in terms of unobserved local shocks for places with different exposures (parallel trend)
- Think of Shanghai, Hong Kong and Shenyang, Wuhan

■ Shanghai, HK are more involved in finance industry than SY, WH

■ If a financial crisis happens, SH, HK are more exposed

■ We have to assume that there is no other unobserved shock hitting SH, HK and SY, WH differently

■ The trend of economic situation (COVID crisis shock) should be similar

## When is Assumption 2 plausible?

- This is an "exposure design" (similar to DID)
- Different exposures of locations to national industry-level shocks affect outcomes only through changing  $x$
- There is no systematic difference in terms of unobserved local shocks for places with different exposures (parallel trend)
- Think of Shanghai, Hong Kong and Shenyang, Wuhan

Shanghai, HK are more involved in finance industry than CN, WH

→ If a financial crisis happens, SH, HK are more exposed

→ We have to assume that there is no other unobserved shock hitting SH, HK and CN, WH differently

→ The effect of economic stimulus (COVID crisis shock) is  $\beta = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x$



When is Assumption 2 plausible?

- This is an "exposure design" (similar to DID)
- Different exposures of locations to national industry-level shocks affect outcomes only through changing  $x$
- There is no systematic difference in terms of unobserved local shocks for places with different exposures (parallel trend)
- Think of Shanghai, Hong Kong and Shenyang, Wuhan
  - SH, HK are more involved in finance industry than SY, WH
  - If a financial crisis happens, SH, HK are more exposed
  - We have to assume that there is no other unobserved shocks hitting SH, HK and SY, WH differently
  - The trend of economic situations (without crisis shock) should be parallel

When is Assumption 2 plausible?

- This is an "exposure design" (similar to DID)
- Different exposures of locations to national industry-level shocks affect outcomes only through changing  $x$
- There is no systematic difference in terms of unobserved local shocks for places with different exposures (parallel trend)
- Think of Shanghai, Hong Kong and Shenyang, Wuhan
  - SH, HK are more involved in finance industry than SY, WH
  - If a financial crisis happens, SH, HK are more exposed
  - We have to assume that there is no other unobserved shocks hitting SH, HK and SY, WH differently
  - The trend of economic situations (without crisis shock) should be parallel

When is Assumption 2 plausible?

- This is an "exposure design" (similar to DID)
- Different exposures of locations to national industry-level shocks affect outcomes only through changing  $x$
- There is no systematic difference in terms of unobserved local shocks for places with different exposures (parallel trend)
- Think of Shanghai, Hong Kong and Shenyang, Wuhan
  - SH, HK are more involved in finance industry than SY, WH
  - If a financial crisis happens, SH, HK are more exposed
  - We have to assume that there is no other unobserved shocks hitting SH, HK and SY, WH differently
  - The trend of economic situations (without crisis shock) should be parallel

When is Assumption 2 plausible?

- This is an "exposure design" (similar to DID)
- Different exposures of locations to national industry-level shocks affect outcomes only through changing  $x$
- There is no systematic difference in terms of unobserved local shocks for places with different exposures (parallel trend)
- Think of Shanghai, Hong Kong and Shenyang, Wuhan
  - SH, HK are more involved in finance industry than SY, WH
  - If a financial crisis happens, SH, HK are more exposed
  - We have to assume that there is no other unobserved shocks hitting SH, HK and SY, WH differently
  - The trend of economic situations (without crisis shock) should be parallel

When is Assumption 2 plausible?

- This is an "exposure design" (similar to DID)
- Different exposures of locations to national industry-level shocks affect outcomes only through changing  $x$
- There is no systematic difference in terms of unobserved local shocks for places with different exposures (parallel trend)
- Think of Shanghai, Hong Kong and Shenyang, Wuhan
  - SH, HK are more involved in finance industry than SY, WH
  - If a financial crisis happens, SH, HK are more exposed
  - We have to assume that there is no other unobserved shocks hitting SH, HK and SY, WH differently
  - The trend of economic situations (without crisis shock) should be parallel

When is Assumption 2 plausible?

- This is an "exposure design" (similar to DID)
- Different exposures of locations to national industry-level shocks affect outcomes only through changing  $x$
- There is no systematic difference in terms of unobserved local shocks for places with different exposures (parallel trend)
- Think of Shanghai, Hong Kong and Shenyang, Wuhan
  - SH, HK are more involved in finance industry than SY, WH
  - If a financial crisis happens, SH, HK are more exposed
  - We have to assume that there is no other unobserved shocks hitting SH, HK and SY, WH differently
  - The trend of economic situations (without crisis shock) should be parallel

When is Assumption 2 plausible?

- This is an "exposure design" (similar to DID)
- Different exposures of locations to national industry-level shocks affect outcomes only through changing  $x$
- There is no systematic difference in terms of unobserved local shocks for places with different exposures (parallel trend)
- Think of Shanghai, Hong Kong and Shenyang, Wuhan
  - SH, HK are more involved in finance industry than SY, WH
  - If a financial crisis happens, SH, HK are more exposed
  - We have to assume that there is no other unobserved shocks hitting SH, HK and SY, WH differently
  - The trend of economic situations (without crisis shock) should be parallel

When is Assumption 2 plausible?

- This is an "exposure design" (similar to DID)
- Different exposures of locations to national industry-level shocks affect outcomes only through changing  $x$
- There is no systematic difference in terms of unobserved local shocks for places with different exposures (parallel trend)
- Think of Shanghai, Hong Kong and Shenyang, Wuhan
  - SH, HK are more involved in finance industry than SY, WH
  - If a financial crisis happens, SH, HK are more exposed
  - We have to assume that there is no other unobserved shocks hitting SH, HK and SY, WH differently
  - The trend of economic situations (without crisis shock) should be parallel



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- Bartik IV is a combination of many industries (Black box)
- Which industry is driving the results?

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- Bartik IV is a combination of many industries (Black box)
- Which industry is driving the results?

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- Bartik IV is a combination of many industries (Black box)
- Which industry is driving the results?

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We can decompose it into a combination of just-identified estimates on each instrument (for each industry)

We can write

$$\beta = \sum_{i=1}^I \beta_i \pi_i$$

where

$$\beta_i = \frac{\text{Cov}(Y, Z_i)}{\text{Cov}(Z_i, X)}$$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We can decompose it into a combination of just-identified estimates on each instrument (for each industry)

Proposition 3 in PSS(2020)

We can write

$$\hat{\beta}_{Bartik} = \sum_k \hat{\alpha}_k \hat{\beta}_k$$

where

$$\hat{\beta}_k = (Z_k' X^\perp)^{-1} Z_k' Y^\perp, \hat{\alpha}_k = \frac{g_k Z_k' X^\perp}{\sum_{k'} g_{k'} Z_{k'}' X^\perp}$$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We can decompose it into a combination of just-identified estimates on each instrument (for each industry)

## Proposition 3 in PSS(2020)

We can write

$$\hat{\beta}_{Bartik} = \sum_k \hat{\alpha}_k \hat{\beta}_k$$

where

$$\hat{\beta}_k = (Z_k' X^\perp)^{-1} Z_k' Y^\perp, \hat{\alpha}_k = \frac{g_k Z_k' X^\perp}{\sum_{k'} g_{k'} Z_{k'}' X^\perp}$$

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We construct a single instrument for each industry  $B_k = z_{ik0}g_k$
- $\hat{\beta}_k$  is IV estimator for each instrument  $k$
- $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is called Rotemberg weight
- The Rotemberg weight means how important this single industry is
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is large, misspecification on this industry is dangerous
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is small, misspecification on this industry could be fine
- In practice, report industries with the highest weights

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We construct a single instrument for each industry  $B_k = z_{lk}g_k$
- $\hat{\beta}_k$  is IV estimator for each instrument  $k$
- $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is called Rotemberg weight
- The Rotemberg weight means how important this single industry is
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is large, misspecification on this industry is dangerous
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is small, misspecification on this industry could be fine
- In practice, **report industries with the highest weights**



## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We construct a single instrument for each industry  $B_k = z_{lk}g_k$
- $\hat{\beta}_k$  is IV estimator for each instrument  $k$
- $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is called Rotemberg weight
- The Rotemberg weight means how important this single industry is
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is large, misspecification on this industry is dangerous
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is small, misspecification on this industry could be fine
- In practice, report industries with the highest weights

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We construct a single instrument for each industry  $B_k = z_{lk}g_k$
- $\hat{\beta}_k$  is IV estimator for each instrument  $k$
- $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is called Rotemberg weight
- The Rotemberg weight means how important this single industry is
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is large, misspecification on this industry is dangerous
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is small, misspecification on this industry could be fine
- In practice, report industries with the highest weights

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We construct a single instrument for each industry  $B_k = z_{lk}g_k$
- $\hat{\beta}_k$  is IV estimator for each instrument  $k$
- $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is called Rotemberg weight
- The Rotemberg weight means how important this single industry is
  - If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is large, misspecification on this industry is dangerous
  - If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is small, misspecification on this industry could be fine
  - In practice, report industries with the highest weights

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We construct a single instrument for each industry  $B_k = z_{lk}g_k$
- $\hat{\beta}_k$  is IV estimator for each instrument  $k$
- $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is called Rotemberg weight
- The Rotemberg weight means how important this single industry is
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is large, misspecification on this industry is dangerous
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is small, misspecification on this industry could be fine
- In practice, report industries with the highest weights

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We construct a single instrument for each industry  $B_k = z_{lk}g_k$
- $\hat{\beta}_k$  is IV estimator for each instrument  $k$
- $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is called Rotemberg weight
- The Rotemberg weight means how important this single industry is
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is large, misspecification on this industry is dangerous
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is small, misspecification on this industry could be fine
- In practice, report industries with the highest weights

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

- We construct a single instrument for each industry  $B_k = z_{lk}g_k$
- $\hat{\beta}_k$  is IV estimator for each instrument  $k$
- $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is called Rotemberg weight
- The Rotemberg weight means how important this single industry is
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is large, misspecification on this industry is dangerous
- If  $\hat{\alpha}_k$  is small, misspecification on this industry could be fine
- In practice, **report industries with the highest weights**

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

## Tips

- This decomposition is different from the main GMM interpretation
- Bartik IV and GMM equivalence is discussed in a *joint estimation* context
- Bartik IV is equivalent to a joint GMM with shares as IVs (in one regression)
- Bartik IV decomposition means Bartik IV can be decomposed to a combination of  *$K$  separately estimated IV estimators*
- We run these IV regs one by one (for each industry share), then take weighted average of each regression coefficient  $\hat{\beta}_k$

## Tips

- This decomposition is different from the main GMM interpretation
- Bartik IV and GMM equivalence is discussed in a *joint estimation* context
- Bartik IV is equivalent to a joint GMM with shares as IVs (in one regression)
- Bartik IV decomposition means Bartik IV can be decomposed to a combination of  *$K$  separately estimated IV estimators*
- We run these IV regs one by one (for each industry share), then take weighted average of each regression coefficient  $\hat{\beta}_k$



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

## Tips

- This decomposition is different from the main GMM interpretation
- Bartik IV and GMM equivalence is discussed in a **joint estimation** context
- Bartik IV is equivalent to a joint GMM with shares as IVs (in one regression)
- Bartik IV decomposition means Bartik IV can be decomposed to a combination of  **$K$  separately estimated IV estimators**
- We run these IV regs one by one (for each industry share), then take weighted average of each regression coefficient  $\hat{\beta}_k$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

## Tips

- This decomposition is different from the main GMM interpretation
- Bartik IV and GMM equivalence is discussed in a **joint estimation** context
- Bartik IV is equivalent to a joint GMM with shares as IVs (in one regression)
- Bartik IV decomposition means Bartik IV can be decomposed to a combination of  **$K$  separately estimated IV estimators**
- We run these IV regs one by one (for each industry share), then take weighted average of each regression coefficient  $\hat{\beta}_k$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

## Tips

- This decomposition is different from the main GMM interpretation
- Bartik IV and GMM equivalence is discussed in a **joint estimation** context
- Bartik IV is equivalent to a joint GMM with shares as IVs (in one regression)
- Bartik IV decomposition means Bartik IV can be decomposed to a combination of  **$K$  separately estimated IV estimators**
- We run these IV regs one by one (for each industry share), then take weighted average of each regression coefficient  $\hat{\beta}_k$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

## Tips

- This decomposition is different from the main GMM interpretation
- Bartik IV and GMM equivalence is discussed in a **joint estimation** context
- Bartik IV is equivalent to a joint GMM with shares as IVs (in one regression)
- Bartik IV decomposition means Bartik IV can be decomposed to a combination of  **$K$  separately estimated IV estimators**
- We run these IV regs one by one (for each industry share), then take weighted average of each regression coefficient  $\hat{\beta}_k$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Decompose Bartik IV

## Tips

- This decomposition is different from the main GMM interpretation
- Bartik IV and GMM equivalence is discussed in a **joint estimation** context
- Bartik IV is equivalent to a joint GMM with shares as IVs (in one regression)
- Bartik IV decomposition means Bartik IV can be decomposed to a combination of  **$K$  separately estimated IV estimators**
- We run these IV regs one by one (for each industry share), then take weighted average of each regression coefficient  $\hat{\beta}_k$

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- In a restricted heterogeneous effect case: Bartik IV is a combination of location level treatment effect
- Weights can be negative: lead the estimator to be uninterpretable
- For single industry share IV:
  - We need an assumption similar to monotonicity in Imbens and Angrist (1994)
- For combined Bartik IV:
  - Monotonicity for each single instrument is not enough
- In general, Bartik IV does not have a LATE interpretation

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- In a restricted heterogeneous effect case: Bartik IV is a combination of location level treatment effect
- Weights can be negative: lead the estimator to be uninterpretable
- For single industry share IV:  
We need an assumption similar to monotonicity in Imbens and Angrist (1994)
- For combined Bartik IV:  
Monotonicity for each single instrument is not enough
- In general, Bartik IV does not have a LATE interpretation

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- In a restricted heterogeneous effect case: Bartik IV is a combination of location level treatment effect
- Weights can be negative: lead the estimator to be uninterpretable
- For single industry share IV:  
We need an assumption similar to monotonicity in Imbens and Angrist (1994)
- For combined Bartik IV:  
Monotonicity for each single instrument is not enough
- In general, Bartik IV does not have a LATE interpretation



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- In a restricted heterogeneous effect case: Bartik IV is a combination of location level treatment effect
- Weights can be negative: lead the estimator to be uninterpretable
- For single industry share IV:  
We need an assumption similar to monotonicity in Imbens and Angrist (1994)
- For combined Bartik IV:  
Monotonicity for each single instrument is not enough
- In general, Bartik IV does not have a LATE interpretation

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- In a restricted heterogeneous effect case: Bartik IV is a combination of location level treatment effect
- Weights can be negative: lead the estimator to be uninterpretable
- For single industry share IV:  
We need an assumption similar to monotonicity in Imbens and Angrist (1994)
- For combined Bartik IV:  
Monotonicity for each single instrument is not enough
- In general, Bartik IV does not have a LATE interpretation

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- In a restricted heterogeneous effect case: Bartik IV is a combination of location level treatment effect
- Weights can be negative: lead the estimator to be uninterpretable
- For single industry share IV:  
We need an assumption similar to monotonicity in Imbens and Angrist (1994)
- For combined Bartik IV:  
Monotonicity for each single instrument is not enough
- In general, Bartik IV does not have a LATE interpretation

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- You will find similar things in the forthcoming lectures when we discuss complicated DID designs
- When treatment effect patterns become more and more complicated
- For instance dynamic, heterogeneous...
- You can hardly identify meaningful causal parameters using simple regressions
- Is this just coincidence?
- No. This is an intrinsically problem. Think about why

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- You will find similar things in the forthcoming lectures when we discuss complicated DID designs
- When treatment effect patterns become more and more complicated
- For instance dynamic, heterogeneous...
- You can hardly identify meaningful causal parameters using simple regressions
- Is this just coincidence?
- No. This is an intrinsically problem. Think about why

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- You will find similar things in the forthcoming lectures when we discuss complicated DID designs
- When treatment effect patterns become more and more complicated
  - For instance dynamic, heterogeneous...
  - You can hardly identify meaningful causal parameters using simple regressions
  - Is this just coincidence?
  - No. This is an intrinsically problem. Think about why

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- You will find similar things in the forthcoming lectures when we discuss complicated DID designs
- When treatment effect patterns become more and more complicated
- For instance dynamic, heterogeneous...
- You can hardly identify meaningful causal parameters using simple regressions
- Is this just coincidence?
- No. This is an intrinsically problem. Think about why

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- You will find similar things in the forthcoming lectures when we discuss complicated DID designs
- When treatment effect patterns become more and more complicated
- For instance dynamic, heterogeneous...
- You can hardly identify meaningful causal parameters using simple regressions
- Is this just coincidence?
- No. This is an intrinsically problem. Think about why



## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- You will find similar things in the forthcoming lectures when we discuss complicated DID designs
- When treatment effect patterns become more and more complicated
- For instance dynamic, heterogeneous...
- You can hardly identify meaningful causal parameters using simple regressions
- Is this just coincidence?
- No. This is an intrinsically problem. Think about why

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Heterogeneous TE

- You will find similar things in the forthcoming lectures when we discuss complicated DID designs
- When treatment effect patterns become more and more complicated
- For instance dynamic, heterogeneous...
- You can hardly identify meaningful causal parameters using simple regressions
- Is this just coincidence?
- No. This is an intrinsically problem. Think about why

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Now we have introduced an econometrics analysis of the Bartik IV
- What should we do in our empirical research if we want to interpret Bartik IV in the framework of Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)?
- First, remember, always add in location and time FE
- Second, focus on industries with high Rotemberg weights

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Now we have introduced an econometrics analysis of the Bartik IV
- What should we do in our empirical research if we want to interpret Bartik IV in the framework of Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)?
- First, remember, always add in location and time FE
- Second, focus on industries with high Rotemberg weights

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Now we have introduced an econometrics analysis of the Bartik IV
- What should we do in our empirical research if we want to interpret Bartik IV in the framework of Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)?
  - First, remember, always add in location and time FE
  - Second, focus on industries with high Rotemberg weights

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Now we have introduced an econometrics analysis of the Bartik IV
- What should we do in our empirical research if we want to interpret Bartik IV in the framework of Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)?
- **First, remember, always add in location and time FE**
- **Second, focus on industries with high Rotemberg weights**

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Now we have introduced an econometrics analysis of the Bartik IV
- What should we do in our empirical research if we want to interpret Bartik IV in the framework of Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)?
- First, remember, always add in location and time FE
- Second, focus on industries with high Rotemberg weights

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

Some tests you can implement

- Test 1: Correlations of controls and industry compositions
- Assume that there are some covariates predicting changes in  $y$  not through  $x$
- Test whether these location covariates are correlated with the industry shares
- Since industry shares need to affect  $y$  only through changes in  $x$
- This is a balance test
- Example:  $y$  is employment;  $x$  is wage;  $z$  is manufacturing share; covariate  $d$  is immigrant share
- A suggestion from GSS: control for higher level shares



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

## Some tests you can implement

- Test 1: Correlations of controls and industry compositions
- Assume that there are some covariates predicting changes in  $y$  not through  $x$
- Test whether these location covariates are correlated with the industry shares
- Since industry shares need to affect  $y$  only through changes in  $x$
- This is a balance test
- Example:  $y$  is employment;  $x$  is wage;  $z$  is manufacturing share; covariate  $d$  is immigrant share
- A suggestion from GSS: control for higher level shares

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

## Some tests you can implement

- Test 1: Correlations of controls and industry compositions
  - Assume that there are some covariates predicting **changes** in  $y$  not through  $x$
  - Test whether these location covariates are correlated with the industry shares
  - Since industry shares need to affect  $y$  only through changes in  $x$
  - This is a balance test
  - Example:  $y$  is employment;  $x$  is wage;  $z$  is manufacturing share; covariate  $d$  is immigrant share
  - A suggestion from GSS: control for higher level shares

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

Some tests you can implement

- Test 1: Correlations of controls and industry compositions
- Assume that there are some covariates predicting **changes** in  $y$  not through  $x$
- Test whether these location covariates are correlated with the industry shares
- Since industry shares need to affect  $y$  only through changes in  $x$
- This is a balance test
- Example:  $y$  is employment;  $x$  is wage;  $z$  is manufacturing share; covariate  $d$  is immigrant share
- A suggestion from GSS: control for higher level shares

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

Some tests you can implement

- Test 1: Correlations of controls and industry compositions
- Assume that there are some covariates predicting **changes** in  $y$  not through  $x$
- Test whether these location covariates are correlated with the industry shares
- Since industry shares need to affect  $y$  only through changes in  $x$
- This is a balance test
- Example:  $y$  is employment;  $x$  is wage;  $z$  is manufacturing share; covariate  $d$  is immigrant share
- A suggestion from GSS: control for higher level shares

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

Some tests you can implement

- Test 1: Correlations of controls and industry compositions
- Assume that there are some covariates predicting **changes** in  $y$  not through  $x$
- Test whether these location covariates are correlated with the industry shares
- Since industry shares need to affect  $y$  only through changes in  $x$
- This is a balance test
- Example:  $y$  is employment;  $x$  is wage;  $z$  is manufacturing share; covariate  $d$  is immigrant share
- A suggestion from GSS: control for higher level shares

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

Some tests you can implement

- Test 1: Correlations of controls and industry compositions
- Assume that there are some covariates predicting **changes** in  $y$  not through  $x$
- Test whether these location covariates are correlated with the industry shares
- Since industry shares need to affect  $y$  only through changes in  $x$
- This is a balance test
- Example:  $y$  is employment;  $x$  is wage;  $z$  is manufacturing share; covariate  $d$  is immigrant share
- A suggestion from GSS: control for higher level shares

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

Some tests you can implement

- Test 1: Correlations of controls and industry compositions
- Assume that there are some covariates predicting **changes** in  $y$  not through  $x$
- Test whether these location covariates are correlated with the industry shares
- Since industry shares need to affect  $y$  only through changes in  $x$
- This is a balance test
- Example:  $y$  is employment;  $x$  is wage;  $z$  is manufacturing share; covariate  $d$  is immigrant share
- A suggestion from GSS: control for higher level shares

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

Some tests you can implement

- Test 1: Correlations of controls and industry compositions
- Assume that there are some covariates predicting **changes** in  $y$  not through  $x$
- Test whether these location covariates are correlated with the industry shares
- Since industry shares need to affect  $y$  only through changes in  $x$
- This is a balance test
- Example:  $y$  is employment;  $x$  is wage;  $z$  is manufacturing share; covariate  $d$  is immigrant share
- A suggestion from GSS: control for higher level shares



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 2: Test for pre-trends if you have pre-shock period
- In specification with pre-period, you are doing DID
- Initial shares are local policy exposure; Growth rates are policy size
- Check pre-trends for both overall Bartik IV and single industry IV with high weight
- Whether locations with high shares of a main industry is different to locations with low shares in trends

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 2: Test for pre-trends if you have pre-shock period
- In specification with pre-period, you are doing DID
- Initial shares are local policy exposure; Growth rates are policy size
- Check pre-trends for both overall Bartik IV and single industry IV with high weight
- Whether locations with high shares of a main industry is different to locations with low shares in trends

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 2: Test for pre-trends if you have pre-shock period
- In specification with pre-period, you are doing DID
- Initial shares are local policy exposure; Growth rates are policy size
- Check pre-trends for both overall Bartik IV and single industry IV with high weight
- Whether locations with high shares of a main industry is different to locations with low shares in trends

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 2: Test for pre-trends if you have pre-shock period
- In specification with pre-period, you are doing DID
- Initial shares are local policy exposure; Growth rates are policy size
- Check pre-trends for both overall Bartik IV and single industry IV with high weight
- Whether locations with high shares of a main industry is different to locations with low shares in trends

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 2: Test for pre-trends if you have pre-shock period
- In specification with pre-period, you are doing DID
- Initial shares are local policy exposure; Growth rates are policy size
- Check pre-trends for both overall Bartik IV and single industry IV with high weight
- Whether locations with high shares of a main industry is different to locations with low shares in trends

## Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 2: Test for pre-trends if you have pre-shock period
- In specification with pre-period, you are doing DID
- Initial shares are local policy exposure; Growth rates are policy size
- Check pre-trends for both overall Bartik IV and single industry IV with high weight
- Whether locations with high shares of a main industry is different to locations with low shares in trends

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 3: Overidentification Tests
- The main equivalence result tells us Bartik IV is an overidentified GMM
- Let's run overidentification test to check the validity of the bundle of share instruments
- If it is rejected, there are two possibilities
- Either your instruments are not exogenous (misspecification)
- Or there is heterogeneous treatment effect etc...
- This is not so recommended

## ■ Test 3: Overidentification Tests

- The main equivalence result tells us Bartik IV is an overidentified GMM
- Let's run overidentification test to check the validity of the bundle of share instruments
- If it is rejected, there are two possibilities
- Either your instruments are not exogenous (misspecification)
- Or there is heterogeneous treatment effect etc...
- This is not so recommended



# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 3: Overidentification Tests
- The main equivalence result tells us Bartik IV is an overidentified GMM
- Let's run overidentification test to check the validity of the bundle of share instruments
- If it is rejected, there are two possibilities
- Either your instruments are not exogenous (misspecification)
- Or there is heterogeneous treatment effect etc...
- This is not so recommended

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 3: Overidentification Tests
- The main equivalence result tells us Bartik IV is an overidentified GMM
- Let's run overidentification test to check the validity of the bundle of share instruments
  - If it is rejected, there are two possibilities
  - Either your instruments are not exogenous (misspecification)
  - Or there is heterogeneous treatment effect etc...
  - This is not so recommended

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 3: Overidentification Tests
- The main equivalence result tells us Bartik IV is an overidentified GMM
- Let's run overidentification test to check the validity of the bundle of share instruments
- If it is rejected, there are two possibilities
  - Either your instruments are not exogenous (misspecification)
  - Or there is heterogeneous treatment effect etc...
  - This is not so recommended

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 3: Overidentification Tests
- The main equivalence result tells us Bartik IV is an overidentified GMM
- Let's run overidentification test to check the validity of the bundle of share instruments
- If it is rejected, there are two possibilities
- Either your instruments are not exogenous (misspecification)
- Or there is heterogeneous treatment effect etc...
- This is not so recommended

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 3: Overidentification Tests
- The main equivalence result tells us Bartik IV is an overidentified GMM
- Let's run overidentification test to check the validity of the bundle of share instruments
- If it is rejected, there are two possibilities
- Either your instruments are not exogenous (misspecification)
- Or there is heterogeneous treatment effect etc...
- This is not so recommended

# Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020): Empirical Suggestions

- Test 3: Overidentification Tests
- The main equivalence result tells us Bartik IV is an overidentified GMM
- Let's run overidentification test to check the validity of the bundle of share instruments
- If it is rejected, there are two possibilities
- Either your instruments are not exogenous (misspecification)
- Or there is heterogeneous treatment effect etc...
- This is not so recommended

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shift as IV

- We have already investigated Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
- They interpret the share part as IV and the shift part as weight
- Another framework is proposed by Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- In contrast, they interpret the shift part as IV and the share part as weight
- The identification assumption then becomes the "random assignment of shocks"

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shift as IV

- We have already investigated Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - They interpret the share part as IV and the shift part as weight
  - Another framework is proposed by Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - In contrast, they interpret the shift part as IV and the share part as weight
  - The identification assumption then becomes the "random assignment of shocks"



## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shift as IV

- We have already investigated Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
- They interpret the share part as IV and the shift part as weight
- Another framework is proposed by Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- In contrast, they interpret the shift part as IV and the share part as weight
- The identification assumption then becomes the "random assignment of shocks"

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shift as IV

- We have already investigated Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
- They interpret the share part as IV and the shift part as weight
- Another framework is proposed by Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- In contrast, they interpret the shift part as IV and the share part as weight
- The identification assumption then becomes the "random assignment of shocks"

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shift as IV

- We have already investigated Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
- They interpret the share part as IV and the shift part as weight
- Another framework is proposed by Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- In contrast, they interpret the shift part as IV and the share part as weight
- The identification assumption then becomes the "random assignment of shocks"

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shift as IV

- We have already investigated Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
- They interpret the share part as IV and the shift part as weight
- Another framework is proposed by Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- In contrast, they interpret the shift part as IV and the share part as weight
- The identification assumption then becomes the "random assignment of shocks"

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Settings

- Assume that we have the following shift-share IV:

$$z_l = \sum_k s_{lk} g_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K$$

- $s_{lk}$  is the share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- $g_k$  is the national shift for industry  $k$
- We seek to estimate parameter  $\beta$  in the following regression:

$$y_l = \beta x_l + w_l' \gamma + \epsilon_l$$

- $w$  is the set of controls
- A valid instrument satisfies moment condition:  $E[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l] = 0$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Settings

- Assume that we have the following shift-share IV:

$$z_l = \sum_k s_{lk} g_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K$$

- $s_{lk}$  is the share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- $g_k$  is the national shift for industry  $k$
- We seek to estimate parameter  $\beta$  in the following regression:

$$y_l = \beta x_l + w_l' \gamma + \epsilon_l$$

- $w$  is the set of controls
- A valid instrument satisfies moment condition:  $E[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l] = 0$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Settings

- Assume that we have the following shift-share IV:

$$z_l = \sum_k s_{lk} g_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K$$

- $s_{lk}$  is the share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- $g_k$  is the national shift for industry  $k$
- We seek to estimate parameter  $\beta$  in the following regression:

$$y_l = \beta x_l + w_l' \gamma + \epsilon_l$$

- $w$  is the set of controls
- A valid instrument satisfies moment condition:  $E[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l] = 0$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Settings

- Assume that we have the following shift-share IV:

$$z_l = \sum_k s_{lk} g_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K$$

- $s_{lk}$  is the share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- $g_k$  is the national shift for industry  $k$
- We seek to estimate parameter  $\beta$  in the following regression:

$$y_l = \beta x_l + w_l' \gamma + \epsilon_l$$

- $w$  is the set of controls
- A valid instrument satisfies moment condition:  $E[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l] = 0$



# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Settings

- Assume that we have the following shift-share IV:

$$z_l = \sum_k s_{lk} g_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K$$

- $s_{lk}$  is the share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- $g_k$  is the national shift for industry  $k$
- We seek to estimate parameter  $\beta$  in the following regression:

$$y_l = \beta x_l + w_l' \gamma + \epsilon_l$$

- $w$  is the set of controls
- A valid instrument satisfies moment condition:  $E[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l] = 0$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Settings

- Assume that we have the following shift-share IV:

$$z_l = \sum_k s_{lk} g_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K$$

- $s_{lk}$  is the share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- $g_k$  is the national shift for industry  $k$
- We seek to estimate parameter  $\beta$  in the following regression:

$$y_l = \beta x_l + w_l' \gamma + \epsilon_l$$

- $w$  is the set of controls
- A valid instrument satisfies moment condition:  $E[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l] = 0$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Settings

- Assume that we have the following shift-share IV:

$$z_l = \sum_k s_{lk} g_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, K$$

- $s_{lk}$  is the share of industry  $k$  in location  $l$
- $g_k$  is the national shift for industry  $k$
- We seek to estimate parameter  $\beta$  in the following regression:

$$y_l = \beta x_l + w_l' \gamma + \epsilon_l$$

- $w$  is the set of controls
- A valid instrument satisfies moment condition:  $E[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l] = 0$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Now we derive the equivalence between the original regression and a shock-level regression
- Plug the definition of SSIV into the moment condition:

$$E\left[\sum_I z_I \epsilon_I\right] = E\left[\sum_I \sum_k s_{Ik} g_k \epsilon_I\right]$$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Now we derive the equivalence between the original regression and a shock-level regression
- Plug the definition of SSIV into the moment condition:

$$E\left[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l\right] = E\left[\sum_l \sum_k s_{lk} g_k \epsilon_l\right]$$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Now we derive the equivalence between the original regression and a shock-level regression
- Plug the definition of SSIV into the moment condition:

$$E\left[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l\right] = E\left[\sum_l \sum_k s_{lk} g_k \epsilon_l\right]$$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We exchange the order of the summation and have:

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l\right] &= E\left[\sum_k \sum_l s_{lk} g_k \epsilon_l\right] = E\left[\sum_k g_k \sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l\right] \\ &= E\left[\sum_k g_k \left(\frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l \cdot \sum_l s_{lk}}{\sum_l s_{lk}}\right)\right] = E\left[\sum_k s_k g_k \bar{\epsilon}_k\right] \end{aligned}$$

- $s_k = \sum_l s_{lk}$  is the sum of shares of industry  $k$  for all locations
- $s_k = 1$  in many common examples
- $\bar{\epsilon}_k = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$  is a weighted average of unobserved terms
- It transforms the original  $\epsilon$  from location-level  $l$  to industry-level  $k$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We exchange the order of the summation and have:

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l\right] &= E\left[\sum_k \sum_l s_{lk} g_k \epsilon_l\right] = E\left[\sum_k g_k \sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l\right] \\ &= E\left[\sum_k g_k \left(\frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l \cdot \sum_l s_{lk}}{\sum_l s_{lk}}\right)\right] = E\left[\sum_k s_k g_k \bar{\epsilon}_k\right] \end{aligned}$$

- $s_k = \sum_l s_{lk}$  is the sum of shares of industry  $k$  for all locations
- $s_k = 1$  in many common examples
- $\bar{\epsilon}_k = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$  is a weighted average of unobserved terms
- It transforms the original  $\epsilon$  from location-level  $l$  to industry-level  $k$



# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We exchange the order of the summation and have:

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l\right] &= E\left[\sum_k \sum_l s_{lk} g_k \epsilon_l\right] = E\left[\sum_k g_k \sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l\right] \\ &= E\left[\sum_k g_k \left(\frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l \cdot \sum_l s_{lk}}{\sum_l s_{lk}}\right)\right] = E\left[\sum_k s_k g_k \bar{\epsilon}_k\right] \end{aligned}$$

- $s_k = \sum_l s_{lk}$  is the sum of shares of industry  $k$  for all locations
- $s_k = 1$  in many common examples
- $\bar{\epsilon}_k = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$  is a weighted average of unobserved terms
- It transforms the original  $\epsilon$  from location-level  $l$  to industry-level  $k$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We exchange the order of the summation and have:

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l\right] &= E\left[\sum_k \sum_l s_{lk} g_k \epsilon_l\right] = E\left[\sum_k g_k \sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l\right] \\ &= E\left[\sum_k g_k \left(\frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l \cdot \sum_l s_{lk}}{\sum_l s_{lk}}\right)\right] = E\left[\sum_k s_k g_k \bar{\epsilon}_k\right] \end{aligned}$$

- $s_k = \sum_l s_{lk}$  is the sum of shares of industry  $k$  for all locations
- $s_k = 1$  in many common examples
- $\bar{\epsilon}_k = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$  is a weighted average of unobserved terms
- It transforms the original  $\epsilon$  from location-level  $l$  to industry-level  $k$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We exchange the order of the summation and have:

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l\right] &= E\left[\sum_k \sum_l s_{lk} g_k \epsilon_l\right] = E\left[\sum_k g_k \sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l\right] \\ &= E\left[\sum_k g_k \left(\frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l \cdot \sum_l s_{lk}}{\sum_l s_{lk}}\right)\right] = E\left[\sum_k s_k g_k \bar{\epsilon}_k\right] \end{aligned}$$

- $s_k = \sum_l s_{lk}$  is the sum of shares of industry  $k$  for all locations
- $s_k = 1$  in many common examples
- $\bar{\epsilon}_k = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$  is a weighted average of unobserved terms
- It transforms the original  $\epsilon$  from location-level  $l$  to industry-level  $k$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We exchange the order of the summation and have:

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\sum_l z_l \epsilon_l\right] &= E\left[\sum_k \sum_l s_{lk} g_k \epsilon_l\right] = E\left[\sum_k g_k \sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l\right] \\ &= E\left[\sum_k g_k \left(\frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l \cdot \sum_l s_{lk}}{\sum_l s_{lk}}\right)\right] = E\left[\sum_k s_k g_k \bar{\epsilon}_k\right] \end{aligned}$$

- $s_k = \sum_l s_{lk}$  is the sum of shares of industry  $k$  for all locations
- $s_k = 1$  in many common examples
- $\bar{\epsilon}_k = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} \epsilon_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$  is a weighted average of unobserved terms
- It transforms the original  $\epsilon$  from location-level  $l$  to industry-level  $k$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Therefore, it transforms the identification assumption from  $l$  level to  $k$  level
- Now assume that we want to identify the effect of U.S. tariff on employment in China
- What is the research design here?
- Can you interpret the identification assumption at  $k$  level?

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Therefore, it transforms the identification assumption from  $l$  level to  $k$  level
- Now assume that we want to identify the effect of U.S. tariff on employment in China
- What is the research design here?
- Can you interpret the identification assumption at  $k$  level?

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Therefore, it transforms the identification assumption from  $l$  level to  $k$  level
- Now assume that we want to identify the effect of U.S. tariff on employment in China
- What is the research design here?
- Can you interpret the identification assumption at  $k$  level?

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Therefore, it transforms the identification assumption from  $l$  level to  $k$  level
- Now assume that we want to identify the effect of U.S. tariff on employment in China
- What is the research design here?
- Can you interpret the identification assumption at  $k$  level?



# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Therefore, it transforms the identification assumption from  $l$  level to  $k$  level
- Now assume that we want to identify the effect of U.S. tariff on employment in China
- What is the research design here?
- Can you interpret the identification assumption at  $k$  level?

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- The industry demand shocks  $g_k$  must be orthogonal with the industry-level unobservables  $\bar{\epsilon}_k$ , the average local supply shocks in different regions weighted by industry size
- Industries experiencing a rise in tariff should not face systematically different labor supply shocks in their primary markets
- Assume a U.S. tariff hits steel industry in China, which hits Hebei hard
- We should expect no labor supply shocks in Hebei, such as a change of enrollment quota in Gaokao at the same time

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- The industry demand shocks  $g_k$  must be orthogonal with the industry-level unobservables  $\bar{\epsilon}_k$ , the average local supply shocks in different regions weighted by industry size
- Industries experiencing a rise in tariff should not face systematically different labor supply shocks in their primary markets
- Assume a U.S. tariff hits steel industry in China, which hits Hebei hard
- We should expect no labor supply shocks in Hebei, such as a change of enrollment quota in Gaokao at the same time

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- The industry demand shocks  $g_k$  must be orthogonal with the industry-level unobservables  $\bar{\epsilon}_k$ , the average local supply shocks in different regions weighted by industry size
- Industries experiencing a rise in tariff should not face systematically different labor supply shocks in their primary markets
- Assume a U.S. tariff hits steel industry in China, which hits Hebei hard
- We should expect no labor supply shocks in Hebei, such as a change of enrollment quota in Gaokao at the same time

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- The industry demand shocks  $g_k$  must be orthogonal with the industry-level unobservables  $\bar{\epsilon}_k$ , the average local supply shocks in different regions weighted by industry size
- Industries experiencing a rise in tariff should not face systematically different labor supply shocks in their primary markets
- Assume a U.S. tariff hits steel industry in China, which hits Hebei hard
- We should expect no labor supply shocks in Hebei, such as a change of enrollment quota in Gaokao at the same time

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- The industry demand shocks  $g_k$  must be orthogonal with the industry-level unobservables  $\bar{\epsilon}_k$ , the average local supply shocks in different regions weighted by industry size
- Industries experiencing a rise in tariff should not face systematically different labor supply shocks in their primary markets
- Assume a U.S. tariff hits steel industry in China, which hits Hebei hard
- We should expect no labor supply shocks in Hebei, such as a change of enrollment quota in Gaokao at the same time

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Now we have the following proposition

The 5SIV estimator  $\hat{\beta}$  equals the second-stage coefficient from a  $\pi$ -weighted shock-level IV regression that uses the shocks  $\pi_{it}$  as the instrument in estimating

$$R_{it} = \beta + \eta_{it} + \epsilon_{it}$$

where  $\pi$ -weighting denotes an export-weighted average of a variable  $x$

- This proposition 1 establishes the equivalence between the original and the shock-level regressions

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Now we have the following proposition

Proposition 1 in BHJ(2022)

The SSIV estimator  $\hat{\beta}$  equals the second-stage coefficient from a  $s_k$ -weighted shock-level IV regression that uses the shocks  $g_k$  as the instrument in estimating

$$\bar{y}_k = \alpha + \beta \bar{x}_k + \bar{\epsilon}_k$$

where  $\bar{v} = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} v_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$  denotes an exposure-weighted average of a variable  $v_l$

- This proposition 1 establishes the equivalence between the original and the shock-level regressions



# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Now we have the following proposition

## Proposition 1 in BHJ(2022)

The SSIV estimator  $\hat{\beta}$  equals the second-stage coefficient from a  $s_k$ -weighted shock-level IV regression that uses the shocks  $g_k$  as the instrument in estimating

$$\bar{y}_k = \alpha + \beta \bar{x}_k + \bar{\epsilon}_k$$

where  $\bar{v} = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} v_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$  denotes an exposure-weighted average of a variable  $v_l$

- This proposition 1 establishes the equivalence between the original and the shock-level regressions

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- Now we have the following proposition

## Proposition 1 in BHJ(2022)

The SSIV estimator  $\hat{\beta}$  equals the second-stage coefficient from a  $s_k$ -weighted shock-level IV regression that uses the shocks  $g_k$  as the instrument in estimating

$$\bar{y}_k = \alpha + \beta \bar{x}_k + \bar{\epsilon}_k$$

where  $\bar{v} = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} v_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$  denotes an exposure-weighted average of a variable  $v_l$

- This proposition 1 establishes the equivalence between the original and the shock-level regressions

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We establish the consistency of this estimator under two assumptions:
  - Assumption 1:  $E[\epsilon_{it}|x_{it}] = 0$ , quasi-random shock assignment
  - Assumption 2:  $E[\epsilon_{it}|x_{it}] = 0$ ,  $\text{Cov}(\epsilon_{it}, \epsilon_{jt}|x_{it}, x_{jt}) = 0$ , many uncorrelated shocks  
Industries should not be too concentrated

Suppose Assumptions 1-2 and some other regularity conditions hold, we have:  $\hat{\beta}_T \rightarrow \beta$

- Identification is valid when shocks are random

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We establish the consistency of this estimator under two assumptions:
  - Assumption 1:  $E[g_k | \bar{\epsilon}, s] = \mu$ , quasi-random shock assignment
  - Assumption 2:  $E[\sum_k s_k^2] \rightarrow 0$ ,  $Cov[g_k, g_{k'} | \bar{\epsilon}, s] = 0$ , many uncorrelated shocks industries should not be too concentrated

Proposition 3 in BHJ(2022)

Suppose Assumptions 1-2 and some other regularity conditions hold, we have:  $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{P} \beta$

- Identification is valid when shocks are random

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We establish the consistency of this estimator under two assumptions:
  - Assumption 1:  $E[g_k | \bar{\epsilon}, s] = \mu$ , quasi-random shock assignment
  - Assumption 2:  $E[\sum_k s_k^2] \rightarrow 0$ ,  $Cov[g_k, g_{k'} | \bar{\epsilon}, s] = 0$ , many uncorrelated shocks industries should not be too concentrated

Proposition 3 in BHJ(2022)

Suppose Assumptions 1-2 and some other regularity conditions hold, we have:  $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{P} \beta$

- Identification is valid when shocks are random

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We establish the consistency of this estimator under two assumptions:
  - Assumption 1:  $E[g_k | \bar{\epsilon}, s] = \mu$ , quasi-random shock assignment
  - Assumption 2:  $E[\sum_k s_k^2] \rightarrow 0$ ,  $Cov[g_k, g_{k'} | \bar{\epsilon}, s] = 0$ , many uncorrelated shocks industries should not be too concentrated

Proposition 3 in BHJ(2022)

Suppose Assumptions 1-2 and some other regularity conditions hold, we have:  $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{P} \beta$

- Identification is valid when shocks are random

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We establish the consistency of this estimator under two assumptions:
  - Assumption 1:  $E[g_k | \bar{\epsilon}, s] = \mu$ , quasi-random shock assignment
  - Assumption 2:  $E[\sum_k s_k^2] \rightarrow 0$ ,  $Cov[g_k, g_{k'} | \bar{\epsilon}, s] = 0$ , many uncorrelated shocks industries should not be too concentrated

## Proposition 3 in BHJ(2022)

Suppose Assumptions 1-2 and some other regularity conditions hold, we have:  $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{P} \beta$

- Identification is valid when shocks are random

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Shock-level Equivalence

- We establish the consistency of this estimator under two assumptions:
  - Assumption 1:  $E[g_k | \bar{\epsilon}, s] = \mu$ , quasi-random shock assignment
  - Assumption 2:  $E[\sum_k s_k^2] \rightarrow 0$ ,  $Cov[g_k, g_{k'} | \bar{\epsilon}, s] = 0$ , many uncorrelated shocks industries should not be too concentrated

## Proposition 3 in BHJ(2022)

Suppose Assumptions 1-2 and some other regularity conditions hold, we have:  $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{P} \beta$

- Identification is valid when shocks are random



# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The first empirical suggestion is about the inference of the std err
- Adao, Kolesár, and Morales (2019) show that the traditional inference is incorrect since samples in the SSIV setting are intrinsically not i.i.d.
- Because there is common shock components  $g_k$  and  $\nu_k$  in  $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$
- $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$  are mechanically correlated across observations
- The correlations are large for locations with similar industry shares

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The first empirical suggestion is about the inference of the std err
- Adao, Kolesár, and Morales (2019) show that the traditional inference is incorrect since samples in the SSIV setting are intrinsically not i.i.d.
- Because there is common shock components  $g_k$  and  $\nu_k$  in  $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$
- $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$  are mechanically correlated across observations
- The correlations are large for locations with similar industry shares

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The first empirical suggestion is about the inference of the std err
- Adao, Kolesár, and Morales (2019) show that the traditional inference is incorrect since samples in the SSIV setting are intrinsically not i.i.d.
- Because there is common shock components  $g_k$  and  $\nu_k$  in  $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$
- $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$  are mechanically correlated across observations
- The correlations are large for locations with similar industry shares

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The first empirical suggestion is about the inference of the std err
- Adao, Kolesár, and Morales (2019) show that the traditional inference is incorrect since samples in the SSIV setting are intrinsically not i.i.d.
- Because there is common shock components  $g_k$  and  $\nu_k$  in  $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$
- $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$  are mechanically correlated across observations
- The correlations are large for locations with similar industry shares

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The first empirical suggestion is about the inference of the std err
- Adao, Kolesár, and Morales (2019) show that the traditional inference is incorrect since samples in the SSIV setting are intrinsically not i.i.d.
- Because there is common shock components  $g_k$  and  $\nu_k$  in  $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$
- $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$  are mechanically correlated across observations
- The correlations are large for locations with similar industry shares

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The first empirical suggestion is about the inference of the std err
- Adao, Kolesár, and Morales (2019) show that the traditional inference is incorrect since samples in the SSIV setting are intrinsically not i.i.d.
- Because there is common shock components  $g_k$  and  $\nu_k$  in  $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$
- $\epsilon_l$  and  $z_l$  are mechanically correlated across observations
- The correlations are large for locations with similar industry shares

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) show that the shock-level regression does not suffer from this
- You can directly use the traditional std err and CI estimated here
- A stata package can help you run this shock-level regression: *ssaggregate*

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) show that the shock-level regression does not suffer from this
- You can directly use the traditional std err and CI estimated here
- A stata package can help you run this shock-level regression: *ssaggregate*



# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) show that the shock-level regression does not suffer from this
- You can directly use the traditional std err and CI estimated here
- A stata package can help you run this shock-level regression: *ssaggregate*

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) show that the shock-level regression does not suffer from this
- You can directly use the traditional std err and CI estimated here
- A stata package can help you run this shock-level regression: *ssaggregate*

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The second empirical suggestion is about the descriptive test for IV validity
- A simple balance test is to regress some pre-determined control  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$
- $r_l$  can be location level GDP, population etc...
- This can be combined with the Oster bound method
- Another balance test is to start from a shock-level confounder  $r_k$
- Then construct observation-level average  $r_l = \sum_k s_{lk} r_k$
- Then run this average  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The second empirical suggestion is about the descriptive test for IV validity
- A simple balance test is to regress some pre-determined control  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$
- $r_l$  can be location level GDP, population etc...
- This can be combined with the Oster bound method
- Another balance test is to start from a shock-level confounder  $r_k$
- Then construct observation-level average  $r_l = \sum_k s_{lk} r_k$
- Then run this average  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The second empirical suggestion is about the descriptive test for IV validity
- A simple balance test is to regress some pre-determined control  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$ 
  - $r_l$  can be location level GDP, population etc...
  - This can be combined with the Oster bound method
  - Another balance test is to start from a shock-level confounder  $r_k$
  - Then construct observation-level average  $r_l = \sum_k s_{lk} r_k$
  - Then run this average  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The second empirical suggestion is about the descriptive test for IV validity
- A simple balance test is to regress some pre-determined control  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$
- $r_l$  can be location level GDP, population etc...
- This can be combined with the Oster bound method
- Another balance test is to start from a shock-level confounder  $r_k$
- Then construct observation-level average  $r_l = \sum_k s_{lk} r_k$
- Then run this average  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The second empirical suggestion is about the descriptive test for IV validity
- A simple balance test is to regress some pre-determined control  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$
- $r_l$  can be location level GDP, population etc...
- This can be combined with the Oster bound method
- Another balance test is to start from a shock-level confounder  $r_k$
- Then construct observation-level average  $r_l = \sum_k s_{lk} r_k$
- Then run this average  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$

## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The second empirical suggestion is about the descriptive test for IV validity
- A simple balance test is to regress some pre-determined control  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$
- $r_l$  can be location level GDP, population etc...
- This can be combined with the Oster bound method
- Another balance test is to start from a shock-level confounder  $r_k$
- Then construct observation-level average  $r_l = \sum_k s_{lk} r_k$
- Then run this average  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$



## Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The second empirical suggestion is about the descriptive test for IV validity
- A simple balance test is to regress some pre-determined control  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$
- $r_l$  can be location level GDP, population etc...
- This can be combined with the Oster bound method
- Another balance test is to start from a shock-level confounder  $r_k$
- Then construct observation-level average  $r_l = \sum_k s_{lk} r_k$
- Then run this average  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- The second empirical suggestion is about the descriptive test for IV validity
- A simple balance test is to regress some pre-determined control  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$
- $r_l$  can be location level GDP, population etc...
- This can be combined with the Oster bound method
- Another balance test is to start from a shock-level confounder  $r_k$
- Then construct observation-level average  $r_l = \sum_k s_{lk} r_k$
- Then run this average  $r_l$  on IV  $z_l$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- Another possible way to implement the balance test is to transform everything to  $k$  level
- We can aggregate location  $l$  level confounder  $r_l$  to industry  $k$  level by  $r_k = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} r_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$
- Then we run this  $r_k$  on shock  $g_k$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- Another possible way to implement the balance test is to transform everything to  $k$  level
- We can aggregate location  $l$  level confounder  $r_l$  to industry  $k$  level by  $r_k = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} r_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$
- Then we run this  $r_k$  on shock  $g_k$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- Another possible way to implement the balance test is to transform everything to  $k$  level
- We can aggregate location  $l$  level confounder  $r_l$  to industry  $k$  level by  $r_k = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} r_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$
- Then we run this  $r_k$  on shock  $g_k$

# Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022): Empirical Suggestions

- Another possible way to implement the balance test is to transform everything to  $k$  level
- We can aggregate location  $l$  level confounder  $r_l$  to industry  $k$  level by  $r_k = \frac{\sum_l s_{lk} r_l}{\sum_l s_{lk}}$
- Then we run this  $r_k$  on shock  $g_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- We have introduced two frameworks to understand Bartik IV
- The first is Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Evidence: OLS with shift as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Exposure OLS
  - Assumptions: Locations with different shocks have parallel trends
- The second is Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - Evidence: OLS with regression, shift as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Randomly assigned shocks
  - Assumptions: Industries with large shocks do not have systematically different unobserved shocks in their primary market location

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- We have introduced two frameworks to understand Bartik IV
- The first is Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Equivalence: GMM with share as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Exposure DID
  - Assumption: Locations with different shares have parallel trend
- The second is Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - Equivalence: Shock-level regression, shift as instrument, share as weight
  - Research design: Randomly assigned shocks
  - Assumption: Industries with large shocks do not have systematically different unobserved shocks in their primary market (location)



# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- We have introduced two frameworks to understand Bartik IV
- The first is Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Equivalence: GMM with share as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Exposure DID
  - Assumption: Locations with different shares have parallel trend
- The second is Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - Equivalence: Shock-level regression, shift as instrument, share as weight
  - Research design: Randomly assigned shocks
  - Assumption: Industries with large shocks do not have systematically different unobserved shocks in their primary market (location)

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- We have introduced two frameworks to understand Bartik IV
- The first is Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Equivalence: GMM with share as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Exposure DID
  - Assumption: Locations with different shares have parallel trend
- The second is Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - Equivalence: Shock-level regression, shift as instrument, share as weight
  - Research design: Randomly assigned shocks
  - Assumption: Industries with large shocks do not have systematically different unobserved shocks in their primary market (location)

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- We have introduced two frameworks to understand Bartik IV
- The first is Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Equivalence: GMM with share as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Exposure DID
  - Assumption: Locations with different shares have parallel trend
- The second is Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - Equivalence: Shock-level regression, shift as instrument, share as weight
  - Research design: Randomly assigned shocks
  - Assumption: Industries with large shocks do not have systematically different unobserved shocks in their primary market (location)

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- We have introduced two frameworks to understand Bartik IV
- The first is Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Equivalence: GMM with share as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Exposure DID
  - Assumption: Locations with different shares have parallel trend
- The second is Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - Equivalence: Shock-level regression, shift as instrument, share as weight
  - Research design: Randomly assigned shocks
  - Assumption: Industries with large shocks do not have systematically different unobserved shocks in their primary market (location)

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- We have introduced two frameworks to understand Bartik IV
- The first is Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Equivalence: GMM with share as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Exposure DID
  - Assumption: Locations with different shares have parallel trend
- The second is Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - Equivalence: Shock-level regression, shift as instrument, share as weight
  - Research design: Randomly assigned shocks
  - Assumption: Industries with large shocks do not have systematically different unobserved shocks in their primary market (location)

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- We have introduced two frameworks to understand Bartik IV
- The first is Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Equivalence: GMM with share as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Exposure DID
  - Assumption: Locations with different shares have parallel trend
- The second is Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - Equivalence: Shock-level regression, shift as instrument, share as weight
  - Research design: Randomly assigned shocks
  - Assumption: Industries with large shocks do not have systematically different unobserved shocks in their primary market (location)

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- We have introduced two frameworks to understand Bartik IV
- The first is Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Equivalence: GMM with share as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Exposure DID
  - Assumption: Locations with different shares have parallel trend
- The second is Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - Equivalence: Shock-level regression, shift as instrument, share as weight
  - Research design: Randomly assigned shocks
  - Assumption: Industries with large shocks do not have systematically different unobserved shocks in their primary market (location)

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- We have introduced two frameworks to understand Bartik IV
- The first is Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Equivalence: GMM with share as instrument, shift as weight
  - Research design: Exposure DID
  - Assumption: Locations with different shares have parallel trend
- The second is Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
  - Equivalence: Shock-level regression, shift as instrument, share as weight
  - Research design: Randomly assigned shocks
  - Assumption: Industries with large shocks do not have systematically different unobserved shocks in their primary market (location)



# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shock
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shock (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of individuals ( $K \rightarrow K, L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific individuals
  - Have some exposure shock related to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shock (shock)
  - All relevant shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty, L \rightarrow L$ )
  - Whenever the second shock arises, but a shift-share strategy
  - Mechanical correlation between  $\beta_1(t, x)$  and first shock  $\epsilon_1(t, x)$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{lk}$  has a shift-share structure  
Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{lk} = \sum_k s_{lk} \epsilon_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{ik}$  has a shift-share structure  
Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{ik} = \sum_k s_{ik} \epsilon_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
    - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
    - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
    - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
    - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{lk}$  has a shift-share structure
    - Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{lk} = \sum_k s_{lk} \epsilon_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{ik}$  has a shift-share structure
    - Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{ik} = \sum_k s_{ik} \epsilon_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{ik}$  has a shift-share structure
    - Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{ik} = \sum_k s_{ik} \epsilon_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{ik}$  has a shift-share structure  
Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{ik} = \sum_k s_{ik} \epsilon_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{ik}$  has a shift-share structure  
Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{ik} = \sum_k s_{ik} \epsilon_k$



# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{lk}$  has a shift-share structure  
Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{lk} = \sum_k s_{lk} \epsilon_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{lk}$  has a shift-share structure  
Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{lk} = \sum_k s_{lk} \epsilon_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{lk}$  has a shift-share structure  
Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{lk} = \sum_k s_{lk} \epsilon_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{lk}$  has a shift-share structure  
Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{lk} = \sum_k s_{lk} \epsilon_k$

# Comparison of the Two Frameworks

- When should we use these two frameworks?
- We should consider Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) when
  - Exogeneity comes from share
  - Emphasize differential exposure to common shocks (DID design)
  - Fixed small number of industries ( $K = K^*$ ,  $L \rightarrow \infty$ )
  - Focus on shock exposure of several specific industries
  - Have some exposure shares tailored to the specific policy question
- We should consider Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) when
  - Exogeneity comes from shift (shock)
  - We believe shocks are randomly assigned
  - Fixed small number of locations ( $K \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $L = L^*$ )
  - Whenever the second-stage error  $\epsilon_{lk}$  has a shift-share structure  
Mechanical correlation between Bartik IV and this error  $\epsilon_{lk} = \sum_k s_{lk} \epsilon_k$

# Application: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- The paper report this week is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)
- Impact of import from China on the local labor markets in the U.S., "China Syndrome"
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) use this paper as an example
- To show how to apply their frameworks
- Please not only read the original paper, but also read the corresponding part in Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)

## Application: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- The paper report this week is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)
- Impact of import from China on the local labor markets in the U.S., "China Syndrome"
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) use this paper as an example
- To show how to apply their frameworks
- Please not only read the original paper, but also read the corresponding part in Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)

## Application: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- The paper report this week is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)
- Impact of import from China on the local labor markets in the U.S., "China Syndrome"
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) use this paper as an example
- To show how to apply their frameworks
- Please not only read the original paper, but also read the corresponding part in Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)



## Application: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- The paper report this week is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)
- Impact of import from China on the local labor markets in the U.S., "China Syndrome"
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) use this paper as an example
- To show how to apply their frameworks
- Please not only read the original paper, but also read the corresponding part in Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)

## Application: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- The paper report this week is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)
- Impact of import from China on the local labor markets in the U.S., "China Syndrome"
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) use this paper as an example
- To show how to apply their frameworks
- Please not only read the original paper, but also read the corresponding part in Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)

## Application: Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)

- The paper report this week is Autor, Dorn, and Hanson (2013)
- Impact of import from China on the local labor markets in the U.S., "China Syndrome"
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022) use this paper as an example
- To show how to apply their frameworks
- Please not only read the original paper, but also read the corresponding part in Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020) and Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)

# Conclusion

- Bartik IV is constructed in a shift-share style
- It is widely used in spatial economics for trade and migration
- We illustrate two frameworks to understand it
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Seaman, and Swift (2020)
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- When to use which framework really depends on the setting of our research

# Conclusion

- Bartik IV is constructed in a shift-share style
- It is widely used in spatial economics for trade and migration
- We illustrate two frameworks to understand it
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- When to use which framework really depends on the setting of our research

# Conclusion

- Bartik IV is constructed in a shift-share style
- It is widely used in spatial economics for trade and migration
- We illustrate two frameworks to understand it
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- When to use which framework really depends on the setting of our research

# Conclusion

- Bartik IV is constructed in a shift-share style
- It is widely used in spatial economics for trade and migration
- We illustrate two frameworks to understand it
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- When to use which framework really depends on the setting of our research

# Conclusion

- Bartik IV is constructed in a shift-share style
- It is widely used in spatial economics for trade and migration
- We illustrate two frameworks to understand it
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- When to use which framework really depends on the setting of our research



# Conclusion

- Bartik IV is constructed in a shift-share style
- It is widely used in spatial economics for trade and migration
- We illustrate two frameworks to understand it
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- When to use which framework really depends on the setting of our research

# Conclusion

- Bartik IV is constructed in a shift-share style
- It is widely used in spatial economics for trade and migration
- We illustrate two frameworks to understand it
  - Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)
  - Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)
- When to use which framework really depends on the setting of our research

# Conclusion

For Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)

- Bartik IV is equivalent to GMM with shares as instruments
- We should always control for location/time FE, or use change variables
- Bartik IV is similar to a policy exposure design, with initial shares as the exposures
- We can decompose Bartik IV to be weighted averages of single share instruments
- The Rotemberg weights show the importance of each single industry

For Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)

- Bartik IV is equivalent to GMM with shares as instruments
- We should always control for location/time FE, or use change variables
- Bartik IV is similar to a policy exposure design, with initial shares as the exposures
- We can decompose Bartik IV to be weighted averages of single share instruments
- The Rotemberg weights show the importance of each single industry

# Conclusion

For Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)

- Bartik IV is equivalent to GMM with shares as instruments
- We should always control for location/time FE, or use change variables
- Bartik IV is similar to a policy exposure design, with initial shares as the exposures
- We can decompose Bartik IV to be weighted averages of single share instruments
- The Rotemberg weights show the importance of each single industry

# Conclusion

For Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)

- Bartik IV is equivalent to GMM with shares as instruments
- We should always control for location/time FE, or use change variables
- Bartik IV is similar to a policy exposure design, with initial shares as the exposures
- We can decompose Bartik IV to be weighted averages of single share instruments
- The Rotemberg weights show the importance of each single industry

# Conclusion

For Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)

- Bartik IV is equivalent to GMM with shares as instruments
- We should always control for location/time FE, or use change variables
- Bartik IV is similar to a policy exposure design, with initial shares as the exposures
- We can decompose Bartik IV to be weighted averages of single share instruments
- The Rotemberg weights show the importance of each single industry

# Conclusion

For Goldsmith-Pinkham, Sorkin, and Swift (2020)

- Bartik IV is equivalent to GMM with shares as instruments
- We should always control for location/time FE, or use change variables
- Bartik IV is similar to a policy exposure design, with initial shares as the exposures
- We can decompose Bartik IV to be weighted averages of single share instruments
- The Rotemberg weights show the importance of each single industry



# Conclusion

For Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)

- Bartik IV is equivalent to a shock-level regression with shifts as instruments
- The research design is based on the assumption of a series of randomly assigned shocks
- Be careful about the inference of the std err due to the serial correlation nature of the DGP  $\Rightarrow$  A transformation to shock-level regression can avoid this issue

For Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)

- Bartik IV is equivalent to a shock-level regression with shifts as instruments
- The research design is based on the assumption of a series of randomly assigned shocks
- Be careful about the inference of the std err due to the serial correlation nature of the DGP  $\Rightarrow$  A transformation to shock-level regression can avoid this issue

# Conclusion

For Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)

- Bartik IV is equivalent to a shock-level regression with shifts as instruments
- The research design is based on the assumption of a series of randomly assigned shocks
- Be careful about the inference of the std err due to the serial correlation nature of the DGP  $\Rightarrow$  A transformation to shock-level regression can avoid this issue

# Conclusion

For Borusyak, Hull, and Jaravel (2022)

- Bartik IV is equivalent to a shock-level regression with shifts as instruments
- The research design is based on the assumption of a series of randomly assigned shocks
- Be careful about the inference of the std err due to the serial correlation nature of the DGP  $\Rightarrow$  A transformation to shock-level regression can avoid this issue

# References

- Adao, Rodrigo, Michal Kolesár, and Eduardo Morales. 2019. “Shift-share Designs: Theory and Inference.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 134 (4):1949–2010.
- Autor, David H, David Dorn, and Gordon H Hanson. 2013. “The China Syndrome: Local Labor Market Effects of Import Competition in the United States.” *American Economic Review* 103 (6):2121–2168.
- Borusyak, Kirill, Peter Hull, and Xavier Jaravel. 2022. “Quasi-experimental Shift-share Research Designs.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 89 (1):181–213.
- Card, David. 2009. “Immigration and Inequality.” *American Economic Review* 99 (2):1–21.
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, Paul, Isaac Sorkin, and Henry Swift. 2020. “Bartik Instruments: What, When, Why, and How.” *American Economic Review* 110 (8):2586–2624.