

15. Instrumental Variable Method

Another way of measuring the impact of the program when treatment has not been randomly assigned is by using the instrumental variable (IV) method. The IV estimation regards the treatment variable (in this case, participation in microfinance programs) as endogenous. The idea is to find an observable exogenous variable or variables (instruments) that influence the participation variable but do not influence the outcome of the program if participating. Thus, one would want at least one instrument that is not in the covariates and that satisfies the preceding requirements. IV estimation is a two-step process. First, the treatment variable is run against all covariates, including the instruments. Then, the predicted value of the treatment—instead of the actual value—is used in the second stage.

IV Implementation Using the “ivreg” Command

The first step in IV implementation is to find an instrument. In the example, a household’s choice to participate in the microcredit program is used as the instrument variable. The household’s choice depends on two factors: availability of microcredit programs in the village and the household’s eligibility to participate (which is determined by its landholding). Even though program placement in the village may be endogenous, a household’s eligibility is not, and the combination of these two factors is therefore exogenous.

Using the 1998 data (hh_98.dta), create a village program variable for females and then a female program choice variable at the household level.¹ As mentioned in earlier exercises, a household is eligible to participate in microcredit programs if it has fewer than 50 decimals of land.

```
egen villfmf=max(dmmfd), by(vill);  
gen fchoice=villfmf==1 & hhland<50;
```

Next, create additional instruments by interacting the choice variable with all covariates. The Stata “for” command is used to do so in one command:

```
for var agehead-educhead lnland vaccess pcirr rice-oil: gen  
fchX=fchoice*X;
```

The next step is the IV implementation, which uses the Stata “ivreg” command. The first-stage equation appears within parentheses in the syntax, and the first option displays the first-stage results:

```
ivreg lexptot agehead-eduhead lnland vaccess pcirr rice-oil
(dfmfd= agehead-eduhead lnland vaccess pcirr rice-oil fch*),
first;
```

The output shows the first-stage results first and then the second-stage results. According to the first-stage output, household head’s education and household’s land asset negatively influence microcredit program participation; so do the instruments. The second-stage results show that after controlling for the endogeneity of program participation, female participation in microcredit programs has a significant impact (32.6 percent) on household’s per capita expenditure ($t = 2.28$).

First-stage regressions

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 1129		
Model	31.9544747	23	1.38932499	F(23, 1105) = 6.15		
Residual	249.471566	1105	.225766123	Prob > F = 0.0000		
Total	281.426041	1128	.249491171	R-squared = 0.1135		
				Adj R-squared = .0951		
				Root MSE = .47515		

dfmfd	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
agehead	-.0017996	.001853	-0.97	0.332	-.0054354	.0018362
sexhead	-.090353	.0949407	-0.95	0.341	-.2766374	.0959314
eduhead	-.0111658	.006549	-1.70	0.088	-.0240157	.0016841
lnland	-.0743253	.0463394	-1.60	0.109	-.1652485	.0165979
vaccess	-.1696796	.0699002	-2.43	0.015	-.3068316	-.0325275
pcirr	-.0459691	.0831373	-0.55	0.580	-.2090939	.1171558
rice	.0085986	.0155203	0.55	0.580	-.0218539	.0390511
wheat	.0102826	.0292563	0.35	0.725	-.0471216	.0676869
milk	-.0211565	.0104327	-2.03	0.043	-.0416267	-.0006864
potato	(dropped)					
egg	.0043442	.0934236	0.05	0.963	-.1789635	.1876519
oil	.0017818	.0065519	0.27	0.786	-.0110737	.0146373
fchoice	-.97571	.4857339	-2.01	0.045	-1.928775	-.022645
fchagehead	.0062515	.0023876	2.62	0.009	.0015669	.0109362
fchsexhead	.1562665	.1116846	1.40	0.162	-.0628713	.3754043
fcheduhead	-.0083186	.0088998	-0.93	0.350	-.0257811	.0091439
fchlnland	-.0028382	.1781701	-0.02	0.987	-.3524282	.3467517
fchvaccess	.1823573	.084952	2.15	0.032	.0156719	.3490427
fchpcirr	.1830853	.1025273	1.79	0.074	-.0180849	.3842554
fchrice	-.0253889	.019694	-1.29	0.198	-.0640307	.0132529
fchwheat	-.019292	.0365608	-0.53	0.598	-.0910284	.0524444
fchmilk	.0319648	.0126207	2.53	0.011	.0072016	.056728
fchegg	.0802827	.1110378	0.72	0.470	-.137586	.2981513
fchoil	.0097549	.007933	1.23	0.219	-.0058106	.0253203
_cons	.7880826	.3962508	1.99	0.047	.0105937	1.565571

Instrumental variables (2SLS) regression

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	1129
Model	48.1621199	12	4.01350999	F(12, 1116) =	22.94
Residual	249.69781	1116	.223743557	Prob > F =	0.0000
				R-squared =	0.1617
				Adj R-squared =	0.1527
Total	297.85993	1128	.264060221	Root MSE =	.47302

lexptot	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
dfmfd	.3255436	.1426528	2.28	0.023	.0456457 .6054415
agehead	.0030299	.0011679	2.59	0.010	.0007383 .0053214
sexhead	-.0566001	.0494292	-1.15	0.252	-.1535847 .0403844
educhead	.0533665	.0048684	10.96	0.000	.0438142 .0629188
lnland	.2210422	.0408664	5.41	0.000	.1408586 .3012258
vaccess	-.0030504	.0403496	-0.08	0.940	-.08222 .0761193
pcirr	.1389462	.0496316	2.80	0.005	.0415644 .2363281
rice	.0054628	.009462	0.58	0.564	-.0131025 .0240281
wheat	-.0401031	.0173472	-2.31	0.021	-.0741399 -.0060664
milk	.0207911	.0058035	3.58	0.000	.0094042 .032178
potato (dropped)					
egg	.1005972	.0508165	1.98	0.048	.0008905 .2003039
oil	.0081386	.0038401	2.12	0.034	.0006041 .0156732
_cons	7.407985	.2280463	32.48	0.000	6.960537 7.855433

```

Instrumented: dfmfd
Instruments: agehead sexhead educhead lnland vaccess pcirr rice
              wheat milk
              potato egg oil fchoice fchagehead fchsexhead
              fcheduchead
              fchlnland fchvaccess fchpcirr fchrice fchwheat
              fchmilk fchegg
              fchoil

```

Testing for Endogeneity: OLS versus IV

A few tests can be used to determine whether an ordinary least squares (OLS) or IV is more appropriate. Stata has a command “ivendog” that performs an F -test and chi-square test following methodologies called the Wu-Hausman test and the Durbin-Wu-Hausman test, respectively. The null hypothesis is that OLS is consistent (in this case, it implies treatment is exogenous). If the null hypothesis is not rejected, an OLS should suffice; otherwise an IV method should be used. The “ivendog” command is used after the “ivreg” command:

```
ivendog;
```

The results show that the null hypothesis is rejected at the 10 percent level, implying that IV is a better model than OLS:

```

Tests of endogeneity of: dfmfd
H0: Regressor is exogenous
      Wu-Hausman F test:      3.01281    F(1,1115)    P-value = 0.08289
      Durbin-Wu-Hausman chi-sq test:  3.04242    Chi-sq(1)    P-value = 0.08111

```

IV Method for Binary Treatment: “treatreg” Command

The preceding IV estimation methods apply when the endogenous regressor is continuous. When the endogenous regressor is binary (participant/nonparticipant), using a linear model in the first stage of the IV procedure may or may not be appropriate. Another method that fits a treatment-effects model when the endogenous regressor is binary is the “treatreg” command in Stata. The “treatreg” command fits a treatment-effects model using either the full maximum likelihood or the two-step consistent estimator. The “treatreg” command takes into account the effect of the binary endogenous variable on the outcome of interests conditional on the two sets of exogenous variables. The command estimates two regressions simultaneously. The first equation is estimated using probit regression to predict the probability of treatment. The second is either a linear or probit regression for the outcome variables. The two error terms are assumed to be jointly normally distributed.

Following is an example of how the “treatreg” command is used with the Bangladesh 1998 data. Its syntax is very similar to that of the “ivreg” command:

```
treatreg lexptot agehead-eduhead lnland vaccess pcirr
rice-oil, treat (dfmfd= agehead-eduhead lnland vaccess pcirr
rice-oil fch*);
```

Following is the treatment-effect method using maximum likelihood estimation. It shows that women’s participation does have a positive significant impact on household’s expenditure ($t = 3.49$):

Treatment effects model -- MLE	Number of obs	=	1129
Log likelihood = -1427.6651	Wald chi2(12)	=	271.45
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0000

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
lexptot					
agehead	.0028983	.0011858	2.44	0.015	.0005742 .0052225
sexhead	-.0558392	.0504364	-1.11	0.268	-.1546927 .0430142
eduhead	.0547403	.0048088	11.38	0.000	.0453152 .0641654
lnland	.2386945	.0384969	6.20	0.000	.163242 .3141469
vaccess	.0026497	.0408488	0.06	0.948	-.0774125 .0827118
pcirr	.1305888	.0500755	2.61	0.009	.0324427 .228735
rice	.0060323	.0096418	0.63	0.532	.0128654 .02493
wheat	-.0404817	.017699	-2.29	0.022	-.0751711 -.0057923
milk	.0208849	.0059217	3.53	0.000	.0092787 .0324912
egg	.0944399	.0515543	1.83	0.067	-.0066047 .1954846
oil	.0074181	.0038636	1.92	0.055	-.0001545 .0149906
dfmfd	.4168906	.1196073	3.49	0.000	.1824647 .6513166
_cons	7.391633	.2322404	31.83	0.000	6.93645 7.846816
dfmfd					
agehead	-.004252	.0050252	-0.85	0.397	-.0141012 .0055973
sexhead	-.1799594	.2534342	-0.71	0.478	-.6766813 .3167625

Instrumental Variable Method

educhead	-.0453168	.0184985	-2.45	0.014	-.0815733	-.0090604
lnland	-.1791062	.1315339	-1.36	0.173	-.4369079	.0786956
vaccess	-.5458849	.1822059	-3.00	0.003	-.9030019	-.1887679
pcirr	-.121319	.2202852	-0.55	0.582	-.5530702	.3104321
rice	.0093552	.0406836	0.23	0.818	-.0703831	.0890935
wheat	.0082867	.0782386	0.11	0.916	-.1450581	.1616316
milk	-.0605588	.0294469	-2.06	0.040	-.1182737	-.002844
egg	.0366651	.2578851	0.14	0.887	-.4687804	.5421107
oil	-.0017389	.0177263	-0.10	0.922	-.0364818	.033004
fchoice	-3.391314	1.291503	-2.63	0.009	-5.922613	-.8600159
fchagehead	.0156243	.0063892	2.45	0.014	.0031018	.0281468
fchsexhead	.3432873	.2937005	1.17	0.242	-.2323551	.9189296
fcheduchead	.0056506	.0247551	0.23	0.819	-.0428685	.0541698
fchlnland	-.2419577	.4632756	-0.52	0.601	-1.149961	.6660458
fchvaccess	.6105495	.2173745	2.81	0.005	.1845032	1.036596
fchpcirr	.4829752	.2662667	1.81	0.070	-.038898	1.004848
fchrice	-.0446986	.050703	-0.88	0.378	-.1440747	.0546775
fchwheat	-.0191072	.0959983	-0.20	0.842	-.2072604	.169046
fchmilk	.0866831	.0345121	2.51	0.012	.0190407	.1543255
fchegg	.1975426	.297008	0.67	0.506	-.3845824	.7796676
fchoil	.0345253	.0207377	1.66	0.096	-.0061198	.0751704
_cons	1.309823	1.095342	1.20	0.232	-.8370069	3.456653

/athrho	-.4622307	.1677019	-2.76	0.006	-.7909205	-.133541
/lnsigma	-.7283617	.0440104	-16.55	0.000	-.8146205	-.642103

rho	-.4319006	.1364191			-.6589302	-.1327528
sigma	.4826991	.0212438			.4428074	.5261847
lambda	-.208478	.0740375			-.3535888	-.0633673

LR test of indep. eqns. (rho = 0): chi2(1) = 5.14 Prob > chi2 = 0.0234

IV with Fixed Effects: Cross-Sectional Estimates

Instrumental variable regression can be combined with fixed effects. Here a demonstration using cross-sectional data is shown. The command to use is “xtivreg” with the “fe” option. A village-level fixed-effects regression is run using the same hh_98.dta. Here is the command for women’s participation in microcredit:

```
xtivreg lexptot year agehead-educhead lnland vaccess pcirr
rice-oil (dfmfd= agehead-educhead lnland vaccess pcirr rice-oil
mch*), fe i(vill);
```

Next, run a village-level fixed-effects regression with the same hh_98.dta. Using village-level fixed effects causes the participation impacts to disappear:

```
Fixed-effects (within) IV regression      Number of obs      =      1129
Group variable: vill                     Number of groups   =       104

R-sq: within = 0.1550                    Obs per group: min =         4
      between = 0.2246                                avg =       10.9
      overall = 0.1618                                max =        19

                                           Wald chi2(5)       = 453021.37
corr(u_i, Xb) = 0.0511                    Prob > chi2        =      0.0000
```

```

-----
lexptot |      Coef.   Std. Err.   z   P>|z|   [95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----
    dfmfd |    .1901029  .1956837  0.97  0.331  -.19343  .5736359
  agehead |   .0020665   .0011244   1.84   0.066  -.0001373  .0042703
  sexhead |  -.0352392   .0472055  -0.75   0.455  -.1277602  .0572818
  educhead |   .0433888   .0056147   7.73   0.000   .0323842  .0543934
    lnland |   .2283189   .0470498   4.85   0.000   .1361029  .3205349
  vaccess | (dropped)
  pcirr   | (dropped)
    rice   | (dropped)
  wheat   | (dropped)
    milk   | (dropped)
    egg    | (dropped)
    oil    | (dropped)
    _cons  |   8.10043    .1268782  63.84   0.000   7.851754  8.349107
-----+-----
  sigma_u |   .24105185
  sigma_e |   .42196914
    rho   |   .24604092  (fraction of variance due to u_i)
-----+-----
F test that all u_i=0:   F(103,1020) =      3.04      Prob > F   = 0.0000
-----
Instrumented:  dfmfd
Instruments:  agehead sexhead educhead lnland vaccess pcirr rice wheat
milk egg oil mchoice mchagehead mchsexhead mcheduchead mchlnland mchvaccess
mchpcirr mchrice mchwheat mchmilk mchegg mchoil

```

IV with Fixed Effects: Panel Estimates

An implementation of “xtivreg” using panel data is now shown with the panel data hh_9198.dta. After creating necessary variables as before, issue the “xtivreg” command.

```

xtivreg lexptot year agehead-educhead lnland vaccess pcirr
rice-oil (dfmfd= agehead-educhead lnland vaccess pcirr rice-oil
mch*), fe i(nh);

```

The results do not show any participation impact on expenditure.

```

Fixed-effects (within) IV regression      Number of obs      =      1652
Group variable: nh                       Number of groups   =      826

R-sq:  within = 0.1667                   Obs per group:  min =      2
      between = 0.1924                                     avg  =      2.0
      overall  = 0.1733                                     max  =      2

                                           Wald chi2(14)      = 866855.47
corr(u_i, Xb) = 0.1215                   Prob > chi2        = 0.0000

```

```

-----
lexptot |      Coef.   Std. Err.   z   P>|z|   [95% Conf. Interval]
-----+-----
    dfmfd |    .0430727  .124483  0.35  0.729  -.2009096  .287055
    year   |   .2360629   .0707606   3.34   0.001   .0973747   .3747511
  agehead |   .000021    .0017636   0.01   0.990  -.0034355   .0034775
  sexhead |  -.0536457   .0727231  -0.74   0.461  -.1961803   .088889
  educhead |   .0136537   .008419    1.62   0.105  -.0028472   .0301546

```

Instrumental Variable Method

lnland		.1362576	.0629346	2.17	0.030	.0129079	.2596072
vaccess		-.0991489	.05371	-1.85	0.065	-.2044186	.0061207
pcirr		.0954609	.0642934	1.48	0.138	-.0305519	.2214737
rice		.0199218	.0131231	1.52	0.129	-.005799	.0456426
wheat		-.0244967	.0128117	-1.91	0.056	-.0496072	.0006138
milk		-.0028403	.0065394	-0.43	0.664	-.0156572	.0099766
potato		-.0199	.0165334	-1.20	0.229	-.0523049	.0125048
egg		.1703499	.0483323	3.52	0.000	.0756203	.2650795
oil		.0045626	.0031518	1.45	0.148	-.0016148	.01074
_cons		7.833876	.2515847	31.14	0.000	7.340779	8.326973

sigma_u		.34559734					
sigma_e		.36468826					
rho		.47314159	(fraction of variance due to u_i)				

F test that all u_i=0:		F(825,812) =	1.57	Prob > F	=	0.0000	

Instrumented: dmfmd

Instruments: year agehead sexhead educhead lnland vaccess pcirr rice wheat
 milk potato egg oil fchoice fchagehead fchsexhead fcheduchead fchlnland
 fchvaccess fchpcirr fchrice fchwheat fchmilk fchpotato fchegg fchoil

Note

1. By 1998, all sample villages had microcredit programs, but for purposes of demonstrating the process of creating the variable, this exercise creates the village program variable.