

# Are Bartik Regressions Always Robust to Heterogeneous Treatment Effects?\*

Clément de Chaisemartin<sup>†</sup>      Ziteng Lei<sup>‡</sup>

October 11, 2021

## Abstract

Bartik regressions use locations' differential exposure to nationwide sector-level shocks as an instrument to estimate the effect of a location-level treatment on an outcome. In the canonical Bartik design, locations' differential exposure to industry-level employment shocks are used as an instrument to measure the effect of their employment evolution on their wage evolution. Some recent papers studying Bartik designs have assumed that the sector-level shocks are exogenous and all have the same expectation. This second assumption may sometimes be implausible. For instance, there could be industries whose employment is more likely to grow than that of other industries. We replace that second assumption by parallel trends assumptions. Under our assumptions, Bartik regressions identify weighted sums of location-specific effects, with weights that may be negative. Accordingly, such regressions may be misleading in the presence of heterogeneous effects, an issue that was not present under the assumptions maintained in previous papers. Estimating the weights attached to Bartik regressions is a way to assess their robustness to heterogeneous effects. We also propose an alternative estimator that is robust to location-specific effects. Finally, we revisit two applications. In both cases, Bartik regressions have fairly large negative weights attached to them. Our alternative estimator is substantially different from the Bartik regression coefficient in one application.

---

\*We are very grateful to Xavier D'Haultfœuille and Félix Pasquier for their helpful comments.

<sup>†</sup>University of California, Santa Barbara, clementdechaisemartin@ucsb.edu.

<sup>‡</sup>University of California, Santa Barbara, ziteng\_lei@umail.ucsb.edu.

# 1 Introduction

The “Bartik instrument”, also known as the “shift-share instrument”, is a popular method to estimate the effect of a treatment on an outcome. It has first been proposed by [Bartik \(1991\)](#). Since then it has been applied in many fields, including labor (see [Altonji & Card 1991](#), [Card 2001](#), [2009](#)), international trade (see [Autor et al. 2013](#), [2020](#)), and finance (see [Greenstone et al. 2020](#)).

To fix ideas, in this introduction we describe our paper in the context of the canonical setting considered by [Bartik \(1991\)](#), but our results apply to any Bartik design. Assume one wants to estimate how the evolution of employment affects the evolution of wages. One could construct a data set with wages and employment evolutions at, say, the commuting-zone level, and regress the former evolution on the latter. However, employment growth may be endogenous. For example, it may be correlated with other commuting-zone-level shocks that could have an impact on wage growth. Instead, a Bartik two-stage least squares (2SLS) regression uses a weighted average of the nationwide employment growth in each industry, with weights equal to the share that each industry accounts for in the employment of a commuting zone, to instrument for commuting zones’ employment growth. Intuitively, this strategy may solve the aforementioned endogeneity problem, because the variation of the Bartik instrument across commuting zones comes from their differential exposure to nationwide shocks, not from local, commuting-zone-level shocks.

A recent literature has considerably improved our understanding of Bartik regressions. [Goldsmith-Pinkham et al. \(2020\)](#) show that they are equivalent to using local industry shares as instruments, and show that the Bartik 2SLS coefficient consistently estimates the treatment effect under the assumption that industry shares are exogenous. [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#) instead assume that shocks are exogenous,<sup>1</sup> and derive consistency results under that assumption. Finally, [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) also adopt the exogenous shocks approach, and show that using robust standard errors of Bartik regression coefficients for inference leads to over-rejection because the instruments of locations with similar industry shares are correlated. They then propose new estimators of the standard errors. These three papers assume that the treatment is generated by a model linear in the shocks, with sector- and commuting-zone first-stage effects, while the outcome evolution is generated by a model linear in the treatment evolution, with commuting-zone second-stage effects. Under their respective assumptions, they all show that the Bartik 2SLS coefficient is consistent for a convex combination of second-stage effects.

In this paper, we show that in the exogenous shock approach, Bartik regressions may be less robust to heterogeneous treatment effects than previously thought. Our identification results are closely related to those in [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#), so we start by describing their results. [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) make two assumptions. First,

---

<sup>1</sup>Whether it is more plausible to assume that shares or shocks are exogenous depends on the context, and we refer to [Goldsmith-Pinkham et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Borusyak & Hull \(2020\)](#) for discussions on these points.

they assume that industries' employment growths are independent of commuting zones' counterfactual employment and wage growths in the absence of any industry-level shock. Second, they assume that each industry has the same expected employment growth. Under those two assumptions, they show that the first-stage Bartik regression identifies a weighted average of industry- and commuting-zone-specific first-stage effects, while the 2SLS Bartik regression identifies a weighted average of commuting-zone specific second-stage effects. The results in [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#) are similar.

The second assumption in [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) may not always be plausible: there could be some industries whose employment is more likely to grow than that of other industries. To substantiate this claim, in Section 5.1 we revisit the canonical Bartik design, and find that several industry characteristics strongly predict the employment growth of US industries from 1990 to 2000 and from 2000 to 2010. For instance, employment grew much more in industries with a higher proportion of college-educated workers in 1990. Similarly, in Section 5.2 we revisit [Autor et al. \(2013\)](#), and also find that industry characteristics strongly predict industry-level shocks.

Instead, we replace this second identifying assumption by two parallel trends conditions: in the absence of any industry shock, the treatment and the outcome would have followed the same evolution in every commuting zone. Under those assumptions, we obtain different results from those in [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#): the first-stage Bartik regression identifies a weighted sum of industry- and commuting-zone-specific first-stage effects, where some weights may be negative; the 2SLS Bartik regression identifies a weighted sum of commuting-zone specific second-stage effects, where some weights may again be negative. Due to the negative weights, the 2SLS Bartik regression coefficient may be, say, negative, even if all second stage effects are positive. Accordingly, under our parallel trends assumptions, Bartik regressions may be misleading in the presence of heterogeneous first- or second-stage effects. The intuition for our results is that Bartik regressions compare the employment and wage evolutions of commuting zones that received high and low shocks. From that perspective, they are comparable to “fuzzy” differences-in-differences estimators, that also do not estimate convex combinations of effects under parallel trends assumptions (see [De Chaisemartin & D’Haultfœuille 2018](#)).

The weights attached to the first-stage and reduced-form Bartik regressions can be estimated. The number of positive and negative weights attached to the 2SLS regression can also be identified, under the assumption that the first-stage effects do not vary across industries and are all positive. Estimating the weights attached to the first-stage and reduced-form regressions, or counting the number of negative weights attached to the 2SLS regression, may help applied researchers assess the robustness of their Bartik regression to heterogeneous effects, in instances where the second identifying assumption in [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) may be implausible. One can perform that diagnosis under various restrictions on the first- and second-stage effects, to assess which type of heterogeneity is more problematic in a given application. For instance,

when we revisit the canonical Bartik design in Section 5.1, we find that without making any assumption, nearly half of the weights attached to the first-stage and reduced-form regressions are negative, and the negative weights sum to -1.22. On the other hand, assuming that first-stage effects do not vary across industries dramatically reduces the negative weights, which now sum to -0.04 only. Accordingly, it seems that Bartik regressions in this application may be robust to first- and second-stage effects that vary across commuting zones, but may be much less robust to industry-specific first-stage effects. By contrast, when we revisit Autor et al. (2013), we find that Bartik regressions may not be robust to commuting-zone-specific first- and second-stage effects, while industry-specific first-stage effects seem less problematic. Overall, our results can help researchers identify which restriction on treatment effect heterogeneity is key to lend a causal interpretation to Bartik regressions.

Finally, we propose an alternative estimator, that can be used when there are at least three periods in the data, and that is more robust to commuting-zone-specific first- and second-stage effects than the Bartik regressions. Under the common trends assumptions and the assumption that first- and second-stage effects only vary across commuting zones, we show that the mean of the treatment (resp. outcome) evolution conditional on the shocks is additively separable in the commuting-zone-specific first-stage (resp. reduced-form) effects. Then, those conditional-mean-models are nested in the correlated random coefficient models studied in Chamberlain (1992), and the average first-stage and reduced-form effects can be estimated following similar steps as in that paper. Finally, a weighted average of second-stage effects can be estimated by taking the ratio of the first-stage and reduced-form estimators. In the canonical Bartik design, our estimator of the second-stage effect is very similar to the Bartik 2SLS estimator. In Autor et al. (2013), our estimator is substantially more negative than the Bartik 2SLS estimator, thus suggesting that the effect of Chinese import exposure on US manufacturing employment could have been more negative than that found by Autor et al. (2013).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces our notation and assumptions. Section 3 presents our identification results. Section 4 presents our alternative estimator. Section 5 presents our empirical applications. Finally, Section 6 concludes.

## 2 Notation and Assumptions

We consider a data set with  $G$  locations, indexed by  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ . For now, we assume the data has two time periods indexed by  $t \in \{1, 2\}$ , but we will relax that assumption later. Locations are typically geographical regions, for instance counties, states or commuting zones. Let  $R_{g,t}$  denote the value of a generic variable  $R$  in location  $g$  and period  $t$ . Then, let  $\Delta R_g = R_{g,2} - R_{g,1}$  denote the change of that variable from period 1 to 2 in location  $g$ . We are interested in how the evolution of a treatment variable  $\Delta D_g$  affects the evolution of an outcome variable  $\Delta Y_g$ . For instance, the canonical setting first proposed by Bartik

(1991) focused on how the evolution of (log) employment affects the evolution of (log) wages, and Autor et al. (2013) have studied how the exposure to Chinese competition affects US local labor markets. We could regress  $\Delta Y_g$  on  $\Delta D_g$ , but we worry that the treatment evolution may be endogenous. For example, in the canonical setting, the effect of employment growth on wage growth may be confounded by other labor market shocks, such as technological changes or inflation.

Instead, the following instrumental variable strategy has been proposed. Assume there are  $S$  sectors indexed by  $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ . Sectors could for instance be industries. Let  $R_{s,t}$  denote the value of a generic variable  $R$  in sector  $s$  and period  $t$ . Then, let  $\Delta R_s = R_{s,2} - R_{s,1}$  denote the change of that variable from period 1 to 2 in sector  $s$ . For every  $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ , let  $\Delta Z_s$  denote a shock affecting sector  $s$  between periods 1 and 2. For example, in the canonical setting,  $\Delta Z_s$  denotes the nationwide employment growth in sector  $s$ .

**Definition 1** *Bartik Instrument:* The Bartik instrument  $\Delta Z_g$  is:

$$\Delta Z_g = \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s.$$

For every  $g$ ,  $Q_{s,g}$  are positive weights summing to 1. Typically,  $Q_{s,g}$  is a measure of the importance of sector  $s$  in location  $g$  at period 1. For instance,  $Q_{s,g}$  could be the share that sector  $s$  accounts for in location  $g$ 's employment at period 1. Throughout the paper, we follow Adão et al. (2019) and Borusyak et al. (2020) and consider those shares as non-random quantities.<sup>2</sup> In the canonical setting, the Bartik instrument represents the employment evolution that location  $g$  would have experienced if all sectors in location  $g$  had experienced the same evolution as in the overall economy.

We start by introducing the notation and assumptions we use to analyze the first-stage Bartik regression. For any  $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S) \in \mathbb{R}^S$ , let  $\Delta D_g(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S)$  denote the potential treatment evolution that location  $g$  will experience if  $(\Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S)$ . And let  $\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) = \Delta D_g(0, \dots, 0)$  denote the potential treatment evolution that location  $g$  will experience in the absence of any shocks. We make the following assumption:

**Assumption 1** *Linear Shock Effects:* for all  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ , there are real numbers  $(\beta_{s,g})_{s \in \{1, \dots, S\}}$  such that for any  $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S) \in \mathbb{R}^S$ :

$$\Delta D_g(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S) = \Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \delta_s \beta_{s,g}.$$

Assumption 1 requires that the effect of the shocks on the treatment evolution be linear. This assumption is also made in Adão et al. (2019) (see their Equation (11)). Increasing  $\Delta Z_s$  by 1 unit, holding all other shocks constant, leads the treatment of location

---

<sup>2</sup>Another approach to analyze Bartik instrument designs considers shares as randoms, see Goldsmith-Pinkham et al. (2020).

$g$  to increase by  $Q_{s,g}\beta_{s,g}$  units. Note that if we further assume that  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g$ , meaning that in every location, the effects of shocks on the treatment evolution are homogeneous across sectors, then Assumption 1 implies that:

$$\Delta D_g(\Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) = \Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_g = \Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) + \beta_g \Delta Z_g,$$

so the potential treatment evolution only depends on the Bartik instrument, not on the specific value of each shock  $\Delta Z_s$ .

**Assumption 2** *Common Trends for the Treatment:*

There is a real number  $\mu^D$  such that  $\forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}: E(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) = \mu^D$ .

To ease the interpretation of Assumption 2, let us consider the following assumption, which is sufficient for Assumption 2 to hold:

**Assumption 3** *Sufficient conditions for Assumption 2:*

1. For all  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}: E(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) = E(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}))$ .
2. There is a real number  $\mu^D$  such that  $\forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}: E(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0})) = \mu^D$ .

The first point of Assumption 3 requires that the location-level potential treatment evolution be mean-independent of the sector-level shocks. Adão et al. (2019) make a related assumption: their Assumption 1 (ii) requires that for every  $s$ ,  $\Delta Z_s$  be mean independent of the vector  $(\Delta D_1(\mathbf{0}), \dots, \Delta D_G(\mathbf{0}))$ . Their mean-independence requirement is neither weaker nor stronger than ours, and both assumptions are implied by the stronger condition  $(\Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) \perp (\Delta D_1(\mathbf{0}), \dots, \Delta D_G(\mathbf{0}))$ . Both our approach and theirs require that shocks be exogenous, in the sense that they should be independent from locations' potential treatment evolution.

The second point of Assumption 3 requires that the expectation of the potential treatment evolution in the absence of any shocks be the same for all locations. This is a parallel trends assumption similar to that made in Difference-in-Differences models (see Abadie 2005, De Chaisemartin & D'Haultfœuille 2020). The results in Adão et al. (2019) do not rely on a parallel trends assumption. Instead, their identification relies on the assumption that sector-level shocks are as-good-as randomly assigned, in the sense that they all have the same expectation, i.e.  $E(\Delta Z_s) = \delta$ , for some real number  $\delta$  (Assumption 1 (ii) in Adão et al. 2019). This as-good-as randomly assigned sector-level shocks has first been proposed by Borusyak et al. (2020) (see their Assumption 1). However, this assumption may be implausible when there are certain “rapidly growing” or “slowly growing” sectors, that may have a higher or lower expected growth than other sectors. For example, in the canonical setting, some sectors may be more likely to receive positive employment shocks than others. In Autor et al. (2013), some sectors may be more likely to see an increase in Chinese competition than other sectors. Assumption 1 (ii) in Adão et al. (2019) and

Assumption 1 in [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#) rule out that possibility. By contrast, we do not require that all sectors have the same expected shocks, but we require that all locations have the same expected treatment evolution in the absence of any shocks.

We now introduce the notation and assumptions we use to analyze the second-stage Bartik regression. Let  $\Delta Y_g(d_g)$  denote the potential outcome evolution that location  $g$  will experience if  $\Delta D_g = d_g$ .<sup>3</sup>

**Assumption 4** *Linear Treatment Effects:* for all  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ , there is a real number  $\alpha_g$  such that for any  $d_g \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\Delta Y_g(d_g) = \Delta Y_g(0) + \alpha_g d_g.$$

Assumption 4 is analogous to equation (30) in [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#), but is weakened to allow for heterogeneous  $\alpha_g$  across locations. Combining Assumption 4 with Assumption 1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Y_g(\Delta D_g(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S)) &= \Delta Y_g(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0})) + \alpha_g(\Delta D_g(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S) - \Delta D_g(\mathbf{0})) \\ &= \Delta Y_g(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0})) + \alpha_g \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \delta_s \beta_{s,g} \\ &= \Delta Y_g(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0})) + \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \delta_s \gamma_{s,g}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma_{s,g} = \alpha_g \beta_{s,g}$ . Therefore, the potential outcome evolution is also linear in sector-level shocks.

**Assumption 5** *Common Trends for the Outcome:*

There is a real number  $\mu^Y$  such that  $\forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ ,  $E(\Delta Y_g(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0})) | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) = \mu^Y$ .

Sufficient conditions for Assumption 5 to hold are as follows: the potential outcome evolution without any shocks should be mean-independent of the shocks, and it should have the same expectation in every location. This parallel trends condition on the potential outcome when the shocks, rather than the treatment, are set to 0, is similar to Assumption A3 in [De Chaisemartin \(2013\)](#), and to Assumption A1 in [Hudson et al. \(2017\)](#). Notice that under the linear treatment effect model in Assumption 4 and the common trends on  $\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0})$  in Assumption 2, common trends on  $\Delta Y_g(\mathbf{0})$  implies common trends on  $\Delta Y_g(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}))$ . So in our setting, common trends on  $\Delta Y_g(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}))$  is slightly weaker than common trends on  $\Delta Y_g(\mathbf{0})$ .

In our analysis, we consider the shares  $Q_{s,g}$  and the first- and second-stage effects  $\beta_{s,g}$  and  $\alpha_g$  as deterministic. On the other hand, we consider  $(\Delta Y_g(0), \Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}))_{g \in \{1, \dots, G\}}$  and  $(\Delta Z_s)_{s \in \{1, \dots, S\}}$  as random, and all the probabilistic statements above and below are with respect to the joint distribution of those random variables.

---

<sup>3</sup>We implicitly make an exclusion restriction assumption: the shocks have no direct effect on the outcome evolution, they can only affect the outcome evolution through their effect on the treatment evolution, see [Angrist & Imbens \(1995\)](#).

### 3 Identification Results for Bartik Regressions

#### 3.1 Results for First-Stage Bartik Regressions

In this section, we consider the first-stage regression of the treatment evolution  $\Delta D_g$  on the Bartik instrument  $\Delta Z_g$ . First, we consider the regression without a constant, following [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#):

**Definition 2** *First-stage Bartik regression (without constant):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_g$  in the first-stage regression of  $\Delta D_g$  on  $\Delta Z_g$ . Let  $\beta_{NC}^D = E[\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D]$ .

Throughout the paper, we consider Bartik regressions that are not weighted, say, by locations' population. It is straightforward to extend all our results to weighted Bartik regressions. For instance, the decompositions in Theorems 2 to 6 still hold, except that the numerator and the denominator of the weights have to be multiplied by  $N_g$ , the weight assigned to location  $g$ , and  $\Delta Z$  has to be redefined as  $\sum_{g=1}^G \frac{N_g}{N} \Delta Z_g$ , where  $N = \sum_{g=1}^G N_g$ .

We start by restating the identification result in Proposition 1 of [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) under our notation. By definition,  $\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_g \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2}$ .

**Theorem 1** *Proposition 1 in Adão et al. (2019):*

Suppose Assumption 1 holds, and the following assumptions also hold:

1. The random variables  $(\Delta Z_s)_{1 \leq s \leq S}$  are mutually independent.
2. For all  $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ ,  $E(\Delta Z_s | \Delta D_1(\mathbf{0}), \dots, \Delta D_G(\mathbf{0})) = 0$ .<sup>4</sup>

Then,

$$\frac{E\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_g \Delta Z_g\right)}{E\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2\right)} = \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g}^2 V(\Delta Z_s)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 V(\Delta Z_s)} \beta_{s,g}.$$
<sup>5</sup>

Alternatively, if we assume common trends rather than randomly-assigned-shocks, we have the following result:

**Theorem 2** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold.*

1. Then,

$$\beta_{NC}^D = E\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g} \beta_{s,g}\right) + \mu^D E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2}\right).$$

<sup>4</sup>Setting the common expectation of the shocks to 0 is just a normalization that [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) make, and that will automatically hold if the shocks are demeaned.

<sup>5</sup>Proposition 1 in [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) applies to  $\frac{E(\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_g \Delta Z_g)}{E(\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2)}$ , instead of  $E(\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D)$ . However, the difference between these two quantities will converge to 0, for instance when the number of sectors goes to infinity and if shocks are independent across sectors, as in [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#), provided a law of large number ensures the numerator and denominator of  $\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D$  both converge towards constants, and one makes technical assumptions ensuring one can apply, e.g., Theorem 2.20 in [Van der Vaart \(2000\)](#) to the numerator of  $\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D$ , to its denominator, and to  $\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D$ .



2. If one further assumes  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g$ ,

$$\beta_{NC}^D = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z_g^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \beta_g \right) + \mu^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right).$$

The first point of Theorem 2 shows that  $\beta_{NC}^D$  is equal to the sum of two terms. The first term is the expectation of a weighted sum of the  $\beta_{s,g}$ s, the first-stage effects of the shocks on the treatment evolution. Note that the denominator of the weights is equal to  $\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2$  and is non-negative. Therefore, the weights are positive for all  $(s, g)$  such that  $\Delta Z_s$  and  $\Delta Z_g$  are of the same sign, and negative otherwise. The second term is a bias term depending on the common trends  $\mu^D$  and the Bartik instrument  $\Delta Z_g$ .<sup>6</sup> The second point of Theorem 2 shows that if we further assume that within locations, the first-stage effects are homogenous across sectors ( $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g$ ), then the first term in  $\beta_{NC}^D$  is the expectation of a weighted average of first-stage effects. Thus, if one could estimate  $\mu^D$ , one could debias  $\beta_{NC}^D$  to estimate that weighted average. We return to that idea in Section 4.

Then, we consider the first-stage regression of the treatment evolution  $\Delta D_g$  on a constant and the Bartik instrument  $\Delta Z_g$ .

**Definition 3** *First-stage Bartik regression (with constant):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_C^D$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_g$  in the first-stage regression of  $\Delta D_g$  on  $\Delta Z_g$  and a constant. Let  $\beta_C^D = E[\hat{\beta}_C^D]$ .

Let  $\Delta Z_{\cdot} = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g$ .

**Theorem 3** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold.*

1. Then,

$$\beta_C^D = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z_{\cdot})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z_{\cdot})} \beta_{s,g} \right).$$

2. If one further assumes  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g$ ,

$$\beta_C^D = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z_{\cdot})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z_{\cdot})} \beta_g \right).$$

The first point of Theorem 3 shows that  $\beta_C^D$  is equal to the expectation of a weighted sum of the first-stage effects  $\beta_{s,g}$ s. Note that the denominator of the weights is equal to  $\sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z_{\cdot})^2$  and is non-negative. Therefore, the weights are positive for all  $(s, g)$  such that  $\Delta Z_s$  and  $\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z_{\cdot}$  are of the same sign, and negative otherwise. The second point of Theorem 3 shows that if we further assume  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g$ ,  $\beta_C^D$  is equal to the expectation of a weighted sum of the  $\beta_g$ s, where some weights may still be negative. To

---

<sup>6</sup>Demeaning  $\Delta D_g$  in the regression would make the bias term in Theorem 2 disappear, but it would also change the weights in the decomposition, and some of the weights in Point 2 may then be negative.

fix ideas, assume  $\Delta Z_s > 0$ . Then, the  $\beta_{gs}$  of all locations that received a less than average positive shock ( $0 < \Delta Z_g < \Delta Z_s$ ) enter with a negative weight in Point 2 of Theorem 3.

Theorems 2 and 3 have several implications. First, they imply that if all the first-stage effects  $\beta_{s,g}$  are equal to a constant  $\beta$ , the first-stage Bartik regression with a constant identifies  $\beta$  under our common trends assumption. On the other hand, the first-stage Bartik regression without a constant only identifies  $\beta$  if one further assumes that  $\mu^D$ , the treatment evolution in the absence of any shocks, is equal to 0. Second, Theorems 2 and 3 show that under common trends, the first-stage Bartik regressions are not robust to heterogeneous first-stage effects across sectors and locations: they do not identify a convex combination of first-stage effects. Accordingly, they do not satisfy the no-sign reversal property, which requires that if all first-stage effects are of the same sign,  $\beta_{NC}^D$  and  $\beta_C^D$  should also be of that sign. This contrasts with the results in Adão et al. (2019) and Borusyak et al. (2020), who show that first-stage Bartik regressions with and without a constant identify a weighted average of first-stage effects under the randomly-assigned-shocks assumption. Accordingly, the robustness of those regressions to heterogeneous effects depends on whether common trends or randomly-assigned-shocks is more plausible in the application under consideration.

Note that the weights in Theorems 2 and 3 can be estimated. Estimating the weights, and assessing if many are negative, can be used to assess the robustness of the first-stage Bartik regression to heterogeneous effects under common trends, as De Chaisemartin & D'Haultfœuille (2020) have proposed for two-way fixed effects regressions.

### 3.2 Results for Reduced-Form Bartik Regressions

In this section, we consider the reduced-form regression of the outcome evolution  $\Delta Y_g$  on  $\Delta Z_g$ . Again we consider regression models with and without a constant:

**Definition 4** *Reduced-form Bartik regression (without constant):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_{NC}^Y$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_g$  in the reduced-form regression of  $\Delta Y_g$  on  $\Delta Z_g$ . Let  $\beta_{NC}^Y = E[\hat{\beta}_{NC}^Y]$ .

**Definition 5** *Reduced-form Bartik regression (with constant):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_C^Y$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_g$  in the reduced-form regression of  $\Delta Y_g$  on  $\Delta Z_g$  and a constant. Let  $\beta_C^Y = E[\hat{\beta}_C^Y]$ .

We have the following identification results:

**Theorem 4** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 4, and 5 hold.*

1. Then,

$$\beta_{NC}^Y = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g} \gamma_{s,g} \right) + \mu^Y E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right).$$

2. If we further assume  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g$  and let  $\gamma_g = \alpha_g \beta_g$ ,

$$\beta_{NC}^Y = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z_g^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \gamma_g \right) + \mu^Y E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right).$$

**Theorem 5** Suppose Assumptions 1, 4, and 5 hold.

1. Then,

$$\beta_C^Y = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \gamma_{s,g} \right).$$

2. If we further assume  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g$  and let  $\gamma_g = \alpha_g \beta_g$ ,

$$\beta_C^Y = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \gamma_g \right).$$

Theorems 4 and 5 are equivalent to Theorems 2 and 3, replacing the treatment evolution by the outcome evolution. Accordingly, their interpretation is the same. They imply that under our common trends assumption, the reduced-form Bartik regressions with and without a constant do not identify a convex combination of reduced-form effects. Note that the weights in Theorems 4 and 5 are the same as in Theorems 2 and 3.

### 3.3 Results for 2SLS Bartik Regressions

In this section, we consider the 2SLS regression of  $\Delta Y_g$  on  $\Delta D_g$ , using  $\Delta Z_g$  as the instrument. We only consider the regression with a constant: the 2SLS regression without a constant is hard to interpret under our assumptions, so the identification result concerning it is relegated to Section B of the Web Appendix.

**Definition 6** 2SLS Bartik regression (with constant): Let  $\hat{\beta}_C^{2SLS} = \hat{\beta}_C^Y / \hat{\beta}_C^D$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta D_g$  in the 2SLS regression of  $\Delta Y_g$  on  $\Delta D_g$  and a constant, using  $\Delta Z_g$  as the instrument for  $\Delta D_g$ . Let  $\beta_C^{2SLS} = E[\hat{\beta}_C^Y] / E[\hat{\beta}_C^D]$ .

Note that  $\beta_C^{2SLS}$  is not the expectation of  $\hat{\beta}_C^{2SLS}$ , but the expectation of its numerator divided by the expectation of its denominator. One can for instance show that when the number of sectors  $S$  goes to infinity, if shocks are independent across sectors  $\beta_C^{2SLS}$  is the probability limit of  $\hat{\beta}_C^{2SLS}$  (see Adão et al. 2019).

**Theorem 6** Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 4, and 5 hold.

1. Then,

$$\beta_C^{2SLS} = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \beta_{s,g}}{E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \beta_{s,g} \right)} \alpha_g \right).$$

2. If one further assumes  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g$ ,

$$\beta_C^{2SLS} = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\frac{\Delta Z_g(\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g(\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \beta_g}{E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z_g(\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g(\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \beta_g \right)} \alpha_g \right).$$

3. If one further assumes  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta$ ,

$$\beta_C^{2SLS} = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z_g(\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g(\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \alpha_g \right).$$

The first point of Theorem 6 shows that  $\beta_C^{2SLS}$  is equal to the expectation of a weighted sum of the second-stage effects  $\alpha_g$ , with weights that may not all be positive.<sup>7</sup> Contrary to the weights in Theorems 2-5, the weights cannot be estimated, as they depend on the first stage effects  $\beta_{s,g}$ . One can still describe which  $\alpha_{gs}$  get positively/negatively weighted. First, notice that the denominator of the weights is the first-stage estimand  $\beta_C^D$ , and to fix ideas let us assume that  $\beta_C^D \geq 0$ . Then, notice that

$$\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) = \sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)^2 \geq 0.$$

Then, locations whose  $\alpha_g$  get weighted positively are those for which  $\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.$  is of the same sign as the effect of the shocks on their treatment evolution  $\sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g}$ . Even if all the shocks  $\Delta Z_s$  are positive and all the first-stage effects  $\beta_{s,g}$  are positive, the  $\alpha_{gs}$  of locations with a  $\Delta Z_g$  below the average are weighted negatively. The second and third points of Theorem 6 show that even under further restrictions on the heterogeneity of the first-stage effects,  $\beta_C^{2SLS}$  still identifies the expectation of a weighted sum of second-stage effects, with weights that may not all be positive. The second point of Theorem 6 also implies that if we assume that  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g \geq 0$ , the sign of the weight of each second-stage effect is identified. One can then compare positively and negatively weighted locations, to assess if their second-stage effects are likely to differ. Similarly, the third point of Theorem 6 implies that if we assume that  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta$ , the weights attached to the second-stage effects can be estimated.

### 3.4 Extension to Applications with Multiple Periods

So far, we have assumed that the data only has two periods. All our previous results readily generalize to settings with more than two periods. Below, we generalize Theorem 6 to settings with more than two periods. The generalizations of all our other results can be found in Section C of the Web Appendix.

<sup>7</sup>The weights do not sum up to 1, but their expectations sum to 1.

We begin by adapting our notation and assumptions to the case where there are multiple time periods indexed by  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ ,  $T \geq 3$ . For all  $t \geq 2$  and any location-level variable  $R_g$ , let  $\Delta R_{g,t} = R_{g,t} - R_{g,t-1}$ . Let  $\Delta Z_{s,t}$  denote the shock affecting sector  $s$  between periods  $t - 1$  and  $t$ , and let  $\Delta \mathbf{Z} = (\Delta Z_{s,t})_{(s,t) \in \{1, \dots, S\} \times \{2, \dots, T\}}$  denote a vector collecting all the shocks  $\Delta Z_{s,t}$ .

**Definition 7** *Bartik Instrument*: The Bartik instrument  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  is:

$$\Delta Z_{g,t} = \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t}.$$

With more than two periods, our definition of the Bartik instrument assumes that the shares  $Q_{s,g}$  do not change over time. In practice, applied researchers sometimes use time-varying shares to define the Bartik instrument. For instance, in the canonical Bartik design,  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  could be constructed using the employment share of sector  $s$  in location  $g$  at time  $t - 1$ , rather than the employment share of sector  $s$  in location  $g$  at the start of the panel. Our results still hold with time-varying shares.

For any  $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S) \in \mathbb{R}^S$ , let  $\Delta D_{g,t}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S)$  denote the potential treatment evolution that location  $g$  will experience from period  $t - 1$  to  $t$  if  $(\Delta Z_{1,t}, \dots, \Delta Z_{S,t}) = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S)$ . And let  $\Delta D_{g,t}(\mathbf{0}) = \Delta D_{g,t}(0, \dots, 0)$  denote the potential treatment evolution that location  $g$  will experience in the absence of any shocks. Finally, let  $\Delta Y_{g,t}(d_{g,t})$  denote the potential outcome evolution that location  $g$  will experience from period  $t - 1$  to  $t$  if  $\Delta D_{g,t} = d_{g,t}$ .

The following assumptions generalize Assumptions 1, 2, 4, and 5 to applications with multiple periods.

**Assumption 6** *Linear Shock Effects*: for all  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ ,  $t \in \{2, \dots, T\}$ , there are real numbers  $(\beta_{s,g,t})_{s \in \{1, \dots, S\}}$  such that for any  $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S) \in \mathbb{R}^S$ :

$$\Delta D_{g,t}(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_S) = \Delta D_{g,t}(\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \delta_s \beta_{s,g,t}.$$

**Assumption 7** *Common Trends for the Treatment*: for all  $t \in \{2, \dots, T\}$ , there are real numbers  $\mu_t^D$  such that  $\forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ ,  $E(\Delta D_{g,t}(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) = \mu_t^D$ .

**Assumption 8** *Linear Treatment Effects*: for all  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ ,  $t \in \{2, \dots, T\}$ , there is a real number  $\alpha_{g,t}$  such that for any  $d_{g,t} \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$\Delta Y_{g,t}(d_{g,t}) = \Delta Y_{g,t}(0) + \alpha_{g,t} d_{g,t}.$$

**Assumption 9** *Common Trends for the Outcome*: for all  $t \in \{2, \dots, T\}$ , there are real numbers  $\mu_t^Y$  such that  $\forall g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ ,  $E(\Delta Y_{g,t}(\Delta D_{g,t}(\mathbf{0})) | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) = \mu_t^Y$ .

With several periods, the analog of the 2SLS regression with a constant is a 2SLS regression with period fixed effects.

**Definition 8** *2SLS Bartik regression (with period fixed effects):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_C^{2SLS}$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta D_{g,t}$  in the 2SLS regression of  $\Delta Y_{g,t}$  on  $\Delta D_{g,t}$  and period fixed effects, using  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  as the instrument for  $\Delta D_{g,t}$ , among observations with  $t \geq 2$ . Let  $\beta_C^{2SLS} = E[\hat{\beta}_C^Y]/E[\hat{\beta}_C^D]$ .

The following result extends Theorem 6 to applications with multiple periods.

**Theorem 7** *Suppose Assumptions 6, 7, 8, and 9 hold.*

1. Then,

$$\beta_C^{2SLS} = E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \beta_{s,g,t}}{E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \beta_{s,g,t} \right)} \alpha_{g,t} \right).$$

2. If one further assumes that  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ ,

$$\beta_C^{2SLS} = E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\frac{\Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \beta_{g,t}}{E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \beta_{g,t} \right)} \alpha_{g,t} \right).$$

3. If one further assumes that  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$ ,

$$\beta_C^{2SLS} = E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \alpha_{g,t}}{\right).$$

4. If one further assumes that  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g$  and  $\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g$ ,

$$\beta_C^{2SLS} = E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\left( \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \right) \beta_g}{E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \left( \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \right) \beta_g \right)} \alpha_g \right).$$

Points 1, 2, and 3 of Theorem 7 are generalizations of Points 1, 2, and 3 of Theorem 6. The only new result is Point 4, where it is assumed that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and over time, and that second-stage effects do not vary over time. Again,  $\beta_C^{2SLS}$  identifies a weighted sum of the location-specific second stage effects  $\alpha_g$ , with weights that may be negative.

### 3.5 Testing the common trends assumptions

When the data contains a time period where no shocks arise, our common trends assumptions can be tested. Let us assume that  $\Delta Z_{s,2} = 0$  for every  $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ . In the canonical design, that means that the nationwide employment should remain stable from  $t = 1$  to  $t = 2$  in every sector. In Autor et al. (2013), that means that the exposure to Chinese imports should remain stable from  $t = 1$  to  $t = 2$  in every sector. Then, one can use the following regressions to test Assumptions 7 and 9.

**Definition 9** *Placebo First-Stage Bartik regression:* Let  $\hat{\beta}_{pl}^D$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_{g,3}$  in the regression of  $\Delta D_{g,2}$  on  $\Delta Z_{g,3}$  and a constant. Let  $\beta_{pl}^D = E[\hat{\beta}_{pl}^D]$ .

**Definition 10** *Placebo Reduced-Form Bartik regression:* Let  $\hat{\beta}_{pl}^Y$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_{g,3}$  in the regression of  $\Delta Y_{g,2}$  on  $\Delta Z_{g,3}$  and a constant. Let  $\beta_{pl}^Y = E[\hat{\beta}_{pl}^Y]$ .

$\beta_{pl}^D$  is the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_{g,3}$ , the period-3 Bartik instrument, from a regression of  $\Delta D_{g,2}$ , the period-1-to-2 treatment evolution, on a constant and  $\Delta Z_{g,3}$ . If  $\Delta Z_{s,2} = 0$  for every  $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ ,  $\Delta D_{g,2} = \Delta D_{g,2}(\mathbf{0})$  for every  $g$ . Under Assumption 7, the expectation of  $\Delta D_{g,2}(\mathbf{0})$  should be the same in every location, and should not correlate with locations' value of the Bartik instrument in the next period. Accordingly,  $\beta_{pl}^D = 0$  so finding that  $\hat{\beta}_{pl}^D$  is significantly different from 0 would imply that Assumption 7 is rejected. As per the same logic, finding that  $\hat{\beta}_{pl}^Y$  is significantly different from 0 would imply that Assumption 9 is rejected. Theorem 8 below formalizes this argument.

**Theorem 8** *Suppose Assumptions 6 and 8 hold, and  $\Delta Z_{s,2} = 0$  for every  $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ .*

1. *If Assumption 7 also holds,  $\beta_{pl}^D = 0$ .*
2. *If Assumption 9 also holds,  $\beta_{pl}^Y = 0$ .*

When  $\Delta Z_{s,2} = 0$  for every  $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$ , testing whether  $\hat{\beta}_{pl}^D$  (resp.  $\hat{\beta}_{pl}^Y$ ) significantly differs from 0 is not the only way to test Assumption 7 (resp. 9). For instance, one could regress  $\Delta D_{g,2}$  (resp.  $\Delta Y_{g,2}$ ) on any of the  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  for  $t \geq 3$ . The reason we focus on the test presented above is that it is closely related to a placebo test commonly implemented by applied researchers, see for instance Autor et al. (2013). Theorem 8 shows that this placebo test is in fact a test of our common trends assumptions.

## 4 Alternative estimators

In this section, we propose alternative estimators. They are closely related to the correlated random coefficients estimator proposed by Chamberlain (1992). They can be used when the data has at least three periods, which is often the case in Bartik applications.<sup>8</sup> They rely on the following assumption:

**Assumption 10** *Constant first-stage effects across sectors and over time, and constant second-stage effects over time: for all  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ , there are real numbers  $\beta_g$  and  $\alpha_g$  such that  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g$  for every  $s \in \{1, \dots, S\}$  and  $t \in \{2, \dots, T\}$  and  $\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g$  for every  $t \in \{2, \dots, T\}$ .*

---

<sup>8</sup>With two periods, the estimation method we propose cannot be used, but one may then be able to follow a similar estimation strategy as that proposed in Graham & Powell (2012).

Assumption 10 requires that first-stage effects be constant across sectors and over time, and that second-stage effects be constant over time, as in Point 4 of Theorem 7. Under Assumption 10, for every  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ , let  $\gamma_g = \alpha_g \beta_g$  denote the reduced-form effect of the instrument on the outcome.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta \mathbf{Z}_g &= (\Delta Z_{g,2}, \dots, \Delta Z_{g,T})' \\ \Delta \mathbf{D}_g &= (\Delta D_{g,2}, \dots, \Delta D_{g,T})' \\ \Delta \mathbf{Y}_g &= (\Delta Y_{g,2}, \dots, \Delta Y_{g,T})'\end{aligned}$$

be  $(T-1) \times 1$  vectors stacking together the instruments, the evolutions of the treatment, and the evolutions of the outcome, respectively. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\mu}^D &= (\mu_2^D, \dots, \mu_T^D)' \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}^Y &= (\mu_2^Y, \dots, \mu_T^Y)'\end{aligned}$$

be  $(T-1) \times 1$  vectors stacking together the common trends affecting the treatment and the outcome, defined in Assumptions 7 and 9. For every  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ , let

$$\mathbf{M}_g = \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g} \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g,$$

where  $\mathbf{I}$  denotes the  $(T-1) \times (T-1)$  identity matrix.

**Theorem 9** *Suppose that Assumptions 6-10 hold,  $E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{M}'_g \mathbf{M}_g\right)$  is invertible, and with probability 1  $\Delta \mathbf{Z}_g \neq 0$  for every  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ . Then:*

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}^D = E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{M}'_g \mathbf{M}_g\right)^{-1} E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{M}'_g \mathbf{M}_g \Delta \mathbf{D}_g\right) \quad (4.1)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}^Y = E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{M}'_g \mathbf{M}_g\right)^{-1} E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{M}'_g \mathbf{M}_g \Delta \mathbf{Y}_g\right) \quad (4.2)$$

$$\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g = E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g (\Delta \mathbf{D}_g - \boldsymbol{\mu}^D)}{\Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g}\right) \quad (4.3)$$

$$\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g = E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g (\Delta \mathbf{Y}_g - \boldsymbol{\mu}^Y)}{\Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g}\right). \quad (4.4)$$

Under Assumptions 6-10,

$$E(\Delta \mathbf{D}_g | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) = \boldsymbol{\mu}^D + \beta_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g, \quad (4.5)$$

an equation that is additively separable in the location-specific coefficient  $\beta_g$  and the common trends  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^D$ , and thus falls into the class of semi-parametric models studied in Chamberlain (1992). Then, identification follows from the same steps as in Chamberlain



(1992). First, it is easy to check that  $M_g \Delta Z_g = 0$ . Accordingly, left-multiplying Equation (4.5) by  $M_g$ , it follows that

$$E(M_g \Delta D_g | \Delta Z) = M_g \mu^D, \quad (4.6)$$

so  $\mu^D$  is identified by a regression of  $M_g \Delta D_g$  on  $M_g$ , as in Equation (4.1). Similarly, Equation (4.3) follows after left-multiplying Equation (4.5) by  $\Delta Z'_g$ , rearranging terms, using the law of iterated expectations, and averaging across  $g$ . Notice that

$$\frac{\Delta Z'_g (\Delta D_g - \mu^D)}{\Delta Z'_g \Delta Z_g}$$

is the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  in the regression, within group  $g$ , of  $\Delta D_{g,t} - \mu_t^D$  on  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  without a constant. Accordingly, once the common trends  $\mu_t^D$  have been identified, Chamberlain's estimator of the average first-stage effect  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g$  amounts to regressing  $\Delta D_{g,t} - \mu_t^D$  on  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  without a constant in every group, and then averaging those coefficients across groups. To estimate the average reduced-form effect  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g$ , the procedure is similar, replacing the treatment evolution by the outcome evolution.

**Corollary 1** *Under the same assumptions as those in Theorem 9,*

$$\sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\beta_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g} \alpha_g = \frac{E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z'_g (\Delta Y_g - \mu^Y)}{\Delta Z'_g \Delta Z_g}\right)}{E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z'_g (\Delta D_g - \mu^D)}{\Delta Z'_g \Delta Z_g}\right)}. \quad (4.7)$$

Corollary 1 directly follows from Equations (4.3) and (4.4) and the definition of  $\gamma_g$ . Under the assumption that all first-stage effects are positive,  $\sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\beta_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g} \alpha_g$  is a weighted average of location-specific second stage effects, that gives a higher weight to the second-stage effect of locations with a higher first-stage effect. Corollary 1 shows that this estimand is identified under the assumptions of Theorem 9.

Operationally, estimators of  $\mu^D$ ,  $\mu^Y$ ,  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g$ , and  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g$  can be computed using the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM). Indeed, one has

$$\begin{aligned} E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G M_g (\Delta D_g - \mu^D)\right) &= 0 \\ E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G M_g (\Delta Y_g - \mu^Y)\right) &= 0 \\ E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z'_g (\Delta D_g - \mu^D)}{\Delta Z'_g \Delta Z_g} - \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g\right) &= 0 \\ E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z'_g (\Delta Y_g - \mu^Y)}{\Delta Z'_g \Delta Z_g} - \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g\right) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

a just-identified system with  $2T$  moment conditions and  $2T$  parameters. All the moment conditions in (4.8) actually hold conditional on  $\mathbf{Z}$ , thus implying that the parameters could be estimated using conditional rather than unconditional GMM. Applying results in Chamberlain (1992), one can derive the optimal estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^D$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^Y$  attached to the first two equations in (4.8). An issue, however, is that Chamberlain's optimality results do not apply to the estimators of  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g$  and  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g$ , our parameters of interest. Moreover, the computation of the optimal estimator requires a non-parametric first-stage estimation. To our knowledge, no data-driven method has been proposed to choose the tuning parameters involved in this first stage. Accordingly, we prefer to stick with the unconditional GMM estimator above.

In our second empirical application, the estimators of  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g$  and  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g$  based on Equation (4.8) are noisy, because  $\frac{1}{\Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g}$  is extremely skewed, due to a few locations with values of the Bartik instrument close to 0 at every period. Then, an alternative estimation strategy is to use the estimators of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^D$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^Y$  to debias Bartik regressions without a constant. Indeed, Theorem C.1 (resp. C.3) in the Web Appendix implies that under Assumptions 6-10, the Bartik first-stage (resp. reduced-form) regression without a constant identifies a weighted average of first-stage (resp. reduced-form) effects, plus a bias term that depends on  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^D$  (resp.  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^Y$ ) and other quantities that can easily be estimated. The following corollary formalizes that alternative estimation strategy.

**Corollary 2** *Suppose that Assumptions 6-10 hold,  $E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{M}'_g \mathbf{M}_g\right)$  is invertible, and with probability 1  $\Delta \mathbf{Z}_g \neq 0$  for every  $g \in \{1, \dots, G\}$ . Then,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^D$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^Y$  are identified by Equations (4.1) and (4.2) above, and*

$$\begin{aligned} E\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \left(\sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}\right) \beta_g\right) &= \beta_{NC}^D - \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}\right) \\ E\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \left(\sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}\right) \gamma_g\right) &= \beta_{NC}^Y - \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^Y E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}\right) \\ E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \left(\sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}\right) \beta_g}{E\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \left(\sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}\right) \beta_g\right)} \alpha_g\right) &= \frac{\beta_{NC}^Y - \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^Y E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}\right)}{\beta_{NC}^D - \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2 directly follows from Theorems 9 and Theorems C.1 and C.3 in the Web Appendix. Under the assumption that all first-stage effects are positive,

$$E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \left(\sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}\right) \beta_g}{E\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \left(\sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}\right) \beta_g\right)} \alpha_g\right)$$

is a weighted average of location-specific second stage effects, with weights that differ from those in Corollary 1, as they depend both on the first-stage effect in group  $g$  and on the strength of the Bartik instruments in that group.

As explained in Section 2,  $(\Delta Y_{g,t}(0), \Delta D_{g,t}(\mathbf{0}))_{(g,t) \in \{1, \dots, G\} \times \{2, \dots, T\}}$  and  $(\Delta Z_{s,t})_{(s,t) \in \{1, \dots, S\} \times \{2, \dots, T\}}$  are the sources of randomness in our setup. Assuming that the vectors  $(\Delta Y_{g,t}(0), \Delta D_{g,t}(\mathbf{0}))_{t \in \{2, \dots, T\}}$  are independent across locations conditional on the shocks, one may use the standard variance estimators attached to the GMM system in (4.8) to perform inference on  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g$ ,  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g$  and  $\sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\beta_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g} \alpha_g$  conditional on the shocks.<sup>9</sup> Accounting for the variance arising from the shocks would require extending the approach in Adão et al. (2019) to the estimators in Theorem 9. This important extension is left for future work.

The estimators we propose are robust to heterogeneous first- and second-stage effects across locations. On the other hand, they are not robust to heterogeneous first- and second-stage effects over time, and to heterogeneous first-stage effects across sectors. Accordingly, they may be preferable to Bartik regressions when our common trends assumptions are plausible but the random shocks assumption is not, and when Assumption 10 is plausible but one suspects first- or second-stage effects may vary across locations.

Finally, the approach in Theorem 9 and Corollary 1 is not the only possible one to adapt the approach in Chamberlain (1992) to Bartik designs. For instance, rather than imposing Assumption 10, one could assume that first-stage effects are fully homogeneous ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$ ) and that second-stage effects are time varying but follow the same evolution over time in every location ( $\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g + \lambda_t$ ). We do not pursue this alternative approach further, because in our two empirical applications its assumptions do not seem compellingly more plausible than Assumption 10, and the estimators we obtain under this alternative approach and under Assumption 10 are very close. But there may be other applications where a fully homogeneous first-stage effect is plausible, while allowing for time-varying second-stage effects is appealing. Finally, a natural extension of this alternative approach would be to assume that both first- and second-stage effects are time varying and follow the same evolution in every location:  $\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g + \lambda_t$  and  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g + \theta_t$ . However, this would imply that the reduced form effects are multiplicatively but not additively separable in location and time. Then, the approach proposed in Chamberlain (1992) cannot be used to estimate the model's parameters, but it may be possible to use a factor model.

## 5 Empirical Applications

### 5.1 Canonical Bartik design

In this section, we revisit the canonical application in Bartik (1991), where the Bartik instrument is used to estimate the inverse elasticity of labor supply.

---

<sup>9</sup>Theorem 9 is also valid conditional on the shocks.

### 5.1.1 Data

Our data construction closely follows [Goldsmith-Pinkham et al. \(2020\)](#). We construct a decennial continental US commuting-zone (CZ) level panel data set, from 1990 to 2010, with CZ wages and employment levels. For 1990 and 2000, we use the 5% IPUMS sample of the U.S. Census. For 2010, we pool the 2009-2011 ACSs ([Ruggles et al. 2019](#)). Sectors are IND1990 industries. We follow [Autor & Dorn \(2013\)](#) to reallocate Public Use Micro Areas level observations of Census data to the CZ level. We also follow [Autor et al. \(2013\)](#) to aggregate the Census industry code ind1990 to a balanced panel of industries for the 1990 and 2000 Censuses and the 2009-2011 ACS, with new industry code ind1990dd.<sup>10</sup> In our final dataset, we have 3 periods, 722 CZs and 212 industries.

The outcome variable is  $\Delta Y_{g,t} = \Delta \log w_{g,t}$ , the change in log wages in CZ  $g$  from  $t - 10$  to  $t$ , for  $t \in \{2000, 2010\}$ . The treatment variable is  $\Delta D_{g,t} = \Delta \log E_{g,t}$ , the change in log employment in CZ  $g$  from  $t - 10$  to  $t$ . We use people aged 18 and older who are employed and report usually working at least 30 hours per week in the previous year to generate employment and average wages. We define  $Q_{s,g}$  as the employment share of industry  $s$  in CZ  $g$  in 1990, and then construct the Bartik instrument using 1990-2000 and 2000-2010 leave-one-out sectoral employment growth rates. Specifically, to construct the nationwide employment growth rate of industry  $s$  for CZ  $g$ , we use the change in log employment in industry  $s$  over all CZs excluding CZ  $g$ , following [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#).<sup>11</sup>

### 5.1.2 Testing the identifying assumptions

We start by assessing the plausibility of the random shock assumption in [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#), by testing whether shocks are independent of industries' characteristics. Table 1 shows regressions of the nationwide sector-level shocks, namely the employment growth of each industry from 1990 to 2000 (in Column (1)) and from 2000 to 2010 (in Column (2)), on a set of pre-determined industry characteristics measured in 1990.<sup>12</sup> These industry characteristics are the log of average wages, the proportion of male workers, the proportion of white workers, the average age of workers, and the proportion of workers with some college education. The results show that large employment shocks tend to appear in industries with low average wages and more educated workers, and in both cases we can reject the hypothesis that the employment shocks

---

<sup>10</sup>Crosswalk files are available online at <https://www.ddorn.net/data.htm>. The original crosswalk file for industry code only creates a balanced panel of industries up to the 2006-2008 ACSs. We extend the crosswalk approach to one additional industry (shoe repair shops, crosswalked into miscellaneous personal services) to create a balanced panel of industries up to the 2009-2011 ACSs.

<sup>11</sup>As discussed in [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Goldsmith-Pinkham et al. \(2020\)](#), we use the leave-one-out definition to construct the national growth rates, in order to avoid the finite sample bias that comes from using own-observation information. In practice, because we have 722 locations, whether one uses leave-one-out or not to estimate the national growth rates barely changes the results.

<sup>12</sup>When constructing the industry characteristics, we only use the workers from continental U.S. CZs, in order to be consistent with our main sample.

are not correlated with any industry characteristic (p-value < 0.001). Therefore, there are industries with certain characteristics that make them more likely to receive a large employment shock, and the random shock assumption may be implausible in this setting.

Table 1: Testing the Random Shock Assumption

	(1)	(2)
Variables	$\Delta \log E$ : 1990-2000	$\Delta \log E$ : 2000-2010
$\log w_{1990}$	-0.372 (0.093)	-0.375 (0.081)
Male <sub>1990</sub>	0.212 (0.200)	0.337 (0.146)
White <sub>1990</sub>	-0.738 (0.547)	-0.182 (0.472)
Age <sub>1990</sub>	-0.027 (0.015)	0.009 (0.011)
Some College <sub>1990</sub>	1.095 (0.229)	1.122 (0.199)
Constant	4.772 (1.345)	2.760 (0.964)
Observations	212	212
R-squared	0.161	0.152
F-test P-value	0.0000	0.0000

Notes: The table reports estimates of regressions of the industry-level employment growth during 1990-2000 and 2000-2010 on a set of pre-determined industry characteristics measured in 1990. The dependent variable in Column (1) is the change in log nationwide employment in the industry from 1990 to 2000. The dependent variable in Column (2) is the change in log nationwide employment in the industry from 2000 to 2010.  $\log w_{1990}$  denotes log average wages in the industry in 1990. Male<sub>1990</sub> denotes the proportion of male workers in the industry in 1990. White<sub>1990</sub> denotes the proportion of white workers in the industry in 1990. Age<sub>1990</sub> denotes the average age of workers in the industry in 1990. Some College<sub>1990</sub> denotes the proportion of workers with at least some college education in the industry in 1990. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The F-test p-value is the p-value of the joint test that all the coefficients of the industry characteristics are equal to 0.

Note that our test of the random shocks assumption is inspired from and closely related to that in Table 3 Panel A in [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#). The only difference is that they separately regress each industry characteristic on the shocks, while we regress the shocks on all the industry characteristics. Our linear model for expected shocks allows us to determine if expected shocks vary with industry characteristics, thus allowing us to directly test the assumption that the shocks's expectation does not vary across industries, an implication of the random shocks assumption.

Unfortunately, in this application we cannot implement the tests of our common trends assumptions in Theorem 8, as there are no consecutive time periods where the nationwide

employment remains stable in every industry.

### 5.1.3 Results

Table 2 below shows the results of Bartik regressions with period fixed effects, as in Definition 8 and Definitions C.2 and C.4 in the Web Appendix. In Column (1), the first-stage coefficient is 0.818. In Column (2), the reduced form coefficient is 0.390. Finally, in Column (3), the 2SLS coefficient is 0.477. If interpreted causally, this 2SLS coefficient means that a 1% increase in employment leads to a 0.477% increase in wages. Robust standard errors clustered at the CZ level are shown between parentheses. As shown by Adão et al. (2019), such standard errors do not account for the fact that the Bartik instruments of CZs with similar sectoral shares are correlated. Accordingly, we also report the standard errors proposed by Adão et al. (2019) between square brackets. All coefficients are significant, irrespective of the inference method used.

Table 2: Bartik Regressions in the Canonical Setting

	First-stage	Reduced-form	2SLS
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Dependent Variable	$\Delta D_{g,t}$	$\Delta Y_{g,t}$	$\Delta Y_{g,t}$
Bartik Instrument $\Delta Z_{g,t}$	0.818	0.390	
	(0.055)	(0.031)	
	[0.082]	[0.064]	
$\Delta D_{g,t}$			0.477
			(0.039)
			[0.075]
Observations	1,444	1,444	1,444

Notes: The table reports estimates of Bartik regressions with period fixed effects, using a decennial US commuting-zone (CZ) level panel data set from 1990 to 2010.  $\Delta Y_{g,t}$  is the change in log wages in CZ  $g$  from  $t - 10$  to  $t$ , for  $t \in \{2000, 2010\}$ .  $\Delta D_{g,t}$  is the change in log employment in CZ  $g$  from  $t - 10$  to  $t$ .  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  is the Bartik instrument, whose construction is detailed in the text. Columns (1), (2), and (3) respectively report estimates of the first-stage, reduced-form, and 2SLS Bartik regression coefficients. Standard errors clustered at the CZ level are shown in parentheses. The standard errors proposed by Adão et al. (2019) are shown in square brackets.

We now investigate if the first-stage, reduced-form, and 2SLS regressions in Table 2 respectively estimate convex combinations of first-stage, reduced-form, and second-stage effects. We follow Theorem C.2 in the Web Appendix, a straightforward generalization of Theorem 3 to applications with more than two periods, to estimate the weights attached to the first-stage regression in Table 2. Panel A of Table 3 reports summary statistics on those weights. Column (1) shows that without making any assumption on the first-stage effects, the first-stage regression estimates a weighted sum of 273,187 first-stage effects, where 134,493 effects receive a negative weight, and where negative weights sum to -

1.249. Column (2) shows that under the assumption that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ ), the first-stage regression estimates a weighted sum of 1,444 first-stage effects, where 446 effects still receive a negative weight, and where negative weights sum to -0.040. Assuming that first-stage effects do not vary over time reduces the number and the sum of negative weights even further, as shown in Column (3). Finally, Column (4) trivially shows that if the first-stage effect is fully homogeneous ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$ ), the first-stage regression estimates  $\beta$ . Similarly, we can follow Theorem C.4 in the Web Appendix to estimate the weights attached to the reduced-form regression in Table 2. We do not report those weights, because they are identical to those in Panel A of Table 3, except that they are obtained under assumptions on the reduced-form effects  $\gamma_{s,g,t}$ .

Then, we follow Theorem 7 to estimate the weights attached to the 2SLS regression in Table 2. Panel B of Table 3 reports summary statistics on those weights. Column (1) shows that without making any assumption on the first-stage effects, we cannot estimate the number of negative weights or their sum. On the other hand, Column (2) shows that under the assumption that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and are all positive ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t} \geq 0$ ), the 2SLS regression estimates a weighted sum of 1,444 second-stage effects, where 446 effects receive a negative weight, even though we cannot estimate the sum of those negative weights. Similarly, Column (3) shows that under the assumption that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and over time and are all positive ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g \geq 0$ ), and that second-stage effects do not vary over time ( $\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g$ ), the 2SLS regression estimates a weighted sum of 722 second-stage effects, where 75 effects receive a negative weight. Finally, Column (4) shows that if the first-stage effect is fully homogeneous ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$ ), the 2SLS regression estimates a weighted sum of 1,444 second-stage effects, where 446 effects receive a negative weight, and where negative weights sum to -0.04. Overall, Table 3 shows that under common trends assumptions, the Bartik regressions in Table 2 do not estimate convex combinations of effects.

Table 3: Summary Statistics on the Weights Attached to Bartik Regressions in Table 2

*Panel A: Weights Attached to the First-Stage Regression*

Assumption on first-stage effects	None	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g$	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Number of negative weights	134,493	446	75	0
Number of positive weights	138,694	998	647	1
Sum of negative weights	-1.249	-0.040	-0.010	0

*Panel B: Weights Attached to the 2SLS Regression*

Assumption on first-stage effects	None	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t} \geq 0$	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g \geq 0$	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$
Assumption on second-stage effects	None	None	$\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g$	None
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Number of negative weights	?	446	75	446
Number of positive weights	?	998	647	998
Sum of negative weights	?	?	?	-0.040

Notes: Panel A of the table reports summary statistics on the weights attached to the first-stage regression in Table 2. The weights are estimated following Theorem C.2 in the Web Appendix. In Column (1), no assumption is made on the first-stage effects. In Column (2), it is assumed that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ ). In Column (3), it is assumed that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and over time ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g$ ). Finally, in Column (4) it is assumed that the first-stage effects are fully homogeneous ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$ ). Panel B of the table reports summary statistics on the weights attached to the 2SLS regression in Table 2. The weights are estimated following Theorem 7. In Column (1), no assumption is made on first- and second-stage effects. In Column (2), it is assumed that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and are positive ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t} \geq 0$ ). In Column (3), it is assumed that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and over time and are positive ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g \geq 0$ ), and that second-stage effects do not vary over time ( $\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g$ ). Finally, in Column (4) it is assumed that the first-stage effects are fully homogeneous ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$ ). In Panel B, question marks indicate that the quantity under consideration cannot be estimated.

Finally, in Table 4 we present the results we obtain using the correlated random coefficient estimators proposed in Theorem 9 and Corollary 1. The estimated average first-stage, reduced-form, and second-stage effects are respectively equal to 0.868, 0.420, and 0.483. Estimation is at the CZ level, hence the number of observations in Column (3). Because the estimation only uses one observation per CZ, the heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in Column (2) rely on the assumption that observations are independent across CZ, and are therefore comparable to the CZ-clustered standard errors between parenthesis in Table 2. Based on the standard errors in Column (2), all the effects in Table 4 are significant. As discussed in the previous section, those standard errors are



valid conditional on the shocks but not unconditionally. In Table 2, accounting for the variance coming from the shocks following Adão et al. (2019) inflates standard errors by a factor of roughly 2. The effects in Columns (1) of Table 4 would all still be significant if their standard errors were multiplied by 2. Even though that is admittedly speculative, this may suggest that the effects in Table 4 would still be significant accounting for the variance coming from the shocks. It is also worth noting that the effects in Table 4 are economically very close to those in Table 2.

Table 4: Correlated Random Coefficient Estimators in the Canonical Setting

	Point estimate	Standard Error	Observations
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Average First-Stage Effect $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g$	0.868	0.082	722
Average Reduced-Form Effect $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g$	0.420	0.056	722
Average Second-Stage Effect $\sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\beta_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g} \alpha_g$	0.483	0.061	722

Notes: This table reports estimates of the first-stage, reduced-form and second-stage effects obtained using the correlated random coefficient estimators proposed in Theorem 9 and Corollary 1. The analysis is at the commuting-zone level. Point estimates are shown in Column (1), and heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are shown in Column (2). The estimation is done in Stata, using the GMM command, and with the system of moment conditions in Equation (4.8).

Overall, Tables 3 and 4 suggest that under our common trends assumptions, the Bartik regressions in Table 2 are robust to heterogeneous effects across commuting zones. Under the assumption that first- and second-stage effects only vary across commuting zones, Column (3) of Table 3 shows that the sum of the negative weights attached to the first-stage and reduced-form Bartik regressions is quite small, around -0.010. The implicit weights attached to Bartik regressions could still be problematic, as the weights are correlated with variables that may themselves be correlated with commuting zones' second-stage effects. For instance, the correlation between the weights in Table 3 Panel A Column (3) and commuting zones' unemployment rate in 1990 is equal to -0.07 (p-value=0.08). Commuting zones with a higher unemployment rate may have a lower second-stage effect, as their labor market is less tight. That would lead, say, the Bartik reduced-form regression to overestimate the average reduced-form effect  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g$ , by putting less weight on those commuting zones. Table 4 appeases that concern: under the assumption that first- and second-stage effects only vary across commuting zones, the correlated random coefficient estimators of the average first-stage, reduced-form, and second-stage effects are remarkably close to the Bartik regression coefficients.

Table 3 may also suggest that the Bartik regressions in Table 2 may be reasonably robust to heterogeneous effects over time: even if one allows first- and second-stage effects to vary across commuting zones and over time, Column (2) of Table 3 shows that the sum of the negative weights attached to the first-stage and reduced-form Bartik regressions is still quite small, around -0.040.

On the other hand, Table 3 strongly suggests that the Bartik regressions in Table 2 are not robust to heterogeneous first-stage effects across sectors. If first-stage effects vary across sectors, locations, and time, Column (1) of Table 3 shows that the sum of the negative weights attached to the first-stage and reduced-form Bartik regressions becomes very large. It seems that whether Bartik regressions can or cannot receive a causal interpretation in this application crucially depends on whether it is plausible to assume homogeneous first-stage effects across sectors. Accordingly, this assumption ought to be carefully discussed in empirical applications.

## 5.2 China Shock

In this section, we revisit Autor et al. (2013), who use the Bartik instrument to estimate the effects of exposure to Chinese imports on manufacturing employment in the US.

### 5.2.1 Data

We use the replication dataset of Autor et al. (2013) on the AEA website. In their main analysis, they use a CZ-level panel data set, with 722 CZs and 3 periods (1990, 2000, and 2007). The outcome variable  $\Delta Y_{g,t}$  is the change in the manufacturing employment share of the working age population in CZ  $g$  between two consecutive periods. The treatment variable  $\Delta D_{g,t}$  is the change in Chinese import exposure per worker in CZ  $g$  between two consecutive periods. The sectoral shocks  $\Delta Z_{s,t}$  are the change in per-worker imports from China to other high-income countries in industry  $s$ , for 397 industries. The share  $Q_{s,g}$  in Autor et al. (2013) is the share of location  $g$  in US employment in sector  $s$ , and the shares are lagged by 1 period when constructing the Bartik instrument (see Equation (4) in Autor et al. 2013). Therefore, the shares do not sum up to 1 in each location (see Borusyak et al. 2020 for a discussion of this). The replication dataset of Autor et al. (2013) does not contain the shock and share variables. However, we obtained those variables from the replication dataset of Borusyak et al. (2020).

### 5.2.2 Testing the identifying assumptions

We start by assessing the plausibility of the random shock assumption, by testing whether shocks are independent of industries' characteristics. We use the five industry characteristics in Acemoglu et al. (2016) that are in the replication dataset of Borusyak et al. (2020). These characteristics are the share of production workers in each industry's employment in 1991, the ratio of the industry's capital to value-added in 1991, the industry's log real wages in 1991, the share of its investment devoted to computers in 1990, and the share of its high-tech equipment in total investment in 1990. These predetermined characteristics reflect the structure of employment and technology across industries. Table 5 shows regressions of sectoral shocks from 1990 to 2000 (in Column (1)) and from 2000 to 2007 (in Column (2)) on these characteristics. We follow Borusyak et al. (2020) and weight

the regressions by the average industry exposure shares and cluster the standard errors at the level of three-digit SIC codes, but the results are very similar when the regressions are not weighted or when one uses robust standard errors.

The results show that large import shocks tend to appear in industries with low wages and more high-tech equipment investment, and we can reject the hypothesis that the import shocks are not correlated with any industry characteristic (p-value  $< 0.001$  in Column (1), p-value = 0.017 in Column (2)). Therefore, there are industries with certain characteristics that make them more likely to receive a large import shock, and the random shock assumption may be implausible in this setting.

Our results differ from those in [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#). Instead of estimating one regression of the shocks on all the industry characteristics, in their Table 3 Panel A they estimate separate regressions of each characteristic on the shocks, and find no significant correlation between characteristics and shocks. As explained above, our approach allows us to determine if expected shocks vary with industry characteristics, thus allowing us to directly test the assumption that the shocks's expectation does not vary across industries. Having several industry characteristics in the model may increase the power of the test.

Table 5: Testing the Random Shock Assumption

Variables	(1) $\Delta Z_{s,t}$ : 1990-2000	(2) $\Delta Z_{s,t}$ : 2000-2007
Production workers' share of employment <sub>1991</sub>	0.178 (5.179)	1.528 (24.436)
Ratio of capital to value-added <sub>1991</sub>	0.209 (0.822)	8.389 (3.000)
Log real wage (2007 USD) <sub>1991</sub>	-8.946 (2.171)	-11.514 (8.505)
Computer investment as share of total investment <sub>1990</sub>	0.103 (0.135)	1.149 (0.633)
High-tech equipment as share of total investment <sub>1990</sub>	0.299 (0.135)	1.095 (0.433)
Constant	29.414 (9.787)	25.161 (40.623)
Observations	397	397
R-squared	0.082	0.067
F-test P-value	0.0000	0.0172

Notes: The table reports estimates of regressions of the industry-level change in per-worker imports from China to other high-income countries during 1990-2000 and 2000-2007 on a set of pre-determined industry characteristics. The dependent variable in Column (1) is the change in per-worker imports from China to other high-income countries from 1990 to 2000. The dependent variable in Column (2) is the change in per-worker imports from China to other high-income countries from 2000 to 2007. The industry characteristics are obtained from [Acemoglu et al. \(2016\)](#), and include an industry's share of production workers in employment in 1991, the ratio of its capital to value-added in 1991, its log real wages in 1991, the share of its investment devoted to computers in 1990, and the share of its high-tech equipment in total investment in 1990. The regressions are weighted by the average industry exposure shares. Standard errors clustered at the level of three-digit SIC codes are shown in parentheses. The F-test p-value is the p-value of the joint test that all the coefficients of the industry characteristics are equal to 0.

In this application, there are periods where all industries barely receive any shocks. As discussed in [Autor et al. \(2013\)](#), the growth in Chinese imports to the US was very small prior to 1990. Accordingly, 1990 and prior periods satisfy, or nearly satisfy, the requirement in [Theorem 8](#) that  $\Delta Z_{s,t}$  should be 0 for every industry. In fact, in their [Table 2](#) [Autor et al. \(2013\)](#) implement a placebo test closely related to that we propose in [Theorem 8](#). They average the 1990-to-2000 and 2000-to-2007 Bartik instrument of each CZ, and then estimate a 2SLS regression of 1970-to-1980 and 1980-to-1990 manufacturing employment growths on 1990-to-2000 and 2000-to-2007 Chinese import exposure growth, using the average Bartik as the instrument. Instead, [Table 6](#) below follows [Point 2](#) of [Theorem 8](#) and presents placebo reduced-form regressions. In Column (1) (resp. (2)), we regress CZs 1970-to-1980 and 1980-to-1990 manufacturing employment growths on

their 1990-to-2000 (resp. 2000-to-2007) Bartik instrument. We use both standard errors clustered at the CZ level (between parenthesis), and the standard errors proposed in [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) (between brackets). Unlike [Autor et al. \(2013\)](#), we do not weight the regression by CZ’s population, to be consistent with Sections 2 to 4, but results remain similar with weighting. We also cluster our standard errors at the CZ rather than at the state level, but results are similar if we cluster at the state level. Finally, we do not average the 1990-to-2000 and 2000-to-2007 instruments, to be consistent with Theorem 8, but again results are similar if we instead use the average of the 1990-to-2000 and 2000-to-2007 instruments. Table 6 shows that the placebo reduced-form coefficients of the 1990-to-2000 and 2000-2007 Bartik instruments are small, and insignificant at the 5% level, irrespective of the inference method used. Overall, it seems that CZs 1970-to-1980 and 1980-to-1990 manufacturing employment growths are uncorrelated with their 1990-to-2000 and 2000-to-2007 Bartik instruments, so Assumption 9, our common trends condition on the outcome evolution without shocks, seems plausible in this application. We are unable to implement the placebo test for the first-stage regression, because trade data with China is unavailable before 1990, as explained by [Autor et al. \(2013\)](#).

Table 6: Testing the Common Trends Assumptions

	(1)	(2)
Dependent Variable	$\Delta Y_{g,t}, t \in \{1980, 1990\}$	$\Delta Y_{g,t}, t \in \{1980, 1990\}$
$\Delta Z_{g,2000}$	0.038 (0.077) [0.067]	
$\Delta Z_{g,2007}$		0.053 (0.031) [0.038]
Observations	1,444	1,444

Notes: The table reports estimates of regressions using a US commuting-zone (CZ) level panel data set with five periods, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2007. The dependent variable is the change of the manufacturing employment share in CZ  $g$ , from 1970 to 1980 and from 1980 to 1990. In Column (1) (resp. (2)), the independent variables are the 1990-to-2000 (resp. 2000-to-2007) Bartik instrument of each CZ, and an indicator equal to 1 if the independent variable is measured from 1980 to 1990. The construction of the Bartik instrument is detailed in the text. Standard errors clustered at the CZ level are shown in parentheses. The standard errors proposed by [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) are shown in square brackets. All regressions are unweighted.

### 5.2.3 Results

Table 7 below shows the results of Bartik regressions with period fixed effects, as in Definition 8 and Definitions C.2 and C.4 in the Web Appendix. In Column (1), the first-stage coefficient is 0.867. In Column (2), the reduced form coefficient is -0.539. Finally, in Column (3), the 2SLS coefficient is -0.622. Robust standard errors clustered at the

CZ level are shown between parentheses. We also report the standard errors proposed by [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) between square brackets. All coefficients are statistically significant under both inference methods. The 2SLS coefficient slightly differs from that in Table 2 Column (3) in [Autor et al. \(2013\)](#), because our 2SLS regression is not weighted by CZ’s population. This is just to be consistent with Sections 2 to 4, where we consider unweighted Bartik regressions.

Table 7: Bartik Regressions in [Autor et al. \(2013\)](#)

	First-stage	Reduced-form	2SLS
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Dependent Variable	$\Delta D_{g,t}$	$\Delta Y_{g,t}$	$\Delta Y_{g,t}$
Bartik Instrument $\Delta Z_{g,t}$	0.867 (0.131) [0.109]	-0.539 (0.087) [0.108]	
$\Delta D_{g,t}$			-0.622 (0.148) [0.184]
Observations	1,444	1,444	1,444

Notes: The table reports estimates of Bartik regressions with period fixed effects, using a US commuting-zone (CZ) level panel data set with three periods, 1990, 2000, and 2007.  $\Delta Y_{g,t}$  is the change of the manufacturing employment share in CZ  $g$ , from 1990 to 2000 for  $t = 2000$ , and from 2000 to 2007 for  $t = 2007$ .  $\Delta D_{g,t}$  is the change in exposure to Chinese imports in CZ  $g$  from 1990 to 2000 for  $t = 2000$ , and from 2000 to 2007 for  $t = 2007$ .  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  is the Bartik instrument, whose construction is detailed in the text. Columns (1), (2), and (3) respectively report estimates of the first-stage, reduced-form, and 2SLS Bartik regression coefficients. Standard errors clustered at the CZ level are shown in parentheses. The standard errors proposed by [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) are shown in square brackets. All regressions are unweighted.

We now investigate if the first-stage, reduced-form, and 2SLS regressions in Table 7 respectively estimate convex combinations of first-stage, reduced-form, and second-stage effects. We follow Theorem C.2 in the Web Appendix, a straightforward generalization of Theorem 3 to applications with more than two periods, to estimate the weights attached to the first-stage regression in Table 7. Panel A of Table 8 reports summary statistics on those weights. Column (1) shows that without making any assumption on the first-stage effects, the first-stage regression estimates a weighted sum of 132,906 first-stage effects, where 70,422 effects receive a negative weight, and where negative weights sum to -0.095. Column (2) shows that under the assumption that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ ), the first-stage regression estimates a weighted sum of 1,442 first-stage effects, where 854 effects receive a negative weight, and where negative weights sum to -0.084. Assuming that first-stage effects do not vary over time only slightly reduces the sum of negative weights, as shown in Column (3). Finally, Column (4) trivially shows that if the first-stage effect is fully homogeneous ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$ ), the first-stage regression

estimates  $\beta$ . Similarly, we can follow Theorem C.4 in the Web Appendix to estimate the weights attached to the reduced-form regression in Table 7. We do not report those weights, because they are identical to those in Panel A of Table 8, except that they are obtained under assumptions on the reduced-form effects  $\gamma_{s,g,t}$ .

Then, we follow Theorem 7 to estimate the weights attached to the 2SLS regression in Table 7. Panel B of Table 8 reports summary statistics on those weights. Column (1) shows that without making any assumption on the first-stage effects, we cannot estimate the number of negative weights or their sum. Column (2) shows that under the assumption that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and are all positive ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t} \geq 0$ ), the 2SLS regression estimates a weighted sum of 1,442 second-stage effects, where 854 effects receive a negative weight, even though we cannot estimate the sum of those negative weights. Similarly, Column (3) shows that under the assumption that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and over time and are all positive ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g \geq 0$ ), and that second-stage effects do not vary over time ( $\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g$ ), the 2SLS regression estimates a weighted sum of 722 second-stage effects, where 390 effects receive a negative weight. Finally, Column (4) shows that if the first-stage effect is fully homogeneous ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$ ), the 2SLS regression estimates a weighted sum of 1,442 second-stage effects, where 854 effects receive a negative weight, and where negative weights sum to -0.084. Overall, Table 8 shows that under common trends assumptions, the Bartik regressions in Table 7 do not estimate convex combinations of effects.

Table 8: Summary Statistics on the Weights Attached to Bartik Regressions in Table 7

*Panel A: Weights Attached to the First-Stage Regression*

Assumption on first-stage effects	None	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g$	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Number of negative weights	70,422	854	390	0
Number of positive weights	62,484	588	332	1
Sum of negative weights	-0.095	-0.084	-0.076	0

*Panel B: Weights Attached to the 2SLS Regression*

Assumption on first-stage effects	None	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t} \geq 0$	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g \geq 0$	$\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$
Assumption on second-stage effects	None	None	$\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g$	None
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Number of negative weights	?	854	390	854
Number of positive weights	?	588	332	588
Sum of negative weights	?	?	?	-0.084

Notes: Panel A of the table reports summary statistics on the weights attached to the first-stage regression in Table 7. The weights are estimated following Theorem C.2 in the Web Appendix. In Column (1), no assumption is made on first-stage effects. In Column (2), it is assumed that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ ). In Column (3), it is assumed that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and over time ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g$ ). Finally, in Column (4) it is assumed that the first-stage effects are fully homogeneous ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$ ). Panel B of the table reports summary statistics on the weights attached to the 2SLS regression in Table 7. The weights are estimated following Theorem 7. In Column (1), no assumption is made on first- and second-stage effects. In Column (2), it is assumed that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and are positive ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t} \geq 0$ ). In Column (3), it is assumed that first-stage effects do not vary across sectors and over time and are positive ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g \geq 0$ ), and that second-stage effects do not vary over time ( $\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g$ ). Finally, in Column (4) it is assumed that the first-stage effects are fully homogeneous ( $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta$ ). In Panel B, question marks indicate that the quantity under consideration cannot be estimated.

Finally, in Table 9 we present the results we obtain using the alternative estimators proposed in Theorem 9 and Corollaries 1 and 2. For the correlated random coefficient estimators in Panel A, estimation is at the CZ level, hence the number of observations in Column (3). Because the estimation only uses one observation per CZ, the heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in Column (2) rely on the assumption that observations are independent across CZ, and are therefore comparable to the CZ-clustered standard errors between parenthesis in Table 7. In this application, the estimators of the first-stage and reduced-form effects are very noisy, because  $\frac{1}{\Delta Z'_g \Delta Z_g}$  is extremely skewed, due to a few locations with values of the Bartik instrument close to 0 at every period.



On the other hand, the estimator of the second-stage effect is precisely estimated. It is of the same sign as the 2SLS coefficient in Table 7, and is almost twice as large in absolute value.

Because the correlated random coefficient estimators of the first-stage and reduced form effects are very noisy, we also compute the debiased estimators in Corollary 2. Panel B first shows estimates of the key parameters entering those estimators, while Panel C shows the estimators themselves. The standard errors in Column (2) of Panel C are obtained from 200 bootstraps draws where commuting zones are drawn with replacement. Based on the standard errors in Column (2), all the effects in Panel C are significant. The second-stage effect in Panel C is of the same sign as the 2SLS coefficient in Table 7, and is 28% larger in absolute value. The difference between the debiased 2SLS estimator and the Bartik 2SLS estimator is equal to -0.177, with a bootstrap standard error of 0.078, so we can reject the null that the estimands attached to those estimators are equal. The bootstrap draws CZ with replacement and does not account for the variance coming from the shocks.

Overall, Tables 8 and 9 suggest that even under the assumption that first- and second-stage effects only vary across commuting zones, the Bartik regressions in Table 7 may be biased. Column (2) of Table 8 shows that under that assumption, the sum of the negative weights attached to the first-stage and reduced-form Bartik regressions is still relatively large, around -0.076. Moreover, the weights attached to Bartik regressions are correlated with variables that may themselves be correlated with commuting zones' first- and second-stage effects. For instance, the correlation between the weights in Table 8 Panel A Column (3) and commuting zones' share of college-educated workers in 1990 is equal to -0.12 (p-value < 0.01). In CZs with a higher proportion of college-educated workers, a rise in nationwide exposure to Chinese imports may lead to a lower rise in Chinese imports than the national average, because manufacturing jobs in those CZs may be more qualified, and less subject to Chinese competition. Accordingly, such CZs could have a lower first-stage effect. That would lead the Bartik first-stage regression to be upward biased for the average first-stage effect  $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g$ . The Bartik second-stage regression could then be upward biased as well, assuming for instance a constant negative second-stage effect. Table 9 substantiates that concern: the correlated random coefficients and debiased estimators of the second-stage effects in Panels A and C are both substantially lower than the Bartik 2SLS regression coefficient, and both estimate convex combinations of second-stage effects, unlike the Bartik regression.

On the other hand, Table 8 suggests that allowing first- and second-stage effects to also vary over time does not make Bartik regressions substantially less robust to heterogeneous effects than just allowing for CZ-specific effects. For instance, Column (2) of Table 8 shows that allowing for CZ- and time-specific effects only slightly increases the sum of the negative weights attached to the first-stage and reduced-form Bartik regressions. Similarly, allowing for heterogeneous first-stage effects across industries only slightly in-

creases the sum of negative weights. This latter finding is in sharp contrast with what we had found in Table 3. This is because most of the shocks  $\Delta Z_{s,t}$  are positive in this application, while many shocks are negative in the canonical design. If all the shocks  $\Delta Z_{s,t}$  are positive, the sum of the negative weights in Points 1 and 2 of Theorems C.2 and C.4 are actually equal. Overall, whether Bartik regressions can or cannot receive a causal interpretation in this application may depend on whether it is plausible to assume homogeneous first- and second-stage effects across CZs. Table 9 suggests that this assumption may not be plausible, and that the effect of Chinese import exposure on US manufacturing employment could be more negative than found by Autor et al. (2013).

Table 9: Alternative Estimators in [Autor et al. \(2013\)](#)

	Point estimate	Standard Error	Observations
	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Panel A: Correlated Random Coefficient Estimators</i>			
Average First-Stage Effect $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g$	-855.752	858.889	722
Average Reduced-Form Effect $\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \gamma_g$	995.537	1004.217	722
Average Second-Stage Effect $\sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\beta_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g} \alpha_g$	-1.163	0.263	722
<i>Panel B: Parameters necessary to form the debiased estimators in Corollary 2</i>			
$\mu_2^D$ : Treatment Trend from 1990 to 2000	0.742	0.093	722
$\mu_3^D$ : Treatment Trend from 2000 to 2007	1.469	0.163	722
$\mu_2^Y$ : Outcome Trend from 1990 to 2000	-0.332	0.107	722
$\mu_3^Y$ : Outcome Trend from 2000 to 2007	-1.016	0.231	722
First-stage coeff. without a constant $\beta_{NC}^D$	0.966	0.072	1444
Reduced-form coeff. without a constant $\beta_{NC}^Y$	-0.727	0.067	1444
<i>Panel C: Debiased estimators in Corollary 2</i>			
Debiased Estimator of First-Stage Effect	0.668	0.082	722
Debiased Estimator of Reduced-Form Effect	-0.533	0.071	722
Debiased Estimator of Second-Stage Effect	-0.798	0.155	722

Notes: Panel A of the table reports estimates of the first-stage, reduced-form, and second-stage effects obtained using the correlated random coefficient estimators proposed in Theorem 9 and Corollary 1. The analysis is at the CZ level. Point estimates are shown in Column (1), and heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are shown in Column (2). The estimation is done in Stata, using the GMM command, and with the system of moment conditions in Equation (4.8). Panel B of the table reports estimates of the parameters necessary to form the debiased estimators in Corollary 2. The trend parameters are from the same GMM estimation as Panel A, and the analysis is at the CZ level. Point estimates are shown in Column (1), and heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are shown in Column (2). The Bartik regression coefficients without a constant come from the regressions in Definitions C.1 and C.3 in the Web Appendix, and the analysis is at the CZ-period level. Point estimates are shown in Column (1), and standard errors clustered at CZ level are shown in Column (2). Panel C of the table reports the debiased estimators of the first-stage, reduced-form and second-stage effects proposed in Corollary 2. Point estimates are shown in Column (1), and standard errors based on 200 bootstraps where commuting zones are drawn with replacement are shown in Column (2).

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we consider Bartik regressions, assuming shocks are exogenous. Instead of assuming that the expectation of shocks does not vary across sectors, as in [Borusyak et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#), we make common trends assumptions requiring that without any shock, the outcome and treatment evolutions would have been the same in every

location. Under those assumptions, we find that Bartik regressions may not be robust to heterogeneous treatment effects. For instance, with two periods, the Bartik 2SLS regression identifies a weighted sum of location-specific second-stage effects, potentially with some negative weights. The weights can be estimated, and applied researchers may estimate them to assess the robustness of their Bartik regression to heterogeneous effects. Finally, we propose an alternative estimator that is robust to location-specific first- and second-stage effects. In future work, we will study the asymptotic distribution of our alternative estimator when shocks are not conditioned upon, following the work of [Adão et al. \(2019\)](#) for Bartik regressions.

## References

- Abadie, A. (2005), ‘Semiparametric difference-in-differences estimators’, *The Review of Economic Studies* **72**(1), 1–19.
- Acemoglu, D., Autor, D., Dorn, D., Hanson, G. H. & Price, B. (2016), ‘Import competition and the great us employment sag of the 2000s’, *Journal of Labor Economics* **34**(S1), S141–S198.
- Adão, R., Kolesár, M. & Morales, E. (2019), ‘Shift-share designs: Theory and inference’, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **134**(4), 1949–2010.
- Altonji, J. G. & Card, D. (1991), The effects of immigration on the labor market outcomes of less-skilled natives, Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Angrist, J. D. & Imbens, G. W. (1995), ‘Two-stage least squares estimation of average causal effects in models with variable treatment intensity’, *Journal of the American statistical Association* **90**(430), 431–442.
- Autor, D., Dorn, D., Hanson, G. & Majlesi, K. (2020), ‘Importing political polarization? the electoral consequences of rising trade exposure’, *American Economic Review* **110**(10), 3139–3183.
- Autor, D. H. & Dorn, D. (2013), ‘The growth of low-skill service jobs and the polarization of the us labor market’, *American Economic Review* **103**(5), 1553–97.
- Autor, D. H., Dorn, D. & Hanson, G. H. (2013), ‘The china syndrome: Local labor market effects of import competition in the united states’, *American Economic Review* **103**(6), 2121–68.
- Bartik, T. J. (1991), ‘Who benefits from state and local economic development policies?’.
- Borusyak, K. & Hull, P. (2020), Non-random exposure to exogenous shocks: Theory and applications, Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Borusyak, K., Hull, P. & Jaravel, X. (2020), ‘Quasi-experimental shift-share research designs’.
- Card, D. (2001), ‘Immigrant inflows, native outflows, and the local labor market impacts of higher immigration’, *Journal of Labor Economics* **19**(1), 22–64.
- Card, D. (2009), ‘Immigration and inequality’, *American Economic Review* **99**(2), 1–21.
- Chamberlain, G. (1992), ‘Efficiency bounds for semiparametric regression’, *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* pp. 567–596.

- De Chaisemartin, C. (2013), ‘A note on the assumptions underlying instrumented difference in differences’, *Unpublished Manuscript, University of Warwick*.
- De Chaisemartin, C. & D’Haultfoeulle, X. (2018), ‘Fuzzy differences-in-differences’, *The Review of Economic Studies* **85**(2), 999–1028.
- De Chaisemartin, C. & D’Haultfoeulle, X. (2020), ‘Two-way fixed effects estimators with heterogeneous treatment effects’, *American Economic Review* **110**(9), 2964–96.
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, P., Sorkin, I. & Swift, H. (2020), ‘Bartik instruments: What, when, why, and how’, *American Economic Review* **110**(8), 2586–2624.
- Graham, B. S. & Powell, J. L. (2012), ‘Identification and estimation of average partial effects in “irregular” correlated random coefficient panel data models’, *Econometrica* **80**(5), 2105–2152.
- Greenstone, M., Mas, A. & Nguyen, H.-L. (2020), ‘Do credit market shocks affect the real economy? quasi-experimental evidence from the great recession and “normal” economic times’, *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **12**(1), 200–225.
- Hudson, S., Hull, P. & Liebersohn, J. (2017), ‘Interpreting instrumented difference-in-differences’, *Metrics Note, Sept*.
- Ruggles, S., Flood, S., Goeken, R., Grover, J., Meyer, E., Pacas, J. & Sobek, M. (2019), ‘Ipums usa: Version 9.0 [dataset]’. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V9.0>.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. (2000), *Asymptotic statistics*, Vol. 3, Cambridge university press.

# A Proofs

## A.1 Theorem 1

**Proof** Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_g \Delta Z_g \right) \\
&= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \left( \Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g} \right) \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \right) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} E \left( E(\Delta Z_s | \Delta D_g(\mathbf{0})) \Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) \right) + E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 \Delta Z_s^2 \beta_{s,g} \right) \\
&+ E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s' \neq s} Q_{s,g} Q_{s',g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_{s'} \beta_{s,g} \right) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 \beta_{s,g} E(\Delta Z_s^2) + \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s' \neq s} Q_{s,g} Q_{s',g} \beta_{s,g} E(\Delta Z_s \Delta Z_{s'}) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 \beta_{s,g} E(\Delta Z_s^2) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 \beta_{s,g} V(\Delta Z_s).
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from Assumption 1. The second equality follows from algebra and the law of iterated expectations. The third equality follows from the fact that  $\beta_{s,g}$  and  $Q_{s,g}$  are non-stochastic, and  $E(\Delta Z_s | \Delta D_g(\mathbf{0})) = 0$ . The fourth equality follows from the facts that  $\Delta Z_s \perp \Delta Z_{s'}$ , and  $E(\Delta Z_s) = 0$ . The fifth equality follows from the fact that  $E(\Delta Z_s) = 0$ . Similarly, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2 \right) &= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \right)^2 \right) \\
&= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 \Delta Z_s^2 \right) + E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s' \neq s} Q_{s,g} Q_{s',g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_{s'} \right) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 E(\Delta Z_s^2) + \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s' \neq s} Q_{s,g} Q_{s',g} E(\Delta Z_s \Delta Z_{s'}) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 E(\Delta Z_s^2) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 V(\Delta Z_s).
\end{aligned}$$

The third equality follows from the fact that the  $Q_{s,g}$ s are non-stochastic. The fourth equality follows from the facts that  $\Delta Z_s \perp \Delta Z_{s'}$ , and  $E(\Delta Z_s) = 0$ . The fifth equality follows from the fact that  $E(\Delta Z_s) = 0$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_g \Delta Z_g\right)}{E\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2\right)} &= \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 \beta_{s,g} V(\Delta Z_s)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 V(\Delta Z_s)} \\ &= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g}^2 V(\Delta Z_s)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g}^2 V(\Delta Z_s)} \beta_{s,g}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

## A.2 Theorem 2

**Proof** Note that

$$\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_g \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{NC}^D &= E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_g \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2}\right) \\ &= E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g E(\Delta D_g | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The second equality comes from the law of iterated expectations. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g E(\Delta D_g | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) \\ &= \sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g E(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) + \sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g E\left(\sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g} | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S\right) \\ &= \sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g E\left(\sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g} | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S\right) + \sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g \mu^D. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The first equality follows from Assumption 1. The second equality follows from Assumption 2. Plugging (A.2) into (A.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{NC}^D &= E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g \left(\sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g}\right)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2}\right) + \mu^D E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2}\right) \\ &= E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g \left(\sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g}\right)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g \left(\sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s\right)}\right) + \mu^D E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2}\right) \\ &= E\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g} \beta_{s,g}\right) + \mu^D E\left(\frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$



The first equality follows from the law of iterated expectations. Note that when  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{NC}^D &= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g} \beta_{s,g} \right) + \mu^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g \Delta Z_g \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right) + \mu^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g \Delta Z_g^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right) + \mu^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right) \\
&= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z_g^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \beta_g \right) + \mu^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

### A.3 Theorem 3

**Proof** Note that

$$\hat{\beta}_C^D = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_C^D &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) E(\Delta D_g | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \right). \quad (\text{A.3})
\end{aligned}$$

The second equality comes from the law of iterated expectations. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) E(\Delta D_g | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) E(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) + \sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) E \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g} | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S \right) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) (E(\Delta D_g(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S) - E(\Delta D_1(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S)) \\
&+ \sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) E \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g} | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S \right) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) E \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g} | \Delta Z_1, \dots, \Delta Z_S \right). \quad (\text{A.4})
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from Assumption 1. The second equality is by algebra. The third equality follows from Assumption 2. Plugging (A.4) into (A.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_C^D &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g} \right)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \beta_{s,g} \right)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \right) \\
&= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \beta_{s,g} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from the law of iterated expectations. Note that when  $\beta_{s,g} = \beta_g$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_C^D &= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \beta_{s,g} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) \beta_g \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.) \beta_g \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \right) \\
&= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{\Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g (\Delta Z_g - \Delta Z.)} \beta_g \right). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

#### A.4 Theorem 4

The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2, so it is omitted.

#### A.5 Theorem 5

The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3, so it is omitted.

#### A.6 Theorem 6

**Proof** The result directly follows from Definition 6 and Theorems 3 and 5. □

#### A.7 Theorem 7

**Proof** The result directly follows from Definition 8 and Theorems C.2 and C.4. □

## A.8 Theorem 8

**Proof** Note that

$$\hat{\beta}_{pl}^D = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_{g,2} (\Delta Z_{g,3} - \Delta Z_{.,3})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,3} (\Delta Z_{g,3} - \Delta Z_{.,3})}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{pl}^D &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta D_{g,2} (\Delta Z_{g,3} - \Delta Z_{.,3})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,3} (\Delta Z_{g,3} - \Delta Z_{.,3})} \right) \\ &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G E(\Delta D_{g,2} | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) (\Delta Z_{g,3} - \Delta Z_{.,3})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,3} (\Delta Z_{g,3} - \Delta Z_{.,3})} \right) \\ &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G E(\Delta D_{g,2}(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) (\Delta Z_{g,3} - \Delta Z_{.,3})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,3} (\Delta Z_{g,3} - \Delta Z_{.,3})} \right) \\ &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \mu_2^D (\Delta Z_{g,3} - \Delta Z_{.,3})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,3} (\Delta Z_{g,3} - \Delta Z_{.,3})} \right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from the law of iterated expectation. The third equality follows from Assumption 6 and the fact that  $\Delta Z_{s,2} = 0$ . The fourth equality follows from Assumption 7. The proof of  $\beta_{pl}^Y = 0$  is similar, so it is omitted.  $\square$

## A.9 Theorem 9

**Proof** Under Assumptions 6-10,

$$E(\Delta \mathbf{D}_g | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) = \boldsymbol{\mu}^D + \beta_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Because  $\mathbf{M}_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g = 0$ , we left-multiply Equation (A.5) by  $\mathbf{M}_g$ , and it follows that

$$E(\mathbf{M}_g \Delta \mathbf{D}_g | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) = \mathbf{M}_g \boldsymbol{\mu}^D.$$

Also note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_g' \mathbf{M}_g &= \left( \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\Delta \mathbf{Z}_g' \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g} \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g' \right)' \left( \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\Delta \mathbf{Z}_g' \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g} \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g' \right) \\ &= \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\Delta \mathbf{Z}_g' \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g} \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g' = \mathbf{M}_g, \end{aligned}$$

therefore, it follows that

$$E(\mathbf{M}_g' \mathbf{M}_g \Delta \mathbf{D}_g | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) = \mathbf{M}_g' \mathbf{M}_g \boldsymbol{\mu}^D.$$

Therefore, by the law of iterated expectation:

$$E \left( \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{M}_g' \mathbf{M}_g \Delta \mathbf{D}_g \right) = E \left( \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{M}_g' \mathbf{M}_g \right) \boldsymbol{\mu}^D.$$

So Equation (4.1) holds. Similarly, we left-multiply Equation (A.5) by  $\Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g$ , and it follows that

$$E(\Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g \Delta \mathbf{D}_g | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) = \Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g \boldsymbol{\mu}^D + \beta_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g.$$

Therefore,

$$E\left(\frac{1}{\Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g} \Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g (\Delta \mathbf{D}_g - \boldsymbol{\mu}^D) | \Delta \mathbf{Z}\right) = \beta_g.$$

Then by the law of iterated expectation:

$$\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g = E\left(\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{1}{\Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g \Delta \mathbf{Z}_g} \Delta \mathbf{Z}'_g (\Delta \mathbf{D}_g - \boldsymbol{\mu}^D)\right).$$

So Equation (4.3) holds. The proofs of Equations (4.2) and (4.4) are similar: one simply needs to replace  $\Delta \mathbf{D}_g$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^D$  and  $\beta_g$  by  $\Delta \mathbf{Y}_g$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}^Y$  and  $\gamma_g$ .  $\square$

# Web Appendix: not for publication

## B Identification Result on the 2SLS Bartik regression without a constant

**Definition B.1** *2SLS Bartik regression (without constant):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_{NC}^{2SLS} = \hat{\beta}_{NC}^Y / \hat{\beta}_{NC}^D$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta D_g$  in the 2SLS regression of  $\Delta Y_g$  on  $\Delta D_g$ , using  $\Delta Z_g$  as the instrument for  $\Delta D_g$ . Let  $\beta_{NC}^{2SLS} = E[\hat{\beta}_{NC}^Y] / E[\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D]$ .

We only state the equivalent of Point 1 of Theorem 6 for the 2SLS regression without a constant. The equivalents of Point 2-4 of Theorem 6 can easily be inferred from Theorem B.1 below.

**Theorem B.1** *2SLS Bartik regression without constant under common trends:* Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 4, 5 hold. Then,

$$\beta_{NC}^{2SLS} = \frac{E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g} \gamma_{s,g} \right) + \mu^Y E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right)}{E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_s \Delta Z_g} \beta_{s,g} \right) + \mu^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g}{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_g^2} \right)}.$$

Theorem B.1 shows that owing to the bias term in its denominator,  $\beta_{NC}^{2SLS}$  does not identify a weighted sum of second-stage effects, or at least a weighted sum of second-stage effects plus a bias term. If one further assumes that  $\mu^D = 0$ , then one can show that  $\beta_{NC}^{2SLS}$  identifies a weighted sum of second-stage effects plus a bias term.

## C Identification Results with Multiple Periods

In this section, we use the same notation, definitions, and assumptions as in Section 4 of the paper. We first consider the first-stage regression of the treatment evolution  $\Delta D_{g,t}$  on the Bartik instrument  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$ .

**Definition C.1** *First-stage Bartik regression (without period fixed effects):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  in the first-stage regression of  $\Delta D_{g,t}$  on  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$ , among observations with  $t \geq 2$ . Let  $\beta_{NC}^D = E[\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D]$ .

**Definition C.2** *First-stage Bartik regression (with period fixed effects):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_C^D$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  in the first-stage regression of  $\Delta D_{g,t}$  on  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  and period fixed effects, among observations with  $t \geq 2$ . Let  $\beta_C^D = E[\hat{\beta}_C^D]$ .

**Theorem C.1** *First-stage Bartik regression without period fixed effects under common trends:*

1. Suppose Assumptions 6, 7 hold. Then,

$$\beta_{NC}^D = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}} \beta_{s,g,t} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right).$$

2. Suppose Assumptions 6, 7 hold, and  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ . Then,

$$\beta_{NC}^D = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \beta_{g,t} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right).$$

3. Suppose Assumptions 6, 7 hold, and  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g$ . Then,

$$\beta_{NC}^D = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \left( \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) \beta_g \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right).$$

Let  $\Delta Z_{.,t} = \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}$ .

**Theorem C.2** *First-stage Bartik regression with period fixed effects under common trends:*

1. Suppose Assumptions 6, 7 hold. Then,

$$\beta_C^D = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \beta_{s,g,t} \right).$$

2. Suppose Assumptions 6, 7 hold, and that  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ . Then,

$$\beta_C^D = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \beta_{g,t} \right).$$

3. Suppose Assumptions 6, 7 hold, and that  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g$ . Then,

$$\beta_C^D = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \left( \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \right) \beta_g \right).$$

Then we consider the reduced-form regression of the outcome evolution  $\Delta Y_{g,t}$  on  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$ .

**Definition C.3** *Reduced-form Bartik regression (without period fixed effects):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_{NC}^Y$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  in the reduced-form regression of  $\Delta Y_{g,t}$  on  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$ , among observations with  $t \geq 2$ . Let  $\beta_{NC}^Y = E[\hat{\beta}_{NC}^Y]$ .

**Definition C.4** *Reduced-form Bartik regression (with period fixed effects):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_C^Y$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  in the reduced-form regression of  $\Delta Y_{g,t}$  on  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  and period fixed effects, among observations with  $t \geq 2$ . Let  $\beta_C^Y = E[\hat{\beta}_C^Y]$ .

Let  $\gamma_{s,g,t} = \alpha_{g,t} \beta_{s,g,t}$ .

**Theorem C.3** *Reduced-form Bartik regression without period fixed effects under common trends:*

1. Suppose Assumptions 6, 8, 9 hold. Then,

$$\beta_{NC}^Y = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}} \gamma_{s,g,t} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^Y E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right).$$

2. Suppose Assumptions 6, 8, 9 hold, and  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ . Let  $\gamma_{g,t} = \alpha_{g,t} \beta_{g,t}$ . Then,

$$\beta_{NC}^Y = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \gamma_{g,t} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^Y E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right).$$

3. Suppose Assumptions 6, 8, 9 hold, and  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g$  and  $\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g$ . Let  $\gamma_g = \alpha_g \beta_g$ . Then,

$$\beta_{NC}^Y = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \left( \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) \gamma_g \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^Y E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right).$$

**Theorem C.4** *Reduced-form Bartik regression with period fixed effects under common trends:*

1. Suppose Assumptions 6, 8, 9 hold. Then,

$$\beta_C^Y = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \gamma_{s,g,t} \right).$$

2. Suppose Assumptions 6, 8, 9 hold, and  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ . Let  $\gamma_{g,t} = \alpha_{g,t} \beta_{g,t}$ . Then,

$$\beta_C^Y = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \gamma_{g,t} \right).$$

3. Suppose Assumptions 6, 8, 9 hold, and  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_g$  and  $\alpha_{g,t} = \alpha_g$ . Let  $\gamma_g = \alpha_g \beta_g$ . Then,

$$\beta_C^Y = E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \left( \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \right) \gamma_g \right).$$

Finally, we consider the 2SLS regression of  $\Delta Y_{g,t}$  on  $\Delta D_{g,t}$ , using  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  as the instrument. We only consider the 2SLS regression without period fixed effects, as we already analyzed that with period fixed effects in the paper.

**Definition C.5** *2SLS Bartik regression (without period fixed effects):* Let  $\hat{\beta}_{NC}^{2SLS} = \hat{\beta}_{NC}^Y / \hat{\beta}_{NC}^D$  denote the coefficient of  $\Delta D_{g,t}$  in the 2SLS regression of  $\Delta Y_{g,t}$  on  $\Delta D_{g,t}$ , using  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  as the instrument for  $\Delta D_{g,t}$ , among observations with  $t \geq 2$ . Let  $\beta_{NC}^{2SLS} = E[\hat{\beta}_{NC}^Y] / E[\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D]$ .

**Theorem C.5** *2SLS Bartik regression without period fixed effects under common trends:*  
*Suppose Assumptions 6, 7, 8, 9 hold. Then,*

$$\beta_{NC}^{2SLS} = \frac{E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}} \gamma_{s,g,t} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^Y E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right)}{E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}} \beta_{s,g,t} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right)}.$$



## D Proofs of results in Web Appendix

### D.1 Theorem B.1

**Proof** The result directly follows from Definition B.1 and Theorems 2 and 4.  $\square$

### D.2 Theorem C.1

**Proof** Note that

$$\hat{\beta}_{NC}^D = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta D_{g,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{NC}^D &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta D_{g,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) \\ &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} E(\Delta D_{g,t} | \Delta \mathbf{Z})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

The second equality comes from the law of iterated expectations. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} E(\Delta D_{g,t} | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) \\ &= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} E(\Delta D_{g,t}(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) + \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} E \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \beta_{s,g,t} | \Delta \mathbf{Z} \right) \\ &= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} E \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \beta_{s,g,t} | \Delta \mathbf{Z} \right) + \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} \mu_t^D. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

The first equality follows from Assumption 6. The second equality follows from Assumption 7. Plugging (D.2) into (D.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{NC}^D &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \beta_{s,g,t} \right)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) \\ &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \beta_{s,g,t} \right)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \right)} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) \\ &= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}} \beta_{s,g,t} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from the law of iterated expectations. Note that when  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{NC}^D &= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}} \beta_{s,g,t} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \beta_{g,t} \Delta Z_{g,t} \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \beta_{g,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right) \\
&= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t}^2}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \beta_{g,t} \right) + \sum_{t=2}^T \mu_t^D E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t}^2} \right). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

### D.3 Theorem C.2

**Proof** Note that by the Frisch-Waugh theorem,

$$\hat{\beta}_C^D = \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta D_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})},$$

where  $\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}$  is the residual from a regression of  $\Delta Z_{g,t}$  on period fixed effects. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_C^D &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta D_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) E(\Delta D_{g,t} | \Delta \mathbf{Z})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \right). \quad (\text{D.3})
\end{aligned}$$

The second equality comes from the law of iterated expectations. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) E(\Delta D_{g,t} | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) E(\Delta D_{g,t}(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) + \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) E \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \beta_{s,g,t} | \Delta \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) (E(\Delta D_{g,t}(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta \mathbf{Z}) - E(\Delta D_{1,t}(\mathbf{0}) | \Delta \mathbf{Z})) \\
&+ \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) E \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \beta_{s,g,t} | \Delta \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) E \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \beta_{s,g,t} | \Delta \mathbf{Z} \right). \quad (\text{D.4})
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from Assumption 6. The second equality is by algebra. The third equality follows from Assumption 7. Plugging (D.4) into (D.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_C^D &= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \beta_{s,g,t} \right)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) \left( \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} \beta_{s,g,t} \right)}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \right) \\
&= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \beta_{s,g,t} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from the law of iterated expectations. Note that when  $\beta_{s,g,t} = \beta_{g,t}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_C^D &= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S \frac{Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \beta_{s,g,t} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) \beta_{g,t} \sum_{s=1}^S Q_{s,g} \Delta Z_{s,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \right) \\
&= E \left( \frac{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t}) \beta_{g,t} \Delta Z_{g,t}}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \right) \\
&= E \left( \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \frac{\Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})}{\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{t=2}^T \Delta Z_{g,t} (\Delta Z_{g,t} - \Delta Z_{.,t})} \beta_{g,t} \right). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

#### D.4 Theorem C.3

The proof is similar to that of Theorem C.1, so it is omitted.

#### D.5 Theorem C.4

The proof is similar to that of Theorem C.2, so it is omitted.

#### D.6 Theorem C.5

**Proof** The proof directly follows from Definition C.5 and Theorems C.1 and C.3.  $\square$