

## Lab02: Causality Review

September 5, 2018

# Today's Goals

## 1. Garner more intuition

- ▶ We want *causal effect*
- ▶ Can't observe it for any given unit
- ▶ *Randomization* helps us get at effect *on average*

# Today's Goals

## 2. Comfortably “speak the language” of randomized experiments

- ▶ unit
- ▶ treatment group/condition
- ▶ control group/condition
- ▶ outcome
- ▶ potential outcomes
- ▶ counterfactuals
- ▶ causal effect
- ▶ fundamental problem of causal inference
- ▶ randomization
- ▶ SATE
- ▶ difference in means

# Today's Goals

- 
- 
3. A little R

# Running Example

- ▶ August 2006 Primary Statewide Election in Michigan
- ▶ Send postcards with randomly assigned message
  1. no message
  2. civic duty message
  3. “you are being studied” message
  4. **neighborhood social pressure message**
- ▶ Source: Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green, and Christopher W. Larimer. “Social pressure and voter turnout: Evidence from a large-scale field experiment.” *American political Science review* 102.1 (2008): 33-48.

# Discuss

- ▶ What is a **unit** in this study?
- ▶ What is the **outcome**?
- ▶ What is the **control group**?
- ▶ What are the **treatment groups**?

# Review

- ▶ What is a **unit** in this study?
  - ▶ a person
- ▶ What is the **outcome**?
  - ▶ whether or not the person voted,  $Y$
- ▶ What is the **control group**?
  - ▶ subset of people who recieved no message
- ▶ What are the **treatment groups**?
  - ▶ subset of people who recieved
    - ▶  $T_1$ : civic duty message
    - ▶  $T_2$ : "you are being studied" message
    - ▶  $T_3$ : social pressure message

→ Let's focus on social pressure message as  $T$  of interest

# Discuss

- ▶ What are **potential outcomes**?
- ▶ What are the potential outcomes as applied to this study?
- ▶ How do you find the true **casual effect**? Is this possible?
- ▶ What is the **fundamental problem of causal inference**?
- ▶ Explain the fundamental problem of causal inference as applied to this study.



# Review

- ▶ What are **potential outcomes**?
  - ▶  $Y(1)$  outcome if you recieved treatment
  - ▶  $Y(0)$  outcome if you recieved control
- ▶ What are the potential outcomes as applied to this study?
- ▶ How do you find the true **casual effect**? Is this possible?
  - ▶  $Y(1) - Y(0)$
- ▶ What is the **fundamental problem of causal inference**?
  - ▶ can only observe one potential outcome
  - ▶ counterfactuals are not observed!
- ▶ Explain the fundamental problem of causal inference as applied to this study.

## Discuss

- ▶ Explain this equation in words:  
$$SATE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)\}$$
 where  $i$  indexes each unit
- ▶ Can we get an answer to this equation? Why or why not?

# Review

- ▶ Explain this equation in words, where  $i$  indexes each unit:  
$$SATE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)\}$$
- ▶ Can we get an answer to this equation? Why or why not?
  - ▶ no because counterfactuals aren't observed
  - ▶ i.e., the fundamental problem of causal inference!!
  - ▶ SATE is a theoretical concept so we must *estimate* it

# Discuss

- ▶ How do we do research given the fundamental problem of causal inference?
- ▶ What did this study do?
- ▶ How do we *estimate* SATE?

# Review

- ▶ How do we do research given the fundamental problem of causal inference?
  - ▶ Randomization
  - ▶ On average, treatment and control groups identical *but for which group they're assigned*
  - ▶ Compare *observed* outcomes across groups
- ▶ What did this study do?
  - ▶ Randomized, so groups were identical but for the message
  - ▶ Compare whether or not people voted across message groups
  - ▶ On average, was there a difference?
- ▶ How do we *estimate* SATE?
  - ▶ difference in means across groups

# Discuss

- ▶ Remember we must *estimate* SATE.
- ▶ We do it using the difference in means.
- ▶ Explain how this equation works:
  - ▶  $\text{diff in means} = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n T_i Y_i - \frac{1}{n-n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - T_i) Y_i$ 
    - ▶  $n_1$  is the number of people in the treatment group
    - ▶  $T_i$  is an indicator s.t.  $T_i = 0$  if unit recieved control and  $T_i = 1$  if treatment

Are you comfortable “speaking the language” now?

- ▶ Hopefully this is getting repetative.
- ▶ If any questions remain. . . ask!

# A little R

- ▶ What is each row?
- ▶ Which variable indicates treatment?
- ▶ Which indicates outcome?
- ▶ What are the other variables for?

```
social <- read.csv("social.csv")  
head(social)
```

##	sex	yearofbirth	primary2004	messages	primary2006	hhsize
## 1	male	1941	0	Civic Duty	0	2
## 2	female	1947	0	Civic Duty	0	2
## 3	male	1951	0	Hawthorne	1	3
## 4	female	1950	0	Hawthorne	1	3
## 5	female	1982	0	Hawthorne	1	3
## 6	male	1981	0	Control	0	3



## Estimate turnout rate (outcome) for each group

```
tapply(X = social$primary2006, INDEX = social$messages, FUN = mean)
```

```
## Civic Duty    Control Hawthorne  Neighbors  
## 0.3145377 0.2966383 0.3223746 0.3779482
```

```
t1 <- mean(social$primary2006[social$messages == "Civic Duty"])  
control <- mean(social$primary2006[social$messages == "Control"])  
t2 <- mean(social$primary2006[social$messages == "Hawthorne"])  
t3 <- mean(social$primary2006[social$messages == "Neighbors"])  
  
c(t1, control, t2, t3)
```

```
## [1] 0.3145377 0.2966383 0.3223746 0.3779482
```

# Estimate the SATE for each group

What do these results tell us?

```
t1 - control
```

```
## [1] 0.01789934
```

```
t2 - control
```

```
## [1] 0.02573631
```

```
t3 - control
```

```
## [1] 0.08130991
```

## Randomization makes groups “identical” but for treatment assignment

```
tapply(social$primary2004, social$messages, mean)
```

```
## Civic Duty      Control Hawthorne  Neighbors  
## 0.3994453 0.4003388 0.4032300 0.4066647
```

```
tapply(social$hhsz, social$messages, mean)
```

```
## Civic Duty      Control Hawthorne  Neighbors  
## 2.189126 2.183667 2.180138 2.187770
```

```
social$sex <- ifelse(social$sex == "female", 1, 0)  
tapply(social$sex, social$messages, mean)
```

```
## Civic Duty      Control Hawthorne  Neighbors  
## 0.5001832 0.4989411 0.4990053 0.5000654
```