

# Index

- adjustment criterion, 136–39
- always taker, 306–14, 320–21
- analysis of covariance model, 275–77, 364–88
- average causal effect, *see* average treatment effect
- average treatment effect, 46–48
  - conditional, 55–56
  - for the controls, 55
  - for the treated, 55
- back-door criterion, 109–10
- back-door path, 106
  - blocking, 110–14
- balancing
  - definition of balance, 128
  - versus adjustment, 128–30
  - determinants of treatment, 162–66
- bias, 58–60
  - baseline, 59
  - differential treatment effect, 59
  - omitted-variable, 110, 194–206
  - self-selection, 122, 197, 287
- bound, 422
  - analysis of, 422–29
  - combinations of, 429–29
  - no-assumptions, 422–25
- causal effect, *see* average treatment effect *and* individual-level treatment effect
- causal graph, 79–81, 97–99
- causal state, 37–43
- chain of mediation, 81, 331
- change score model, 364–88
- collider, 81
- complier, 306–14, 320–21
- conditioning, 82–84
- control group, 44–45
- control state, 37, 43–44
- counterfactual, 37–46
  - conditional expectation, 58
- covering law, 11, 340–43, 442
- data-driven specification search, 130, 222–23
- deffer, 306–14, 320–21
- descendant, 80
- directed acyclic graph (DAG), 80, 96
- directed path, 80
- error term, 88–89, 122–24, 131–36, 196–200
- examples
  - Catholic schools, 22–23, 39–41, 47, 50, 55–58, 61, 120–21, 171–80, 215, 220–24, 234–37, 243–62, 269–77, 300–301, 317, 348, 365–374, 394–413
  - charter schools, 3, 24–25, 38, 50, 85–90, 278–90, 318–22
  - class size, 362
  - educational attainment, 14–15, 327–28
  - education on earnings, 15–16, 59–60, 72–73, 83–84, 98–101, 195–96, 219, 299
  - father absence, 21–22, 38–39
  - fertility, 17–19, 67
  - felons and election outcomes, 42
  - health and mortality, 19–20, 41–42, 299–300
  - military service, 300, 328–29

- examples (*cont.*)
  - neighborhoods, 21, 85–90, 284–89, 318, 322, 432
  - obesity, 26, 52, 432–34
  - Operation Ceasefire, 357–360
  - political participation, 16–17
  - voting, 26–27
  - school vouchers, 23–24
  - worker training, 25–26, 390–91
  - Year of the Fire Horse, 64–68, 355, 360
- experiment
  - definition of, 6
- experimental design, 6–7, 118–19
- front-door criterion, 330–38
- generative mechanism, 338–42
- how-actually model, 345–46
- how-plausibly model, 345
- how-possibly model, 345
- ignorability, 119–22, 127, 205, 268–69, 430–32
  - sequential, 396–97
- independence
  - of potential outcomes from treatment, 119
  - of instrument, 307, 311–13
- instrumental variable (IV)
  - binary, 291–94
  - IV Demonstration 1, 294–96
  - IV Demonstration 2, 309–314
  - LATE assumptions, 305–309
  - Traditional assumptions, 297–99
- interrupted time series (ITS) design, 67, 355–60
- local average treatment effect (LATE), 305, 327
- local instrumental variable (LIV), 323, 421
- Mahalanobis metric, 158
- manipulability, 339, 439–41
- many-valued treatments, 70–73, 185–86, 218–19
- marginal treatment effect (MTE), 322–23
- matching
  - as data analysis algorithm, 158–81
  - as stratification, 143–50
  - as weighting, 150–58
  - caliper, 160–61
  - coarsened exact, 169–70, 181
  - exact, 159–160
  - genetic, 167–68
  - interval, 161
  - kernel, 162
  - many-valued causes, 185–86
  - Matching Demonstration 1, 145–47
  - Matching Demonstration 2, 148–50
  - Matching Demonstration 3, 153–56
  - Matching Demonstration 4, 171–80
  - nearest-neighbor, 160–61
  - on the region of common support, 182–83
  - optimal, 168–69
- mechanism, 330–53
  - exhaustive, 332–38
  - isolated, 332–38
- mechanism schema, 347, 349
- mechanism sketch, 347, 349–52, 440–41
- monotone instrumental variable (MIV), 427–28
- monotone treatment response (MTR), 426–27
- monotone treatment selection (MTS), 426–27
- monotonicity
  - of response to instrument, 307–309
- naïve estimator, 57–60
- natural experiment, 303–305, 326–30
- never taker, 306–14, 320–21
- nonignorable, *see* ignorability
- nonmanipulability, 339, 439–41
- observational study, 7, 54
- omitted variable bias, *see* bias, omitted variables
- ordinary least squares (OLS), *see* regression, ordinary least squares

- panel data, 68–70, 363–92
  - Panel Data Demonstration 1, 273–77
  - Panel Data Demonstration 2, 365–74
- partial identification, *see* bounds, analysis of
- path, 80
- path model, 10, 85–87
- point identification, 78–79, 422
- policy-relevant treatment effect (PRTE), 323
- population, 27–28, 37, 74–76
- potential outcome, 43–46
  - over-time, 62–70
- propensity score, 118–22, 151
  - estimated, 152, 157–58, 166–68
  - true, 118–22, 151
- quasi-experiment, 9
- realism, 445–46
  - critical, 343–44
- regression, 9–13, 188–225
  - as conditional-variance-weighted matching, 206–14
  - ordinary least squares (OLS), 201–202
  - Regression Demonstration 1, 189–92
  - Regression Demonstration 2, 207–11
  - Regression Demonstration 3, 213–14
  - Regression Demonstration 4, 216–17
  - as supplemental adjustment when matching, 215–217
  - weighted, 226–63
  - Weighted Regression Demonstration 1, 229–30, 232–33
  - Weighted Regression Demonstration 2, 235–37
  - Weighted Regression Demonstration 3, 243–62
- regression discontinuity (RD) design, 360–63
- selection
  - on the observables, 124–26, 268
  - on the unobservables, 124–26, 268
- sensitivity analysis, 429–34
- set identification, 422
- stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA), 48–52, 307, 438
- stratification, *see* conditioning *and* matching, as stratification
- superpopulation, 28, 74–76
- treatment assignment, 53–54
- treatment effect, 43–44
- treatment group, 44–45
- treatment selection, *see* selection *and* treatment assignment treatment state, 37, 43–44
- two-stage least squares (2SLS), 316–17
- unconditional association, 81–82
  - weighted regression, *see* regression