


Causation



A Spotify playlist cover for "psych252". The background is dark with light blue bars resembling a histogram. A cartoon face is drawn on the bars, smiling with arms raised. The text "COLLABORATIVE PLAYLIST" is at the top left, followed by "psych252" in large white letters. Below it is the URL "<https://tinyurl.com/psych252spotify25>". At the bottom are green "PLAY" and "..." buttons.

Feedback

Responses cannot be edited

Psych 252 anonymous feedback form

Please use the text box below if you'd like to provide anonymous feedback for Psych 252.

* Indicates required question

*

I wish more posts were visible on Ed Discussion. I have heard from instructors and students that questions are being asked and answered, but few of them are made public.

Logistics

Homework 6

Linear mixed effects models

My name and the names of the people and AI I have worked with go here

2025-02-26 11:15:59.062313

Instructions

This homework is due by **Thursday, March 6th, 8:00pm**.

Note:

- When asked to report results, please do so like you would in a scientific article (see examples from lectures, as well as in ‘Reporting Results.pdf’ on Canvas under Files > papers).
- Some code chunks contain some skeleton code. The code chunk option for these chunks is set to `eval=F` so that knitting the RMarkdown document doesn’t throw any errors. Make sure to set these chunks to `eval=T` when you knit your homework, so that your calculations are shown in the pdf.
- Make sure to show the results of your calculations in the knitted pdf, for example, by using the `print()` function at the end of a code chunk.
- Some questions ask for a short written response as indicated by this prompt: **Your answer:**

Part 1 (4 points)

Load and visualize data

Here we have (simulated) data on measurements of extroversion from students nested within classes. Extroversion is one of the big-5 personality traits. We would like to know whether a student’s openness and agreeableness predicts their social behavior (extroversion). We know the data are non-independent because the students were sampled from 4 different classes, and we might expect that students from the same class are more similar to each other than students from different classes. We need to take this dependence into account when modeling our data.

First, let’s Load the data set.

```
df.class = read_csv("data/extraclass.csv")
```

1.1 (0.5 points)

Below is a plot that shows the relationship between openness (`open`) on the x-axis and extroversion (`extra`) on the y-axis for you, separated by class (“a”–“d”). Briefly describe the plot.

```
ggplot(data = df.class,
       mapping = aes(x = open,
                     y = extra)) +
  geom_point(alpha = .5) +
  geom_smooth(method = "lm") +
  facet_wrap(~ class)
```

1.4 (1 point)

Add a fixed effect of agreeableness (`agreee`) to the linear mixed effects model (with random intercepts for `class`). Is a model that takes both agreeableness and openness into account when trying to predict extroversion significantly better than a mixed effects model that only considers openness?

Tip: You can use a likelihood ratio test (via the `anova()` function), or use the `joint_tests()` function from the “emmeans” package.

```
### YOUR CODE HERE ###
```

```
#####
```

Your answer:

1.5 (1 point)

In addition to the random intercept, add random slopes for the agreeableness-extroversion relation to the linear mixed effects model that has both agreeableness and openness as fixed effects. Fit the model and compare it to the model without random slopes. Is adding the random slopes worth it?

```
### YOUR CODE HERE ###
```

```
#####
```

Your answer:

Part 2 (4 points)

A recent paper in Psychological Science reported that children as young as 4 years of age use probability to infer how good an outcome is. You can check out the original paper [here](#). They share the data on [OSF](#) so we can try to reproduce their analysis using the tools we have learned in class.

In Experiment 4, the **Mostly Yummy** vs. **Mostly Yucky** condition was manipulated within participants (and the order was counterbalanced). At the end of each experiment, children gave a rating from -3 to +3 to either a **happiness** question (“How does the girl feel about the gumballs that she got?”) or a **quality** question (“How good was that?”). The type of the question was manipulated between participants. You can read the experiment procedures in more details in the figure below.




Fig. 6. Sample slides and script for the mostly yucky condition in Experiment 4. The mostly yummy condition was identical, but the distribution of yummy and yucky gumballs was reversed.

Plan for today

- Quick recap
- Linear Mixed Model
 - Different random effect structures
 - lmer() standard operating procedures
- Causation
 - Causation vs. correlation
 - Controlling for variables
 - Mediation
 - Moderation

Quick recap

Quick recap: Simulation

Let's simulate an **lmer()**

```

1 # make example reproducible
2 set.seed(1)
3
4 # parameters
5 sample_size = 100
6 b0 = 1
7 b1 = 2
8 sd_residual = 1
9 sd_participant_intercept = 0.5
10
11 # generate the data
12 df.mixed = tibble(participant = rep(1:sample_size, 2),
13                     condition = rep(0:1, each = sample_size)) %>%
14   group_by(participant) %>%
15   mutate(participant_intercept = rnorm(n = 1, sd = sd_participant_intercept)) %>%
16   ungroup() %>%
17   mutate(value = b0 + b1 * condition + participant_intercept + rnorm(n(), sd = sd_residual)) %>%
18   arrange(participant, condition)

```

$$\text{value}_{ij} = b_0 + b_1 \cdot \text{condition}_{ij} + U_i + e_{ij}$$


$$e_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(\text{mean} = 0, \text{sd} = s_{\text{error}})$$

$$U_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\text{mean} = 0, \text{sd} = s_U)$$

simulating data from a model and trying to recover the parameters is a great way to check one's understanding of what the model does


15

With outlier



18

Non-equal variance



clearly there are interindividual differences though!

Quick recap: Worked examples

Sleep data

```

1 fit = lmer(formula = reaction ~ 1 + days + (1 | subject),
2             data = df.sleep %>%
3               mutate(days = as.factor(days)))
4
5 contrast = list(first_vs_second = c(-1, 1, rep(0, 8)),
6                  early_vs_late = c(rep(-1, 5)/5, rep(1, 5)/5))
7
8 fit %>%
9   emmeans(specs = "days",
10          contr = contrast) %>%
11  pluck("contrasts")

```

fit the model

define the contrasts

test the contrasts

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
first_vs_second	7.82	10.10	156	0.775	0.4398
early_vs_late	53.66	4.65	155	11.534	<.0001

Degrees-of-freedom method: kenward-roger

days	reaction
0	257.54
1	265.73

index	reaction
early	271.67
late	325.39

<https://aosmith.rbind.io/2019/03/25/getting-started-with-emmeans/>

Weight loss data

1. Is the score at the third time point different from the other two time points?
2. Is there a linear increase across time points?


```

1 fit = aov_ez(id = "id",
2                 dv = "score",
3                 between = "exercises",
4                 within = c("diet", "timepoint"),
5                 data = df.weightloss)
6
7 contrasts = list(first_two_vs_last = c(-0.5, -0.5, 1),
8                   linear_increase = c(-1, 0, 1))
9
10 fit %>%
11   emmeans(spec = "timepoint",
12            contr = contrasts)

```

contrast	estimate	SE	df	t.ratio	p.value
first_two_vs_last	2.24	0.200	4	11.194	<.0001
linear_increase	2.97	0.231	4	12.820	<.0001

df.weightloss				
id	diet	exercises	timepoint	score
1	no	no	t1	10.43
1	no	no	t2	13.21
1	no	no	t3	11.59
1	yes	no	t1	10.20
1	yes	no	t2	12.51
1	yes	no	t3	14.60
2	no	no	t1	11.59



31

Politeness


Was there an effect of gender and attitude on pitch?

```

1 lmer(formula = frequency ~ 1 + attitude * gender + (1 + attitude | subject) + (1 | scenario),
2       data = df.politeness) %>%
3     joint_tests()

```

model term	df1	df2	F.ratio	p.value
attitude	1	3.99	12.411	0.0244
gender	1	4.00	26.570	0.0067
attitude:gender	1	3.99	1.959	0.2342



main effect of attitude, main effect of gender, no significant interaction effect

Linear mixed effects model

Different random effect structures

[Contents](#)[Data format](#)[Power analysis, and simulating these models](#)[Longitudinal two-level model](#)[Three-level models](#)[More on level 1 specification](#)[Hypothesis tests](#)[Book recommendations](#)[Suggestions, errors or typos](#)

Using R and lme/lmer to fit different two- and three-level longitudinal models

April 21, 2015




I often get asked how to fit different multilevel models (or individual growth models, hierarchical linear models or linear mixed-models, etc.) in R. In this guide I have compiled some of the more common and/or useful models (at least common in clinical psychology), and how to fit them using `nlme::lme()` and `lme4::lmer()`. I will cover the common two-level random intercept-slope model, and three-level models when subjects are clustered due to some higher level grouping (such as therapists), partially nested models where there are clustering in one group but not the other, and different level 1 residual covariances (such as AR(1)). The point of this post is to show how to fit these longitudinal models in R, not to cover the statistical theory behind them, or how to interpret them.

<https://rpsychologist.com/r-guide-longitudinal-lme-lmer#power-analysis-and-simulating-these-models>

Two-level model

Graphical representation




Simulate data

```
1 set.seed(1)
2
3 n_participants = 100
4 n_timepoints = 3
5 n_conditions = 2
6 p_condition = 0.5
7 b0 = 10
8 b1 = 10
9 sd_participant = 2
10 sd_residual = 1
11
12 df.data = tibble(participant = rep(1:n_participants, each = n_timepoints),
13                    timepoint = rep(1:n_timepoints, times = n_participants),
14                    intercept_participant = rep(rnorm(n_participants, sd = sd_participant),
15                                         each = n_timepoints)) %>%
16  group_by(participant) %>%
17  mutate(condition = rbinom(n = 1, size = 1, prob = p_condition)) %>%
18  ungroup() %>%
19  mutate(value = b0 + b1 * condition + intercept_participant +
20         rnorm(n_participants * n_timepoints, sd = sd_residual))
```

	participant	timepoint	intercept_participant	condition	value
1	1	1	-1.25290762	0	9.197279
2	1	2	-1.25290762	0	8.728533
3	1	3	-1.25290762	0	8.429024
4	2	1	0.36728665	0	9.437925
5	2	2	0.36728665	0	8.879826
6	2	3	0.36728665	0	9.292094
7	3	1	-1.67125722	1	19.328772
8	3	2	-1.67125722	1	17.707476
9	3	3	-1.67125722	1	16.944316
10	4	1	3.19056160	0	15.059852
11	4	2	3.19056160	0	13.615662
12	4	3	3.19056160	0	12.951915

Plot data



Fit the model

```
1 fit = lmer(formula = value ~ 1 + condition + (1 | participant),  
2             data = df.data)
```


```
7 b0 = 10  
8 b1 = 10  
9 sd_participant = 2  
10 sd_residual = 1
```

```
Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']  
Formula: value ~ 1 + condition + (1 | participant)  
Data: df.data  
  
REML criterion at convergence: 1102  
  
Scaled residuals:  
    Min     1Q   Median     3Q    Max  
-2.30522 -0.57146  0.03152  0.56826  2.28135  
  
Random effects:  
Groups      Name        Variance Std.Dev.  
participant (Intercept) 3.106    1.762  
Residual            1.087    1.043  
Number of obs: 300, groups: participant, 100  
  
Fixed effects:  
          Estimate Std. Error t value  
(Intercept) 10.2199    0.2365  43.21  
condition    10.0461    0.3837  26.18  
  
Correlation of Fixed Effects:  
           (Intr)  
condition -0.616
```


Simulate new data from the model

```
1 set.seed(1)
2
3 fit %>%
4   simulate() %>%
5   bind_cols(df.data) %>%
6   mutate(condition = factor(condition,
7                             levels = c(0, 1),
8                             labels = c("control", "treatment")),
9          timepoint = as.factor(timepoint)) %>%
10 ggplot(data = .,
11         mapping = aes(x = timepoint,
12                         y = sim_1,
13                         group = participant)) +
14   geom_point(alpha = 0.5,
15             color = "blue") +
16   geom_line(alpha = 0.5,
17             color = "blue") +
18   facet_grid(~ condition) +
19   labs(x = "timepoint")
```

original data




simulated data



Two-level growth model

Graphical representation



assume a linear effect of time

Simulate data

```


1 set.seed(1)
2
3 n_participants = 100
4 n_timepoints = 3
5 n_conditions = 2
6 p_condition = 0.5
7 b0 = 10 # intercept
8 b1 = 10 # condition
9 b2 = 2 # time
10 b3 = 3 # interaction
11 sd_intercept_participant = 2
12 sd_time_participant = 2
13 sd_residual = 1
14
15 df.data = tibble(participant = rep(1:n_participants, each = n_timepoints),
16                   timepoint = rep(1:n_timepoints, times = n_participants),
17                   intercept_participant = rep(rnorm(n_participants, sd = sd_intercept_participant),
18                                     each = n_timepoints),
19                   time_participant = rep(rnorm(n_participants, sd = sd_time_participant),
20                                     each = n_timepoints)) %>%
21   group_by(participant) %>%
22   mutate(condition = rbinom(n = 1, size = 1, prob = p_condition)) %>%
23   ungroup() %>%
24   mutate(value = b0 + intercept_participant +
25         b1 * condition +
26         (b2 + time_participant) * timepoint +
27         b3 * condition * timepoint +
28         rnorm(n_participants * n_timepoints, sd = sd_residual))

```

participant	timepoint	intercept_participant	time_participant	condition	value
1	1	-1.252907621	-0.310183339	1	20.573131
2	1	-1.252907621	-0.310183339	1	22.844077
3	1	-1.252907621	-0.310183339	1	24.367254
4	2	0.367286648	0.021057937	0	12.119622
5	2	0.367286648	0.021057937	0	15.062837
6	2	0.367286648	0.021057937	0	17.513515
7	3	-1.671257225	-0.455460824	1	17.470186
8	3	-1.671257225	-0.455460824	1	22.446022
9	3	-1.671257225	-0.455460824	1	24.248006
10	4	3.190561604	0.079014386	1	24.844308
11	4	3.190561604	0.079014386	1	28.220589
12	4	3.190561604	0.079014386	1	28.880339
13	5	0.659015544	-0.327292322	1	22.047393
14	5	0.659015544	-0.327292322	1	25.189133
15	5	0.659015544	-0.327292322	1	28.051351

random slopes

Plot data




Fit the model


```
1 fit = lmer(formula = value ~ 1 + condition * timepoint + (1 + timepoint | participant),  
2             data = df.data)
```

```
Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']  
Formula: value ~ 1 + condition * timepoint + (1 + timepoint | participant)  
Data: df.data  
  
REML criterion at convergence: 1360.3  
  
Scaled residuals:  
    Min     1Q   Median     3Q     Max  
-2.14633 -0.46360  0.03902  0.42302  2.82945  
  
Random effects:  
Groups      Name        Variance Std.Dev. Corr  
participant (Intercept) 3.190    1.786  
                timepoint  3.831    1.957  -0.06  
Residual            1.149    1.072  
Number of obs: 300, groups: participant, 100  
  
Fixed effects:  
              Estimate Std. Error t value  
(Intercept)  10.0101  0.3328  30.079  
condition     10.0684  0.4854  20.741  
timepoint     2.0595   0.2883   7.143  
condition:timepoint  2.9090  0.4205   6.917  
  
Correlation of Fixed Effects:  
          (Intr) condtn timpnt  
condition -0.686  
timepoint -0.266  0.182  
cndtn:tmpnt 0.182 -0.266 -0.686
```

Visualize model predictions (individual)




Visualize model predictions (overall)




Simulate new data from the model

```
1 set.seed(1)
2
3 fit %>%
4   simulate() %>%
5   bind_cols(df.data) %>%
6   mutate(condition = factor(condition,
7                             levels = c(0, 1),
8                             labels = c("control", "treatment")),
9          timepoint = as.factor(timepoint)) %>%
10 ggplot(data = .,
11         mapping = aes(x = timepoint,
12                         y = sim_1,
13                         group = participant)) +
14   geom_point(alpha = 0.5,
15             color = "blue") +
16   geom_line(alpha = 0.5,
17             color = "blue") +
18   facet_grid(~ condition) +
19   labs(x = "timepoint")
```

original data





simulated data



Three-level model

Graphical representation



<https://rpsychologist.com/r-guide-longitudinal-lme-lmer#power-analysis-and-simulating-these-models>

lmer() standard operating procedures

Standard Operating Procedures For Using Mixed-Effects Models

A Principled Workflow from the Decision, Development, and Psychopathology (D2P2) Lab
document version 1.0.0 -- 28 June 2020

[This document will be continuously updated and expanded; it may contain typos and other errors--both unintentional errors and errors based on incorrect or outdated knowledge--we will try to improve these things in future versions. Feel free to let us know if you spotted such things, how to further improve this document!]

Authors (in alphabetical order except that the youngsters were so kind to put the oldest guy in the lab first; BF)

Bernd Figner, Johannes Algermissen, Floor Burghoorn, Leslie Held, Afreene Khalid, Felix Klaassen, Farnaz Mosannenzadeh, Julian Quandt

Content/Analysis Steps

Content/Analysis Steps	1
1. Before data collection:	
Power/ design/ planning/ sample size	3
1.1. Power analysis	3
1.2. Sensitivity analysis	4
1.3. Sequential sampling with stopping rules	5
1.4. More readings	5
2. Preparing data	6
2.1. Categorical variables	6
2.2. Continuous variables	6
3. Running the model	7
3.1. Model specification and random effects	7
3.2. Addressing convergence warnings	7
3.2.1. Convergence warnings in R's lme4	7
3.2.2. Or we choose the Bayesian approach	9
3.2.3. MixedModels in Julia	9

http://decision-lab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/SOP_Mixed_Models_D2P2_v1_0_0.pdf

What shall I include as random effects?

- mixed opinions on the topic
- go maximal!



Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing:
Keep it maximal

Dale J. Barr ^{a,*}, Roger Levy ^b, Christoph Scheepers ^a, Harry J. Tily ^c

^aInstitute of Neuroscience and Psychology, University of Glasgow, 58 Hillhead St., Glasgow G12 8QB, United Kingdom

^bDepartment of Linguistics, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0108, USA

^cDepartment of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA



"Through theoretical arguments and Monte Carlo simulation, we show that LMEMs generalize best when they include the maximal random effects structure justified by the design. ...

Maximal LMEMs should be the 'gold standard' for confirmatory hypothesis testing in psycholinguistics and beyond."

What shall I include as random effects?

- general advice:
 - start maximal (as supported by the design)
 - random intercepts and slopes for participants
 - random intercepts for items
 - reduce complexity of the random effects structure step by step
 - remove the correlations between random effects first

Remove the correlation component from your model

```
1 # fit the model
2 fit.lmer = lmer(formula = reaction ~ 1 + days + (1 + days | subject),
3                  data = df.sleep)
4 # model summary
5 fit.lmer %>%
6   summary()
```

```
Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']
Formula: reaction ~ 1 + days + (1 + days | subject)
Data: df.sleep

REML criterion at convergence: 1771.4

Scaled residuals:
    Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max 
-3.9707 -0.4703  0.0276  0.4594  5.2009 


Random effects:
Groups      Name        Variance Std.Dev. Corr
subject (Intercept) 582.73   24.140
          days       35.03   5.919   0.07
Residual           649.36   25.483

Number of obs: 183, groups: subject, 20


Fixed effects:
            Estimate Std. Error t value
(Intercept) 252.543    6.433 39.256
days         10.452    1.542  6.778

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
  (Intr) days  
days -0.137
```


multivariate
Gaussian




Remove the correlation component from your model



uncorrelated



positively correlated



negatively correlated


Remove the correlation component from your model

```
1 # fit the model  
2 fit.lmer = lmer(formula = reaction ~ 1 + days + (0 + days | subject) + (1 | subject),  
3                   data = df.sleep)  
4 # model summary  
5 fit.lmer %>%  
6   summary()
```

↑
random slopes ↑
random intercepts

```
Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']  
Formula: reaction ~ 1 + days + (0 + days | subject) + (1 | subject)  
Data: df.sleep  
  
REML criterion at convergence: 1771.5  
  
Scaled residuals:  
    Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max  
-3.9805 -0.4673  0.0250  0.4589  5.2083  
  
Random effects:  
Groups   Name        Variance Std.Dev.  
subject  days        35.88    5.99  
subject.1 (Intercept) 598.11   24.46  
Residual           647.90   25.45  
Number of obs: 183, groups: subject, 20  
  
Fixed effects:  
            Estimate Std. Error t value  
(Intercept) 252.550     6.491  38.907  
days         10.439     1.556   6.708  
  
Correlation of Fixed Effects:  
  (Intr)  
days -0.184
```

independent Gaussians



Remove the correlation component from your model

```
1 # fit the model
2 fit.lmer = lmer(formula = reaction ~ 1 + days + (1 + days || subject),
3                  data = df.sleep)
4 # model summary
5 fit.lmer %>%
6   summary()
```

```
Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']
Formula: reaction ~ 1 + days + (0 + days | subject) + (1 | subject)
Data: df.sleep

REML criterion at convergence: 1771.5

Scaled residuals:
    Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max 
-3.9805 -0.4673  0.0250  0.4589  5.2083 

Random effects:
 Groups   Name        Variance Std.Dev. 
subject  days       35.88    5.99    
subject  (Intercept) 598.11   24.46  
Residual           647.90   25.45  
Number of obs: 183, groups: subject, 20

Fixed effects:
            Estimate Std. Error t value
(Intercept) 252.550    6.491  38.907
days         10.439    1.556   6.708


Correlation of Fixed Effects:
  (Intr) days  
days -0.184
```

alternative syntax (doesn't
model correlation between
random effects)

independent
Gaussians

What if lmer() fails to converge?

1. We drop random effects in the following order: random correlations, random slopes of covariates (where significance is of no interest), random intercepts ("0+" instead "1+") (following [Barr et al., 2013](#)). We never remove the random slopes of the variables of interest (i.e., the ones for which we want to conduct significance tests).
Please note that removing random correlation terms can be tricky if random slopes are estimated for factors with 3 or more levels. In that case, it is probably easiest to use `afex::mixed()` with `expand_re = TRUE` (an alternative option is to create manually the relevant contrasts yourself and add them as predictors to your model, which allows you to suppress the random corrections using the double pipe symbol `||`).
2. We try to run separate analyses: For example, one model to only test the fixed and random effect of A (with fixed effect of B present); then one model to only test the effect of B. If we really have to drop random slopes, we follow the next step:
3. We follow the PCA approach suggested by **rePsychLing** (see [Bates et al., 2015](#)) that is performing a PCA on the random effects and following the guidelines described in the paper.
 - a. We use a likelihood ratio test to test whether the model fit becomes significantly worse. As we prefer a more conservative approach here (i.e., rather err on the side of keeping too many random effects; we prioritize avoiding inflated Type 2 errors for this kind of decision), we use larger alpha-level of .2 ([Matuschek et al., 2017](#)).
 - b. Alternatively, we suggest an Information criterion approach to avoid using a *p* value for our inclusion/exclusion decision, but choose the best model based on *B/C* or *A/C*.




3.2.2. Or we choose a Bayesian approach



As an alternative to targeting convergence issues within **lme4**, we suggest fitting the same model with **brms** and comparing it to the **lme4** fit. We assume that both provide similar results when

02:00

stretch break!



Causation vs. correlation



The Effect: An Introduction to Research Design and Causality

[Search](#)

[Additional Materials](#)

[Revision and Updates](#)

Introduction

- 1 - Designing Research
- 2 - Research Questions
- 3 - Describing Variables
- 4 - Describing Relationships
- 5 - Identification
- 6 - Causal Diagrams
- 7 - Drawing Causal Diagrams
- 8 - Causal Paths and Closing Back Doors
- 9 - Finding Front Doors
- 10 - Treatment Effects
- 11 - Causality with Less Modeling
- The Toolbox
- 12 - Opening the Toolbox
- 13 - Regression
- 14 - Matching
- 15 - Simulation
- 16 - Fixed Effects
- 17 - Event Studies
- 18 - Difference-in-Differences
- 19 - Instrumental Variables
- 20 - Regression Discontinuity
- 21 - A Gallery of Rogues: Other Methods
- 22 - Under the Rug
- References

Nick Huntington-Klein
The Effect
An Introduction to Research Design and Causality



CRC Press
A Taylor & Francis Group Book

Click here to [order your copy of The Effect from Chapman & Hall now!](#) It can also be ordered on [Amazon](#) or [Barnes and Noble](#).

Welcome to the web version of *The Effect*. *The Effect* is now out in published form from Chapman & Hall, but they have allowed this free Bookdown version to remain here on theeffectbook.net. This Bookdown version will continue to be free, but I also hope that you will [purchase the published version now that it is available](#). If you would like to be kept informed about updates to the book, such as when new teaching materials come out, please add your email to the [mailing list](#) (no more than one email/month).

made with RMarkdown

<https://theeffectbook.net/>



Pearl, J. (2000). *Causality: Models, reasoning and inference*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.


Spirtes, P., Glymour, C. N., & Scheines, R. (2000). *Causation, prediction, and search*. The MIT Press.

What do you think?

Suppose there is a robust, statistically significant, and long-term correlation between the color of cars and the annual rate at which they are involved in accidents.


To be concrete, assume that red cars, in particular, are involved in accidents year after year at a higher rate than cars of any other color. When you go to buy a new car, should you avoid the color red in your quest to remain safe on the road?

Possible causal mechanisms



running experiments


controlling for variables




can help/hinder

Seeing vs. doing


Observation vs. Intervention



Inferring causal structure through intervention




Experiment 1




$$p(\text{Happy} | \text{do}(\text{Exercise} = 0)) = 0.3$$

$$p(\text{Happy} | \text{do}(\text{Exercise} = 1)) = 0.3$$

Inferring causal structure through intervention




Experiment 2




$$p(\text{Exercise} | \text{do}(\text{Happy} = 0)) = 0.1$$

$$p(\text{Exercise} | \text{do}(\text{Happy} = 1)) = 0.1$$



Inferring causal structure through intervention



$$p(\text{Happy} \mid \text{do}(\text{Healthy} = 0)) = 0.05$$


$$p(\text{Exercise} \mid \text{do}(\text{Healthy} = 0)) = 0.1$$

$$p(\text{Happy} \mid \text{do}(\text{Healthy} = 1)) = 0.5$$

$$p(\text{Exercise} \mid \text{do}(\text{Healthy} = 1)) = 0.75$$


Important take home message

- correlation is not causation
- correlation (= probabilistic dependence) suggests that there is *some* causal relationship
- but we don't know which one it is



- **causal interventions** / experiments can reveal the underlying causal structure


Observation, intervention, counterfactual



Level	Concept	Expression	Activity	Question	Example
I	Observation/ Prediction	$p(y x)$	Seeing	How does x change my belief in y ?	Would the grass be wet if we <i>found</i> the sprinkler off?




Level	Concept	Expression	Activity	Question	Example
I	Observation/ Prediction	$p(y x)$	Seeing	How does x change my belief in y ?	Would the grass be wet if we <i>found</i> the sprinkler off?
II	Intervention/ Hypothetical	$p(y \text{do}(x))$	Doing	Would y happen if I did x ?	Would the grass be wet if <i>made sure</i> that the sprinkler was off?




Level	Concept	Expression	Activity	Question	Example
I	Observation/ Prediction	$p(y x)$	Seeing	How does x change my belief in y ?	Would the grass be wet if we <i>found</i> the sprinkler off?
II	Intervention/ Hypothetical	$p(y \text{do}(x))$	Doing	Would y happen if I did x ?	Would the grass be wet if <i>made sure</i> that the sprinkler was off?
III	Counterfactual	$p(y_x x', y')$	Explaining	Would y have happened instead of y' , if I had done x instead of x' ?	Would the grass have been wet if we <i>had made sure</i> that the sprinkler was off, given that the grass is wet and the sprinkler on?

Observation



Intervention/Experiment





with flyer



without
flyer

flyer handed out



= returned

= didn't return

Counterfactual

Did this person go because
they were handed a flyer?







with flyer




without
flyer

flyer handed out




= returned




= didn't return

Did A cause B to go through the gate?



Counterfactual Simulation Model


What happened?



Actual situation


B went through the gate

What would have happened?



Counterfactual situation

B would have missed the gate




Did A prevent B from go through the gate?


1/2 speed

Controlling for variables

The Relationship between Y and X, Controlling for a Binary Variable W
1. Start with raw data. Correlation between X and Y: 0.319



Simpson's paradox



What does controlling for variables mean?

we are not actually "**controlling**" the variable

instead, we are taking the variable into consideration when making predictions



the hope is that we get a better estimate of the parameter that we are interested in by taking into account other factors

Patterns of inference


Patterns of inference: Common cause

$$p(S | R) = p(S)$$

or

$$p(S | R) \neq p(S)$$

?




Patterns of inference: Common cause

- effects of a common cause are *unconditionally dependent*

$$p(S | R) \neq p(S)$$

$$p(S | C) < p(S)$$




C	$p(S)$	C	$p(R)$
F	0.5	F	0
T	0.1	T	0.3

Patterns of inference: Common cause

- effects of a common cause are *conditionally independent given the cause*


$$p(S | R, C) = p(S | C)$$



Patterns of inference: **Causal chain**

- cause and effect in a causal chain are *unconditionally dependent*


$$p(W | C) \neq p(W)$$



Patterns of inference: Causal chain

- cause and effect in a causal chain are *conditionally independent*

$$p(W | C, R) = p(W | R)$$




Patterns of inference: **Common effect**

- two causes of a common effect are *unconditionally independent*

$$p(S | R) = p(S)$$

(e.g. Sprinkler is set by a timer)




Patterns of inference: Common effect

- two causes of a common effect
are *conditionally dependent*
given the effect

$$p(S | R, W) \neq p(S | W)$$

explaining away




- intuitively: both causes compete
to explain the effect

Note: The pattern of inference depends on the structural form which captures how Sprinkler and Rain jointly affect Wet grass. Explaining away holds for the commonly used noisy-or integration function.

Should I control?

When should I control for variables?

recent advances in graphical models have produced a way to help distinguish good from bad controls

 **d-separation**
directional

decide from a causal graph whether a set of variables X is independent of another set Y , given a third set Z

Goal: we want a precise (and unbiased) estimate of the predictive relationship between X and Y

 **we want to block all other paths from X to Y**

When should I control for variables?

How can I tell whether two variables are independent?


Recipe for independence

1. Draw the ancestral graph
2. "Moralize" the graph by "marrying" the parents
3. "Disorient" the graph by replacing arrows with edges
4. Delete the givens and their edges
5. Read the answer off the graph
 - if variables are **disconnected** they are independent
 - if variables are connected (have a path between them) they are not guaranteed to be independent

When should I control for variables?


Are D and E independent?

$$p(D | E) = p(D) ?$$



1. Draw the ancestral graph


Construct the "ancestral graph" of all variables mentioned in the probability expression. This is a reduced version of the original net, consisting only of the variables mentioned and all of their ancestors (parents, parents' parents, etc.)



When should I control for variables?


Are D and E independent?

$$p(D | E) = p(D) ?$$



**2. "Moralize" the graph
let's get married!**


For each pair of variables with a common child, draw an undirected edge (line) between them. (If a variable has more than two parents, draw lines between every pair of parents.)



When should I control for variables?


Are D and E independent?

$$p(D | E) = p(D) ?$$



3. "Disorient" the graph


Replace arrows with lines



When should I control for variables?

Are D and E independent?


$$p(D | E) = p(D) ?$$



4. Delete the givens

Remove the variables that we condition on, as well as their edges


**we didn't condition on anything,
so there is nothing to delete**



When should I control for variables?

Are D and E independent?


$$p(D | E) = p(D) ?$$



5. Read answer off the graph

- if variables are **disconnected** they are independent
- if variables are connected (have a path between them) they are not guaranteed to be independent

D and E are not independent from each other




they are connected via at least one path


When should I control for variables?

Are D and E independent, given C? 1. Draw the ancestral graph

$$p(D | E, C) = p(D | C) ?$$




Construct the "ancestral graph" of all variables mentioned in the probability expression. This is a reduced version of the original net, consisting only of the variables mentioned and all of their ancestors (parents, parents' parents, etc.)




When should I control for variables?

**Are D and E independent, given C? 2. "Moralize" the graph
let's get married!**

$$p(D | E, C) = p(D | C) ?$$



For each pair of variables with a common child, draw an undirected edge (line) between them. (If a variable has more than two parents, draw lines between every pair of parents.)





When should I control for variables?

Are D and E independent, given C? 3. "Disorient" the graph

$$p(D | E, C) = p(D | C) ?$$

Replace arrows with lines





When should I control for variables?

Are D and E independent, given C? 4. Delete the givens

$$p(D | E, C) = p(D | C) ?$$

Remove the variables that we condition on, as well as their edges

we conditioned on C!




When should I control for variables?


Are D and E independent, given C? 5. Read answer off the graph

$$p(D | E, C) = p(D | C) ?$$

- if variables are **disconnected** they are independent
- if variables are connected (have a path between them) they are not guaranteed to be independent



D and E are independent from each other conditioned on C



they aren't connected via a path




So what?




Patterns of inference


We want to estimate the (causal) relationship between X and Y



common cause



common effect




causal chain

by controlling for Z we hope to get a better estimate of the relationship between X and Y

d-separation helps us tell apart **good controls** from **bad controls**

When should I control for variables?


I want to estimate the effect that X has on Y



Is Z a **good** or a **bad** control here?

When should I control for variables?

```
1 set.seed(1)
2
3 n = 1000
4 b_zx = 2
5 b_xy = 2
6 b_zy = 2
7 sd = 1
8
9 df = tibble(z = rnorm(n = n, sd = sd),
10             x = b_zx * z + rnorm(n = n, sd = sd),
11             y = b_zy * z + b_xy * x + rnorm(n = n, sd = sd))
```



overestimating X's effect on Y

$$Y = b_0 + b_1 \cdot X + e$$

```
1 # without control
2 lm(formula = y ~ 1 + x,
3     data = df) %>%
4     summary()
```

```
Call:
lm(formula = y ~ x, data = df)


Residuals:
    Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max 
-4.6011 -0.9270 -0.0506  0.9711  4.0454 

Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)    
(Intercept) 0.02449   0.04389   0.558   0.577    
x           2.82092   0.01890  149.225 <2e-16 ***  
---
Signif. codes:  0 '****' 0.001 '***' 0.01 '**' 0.05 '*' 0.1 '.' 1

Residual standard error: 1.388 on 998 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.9571,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.9571 
F-statistic: 2.227e+04 on 1 and 998 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

When should I control for variables?

```
1 set.seed(1)
2
3 n = 1000
4 b_zx = 2
5 b_xy = 2
6 b_zy = 2
7 sd = 1
8
9 df = tibble(z = rnorm(n = n, sd = sd),
10             x = b_zx * z + rnorm(n = n, sd = sd),
11             y = b_zy * z + b_xy * x + rnorm(n = n, sd = sd))
```



accurate estimate
of X's effect on Y

$$Y = b_0 + b_1 \cdot X + b_2 \cdot Z + e$$

```
1 # with control
2 lm(formula = y ~ 1 + x + z,
3     data = df) %>%
4     summary()
```

```
Call:
lm(formula = y ~ x + z, data = df)


Residuals:
    Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max 
-3.6151 -0.6564 -0.0223  0.6815  2.8132 

Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)    
(Intercept) 0.01624   0.03260   0.498   0.618    
x           2.02202   0.03135  64.489 <2e-16 ***  
z           2.00501   0.07036  28.497 <2e-16 ***  
---
Signif. codes:  0 '****' 0.001 '***' 0.01 '**' 0.05 '*' 0.1 '.' 1

Residual standard error: 1.031 on 997 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.9764,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.9763 
F-statistic: 2.059e+04 on 2 and 997 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

When should I control for variables?


I want to estimate the effect that X has on Y



Z is a **good** control here!

When should I control for variables?


I want to estimate the effect that X has on Y



Z is a **good** control here!

When should I control for variables?


I want to estimate the effect that X has on Y



Is Z a **good** or a **bad** control here?

When should I control for variables?

```
1 set.seed(1)
2
3 n = 1000
4 b_xz = 2
5 b_yz = 2
6 sd = 1
7
8 df = tibble(x = rnorm(n = n, sd = sd),
9               y = rnorm(n = n, sd = sd),
10              z = x * b_xz + y * b_yz + rnorm(n = n, sd = sd))
```



accurate estimate
of X's effect on Y

$$Y = b_0 + b_1 \cdot X + e$$

```
1 # without control
2 lm(formula = y ~ 1 + x,
3     data = df) %>%
4     summary()
```


```
Call:
lm(formula = y ~ x, data = df)

Residuals:
    Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max 
-3.2484 -0.6720 -0.0138  0.7554  3.6443 

Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)    
(Intercept) -0.016187  0.032905 -0.492   0.623    
x            0.006433  0.031809  0.202   0.840    
                                                        
Residual standard error: 1.04 on 998 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  4.098e-05, Adjusted R-squared: -0.000961 
F-statistic: 0.0409 on 1 and 998 DF,  p-value: 0.8398
```

When should I control for variables?

```
1 set.seed(1)
2
3 n = 1000
4 b_xz = 2
5 b_yz = 2
6 sd = 1
7
8 df = tibble(x = rnorm(n = n, sd = sd),
9               y = rnorm(n = n, sd = sd),
10              z = x * b_xz + y * b_yz + rnorm(n = n, sd = sd))
```



inaccurate
estimate of X's
effect on Y

$$Y = b_0 + b_1 \cdot X + b_2 \cdot Z + e$$

```
1 # with control
2 lm(formula = y ~ 1 + x + z,
3     data = df) %>%
4     summary()
```

```
Call:
lm(formula = y ~ x + z, data = df)


Residuals:
    Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max 
-1.35547 -0.30016  0.00298  0.31119  1.73408 

Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)    
(Intercept) -0.009608  0.014477  -0.664   0.507    
x            -0.816164  0.018936 -43.102 <2e-16 ***  
z             0.398921  0.006186  64.489 <2e-16 ***  
---
Signif. codes:  0 '****' 0.001 '***' 0.01 '**' 0.05 '*' 0.1 '.' 1

Residual standard error: 0.4578 on 997 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.8066,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.8062 
F-statistic: 2079 on 2 and 997 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16
```

When should I control for variables?

I want to estimate the effect that X has on Y




Z is a **bad** control here!

When should I control for variables?

- checking for **d-separation** tells us whether or not variables are (conditionally) independent
- it also tells us whether paths of dependence "open up", or get "closed down"
- the graphical procedure doesn't necessarily reveal whether the dependence between variables changes: it reveals the **structure** of dependence but not the **strength**
- you can always double check via running simulations in R

When should I control for variables?

I want to estimate the effect that X has on Y




Z is a **bad** control here!

When should I control for variables?

- **good controls** reduce additional paths from X to Y apart from the direct path we are interested in estimating
- **bad controls** introduce additional paths (or change existing ones) that lead to a biased estimate of the direct path between X and Y

When should I control for variables?


Problem: We don't know the ground truth ...



we need to manipulate X experimentally to tell these apart

Mediation

Definition




Rather than a direct causal relationship between **X** and **Y**, a mediation model proposes that **X** influences the mediator variable **M**, which in turn influences **Y**. Thus, the mediator variable serves to clarify the nature of the relationship between **X** and **Y**.

Adapted from Wikipedia

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mediation_\(statistics\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mediation_(statistics))

Example



X = grades in Psych 252


M = feelings of self-esteem

Y = happiness

Is the relationship between grades in Psych 252 and happiness mediated by feelings of self-esteem?


Simulate a mediation analysis

```
1 # number of participants
2 n = 100
3
4 # generate data
5 df.mediation = tibble(
6   x = rnorm(n, 75, 7),           # grades
7   m = 0.7 * x + rnorm(n, 0, 5), # self-esteem
8   y = 0.4 * m + rnorm(n, 0, 5) # happiness
9 )
```



Bootstrapping

```
1 library("mediation")
2
3 # bootstrapped mediation
4 fit.mediation = mediate(model.m = fit.m_x,
5                           model.y = fit.y_mx,
6                           treat = "x",
7                           mediator = "m",
8                           boot = T)
9
10 # summarize results
11 fit.mediation %>% summary()
```



$$\begin{aligned} \hat{m} &= b_0 + b_1 \cdot x \\ \hat{y} &= b_0 + b_1 \cdot m + b_2 \cdot x \end{aligned}$$

```
Causal Mediation Analysis

Nonparametric Bootstrap Confidence Intervals with the Percentile Method

      Estimate 95% CI Lower 95% CI Upper p-value
ACME       0.28078   0.14059       0.42 <2e-16 ***
ADE        -0.11179  -0.29276      0.10    0.272
Total Effect  0.16899  -0.00415      0.34    0.064 .
Prop. Mediated 1.66151  -3.22476     11.46    0.064 .

---
Signif. codes:  0 '****' 0.001 '***' 0.01 '**' 0.05 '*' 0.1 ' ' 1

Sample Size Used: 100

Simulations: 1000
```

2. Bootstrapping

Causal Mediation Analysis



Nonparametric Bootstrap Confidence Intervals with the Percentile Method

	Estimate	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value
ACME	0.28078	0.14059	0.42	<2e-16 ***
ADE	-0.11179	-0.29276	0.10	0.272
Total Effect	0.16899	-0.00415	0.34	0.064 .
Prop. Mediated	1.66151	-3.22476	11.46	0.064 .

Signif. codes:	0 **** 0.001 ** 0.01 * 0.05 . 0.1 ' ' 1			

Sample Size Used: 100

Simulations: 1000



2. Bootstrapping

Causal Mediation Analysis

Nonparametric Bootstrap Confidence Intervals with the Percentile Method

	Estimate	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value	
ACME	0.28078	0.14059	0.42	<2e-16	***
ADE	-0.11179	-0.29276	0.10	0.272	
Total Effect	0.16899	-0.00415	0.34	0.064	.
Prop. Mediated	1.66151	-3.22476	11.46	0.064	.

Signif. codes: 0 '****' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Sample Size Used: 100

Simulations: 1000

$$\hat{y} = b_0 + b_1 \cdot x$$

Call:



```
lm(formula = y ~ 1 + x, data = df.mediation)
```

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-10.917	-3.738	-0.259	2.910	12.540

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	8.78300	6.16002	1.426	0.1571
x	0.16899	0.08116	2.082	0.0399 *



c

2. Bootstrapping

Causal Mediation Analysis


Nonparametric Bootstrap Confidence Intervals with the Percentile Method

	Estimate	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value	
ACME	0.28078	0.14059	0.42	<2e-16	***
ADE	-0.11179	-0.29276	0.10	0.272	
Total Effect	0.16899	-0.00415	0.34	0.064	.
Prop. Mediated	1.66151	-3.22476	11.46	0.064	.

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Sample Size Used: 100

Simulations: 1000



$$\hat{y} = b_0 + b_1 \cdot m + b_2 \cdot x \quad \text{ADE: Average direct effect}$$

Call:
lm(formula = y ~ 1 + m + x, data = df.mediation)

Residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-9.3651	-3.3037	-0.6222	3.1068	10.3991

Coefficients:

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	7.80952	5.68297	1.374	0.173
m	0.42381	0.09899	4.281	4.37e-05 ***
x	-0.11179	0.09949	-1.124	0.264

2. Bootstrapping

```
Causal Mediation Analysis

Nonparametric Bootstrap Confidence Intervals with the Percentile Method

      Estimate 95% CI Lower 95% CI Upper p-value
ACME       0.28078    0.14059      0.42 <2e-16 ***
ADE        -0.11179   -0.29276     0.10  0.272
Total Effect  0.16899   -0.00415     0.34  0.064 .
Prop. Mediated 1.66151   -3.22476    11.46  0.064 .

---
Signif. codes:  0 '****' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Sample Size Used: 100

Simulations: 1000
```


ACME: Average causal mediation effect

ACME = Total effect - ADE


ADE: Average direct effect

Underlying causal model


Full mediation



Partial mediation



No mediation




Full mediation: When the effect of **X** on **Y** completely disappears, **M** fully mediates between **X** and **Y**.

Partial mediation: When the effect of **X** on **Y** still exists, but in a smaller magnitude, **M** partially mediates between **X** and **Y**.

Beware of mediation analyses!!!

```
1 set.seed(1)
2
3 n = 100 # number of observations
4
5 # causal chain
6 df.causal_chain = tibble(x = rnorm(n, 0, 1),
7                           z = 2 * x + rnorm(n, 0, 1),
8                           y = 2 * z + rnorm(n, 0, 1))
```




Causal Mediation Analysis								
Nonparametric Bootstrap Confidence Intervals with the Percentile Method								
	Estimate	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	p-value				
ACME	0.8287	0.6234	1.05	<2e-16 ***				
ADE	-0.0535	-0.2548	0.15	0.55				
Total Effect	0.7752	0.6391	0.90	<2e-16 ***				
Prop. Mediated	1.0690	0.8131	1.35	<2e-16 ***				

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1								
Sample Size Used: 100								
Simulations: 1000								

nice mediation result!

Beware of mediation analyses!!!

```
1 set.seed(1)
2
3 n = 100 # number of observations
4
5 # common cause
6 df.common_cause = tibble(z = rnorm(n, 0, 1),
7                           x = 2 * z + rnorm(n, 0, 1),
8                           y = 2 * z + rnorm(n, 0, 1))
```



```
Causal Mediation Analysis

Nonparametric Bootstrap Confidence Intervals with the Percentile Method

      Estimate 95% CI Lower 95% CI Upper p-value
ACME       0.8287    0.6065     1.04 <2e-16 ***
ADE        -0.0535   -0.2675     0.16    0.56
Total Effect  0.7752    0.6353     0.90 <2e-16 ***
Prop. Mediated 1.0690    0.8134     1.37 <2e-16 ***
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1


Sample Size Used: 100

Simulations: 1000
```

(not) nice mediation result!

Limitations

- correlational analysis
 - we need theories / experiments to tease apart causes and effects to properly map our variables onto the diagram



The image shows the cover of a journal article from the Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. The top half features the Elsevier logo (a tree and a figure) and the journal title "Journal of Experimental Social Psychology". Below the title, it says "Contents lists available at ScienceDirect" and "journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jesp". The bottom half contains the article title "What mediation analysis can (not) do" with a small star icon, the authors' names "Klaus Fiedler ^{a,*}, Malte Schott ^a, Thorsten Meiser ^b", and their affiliations "^a University of Heidelberg, Germany" and "^b University of Mannheim, Germany".

Fiedler, K., Schott, M., & Meiser, T. (2011). What mediation analysis can (not) do. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(6), 1231-1236.

Limitations

many-to-one mapping




Fig. 1. Illustration of a mediation analysis in the context of persuasion research: The impact of message strength (X) on attitude change (Y) is supposed to be mediated by the recipients' cognitive responses (Z).





Fig. 2. Different causal models for the interpretation of the same intercorrelations between three variables, X , Y , and Z .

only experiments allow us to tell apart possible causal structures

Fiedler, K., Schott, M., & Meiser, T. (2011). What mediation analysis can (not) do. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(6), 1231-1236.

Moderation

Definition




Moderation means that the effect of a predictor depends on the value of another.

Here, the nature of the relationship between **X** and **Y** depends on **Z**.

Have we come across moderation already?

Relationship
between credit card
balance, income,
and whether the
person is a student.




$$\widehat{\text{balance}}_i = 200.62 + 6.22 \cdot \text{income}_i + 476.68 \cdot \text{student}_i - 2.00 \cdot (\text{income}_i \times \text{student}_i)$$

if student = "No" $\widehat{\text{balance}}_i = 200.62 + 6.22 \cdot \text{income}_i$

if student = "Yes"

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widehat{\text{balance}}_i &= 200.62 + 6.22 \cdot \text{income}_i + 476.68 \cdot 1 - 2.00 \cdot (\text{income}_i \times 1) \\
 &= 677.3 + 6.22 \cdot \text{income}_i - 2.00 \cdot \text{income}_i \\
 &= 677.3 + 4.22 \cdot \text{income}_i
 \end{aligned}$$

Learn more about mediation and moderation



Recoded with `brms` by
Solomon Kurz here:
[https://bookdown.org/
connect/#/apps/1523/access](https://bookdown.org/connect/#/apps/1523/access)

Plan for today



- Quick recap
- Linear Mixed Model
 - Different random effect structures
 - lmer() standard operating procedures
- Causation
 - Causation vs. correlation
 - Controlling for variables
 - Mediation
 - Moderation

Feedback

How was the pace of today's class?

much a little just a little much
too too right too too
slow slow fast fast

How happy were you with today's class overall?



What did you like about today's class? What could be improved next time?

Thank you!