



Universiteit Utrecht

Estimating causal effects of policy interventions

Workshop ODISSEI

Oisín Ryan & Erik-Jan van Kesteren

About us



Erik-Jan van Kesteren

- Background in statistics / social science
- Assistant professor @ methodology & statistics UU
- Social Data Science team lead @ ODISSEI (consortium of universities)



Some stuff I work on:

Latent variables, high-dimensional data, optimization, regularization, visualisation, Bayesian statistics, multilevel models, spatial data, generalized linear models, privacy, synthetic data, high-performance computing, software development, open science & reproducibility

About us



Oisín Ryan

- Background in statistics / social science
- Currently: Postdoc @ methodology & statistics UU
- From July: Assistant Professor @ Data Science and Biostatistics, Julius Center, UMC Utrecht
- Co-ordinator [Special Interest Group in Causal Data Science](#) UU/UMCU

Website: oisinryan.org

Some stuff I work on:

Causal inference, causal discovery, time-series analysis, computational modeling and complex systems, Bayesian statistics, multilevel models, open science & reproducibility, R programming

Today's Goal

A brief survey and practical introduction to the

- Core concepts
- Key assumptions
- Different statistical methods

used to evaluate the **causal effects** of **policy interventions**

Disclaimer:

We take a “wide” instead of “deep” view

Many details / extensions / advanced topics omitted!

causalpolicy.nl

Today's plan: morning

- Introduction + Practical (105 minutes)
 - Policy Interventions and Causal Inference
 - Pre-Post Analyses and Difference-in-Difference
- Break (15 minutes)
- Interrupted Time Series (30 minutes)
- Practical (30 minutes)
- Lunch around 12:00 ; re-start at 13:00

Today's plan: afternoon

- Synthetic Control Methods (45 minutes)
- Practical (45 minutes)
- Break (15 minutes)

- Controlled ITS and CausalImpact (45 minutes)
- Practical (45 minutes)
- Break (15 minutes)

- Discussion session (30 minutes)

- Finish around 17:00

Context: “Policy Evaluations”

Many social science **research questions** concern evaluating what **the effect** of implementing a particular **policy** or **intervention** was on some outcome of interest

Examples:

- What was the effect of raising the maximum speed limit on road deaths?
- What effect did introducing students loans have on post-graduation debt levels?
- Did introducing an after-school programme in disadvantaged neighbourhoods lead to improved educational outcomes in children from that neighbourhood?

Context: “Policy Evaluations”

Sometimes referred to as “policy evaluation” research or “comparative case studies”

Basic Structure:

- We have some **unit** (or units) which we observe **before** and **after** some intervention or action
- Did the intervention produce a change in the outcome for that unit?

Methods for Policy Evaluation

Many different methods have been developed to answer these types of research questions

These methods differ in terms of:

- The **amount** and **type** of information they use
 - Amount of time-points and amount of potential “control” units
- The specific **statistical approach** they take
- The types of **assumptions** they make

		# Control Units		
		0	1	Many
# Time-Points	2	Post - Pre (inference only with multiple treated units)	Diff-in-Diff (inference only with multiple treated units)	Synthetic Diff-in-Diff, Matching DID
	Few (>2)	Regression Discontinuity Design, Post - Pre	Diff-in-Diff (inference based on time-averages)	Synthetic Control
	Many	Interrupted Time Series (ITS)	Controlled Interrupted Time Series (CITS)	Synthetic CITS Synthetic Control

Causal Inference: A primer

Potential Outcomes

Causal Inference is (broadly) concerned with using **data** to estimate what the effect is of **intervening or changing** the value of one or more **variables**.

Using the **potential outcomes** framework, we can define causal inference as a *missing data problem*



Potential Outcomes

Let Y_i represent your headache level (high is a very bad headache, low is no headache), and let A_i be whether you take aspirin or not ($A = 1$ you take it, $A = 0$ you don't)

You only want to take an aspirin if your headache level **after taking aspirin** is lower relative to what your headache would be **if you wouldn't take aspirin**

There are **two possible versions** of the outcome variable

- Y_i^1 your headache level **if you would take aspirin**
- Y_i^0 your headache level **if you would not take aspirin**

Causal Effects

We can define the **causal effect** of taking aspirin on your headache levels as the difference in potential outcomes

$$CE_i = Y_i^1 - Y_i^0$$

The **fundamental problem of causal inference**: You only ever observe one of the potential outcomes!

Data and Potential Outcomes

ID	Y
1	7
2	9
3	6
4	5
5	6
6	2
7	3
8	1
...	...
I	2

Data and Potential Outcomes

ID	Y	A	Y^0	Y^1
1	7	0	7	NA
2	9	0	9	NA
3	6	0	6	NA
4	5	0	5	NA
5	6	0	6	NA
6	2	1	NA	2
7	3	1	NA	3
8	1	1	NA	1
...
I	2	1	NA	2

Data and Potential Outcomes

<i>ID</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>Y</i> ⁰	<i>Y</i> ¹
1	7	0	7	<i>NA</i>
2	9	0	9	<i>NA</i>
3	6	0	6	<i>NA</i>
4	5	0	5	<i>NA</i>
5	6	0	6	<i>NA</i>
6	2	1	<i>NA</i>	2
7	3	1	<i>NA</i>	3
8	1	1	<i>NA</i>	1
...
<i>I</i>	2	1	<i>NA</i>	2

Causal Inference

In cross-sectional settings, we typically aim to make inferences about the **average causal effect**. This is known as a **causal estimand**:

$$ACE = E[Y^1] - E[Y^0]$$

In a **Randomized Controlled Trial**, we often use the difference in treated and untreated groups as an **estimator** of this causal effect:

$$\widehat{ACE} = E[Y | A = 1] - E[Y | A = 0]$$

Causal Inference

In cross-sectional settings, we typically aim to make inferences about the **average causal effect**. This is known as a **causal estimand**:

$$ACE = E[Y^1] - E[Y^0]$$

In a **Randomized Controlled Trial**, we often use the difference in treated and untreated groups as an **estimator** of this causal effect:

$$\widehat{ACE} = E[Y | A = 1] - E[Y | A = 0]$$

Causal Inference

ID	Y	A	Y^0	Y^1
1	7	0	7	NA
2	9	0	9	NA
3	6	0	6	NA
4	5	0	5	NA
5	6	0	6	NA
6	2	1	NA	2
7	3	1	NA	3
8	1	1	NA	1
...
I	2	1	NA	2

Causal Inference

In cross-sectional settings, we typically aim to make inferences about the **average causal effect**. This is known as a **causal estimand**:

$$ACE = E[Y^1] - E[Y^0]$$

In a **Randomized Controlled Trial**, we often use the (sample) difference in treated and untreated groups as an **estimator** of this causal effect:

$$\widehat{ACE} = E[Y | A = 1] - E[Y | A = 0]$$

Causal Inference

ID	Y	A	Y^0	Y^1
1	7	0	7	NA
2	9	0	9	NA
3	6	0	6	NA
4	5	0	5	NA
5	6	0	6	NA
6	2	1	NA	2
7	3	1	NA	3
8	1	1	NA	1
...
I	2	1	NA	2

Causal Inference Assumptions

This type of **inference** about causal effects from **observed data** is only possible under certain **conditions** or **assumptions**

Exchangeability

- If we were to reverse treatment assignment we would observe the same group differences. Information is exchangeable between groups
- Basically: absence of **confounder variables**
 - E.g. People who have bad headaches choose to take the aspirin
- **RCTs** are powerful because **randomization** ensures exchangeability. But in principle this kind of inference is possible from non-RCT designs
- In practice we need **conditional exchangeability**; to control for **confounders!**

Causal Inference Assumptions

This type of **inference** about causal effects from **observed data** is only possible under certain **conditions** or **assumptions**

Stable Unit Treatment Value (also known as SUTVA)

- **No Interference:** The potential outcomes of one unit does not depend on the treatment assigned to another unit.
 - No “spillover”: My taking an aspirin does not influence your headache levels
- **Consistency:** Only one version of treatment, treatment is unambiguously defined.
- I can directly observe one of the potential outcomes. $Y_i = Y_i^1$

Causal Inference Assumptions

These two generic assumptions essentially always appear in causal inference problems, and as we will see, we will have to deal with concerns around **confounders** and **no interference** repeatedly today

Other assumptions or conditions may also be needed depending on the specific **design** and **analytic approach you take**

Causal Inference and Policy Evaluations

Today's Topic

Policy evaluation is a special case of causal inference

We typically have **one unit** observed **repeatedly over time**

At some point in time (T_0) an **intervention** takes place

Pre-intervention we observe Y_t^0 and **post-intervention** Y_t^1

<i>Time</i>	Y_t	A_t
1	7	0
2	9	0
3	6	0
4	5	0
5	6	0
6	2	1
7	3	1
8	1	1
...
T	2	1

<i>Time</i>	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1
1	7	0	7	<i>NA</i>
2	9	0	9	<i>NA</i>
3	6	0	6	<i>NA</i>
4	5	0	5	<i>NA</i>
5	6	0	6	<i>NA</i>
6	2	1	<i>NA</i>	2
7	3	1	<i>NA</i>	3
8	1	1	<i>NA</i>	1
...
<i>T</i>	2	1	<i>NA</i>	2

Causal Effects of Policies

We want to estimate the **causal effect of the policy intervention**

We think about this as the difference between

(a) the **observed outcome** after the policy was introduced

(b) What the outcome **would have been** without the intervention

$$CE_t = Y_t^1 - Y_t^0$$

where $t > T_0$ (i.e., the post-intervention time period)

<i>Time</i>	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1
1	7	0	7	NA
2	9	0	9	NA
3	6	0	6	NA
4	5	0	5	NA
5	6	0	6	NA
6	2	1	NA	2
7	3	1	NA	3
8	1	1	NA	1
...
<i>I</i>	2	1	NA	2

Running Example: Proposition 99

Proposition 99

- A famous example in causal inference literature

*Abadie, A., Diamond, A., & Hainmueller, J. (2010). Synthetic control methods for comparative case studies: **Estimating the effect of California's tobacco control program**. Journal of the American statistical Association, 105(490), 493-505.*

- In 1988, the state of California imposed a 25% tax on tobacco cigarettes
- Total savings in personal health care expenditure until 2004 is \$86 billion (Lightwood et al., 2008)


Proposition 99

- We prepared a dataset for this workshop:

proposition99.rds

- Panel (i.e. longitudinal) dataset
- Can be downloaded from the website
- Let's explore!

Panel data for proposition 99



Proposition 99

```
> prop99 <- read_rds("data/proposition99.rds")
> prop99
# A tibble: 1,209 × 7
  state      year cigsale lnincome beer age15to24 retprice
  <fct>    <int>   <dbl>   <dbl> <dbl>   <dbl>   <dbl>
1 Rhode Island  1970   124.    NA    NA     0.183   39.3
2 Tennessee    1970    99.8    NA    NA     0.178   39.9
3 Indiana      1970   135.    NA    NA     0.177   30.6
4 Nevada       1970   190.    NA    NA     0.162   38.9
5 Louisiana    1970   116.    NA    NA     0.185   34.3
6 Oklahoma     1970   108.    NA    NA     0.175   38.4
7 New Hampshire 1970   266.    NA    NA     0.171   31.4
8 North Dakota 1970    93.8    NA    NA     0.184   37.3
9 Arkansas     1970   100.    NA    NA     0.169   36.7
10 Virginia    1970   124.    NA    NA     0.189   28.8
# ... with 1,199 more rows
# i Use `print(n = ...)` to see more rows
```

Proposition 99

state: 39 different states, used in Abadie et al. (2010)

year: 1970 until 2000

cigsale: packs of cigarettes per 100 000 people

lnincome: natural log of mean income

beer: beer sales per 100 000 people

age15to24: proportion of people between 15 & 24

retprice: retail price of a box of cigarettes

Proposition 99


- Which state sold the least cigarettes per capita?
- We make use of **tidyverse**:

```
5 prop99 ▶  
6   group_by(state) ▶  
7   summarize(total_cigsales = sum(cigsale)) ▶  
8   arrange(total_cigsales)
```

- This works well with our prepared dataset

Proposition 99

```
# A tibble: 39 × 2
  state      total_cigsales
  <fct>      <dbl>
1 Utah      1979.
2 New Mexico 2612.
3 California 2932.
4 North Dakota 3062.
5 Idaho      3097.
6 South Dakota 3106.
7 Connecticut 3124.
8 Minnesota  3127.
9 Nebraska   3145.
10 Texas     3158.
# ... with 29 more rows
# i Use `print(n = ...)` to see more rows
```



Practical: set-up and data

Work in pairs/groups!

Exercises 1 – 3

15 minutes

causalpolicy.nl

Estimating the causal effect

Basic methods


		# Control Units		
		0	1	Many
# Time-Points	2	Post - Pre (inference only with multiple treated units)	Diff-in-Diff (inference only with multiple treated units)	Synthetic Diff-in-Diff, Matching DID
	Few (>2)	Regression Discontinuity Design, Post - Pre	Diff-in-Diff (inference based on time-averages)	Synthetic Control
	Many	Interrupted Time Series (ITS)	Controlled Interrupted Time Series (CITS)	Synthetic CITS Synthetic Control

		# Control Units		
		0	1	Many
# Time-Points	2	Post - Pre (inference only with multiple treated units)	Diff-in-Diff (inference only with multiple treated units)	Synthetic Diff-in-Diff, Matching DID
	Few (>2)	Regression Discontinuity Design, Post - Pre	Diff-in-Diff (inference based on time-averages)	Synthetic Control
	Many	Interrupted Time Series (ITS)	Controlled Interrupted Time Series (CITS)	Synthetic CITS Synthetic Control

Pre-Post Estimator

Pre-post estimator

We use only the cigarette sales time series for California



Pre-post estimator

- We want to estimate the following quantity:

$$\overline{CE}_{post} = \bar{Y}_{post}^1 - \bar{Y}_{post}^0$$

- But we cannot observe \bar{Y}_{post}^0 !
- Solution: replace $\bar{Y}_{\textcolor{teal}{post}}^0$ by $\bar{Y}_{\textcolor{teal}{pre}}^0$, which is observable

$$\overline{CE}_{post} = \bar{Y}_{post}^1 - \bar{Y}_{pre}^0$$

<i>Time</i>	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1
1	7	0	7	NA
2	9	0	9	NA
3	6	0	6	NA
4	5	0	5	NA
5	6	0	6	NA
6	2	1	NA	2
7	3	1	NA	3
8	1	1	NA	1
...
T	2	1	NA	2

Pre – Post analysis

<i>Time</i>	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1
1	7	0	7	NA
2	9	0	9	NA
3	6	0	6	NA
4	5	0	5	NA
5	6	0	6	NA
6	2	1	NA	2
7	3	1	NA	3
8	1	1	NA	1
...
T	2	1	NA	2

\bar{Y}_{pre}^0

\bar{Y}_{post}^1

Pre – Post analysis

<i>Time</i>	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1
1	7	0	7	NA
2	9	0	9	NA
3	6	0	6	NA
4	5	0	5	NA
5	6	0	6	NA
6	2	1	NA	2
7	3	1	NA	3
8	1	1	NA	1
...
T	2	1	NA	2

Diagram illustrating the Pre-Post analysis structure. The table shows data for Time (1 to T), Y_t , A_t , Y_t^0 , and Y_t^1 . The Y_t^0 column is highlighted with a blue box, and the Y_t^1 column is highlighted with a red box. A blue arrow points from the Y_t^0 column to \bar{Y}_{pre}^0 . A red arrow points from the Y_t^1 column to $\bar{Y}_{post}^1 - \bar{Y}_{post}^0$. A purple arrow points from \bar{Y}_{pre}^0 to $\bar{Y}_{post}^1 - \bar{Y}_{post}^0$ with the label "Assume equal to".

$$\overline{CE}_{post} = \bar{Y}_{post}^1 - \bar{Y}_{post}^0$$

Pre-post estimator

- Estimate the mean before the intervention \bar{Y}_{pre}
- Estimate the mean after the intervention \bar{Y}_{post}

$$\widehat{CE}_{post} = \bar{Y}_{post} - \bar{Y}_{pre}$$

- We can choose to consider equal time before and after the intervention (!)


Pre-post estimator

- Filter & compute pre-post factor variable

```
46 prop99_cali ←  
47   prop99 ▷  
48   filter(state %in% "California", year ≥ 1976) ▷  
49   mutate(prepost = as_factor(ifelse(year ≤ 1988, "Pre", "Post")))  
50
```

- Compute the pre-post difference

Pre-post estimator



Pre-post estimator

- But what about uncertainty?
- Use linear regression / OLS to compute \widehat{CE}

```
52 summary(lm(cigsale ~ prepost, data = prop99_cali))
```

<i>Time</i>	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1
1	7	0	7	<i>NA</i>
2	9	0	9	<i>NA</i>
3	6	0	6	<i>NA</i>
4	5	0	5	<i>NA</i>
5	6	0	6	<i>NA</i>
6	2	1	<i>NA</i>	2
7	3	1	<i>NA</i>	3
8	1	1	<i>NA</i>	1
...
<i>T</i>	2	1	<i>NA</i>	2

Pre-post estimator

Result:

```
Call:
lm(formula = cigsale ~ prepost, data = prop99_cali)

Residuals:
    Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-22.385  -8.050  -1.685   8.350  22.050

Coefficients:
            Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)  112.485     3.404   33.05  < 2e-16 ***
prepostPost  -52.135     4.913  -10.61 2.47e-10 ***
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 12.27 on 23 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.8304,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.823
F-statistic: 112.6 on 1 and 23 DF,  p-value: 2.467e-10
```

Standard errors
assume no
autocorrelation
(!)

Pre-post estimator

The causal effect of the tax increase on cigarette sales is an average yearly decrease of 52 packs of cigarettes per 100000 people

- Interpretation depends on choices in analysis
- In this case: effect averaged over 1989 – 2000
- Be precise – define your causal estimand \overline{CE}_{post}

Pre-post estimator


Most important / strict assumption:

No trend in time

- Remember: we assumed $\bar{Y}_{post}^0 = \bar{Y}_{pre}^0$
- We assume the pre-post difference is caused by intervention **only**
- If trend exists, then the effect of trend and of intervention cannot be distinguished

Pre-post estimator

- Is there a trend in time, independent of the intervention?
- How much of pre-post difference is caused by intervention?



Difference-in-Differences

Difference-in-differences

„transparent and often at least superficially plausible”

Angrist, J. D. and Krueger, A. B. (1999). Empirical strategies in labor economics. In Handbook of labor economics, volume 3, pages 1277–1366. Elsevier.

- Used a lot in economics
- There is a lot of discussion around this topic
- We will explain the basic method here
- There are a lot of possible extensions!


Difference-in-differences

- Like before:
 - Measure outcome pre- and post-intervention
 - Choose what time period to consider
- Unlike before:
 - Also measure pre & post outcome C for a **control unit**
 - The control should not have received the intervention

```
76 prop99_did <-  
77   prop99 ▶  
78   filter(state %in% c("California", "Utah"), year ≥ 1976) ▶  
79   mutate(prepost = as_factor(ifelse(year ≤ 1988, "Pre", "Post")))
```

$Time$	Y_t	A_t	Y_t^0	Y_t^1	C_{1t}
1	7	0	7	NA	2
2	9	0	9	NA	6
3	6	0	6	NA	4
4	5	0	5	NA	2
5	6	0	6	NA	1
6	2	1	NA	2	3
7	3	1	NA	3	2
8	1	1	NA	1	4
...
T	2	1	NA	2	3

Difference-in-differences



Pre-post estimator

- Like before, we estimate the following quantity:

$$\overline{CE}_{post} = \bar{Y}_{post}^1 - \bar{Y}_{post}^0$$

- Now, we assume there is an effect of time: $\beta \cdot Time$
- We can represent unobservable \bar{Y}_{post}^0 as

$$\bar{Y}_{post}^0 = \bar{Y}_{pre}^0 + \beta \cdot Time$$

Pre-post estimator

- But the trend $\beta \cdot Time$ is also unobservable!
- Solution: assume equal trends for Utah and California

$$\beta \cdot Time = (\bar{C}_{post}^0 - \bar{C}_{pre}^0)$$

- Thus, our model for the counterfactual is:

$$\bar{Y}_{post}^0 = \bar{Y}_{pre}^0 + (\bar{C}_{post}^0 - \bar{C}_{pre}^0)$$

Pre-post estimator

- Plugging this into the causal effect equation:

$$\overline{CE}_{post} = (\bar{Y}_{post}^1 - \bar{Y}_{pre}^0) - (\bar{C}_{post}^0 - \bar{C}_{pre}^0)$$

- Difference in differences!

$$\widehat{CE}_{post} = (\bar{Y}_{post} - \bar{Y}_{pre}) - (\bar{C}_{post} - \bar{C}_{pre})$$


Difference-in-differences

$$CE = (\text{Cali_post} - \text{Cali_pre}) - (\text{Utah_post} - \text{Utah_pre})$$


	state	Pre	Post
	<i><fct></i>	<i><dbl></i>	<i><dbl></i>
1	California	112.	60.4
2	Utah	71.5	51.7

$$(60.4 - 112) - (51.7 - 71.5) = -32.3$$


Difference-in-differences



Difference-in-differences



Difference-in-differences



Difference-in-differences

- But what about uncertainty?
- Use linear regression / OLS to compute \widehat{CE}

```
88 # Now we want to know about uncertainty  
89 # model with interaction effect  
90 mod_did ← lm(cigsale ~ state * prepost, data = prop99_did)  
91 summary(mod_did)
```


Difference-in-differences

```
Call:
lm(formula = cigsale ~ state * prepost, data = prop99_did)

Residuals:
    Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
-22.385  -6.963   1.933   6.329  22.050

Coefficients:
              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
(Intercept)    112.485     2.745   40.983 < 2e-16 ***
stateUtah      -40.985     3.882  -10.559 7.02e-14 ***
prepostPost    -52.135     3.962  -13.160 < 2e-16 ***
stateUtah:prepostPost  32.368     5.602   5.777 6.24e-07 ***
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 9.896 on 46 degrees of freedom
Multiple R-squared:  0.8592,    Adjusted R-squared:  0.85
F-statistic: 93.58 on 3 and 46 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16
```



Standard errors
assume no
autocorrelation
(!)

Most important assumptions

Parallel trends

$$\beta \cdot Time = (\bar{C}_{post}^0 - \bar{C}_{pre}^0)$$

Time effect is the same for the treated and the control unit


No interference / spillover

$$\bar{C}_{post} = \bar{C}_{post}^0$$

The control does not receive any intervention effect

Most important assumptions

- Can we assume parallel trends?
- At least superficially plausible 😊



Practical: pre-post & DiD

Work in pairs/groups!

Take a break from 10:45 to 11:00

Break