

Critique Papers on Causal Inferences

Tony Tan

Centre for Educational Measurement

University of Oslo

MAE4051: Selected Topics in Educational Measurement

Prof Jan-Eric Gustafsson

9 April 2021

Propensity Scores

Sullivan, A. L., & Field, S. (2013). Do preschool special education services make a difference in kindergarten reading and mathematics skills?: A propensity score weighting analysis. *Journal of School Psychology, 51*(2), 243–260.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2012.12.004>

Summary

Sullivan and Field (2013) attempted to investigate the marginal benefit created by a special education program mandated by the US *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA). The 1986 amendments to the IDEA legislation imposed legal requirement on the states to create a sequence of intervention programs targeting three stages of development for children with needs: 1) from birth to 2-year-old, 2) 3-year to kindergarten entry, and 3) kindergarten to 21-year-and-11-month-old. This paper focused on the middle segment of the intervention sequence named preschool special education services and followed children longitudinally through the delivery period. The study began by measuring children's probability of being admitted into the special education program using a logit regression, and at the end of the intervention period, compared the average performance scores in maths and reading of the children who actually received the preschool special education treatment against the average scores of those who have not. Using the propensity score weighting technique, the authors interrogated the counterfactual question of “what if” the treatment were never applied and reached an conclusion that children in treatment group would have been better off academically had they not received any intervention at all. This disappointing result lent itself to an existing literature of similar negative findings evaluating special education effectiveness, cautioning the rosy objectives of preschool special education services originally marketed by policy makers.

Causal Question

Would the children who received special education services have been better off academically, on average, had they not received such services?

Validity

Internal and External Validity

Historically, internal validity referred to inferences about whether “the experimental treatments make a difference in this specific experimental instance” while external validity asked “to what populations, settings, treatment variables, and measurement variables can this effect be generalized” (Campbell & Stanley, 1963, p. 5). Cook and Campbell (1979) advanced the idea of internal validity to the question whether the covariation observed between the independent and dependent variables were resulted from a *causal* relationship, whereas external validity further asks whether such cause-effect relationship holds over certain variation in persons, settings, treatment variables, and measurement variables.

In order to support an inference that the observed covariation between A and B reflects a causal relationship, Shadish et al. (2002) prescribed a trifecta that 1) A preceded B in time, 2) A covaries with B , and 3) no other explanations for the relationship are plausible. It is too often the third strand that undermines the internal validity of inference making—the relationship between A and B is not causal because it could have occurred even in the absence of the treatment and that it could have led to the same outcomes that were observed for the treatment. Amongst the list of potential threats to internal validity (Shadish et al., 2002, pp. 54–61), maturation presents the strongest challenge to Sullivan and Field (2013). Children who have been identified as “in need” so early in life (“early onsetters”) can be reasonably believed to be in possession of different developmental profiles from children who showed needs later in life (“late onsetters”). As participants in the treatment group mature, gaps in academic performance may well emerge out of such delayed developmental trajectories with or without education services. It is therefore not preschool interventions that “caused” lower academic scores but the two-tier growth profiles that did. Failing to rule out such alternative, and rather plausible, explanation weakens the internal validity of inference made by the authors.

Weak external validity has also been acknowledged by the authors in Section 4.2 of the paper. Inferences can only been drawn, first of all, over children with mild to moderate impairments resultant from the sample deletion procedure; while it were the children with the most severe impairment that policy makers wished to monitor and retain (“interaction of the causal relationship with units” by Shadish et al. (2002)). Secondly, Sullivan and Field (2013)

evaluated only the academic performance of young children to the exclusion of other developmental markers such as motor-behavioural and social-affective skills—all vital policy objectives along with reading and maths scores, if not more important, for kindergarten-entry age children (“interaction of the causal relationship with outcomes”). Lastly, the averaging procedure in calculating ATT washed out important differences across race and socio-economic groups, important factors reported by prior literatures as non-ignorable (“context-dependent mediation”).

Construct Validity

Construct validity concerns itself with the degree of agreement between the concept the researchers intended to understand (e.g., academic performance) and the procedure as well as instrument they employed to capture and measure such concept (e.g., sum scores in maths and reading tests). Amongst the various threats proposed by Shadish et al. (2002, pp. 72–81), Sullivan and Field (2013) were particularly susceptible to “inadequate explication of constructs” and “construct confounding”. The concept of academic performance can be thought as the end result of a sequence of social activities: academic input (I)–academic processing(P)–academic output(O). When academic scores were low, one is unable to ascertain whether it was the result of inferior teaching (xPO), lack of learning skills (IxO), or inability to demonstrate or document learning outcome to observers (IPx). Although both xPO and IPx may show up as low academic scores, the “causal pathways” cannot be more different—a situation not assisted by the ECLS-B early reading and math batteries used in Sullivan and Field (2013) since none was designed to locate the source(s) of academic deficiency.

Construct confounding occurs when the concept under investigation has not been careful separated from other related concepts. Sullivan and Field (2013) clearly wished to study “academic performance” of young children but such construct covary particularly strongly for this age group with attention span and sociability. It is not unreasonable to conjecture that recipients of the special education program may not develop the above-mentioned skills at the same pace as their counterparts. Effectively, the ECLS-B batteries employed by Sullivan and Field (2013) were capturing young children’s short attention spans and under-developed social skills and presenting them as inferior academic performance. Both inadequate explication of constructs and construct confounding have,

therefore, weakened this study’s construct validity, undermining its inference of “special education causing lower academic performance”.

Statistical Conclusion Validity

By Cook and Campbell (1979), statistical conclusion validity refers to the appropriateness of statistical techniques employed by the researcher for the purposes of inferring whether the presumed independent and dependent variables indeed covary. The propensity score weighting technique employed by Sullivan and Field (2013) successfully circumvented many pitfalls summarised by Shadish et al. (2002, pp. 45–52) except for the “restriction of range” threat to statistical conclusion validity. Due to the necessity of constructing a region of common support, children are purposefully excluded from analyses if their probabilities of being accepted into the special education program fall outside of the 1% to 82% range. This practice is especially concerning for the above-82% group since these are the young children with demonstrated need for urgent education assistance. Under the law of diminishing marginal returns, it is more than probable that it is this most-in-need group that would have responded best and most rapidly to special education interventions. The wholesale omission of this positive outcome pool may have well contributed to the underestimation of the project effectiveness.

Appropriateness of Methods

Sullivan and Field (2013) largely followed the propensity score analysis procedure prescribed by Imbens and Rubin (2015) and Imbens (2015) in assessing causal effects. At the first stage DESIGN, the authors established sufficient overlapping by discarding some units from the original sample in order to establish the region of common support; the second stage SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSIS, however, appeared to be lacking in Sullivan and Field (2013) where the plausibility of unconfoundedness shall be further addressed through pseudo-average treatment effect on the pseudo-outcome for trimmed sample (see Imbens, 2015, pp. 383–384); such absence would cast doubt on any result in the third stage ANALYSIS over the source of average treatment effect.

One highlight on methodology is the Bayesian approach to AAT sampling weights. Sullivan and Field (2013) correctly pointed out the “curse of dimensionality” when computing w_i for $D_i = 0$ cases and provided sufficient derivation through Bayes formula in reaching the

form

$$w_i = \frac{\mathbb{P}(D = 1|z_i)}{1 - \mathbb{P}(D = 1|z_i)} \cdot \frac{\mathbb{P}(D = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(D = 1)}, \text{ for } D_i = 0.$$

The authors, however, stayed short of advocating for a wider adoption of this approach to resampling weights but gave in to conventional literature in order to maximise comparability. This weighting formula overcome the peculiarity of the conventional scheme (only the first term in the formula above) summing to twice the size of the treated subsample and provided a more intuitive formation of summing to the sample size. Stronger advocacy can be expected from continuing research in popularising Sullivan and Field’s (2013) weighting formulation.

Conclusion

Sullivan and Field (2013) made a good attempt to apply the propensity score technique for causal assessment of preschool special education data. Despite some omissions in statistical procedure, what limited this paper’s impact on policy was *not* the econometric methodology it employed but the weak inferential validity. Since “[v]alidity is a property of inferences [...] *not* a property of designs or methods,” (Shadish et al., 2002, p. 34, emphasis in original text) no amount of technical sophistication is capable of compensating for validity, or the lack thereof. Sullivan and Field’s (2013) result shall be interpreted narrowly based on *this* particular round of study, using *this* sub-sample to quantify *this* particular sub-set of outcome measures, subject to *these* particular restrictions, omissions and commissions, and based on *these* many statistical assumptions which may or may not have been met. A naïve interpretation of “special education *causes* even worse academic outcomes” shall be rejected out right. After all, an absence of evidence is *not* the evidence of the absence, and the total social return generated by early-life education intervention programs shall be contextualised in the general equilibrium analysis framework (e.g., through estimating the multiplier effect) rather than a partial one. Nevertheless, Sullivan and Field (2013) had made contribution to both the propensity score methodology and to the substantive debate over the direction and magnitude of the effectiveness of one social project.

Instrumental Variables

Hanandita, W., & Tampubolon, G. (2014). Does poverty reduce mental health? An instrumental variable analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*, 113, 59–67.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.05.005>

Summary

Hanandita and Tampubolon (2014) investigated the causal relationship between poverty and mental health decline using an instrumental variable (IV) approach in order to overcome the endogeneity problem. Using a sample size of 577,548 across 440 districts in Indonesia and precipitation anomaly as the IV, the authors were able to quantify the expenditure/income elasticity of mental disorders as -0.62 —a result five times stronger than that of the non-IV approach and robust to various stress tests. Moreover, income inequality also appeared to carry explanatory power to mental health concerns in addition to that of poverty, suggesting both the position (quantity of income) and the shape (distribution of income) of the income curve as policy variables worth pursuing for the betterment of population mental welfare.

Causal Question

Does poverty cause poor mental health?

Validity

Construct Validity

Internal Validity

External Validity

Statistical Conclusion Validity

Appropriateness of Methods

The authors of Hanandita and Tampubolon (2014) had delivered a carefully designed study to the social science community. They elevated this research enquiry from a correlational endeavour to a causal one not only to satisfy one's methodological curiosity but to provide a conclusive response to the policy choice that “if causal links between wealth and

health were confirmed, society would likely benefit from more universal access to health care and redistributive economic policy. Yet, if such causal links were rebutted, resources would be better spent on influencing health knowledge, preferences, and ultimately the behavior of individuals.” (Stowasser et al. (2011) as cited in Hanandita and Tampubolon ([2014](#))).

Conclusion

Fixed-effect Regression

White, M. P., Alcock, I., Wheeler, B. W., & Depledge, M. H. (2013). Would you be happier living in a greener urban area? A fixed-effects analysis of panel data. *Psychological Science*, 24(6), 920–928. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612464659>

Summary

White et al. (2013)

Causal Question

Validity

Construct Validity

Internal Validity

External Validity

Statistical Conclusion Validity

Appropriateness of Methods

Conclusion

References

- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Rand McNally.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Rand McNally.
- Hanandita, W., & Tampubolon, G. (2014). Does poverty reduce mental health? An instrumental variable analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*, 113, 59–67.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.05.005>
- Imbens, G. W. (2015). Matching methods in practice: Three examples. *Journal of Human Resources*, 50(2), 373–419. <https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.50.2.373>
- Imbens, G. W., & Rubin, D. B. (2015). *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139025751>
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Sullivan, A. L., & Field, S. (2013). Do preschool special education services make a difference in kindergarten reading and mathematics skills?: A propensity score weighting analysis. *Journal of School Psychology*, 51(2), 243–260.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2012.12.004>
- White, M. P., Alcock, I., Wheeler, B. W., & Depledge, M. H. (2013). Would you be happier living in a greener urban area? A fixed-effects analysis of panel data. *Psychological Science*, 24(6), 920–928. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612464659>