

EKT-816 Lecture 3

Counterfactuals, Causality, and Potential Outcomes

Jesse Naidoo

University of Pretoria

Potential Outcomes and Causality

- what do we mean by “causation”?
 - B happens after A ?
 - B and A often happen together?
- suppose we have a binary “treatment”, D
 - corresponding to each person i there is a pair of *potential outcomes* (Y_i^0, Y_i^1)
 - the *causal effect* or *treatment effect* for person i is $Y_i^1 - Y_i^0$
- we only observe one of the two potential outcomes
 - sometimes called “fundamental problem of causal inference”
 - thus, in order to make statements about causality, we have to fill in missing data
- the outcomes which we do not observe are called *counterfactuals*

The Selection Problem

- notice that $Y = DY^1 + (1 - D)Y^0$, for all individuals
- what does a naive comparison of mean outcomes give us?

$$\begin{aligned}E[Y|D = 1] - E[Y|D = 0] &= E[Y^1|D = 1] - E[Y^0|D = 0] \\&= E[Y^1|D = 1] - E[Y^0|D = 1] \\&\quad + E[Y^0|D = 1] - E[Y^0|D = 0] \\&= E[Y^1 - Y^0|D = 1] \\&\quad + E[Y^0|D = 0] - E[Y^0|D = 0]\end{aligned}$$

- we call $E[Y^1 - Y^0|D = 1]$ the (average) *effect of treatment on the treated* (ATT)
 - similar definitions for the effect of treatment on the *untreated* (TUT)
 - the *average treatment effect* (ATE) is just $E[Y^1 - Y^0]$
- what “policy” questions do these answer?
- the term $E[Y^1|D = 0] - E[Y^0|D = 0]$ is called “selection bias”
 - more specifically, it is due to selection on the *baseline* level of Y^0

Examples for Discussion

- what is being claimed?
 - is it a causal statement?
 - a statement of fact?
 - a normative judgement?
 - ▶ is there an implicit causal claim underlying it?
 - ▶ if yes, would there be effects on other outcomes?
 - ▶ might lead us to think about efficiency, equilibrium, etc.
 - something else?
- if there is a causal statement being made:
 - what is the counterfactual?
 - is any evidence presented in favor of the claim?

Randomization Solves the Selection Problem

- suppose we do an experiment, so that $D \perp\!\!\!\perp (Y^1, Y^0)$
- then our comparison of means delivers the ATE:

$$E[Y^1|D=1] - E[Y^0|D=0] = E[Y^1] - E[Y^0] = E[Y^1 - Y^0]$$

- Tennessee STAR experiment
 - affected about 11 600 children over 4 years (1985 - 1988)
 - 3 treatments:
 - ▶ small class (13 - 17)
 - ▶ normal class (22 - 25) + part-time TA
 - ▶ normal class + full-time TA
 - Table 2.2.1: descriptive statistics
 - ▶ do we have covariate balance?
 - ▶ what about attrition rates?
 - Table 2.2.2: experimental results

SUTVA, General Equilibrium and External Validity

- “stable unit treatment value assumption”
- this is actually two assumptions
 - potential outcomes for a given individual don't depend on treatment for others
 - ▶ earnings effects of education for a given person vs mass school construction
 - ▶ Bill Gates' proposal to give 30% of families in rural sub-Saharan African chickens
 - ▶ peer effects in schooling?
 - ▶ often economists think of these as “general equilibrium effects”
 - potential outcomes for a given individual don't depend on the way treatment was assigned
 - ▶ voluntary migration vs kidnapping!
 - ▶ being raised by a single parent: voluntary divorce vs spousal death vs never-married?
 - ▶ may be able to get around some of these problems by observing other outcomes to use as instruments

Causal Mechanisms vs Treatment Effects

- often, we do not just want to know “what works”
 - also want to know *why* it works
- Keane (2010) gives a medical example: gastric distension from abdominal wounds
 - belief at the time was this was due to buildup of toxicity in intestines
 - Wangsteen’s experiments showed that in fact it was just swallowed air
 - estimated to have saved about 100,000 lives of US soldiers in WWII
- completely naive attempts to see “what works” quickly run into combinatorial problems
 - there are many more combinations of policies than you can run experiments for!
 - a model (even implicit) is an essential device to fill in missing information
 - ▶ “data and assumptions are perfect substitutes” - Charles Manski
- of course, we want to be clear about where our conclusions come from:
 - which facts in the data drive our estimates?
 - under which assumptions are these facts informative about the parameters of interest?

The “Four FAQs”

- Angrist and Pischke outline their four FAQs:
 - 1: what is the causal relationship of interest?
 - 2: what would be the ideal experiment?
 - 3: what is your identification strategy?
 - 4: what is your mode of statistical inference?
- there is more to research than this, but:
 - answers to these questions are the core of a project
- evaluating whether given strategies are appropriate
 - given the question
 - given the data
 - will be our agenda for the rest of the course
- conversely, thinking through whether a particular strategy would deliver a credible estimate
 - helps you design a project
 - helps focus attention on the biggest potential weaknesses (and how to overcome them)

What is the Causal Relationship of Interest?

- not all good research is about causal relationships
 - wage and productivity trends
 - flow approach to labor markets
- still, a large majority of economic research at least aims at causality
 - might correspond to a parameter in an economic model
 - ▶ a labor supply elasticity
 - ▶ an elasticity of substitution (in production)
 - might be “policy relevant”
 - ▶ have to think carefully about external validity here
 - ▶ would the policy change itself alter the causal relationship?
 - ▶ e.g. is the “causal effect of schooling” a supply-side or a demand-side parameter?

What Would Be the Ideal Experiment?

- example: Milgram experiment
- racial or gender discrimination
 - do we want to manipulate race or gender itself? or the *perception* of race?
 - Goldin and Rouse (2000) experiment on blind auditions for orchestras
 - resume audit studies
- school start age and test scores
 - if maturity has an effect (ability to sit still, concentrate), inherently confounded with age
 - option 1: randomize start age (e.g. 6 vs 7) and test in Gr 1
 - option 2: randomize start age but test at age 8
 - what if you had a cohort who were *not* in school?

What is Your Identification Strategy?

- also known as: “what is the source of the identifying variation?”
 - this will make more sense later when we discuss OLS and IV
 - basic idea: *what, precisely, is the evidence for your causal claim?*
- if we don't understand what aspects of the data drive the conclusions, how can we assess the credibility of the claims?
 - if you cannot answer this clearly, no one will take your claims seriously

What is Your Mode of Statistical Inference?

- need to quantify the precision of estimates and test hypotheses
- with more complex research designs this can be very involved
- when your data are clustered, grouped or aggregated, need to adjust for correlated unobservables

References

- Goldin, Claudia, and Cecilia Rouse. 2000. "The Impact of "Blind" Auditions on Female Musicians." *American Economic Review* 90 (4): 715–41.
- Keane, Michael. 2010. "A Structural Perspective on the Experimentalist School." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 24 (2): 47–58.
<https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.2.47>.

Table of Contents

Potential Outcomes and Causality

The “Four FAQs”