

Index

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

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

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