# API-202B Empirical Methods II

# Session #10: Randomized Experiments

<u>miguel\_santos@hks.harvard.edu</u> @miguelsantos12

- Introduction
- Policy question: Does deworming raise students' performance?
- Trichuris trichiura, growth and students' performance: Evidence from Jamaica
- Takeaways
- In preparation for Monday's class with Lant Pritchett
- Vocabulary

- Randomly assigning subjects to control and treatment groups:
  - Ensures that treatment is not correlated with individual characteristics (even unobservable characteristics)
  - Ensures that any differences in outcomes between the treatment and control groups are attributable to the treatment, and not to other differences between the two groups

• We have two ways of estimate effects of randomized experiments:

	Difference in Means	Regression Analysis	
Estimation	Impact = $\overline{Y}_T - \overline{Y}_C$	$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TREAT + u$	
		TREAT is a dummy variable indicating person is in treatment group	
		Impact : $\beta_1$	
Hypothesis Testing	Conduct a t-test for the difference in means:	Conduct a t test to determine whether $\beta_{1 is}$ significantly different from zero:	
	$H_0: \underline{u_T} - \underline{u_C} = 0$	$H_0: \beta_1 = 0$	
Additional Benefits of Method:		Can include additional controls to improve the precision of the estimate:	
		$\begin{array}{lll} Y=\beta_0+\beta_1TREAT+\beta_2X_2++\beta_kX_k+u\\ where & X_2,X_k & are & several\\ characteristics at baseline \end{array}$	

# Policy question: Does deworming raise students' performance

- Each year, approximately 1.3 billion people suffer from hookworm and roundworm infections
- There is concern that poor health due to such infections may reduce students' performance in developing countries
- Policy Question:
  - What are the effects of implementing a deworming program on students' performance?

# Trichuris trichiura, growth and students' performance Evidence from Jamaica: Description

- Simeon DT, Grantham-McGregor SM, Callender JE, Wong MS (1995): "Treatment of Trichuris trichiura infections improves growth, spelling scores and school attendance in some children," Journal of Nutrition, 125, 1875-83.
- Study design:
  - 407 children in ages 6-12 in grades 2 to 5 from 14 public schools
  - Schools chosen on the advice of local health professionals: children already infected with *Trichuris trichiura infections* were recruited for study
  - Individual students were then randomly assigned to:
    - Treatment: Deworming drug given
    - Control: Placebo drug given
- Length of study: 6 months
- School attendance data were collected before and during the intervention (only available for 264 children due to loss of class registers in some schools/grades)

### Trichuris trichiura, growth and students' performance Evidence from Jamaica: Description

• What do researchers mean by "residualized gain scores for each outcome variable"

They run a univariate regression between each outcome measure post-RCT  $(Y_t)$  and their corresponding levels pre-RCT  $(Y_{t-1})$  and use residuals as their outcome variables. When they do this, they are stripping away the post-RCT result from all its correlation with pre-RCT levels on those same measures

Treatment effects were determined using multiple regression analyses. First, residualized gain scores were calculated for each outcome variable. To do this, linear regression analyses were conducted with the post-test measures as the dependent variable and the pretest measures as the independent variable. The residuals from these analyses were saved for use as the dependent variables in subsequent analyses. In these multiple regression analyses, treatment group was entered as a dummy variable and other potentially confounding variables were entered as covariates. The latter included gender, age, socioeconomic status, the intensity of Ascaris infections (log transformed) and school attended (as dummy variables). The analyses were repeated with treatment-bystunting and treatment-by-intensity interactions as additional independent variables.

#### TABLE 2

# Mean school achievement test scores, school attendance and anthropometry of Jamaican school children at baseline and at post-test<sup>1,2</sup>

	Group		
	Treatment $\langle n = 206 \rangle$	Placebo $\langle n = 201 \rangle$	Significance <sup>3</sup> P
Arithmetic			
Baseline	$19.2 \pm 7.1$	$19.6 \pm 6.5$	0.54
Post-test	$21.4 \pm 6.2$	$21.5 \pm 6.2$	0.92
Spelling			
Baseline	$14.3 \pm 8.7$	$15.2 \pm 8.6$	0.29
Post-test	$16.9 \pm 10.2$	$17.6 \pm 10.0$	0.43
Reading			
Baseline	$23.7 \pm 13.4$	$24.7 \pm 12.6$	0.45
Post-test	$27.7 \pm 15.2$	$28.4 \pm 14.0$	0.65
School attendance (%)			
Baseline	$62.6 \pm 20.4$	$66.3 \pm 20.8$	0.15
Post-test	$67.3 \pm 18.4$	69.3 ± 17.5	0.40
Height-for-age, Z-score			
Baseline	$-0.48 \pm 0.95$	$-0.39 \pm 0.90$	0.35
Post-test	$-0.48 \pm 0.97$	$-0.41 \pm 0.89$	0.46
Body mass index, $kg/m^2$			
Baseline	$15.3 \pm 1.3$	$15.5 \pm 1.3$	0.07
Post-test	$15.6 \pm 1.3$	$15.8 \pm 1.4$	0.25

<sup>1</sup>Values are means  $\pm$  sp.

<sup>2</sup>Fifteen children (10 from the treatment group and five from the placebo group) did not complete the post tests because they changed school during the study period.

 $^{3}t$  tests.

- Looking at Table 2, would you say there is significant evidence that deworming in these schools in Jamaica is associated with:
  - Improvements in students' performance?

There is no significant evidence of any relationship between deworming and students' performance. Difference in post-RCT means score in arithmetic (-0.1), spelling (-0.7) and reading (-0.7) are not statistically different from zero (and besides, have the opposite sign: treatment lower than placebo!)

• Increases in school attendance?

There is no significant evidence either supporting the hypothesis that deworming is associated with school attendance. Difference in post-RCT mean attendance (-2.0) are not statistically different from zero (and have the opposite sign: treatment lower than placebo!)

• Better anthropometric measures (height-for-age and body/mass index)? There is no significant evidence associating deworming to height-for-age or body mass index. In the case of body-mass index there is even a difference between baseline BMI (higher for placebo group) that is statistically significant at 10% level. In any case, post-RCT BMI are not significantly different from zero.

• When researchers switch from comparing means to regression analysis, what is the sample regression function with interactions they are running?

Regression #1 and #3 (only changes the  $Yr_i$ , residual spelling scores in the first one, residual body mass index in the third one)

 $Yr_{i} = \beta_{0} + \beta_{1}Treatment + \beta_{2}AscarisInt + \beta_{3}Treatment * AscarisInt + \beta_{4}age + \beta_{5}Female + \beta_{6}socio + \beta_{7}school + e_{i}$ 

Regression #2 ( $Yr_i$ , residual school attendance)

$$\begin{split} Yr_{i} &= \beta_{0} + \beta_{1} Treatment \ + \ \beta_{2} Stunting \ + \ \beta_{3} Treatment \ * \ Stunting \ + \ \beta_{4} age \ + \\ \beta_{5} Female \ + \ \beta_{6} socio \ + \ \beta_{7} school \ + \ e_{i} \end{split}$$

• What additional information do the interactions provide in this specification?

The interactions allows to determine if treatment was more effective (or effective at all) for children that already infected or stunted. The results (Table 3) suggest: Spelling residual scores and intensity of infection:

• Deworming treatment and intensity of infection seem to be unrelated to spelling scores, although there is some evidence that treatment is more effective among the most intensely infected...

Body mass index and intensity of infection:

• Deworming treatment is positively and significantly associated to body mass index, although the impact is higher at low levels of infection intensity

School attendance:

• Deworming treatment has significant and positive impacts on school attendance for stunted children, the large the degree of stunting, the higher the impacts

TABLE 3

Results of the multiple regression analyses showing the significant treatment-by-stunting and treatment-by-intensity interactions for Jamaican school children, after controlling for the covariates<sup>1</sup>

	$b^2$	Р
Spelling		
Treatment	-0.1	0.62
Intensity	-0.3	0.57
Treatment × intensity	1.6	<0.05
School attendance		
Treatment	-3.2	0.08
Stunting <sup>3</sup>	-6.8	0.01
Treatment × stunting	9.9	0.007
Body mass index		
Treatment	0.12	0.003
Intensity <sup>4</sup>	0.13	0.15
Treatment × intensity	-0.35	0.009

<sup>1</sup>Covariates included age, gender, socioeconomic status, intensity of Ascaris infection and school attended.

 $^{2}b$  is the unstandardized regression coefficient.

<sup>3</sup>Defined as height-for-age Z-score <-1.

<sup>4</sup>Defined as *Trichuris* infection intensities above and below 7000 eggs per gram of stool.

#### • Threat #1: Unbalanced Groups

- If the treatment and controls group are different to begin with, the estimated treatment effect is likely to be biased
- Are the treatment and control groups balanced here (Table 1)?

	Group		
	Treatment $(n = 206)$	Placebo $\{n = 201\}$	Significance P
xge, <sup>1</sup> y	9.2 ± 1.2	9.2 ± 1.3	0.63
Gender, % boys	52	47	0.35
Residence, % Kingston	35	33	0.77
Ascaris infection			
% Infected	42	50	0.13
Light	11	10	
Moderate	25	29	
Heavy	7	11	
ocioeconomic index <sup>1</sup>	5.9 ± 2.2	$6.1 \pm 2.2$	0.28
Frichuris intensity, <sup>2,3</sup> epg	2421 (1200-25,458)	2667 (1200-41,733)	0.06
Anemia, <sup>4</sup> % hemoglobin <110 g/L	10	16	0.20
ow ferritin, $\frac{4}{\%} < 12 \ \mu g/L$	6	9	0.39

#### TABLE 1

#### Baseline characteristics of the treatment and placebo groups of Jamaican school children

<sup>1</sup>Means  $\pm$  sD.

<sup>2</sup>epg = eggs per gram of stool.

<sup>3</sup>Values are medians, with the range in parentheses.

<sup>4</sup>Blood samples were obtained from only 264 children.

- Threat # 2: Imperfect compliance
- In practice, the researcher may not be able to enforce that the treatment protocol is followed
- There are two forms of imperfect compliance:
  - No-shows: Not all the treatment group members get treated (i.e. take-up rate <100%).
  - **Crossovers**: Some control group members get treated.

• Suppose some children assigned to the treatment group never took the deworming drug. Will the mean difference in table 2 be larger or smaller than the true effect of taking deworming drugs?

Not giving the drug to students on the treatment group will result in underestimating the impacts of deworming.

• Suppose some children assigned to the control group ended up taking deworming drugs. Will the mean difference in table 2 be larger or smaller than the true effect of taking deworming drugs?

Having people in the control group taking the deworming drugs will result in underestimating the impacts of deworming.

- Summary: no-shows and crossovers lead to <u>under</u> estimation of the true treatment effects.
  - Jamaica study: no direct evidence of non-shows and crossovers.
  - We will learn statistical solution (instrumental variables) to estimate the treatment effect even in the presence of no-shows and crossovers.

- Threat # 3: Attrition
- Attrition or non-response means that some individuals disappear from the final sample. This may lead to an attrition bias.
  - If attrition is not correlated with treatment status, this does not create bias (but smaller sample size reduces precision)
  - If attrition is correlated with treatment status (i.e. those who left treatment group differ from those who left control group), this creates a bias i.e. attrition bias

• In the Jamaica study, 10 children from the treatment group and 5 children from the control group changed schools and thus were not in the final sample. Is this a threat to the internal validity of the experiment? Under what conditions is the answer yes?

Only if attrition is correlated with treatment status will it pose an internal validity threat.

If those who left treatment in the treatment group were somehow more likely to suffer from worms (i.e. they left the school because they live in rural areas and had to walk a lot), this would lead to a situation where the impacts of deworming will be overestimated.

- Threat #4: Spillover Effects
- If the treatment affects outcomes of control group members indirectly, there are spillover effects.
- We will <u>underestimate</u> estimate the true treatment effect if some control group members are affected indirectly by the treatment.
- Could there be spillover effects in the Jamaica deworming experiment?

This particularly type of infections seem to be contagious, that poses a problem because: a) we miss externality benefits from treatment-group to control group, and b) lower contagion within the treatment group might leads to underestimating the impact of deworming

Other papers correct for this possibility by randomizing at the school level (not at the student level as in Jamaica).

### WORMS: IDENTIFYING IMPACTS ON EDUCATION AND HEALTH IN THE PRESENCE OF TREATMENT EXTERNALITIES

#### BY EDWARD MIGUEL AND MICHAEL KREMER<sup>1</sup>

Intestinal helminths—including hookworm, roundworm, whipworm, and schistosomiasis—infect more than one-quarter of the world's population. Studies in which medical treatment is randomized at the individual level potentially doubly underestimate the benefits of treatment, missing externality benefits to the comparison group from reduced disease transmission, and therefore also underestimating benefits for the treatment group. We evaluate a Kenyan project in which school-based mass treatment with deworming drugs was randomly phased into schools, rather than to individuals, allowing estimation of overall program effects. The program reduced school absenteeism in treatment schools by one-quarter, and was far cheaper than alternative ways of boosting school participation. Deworming substantially improved health and school participation among untreated children in both treatment schools and neighboring schools, and these externalities are large enough to justify fully subsidizing treatment. Yet we do not find evidence that deworming improved academic test scores.

KEYWORDS: Health, education, Africa, externalities, randomized evaluation, worms.

- To assess the validity of any study, we should focus on both internal and external validity
- Randomization is a particularly useful way of improving internal validity
- We should still consider whether any of the problems discussed today (unbalanced groups, imperfect compliance, attrition, spillovers) might create bias in our estimates
- In particular, we should think hard about whether the experimental design used correctly mimics the public policy measures that would be enacted in reality

- Randomized experiments were once considered the "gold standard" for estimating causal effects and all World Bank programs were subject to a "specific program evaluation" (RCT)
- RCTs absorbed much of the funds available for development research and compromised funding for other disciplines addressing more comprehensive questions (with potentially larger impacts)
- Context matters: In trying to adapt every policy/program to the specifics of each context, we give studies lots of internal validity but compromise entirely external validity

- Randomized experiments
- Selection bias
- Internal and external validity (review)
- Threats to internal validity:
  - Unbalanced groups
- Imperfect compliance
  - No shows
  - Cross-overs
- Attrition
- Attrition bias
- Spillover effects (in the context of experiments)