

# Causal Mediation Analysis Using R\*

Kosuke Imai<sup>†</sup>   Luke Keele<sup>‡</sup>   Dustin Tingley<sup>§</sup>   Teppei Yamamoto<sup>¶</sup>

November 5, 2024

## Abstract

Causal mediation analysis is widely used across many disciplines to investigate possible causal mechanisms. Such an analysis allows researchers to explore various causal pathways, going beyond the estimation of simple causal effects. Recently, Imai, Keele, and Yamamoto (2010c) and Imai, Keele, and Tingley (2010b) developed general algorithms to estimate causal mediation effects with the variety of data types that are often encountered in practice. The new algorithms can estimate causal mediation effects for linear and nonlinear relationships, with parametric and nonparametric models, with continuous and discrete mediators, and various types of outcome variables. In this paper, we show how to implement these algorithms in the statistical computing language **R**. Our easy-to-use software, **mediation**, takes advantage of the object-oriented programming nature of the **R** language and allows researchers to estimate causal mediation effects in a straightforward manner. Finally, **mediation** also implements sensitivity analyses which can be used to formally assess the robustness of findings to the potential violations of the key identifying assumption. After describing the basic structure of the software, we illustrate its use with several empirical examples.

---

\*This is an **old** vignette for the **mediation** package, which itself is an updated version of the tutorial originally published in an edited (Imai *et al.*, 2010a). The description is based on **version 3.1** of **mediation** and **does not accurately describe the most current version**. For the most up-to-date tutorial type vignette("mediation") to read the new vignette. Financial support from the National Science Foundation (SES-0752050) is acknowledged.

<sup>†</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Politics, Princeton University, Princeton NJ 08544. Phone: 609-258-6610, Email: kimai@princeton.edu, URL: <http://imai.princeton.edu>

<sup>‡</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, 2140 Derby Hall, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210 Phone: 614-247-4256, Email: keele.4@polisci.osu.edu

<sup>§</sup>Assistant Professor, Government Department, Harvard University. Email: dtingley@gov.harvard.edu, URL: <http://scholar.harvard.edu/dtingley>

<sup>¶</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139. Phone: 617-253-6959, Email: teppei@mit.edu, URL: <http://web.mit.edu/teppey/www>

# 1 Introduction

Causal mediation analysis is important for quantitative social science research because it allows researchers to identify possible causal mechanisms, thereby going beyond the simple estimation of causal effects. As social scientists, we are often interested in empirically testing a theoretical explanation of a particular causal phenomenon. This is the primary goal of causal mediation analysis. Thus, causal mediation analysis has a potential to overcome the common criticism of quantitative social science research that it only provides a black-box view of causality.

Recently, Imai, Keele, and Yamamoto (2010c) and Imai, Keele, and Tingley (2010b) developed general algorithms for the estimation of causal mediation effects with a wide variety of data that are often encountered in practice. The new algorithms can estimate causal mediation effects for linear and nonlinear relationships, with parametric and nonparametric models, with continuous and discrete mediators, and various types of outcome variables. Imai *et al.* (2010c,b) also develop sensitivity analyses which can be used to formally assess the robustness of findings to the potential violations of the key identifying assumption. In this paper, we describe the easy-to-use software, **mediation**, which allows researchers to conduct causal mediation analysis within the statistical computing language **R** (R Development Core Team, 2009). We illustrate the use of the software with some of the empirical examples presented in Imai *et al.* (2010b).

**Installation and Updating.** Before we begin, we explain how to install and update the software. First, researchers need to install **R** which is available freely at the Comprehensive R Archive Network (<http://cran.r-project.org>). Next, open **R** and then type the following at the prompt,

```
R> install.packages("mediation")
```

Once **mediation** is installed, the following command will load the package,

```
R> library("mediation")
```

Finally, to update **mediation** to its latest version, try the following command,

```
R> update.packages("mediation")
```

## 2 New Features in Versions 3.x

This section describes the new features implemented since the release of **mediation** version 3.0. Although the rest of this document has also been updated to incorporate those additional features, we discuss them separately here for those readers who are already familiar with previous versions of the package and only want specific information about the recent updates. Those who are new to this package can safely skip this section and obtain the same information elsewhere in this vignette or in the help documents.

### 2.1 Features Added in Version 3.0

We implemented many new features in version 3.0, along with numerous small changes to the internal code for efficiency improvement. The user-level changes from the previous version include:

- More model types have been added to the main mediation analysis function `mediate`. In addition to the models already implemented in the previous version, the `mediate` function can now be used for ordered response models fitted via the `polr` function, quantile regressions for mediators fitted via the `qr` function in package `quantreg`, and the tobit model for censored outcome variables fitted via the `vglm` function in package `VGAM`. These models have not been made available for sensitivity analysis via `medsens`, however.
- Continuous treatment variables can now be used with the `mediate` function via the `treat.value` and `control.value` arguments. The estimated average causal mediation effects (ACME) and average direct effects (ADE) will be equal to the effects of changing treatment from `control.value` to `treat.value` while holding the appropriate treatment status constant at either of these two values. This functionality, however, has not been implemented for the `medsens` function yet.
- The sensitivity analysis via `medsens` can now be conducted with respect to the average direct effects. Users can choose from "indirect", "direct" or "both" using the `effect.type` argument. The `summary` and `plot` methods are also added for these cases.
- A `plot` method function for `mediate` objects is now included, so that the results of mediation analysis using `mediate` can be easily graphically summarized. When the input includes treatment-mediator interaction and the effect estimates therefore differ between the treatment and control conditions, the user can choose which set of estimates to plot by setting the `treatment` argument to "treated", "control", or "both".
- The `summary` output for `mediate` objects has been updated to include additional information and not to include unnecessary information (e.g. separate estimates for  $\bar{\delta}(0)$  and  $\bar{\delta}(1)$  when they are equal).
- The output of the `mediate` function now by default includes the entire sets of simulation draws (`d0.sims`, `z0.sims`, etc.) in addition to their means and quantiles. This can be disabled by setting the `long` argument to `FALSE`.
- The `mediate` function can now run even when different data frames are used for the mediator model (`model.m`) and outcome model (`model.y`). This is done by internally refitting both models using a combined data frame created via `merge`. As a result, observations which contain missing values for either model will be automatically listwise discarded. This feature is by default disabled and can be enabled by setting the `dropobs` option to `TRUE`.
- Confidence intervals can now be calculated using heteroskedasticity-consistent standard errors for some parametric models (e.g. `lm`, `glm`). This feature is controlled by the new `robustSE` argument of the `mediate` function. The standard errors are obtained via the `vcovHC` function in package `sandwich` and users may also pass options for `vcovHC` to use different types of robust standard errors. However, these standard errors are currently not carried through

for sensitivity analysis; the output of `medsens` will not be based on robust standard errors regardless of the `robustSE` argument.

- Users no longer need to manually indicate whether their models include a treatment-mediator interaction. The old `INT` argument is therefore deprecated (but still accepted with a warning).
- Sampling weights can now be used for the `mediate` and `medsens` functions via the `weights` arguments in the input mediator and outcome models. The estimated quantities will thus be weighted averages when the mediator and outcome models are fitted with a non-NULL `weights` argument. This will be useful if, for example, data come from a complex survey.
- We have added a new function `mediations` to easily conduct multiple causal mediation analyses for different treatment-mediator-outcome combinations. Both `summary` and `plot` methods have also been added for this function. The function is intended for exploratory analyses only and users are cautioned against its potential abuse. See Section 5 for more discussion.

## 2.2 Features Added in Version 3.1

We made minor updates to the `mediation` package upon the release of version 3.1.

- Confidence intervals can now be calculated using one way clustered standard errors<sup>1</sup> for some parametric models (e.g., `lm`, `glm`). This feature is controlled by the new `cluster` argument of the `mediate` function. These standard errors are currently not carried through for sensitivity analysis. The `cluster` option is enabled by specifying the variable on which to cluster. The default is to not cluster and hence is set to `NULL`.
- Ordered mediator and outcome models can now be fitted via the `bayespolr` function in the `arm` package, along with the `polr` function.

## 3 The Software

In this section, we give an overview of the software by describing its design and architecture. To avoid the duplication, we do not provide the details of the methods that are implemented by `mediation` and the assumptions that underline them. Readers are encouraged to read Imai *et al.* (2010c,b) for more information about the methodology implemented in `mediation`.

### 3.1 The Overview

The methods implemented via `mediation` rely on the following identification result obtained under the sequential ignorability assumption of Imai *et al.* (2010c),

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\delta}(t) &= \int \int \mathbb{E}(Y_i | M_i = m, T_i = t, X_i = x) \{dF_{M_i|T_i=1, X_i=x}(m) - dF_{M_i|T_i=0, X_i=x}(m)\} dF_{X_i}(x), & (1) \\ \bar{\zeta}(t) &= \int \int \{\mathbb{E}(Y_i | M_i = m, T_i = 1, X_i = x) - \mathbb{E}(Y_i | M_i = m, T_i = 0, X_i = x)\} dF_{M_i|T_i=t, X_i=x}(m) dF_{X_i}(x), & (2) \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>See <http://people.su.se/~ma/clustering.pdf> for a discussion of the implementation.




Figure 1: The Diagram Illustrating the Use of the Software **mediation**. Users first fit the mediator and outcome models. Then, the function `mediate` conducts causal mediation analysis while `medsens` implements sensitivity analysis. The functions `summary` and `plot` help users interpret the results of these analyses.

where  $\bar{\delta}(t)$  and  $\bar{\zeta}(t)$  are the average causal mediation and average (natural) direct effects, respectively, and  $(Y_i, M_i, T_i, X_i)$  represents the observed outcome, mediator, treatment, and pre-treatment covariates. The sequential ignorability assumption states that the observed mediator status is as if randomly assigned conditional on the randomized treatment variable and the pre-treatment covariates. Causal mediation analysis under this assumption requires two statistical models; one for the mediator  $f(M_i | T_i, X_i)$  and the other for the outcome variable  $f(Y_i | T_i, M_i, X_i)$ . (Note that we use the empirical distribution of  $X_i$  to approximate  $F_{X_i}$ .) Once these models are chosen and fitted by researchers, then **mediation** will compute the estimated causal mediation and other relevant estimates using the algorithms proposed in Imai *et al.* (2010b). The algorithms also produce uncertainty estimates such as standard errors and confidence intervals, based on either a nonparametric bootstrap procedure (for parametric or nonparametric models) or a quasi-Bayesian Monte Carlo approximation (for parametric models).

Figure 1 graphically illustrates the three steps required for a mediation analysis. The first step is to fit the mediator and outcome models using, for example, regression models with the usual `lm` or `glm` functions. In the second step, the analysts takes the output objects from these models, which in Figure 1 we call `model.m` and `model.y`, and use them as inputs for the main function, `mediate`. This function then estimates the causal mediation effects, direct effects, and total effect along with their uncertainty estimates. Finally, sensitivity analysis can be conducted via the function `medsens` which takes the output of `mediate` as an input. For these outputs, there are both `summary` and `plot` methods to display numerical and graphical summaries of the analyses, respectively.

### 3.2 Estimation of the Causal Mediation Effects

Estimation of the causal mediation effects is based on Algorithms 1 and 2 of Imai *et al.* (2010b). These are general algorithms in that they can be applied to any parametric (Algorithm 1 or 2) or semi/nonparametric models (Algorithm 2) for the mediator and outcome variables. Here, we briefly describe how these algorithms have been implemented in **mediation** by taking advantage of the object-oriented nature of **R** programming language.

**Algorithm 1 for Parametric Models.** We begin by explaining how to implement Algorithm 1 of Imai *et al.* (2010b) for standard parametric models. First, analysts fit parametric models for the mediator and outcome variables. That is, we model the observed mediator  $M_i$  given the treatment  $T_i$  and pre-treatment covariates  $X_i$ . Similarly, we model the observed outcome  $Y_i$  given the treatment, mediator, and pre-treatment covariates. For example, to implement the Baron-Kenny procedure in **mediation**, linear models are fitted for both the mediator and outcome models using the `lm` command.

The model objects from these two parametric models form the inputs for the `mediate` function. The user must also supply the names for the mediator and outcome variables along with how many simulations should be used for inference, and whether the mediator variable interacts with the treatment variable in the outcome model. Given these model objects, the estimation proceeds by simulating the model parameters based on their approximate asymptotic distribution (i.e., the multivariate normal distribution with the mean equal to the parameter estimates and the variance equal to the asymptotic variance estimate), and then computing causal mediation effects of interest for each parameter draw (e.g., using equations (1) and (2) for average causal mediation and (natural) direct effects, respectively). This method of inference can be viewed as an approximation to the Bayesian posterior distribution due to the Bernstein-Von Mises Theorem (King *et al.*, 2000). The advantage of this procedure is that it is relatively computationally efficient (when compared to Algorithm 2).

We take advantage of the object-oriented nature of **R** programming language at several steps in the function `mediate`. For example, the functions like `coef` and `vcov` are useful for extracting the point and uncertainty estimates from the model objects to form the multivariate normal distribution from which the parameter draws are sampled. In addition, the computation of the estimated causal mediation effects of interest requires the prediction of the mediator values under different treatment regimes as well as the prediction of the outcome values under different treatment and mediator values. This can be done by using `model.frame` to set the treatment and/or mediator values to specific levels while keeping the values of the other variables unchanged. We then use the `model.matrix` and matrix multiplication with the distribution of simulated parameters to compute the mediation and direct effects. The main advantage of this approach is that it is applicable to a wide range of parametric models and allows us to avoid coding a completely separate function for different models.

**Algorithm 2 for Non/Semiparametric Inference.** The disadvantage of Algorithm 1 is that it cannot be easily applied to non/semiparametric models. For such models, Algorithm 2, which

is based on nonparametric bootstrap, can be used although it is more computationally intensive. Algorithm 2 may also be used for the usual parametric models which may be useful since mediation effects are known to have skewed distributions (e.g., Mackinnon *et al.*, 2004; Preacher and Hayes, 2008). Specifically, in Algorithm 2, we resample the observed data with replacement. Then, for each of bootstrapped samples, we fit both the outcome and mediator models and compute the quantities of interest. As before, the computation requires the prediction of the mediator values under different treatment regimes as well as the prediction of the outcome values under different treatment and mediator values. To take advantage of the object-oriented nature of the **R** language, Algorithm 2 relies on the `predict` function to compute these predictions, while we again manipulate the treatment and mediator status using the `model.frame` function. This process is repeated a large number of times and returns a bootstrap distribution of the mediation, direct, and total effects. We use the percentiles of the bootstrap distribution for confidence intervals. Thus, Algorithm 2 allows analysts to estimate mediation effects with more flexible model specifications or to estimate mediation effects for quantiles of the distribution.

### 3.3 Sensitivity Analysis

Causal mediation analysis relies on the sequential ignorability assumption that cannot be directly verified with the observed data. The assumption implies that the treatment is ignorable given the observed pre-treatment confounders and that the mediator is ignorable given the observed treatment and the observed pre-treatment covariates. In order to probe the plausibility of such a key identification assumption, analysts must perform a sensitivity analysis (Rosenbaum, 2002). Unfortunately, it is difficult to construct a sensitivity analysis that is generally applicable to any parametric or nonparametric model. Thus, Imai *et al.* (2010c,b) develop sensitivity analyses for commonly used parametric models, which we implement in **mediation**.

**The Baron-Kenny Procedure.** Imai *et al.* (2010c) develop a sensitivity analysis for the Baron-Kenny procedure and Imai *et al.* (2010b) generalize it to the linear structural equation model (LSEM) with an interaction term. This general model is given by,

$$M_i = \alpha_2 + \beta_2 T_i + \xi_2^\top X_i + \epsilon_{i2}, \quad (3)$$

$$Y_i = \alpha_3 + \beta_3 T_i + \gamma M_i + \kappa T_i M_i + \xi_3^\top X_i + \epsilon_{i3}, \quad (4)$$

where the sensitivity parameter is the correlation between  $\epsilon_{i2}$  and  $\epsilon_{i3}$ , which we denote by  $\rho$ . Under sequential ignorability,  $\rho$  is equal to zero and thus the magnitude of this correlation coefficient represents the departure from the ignorability assumption (about the mediator). Note that the treatment is assumed to be ignorable as it would be the case in randomized experiments where the treatment is randomized but the mediator is not. Theorem 2 of Imai *et al.* (2010b) shows how the average causal mediation effects change as a function of  $\rho$ .

To obtain the confidence intervals for the sensitivity analysis, we apply the following iterative algorithm to equations (3) and (4) for a fixed value of  $\rho$ . At the  $t$ th iteration, given the current values of the coefficients, i.e.,  $\theta^{(t)} = (\alpha_2^{(t)}, \beta_2^{(t)}, \xi_2^{(t)}, \alpha_3^{(t)}, \beta_3^{(t)}, \xi_3^{(t)}, \gamma^{(t)}, \kappa^{(t)})$ , and a given error correlation  $\rho$ , we compute the variance-covariance matrix of  $(\epsilon_{i2}, \epsilon_{i3})$ , which is denoted by  $\Sigma^{(t)}$ . The matrix is

computed by setting  $\sigma_j^{(t)2} = \|\hat{\epsilon}_j^{(t)}\|^2/(n - L_j)$  and  $\sigma_{23}^{(t)} = \rho\sigma_2^{(t)}\sigma_3^{(t)}$ , where  $\hat{\epsilon}_j^{(t)}$  is the residual vector and  $L_j$  is the number of coefficients for the mediator model ( $j = 2$ ) and the outcome model ( $j = 3$ ) at the  $t$ th iteration. We then update the parameters via generalized least squares, i.e.,

$$\theta^{(t+1)} = \{V^\top(\Sigma^{(t)-1} \otimes I_n)V\}^{-1}V^\top(\Sigma^{(t)-1} \otimes I_n)W$$

where  $V = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} & T & X & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{1} & T & M & TM & X \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $W = \begin{bmatrix} M \\ Y \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $T = (T_1, \dots, T_n)^\top$ ,  $M = (M_1, \dots, M_n)^\top$ , and  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top$  are column vectors of length  $n$ , and  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)^\top$  are the  $(n \times K)$  matrix of observed pre-treatment covariates, and  $\otimes$  represents the Kronecker product. We typically use equation-by-equation least squares estimates as the starting values of  $\theta$  and iterate these two steps until convergence. This is essentially an application of the iterative feasible generalized least square (FGLS) algorithm of the seemingly unrelated regression (Zellner, 1962), and thus the asymptotic variance of  $\hat{\theta}$  is given by  $\text{Var}(\hat{\theta}) = \{V^\top(\Sigma^{-1} \otimes I_n)V\}^{-1}$ . Then, for a given value of  $\rho$ , the asymptotic variance of the estimated average causal mediation effects is found, for example, by the Delta method and the confidence intervals can be constructed.

**The Binary Outcome Case.** The sensitivity analysis for binary outcomes parallels the case when both the mediator and outcome are continuous. Here, we assume that the model for the outcome is a probit regression. Using a probit regression for the outcome allows us to assume the error terms are jointly normal with a possibly non-zero correlation  $\rho$ . Imai *et al.* (2010b) derive the average causal mediation effects as a function of  $\rho$  and a set of parameters that are identifiable due to randomization of the treatment. This lets us use  $\rho$  as a sensitivity parameter in the same way as in the Baron-Kenny procedure. For the calculation of confidence intervals, we rely on the quasi-Bayesian approach of Algorithm 1 by approximating the posterior distribution with the sampling distribution of the maximum likelihood estimates.

**The Binary Mediator Case.** Finally, a similar sensitivity analysis can also be conducted in a situation where the mediator variable is dichotomous and the outcome is continuous. In this case, we assume that the mediator can be modeled as a probit regression where the error term is independently and identically distributed as standard normal distribution. A linear normal regression with error variance equal to  $\sigma_3^2$  is used to model the continuous outcome variable. We further assume that the two error terms jointly follow a bivariate normal distribution with mean zero and covariance  $\rho\sigma_3$ . Then, as in the other two cases, we use the correlation between the two error terms  $\rho$  as the sensitivity parameter. Imai *et al.* (2010b) show that under this setup, the causal mediation effects can be expressed as a function of the model parameters that can be consistently estimated given a fixed value of  $\rho$ . Uncertainty estimates are computed based on the quasi-Bayesian approach, as in the binary outcome case. The results can be graphically summarized via the `plot` function in a manner similar to the other two cases.

**Alternative Interpretations Based on  $R^2$**  The main advantage of using  $\rho$  as a sensitivity parameter is its simplicity. However, applied researchers may find it difficult to interpret the magnitude of this correlation coefficient. To overcome this limitation, Imai *et al.* (2010c) proposed



alternative interpretations of  $\rho$  based on the coefficients of determination or  $R^2$  and Imai *et al.* (2010b) extended them to the binary mediator and binary outcome cases. In that formulation, it is assumed that there exists a common unobserved pre-treatment confounder in both mediator and outcome models. Applied researchers are then required to specify whether the coefficients of this unobserved confounder in the two models have the same sign or not; i.e.,  $\text{sgn}(\lambda_2\lambda_3) = 1$  or  $-1$  where  $\lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_3$  are the coefficients in the mediator and outcome models, respectively. Once this information is provided, the average causal mediation effect can be expressed as the function of “the proportions of original variances explained by the unobserved confounder” where the original variances refer to the variances of the mediator and the outcome (or the variance of latent variable in the case of binary dependent variable). This allows researchers to quantify how large the unobserved confounder must be (relative to the observed pre-treatment covariates in the model) in order for the original conclusions to be reversed.

**Sensitivity Analyses with Respect to the Average Direct Effects.** In addition to the above procedures for the average causal mediation effects, an analogous sensitivity analysis can also be conducted for the average direct effects using the `medsens` function. This is possible because it can be shown that the average direct effects are also expressed as a function of  $\rho$  in any of the above three cases. First, when both the mediator and outcome variables are continuous and modelled using linear structural equations, the iterative FGLS algorithm given above can be used to estimate the model coefficients and both the point and interval estimates of the average direct effects can be obtained using the formulas given by Imai *et al.* (2010c, Section 4.1) and Imai *et al.* (2010b, p.314 and Appendix A). Second, when the mediator is binary and modelled using the probit regression, the average direct effect is given by  $\bar{\zeta}(t) = \beta_3 + \kappa\mathbb{E}\{\Phi(\alpha_2 + \beta_2t + \xi_2^\top X_i)\}$  using the same notation as Imai *et al.* (2010b, footnote 12), where all of the parameters,  $(\alpha_2, \beta_2, \xi_2, \beta_3, \kappa)$ , are identified and consistently estimated using the same procedure. Finally, for the binary outcome case, the average direct effect is identified given a value of  $\rho$  and expressed as  $\bar{\zeta}(t) = \mathbb{E}\{\Phi(\alpha_1 + \beta_1t + \xi_1^\top X_i + \beta_3(1 - t)/\sqrt{\gamma^2\sigma_2^2 + 2\gamma\rho\sigma_2 + 1}) - \Phi(\alpha_1 + \beta_1t + \xi_1^\top X_i - \beta_3t/\sqrt{\gamma^2\sigma_2^2 + 2\gamma\rho\sigma_2 + 1})\}$ , which can be estimated via the same procedure as described in Appendix H of Imai *et al.* (2010b). The `medsens` function uses these procedures for sensitivity analyses for the average direct effects.

### 3.4 Current Limitations

Our software, `mediation`, is quite flexible and can handle many of the model types that researchers are likely to use in practice. Table 1 categorizes the types of the mediator and outcome models and lists whether `mediation` can produce the point and uncertainty estimates of causal mediation effects. For example, while `mediation` can estimate average causal mediation effects for censored outcomes with the tobit model, it has not yet been extended to cases involving censored mediators. In addition, `mediate` can be used with common generalized linear models (GLMs) such as binary logit and probit, Poisson and gamma regression models, but it cannot be used with binomial mediator models with multiple trials.

In each situation handled by `mediation`, it is possible to have an interaction term between treatment status and the mediator variable, in which case the estimated quantities of interest will

| <i>Mediator Model Types</i>                            | <i>Outcome Model Types</i> |     |         |          |          |                |
|--|----------------------------|-----|---------|----------|----------|----------------|
|  | Linear                     | GLM | Ordered | Censored | Quantile | Semiparametric |
| Linear ( <code>lm</code> )                             | ✓                          | ✓   | ✓*      | ✓        | ✓        | ✓*             |
| GLM (probit etc. via <code>glm</code> )                | ✓                          | ✓   | ✓*      | ✓        | ✓        | ✓*             |
| Ordered ( <code>polr</code> / <code>bayespolr</code> ) | ✓                          | ✓   | ✓*      | ✓        | ✓        | ✓*             |
| Censored (tobit via <code>vglm</code> )                | -                          | -   | -       | -        | -        | -              |
| Quantile ( <code>rq</code> )                           | ✓*                         | ✓*  | ✓*      | ✓*       | ✓*       | ✓*             |
| Semiparametric ( <code>gam</code> )                    | ✓*                         | ✓*  | ✓*      | ✓*       | ✓*       | ✓*             |

Table 1: The Types of Models That Can be Handled by `mediate` for the Estimation of Causal Mediation Effects. Stars (\*) indicate the model combinations that can only be estimated using the nonparametric bootstrap (i.e. with `boot = TRUE`).

| <i>Mediator Model Types</i> | <i>Outcome Model Types</i> |               |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
|                             | Linear                     | Binary Probit |
| Linear                      | ✓                          | ✓             |
| Binary Probit               | ✓                          | -             |

Table 2: The Types of Models That Can Be Handled by `medsens` for Sensitivity Analysis.

be reported separately for the treatment and control groups.

Our software provides a convenient way to probe the sensitivity of results to potential violations of the ignorability assumption for certain model types. The sensitivity analysis requires the specific derivations for each combination of models, making it difficult to develop a general sensitivity analysis method. As summarized in Table 2, **mediation** can handle several cases that are likely to be encountered by applied researchers in practice. When the mediator is continuous, then sensitivity analysis can be conducted with continuous and binary outcome variables. In addition, when the mediator is binary, sensitivity analysis is available for continuous outcome variables. For sensitivity analyses that combine binary or continuous mediators and outcomes, analysts must use a probit regression model with a linear regression model. It should be noted that unlike the estimation of causal mediation effects, sensitivity analysis with treatment/mediator interactions can only be done for the continuous outcome/continuous mediator and continuous outcome/binary mediator cases. In the future, we hope to expand the range of models that are available for sensitivity analysis.

## 4 Examples

Next, we provide several examples to illustrate the use of **mediation** for the estimation of causal mediation effects and sensitivity analysis. The data used is available as part of the package so that readers can replicate the results reported below. We demonstrate the variety of models that can be used for the outcome and mediating variables.

Before presenting our examples, we load the **mediation** library and the example data set included with the library.

```
R> library("mediation")
```

mediation: R Package for Causal Mediation Analysis

Version: 3.0

```
R> data("jobs")
```

This dataset is from the Job Search Intervention Study (JOBS II) (Vinokur and Schul, 1997). In the JOBS II field experiment, 1,801 unemployed workers received a pre-screening questionnaire and were then randomly assigned to treatment and control groups. Those in the treatment group participated in job-skills workshops. Those in the control condition received a booklet describing job-search tips. In follow-up interviews, two key outcome variables were measured; a continuous measure of depressive symptoms based on the Hopkins Symptom Checklist (`depress2`), and a binary variable representing whether the respondent had become employed (`work1`). In the JOBS II data, a continuous measure of job-search self-efficacy represents a key mediating variable (`job_seek`). In addition to the outcome and mediators, the JOBS II data also include the following list of baseline covariates that were measured prior to the administration of the treatment: pre-treatment level of depression (`depress1`), education (`educ`), income, race (`nonwhite`), marital status (`marital`), age, sex, previous occupation (`occip`), and the level of economic hardship (`econ_hard`).

#### 4.1 Estimation of Causal Mediation Effects

**The Baron-Kenny Procedure.** We start with an example when both the mediator and the outcome are continuous. In this instance, the results from either algorithm will return point estimates essentially identical to the usual Baron and Kenny procedure though the quasi-Bayesian or nonparametric bootstrap approximation is used. Using the JOBS II data, we first estimate two linear regressions for both the mediator and the outcome using the `lm` function.

```
R> model.m <- lm(job_seek ~ treat + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age
                + occip + marital + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)
R> model.y <- lm(depress2 ~ treat + job_seek + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age
                + occip + marital + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)
```

These two model objects, `model.m` and `model.y`, become the arguments for the `mediate` function. When different data frames are used for these two models, the `mediate` function internally refits them using a merged dataset if the `dropobs` argument is set to `TRUE`; otherwise an error message is returned.

In the first call to `mediate` below, we specify `boot = TRUE` to call the nonparametric bootstrap with 1000 resamples (`sims = 1000`). When this option is set to `FALSE` in the second call, inference proceeds via the quasi-Bayesian Monte Carlo approximation using Algorithm 1 rather than Algorithm 2. In this case, heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors can be used for the calculation of confidence intervals for some types of models by setting the `robustSE` argument to `TRUE`. Cluster-robust standard errors can also be used by the `cluster` argument. Finally, we must also specify the variable names for the treatment indicator and the mediator variable using `treat` and `mediator`, respectively.

```
R> out.1 <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, boot = TRUE, treat = "treat",
  mediator = "job_seek")
R> out.2 <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, treat = "treat",
  mediator = "job_seek")
```

The objects from a call to `mediate`, i.e., `out.1` and `out.2` above, are lists of class "mediate" which contain several different quantities from the analysis. For example, `out.1$d0` returns the point estimate for the average causal mediation effect based on Algorithm 1. The help file contains a full list of values that are contained in `mediate` objects.

The `summary` function prints out the results of the analysis in tabular form:

```
R> summary(out.2)
```

Causal Mediation Analysis

Quasi-Bayesian Confidence Intervals

```
Mediation Effect:  -0.01375 95 % CI  -0.031812  0.003299
Direct Effect:    -0.03873 95 % CI  -0.11938  0.04668
Total Effect:     -0.05247 95 % CI  -0.13431  0.03150
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation:  0.2028 95 % CI  -1.383  1.934
```

Sample Size Used: 899

The output from the `summary` function displays the estimates for the average causal mediation effect, direct effect, total effect, and proportion of total effect mediated. The first column displays the quantity of interest, the second column displays the point estimate, and the other columns present the confidence intervals at the level specified by the `conf.level` argument which defaults to `0.95`. The number of observations used for the estimation is then displayed at the bottom. In this case, we find that job search self-efficacy mediated the effect of the treatment on depression in the negative direction. This effect, however, was small with a point estimate of  $-.014$  and the 95% confidence interval  $(-.032, -.003)$  barely covers 0.

These results can be graphically presented by using the `plot` function:

```
R> plot(out.2)
```

The output is shown in Figure 2. The standard arguments for `plot`, such as titles (`main`, `xlab`, etc.) and line widths (`lwd`), can be used and behave as expected.

**The Baron-Kenny Procedure with the Interaction Term.** Analysts can also allow the causal mediation effect to vary with treatment status. Here, the model for the outcome must be altered by including an interaction term between the treatment indicator, `treat`, and the mediator variable, `job_seek`:




Figure 2: Graphical Summary of Causal Mediation Analysis.

```
R> model.y <- lm(depress2 ~ treat + job_seek + treat:job_seek + depress1 + econ_hard
+ sex + age + occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)
R> out.3 <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, boot = TRUE,
treat = "treat", mediator = "job_seek")
R> summary(out.3)
```

#### Causal Mediation Analysis

#### Quasi-Bayesian Confidence Intervals

```
Mediation Effect_0: -0.01899 95 % CI -0.045271 0.003649
Mediation Effect_1: -0.01203 95 % CI -0.029640 0.002195
Direct Effect_0: -0.03596 95 % CI -0.1187 0.0426
Direct Effect_1: -0.02899 95 % CI -0.10879 0.05082
Total Effect: -0.04799 95 % CI -0.13495 0.03154
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation_0: 0.2912 95 % CI -3.386 2.707
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation_1: 0.1823 95 % CI -1.994 2.018
```

```
Mediation Effect (Average):  -0.01551 95 % CI  -0.035757  0.003138
Direct Effect (Average):    -0.03248 95 % CI  -0.1129  0.0464
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation (Average):  0.2381 95 % CI  -2.867  2.443
```

Sample Size Used: 899

Again using the `summary` function provides a table of the results. Now estimates for the mediation effects, direct effects and proportion of total effect mediated correspond to the levels of the treatment and are printed as such in the tabular summary. In this case, the mediation effect under the treatment condition, listed as `Mediation Effect_1` is estimated to be  $-.012$  while the mediation effect under the control condition, `Mediation Effect_0`, is  $-.019$ . The bottom of the table shows the overall summary of these quantities averaged over the two treatment levels, as well as the number of data points.

When using the `plot` function on a `mediate` object with interactions, one can select which treatment condition to plot the estimated effects for by specifying the `treatment` argument. The default is to plot both estimates, which is equivalent to setting `treatment` to `"both"`:

```
R> plot(out.3, treatment = "both")
```

The resulting plot is in Figure 3.

**Use of Non/Semi-parametric Regression.** The flexibility of `mediate` becomes readily apparent when we move beyond standard linear regression models. For example, we might suspect that the mediator has a nonlinear effect on the outcome. Generalized Additive Models (GAMs) allow analysts to use splines for flexible nonlinear fits. This presents no difficulties for the `mediate` function. We model the mediator as before, but we alter the outcome model using the `gam` function from the `mgcv` library.

```
R> library(mgcv)
R> model.m <- lm(job_seek ~ treat + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age + occp + marital
                + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)
R> model.y <- gam(depress2 ~ treat + s(job_seek, bs = "cr") + depress1 + econ_hard
                + sex + age + occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)
```

In this case we fit a Generalized Additive Model for the outcome variable, but allow the effect of the `job_seek` variable to be non-linear and determined by the data. This is done by using the `s` notation which allows the fit between the mediator and the outcome to be modeled with a spline. Using the spline for the fit allows the estimate for the mediator on the outcome to be a series of piecewise polynomial regression fits. This semiparametric regression model is a more general version of nonparametric regression models such as `lowess`. The model above allows the estimate to vary across the range of the predictor variable. Here, we specify the model with a cubic basis function (`bs = "cr"`) for the smoothing spline and leave the smoothing selection to be done at the program defaults which is generalized cross-validation. Fully understanding how to fit such models




Figure 3: Causal Mediation Analysis with Interaction between Treatment and Mediator.

is beyond the scope here. Interested readers should consult Wood (2006) for full technical details and Keele (2008) provides coverage of these models from a social science perspective.

The call to `mediate` with a `gam` fit remains unchanged except that when the outcome model is a semiparametric regression only the nonparametric bootstrap is valid for calculating uncertainty estimates, i.e., `boot = TRUE`.

```
R> out.4 <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, boot = TRUE, treat = "treat",
  mediator = "job_seek")
```

The model for the mediator can be modeled with the `gam` function as well. The `gam` function also allows analysts to include interactions; thus analysts can still allow the mediation effects to vary with treatment status. This simply requires altering the model specification by using the `by` option in the `gam` function and using two separate indicator variables for treatment status. To fit this model we need one variable that indicates whether the observation was in the treatment group and a second variable that indicates whether the observation was in the control group. To allow the mediation effect to vary with treatment status, the call to `gam` takes the following form:

```
R> model.y <- gam(depress2 ~ treat + s(job_seek, by = treat) + s(job_seek, by = control)
  + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age + occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income,
  data = jobs)
```

In this case, we must also alter the options in the `mediate` function by providing the variable name for the control group indicator using the `control` option.

```
R> out.5 <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, boot = TRUE,
  treat = "treat", mediator = "job_seek", control = "control")
R> summary(out.5)
```

#### Causal Mediation Analysis

##### Confidence Intervals Based on Nonparametric Bootstrap

```
Mediation Effect_0: -0.02254 95 % CI -0.051956 0.004447
Mediation Effect_1: -0.0171 95 % CI -0.038895 0.002281
Direct Effect_0: -0.009742 95 % CI -0.09718 0.07924
Direct Effect_1: -0.004302 95 % CI -0.08926 0.08285
Total Effect: -0.02684 95 % CI -0.11932 0.06449
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation_0: 0.3892 95 % CI -4.411 9.161
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation_1: 0.2768 95 % CI -3.614 6.960
```

```
Mediation Effect (Average): -0.01982 95 % CI -0.045831 0.003105
Direct Effect (Average): -0.007022 95 % CI -0.09207 0.08178
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation (Average): 0.3398 95 % CI -3.870 8.105
```

Sample Size Used: 899

**Quantile Causal Mediation Effects.** Researchers might also be interested in modeling mediation effects for quantiles of the outcome. Quantile regression allows for a convenient way to model the quantiles of the outcome distribution while adjusting for a variety of covariates (Koenker, 2008). For example, a researcher might be interested in the 0.5 quantile (i.e., median) of the distribution. This also presents no difficulties for the `mediate` function. Again for these models, uncertainty estimates are calculated using the nonparametric bootstrap. To use quantile regression, we use the `rq` function in package `quantreg` and model the median of the outcome, though other quantiles are also permissible. Analysts can also relax the no-interaction assumption for the quantile regression models as well. Below we estimate the mediator with a standard linear regression, while for the outcome we use `rq` to model the median.

```
R> library(quantreg)
R> model.m <- lm(job_seek ~ treat + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age + occp + marital
  + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)
R> model.y <- rq(depress2 ~ treat + job_seek + depress1 + econ_hard + sex
  + age + occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income,
  tau = 0.5, data = jobs)
```



```
R> out.6 <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, boot = TRUE, treat = "treat",
  mediator = "job_seek")
R> summary(out.6)
```

### Causal Mediation Analysis

#### Confidence Intervals Based on Nonparametric Bootstrap

```
Mediation Effect:  -0.01424 95 % CI  -0.031317  0.002109
Direct Effect:    -0.04165 95 % CI  -0.12413  0.03538
Total Effect:    -0.05589 95 % CI  -0.14305  0.02377
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation:  0.2042 95 % CI  -2.003  2.707
```

Sample Size Used: 899

where the `summary` command gives the estimated median causal mediation effect along with the estimates for the other quantities of interest.

It is also possible to estimate mediation effects for quantiles of the outcome other than the median. This is done simply by specifying a different outcome quantile in the quantile regression model. For example, if the 10th percentile of the outcome were of interest, then the user can change `tau` option,

```
R> model.y <- rq(depress2 ~ treat + job_seek + depress1 + econ_hard + sex
  + age + occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income,
  tau = 0.1, data = jobs)
```

Furthermore, it is straightforward to loop over a set of quantiles and graph the mediation effects for a range of quantiles, as done in Imai *et al.* (2010b).

**Discrete Mediator and Outcome Data.** Often analysts use measures for the mediator and outcome that are discrete. For standard methods, this has presented a number of complications requiring individually tailored techniques. The `mediation` software, however, can handle a number of different discrete data types using the general algorithms developed in Imai *et al.* (2010b). For example, one outcome of interest in the JOBS II study is a binary indicator (`work1`) for whether the subject became employed after the training sessions. To estimate the mediation effect, we simply use a probit regression instead of a linear regression for the outcome and then call `mediate` as before,

```
R> model.m <- lm(job_seek ~ treat + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age
  + occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)
R> model.y <- glm(work1 ~ treat + job_seek + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age
  + occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income,
  family = binomial(link = "probit"), data = jobs)
```

```
R> out.7 <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, treat = "treat",
                    mediator = "job_seek")
R> summary(out.7)
```

### Causal Mediation Analysis

#### Quasi-Bayesian Confidence Intervals

```
Mediation Effect_0:  0.003290 95 % CI  -0.0009537  0.0098747
Mediation Effect_1:  0.003538 95 % CI  -0.001052  0.010728
Direct Effect_0:    0.05514 95 % CI  -0.006427  0.113568
Direct Effect_1:    0.05538 95 % CI  -0.006487  0.114191
Total Effect:       0.05867 95 % CI  -0.003816  0.117091
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation_0:  0.0455 95 % CI  -0.0768  0.4070
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation_1:  0.05042 95 % CI  -0.0777  0.4110

Mediation Effect (Average):  0.003414 95 % CI  -0.001003  0.010269
Direct Effect (Average):     0.05526 95 % CI  -0.006457  0.113879
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation (Average):  0.04802 95 % CI  -0.07725  0.41005
```

Sample Size Used: 899

In the table printed by the `summary` function, the estimated average causal mediation effect along with the quasi-Bayesian confidence interval are printed on the first line followed by the direct and total effects, and the proportion of the total effect due to mediation. Even though the outcome model does not include an interaction term between the treatment and mediator, the estimated effects slightly differ between the treatment and control conditions. This difference, however, is solely due to the nonlinearity in the outcome model and should be extremely small. It is also possible to use a logit model for the outcome instead of a probit model. However, we recommend the use of a probit model because our implementation of the sensitivity analysis below requires a probit model for analytical tractability.

The mediator can also be binary or ordered measures as well. This simply requires modeling the mediator with either a probit or ordered probit model. For demonstration purposes, the `jobs` data contains two variables, `job_dich` and `job_disc`, which are recoded versions of `job_seek`. The first measure is simply the continuous scale divided at the median into a binary variable. The second measure, `job_disc`, recodes the continuous scale into a discrete four point scale. We emphasize that this is for demonstration purposes only, and analysts in general should not recode continuous measures into discrete measures. Estimating mediation effects with a binary mediator is quite similar to the case above with a binary outcome. We simply now use a probit model for the mediator and a linear regression for the outcome,

```
R> model.m <- glm(job_dich ~ treat + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age
+ occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income, data = job,
family = binomial(link = "probit"))
R> model.y <- lm(depress2 ~ treat + job_dich + treat:job_dich + depress1
+ econ_hard + sex + age + occp + marital + nonwhite
+ educ + income, data = jobs)
```

In this example we include the interaction term between the treatment and mediator to allow the effect of the mediator to vary with treatment status. The user now calls `mediate` and can use either the quasi-Bayesian approximation or nonparametric bootstrap.

```
R> out.8 <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, treat = "treat",
mediator = "job_dich")
R> summary(out.8)
Causal Mediation Analysis
```

#### Quasi-Bayesian Confidence Intervals

```
Mediation Effect_0: -0.01823 95 % CI -0.038944 -0.002616
Mediation Effect_1: -0.02040 95 % CI -0.038965 -0.003155
Direct Effect_0: -0.02823 95 % CI -0.10786 0.05154
Direct Effect_1: -0.03039 95 % CI -0.11164 0.04764
Total Effect: -0.04863 95 % CI -0.13146 0.02839
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation_0: 0.2782 95 % CI -3.055 3.325
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation_1: 0.3162 95 % CI -3.443 3.628
```

```
Mediation Effect (Average): -0.01932 95 % CI -0.037878 -0.003201
Direct Effect (Average): -0.02931 95 % CI -0.11052 0.04807
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation (Average): 0.301 95 % CI -3.016 3.477
```

Sample Size Used: 899

In the table, we see that `Mediation Effect_0` is the mediation effect under the control condition, while `Mediation Effect_1` is the mediation effect under the treatment condition. The same notation applies to the direct effects. As the reader can see, the output also indicates which algorithm is used for the 95% confidence intervals.

When the mediator is an ordered variable, we switch to an ordered probit model for the mediator. In **R**, the `polr` function in the `MASS` library provides this functionality. (Alternatively, the `bayespolr` function in the `arm` library can also be used.) Thus, we fit the outcome and mediator models below,

```
R> model.m <- polr(job_disc ~ treat + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age
+ occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income,
```

```

      data = jobs, method = "probit", Hess = TRUE)
R> model.y <- lm(depress2 ~ treat + job_disc + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age
      + occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)

```

The reader should note that in the call to `polr` the `Hess = TRUE` should be specified to compute the asymptotic variance covariance matrix for the estimated model coefficients in the quasi-Bayesian approximation. Otherwise, the Hessian of the log-likelihood will be recalculated within the `mediate` call.

Once we have estimated these two models, analysis proceeds as before,

```

R> out.9 <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, treat = "treat",
      mediator = "job_disc")
R> summary(out.9)

```

### Causal Mediation Analysis

#### Quasi-Bayesian Confidence Intervals

```

Mediation Effect:  -0.01048 95 % CI  -0.03188  0.01008
Direct Effect:    -0.03311 95 % CI  -0.10759  0.04848
Total Effect:     -0.04360 95 % CI  -0.12376  0.03895
Proportion of Total Effect via Mediation:  0.1726 95 % CI  -2.752  2.077

```

Sample Size Used: 899

Again, for any of these data types, analysts can relax the no-interaction assumption as before by including the interaction between treatment and the mediator variable in the outcome model.

## 4.2 Sensitivity Analysis

Once analysts have estimated mediation effects, they should explore how robust their finding is to the ignorability assumption, whenever possible. The `medsens` function allows analysts to conduct sensitivity analyses for mediation effects as well as direct effects. In this section we provide a demonstration of these functionalities. Currently, **mediation** can conduct sensitivity analyses when both mediator and outcome are continuous and modelled with the `lm` function, as well as when either mediator or outcome (but not both) is binary and modelled using a binary probit regression via `glm`.

**The Baron-Kenny Procedure.** As before, one must first fit models for the mediator and outcome and then pass these model objects through the `mediate` function:

```

R> model.m <- lm(job_seek ~ treat + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age + occp
      + marital + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)
R> model.y <- lm(depress2 ~ treat + job_seek + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age + occp

```

```

+ marital + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)
R> med.cont <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims=1000, treat = "treat",
mediator = "job_seek")

```

Once the analyst estimates the mediation effects, the output from the `mediate` function becomes the argument for `medsens`, which is the workhorse function. The `medsens` function recognizes main arguments specified in the `mediate` function and thus there is no need to specify options such as `treat` or `mediator`.

```
R> sens.cont <- medsens(med.cont, rho.by = 0.05)
```

The `rho.by` option specifies how finely incremented the parameter  $\rho$  is for the sensitivity analysis. When  $\rho$  is on a coarser grid, this speeds up estimation considerably but comes at the cost of estimating the robustness of the original conclusion only imprecisely.

After running the sensitivity analysis via `medsens`, the `summary` function can be used to produce a table with the values of  $\rho$  for which the confidence interval contains zero. This allows the analyst to immediately see the approximate range of  $\rho$  where the sign of the causal mediation effect is indeterminate. The second section of the table contains the value of  $\rho$  for which the mediation effect is exactly zero, which in this application is  $-0.19$ . The table also presents coefficients of determination that correspond to the critical value of  $\rho$  where the mediation effect is zero. First,  $R_M^2 R_Y^2$  is the product of coefficients of determination which represents the proportion of the *previously unexplained* variance in the mediator and outcome variables that is explained by an unobservable pretreatment unconfounder. An alternative formulation is in terms of the proportion of the *original* variance explained by an unobserved confounder, which we denote as  $\tilde{R}_M^2 \tilde{R}_Y^2$ .

```
R> summary(sens.cont)
```

Mediation Sensitivity Analysis for Average Causal Mediation Effect

Sensitivity Region

|       | Rho   | Med. Eff. | 95% CI Lower | 95% CI Upper | $R_M^2 R_Y^2$ | $\tilde{R}_M^2 \tilde{R}_Y^2$ |
|-------|-------|-----------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| [14,] | -0.30 | 0.0064    | -0.0025      | 0.0153       | 0.0900        | 0.0588                        |
| [15,] | -0.25 | 0.0028    | -0.0026      | 0.0082       | 0.0625        | 0.0408                        |
| [16,] | -0.20 | -0.0007   | -0.0049      | 0.0036       | 0.0400        | 0.0261                        |
| [17,] | -0.15 | -0.0040   | -0.0105      | 0.0025       | 0.0225        | 0.0147                        |

Rho at which ACME = 0: -0.2

$R_M^2 R_Y^2$  at which ACME = 0: 0.04

```
R^2_M~R^2_Y~ at which ACME = 0: 0.0261
```

The table above presents the estimated mediation effect along with its confidence interval for each value of  $\rho$ . The reader can verify that when  $\rho$  is equal to zero, the reported mediation effect matches the estimate produced by the `mediate` function. For other values of  $\rho$ , the mediation effect is calculated under different levels of unobserved confounding.

The information from the sensitivity analysis can also be summarized graphically using the `plot` function. First, passing the `medsens` object to `plot` and specifying the `sens.par` option to "rho", i.e.,

```
R> plot(sens.cont, sens.par = "rho")
```

produces the left hand side of Figure 4. In the plot, the dashed horizontal line represents the estimated mediation effect under the sequential ignorability assumption, and the solid line represents the mediation effect under various values of  $\rho$ . The grey region represents the 95% confidence bands.

Similarly, we can also plot the sensitivity analysis in terms of the coefficients of determination as discussed above. Here we specify `sens.par` option to "R2". We also need to specify two additional pieces of information. First, `r.type` option tells the plot function whether to plot  $R_M^{*2}R_Y^{*2}$  or  $\tilde{R}_M^2\tilde{R}_Y^2$ . To plot the former `r.type` is set to "residual" and to plot the latter `r.type` is set to "total". Finally, the `sign.prod` option specifies the sign of the product of the coefficients of the unobserved confounder in the mediator and outcome models. This product indicates whether the unobserved confounder affects both mediator and outcome variables in the same direction ("positive") or different directions ("negative"), thereby reflecting the analyst's expectation about the nature of confounding.

For example, the following command produces the plot representing the sensitivity of estimates with respect to the proportion of the original variances explained by the unobserved confounder when the confounder is hypothesized to affect the mediator and outcome variables in opposite directions.

```
R> plot(sens.cont, sens.par = "R2", r.type = "total", sign.prod = "negative")
```

The resulting plot is shown on the right hand side of Figure 4. Each contour line represents the mediation effect for the corresponding values of  $\tilde{R}_M^2$  and  $\tilde{R}_Y^2$ . For example, the 0 contour line corresponds to values of the product  $\tilde{R}_M^2\tilde{R}_Y^2$  such that the ACME is 0. As reported in the table, even a small proportion of original variance unexplained by the confounder, .02%, produces mediation effects of 0. Accordingly, the right hand side of Figure 4 shows how increases in  $\tilde{R}_M^2\tilde{R}_Y^2$  (moving from the lower left to upper right) produce *positive* mediation effects.

For both types of sensitivity plots, the user can specify additional options available in the plot function such as alternative title (`main`) and axis labels (`xlab`, `ylab`) or manipulate common graphical options (e.g., `xlim`).




Figure 4: Sensitivity Analysis with Continuous Outcome and Mediator.

**Binary Outcome.** The `medsens` function also extends to analyses where the mediator is binary and the outcome is continuous, as well as when the mediator is continuous and the outcome is binary. If either variable is binary, `medsens` takes an additional argument. For example, recall the binary outcome model estimated earlier:

```
R> model.y <- glm(work1 ~ treat + job_seek + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age
+ occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income,
family = binomial(link = "probit"), data = jobs)
R> med.bout <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, treat = "treat",
mediator = "job_seek")
```

The call to `medsens` works as before, with the output from the `mediate` function passed through `medsens`.

```
R> sens.bout <- medsens(med.bout, rho.by = 0.05, sims = 1000)
```

The `sims` option provides control over the number of Monte Carlo draws used to compute confidence bands. When either the mediator or outcome is binary, the exact values of sensitivity parameters where the mediation effects are zero cannot be analytically obtained as in the fully continuous case (see Imai *et al.*, 2010c, Section 4). Thus, this information is reported based on the signs of the estimated mediation effects under various values of  $\rho$  and corresponding coefficients of determination. The usage of the `summary` function, however, remains identical to the fully continuous case in that the output table contains the estimated mediation effects and the corresponding values of  $\rho$  for which the confidence region contains zero.

As in the case with continuous mediator and outcome variables, we can plot the results of the sensitivity analysis. The following code produces Figure 5.

```
R> plot(sens.bout, sens.par = "rho")
R> plot(sens.bout, sens.par = "R2", r.type = "total", sign.prod = "positive")
```




Figure 5: Sensitivity Analysis with Continuous Outcome and Binary Mediator.

On the left hand side we plot the ACME in terms of  $\rho$ , while we plot the ACME in terms of  $\tilde{R}_M^2$  and  $\tilde{R}_Y^2$  on the right hand side. In the  $\rho$  plot, the dashed line represents the estimated mediation effect under sequential ignorability, and the solid line represents the mediation effect under various values of  $\rho$ . The grey region represents the 95% confidence bands. In the  $\tilde{R}^2$  plot the ACME is plotted against various values of  $\tilde{R}_M^2$  and  $\tilde{R}_Y^2$  and is interpreted in the same way as above.

When the outcome is binary, the proportion of the the total effect due to mediation can also be calculated as function of the sensitivity parameter  $\rho$ . The `pr.plot` option in the plot command (in conjunction with the `sens.par = "rho"` option) allows users to plot a summary of the sensitivity analysis for the proportion mediated. For example, the following call would provide a plot of this quantity:

```
R> plot(sens.bout, sens.par = "rho", pr.plot = TRUE)
```

**Binary Mediator.** The final form of sensitivity analysis deals with the case where the outcome variable is continuous but the mediator is binary. For the purpose of illustration, we simply dichotomize the `job_seek` variable to produce a binary measure `job_dich`. We fit a probit model for the mediator and linear regression for the outcome variable.

```
R> model.m <- glm(job_dich ~ treat + depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age
```






Figure 6: Sensitivity Analysis with Continuous Outcome and Binary Mediator.

```

+ occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income,
  data = jobs, family = binomial(link = "probit"))
R> model.y <- lm(depress2 ~ treat + job_dich+ depress1 + econ_hard + sex + age
+ occp + marital + nonwhite + educ + income, data = jobs)
R> med.bmed <- mediate(model.m, model.y, sims = 1000, treat = "treat",
mediator = "job_dich")
R> sens.bmed <- medsens(med.bmed, rho.by = 0.05, sims = 1000)

```

Again we can pass the output of the `medsens` function through the `plot` function,

```
R> plot(sens.bmed, sens.par = "rho")
```

producing Figure 6. The plot is interpreted in the same way as the above cases. The user also has the option to plot sensitivity results in terms of the coefficients of determination just as in the case with continuous outcome and mediator variables.

When the mediator variable is binary, the plotted values of the mediation effect and their confidence bands may not be perfectly smooth curves due to simulation errors. This is especially likely when the number of simulations (`sims`) is set to a small value. In such situations, the user can choose to set the `smooth.effect` and `smooth.ci` options to `TRUE` in the `plot` function so

that the corresponding values become smoothed out via a lowess smoother before being plotted. Although this option often makes the produced graph look nicer, the user should be cautious as the adjustment could affect one's substantive conclusions in a significant way. A recommended alternative is to increase the number of simulations.

## 5 Multiple Causal Mediation Analyses via mediations

Researchers may face a situation where they want to conduct multiple causal mediation analyses. For example, the researcher may have run several different experiments that had different treatment conditions but had the same mediator and outcome variables. Or, a researcher may measure several different mediating variables in their experiment and wish to estimate causal mediation effects for each of these cases. In these situations the researcher would need to write separate lines of code for the different models. A more efficient way is to loop over the different combinations of interest. The `mediations` function facilitates this process.

The `mediations` function can be used to conduct causal mediation analyses over the range of treatment, mediator, and outcome combinations that could be present within a study. For example, if there were two treatment conditions, two measured mediators, and two outcomes, `mediations` would run eight causal mediation analyses. The results can then be analyzed with the `summary` and `plot` functions. If there is only one treatment variable, the user needs only a single data set that contains all mediators and outcomes of interest. If there are multiple treatment variables, then the researcher must first create separate data frames, each with all mediator/outcome variables to be considered, and named using a convention where the name of the data frame object begins with the name of the treatment variable contained within it.

Use of the `mediations` function is straightforward. First, the user creates vectors of the treatment, mediator, outcome, and covariates names that are to be used. The treatment, mediator, and outcome variables are looped over to produce all possible combinations of mediator and outcome models. The set of covariates is held constant across the models. The different model combinations are then entered into the `mediate` function.

The user can specify several different options for `mediations`. First, the type of model to be used for the mediator and outcome equations must be specified. Currently, `mediations` can handle a variety of different model combinations. Either the mediator or outcome equation can be modeled with linear regression, probit, ordered probit, and quantile regression. The `mediations` function also handles the case where tobit is used for the outcome. Next, the user must also specify the standard features that are necessary for the `mediate` function, such as the number of simulations (`sims`). In addition, if quantile regression or tobit regression is used, the user needs to specify the appropriate parameters, such as the quantiles to be estimated (`tau.m`, `tau.y`) and cutpoints (`LowerY`, `UpperY`). If the user wishes for estimates to include weights (e.g., survey weights) then the name of the weight variable needs to be passed via the `weights` argument.

The output of `mediations` contains a collection of `mediate` objects. The naming system uses the name of the particular outcome variable, mediator, and treatment, each separated by a dot. For example, if the output of `mediations` is `output` and the outcome, mediator and treatment variable

names `O`, `M1` or `M2`, and `T`, respectively, then `output$O.M2.T` would be the `mediate` object from using mediator `M2`.

There are several limitations to the code. First, it works only with a subset of the model types that will be accommodated if `mediate` is used individually. Second, one cannot specify separate sets of covariates for different treatment/mediator/outcome combinations. Users should use `mediate` separately for individual models if more flexibility is required in their specific applications.

While `mediations` is a helpful function, it is also easy to abuse. First, researchers must be aware of the assumptions being made at every step of causal mediation analysis. For example, if there are multiple mediators, a strong assumption must be made for the estimates to be interpreted as causal quantities. One such assumption is that the mediators are not causally related. Second, care must be taken against the risks of multiple testing when a large number of treatment/mediator/outcome combinations are involved. The `mediations` function simply runs independent `mediate` processes and does not use any correction procedures for multiple testing, so the confidence intervals may be too narrow. We recommend that the use of this function be limited for exploratory analyses.

An illustration of the `mediations` function can be found in the `Examples` section of its help document; see `?mediations` or `example(mediations)`.

## 6 Concluding Remarks

Causal mediation analysis is a key tool for social scientific research. In this paper, we describe our easy-to-use software for causal mediation analysis, **mediation**, that implements the new methods and algorithms introduced by Imai, Keele, and Yamamoto (2010c) and Imai, Keele, and Tingley (2010b). The software provides a flexible, unified approach to causal mediation analysis in various situations encountered by applied researchers. The object-oriented nature of the **R** programming made it possible for us to implement these algorithms in a fairly general way. In addition to the estimation of causal mediation effects, **mediation** implements formal sensitivity analyses so that researchers can assess the robustness of their findings to the potential violations of the key identifying assumption. This is an important contribution for at least two reasons. First, even in randomized experiments, causal mediation analysis requires an additional assumption that is not directly testable from the observed data. Thus, researchers must evaluate the consequences of potential violations of the assumption via sensitivity analysis. Second, the accumulation of such sensitivity analyses is essential for interpreting the relative degree of robustness across different studies. Thus, the development of easy-to-use software, such as **mediation**, facilitates causal mediation analysis in applied social science research in several critical directions.

## References

- Imai, K., Keele, L., Tingley, D., and Yamamoto, T. (2010a). *Advances in Social Science Research Using R* (ed. H. D. Vinod), chapter Causal Mediation Analysis Using R, pages 129–154. Lecture Notes in Statistics. Springer, New York.
- Imai, K., Keele, L., and Tingley, D. (2010b). A general approach to causal mediation analysis. *Psychological Methods*, **15**(4), 309–334.
- Imai, K., Keele, L., and Yamamoto, T. (2010c). Identification, inference, and sensitivity analysis for causal mediation effects. *Statistical Science*, **25**(1), 51–71.
- Keele, L. (2008). *Semiparametric Regression for the Social Sciences*. Wiley and Sons, Chichester, UK.
- King, G., Tomz, M., and Wittenberg, J. (2000). Making the most of statistical analyses: Improving interpretation and presentation. *American Journal of Political Science*, **44**(2), 341–355.
- Koenker, R. (2008). *Quantile Regression*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mackinnon, D., Lockwood, C., and Williams, J. (2004). Confidence limits for the indirect effect: Distribution of the product and resampling methods. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, **39**(1), 99–129.
- Preacher, K. and Hayes, A. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavioral Research Methods*, **40**, 879–891.
- R Development Core Team (2009). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. (2002). *Observational Studies*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2nd edition.
- Vinokur, A. and Schul, Y. (1997). Mastery and inoculation against setbacks as active ingredients in the jobs intervention for the unemployed. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, **65**(5), 867–877.
- Wood, S. (2006). *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction With R*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton.
- Zellner, A. (1962). An efficient method of estimating seemingly unrelated regressions and tests for aggregation bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **57**, 348–368.