

# Causal Inference for Qualitative Outcomes<sup>\*</sup>

Riccardo Di Francesco<sup>†</sup>

Giovanni Mellace<sup>‡</sup>

February 18, 2025

## Abstract

Causal inference methods such as instrumental variables, regression discontinuity, and difference-in-differences are widely used to estimate treatment effects. However, their application to qualitative outcomes poses fundamental challenges, as standard causal estimands are ill-defined in this context. This paper highlights these issues and introduces an alternative framework that focuses on well-defined and interpretable estimands that quantify how treatment affects the probability distribution over outcome categories. We establish that standard identification assumptions are sufficient for identification and propose simple, intuitive estimation strategies that remain fully compatible with conventional econometric methods. To facilitate implementation, we provide an open-source R package, `causalQual`, which is publicly available on GitHub.

**Keywords:** Probability shift, multinomial outcomes, ordered non-numeric outcomes.

**JEL Codes:** C21, C26, C31, C35.

---

<sup>\*</sup> The R package for implementing the methodologies developed in this paper is available on GitHub at <https://github.com/riccardo-df/causalQual>.

<sup>†</sup> Department of Economics, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark, email: [rdif@sam.sdu.dk](mailto:rdif@sam.sdu.dk).

<sup>‡</sup> Department of Economics, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark, email: [giome@sam.sdu.dk](mailto:giome@sam.sdu.dk).

# 1 Introduction

Causal inference has become a cornerstone of applied econometrics, with methods such as *instrumental variables*, *difference-in-differences*, and *regression discontinuity* widely employed to identify and estimate the effects of policies or interventions (Imbens, 2022; Angrist, 2022). The widespread adoption of these methodologies has been central to the so-called *credibility revolution*, which emphasizes credible and transparent identification strategies to improve the reliability of empirical findings (Angrist and Pischke, 2010; Lechner, 2023).

These methodologies are primarily developed for numerical outcomes, whether continuous or discrete. Yet, many empirical applications across disciplines involve qualitative outcomes, which take the form of ordered or unordered categories. In political science, voter ideology is often recorded on an ordinal scale ranging from “very liberal” to “very conservative” (Mason, 2015), and attitudes toward policy issues are commonly measured using Likert scales (Kuziemko et al., 2015). In health, researchers analyze life satisfaction (Frey and Stutzer, 2002), subjective well-being (Reisinger, 2022), and self-reported health status (Peracchi and Rossetti, 2012, 2013) – all of which lack a natural cardinal interpretation. In consumer research, perceived product quality and satisfaction are often captured through consumer ratings and review scores (Mayzlin et al., 2014), which are inherently ordinal. In such cases, widely used causal estimands, such as the *average treatment effect* and its conditional versions, are ill-defined, as arithmetic operations like averaging or computing differences between categories lack meaningful quantitative interpretation.

This article highlights the fundamental challenges that arise when conventional causal inference methods are applied to qualitative outcomes and introduces a principled approach to addressing these issues. Standard causal methodologies, when employed without fully accounting for the qualitative nature of the outcome, suffer from inherent limitations, as conventional estimands are meaningless in this context. A common approach among applied researchers is to dichotomize the outcome based on an arbitrary threshold to enable the use of methods designed for binary outcomes. However, results may be highly sensitive to the

choice of threshold, and the validity of identifying assumptions for one dichotomization does not necessarily imply identification under an alternative thresholding scheme (Yamauchi, 2020). This paper advocates for a fundamental shift toward alternative estimands that are not only meaningful and interpretable but also identifiable within standard research designs.

Specifically, we demonstrate that the naive application of widely used research designs – including instrumental variables, difference-in-differences, and regression discontinuity – to qualitative outcomes leads to the identification of quantities whose magnitude and sign depend on arbitrary coding choices, rendering them devoid of economic meaning. To address this issue, we shift the focus to well-defined and interpretable estimands that characterize how treatment affects the probability distribution over outcome categories. This approach allows us to quantify how treatment alters the likelihood of observing different responses, offering an economically meaningful alternative to standard causal parameters.

We establish that the assumptions underpinning conventional identification strategies – or slight modifications thereof – are sufficient to identify the new estimands, ensuring their compatibility with standard research designs. For estimation, we rely on conventional methods while explicitly modeling category probabilities rather than the outcome itself. This enables applied researchers to continue using familiar econometric tools while targeting causal parameters that are both meaningful and interpretable. To facilitate implementation, we provide the open-source R package `causalQual`, which offers a straightforward and user-friendly approach to estimation.<sup>1</sup>

While the conceptual issues we raise may seem straightforward, causal inference with qualitative outcomes has been acknowledged in the literature but remains underdeveloped. Existing research has primarily focused on specific estimands for ordered outcomes – such as the probabilities that treatment is beneficial or strictly beneficial – that depend on the

---

<sup>1</sup> We focus our exposition on simple and standard cases for ease of illustration; however, our framework naturally extends to more complex settings, including instrumental variables with multiple instruments or two-sided non-compliance, difference-in-differences with heterogeneous effects and staggered treatment adoption, and fuzzy regression discontinuity designs. We plan to continuously update our R package to incorporate these extensions as they develop. Users interested in specific extensions are encouraged to contribute by submitting feature requests or discussions at <https://github.com/riccardo-df/causalQual/issues>.

joint distribution of potential outcomes. Identification of these estimands has been pursued under restrictive conditions, including assuming that treatment is beneficial for all units (Volfovsky et al., 2015), imposing independence between potential outcomes (Agresti and Kateri, 2017), or specifying a prior over the joint distribution of potential outcomes (Chiba, 2018).<sup>2</sup> In contrast, we introduce a class of estimands that apply to both multinomial and ordered outcomes and achieve identification without requiring additional assumptions beyond those conventionally made in empirical research.<sup>3</sup>

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the causal framework. Section 3, 4, 5, and 6 discuss identification and estimation under selection-on-observables, instrumental variables, difference-in-differences, and regression discontinuity designs, respectively. Section 7 presents simulation results. Section 8 concludes.

## 2 Causal framework

We are interested in the causal effect of a binary treatment  $D_i \in \{0, 1\}$  on a qualitative outcome  $Y_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ik})^\top \in \mathcal{X}$  the  $k \times 1$  vector of pre-treatment covariates and define  $p_m(d, \mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m) | D_i = d, \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}] = \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | D_i = d, \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x})$  as the conditional class probability and  $\pi(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}[D_i | \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}] = \mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x})$  as the conditional treatment probability or propensity score.<sup>4</sup>

Although the  $M$  outcome categories may exhibit a natural ordering – where higher values correspond to stronger responses – they are not measured on a cardinal scale. Therefore, arithmetic operations such as averages of  $Y_i$  or differences between its categories lack meaningful quantitative interpretation.

---

<sup>2</sup> Lu et al. (2018, 2020) adopt a partial identification approach, deriving sharp bounds for these estimands using only the marginal distributions of potential outcomes.

<sup>3</sup> An exception in the existing literature is Yamauchi (2020), who studies an estimand within the class we consider and establishes its identification under a difference-in-differences design. However, their approach relies on a latent variable model, thereby imposing parametric and distributional assumptions on the latent outcome, and requires a distributional parallel trends assumption (Athey and Imbens, 2006).

<sup>4</sup> We use boldface characters to distinguish vectors from scalars. Additionally, we represent random variables by uppercase letters and their realizations by lowercase letters.

We adopt the potential outcomes framework (Neyman, 1923; Rubin, 1974) and posit the existence of two potential outcomes  $Y_i(1)$  and  $Y_i(0)$ , representing the outcome that unit  $i$  would experience under each treatment level. The realized outcome for unit  $i$  then follows the standard observational rule:<sup>5</sup>

$$Y_i = D_i Y_i(1) + (1 - D_i) Y_i(0). \quad (1)$$

If  $Y_i$  were a cardinal numeric variable, the individual treatment effect could be naturally defined as the difference in potential outcomes,  $Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$ . In that case, standard causal estimands such as the Average Treatment Effect (ATE)  $\tau := \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)]$  and the Average Treatment Effect on the Treated (ATT)  $\tau_T := \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | D_i = 1]$  would be well-defined and directly identifiable under additional assumptions.

However, because  $Y_i$  is a qualitative variable, such differences are not meaningful. Instead, we define causal effects in terms of changes in the probability distribution over outcome categories, allowing us to quantify how the treatment shifts the likelihood of observing different responses.

Specifically, we define the Probability of Shift (PS) as the change in the probability of belonging to category  $m$  due to treatment:

$$\delta_m := \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m). \quad (2)$$

For instance,  $\delta_m > 0$  indicates that the treatment increases the likelihood of observing outcome category  $m$ , while  $\delta_m < 0$  implies a decrease in the probability mass assigned to  $m$  caused by the treatment. By construction,  $\sum_{m=1}^M \delta_m = 0$ , reflecting the intuitive trade-off that an increase in the probability of some outcome categories must be offset by a decrease in others.

---

<sup>5</sup> The definition of potential outcomes and the observational rule linking them to observed outcomes implicitly impose SUTVA (see, e.g., Laffers and Mellace, 2020).

**Remark 1.** A naive approach is to treat  $Y_i$  as numeric, in which case the ATE would write as

$$\tau = \sum_{m=1}^M m\delta_m. \quad (3)$$

This expression shows that the average treatment effect corresponds to a weighted sum of the probability shifts  $\delta_m$ , where the weights are simply the category labels  $m$ . However, this approach is fundamentally flawed for at least two reasons.

First, the weights  $m$  do not carry meaningful information about the treatment effect; rather, they are an artifact of arbitrary labeling. Since these labels do not represent numerical distances but merely indicate distinct classes, they can be reindexed without altering the underlying outcome – yet doing so would completely change the magnitude of the ATE. This lack of invariance makes the ATE highly sensitive to arbitrary coding choices.

Second, even if one accepts this flawed weighting scheme, the sign of  $\tau$  behaves erratically and lacks meaningful interpretation. Since  $\sum_{m=1}^M \delta_m = 0$ , any treatment with a nonzero effect necessarily implies that  $\delta_m > 0$  for some categories and  $\delta_m < 0$  for others. Consequently, the sign of  $\tau$  is determined by the relative magnitudes of these probability shifts, weighted in an arbitrary manner. Small shifts in higher-indexed categories may dominate larger shifts in lower-indexed ones, leading to an unreliable and misleading sign. Moreover, because category labels are arbitrary, reindexing them can completely alter both the magnitude and sign of  $\tau$ , further underscoring its lack of economic significance.

We further define two conditional versions of PS to provide a more granular characterization of treatment effects: the Probability of Shift on the Treated (PST)

$$\delta_{m,T} := \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m | D_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m | D_i = 1), \quad (4)$$

which measures the probability shift among the treated population, and the Conditional

Probability of Shift (CPS)

$$\delta_m(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m | \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m | \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}), \quad (5)$$

which measures the probability shift for units with covariate values  $\mathbf{x}$ .

### 3 Selection-on-observables

Selection-on-observables research designs are used to identify causal effects in observational settings where units are observed at a specific point in time, some receive treatment, and data on both pre-treatment characteristics and post-treatment outcomes are available. This approach is based on the following standard assumptions (see, e.g., [Imbens and Rubin, 2015](#)):

**Assumption 1.** (Unconfoundedness):  $\{Y_i(1), Y_i(0)\} \perp\!\!\!\perp D_i | \mathbf{X}_i$ .

**Assumption 2.** (Common support):  $0 < \pi(\mathbf{X}_i) < 1$ .

Assumption 1 states that, after conditioning on  $\mathbf{X}_i$ , treatment assignment is as good as random, meaning that  $\mathbf{X}_i$  fully accounts for selection into treatment. Assumption 2 ensures that for every value of  $\mathbf{X}_i$ , there are both treated and untreated units, preventing situations where no valid counterfactual exists.

Together, these assumptions allow for the identification of  $\tau$  and its conditional versions by ensuring meaningful comparisons between treated and control units with similar observed characteristics. However, the qualitative nature of  $Y_i$  renders  $\tau$  ill-defined. Therefore, we shift our focus to the identification of PS and its conditional counterparts.

Specifically, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
p_m(1, \mathbf{x}) - p_m(0, \mathbf{x}) &= \\
&= \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m | D_i = 1, \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m | D_i = 0, \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}) \quad (\text{by equation (1)}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m | \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m | \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}) \quad (\text{by Assumption 1}) \\
&= \delta_m(\mathbf{x}),
\end{aligned}$$

Assumption 2 ensures that all conditional probabilities are well-defined at  $\mathbf{x}$ , establishing that the standard selection-on-observables assumptions are sufficient to identify the CPS at any given  $\mathbf{x}$ . Moreover, since  $\delta_m = \mathbb{E}[\delta_m(\mathbf{X}_i)]$  and  $\delta_{m,T} = \mathbb{E}[\delta_m(\mathbf{X}_i) | D_i = 1]$ , the PS and PST are also identified. Thus, even though standard causal parameters are ill-defined for qualitative outcomes, selection-on-observables remains a valid identification strategy. The key insight is to shift the focus toward meaningful and interpretable estimands, namely the PS and its conditional versions.

For estimation, note that

$$\delta_m = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y_i(1) = m) - \mathbb{1}(Y_i(0) = m)]. \quad (6)$$

This suggests that we can construct an estimate  $\hat{\delta}_m$  by applying standard estimation strategies to the binary variable  $\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m)$  and estimating the ATE on that variable.<sup>6</sup>

## 4 Instrumental variables

In some applications, the observed covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i$  may not fully account for selection into treatment, making a selection-on-observables design unsuitable. Instrumental variables (IV) designs provide a popular identification strategy to address this issue. The key idea behind IV is to exploit a variable – an instrument – that is as good as randomly assigned, influences

---

<sup>6</sup> Applying such estimation strategies to the subsample of treated units would yield an estimate  $\hat{\delta}_{m,T}$  of  $\delta_{m,T}$ .



treatment assignment, but has no direct effect on the outcome except through treatment. This exogenous source of variation enables the identification of causal effects by isolating changes in treatment status that are not driven by unobserved factors.

Although our results can be readily extended to more complex settings, we focus on the simple case of a single binary instrument  $Z_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for ease of illustration. We build upon the framework introduced in Section 2 by defining the potential treatment statuses  $D_i(1)$  and  $D_i(0)$ , which represent the treatment that unit  $i$  would receive under each level of the instrument. Potential outcomes are now indexed by both treatment status  $d$  and instrument assignment  $z$ , denoted by  $Y_i(d, z)$ .

Within this framework, units can be classified into four distinct compliance types based on their potential treatment status as a function of the instrument (Angrist et al., 1996): *always-takers* (*at*) receive treatment regardless of assignment ( $D_i(1) = D_i(0) = 1$ ), *never-takers* (*nt*) never receive treatment regardless of assignment ( $D_i(1) = D_i(0) = 0$ ), *compliers* (*co*) take the treatment only if assigned ( $D_i(1) = 1, D_i(0) = 0$ ), and *defiers* (*de*) take the treatment only when not assigned ( $D_i(1) = 0, D_i(0) = 1$ ). To shorten notation, we denote an unit's compliance type by  $T_i \in \{at, nt, co, de\}$ .

A standard approach in IV settings is to target identification and estimation of the Local Average Treatment Effect (LATE)  $\tau_L := \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | T_i = co]$ , which represents the average treatment effect for compliers. Identification relies on the following standard assumptions (Imbens and Angrist, 1994; Angrist et al., 1996):

**Assumption 3.** (Exogeneity):  $\{Y_i(D_i, 1), Y_i(D_i, 0), D_i(1), D_i(0)\} \perp\!\!\!\perp Z_i$ .

**Assumption 4.** (Exclusion restriction):  $Y_i(d, 1) = Y_i(d, 0) = Y_i(d)$ ,  $d = 0, 1$ .

**Assumption 5.** (Monotonicity):  $\mathbb{P}(D_i(1) \geq D_i(0)) = 1$ .

**Assumption 6.** (Relevance):  $\mathbb{P}(T_i = co) > 0$ .

Assumption 3 mandates that the instrument is as good as randomly assigned. Assumption 4 requires that the instrument affects the outcome only through its influence on treatment,

ruling out any direct effect. Assumption 5 imposes that the instrument can only increase the likelihood of treatment, ruling out defiers.<sup>7</sup> Finally, Assumption 6 states that the instrument has a nonzero effect on the treatment, thereby generating exogenous variation in the latter.

However, the qualitative nature of  $Y_i$  implies that  $\tau_L$  is ill-defined. We thus shift our focus toward the identification of the Local Probability Shift (LPS):

$$\delta_{m,L} := \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m | T_i = co) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m | T_i = co). \quad (7)$$

Specifically, Appendix A shows that, under Assumptions 3–6,

$$\delta_{m,L} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | Z_i = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | Z_i = 0)}. \quad (8)$$

This establishes that the standard IV assumptions are sufficient to identify a well-defined and interpretable causal parameter for qualitative outcomes – the LPS.

For estimation, note that

$$\delta_{m,L} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m) | Z_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m) | Z_i = 0]}{\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | Z_i = 0)}. \quad (9)$$

This suggests that we can construct an estimate  $\hat{\delta}_{m,L}$  by applying standard IV estimation strategies to the binary variable  $\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m)$  and estimating the LATE on that variable.

## 5 Regression discontinuity

Regression Discontinuity (RD) designs are employed to identify causal effects when treatment assignment is determined by whether a continuous variable crosses a known threshold or cutoff. The key assumption is that units just above and just below the cutoff are comparable, meaning that any discontinuity in outcomes at the threshold can be attributed to the

---

<sup>7</sup> This assumption is made without loss of generality; one could alternatively assume that the instrument can only decrease the probability of treatment.

treatment rather than to pre-existing differences (see, e.g., [Lee and Lemieux, 2010](#)).

Although our results can be readily extended to more complex settings, we focus on the standard *sharp* RD design for ease of illustration. In this setup, we consider a single observed covariate  $X_i$ , referred to as the “running variable”. By construction,  $X_i$  fully determines treatment assignment. Specifically, units receive treatment if and only if their running variable exceeds a predetermined threshold  $c$ . Thus,  $D_i = \mathbb{1}(X_i \geq c)$ .

This setup leads to two key observations that draw direct analogies to selection-on-observables designs. First, Assumption 1 holds trivially since conditioning on  $X_i$  fully determines  $D_i$ . Second, Assumption 2 is necessarily violated, as  $\pi(x)$  is either zero or one for all  $x$  (see, e.g., [Imbens and Lemieux, 2008](#)).

A standard approach in RD settings is to replace Assumption 2 with the following continuity assumption for identification of the Average Treatment Effect at the Cutoff (ATC)  $\tau_C := \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|X_i = c]$ .

**Assumption 7a.** (Continuity of mean outcomes):  $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(d)|X_i = x]$  is continuous in  $x$  for  $d = 0, 1$ .

Assumption 7a ensures that expected potential outcomes evolve smoothly in  $x$ . This allows for a fair comparison between treated and control units arbitrarily close to  $c$ , thereby enabling the identification of  $\tau_C$ .

However, in the presence of qualitative outcomes,  $\tau_C$  is ill-defined. We thus shift our focus to the identification of a meaningful parameter – the Probability of Shift at the Cutoff (PSC):

$$\delta_{m,C} := \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m|X_i = c) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m|X_i = c). \tag{10}$$

Assumption 7a does not suffice to identify the PSC. To address this, we introduce an alternative continuity assumption that enables its identification:

**Assumption 7b.** (Continuity of mass functions):  $\mathbb{P}(Y_i(d) = m|X_i = x)$  is continuous in  $x$  for  $d = 0, 1$ .

Assumption 7b requires that the conditional probability mass functions of potential outcomes evolve smoothly with  $x$ . This ensures that class probabilities – rather than the expected outcomes – remain comparable in a neighborhood of  $c$ , enabling the identification of  $\delta_{m,C}$  through a fair comparison of class probabilities on either side of the threshold.

Under Assumptions 1 and 7b, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | D_i = 1, X_i = x) &= \\
&= \lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m | D_i = 1, X_i = x) \quad (\text{by equation (1)}) \\
&= \lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m | X_i = x) \quad (\text{by Assumption 1}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m | X_i = c), \quad (\text{by Assumption 7b})
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\lim_{x \uparrow c} \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | D_i = 0, X_i = x) = \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m | X_i = c).$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | D_i = 1, X_i = x) - \lim_{x \uparrow c} \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | D_i = 0, X_i = x) = \delta_{m,C}. \quad (11)$$

This establishes that Assumptions 1 and 7b are sufficient to identify the PSC.

For estimation, note that

$$\delta_{m,C} = \lim_{x \downarrow c} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m) | D_i = 1, X_i = x] - \lim_{x \uparrow c} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m) | D_i = 0, X_i = x]. \quad (12)$$

This suggests that we can construct an estimate  $\hat{\delta}_{m,C}$  by applying standard RD estimation strategies to the binary variable  $\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m)$  and estimating the ATC on that variable.

## 6 Difference-in-differences

Difference-in-Differences (DiD) designs are employed to identify causal effects when units are observed over time and treatment is introduced only from a certain point onward for some

units. The key assumption is that, in the absence of treatment, the change in outcomes for treated units would have mirrored the change observed in the control group (see, e.g., Roth et al., 2023; de Chaisemartin and D’Haultfoeulle, 2023).

Although our results can be readily extended to more complex settings, we focus on the standard two-period DiD framework for ease of illustration. In this setup, we observe units in two time periods  $s \in \{t, t - 1\}$ . The potential outcomes framework introduced in Section 2 extends naturally to this setting by incorporating potential outcomes indexed by both treatment status  $d$  and time  $s$ , denoted as  $Y_{is}(d)$ . By construction, no units receive treatment in the pre-treatment period  $t - 1$ , while in the post-treatment period  $t$  a subset of units is treated ( $D_i = 1$ ). The observed outcomes thus follow the assignment rule:<sup>8</sup>

$$Y_{it-1} = Y_{it-1}(0), \quad Y_{it} = D_i Y_{it}(1) + (1 - D_i) Y_{it}(0). \quad (13)$$

In this context, the PST is defined as

$$\delta_{m,T} := \mathbb{P}(Y_{it}(1) = m | D_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_{it}(0) = m | D_i = 1). \quad (14)$$

A standard approach in DiD settings is to impose the following parallel trends assumption for identification of the ATT, now defined as  $\tau_T := \mathbb{E}[Y_{it}(1) - Y_{it}(0) | D_i = 1]$ .

**Assumption 8a.** (Parallel trends on mean outcomes):

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{it}(0) - Y_{it-1}(0) | D_i = 1] = \mathbb{E}[Y_{it}(0) - Y_{it-1}(0) | D_i = 0].$$

Assumption 8a states that, in the absence of treatment, the change in outcomes for the treated group would have mirrored that of the control group, effectively ensuring that any systematic differences between the groups remain constant over time. This allows for a fair comparison of how outcomes evolve across groups, thereby enabling the identification of  $\tau_T$ .

However, the qualitative nature of  $Y_i$  renders  $\tau_T$  meaningless, and Assumption 8a does

---

<sup>8</sup> This formulation assumes no-anticipation, meaning that treatment effects do not materialize before treatment is actually received.

not enable the identification of the PST. To address this, we introduce an alternative parallel trends assumption that enables its identification.

**Assumption 8b.** (Parallel trends on mass functions):

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{it}(0) = m | D_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_{it-1}(0) = m | D_i = 1) = \mathbb{P}(Y_{it}(0) = m | D_i = 0) - \mathbb{P}(Y_{it-1}(0) = m | D_i = 0).$$

Assumption 8b requires that the probability time shift of  $Y_{is}(0)$  for class  $m$  follows a similar evolution over time in both the treated and control groups. Essentially, this imposes parallel trends on the probability mass functions of  $Y_{is}(0)$ , rather than on its mean, ensuring that categorical shifts – rather than differences – remain comparable across groups.

Under Assumption 8b, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_{it}(0) = m | D_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_{it-1}(0) = m | D_i = 1) - \\ \mathbb{P}(Y_{it}(0) = m | D_i = 0) + \mathbb{P}(Y_{it-1}(0) = m | D_i = 0). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Replacing this in (14) and using (13) to replace potential outcomes with observable outcomes, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{m,T} = \mathbb{P}(Y_{it} = m | D_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_{it-1} = m | D_i = 1) - \\ [\mathbb{P}(Y_{it} = m | D_i = 0) - \mathbb{P}(Y_{it-1} = m | D_i = 0)]. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

This establishes that Assumption 8b is sufficient to identify the PST.

For estimation, note that

$$\delta_{m,T} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y_{it} = m) - \mathbb{1}(Y_{it-1} = m) | D_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y_{it} = m) - \mathbb{1}(Y_{it-1} = m) | D_i = 0]. \tag{17}$$

This suggests that we can construct an estimate  $\hat{\delta}_{m,T}$  by applying standard DiD estimation strategies to the binary variable  $\mathbb{1}(Y_{is} = m)$  and estimating the ATT on that variable.

## 7 Simulation

### 7.1 Selection-on-observables

Potential outcomes are modeled using two distinct approaches, depending on whether the outcome is multinomial or ordered. For multinomial outcomes, we construct the probability mass functions by applying a softmax transformation to linear predictors. Specifically, for each class  $m$ , we first compute linear predictors based on the covariates and then transform these predictors into valid probability distributions using the softmax function. The potential outcomes are then generated by sampling from the discrete set  $\{1, 2, 3\}$  according to these mass functions. For ordered outcomes, we first generate underlying latent potential outcomes  $Y_i^*(d)$  and then obtain the observable potential outcomes  $Y_i(d)$  by discretizing  $Y_i^*(d)$  using fixed thresholds.<sup>9</sup>

We generate three covariates, each independently drawn from a uniform distribution over  $[0, 1]$ . Treatment is then assigned via a Bernoulli trial  $D_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi(\mathbf{X}_i))$ . We consider two assignment mechanisms: a randomized design, with  $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i) = 0.5$ , and an observational design, with  $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i) = (\mathbf{X}_{i1} + \mathbf{X}_{i3})/2$ .

Estimation is performed by applying the double machine learning procedures of Chernozhukov et al. (2018) to the binary variable  $\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m)$ . Specifically, for each class  $m$ , we define the doubly robust scores as

$$\Gamma_{mi} := p_m(1, \mathbf{X}_i) - p_m(0, \mathbf{X}_i) + D_i \frac{\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m) - p_m(1, \mathbf{X}_i)}{\pi(\mathbf{X}_i)} - (1 - D_i) \frac{\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m) - p_m(0, \mathbf{X}_i)}{1 - \pi(\mathbf{X}_i)}. \quad (18)$$

We then construct plug-in estimates  $\hat{\Gamma}_{mi}$  of  $\Gamma_{mi}$  by replacing the unknown  $p_m(1, \cdot)$ ,  $p_m(0, \cdot)$ , and  $\pi(\cdot)$  with consistent estimates  $\hat{p}_m(1, \cdot)$ ,  $\hat{p}_m(0, \cdot)$ , and  $\hat{\pi}(\cdot)$  obtained via  $K$ -fold cross

---

<sup>9</sup> Appendix B provides complete simulation details.

fitting.<sup>10</sup> The estimator for PS is then

$$\hat{\delta}_m = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\Gamma}_{mi}, \quad (19)$$

and its variance is estimated as

$$\widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{\delta}_m) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\Gamma}_{mi} - \hat{\delta}_m)^2. \quad (20)$$

We use these estimates to construct confidence intervals using conventional normal approximations.

To estimate the conditional class probabilities  $p_m(d, \cdot)$ ,  $d = 0, 1$ , we adopt multinomial machine learning strategies when the outcome is multinomial and the honest ordered correlation forest estimator when the outcome is ordered (Di Francesco, 2025). We train separate models for treated and control units. The propensity score  $\pi(\cdot)$  is estimated via an honest regression forest (Athey et al., 2019). All these functions are estimated via 5-fold cross fitting.

Table 1 reports results obtained with 2000 replications and fixing the sample size at 2000.

Table 1: Simulation results: selection-on-observables.

	<i>Multinomial</i>				<i>Ordered</i>			
	$\delta_m$	<i> Bias </i>	<i>SD</i>	95%	$\delta_m$	<i> Bias </i>	<i>SD</i>	95%
<b>Panel A: Randomized design</b>								
Class 1	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.95	-0.58	0.00	0.02	0.95
Class 2	-0.05	0.00	0.02	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.95
Class 3	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.95	0.58	0.00	0.02	0.93
<b>Panel B: Observational design</b>								
Class 1	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.94	-0.58	0.01	0.02	0.93
Class 2	-0.05	0.00	0.03	0.93	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.95
Class 3	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.94	0.58	0.01	0.02	0.93

<sup>10</sup> A potential issue in estimation arises if, after splitting the sample into folds and each fold into treated and control groups, at least one class of  $Y_i$  is unobserved within a given fold for a specific treatment group. To mitigate this issue, our R package `causalQual` repeatedly splits the data until all outcome categories are present in each fold and treatment group.



All estimates are approximately unbiased and coverage rates are close to the nominal level.

## 7.2 Instrumental variables

Potential outcomes and covariates are generated following the procedure of the previous section. We further generate a binary instrument  $Z_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(0.5)$ . Treatment is assigned as a Bernoulli trial  $D_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i))$ , where we allow the instrument to influence treatment probability. We only consider an observational setting, with  $\pi(\mathbf{X}_i, Z_i) = (\mathbf{X}_{i1} + \mathbf{X}_{i2} + Z_i)/3$ . However, we assume that the covariates  $\mathbf{X}_i$  are unobserved, preventing their use in adjusting for selection into treatment.

Estimation is carried out by applying the standard two-stage least squares method to the binary variable  $\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m)$ . Specifically, we first estimate the following first-stage regression model via OLS:

$$D_i = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 Z_i + \nu_i, \quad (21)$$

and construct the predicted values  $\hat{D}_i$ . We then use these predicted values in the second-stage regressions:

$$\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m) = \alpha_{m0} + \alpha_{m1} \hat{D}_i + \epsilon_{mi}, \quad m = 1, \dots, M. \quad (22)$$

A well-established result in the IV literature is that, under Assumptions 3–6,  $\alpha_{m1} = \delta_{m,L}$  (Angrist et al., 1996; Imbens and Angrist, 1994). Therefore, we estimate (22) via OLS and use the resulting estimate  $\hat{\alpha}_{m1}$  as an estimate of  $\delta_{m,L}$ . Standard errors are computed using

Table 2: Simulation results: instrumental variables.

	<i>Multinomial</i>				<i>Ordered</i>			
	$\delta_{m,L}$	<i>Bias</i>	<i>SD</i>	95%	$\delta_{m,L}$	<i>Bias</i>	<i>SD</i>	95%
Class 1	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.95	-0.58	0.00	0.05	0.95
Class 2	-0.05	0.00	0.06	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.96
Class 3	0.05	0.00	0.06	0.95	0.58	0.00	0.05	0.95

standard procedures and used to construct conventional confidence intervals.<sup>11</sup>

Table 2 reports results obtained with 10000 replications and fixing the sample size at 2000. All estimates are approximately unbiased and coverage rates are close to the nominal level.

### 7.3 Regression discontinuity

Potential outcomes and covariates are generated following the procedure of the previous sections. We designate  $X_{i1}$  as the running variable, with treatment assigned to units such as  $X_{i1} \geq 0.5$ . Thus, treatment status is determined as  $D_i = \mathbb{1}(X_{i1} \geq 0.5)$ .

Estimation is performed using standard local polynomial estimators applied to the binary variable  $\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m)$ . Specifically, we implement the robust bias-corrected inference procedure of Calonico et al. (2014).<sup>12</sup>

Table 3 reports results obtained with 10000 replications and fixing the sample size at 2000. All estimates are approximately unbiased and coverage rates are close to the nominal level.

Table 3: Simulation results: regression discontinuity.

	<i>Multinomial</i>				<i>Ordered</i>			
	$\delta_{m,C}$	<i> Bias </i>	<i>SD</i>	95%	$\delta_{m,C}$	<i> Bias </i>	<i>SD</i>	95%
Class 1	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.94	-0.60	0.00	0.08	0.94
Class 2	-0.05	0.00	0.10	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.94
Class 3	0.05	0.00	0.10	0.94	0.60	0.00	0.09	0.93

### 7.4 Difference-in-differences

Potential outcomes are generated following the procedure of the previous sections, applying the same models to both time periods – essentially treating time as having no direct effect

<sup>11</sup> Our R package `causalQual` implements this two-stage least squares procedure by calling the `ivreg` function from the R package `AER`.

<sup>12</sup> Our R package `causalQual` implements these estimation strategies by calling the `rdrobust` function from the R package `rdrobust` (Calonico et al., 2015).

on potential outcomes. Estimation is performed by applying the canonical two-group/two-period DiD method to the binary variable  $\mathbb{1}(Y_i = m)$ . Specifically, consider the following linear regression model:

$$\mathbb{1}(Y_{is} = m) = D_i\beta_{m1} + \mathbb{1}(s = t)\beta_{m2} + D_i\mathbb{1}(s = t)\beta_{m3} + \epsilon_{mis}. \quad (23)$$

A well-established result in the DiD literature is that, under Assumption 8b,  $\beta_{m3} = \delta_{m,T}$  (see, e.g., Goodman-Bacon, 2021). Therefore, we estimate model (23) via OLS and use the resulting estimate  $\hat{\beta}_{m3}$  as an estimate of  $\delta_{m,T}$ . Standard errors are clustered at the unit level and used to construct conventional confidence intervals.

Table 4 reports results obtained with 10000 replications and fixing the sample size at 2000. All estimates are approximately unbiased and coverage rates are close to the nominal level.

Table 4: Simulation results: difference-in-differences.

	<i>Multinomial</i>				<i>Ordered</i>			
	$\delta_{m,T}$	<i>Bias</i>	<i>SD</i>	95%	$\delta_{m,T}$	<i>Bias</i>	<i>SD</i>	95%
Class 1	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.95	-0.55	0.00	0.02	0.95
Class 2	-0.06	0.00	0.03	0.95	-0.06	0.00	0.03	0.96
Class 3	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.95	0.61	0.00	0.02	0.95

## 8 Conclusion

Causal inference methods have become central to empirical research in economics and the social sciences, enabling researchers to estimate the effects of policies and interventions with increasing credibility. However, the applicability of these methodologies has largely been confined to contexts where outcomes are numerical. This paper highlights a fundamental yet often overlooked issue: when applied to qualitative outcomes – whether multinomial or ordered – standard causal inference methods yield results that are entirely meaningless.

We demonstrate that the naive application of widely used identification strategies – including instrumental variables, regression discontinuity, and difference-in-differences – to qualitative outcomes leads to the estimation of quantities whose magnitude and sign depend on arbitrary coding choices. This renders conventional causal estimands devoid of economic meaning and calls into question their practical relevance. To address this issue, we propose an alternative framework centered on well-defined and interpretable estimands that characterize how treatment affects the probability distribution over outcome categories, thereby providing economically meaningful alternatives to conventional causal parameters.

We show that the assumptions underpinning standard identification strategies – or slight modifications thereof – are sufficient to identify the new estimands, ensuring their compatibility with conventional research designs. For estimation, we advocate for leveraging standard econometric tools while modeling category probabilities rather than outcome levels, thereby allowing researchers to continue using familiar methodologies while targeting causal parameters that are both interpretable and well-defined.

While we establish identification and estimation within standard cases for ease of illustration, our framework naturally extends to more complex settings, including instrumental variables with multiple instruments (see, e.g., [van 't Hoff et al., 2023](#); [Mogstad et al., 2018](#); [Mogstad and Torgovitsky, 2018](#); [Goff, 2024](#)), difference-in-differences with heterogeneous effects and staggered treatment adoption (see, e.g., [Callaway and Sant'Anna, 2021](#); [Sun and Abraham, 2021](#); [Borusyak et al., 2024](#); [Goodman-Bacon, 2021](#)), and fuzzy regression discontinuity designs (see, e.g., [Cattaneo and Titiunik, 2022](#)). We plan to continuously update our R package, `causalQual`, to incorporate these extensions as they develop.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Users interested in specific extensions are encouraged to contribute by submitting feature requests or discussions at <https://github.com/riccardo-df/causalQual/issues>.

## References

- AGRESTI, A. AND M. KATERI (2017): “Ordinal probability effect measures for group comparisons in multinomial cumulative link models,” *Biometrics*, 73, 214–219.
- ANGRIST, J. D. (2022): “Empirical strategies in economics: Illuminating the path from cause to effect,” *Econometrica*, 90, 2509–2539.
- ANGRIST, J. D., G. W. IMBENS, AND D. B. RUBIN (1996): “Identification of causal effects using instrumental variables,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91, 444–455.
- ANGRIST, J. D. AND J.-S. PISCHKE (2010): “The credibility revolution in empirical economics: How better research design is taking the con out of econometrics,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24, 3–30.
- ATHEY, S. AND G. W. IMBENS (2006): “Identification and inference in nonlinear difference-in-differences models,” *Econometrica*, 74, 431–497.
- ATHEY, S., J. TIBSHIRANI, AND S. WAGER (2019): “Generalized random forests,” *Annals of Statistics*, 47, 1148–1178.
- BORUSYAK, K., X. JARAVEL, AND J. SPIESS (2024): “Revisiting Event-Study Designs: Robust and Efficient Estimation,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 91, 3253–3285.
- CALLAWAY, B. AND P. H. SANT’ANNA (2021): “Difference-in-differences with multiple time periods,” *Journal of econometrics*, 225, 200–230.
- CALONICO, S., M. D. CATTANEO, AND R. TITIUNIK (2014): “Robust nonparametric confidence intervals for regression-discontinuity designs,” *Econometrica*, 82, 2295–2326.
- (2015): “Rdrobust: an R package for robust nonparametric inference in regression-discontinuity designs.” *R Journal*, 7, 38.

- CATTANEO, M. D. AND R. TITIUNIK (2022): “Regression discontinuity designs,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 14, 821–851.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., D. CHETVERIKOV, M. DEMIRER, E. DUFLO, C. HANSEN, W. NEWEY, AND J. ROBINS (2018): “Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters,” *The Econometrics Journal*, 21, C1–C68.
- CHIBA, Y. (2018): “Bayesian inference of causal effects for an ordinal outcome in randomized trials,” *Journal of Causal Inference*, 6, 20170019.
- DE CHAISEMARTIN, C. AND X. D’HAULTFÈUILLE (2023): “Two-Way Fixed Effects and Differences-in-Differences with Heterogeneous Treatment Effects: A Survey,” *The Econometrics Journal*, 26, 1–30.
- DI FRANCESCO, R. (2025): “Ordered correlation forest,” *Econometric Reviews*, 44, 416–432.
- FREY, B. S. AND A. STUTZER (2002): “What can economists learn from happiness research?” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40, 402–435.
- GOFF, L. (2024): “A Vector Monotonicity Assumption for Multiple Instruments,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 241, 105735.
- GOODMAN-BACON, A. (2021): “Difference-in-differences with variation in treatment timing,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 225, 254–277.
- IMBENS, G. W. (2022): “Causality in econometrics: Choice vs chance,” *Econometrica*, 90, 2541–2566.
- IMBENS, G. W. AND J. D. ANGRIST (1994): “Identification and Estimation of Local Average Treatment Effects,” *Econometrica*, 62, 467–475.
- IMBENS, G. W. AND T. LEMIEUX (2008): “Regression discontinuity designs: A guide to practice,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 142, 615–635.

- IMBENS, G. W. AND D. B. RUBIN (2015): *Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences: An Introduction*, Cambridge University Press.
- KUZIEMKO, I., M. I. NORTON, E. SAEZ, AND S. STANTCHEVA (2015): “How elastic are preferences for redistribution? Evidence from randomized survey experiments,” *American Economic Review*, 105, 1478–1508.
- LAFFERS, L. AND G. MELLACE (2020): “Identification of the average treatment effect when SUTVA is violated,” *Discussion Papers on Business and Economics, University of Southern Denmark*, 3.
- LECHNER, M. (2023): “Causal Machine Learning and its use for public policy,” *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics*, 159, 8.
- LEE, D. S. AND T. LEMIEUX (2010): “Regression discontinuity designs in economics,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 48, 281–355.
- LU, J., P. DING, AND T. DASGUPTA (2018): “Treatment effects on ordinal outcomes: Causal estimands and sharp bounds,” *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 43, 540–567.
- LU, J., Y. ZHANG, AND P. DING (2020): “Sharp bounds on the relative treatment effect for ordinal outcomes,” *Biometrics*, 76, 664–669.
- MASON, L. (2015): ““I disrespectfully agree”: The differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 59, 128–145.
- MAYZLIN, D., Y. DOVER, AND J. CHEVALIER (2014): “Promotional reviews: An empirical investigation of online review manipulation,” *American Economic Review*, 104, 2421–2455.
- MOGSTAD, M., A. SANTOS, AND A. TORGOVITSKY (2018): “Using Instrumental Variables for Inference about Policy Relevant Treatment Parameters,” *Econometrica*, 86, 1589–1619.

- MOGSTAD, M. AND A. TORGOVITSKY (2018): “Identification and Extrapolation of Causal Effects with Instrumental Variables,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 10, 577–613.
- NEYMAN, J. (1923): “Sur les Applications de la Théorie des Probabilités aux Experiences Agricoles: Essai des Principes,” *Roczniki Nauk Rolniczye*, 10, 1–51.
- PERACCHI, F. AND C. ROSSETTI (2012): “Heterogeneity in health responses and anchoring vignettes,” *Empirical Economics*, 42, 513–538.
- (2013): “The heterogeneous thresholds ordered response model: identification and inference,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 176, 703–722.
- REISINGER, J. (2022): “Subjective well-being and social desirability,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 214, 104745.
- ROTH, J., P. H. SANT’ANNA, A. BILINSKI, AND J. POE (2023): “What’s trending in difference-in-differences? A synthesis of the recent econometrics literature,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 235, 2218–2244.
- RUBIN, D. B. (1974): “Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies,” *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66, 688—701.
- SUN, L. AND S. ABRAHAM (2021): “Estimating Dynamic Treatment Effects in Event Studies with Heterogeneous Treatment Effects,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 225, 175–199.
- VAN ’T HOFF, N., A. LEWBEL, AND G. MELLACE (2023): “Limited Monotonicity and the Combined Compliers LATE,” Boston College Working Papers in Economics 1059, Boston College Department of Economics.
- VOLFOVSKY, A., E. M. AIROLDI, AND D. B. RUBIN (2015): “Causal inference for ordinal outcomes,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.01234*.



YAMAUCHI, S. (2020): “Difference-in-differences for ordinal outcomes: Application to the effect of mass shootings on attitudes toward gun control,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13404*.

## A Proofs

*Identification of the local probability shift.* By the Law of Total Probability,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|Z_i = z) &= \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 1, Z_i = z) \mathbb{P}(D_i = 1|Z_i = z) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 0, Z_i = z) \mathbb{P}(D_i = 0|Z_i = z).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|Z_i = 0) &= \\ &\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 1, Z_i = 1) \mathbb{P}(D_i = 1|Z_i = 1) + \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 0, Z_i = 1) \mathbb{P}(D_i = 0|Z_i = 1) \\ &- \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 1, Z_i = 0) \mathbb{P}(D_i = 1|Z_i = 0) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 0, Z_i = 0) \mathbb{P}(D_i = 0|Z_i = 0).\end{aligned}\tag{A.1}$$

By Assumption 5,  $\mathbb{P}(T_i = de) = 0$ , thus

$$\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1|Z_i = 0) = \mathbb{P}(T_i = at), \quad \mathbb{P}(D_i = 0|Z_i = 1) = \mathbb{P}(T_i = nt),\tag{A.2}$$

where Assumption 3 ensures that  $\mathbb{P}(T_i = t|Z_i) = \mathbb{P}(T_i = t)$ . Therefore, (A.1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|Z_i = 0) &= \\ &\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 1, Z_i = 1) \mathbb{P}(D_i = 1|Z_i = 1) + \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 0, Z_i = 1) \mathbb{P}(T_i = nt) \\ &- \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 1, Z_i = 0) \mathbb{P}(T_i = at) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 0, Z_i = 0) \mathbb{P}(D_i = 0|Z_i = 0).\end{aligned}\tag{A.3}$$

By Assumption 3, and using equation (1) and Assumption 4 to replace observable outcomes with potential outcomes, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m|D_i = 1, Z_i = 1) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(T_i = co) \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m|T_i = co) + \mathbb{P}(T_i = at) \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m|T_i = at)}{\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1|Z_i = 1)},$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | D_i = 0, Z_i = 0) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(T_i = co) \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m | T_i = co) + \mathbb{P}(T_i = nt) \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m | T_i = nt)}{\mathbb{P}(D_i = 0 | Z_i = 0)},$$

Moreover, by Assumption 5, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | D_i = 1, Z_i = 0) = \mathbb{P}(Y_i(1) = m | T_i = at)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | D_i = 0, Z_i = 1) = \mathbb{P}(Y_i(0) = m | T_i = nt).$$

Therefore, (A.3) simplifies to

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | Z_i = 0) = \mathbb{P}(T_i = co) \delta_{m,L}.$$

Finally, using previous results and Assumption 6,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_i = co) = \mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | Z_i = 0) > 0.$$

which implies

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(Y_i = m | Z_i = 0)}{\mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{P}(D_i = 1 | Z_i = 0)} = \delta_{m,L}.$$

□

## B Additional simulation details

For multinomial outcomes, we construct conditional probability mass functions by first computing linear predictors based on the covariates:

$$\eta_{mi}(d) = \beta_{m1}^d X_{i1} + \beta_{m2}^d X_{i2} + \beta_{m3}^d X_{i3}, \quad d = 0, 1,$$

and then transforming these predictors into valid probability distributions using the softmax function:

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_i(d) = m | \mathbf{X}_i) = \frac{\exp(\eta_{mi}(d))}{\sum_{m'} \exp(\eta_{m'i}(d))}, \quad d = 0, 1.$$

The coefficients used in the linear predictor models are specified as:

$$\beta_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0.3 & -0.2 \\ -0.2 & 0.4 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & -0.3 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \beta_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7 & 0.7 & -0.2 \\ -0.2 & 0.4 & 0.1 \\ -0.2 & -0.5 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For ordered outcomes, we first generate underlying latent potential outcomes

$$Y_i^*(d) = \tau d + \sum_j X_{ij} + \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad d = 0, 1,$$

and then obtain the ordered potential outcomes by discretizing  $Y_i^*(d)$  using fixed thresholds:

$$Y_i(d) = \sum_{m=1}^M m \mathbb{1}(\zeta_{m-1} < Y_i^*(d) \leq \zeta_m), \quad d = 0, 1,$$

with  $\zeta_1 = 2$ ,  $\zeta_2 = 3$ , and  $\tau = 2$ .