

How can I compute indirect effects with imputed data using Method 1?

Authored by
stats writer

July 1, 2024

RECOMMENDED CITATION

stats writer (2024). *How can I compute indirect effects with imputed data using Method 1?*. PSYCHOLOGICAL SCALES. Retrieved from <https://scales.arabpsychology.com/?p=163765>

Method 1 is a statistical approach used to compute indirect effects with imputed data. This method involves imputing missing data values and then using a regression model to estimate the indirect effects of a particular variable. The process starts by creating multiple imputed datasets, which are used to estimate the missing values. These datasets are then combined to create a single dataset, and the indirect effect is computed by running a regression analysis. This method is useful when dealing with incomplete data as it allows for a more accurate estimation of indirect effects and can provide valuable insights into the relationship between variables.

How can I compute indirect effects with imputed data? (Method 1) | Stata FAQ

NOTE: Code for this page was tested in Stata 12.

Computing indirect effects with multiply imputed data takes a few more step than for a conventional non-imputed model.

Let's begin by looking at the data.

use <https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/stat/data/hsbmar>, clear

sum science read math female

Variable | Obs Mean Std. Dev. Min Max

-----+-----

science | 193 51.57513 9.86396 26 74

read | 185 51.61622 10.19104 28 76

math | 190 52.17895 9.246168 33 75

female | 185 .5459459 .4992356 0 1

As you can see from the table above, all of the variables have a different number of observations. For our example science is the dependent variable, read is the mediator, math is the independent variable and female is a covariate.

The method we will use to compute an indirect effect involves the sureg and nlcom commands to get the product of coefficients.

So, what's the problem?

Why not just impute the data and run the analyses. Well, sureg does not work with imputed data unless we add the cmdok option to our mi estimate.

But then nlcom can't find the results in the correct location. nlcom looks for e(b) and e(V) but mi estimate saves the results in e(b_mi) and e(V_mi).

We can move the results to the correct location by writing an eclass

**program which we are calling called myeret.ado.
It makes use of the ereturn repost command.
Here is what the program looks like.**

```
prog myeret, eclass  
ereturn repost b=b V=V  
end
```

**It has to be declared to be an eclass command. The
repost
places matrix b into e(b) and V into
e(V).**

We saved the program in our ado/personal directory.

**Now, let's start our example analysis by running the
multiple imputation.**

```
mi set mlong
```

```
mi register imputed read math science female
```

```
set seed 485769
```

```
mi impute mvn read math science female = write,  
add(20)
```

Performing EM optimization:**observed log likelihood = -1349.5408 at iteration 7****Performing MCMC data augmentation ...****Multivariate imputation Imputations = 20****Multivariate normal regression added = 20****Imputed: m=1 through m=20 updated = 0****Prior: uniform Iterations = 2000****burn-in = 100****between = 100**-----
| Observations per m

|-----

Variable | Complete Incomplete Imputed | Total

-----+-----+

read | 185 15 15 | 200**math | 190 10 10 | 200****science | 193 7 7 | 200****female | 185 15 15 | 200**
-----**(complete + incomplete = total; imputed is the minimum
across m**

of the number of filled-in observations.)

If you try to run `mi estimate: sureg (read math female)(science read math female)`

you will get an error message that `sureg` is not officially supported.

However if you add the `cmdok` option it will run just fine.

`mi estimate, cmdok: sureg (read math female)(science read math female)`

Multiple-imputation estimates Imputations = 20

Number of obs = 200

Average RVI = 0.1236

Largest FMI = 0.1816

DF adjustment: Large sample DF: min = 594.26

avg = 1602.26

max = 3257.71

| Coef. Std. Err. t P>|t|

-----+-----
read |

math | .7030755 .0627357 11.21 0.000 .5800272 .8261238

```

female | -.8018491  1.156265 -0.69  0.488 -3.068929
1.465231
_cons | 15.58747  3.385455 4.60  0.000 8.949015 22.22592
-----+-----
science |
read | .3661471  .0686624 5.33  0.000 .23146 .5008342
math | .411848  .077228 5.33  0.000 .2602325 .5634634
female | -1.772933  1.122191 -1.58  0.115 -3.976875
.4310101
_cons | 12.17901  3.384061 3.60  0.000 5.53725 18.82077
-----

```

Next, we need to copy the `e(b_mi)` and `e(V_mi)` matrices.

```

matrix b = e(b_mi)
matrix V = e(V_mi)

```

To get all of the pieces into the right place we quietly run `sureg` on the imputation zero data followed by our `myeret` command that was shown above.

```

quietly sureg (read math female)(science read math
female) if _mi_m == 0

```

myeret

We are finally able to use the nlcom command to get the product of the coefficients.

```
nlcom _b*_b
```

```
_nl_1: _b*_b
```

```
-----
| Coef. Std. Err. z P>|z|
```

```
-----+-----
|_nl_1 | .257429 .0531467 4.84 0.000 .1532635 .3615946
```

To get the total effect of math just add the direct effect to the nlcom command above.

```
nlcom _b*_b + _b
```

```
_nl_1: _b*_b + _b
```

```
-----
| Coef. Std. Err. z P>|z|
```

-----+-----
_nl_1 | .669277 .0617048 10.85 0.000 .5483379 .7902161

And that is how you can compute an indirect effect using multiply imputed data.

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM