

Treatment Effects with Targeting Instruments^{*}

Sokbae Lee[†]

Bernard Salanié[‡]

November 14, 2023

Abstract

Multivalued treatments are commonplace in applications. We explore the use of discrete-valued instruments to control for selection bias in this setting. Our discussion revolves around the concept of targeting instruments: which instruments target which treatments. It allows us to establish conditions under which counterfactual averages and treatment effects are point- or partially-identified for composite complier groups. We illustrate the usefulness of our framework by applying it to data from the Head Start Impact Study. Under a plausible positive selection assumption, we derive informative bounds that suggest less beneficial effects of Head Start expansions than the parametric estimates of Kline and Walters (2016).

KEYWORDS: Identification, selection, multivalued treatments, discrete instruments, monotonicity.

^{*}This is a shorter, revised version of our “Filtered and Unfiltered Treatment Effects with Targeting Instruments” (first arXiv version July 2020). We thank Josh Angrist, Junlong Feng, Len Goff, and Jim Heckman for helpful comments. This work is in part supported by the European Research Council (ERC-2014-CoG-646917-ROMIA) and the UK Economic and Social Research Council for research grant (ES/P008909/1) to the CeMMAP.

[†]Department of Economics, Columbia University and Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice, Institute for Fiscal Studies, sl3841@columbia.edu.

[‡]Department of Economics, Columbia University, bsalanie@columbia.edu.

Introduction

Much of the literature on the evaluation of treatment effects has concentrated on the paradigmatic “binary/binary” example, in which both treatment and instrument only take two values. Multivalued treatments are common in actual policy implementations, however, as are multivalued instruments. Many different programs aim to help train job seekers for instance, and each of them has its own eligibility rules. Tax and benefit regimes distinguish many categories of taxpayers and eligible recipients. The choice of a college and major has many dimensions too, and responds to a variety of financial help programs and other incentives. Finally, more and more randomized experiments in economics resort to factorial designs¹.

As the training, education choice, and tax-benefit examples illustrate, multivalued treatments often are also subject to selection on unobservables. We explore in this paper the use of discrete-valued instruments in order to control for selection bias when evaluating such discrete-valued treatments. Our goal is to find conditions under which counterfactual averages and treatment effects are point- or partially identified for various (sometimes composite) complier groups.

In the binary/binary model, the analyst can usually take for granted that switching on the binary instrument makes treatment (weakly) more likely for all or no observations. This is satisfied under the local average treatment effect (LATE)-monotonicity assumption (e.g., Imbens and Angrist, 1994; Vytlacil, 2002; Heckman and Vytlacil, 2007a). With multiple instrument values and multiple treatments, there is often no natural ordering of instrument or treatment values that would give meaning to the word “monotonicity”². Even when some sort of monotonicity holds, there exist several groups of compliers—individuals whose treatment assignment changes with the value of the instrument.

Existing work on multivalued treatments under selection on observables includes Imbens (2000), Cattaneo (2010), and Ao, Calonico, and Lee (2021) among others. The use of instruments to evaluate the effects of multivalued treatments under selection on unobservables has received increasing attention in the literature. In previous work (Lee and Salanié, 2018), we analyzed the case when enough continuous instruments are available. Identification is of course more difficult when instruments only take discrete values. Angrist and Imbens (1995) analyzed two-stage least squares (TSLS) estimation when the treatment takes a finite number of ordered values. Closer to us, Heckman, Urzua, and Vytlacil (2006); Heckman and Vytlacil (2007b); Heckman, Urzua, and Vytlacil (2008) discussed the identification of treatment effects in the presence of discrete-valued instruments when assignment to treatment can be

¹Muralidharan, Romero, and Wüthrich (2023) review recent applications of factorial designs.

²This is why Heckman and Pinto (2018) defined an “unordered monotonicity” property; see also Navjeevan and Pinto (2022) for a detailed analysis of various monotonicity properties.

modeled as a discrete choice model. Several recent papers have studied the case of binary treatments with multiple instruments. Mogstad, Torgovitsky, and Walters (2021) and Goff (2023) analyzed the identifying power of different monotonicity assumptions in this context³. Others have studied models with binary instruments and multivalued or continuous treatments. Torgovitsky (2015), D’Haultfoeuille and Février (2015), Huang, Khalil, and Yildiz (2019), Caetano and Escanciano (2021), and Feng (2024) developed identification results for different models.

As can be seen from this list, the multiplicity of treatments and instruments may give rise to a bewildering number of cases. Rather than focusing on a very general case, we seek a parsimonious framework within which we can make constructive progress. In order to reduce the complexity of the problem, we start by imposing an additive random-utility model (ARUM) structure. While we do this mostly for practicality, we should note here that it is related to the unordered monotonicity property of Heckman and Pinto (2018), and applied by Pinto (2021) to the Moving to Opportunity program. Under ARUM, it is natural to speak of an instrument *targeting* a treatment when it increases its relative “mean value”. Most of our paper relies on the assumption of *strict targeting*, which obtains when each instrument only promotes the treatments it targets. Our use of “targeting” instruments is similar in spirit to Section 7.3 of Heckman and Vytlacil (2007b)⁴. We define it differently and we seek to identify a more general class of treatment effects.

To illustrate, consider the effect of various programs indexed by t on some outcomes of interest. Let each instrument value z stand for a policy regime, under which the access to some programs is made easier or harder than in a control group. Under ARUM, this translates into a profile of relative mean values of any treatment t under the policy regimes $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. We say that an instrument value z targets a treatment t when it maximizes its relative mean value. For simplicity, we will use the term “subsidy” to refer to any exogenous shift in the mean values, which may also stand for variations in costs or eligibility conditions. Each policy regime consists of values of subsidies for a subset of the programs; we assume that these subsidies enter mean values additively. Then a policy regime z *targets* a treatment t if it has the highest subsidy for this program among all policy regimes. *Strict targeting* requires that all policy regimes z' that do not target t have the same (lower) subsidy for t . In *one-to-one targeting*, each non-zero instrument targets one treatment only, and each treatment beyond the control is targeted by one instrument only.

³Mogstad, Torgovitsky, and Walters (2020) further apply their framework of monotonicity with multiple instruments to marginal treatment effects (e.g., Heckman and Vytlacil, 2001, 2005; Carneiro, Heckman, and Vytlacil, 2011).

⁴See also the recent contribution by Buchinsky, Gertler, and Pinto (2023), which uses revealed preference arguments.

Combining ARUM and assumptions on targeting allows us to point-identify the size of some complier groups and the corresponding counterfactual averages and treatment effects on any function of the outcomes, and to partially identify others. We use two examples to demonstrate the identification power and implications of ARUM and targeting. Our first example is a $2 \times T$ model where a binary instrument targets only one of $T \geq 3$ treatment values, as in Kline and Walters (2016). In our second example, three unordered treatment values target three instrument values. This 3×3 model was also studied by Kirkeboen, Leuven, and Mogstad (2016)⁵. Unlike them, we do not assume that the data contains information on next-best alternatives. We obtain novel identification results for both examples; they lead to new estimands or bounds for average treatment effects on various groups. Further identifying assumptions such as *positive selection* can refine these bounds.

To illustrate the usefulness of our framework, we apply it to the Head Start Impact Study (HSIS). Kline and Walters (2016) revisited the HSIS; they took into account the presence of a substitute treatment (alternative preschools in this case)⁶. They found that Head Start was only beneficial for children who would not have attended an other preschool program instead. We confirm the importance of taking into consideration alternative preschools when evaluating Head Start. Unlike Kline and Walters (2016), we do not rely on parametric selection models. Under a plausible positive selection assumption, our estimates suggest that the large difference between complier groups that they find can only be rationalized under *negative* selection into Head Start. As a by-product, we provide an upper bound on the welfare effect of expanding access to Head Start. Interestingly, the estimated upper bound turns out to be lower than their point estimate; and it yields a lower marginal value for public funds used in expanding access to Head Start.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 defines our framework. In Section 2, we define and discuss the concepts of targeting, one-to-one targeting, and strict targeting. Section 3 derives their implications for the identification of population shares, counterfactual averages, and the effects of the treatments on various complier groups. Finally, we present estimation results for Head Start in Section 4. The Appendices contain the proofs of all propositions and lemmata, along with some additional material.

⁵See also more recent work by Bhuller and Sigstad (2023), and Heinesen, Hvid, Kirkeboen, Leuven, and Mogstad (2022), Nibbering, Oosterveen, and Silva (2022).

⁶Kamat (2023) also analyzed the average effects of Head Start preschool access using the HSIS dataset.

1 The Framework

In all of the paper, we denote observations as $i = 1, \dots, n$. Each observation consists of covariates X_i , instruments Z_i , outcome variables Y_i , and treatments T_i . We assume that the covariates X_i are exogenous to treatment assignment and outcomes. Since they will not play any role in our identification strategy, we condition on the covariates throughout and we omit them from the notation. All of our results should therefore be interpreted as conditional on X .

We focus in this paper on treatment variables that take discrete values, which we label $t \in \mathcal{T}$. For simplicity, we will call $T = t$ “treatment t ”. These values do not have to be ordered; e.g., when $t = 2$ is available, it does not necessarily indicate “more treatment” than $t = 1$. We assume that the only available instruments are discrete-valued, and we label their values as $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.

We will use the standard counterfactual notation: $T_i(z)$ and $Y_i(t, z)$ denote respectively potential treatments and outcomes. $\mathbf{1}(A)$ denotes the indicator of set A .

The validity of the instruments requires the usual exclusion and independence restrictions:

Assumption 1 (Valid Instruments). *(i) $Y_i(t, z) = Y_i(t)$ for all (t, z) in $\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{Z}$.*

(ii) $Y_i(t)$ and $T_i(z)$ are independent of Z_i for all (t, z) in $\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{Z}$.

Under Assumption 1, we define $T_i := T_i(Z_i)$ and $Y_i := Y_i(T_i)$. Throughout the paper, we assume that we observe (Y_i, Z_i) for each i . In addition, the instruments must be relevant. In the usual binary instrument/binary treatment case (hereafter “binary/binary”), this translates into a requirement that the propensity score vary with the instruments. In our more general setting, we impose:

Assumption 2 (Relevant Instruments). *Let \mathbf{Z}_i denote a column vector whose elements are $\mathbf{1}(Z_i = z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, and \mathbf{T}_i denote a column vector whose elements are $\mathbf{1}(T_i = t)$ for $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Then $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}_i \mathbf{T}_i^\top]$ has full rank.*

1.1 Restricting Heterogeneity

As in most of this literature, we will need an assumption that restricts the heterogeneity in the counterfactual mappings $T_i(z)$. In the binary/binary model, this is most often done by imposing LATE-monotonicity. As is well-known, LATE-monotonicity imposes that (denoting instrument values as $z = 0, 1$) (i) or (ii) must hold:

(i) for each observation i , $T_i(1) \geq T_i(0)$;

(ii) for each observation i , $T_i(0) \geq T_i(1)$.

With more than two treatment values and/or more than two instrument values, there are many ways to restrict the heterogeneity in treatment assignment. Since treatments may not be ordered in any meaningful way, we cannot apply the results in Angrist and Imbens (1995) for instance. Mogstad, Torgovitsky, and Walters (2021) state several versions of monotonicity for a binary treatment model with $|\mathcal{Z}| > 2$. They propose a “partial monotonicity” assumption which applies binary LATE-monotonicity component by component. This requires that the instruments be interpretable as combinations of component instruments, which is not necessarily the case here.

To cut through this complexity, we assume from now on that assignment to treatment can be represented by an Additive Random-Utility Model (ARUM), that is by a discrete choice problem with additively separable errors:

$$T_i(z) = \arg \max_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (U_z(t) + u_{it})$$

for some real numbers $U_z(t)$ which are common across observations, and random vectors $(u_{it})_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ that are distributed independently of Z_i . We do not restrict the codependence of the random variables u_{it} , or their support. The usual models of multinomial choice belong to this family. ARUM also includes ordered treatments, for which $u_{it} \equiv \sigma(t)u_i$ for some increasing positive function σ .

Imposing an ARUM structure will greatly simplify our discussion of treatment assignment. It incorporates a substantial restriction, however. Suppose that observation i has treatment values t under z and t' under z' . By the ARUM structure, this implies

$$\begin{aligned} U_z(t) + u_{it} &\geq U_z(t') + u_{it'} \\ U_{z'}(t') + u_{it'} &\geq U_{z'}(t) + u_{it}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two restrictions implies an “increasing differences” property:

$$U_{z'}(t') - U_{z'}(t) \geq U_z(t') - U_z(t).$$

This inequality in turn is incompatible with the existence of an observation j that has treatment values t' under z and t under z' . Thus we rule out “two-way flows”: if a change in the value of an instrument causes an observation to shift from a treatment value t to a treatment value t' , it can cause no other observation to switch from t' to t . The argument above is a special case of the general discussion in Heckman and Pinto (2018); their Theorem T-3 shows that the treatment assignment models that satisfy unordered monotonicity for each

pair of instrument values can be represented as an ARUM.

1.2 Assignment to Treatment

Assumption 3 defines the class of models of assignment to treatment that we analyze in this paper.

Assumption 3 (ARUM). *The treatment assignment model consists of:*

1. *a finite set $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1, \dots, |\mathcal{T}| - 1\}$;*
2. *a finite set of instrument values $\mathcal{Z} = \{0, 1, \dots, |\mathcal{Z}| - 1\}$;*
3. *an ARUM model of treatment:*

$$T_i(z) = \arg \max_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (U_z(t) + u_{it}),$$

where the vector $(u_{it})_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is distributed independently of Z_i .

Without loss of generality, we normalize $U_z(0) = 0$ for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.

We will often refer to the $U_z(t)$ as “mean values”. This is only meant to simplify the exposition; it is consistent with, but need not refer to, preferences on the part of the agent. Note that when $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1\}$, Assumption 3 is just the standard monotonicity assumption, with a threshold-crossing rule

$$T_i(z) = \mathbb{1}(u_{i0} - u_{i1} \leq U_z(1)).$$

If we add a third treatment value so that $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1, 2\}$, the ARUM assumption starts to bite as it excludes two-way flows in the treatment model. However, the combination of Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 is far from sufficient to identify interesting treatment effects in general. In order to better understand what is needed, we now resort to the notion of *response-groups* of observations, whose members share the same mapping from instruments z to treatments t . We first state a general definition⁷.

Definition 1 (Response-vectors and Response-groups). Let R be an element of the Cartesian product $\mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ and $R(z) \in \mathcal{T}$ denote its component for instrument value $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.

- Observation i has (elemental) *response-vector* R if and only if for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $T_i(z) = R(z)$. The set C_R denotes the set of observations with response-vector R and we call it a *response-group*.

⁷This is analogous to the definitions in Heckman and Pinto (2018).

- We extend the definition in the natural way to incompletely specified mappings, where each $R(z)$ is a subset of \mathcal{T} . We call the corresponding response-vectors and response-groups *composite*. In particular, if $R(z) = \mathcal{T}$ we denote it by an asterisk in the corresponding position.
- If $C = C_R$, we denote $C_{(z)} = R(z)$ the set of treatment values assigned under z to observations in C .

To illustrate, consider the binary instrument/binary treatment case. It has a priori $2^2 = 4$ response vectors, $R \in \{00, 01, 10, 11\}$ with corresponding response-groups $C_{00}, C_{01}, C_{10}, C_{11}$. In this notation, the first number refers to a treatment value with $z = 0$ and the second number with $z = 1$. For instance, C_{01} refers to those with $T_i(0) = 0$ and $T_i(1) = 1$, while the composite response-group C_{*1} , for which $R(0) = \{0, 1\}$, represents the union of C_{01} and C_{11} . The LATE-monotonicity assumption implies that either C_{01} or C_{10} is empty.

2 Targeting

We start by introducing additional assumptions on the underlying treatment model. We will illustrate these assumptions on two examples which we call the “binary instrument model” or the “ $2 \times T$ ” model; and the “ 3×3 model”. We first define them briefly.

Example 1 (The binary instrument ($2 \times T$) model). $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1, \dots, T-1\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \{0, 1\}$. This could for instance represent an intent-to-treat model, where agents in the control group $Z = 0$ are not treated ($T = 0$) and agents with $Z = 1$ self-select the type of the treatment $T \geq 1$ or opt out altogether ($T = 0$). \square


When $|T| = 3$, treatment assignment can be represented in the $(u_{i1} - u_{i0}, u_{i2} - u_{i0})$ plane. The points of coordinates $P_z = (-U_z(1), -U_z(2))$ play an important role as for a given z ,

- $T_i(z) = 0$ to the south-west of P_z ;
- $T_i(z) = 1$ to the right of P_z and below the diagonal that goes through it;
- $T_i(z) = 2$ above P_z and above the diagonal that goes through it.

Treatment assignment is illustrated in Figure 1 for a given z , where the origin is in P_z . We will make recurrent use of this type of figure.

Example 2 (3×3 model). Assume that $\mathcal{Z} = \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1, 2\}$. As a leading example, Kirkeboen, Leuven, and Mogstad (2016) investigate the 3×3 model in order to analyze the effect of students’ choice of field of study on their earnings; each instrument value shifts the eligibility of a student for a given field. We will return to this application in Section 3.3.

Figure 1: Treatment assignment for $|T| = 3$ for given z



“Targeting” will be the common thread in our analysis. Just as in general economic discussions a policy measure may target a particular outcome, we will speak of instruments (in the econometric sense) targeting the assignment to a particular treatment.

Under Assumption 3, assignment to treatment is governed by the differences in mean values $(U_z(t) - U_z(\tau))$ and by the differences in unobservables $u_{it} - u_{i\tau}$. Only the former depend on the instrument. We will say that an instrument value z *targets* a treatment value t if it maximizes the mean utility $U_z(t)$.

Definition 2 (Targeted Treatments and Targeting Instruments). For any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$, let

$$\bar{U}(t) \equiv \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} U_z(t) \text{ and } Z^*(t) \equiv \arg \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} U_z(t)$$

denote the maximum value of $U_z(t)$ over $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and the set of maximizers, respectively. If $Z^*(t)$ is not all of \mathcal{Z} , then we will say that the instrument values $z \in Z^*(t)$ *target* treatment value t ; and we write $t \in T^*(z)$. We denote by \mathcal{T}^* the set of targeted treatments and $\mathcal{Z}^* = \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}^*} Z^*(t)$ the set of targeting instruments.

Definition 2 calls for several remarks. First, by construction $U_z(0) \equiv 0$ and $Z^*(0) = \mathcal{Z}$. Therefore $t = 0$ is not in \mathcal{T}^* ; the set \mathcal{T}^* may exclude other treatment values, however. If a treatment value t is not targeted ($t \notin \mathcal{T}^*$), by definition the function $z \rightarrow U_z(t)$ is constant over $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, with value $\bar{U}(t)$. If an instrument value z does not target any treatment ($z \notin \mathcal{Z}^*$), then $U_z(t) < \bar{U}(t)$ for every $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$. While non-targeted treatment values ($t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^*$) have mean values that do not respond to changes in the instruments, these mean values may and in general will differ across treatments. The probability that an individual observation takes a treatment $t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^*$ also generally depends on the value of the instrument.

It is important to note here that the values $U_z(t)$ and therefore the targeting maps Z^* and \mathcal{T}^* are not observable; any assumption on targeting instruments and targeted treatments

must be a priori and context-dependent. As we will see, these prior assumptions sometimes have consequences that can be tested.

Let us return to the illustration that we used in the introduction. A policy regime z consists of a set of (possibly zero or negative) subsidies $S_z(t)$ for treatments $t \in \mathcal{T}$. If there is a no-subsidy regime $z = 0$ with $S_0(t) = 0$ for all t , it seems natural to write the mean value as $U_z(t) = U_0(t) + S_z(t)$. Then for any treatment t , the set $Z^*(t)$ consists of the instrument values z that subsidize t most heavily.

As this illustration suggests, the sets $Z^*(t)$ may not be singletons, and they may well intersect. We now introduce two more restrictive definitions that rule out these two possibilities.

Definition 3 (Injective and one-to-one targeting). Targeting is *injective* when the correspondence Z^* has an injective selection z^* . When targeting is injective, we relabel targeted treatments $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$ and the corresponding instrument values $z^*(t)$ so that $\mathcal{T}^* = \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{T}^*|\}$ and $z^*(t) = t$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$.

Targeting is *one-to-one* when both $Z^* : \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}^*$ and $T^* : \mathcal{Z}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^*$ are functions.

When targeting is injective, the sets $Z^*(t)$ may not intersect. If it is one-to-one, then the injective selection is unique: $Z^*(t) = \{z^*(t)\} = \{t\}$. Injective targeting obviously requires that there be at least as many targeting instruments as targeted treatments; Hall's marriage theorem⁸ gives a necessary and sufficient condition.

Lemma 1 (Modes of Targeting). *Targeting is injective if and only if for every subset S of \mathcal{T}^* , the number of targeted treatments in S does not exceed the number of instruments that target them. That is,*

$$(2.1) \quad |S| \leq |Z^*(S)|,$$

where $Z^*(S)$ denotes the set of all values in $Z^*(t)$ for $t \in S$.

Targeting is one-to-one if and only if all inequalities in (2.1) are equalities.

Let us illustrate these varieties of targeting on Example 2.

Example 2 continued. Table 1 shows the values of $U_z(t)$ in the 3×3 model of Example 2. Suppose that $t = 1$ is targeted; choose some z that targets it and relabel it as $z = 1$. This means that

$$b \geq \max(a, c) \text{ and } b > \min(a, c).$$

⁸See for instance Roth and Sotomayor (1990, p. 210).

If $t = 2$ is also targeted, and targeting is injective, we can choose some $z \neq 1$ in $Z^*(2)$ and relabel it as $z = 2$. This gives

$$f \geq \max(d, e) \text{ and } f > \min(d, e).$$

Finally, if targeting is one-to-one we have $b > \max(a, c)$ and $f > \max(d, e)$.

Table 1: Values of $U_z(t)$ in the 3×3 model

	$t = 0$	$t = 1$	$t = 2$
$z = 0$	0	a	d
$z = 1$	0	b	e
$z = 2$	0	c	f

2.1 Consequences of One-to-One Targeting

In this subsection, we impose

Assumption 4 (One-to-one Targeting). *Targeting is one-to-one.*

Remember that under Assumption 4, we can relabel instrument values so that if t is targeted, then it is targeted by $z = t$. Moreover, $t_i^*(z)$ must equal z .

This implies some useful restrictions on response-groups.

Proposition 1 (Response-groups under one-to-one targeting). *Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 4, take a targeted treatment $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$.*

- (i) *If an observation i has $T_i(t) = 0$, then it never receives treatment t : $T_i(z) \neq t$ for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.*
- (ii) *As a consequence, all response-groups C_R with $R(t) = 0$ and $R(z) = t$ for some $z \neq t$ are empty.*

Example 2 (continued) Return to the 3×3 model and to Table 1. Suppose that both $t = 1$ and $t = 2$ are targeted. Under the conditions of Proposition 1, we have $b > \max(a, c)$ and $f > \max(d, e)$.

Since the points P_z have coordinates $(-U_z(1), -U_z(2))$,


- $P_1 = (-b, -e)$ must lie to the left of $P_0 = (-a, -d)$ and of $P_2 = (-c, -f)$,
- P_2 must lie below P_0 and P_1 .

This is easily rephrased in terms of the response-vectors of definition 1. First note that in the 3×3 case, there are a priori $3^3 = 27$ response-vectors, $R = 000$ to $R = 222$, with corresponding response-groups C_{000} to C_{222} . Groups C_{ddd} are “always-takers”⁹ of treatment value d . All other groups are “compliers” of some kind, in that their treatment changes under some changes in the instrument. We will also pay special attention to some non-elemental groups. For instance, C_{0*2} will denote the group who is assigned treatment 0 under $z = 0$ and treatment 2 under $z = 2$, and any treatment under $z = 1$. That is,

$$C_{0*2} = C_{002} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{022}.$$

Assumptions 3 and 4 together imply the emptiness of four composite groups out of the 27 possible: C_{10*} , C_{*01} , C_{*20} , and C_{2*0} by Proposition 1. They correspond to 10 elemental groups¹⁰. This still leaves us with 17 elemental groups, and potentially complex assignment patterns. Consider for instance Figure 2. It shows one possible configuration for the 3×3 model; the positions for P_0, P_1 and P_2 are consistent with Assumptions 3 and 4.

Figure 2: A 3×3 example



The number of distinct response-groups (ten in this case) and the contorted shape of the C_{212} and C_{112} groups in Figure 2 point to the difficulties we face in identifying response-groups without further assumptions. Moreover, this is only one possible configuration: other cases exist, which would bring up other response-groups.

Heckman and Pinto (2018, pp. 16–20), Pinto (2021), and Kirkeboen, Leuven, and Mogstad (2016) also studied the 3×3 model; they proposed sets of assumptions that identify some treatment effects. The example in Heckman and Pinto (2018, pp. 16–20) is rather specific.

⁹Observations in group C_{000} are usually called the “never-takers”. We prefer not to break the symmetry in our notation. We hope this will not cause confusion.

¹⁰Specifically, they are: $C_{100}, C_{101}, C_{102}, C_{001}, C_{201}, C_{020}, C_{120}, C_{220}, C_{200}$, and C_{210} .

We show in Appendix C how to apply our framework to the Moving to Opportunity experiment studied in Pinto (2021). The setup in Kirkeboen, Leuven, and Mogstad (2016) is most similar to ours; we will return to the differences between our approach and theirs in Section 3.2. \square

2.2 Strict Targeting

Figure 2 suggests that if we could make sure that P_1 is directly to the left of P_0 , the shape of C_{212} would become nicer—and group C_{202} would be empty. Bringing P_2 directly under P_0 would have a similar effect. This translates directly into assumptions on the dependence of the $U_z(t)$ on the instruments: the first one imposes $d = e$ and the second one imposes $a = c$. This can be interpreted as policy regime $z = 1$ (resp. $z = 2$) subsidizing treatment $t = 1$ (resp. $z = 2$) only. To return to the general model, there are applications in which the instruments $z \in Z^*(t)$, which maximize $U_z(t)$, do not shift assignment between the other values of the treatment. The following definition is a direct extension of this discussion.

Definition 4 (Strict Targeting of Treatment t). Take any targeted treatment value $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$. It is strictly targeted if the function $z \in \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow U_z(t)$ takes the same value for all instruments that do not target t (the values $z \notin Z^*(t)$). We denote this common value by $\underline{U}(t)$, and we will say of the instrument values $z \in Z^*(t)$ that they strictly target t .

Under strict targeting, turning on instrument $z \in Z^*(t)$ promotes treatment t without affecting the mean values $U_z(t')$ of other treatment values t' . This explains our use of the term “strict targeting”. In this ARUM specification, an instrument in $Z^*(t)$ plays the same role as a price discount on good t in a model of demand for goods whose mean values only depend on their own prices. In the language of program subsidies, all $z \in Z^*(t)$ subsidize t at the same high rate, and all other instrument values offer the same, lower subsidy.

Note that strict targeting only bites if \mathcal{Z} contains at least three instrument values. If $|\mathcal{Z}| = 2$ (one binary instrument, as in our Example 1) and say $z = 1$ targets t , then $\mathcal{Z} \setminus Z^*(t)$ can only consist of $z = 0$ and Assumption 5 trivially holds.

Finally, we should emphasize that one-to-one targeting and strict targeting are logically independent assumptions: neither one implies the other. Consider the 3×3 model of Example 2 under one-to-one targeting; strict targeting only holds for $t = 1$ if $a = c$, and for $t = 2$ if $d = e$. On the other hand, the 3×3 model with $b > a = c$ and $e > d = f$ satisfies strict targeting but not one-to-one targeting, as $t = 1$ is targeted by both $z = 1$ and $z = 2$.

2.3 Consequences of Strict Targeting

Now consider the general model. If a treatment t is strictly targeted, then $U_z(t)$ can only take one of two values: $\bar{U}(t)$ if z targets t , and $\underline{U}(t)$ otherwise. By definition, if t is not targeted then the value of $U_z(t)$ does not depend on z ; we also denote it $\underline{U}(t)$.

We will assume in this subsection that all targeted treatments are strictly targeted:

Assumption 5 (Strict targeting). *If t is in \mathcal{T}^* , then t is strictly targeted.*

Under strict targeting, the values of $U_z(t)$ are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Values of $U_z(t)$ under strict targeting

	$t \in T^*(z)$	$t \notin T^*(z)$
$z \in Z^*$	$\bar{U}(t)$	$\underline{U}(t)$
$z \notin Z^*$	$\underline{U}(t)$	$\underline{U}(t)$

For simplicity, we work from now on under the assumption that the distribution of the error terms in the ARUM has no mass points.

Assumption 6 (Absolutely continuous errors). *The distribution of the random vector $(u_{it})_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is absolutely continuous.*

Consider an observation i under strict targeting. If it is assigned an instrument value z , it can end up with one of the treatment values t that z targets (if any), with a value $\bar{U}(t) + u_{it}$ in the ARUM. Alternatively, if its treatment is some t' that z does not target, then the ARUM value will be $\underline{U}(t') + u_{it'}$. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 5 (Top targeted and top alternative treatments). Take any observation i in the population.

- (i) For any targeting instrument $z \in \mathcal{Z}^*$, let

$$V_i^*(z) = \max_{t \in T^*(z)} (\bar{U}(t) + u_{it})$$

and $T_i^*(z) \subset T^*(z)$ denote the set of maximizers. We call the elements of $T_i^*(z)$ the *top targeted treatments* for observation i under instrument value z .

- (ii) Also define

$$\underline{V}_i = \max_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\underline{U}(t) + u_{it})$$

and let $\underline{T}_i \subset \mathcal{T}$ denote the set of maximizers. We call the elements of \underline{T}_i the *top alternative treatments* for observation i .

- (iii) Under Assumption 6, the sets $T_i^*(z)$ and \underline{T}_i are singletons¹¹ with probability 1; we let $t_i^*(z)$ and \underline{t}_i denote the top targeted treatment and the top alternative treatment.

The term “top alternative treatment” may read like a misnomer since the maximization runs over all treatment values. The following result justifies it; more importantly, it shows that strict targeting imposes a lot of structure on the mapping from instruments to treatments.

Proposition 2 (Response groups under strict targeting). *Let Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 hold. Let i be any observation in the population. For any instrument value z , $T_i(z)$ is either the top targeted treatment or the top alternative treatment. If z is not a targeting instrument, $T_i(z)$ can only be the top alternative treatment. That is:*

- (i) *if $z \in \mathcal{Z}^*$, then $T_i(z)$ is $t_i^*(z)$ if $V_i^*(z) > \underline{V}_i$; if $V_i^*(z) < \underline{V}_i$, then $T_i(z) = \underline{t}_i$ and \underline{t}_i is not targeted by z .*
- (ii) *if $z \notin \mathcal{Z}^*$, then $T_i(z)$ is \underline{t}_i .*

Note that in a sense, all instrument values in $\mathcal{Z} \setminus \mathcal{Z}^*$ are equivalent under strict targeting. If z and z' are both in \mathcal{Z}^* , then the functions U_z and $U_{z'}$ coincide on all of \mathcal{T} and the counterfactual treatments $T_i(z)$ and $T_i(z')$ must be in \underline{T}_i for any observation i .

In the 2×2 model, we have $\bar{U}(1) = U_1(1)$ and $\underline{U}_0 = \underline{U}_1 = 0$. A complier is an observation $i \in C_{01}$; it is in treatment arm $t = 0$ when $z = 0$ and in $t^*(1) = 1$ when $z = 1$. In our more general model, it seems natural to define a *t-complier* as an observation i that is in treatment arm t when assigned an instrument value z such that $t_i^*(z) = t$, and only then. This is, clearly, a composite group. Take the 3×3 model as an example, and assume that $t^*(1) = 1$. Then the set of 1-compliers consists of the five response-groups C_{010} , C_{012} , C_{111} , C_{112} , and C_{212} .

2.4 Strict one-to-one targeting

We now impose one-to-one targeting (Assumption 4) as well as strict targeting. Under one-to-one targeting, the sets $Z^*(t)$ and $T^*(z)$ are singletons; and each targeting instrument z can be relabeled as the treatment value $t = t_i^*(z)$ that it targets.

Corollary 1 (Treatment assignment under strict, one-to-one targeting). *Take any observation i . Let A_i be the (possibly empty) subset of $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$ such that $T_i(t) = t$. Then under Assumptions 1 to 6,*

1. $T_i(t) = \underline{t}_i$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus A_i$;

¹¹Note that this does not extend to the sets $Z^*(t)$ and $T^*(z)$, which can still have several elements.

2. if \underline{t}_i is a targeted treatment, it must belong to A_i .

The pair (A_i, \underline{t}_i) defines an elemental response group which we denote $C(A_i, \underline{t}_i)$. The family of sets $\{C(A, t) \mid A \subset \mathcal{T}^*, t \notin \mathcal{T}^* \setminus A\}$ form a partition of the set of observations.

Note that the $C(A, t)$ notation is just a shortcut: every $C(A, t)$ is an elemental group, and every elemental group is a $C(A, t)$. If for instance $|\mathcal{T}| = 6$, it is just more convenient to write $C(\{1, 3\}, 2)$ than to write C_{212322} .

If $\underline{t}_i \notin \mathcal{T}^*$ and the set A_i is non-empty, then the observation i is what one could call a *strict A_i -complier*: when the value of the instrument moves from $\mathcal{Z} \setminus A_i$ to $t \in A_i$, observation i switches from its top alternative treatment \underline{t}_i to the treatment t . In the 3-by-3 model with $\mathcal{T}^* = \{1, 2\}$, there are three groups of strict compliers: $C_{010} = C(\{1\}, 0)$, $C_{002} = C(\{2\}, 0)$, and $C_{012} = C(\{1, 2\}, 0)$.

Strict one-to-one targeting brings us very close to the main identifying assumption in Heckman and Vytlacil (2007b, Assumption B-2a, p. 5006): the indicator variable $\mathbf{1}(Z = t)$ can be used as the $Z^{[t]}$ in their assumption. Heckman and Vytlacil use their Assumption B-2a to identify the effect of the preferred treatment t relative to the next-best treatment. Their complier group consists of those individuals who choose treatment t under $Z = z$ and another treatment under $Z = z'$. This can be a very heterogeneous group, as our examples will show. To paraphrase Heckman and Vytlacil (2007b, p. 5013): the mean effect of treatment t versus the next best option is a weighted average over $t' \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{t\}$ of the effect of treatment t versus treatment t' , conditional on t' being the next best option, weighted by the probability that t' is the next best option. In contrast, we seek a complete characterization of all treatment effects that can be identified under this set of assumptions.

3 Identification

Now that we have characterized response-groups, we seek to identify the probabilities of the corresponding response-groups in the treatment model.

Definition 6 (Generalized propensity scores). We write $P(t|z)$ for the generalized propensity score $\Pr(T_i = t | Z_i = z)$.

Under strict, one-to-one targeting, the response-groups are easily enumerated.

Proposition 3 (Counting response-groups under strict, one-to-one targeting). *Suppose that p treatment values are targeted and q are not. Under Assumptions 1 to 6, the number of response-groups is $N \equiv (p + 2q) \times 2^{p-1}$.*

As the probabilities of the response-groups must sum to one, we have $(N - 1)$ unknowns. The data gives us the generalized propensity scores $P(t|z)$ for $(t, z) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{Z}$. The adding-up constraints $\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} P(t|z) = 1$ for each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ reduce the count of independent data points to $(|\mathcal{T}| - 1) \times |\mathcal{Z}| = (p + q - 1)(p + 1)$.

Table 3: Identifying the sizes of the response groups under strict, one-to-one targeting

Row	\mathcal{T}	p	q	Unknowns	Equations	Required	Example
(1)	$\{0,1\}$	1	1	2	2	0	<i>LATE</i>
(2)	$\{0,1,\dots, \mathcal{T} - 1\}$	1	$ \mathcal{T} - 1$	$2(\mathcal{T} - 1)$	$2(\mathcal{T} - 1)$	0	Example 1
(3)	$\{0,1,2\}$	2	1	7	6	1	Example 2

Table 3 shows some values of the number of equations and the number of unknowns $(N - 1)$ for three examples. The first row has $|\mathcal{T}| = |\mathcal{Z}| = 2$; it generates the standard LATE case, where the response group consists of never-takers (C_{00}), compliers (C_{01}), and always-takers (C_{11}). Row (2) is another case of exact identification. Row (3) shows that one restriction is required to identify the sizes of the response-groups for the 3×3 model. More generally, the degree of underidentification increases exponentially with the number of targeted treatments p .

It is not difficult to write down the equations that link observed propensity scores and group probabilities.

Proposition 4 (Identifying equations for group sizes under strict, one-to-one targeting). *Under Assumptions 1 to 6, the empirical content of the generalized propensity scores of the treatment model is the following system of equations, for all $(z, t) \in \mathcal{T}^2$:*

$$(3.1) \quad P(t|z) = \sum_{A \subset \mathcal{T}^* \setminus \{z\}} \mathbf{1}(t \in \bar{A}) \Pr(i \in C(A, t)) \\ + \sum_{A \subset \mathcal{T}^*} \mathbf{1}(t = z \in A) \sum_{\tau \in \bar{A}} \Pr(i \in C(A, \tau))$$

where we denote $\bar{A} \equiv (\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^*) \cup A$.

While this may look cryptic, it follows directly from Corollary 1: the first line corresponds to $z \in \mathcal{T} \setminus A_i$ and $t = \underline{t}_i$, and the second line corresponds to $t = z \in A_i$. The set $\bar{A}_i \equiv (\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^*) \cup A_i$ contains the non-targeted treatments and those for which $T_i(t) = t$. These formulæ are easy enough to apply in specific cases, as we will see.

To simplify the exposition, we introduce one more element of notation.

Definition 7 (Conditional average outcomes and group average outcomes). For any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$, we define the *conditional average outcome* by

$$\bar{E}_z(t) = \mathbb{E}(Y_i \mathbf{1}(T_i = t) | Z_i = z).$$

For any response-group C and treatment value $t \in \mathcal{T}$, we define the *group average outcome* as

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i(t) | i \in C).$$

While the conditional average outcomes $\bar{E}_z(t)$ are directly identified from the data, the group average outcomes of course are not. We do know that some of them are zero; and that they combine with the group probabilities to form the conditional average outcomes. We will use the following identity repeatedly:

Lemma 2 (Decomposing conditional average outcomes). *Let $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Then*

$$\bar{E}_z(t) = \sum_{C \mid C_{(z)}=t} \mathbb{E}(Y_i(t) | i \in C) \Pr(i \in C),$$

where $C_{(z)} = t$ means that response group C has treatment t when assigned instrument z . In addition,

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i | Z_i = z) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \bar{E}_z(t).$$

The combination of Lemma 2 and Proposition 2 (under strict targeting) or Proposition 4 (under strict, one-to-one targeting) summarizes the empirical content of the model. Under strict, one-to-one targeting, the set of response-groups C such that $C_{(z)} = t$ is as enumerated in Proposition 4: it consists of

- all $C(A, t)$ such that $A \subset \mathcal{T}^* \setminus \{z\}$ and $t \in \bar{A}$;
- and, if $t = z$, all $C(A, \tau)$ for $z \in A \subset \mathcal{T}^*$ and $\tau \in \bar{A}$.

Note that while we state all of our results in terms of effects of the treatment on the expectation of the outcomes Y , we could replace Y with any finite-mean function $g(Y)$ everywhere. In particular, we could take $g(Y) = \mathbf{1}(Y \leq t)$ for some value t and identify the effects of the treatment on the cumulative distribution function of the outcome; by inversion, we would recover the quantile treatment effects.

3.1 The Binary Instrument Model

Recall that with a binary instrument, strict targeting is trivially satisfied. Under one-to-one targeting, Proposition 4 can be applied directly to some of the rows of Table 3.

3.1.1 Identification Under One-to-one Targeting

Row (2) of Table 3 shows that the group probabilities are just identified in our Example 1 under strict, one-to-one targeting. Proposition 4 gives $2(T - 1)$ independent equations: for $t \neq 1$,

$$P(t|0) = \Pr(i \in C(\emptyset, t)) + \Pr(i \in C(\{1\}, t)) \quad \text{and} \quad P(t|1) = \Pr(i \in C(\emptyset, t)).$$

Moreover, $C(\emptyset, t) = C_{tt}$ for $t \neq 1$ and $C(\{1\}, t) = C_{t1}$ for all t . Proposition 5 gives explicit formulæ and simple testable predictions.

Proposition 5 (Response-group probabilities in Example 1 under one-to-one targeting). *Under Assumptions 1 to 6, the following probabilities are identified:*

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pr(C_{11}) &= P(1|0), \\ \Pr(C_{tt}) &= P(t|1) \text{ for } t \neq 1, \\ \Pr(C_{t1}) &= P(t|0) - P(t|1) \text{ for } t \neq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The model has $(|T| - 1)$ testable predictions:

$$P(t|0) \geq P(t|1) \text{ for } t \neq 1.$$

While the probabilities of all $(2|T| - 1)$ response groups are identified under one-to-one targeting in the binary instrument model (Proposition 5), only some group average outcomes are point identified without further restrictions. Lemma 2 gives $2T$ equations:

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{E}_0(1) &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)|i \in C(\{1\}, 1)) \Pr(i \in C(\{1\}, 1)) = \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)|i \in C_{11}) \Pr(C_{11}) \\ \text{for } t \neq 1, \bar{E}_0(t) &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(t)|i \in C(\emptyset, t)) \Pr(i \in C(\emptyset, t)) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}(Y_i(t)|i \in C(\{1\}, t)) \Pr(i \in C(\{1\}, t)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(t)|i \in C_{tt}) \Pr(C_{tt}) + \mathbb{E}(Y_i(t)|i \in C_{t1}) \Pr(C_{t1}) \\ \bar{E}_1(1) &= \sum_{\tau \in T} \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)|i \in C(\{1\}, \tau)) \Pr(i \in C(\{1\}, \tau)) \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in T} \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)|i \in C_{\tau 1}) \Pr(C_{\tau 1}) \\ \text{for } t \neq 1, \bar{E}_1(t) &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(t)|i \in C(\emptyset, t)) \Pr(i \in C(\emptyset, t)) = \mathbb{E}(Y_i(t)|i \in C_{tt}) \Pr(C_{tt}). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 6 follows¹².

¹²We use the term “LATEs” for the average treatment effects on the various complier groups. Through-

Proposition 6 (Group average outcomes in Example 1 under one-to-one targeting). *Under Assumptions 1 to 6, the following group average outcomes are point-identified:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{11}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_0(1)}{P(1|0)}, \\ \mathbb{E}[Y_i(t)|i \in C_{tt}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_1(t)}{P(t|1)} \text{ for } t \neq 1, \\ \mathbb{E}[Y_i(t)|i \in C_{t1}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_0(t) - \bar{E}_1(t)}{P(t|0) - P(t|1)} \text{ for } t \neq 1.\end{aligned}$$

However, if $T > 2$ the standard Wald estimator only identifies a convex combination of the LATEs on the complier groups C_{t1} :

$$\begin{aligned}(3.4) \quad \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y_i|Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{E}(Y_i|Z_i = 0)}{\Pr(T_i = 1|Z_i = 1) - \Pr(T_i = 1|Z_i = 0)} &= \frac{(\bar{E}_1(1) - \bar{E}_0(1)) - \sum_{t \neq 1}(\bar{E}_0(t) - \bar{E}_1(t))}{P(1|1) - P(1|0)} \\ &= \sum_{t \neq 1} \alpha_t \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(t)|i \in C_{t1}],\end{aligned}$$

where the weights $\alpha_t = \Pr(i \in C_{t1}|i \in \bigcup_{\tau \neq 1} C_{\tau 1}) = (P(t|0) - P(t|1))/(P(1|1) - P(1|0))$ are identified, positive, and sum to 1.

If $T = 2$ we have $\alpha_0 = 1$ and the familiar LATE formula

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in C_{01}) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y_i|Z_i = 1) - \mathbb{E}(Y_i|Z_i = 0)}{\Pr(T_i = 1|Z_i = 1) - \Pr(T_i = 1|Z_i = 0)}.$$

Proposition 6 shows that we only identify a known convex combination of the $(|\mathcal{T}| - 1)$ LATEs. It is possible to bound the average treatment effects in a straightforward manner if we assume that the support of Y_i is known and finite. One could instead add restrictions to achieve point identification of average treatment effects for the compliers. Assuming that the ATEs are all equal is one obvious solution. Another one is to assume some degree of homogeneity of group average outcomes. Alternatively, we may consider weaker conditions under which the average treatment effects for the compliers are only partially identified. We explore these ideas below.

3.1.2 Adding Identification Constraints

Consider the binary instrument model with $T \geq 3$.

out the remainder of the paper, we assume, as is standard, that probability differences appearing in the denominator of estimands are always nonzero.

Beyond one-to-one targeting First note that the probabilities of the response-groups can be identified under weaker restrictions than one-to-one targeting.

Suppose for instance that $z = 1$ targets all treatment values $t \geq 1$: we have $U_1(t) - U_0(t) > 0$ for all $t \geq 1$. Then the complier groups C_{t0} for $t \geq 1$ must be empty. To see this, suppose that $T_i(0) = t \geq 1$. This implies $U_0(t) + u_{it} > U_0(0) + u_{i0} = u_{i0}$, so that

$$U_1(t) + u_{it} > (U_1(t) - U_0(t)) + u_{i0} > u_{i0}$$

and $T_i(1)$ cannot be 0. All other groups $C_{tt'}$ may exist. This leaves $|\mathcal{T}|(|\mathcal{T}| - 1)$ unknown group probabilities, which is $|\mathcal{T}|/2$ times more than the $2(|\mathcal{T}| - 1)$ propensity scores we observe. We need $(|\mathcal{T}| - 1)(|\mathcal{T}| - 2)$ additional constraints to point-identify all group probabilities.

Single-peaked Mean Utilities Now suppose that mean utilities are “single-peaked” in the sense that the function $t \rightarrow U_1(t) - U_0(t)$ is decreasing over $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$. This would be a reasonable assumption if $z = 1$ makes treatment $t = 1$ more attractive and the treatments $t > 1$ are ordered by their proximity to $t = 1$.

If this holds, then the same argument as above shows that the response groups $C_{tt'}$ must be empty when $t' > t \geq 1$. This eliminates $(|\mathcal{T}| - 1)(|\mathcal{T}| - 2)/2$ response groups; we divided by two the number of additional identification constraints that we need.

Positive Selection For another example, consider the identification of group average outcomes in the 2×3 model under one-to-one targeting. There are five response-groups, as illustrated in Figure 3. Proposition 6 shows that the Wald estimator only identifies

$$\alpha_0 \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | i \in C_{01}] + (1 - \alpha_0) \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(2) | i \in C_{21}],$$


where $\alpha_0 = (P(0|0) - P(0|1)) / (P(1|1) - P(1|0))$ is point-identified. Consider the two complier groups C_{01} and C_{21} : they both have $t = 1$ when $z = 1$, but they shift to it from different treatments under $z = 0$. Depending on the context, this may suggest some ordering of the group average outcomes for $t = 1$, say

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) | i \in C_{01}] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) | i \in C_{21}].$$

Corollary 2 shows that this inequality gives bounds on the corresponding LATEs.

Corollary 2 (Positive selection and treatment effects in the 2×3 model under one-to-one

Figure 3: A 2×3 model with one targeted treatment



targeting). If

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{01}] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{21}],$$

then the local average treatment effects for C_{01} and C_{21} are partially identified:

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in C_{01}] &\leq \frac{\bar{E}_1(1) - \bar{E}_0(1)}{P(1|1) - P(1|0)} - \frac{\bar{E}_0(0) - \bar{E}_1(0)}{P(0|0) - P(0|1)}, \\ \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(2)|i \in C_{21}] &\geq \frac{\bar{E}_1(1) - \bar{E}_0(1)}{P(1|1) - P(1|0)} - \frac{\bar{E}_0(2) - \bar{E}_1(2)}{P(2|0) - P(2|1)}, \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (3.5) implies the following testable prediction:

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{\bar{E}_0(2) - \bar{E}_1(2)}{P(2|0) - P(2|1)} \geq \frac{\bar{E}_0(0) - \bar{E}_1(0)}{P(0|0) - P(0|1)}.$$


If (3.5) holds at equality, then the two statements in (3.6) and the testable prediction in (3.7) also become equalities, and the two LATEs are point-identified.

3.2 The 3×3 Model

Let us now turn to the 3×3 model of Example 2, where $\mathcal{Z}^* = \mathcal{T}^* = \{1, 2\}$ and $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{T} = \{0, 1, 2\}$. We now assume strict one-to-one targeting: for all of our results in this section, we impose Assumptions 1-6; $z = 1$ targets $t = 1$ and $z = 2$ targets $t = 2$.

The set A in Corollary 1 can be $\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}$, or $\{1, 2\}$, with corresponding values of t in $\{0\}, \{0, 1\}, \{0, 2\}$ or $\{0, 1, 2\}$ respectively. The set $c(\emptyset, 0)$ corresponds to the never-takers C_{000} . For $A = \{1\}$ we get C_{010} and C_{111} , and for $A = \{2\}$ we get C_{002} and C_{222} . Finally, with $A = \{1, 2\}$ we have C_{012}, C_{112} , and C_{212} .

Figure 4: Strictly one-to-one targeted treatment in the 3×3 model



These eight elemental response groups are illustrated in Figure 4, again with the origin in P_0 . Comparing Figure 4 with Figure 2 shows the identifying power of Assumption 5. Table 4 shows which groups take $T_i = t$ when $Z_i = z$.

Table 4: Response Groups of Example 2

	$T_i(z) = 0$	$T_i(z) = 1$	$T_i(z) = 2$
$z = 0$	$C_{000} \cup C_{010} \cup C_{002} \cup C_{012}$	$C_{111} \cup C_{112}$	$C_{222} \cup C_{212}$
$z = 1$	$C_{000} \cup C_{002}$	$C_{111} \cup C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{112} \cup C_{212}$	C_{222}
$z = 2$	$C_{000} \cup C_{010}$	C_{111}	$C_{222} \cup C_{002} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{112} \cup C_{212}$

We know from row (3) of Table 3 that one restriction is missing to point-identify the probabilities of all eight response-groups. The following proposition shows that the probabilities of four of the eight elemental groups are point-identified: two groups of always-takers, and two groups of compliers. The other four probabilities are constrained by three adding-up constraints.

Proposition 7 (Response-group probabilities in the 3×3 model under strict, one-to-one targeting). *The following four probabilities are identified: $\Pr(C_{111}) = P(1|2)$, $\Pr(C_{222}) = P(2|1)$, $\Pr(C_{112}) = P(1|0) - P(1|2)$, and $\Pr(C_{212}) = P(2|0) - P(2|1)$. The remaining four response group probabilities are partially-identified and can be parameterized as: $\Pr(C_{000}) = p$, $\Pr(C_{002}) = P(0|1) - p$, $\Pr(C_{010}) = P(0|2) - p$, and $\Pr(C_{012}) = P(0|0) - P(0|1) - P(0|2) + p$, where the unknown p satisfies $\max\{0, P(0|1) + P(0|2) - P(0|0)\} \leq p \leq \min\{1, P(0|1), P(0|2)\}$.*

The model has the following testable implications: $P(1|1) \geq P(1|0) \geq P(1|2)$, $P(2|2) \geq P(2|0) \geq P(2|1)$, and $P(0|0) \geq \max(P(0|1), P(0|2))$.

The following proposition identifies a number of group average outcomes.

Proposition 8 (Group average outcomes in the 3×3 model under strict, one-to-one targeting).

The following group average outcomes are point-identified:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|i \in C_{000} \cup C_{002}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_1(0)}{P(0|1)}, & \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|i \in C_{000} \cup C_{010}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_2(0)}{P(0|2)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{111}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_2(1)}{P(1|2)}, & \mathbb{E}[Y_i(2)|i \in C_{222}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_1(2)}{P(2|1)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_0(0) - \bar{E}_1(0)}{P(0|0) - P(0|1)}, & \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_0(0) - \bar{E}_2(0)}{P(0|0) - P(0|2)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{212}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_1(1) - \bar{E}_0(1)}{P(1|1) - P(1|0)}, & \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{112}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_0(1) - \bar{E}_2(1)}{P(1|0) - P(1|2)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(2)|i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{112}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_2(2) - \bar{E}_0(2)}{P(2|2) - P(2|0)}, & \mathbb{E}[Y_i(2)|i \in C_{212}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_0(2) - \bar{E}_1(2)}{P(2|0) - P(2|1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By itself, Proposition 8 does not allow us to identify an average treatment effect for *any* (even composite) response-group. Suppose for instance that we want to identify $\mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in C)$ for some group C . Then C needs to exclude C_{111} , C_{112} , and C_{212} , since $\mathbb{E}(Y_i(0)|i \in C')$ is not identified for any group C' that contains C_{111} , C_{112} , or C_{212} . Since we only know the mean outcome of treatment 1 for groups that contain one of these three elemental groups, the conclusion follows.

Note that if we assumed $\mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)|i \in C_{112}) = \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)|i \in C_{212})$, then we could combine the two equations in the fourth displayed line of Proposition 8 and the probabilities of C_{112} and C_{212} (which are point-identified by Proposition 7) to obtain $\mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)|i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012})$. This would point-identify the average effect of treatment 1 vs treatment 0 on this composite complier group C_{01*} . While this assumption may be overly strong, it seems natural to impose that $Y(\tau)$ is on average larger in a response group that has $t = \tau$ for more values of z . Assumption 7 formalizes this intuition in our setting.

Assumption 7 (Positive selection in the 3×3 model). *Either or both of the following assumptions hold:*

$$(3.8) \quad \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{112}] \geq \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{212}],$$

$$(3.9) \quad \mathbb{E}[Y_i(2)|i \in C_{212}] \geq \mathbb{E}[Y_i(2)|i \in C_{112}].$$

Assumption 7 states a form of positive selection into treatment. Consider Equation (3.8) for instance. It says that within the group of “12-compliers” $C_{*12} = C_{012} \cup C_{112} \cup C_{212}$, those observations with $T(0) = 1$ have a larger average counterfactual $Y(1)$ than those with

$T(0) = 2$. Corollary 3 shows that this gives bounds on the local average treatment effects for C_{01*} -compliers, with a similar result for Equation (3.9) and C_{0*2} -compliers.

Corollary 3 (Identifying treatment effects in the 3×3 model). *1. Under (3.8), the local average treatment effect*

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | i \in C_{01*}]$$

is at least as large as

$$\frac{(\bar{E}_1(1) - \bar{E}_0(1)) - (\bar{E}_0(0) - \bar{E}_1(0))}{P(0|0) - P(0|1)} - \frac{\bar{E}_0(1) - \bar{E}_2(1)}{P(1|0) - P(1|2)} \frac{P(2|0) - P(2|1)}{P(0|0) - P(0|1)}.$$

2. Under (3.9), the local average treatment effect

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_i(2) - Y_i(0) | i \in C_{0*2}]$$

is at least as large as

$$\frac{(\bar{E}_2(2) - \bar{E}_0(2)) - (\bar{E}_0(0) - \bar{E}_2(0))}{P(0|0) - P(0|2)} - \frac{\bar{E}_0(2) - \bar{E}_1(2)}{P(2|0) - P(2|1)} \frac{P(1|0) - P(1|2)}{P(0|0) - P(0|2)}.$$

3. In both 1 and 2, “at least as large” can be replaced with “equals” if the corresponding inequality in Assumption 7 is an equality.

3.3 What do the IV estimators identify in the 3×3 model?

Kirkeboen, Leuven, and Mogstad (2016, hereafter KLM) used a 3×3 model to study the impact of the field of study on later earnings. Their Proposition 2 characterizes what two-stage least squares (TSLS) estimators identify under different sets of assumptions. The least stringent version combines a monotonicity assumption (Assumption 4 in KLM) and condition (iii) in their Proposition 2, which they call “irrelevance and information on next-best alternatives”. “Irrelevance” is a set of exclusion restrictions, while “information on next-best alternatives” assumes the availability of additional data.

3.3.1 Monotonicity and Irrelevance

While we take quite a different path, our strict one-to-one targeting assumption turns out to yield exactly the same identifying restrictions as the combination of monotonicity and irrelevance in Kirkeboen, Leuven, and Mogstad (2016). We show it in Appendix B.

This set of assumptions in itself is too weak to give two-stage least squares estimates a simple interpretation. To see this, let β_1 and β_2 be the probability limits of the coefficients in a regression of Y_i on the indicator variables $\mathbf{1}(T_i = 1)$ and $\mathbf{1}(T_i = 2)$, with instruments Z_i . Remember from Table 4 that under strict one-to-one targeting, five response-groups have $T(1) = 1$:

1. the always-takers C_{111} ;
2. the “intermediate” group C_{112} , which has $T(z) = 1$ unless $z = 2$;
3. the three groups C_{010} , C_{012} , and C_{212} , which have $T(z) = 1$ if and only of $z = 1$.

A similar distinction applies to the groups that have $T(2) = 2$; it motivates Definition 8.

Definition 8 (1-compliers and 2-compliers). We call

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{212},$$

the 1-compliers group and

$$\mathcal{C}_2 = C_{002} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{112}$$

the 2-compliers group.

The β_1 and β_2 coefficients turn out to be weighted averages of the LATEs on these two groups and on the intermediate groups C_{112} and C_{212} .

Proposition 9 (TSLS in the 3×3 model under strict, one-to-one targeting). *The parameters β_1 and β_2 satisfy*

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_1) & -\Pr(i \in C_{212}) \\ -\Pr(i \in C_{112}) & \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_2) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[\{Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)\}\mathbf{1}(i \in \mathcal{C}_1)] - \mathbb{E}[\{Y_i(2) - Y_i(0)\}\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{212})] \\ \mathbb{E}[\{Y_i(2) - Y_i(0)\}\mathbf{1}(i \in \mathcal{C}_2)] - \mathbb{E}[\{Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)\}\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{112})] \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proposition 9 implies that β_1 and β_2 are weighted averages of the four local average treatment effects on the right-hand side of this system of two equations. The weights are functions of the four probabilities on the left-hand side, which are point identified by Proposition 7. However, these weights may be positive or negative. This complicates interpretation further¹³.

¹³Mogstad, Torgovitsky, and Walters (2021) give a set of assumptions under which the weights are positive in a model with multiple binary instruments.

3.3.2 Additional Assumptions

Next-best alternatives Using the additional information on next-best alternatives in KLM amounts, in our notation, to dropping the “intermediate” response-groups C_{212} and C_{112} from the data. Then the system of equations in Proposition 9 becomes diagonal and it yields

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_1 &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in \mathcal{C}_1], \\ \beta_2 &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(2) - Y_i(0)|i \in \mathcal{C}_2],\end{aligned}$$

where now \mathcal{C}_1 reduces to $C_{010} \cup C_{012}$ and \mathcal{C}_2 reduces to $C_{002} \cup C_{012}$. This is exactly Proposition 2 (iii) of Kirkeboen, Leuven, and Mogstad (2016).

Positive Selection Additional information of the type used by KLM often is not available. On the other hand, reasonable assumptions can be used to generate bounds on the local average treatment effects for 1-compliers and 2-compliers. Corollary 4 illustrates this.

Corollary 4 (TSLS in the 3×3 model under strict, one-to-one targeting). *Assume that*

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{D} \equiv \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_1) \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_2) - \Pr(i \in C_{212}) \Pr(i \in C_{112}) \neq 0.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{D}_1 \equiv \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in \mathcal{C}_1) - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in C_{112})$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_2 \equiv \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2) - Y_i(0)|i \in \mathcal{C}_2) - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2) - Y_i(0)|i \in C_{212}).$$

If $\mathcal{D}_1 \mathcal{D}_2 > 0$, then $\beta_1 - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in \mathcal{C}_1)$ and $\beta_2 - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2) - Y_i(0)|i \in \mathcal{C}_2)$ have the sign of \mathcal{D} .

Note that the KLM result of the previous paragraph is the limit case where $\mathcal{D}_1 = \mathcal{D}_2 = 0$.

The regularity condition (3.10) ensures that the 2×2 matrix that premultiplies $(\beta_1, \beta_2)'$ in Proposition 9 is invertible¹⁴. To interpret the assumptions on signs, suppose that \mathcal{D}_1 is positive. Since $\mathcal{C}_1 = C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{212}$, the positivity of \mathcal{D}_1 states that the average effect of treatment 1 on $C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{212}$ is at least as large as on C_{112} . This is a form of positive selection that is in the same spirit as (but different from) Assumption 7. If this form of positive selection holds for both treatments, then the TSLS estimates overestimate the LATEs on the corresponding compliers if $\mathcal{D} > 0$, and they underestimate them if $\mathcal{D} < 0$.

¹⁴It holds if C_{212} and C_{112} have positive probability and either $C_{010} \cup C_{012}$ or $C_{002} \cup C_{012}$ has positive probability.

To summarize, the TSLS estimators in the 3×3 model are difficult to interpret unless additional information is available and/or some additional assumptions are imposed. If the groups C_{112} and C_{212} are indeed empty, then both the TSLS estimators and those we obtained in Corollary 3 should identify the LATEs on the 1- and 2-compliers. Comparing their values is a useful (if informal) way of testing the assumptions and of exploring further the heterogeneity of the treatment effects.


4 Empirical Example: The Head Start Impact Study

We now reexamine the Kline and Walters's (2016) analysis of the Head Start Impact Study (HSIS) using our framework. We use exactly the same data as they did; we only apply different identifying assumptions.

The structure of HSIS is identical to that of Example 1: it is a 2×3 model. The treatments here consist of no preschool (n), Head Start (h), and other preschool centers (c): $\mathcal{T} = \{n, h, c\}$. The instrument is binary, with a control group ($z = 0$) and a group that is offered admission to Head Start ($z = 1$). The outcome variable is test scores, measured in standard deviations from their mean.

In the terminology of this paper, treatment assignment satisfies strict, one-to-one targeting: strict targeting as the instrument is binary, and one-to-one targeting as $z = 1$ only targets Head Start. Figure 5 reproduces Figure 3 in this setting. In addition to the three always-taker groups C_{nn} , C_{cc} , and C_{hh} , there are two complier groups: C_{nh} , and C_{ch} . In Sections 4.1 and 4.2, we focus on the LATEs on the two complier groups C_{nh} and C_{ch} . Section 4.3 embeds the model into a larger, 3×3 model in order to evaluate the marginal value of the public funds used in Head Start.

Figure 5: The Kline and Walters (2016) Model of Preschool Choice



4.1 Group proportions and counterfactual means

Our estimates of the proportions of the two complier groups in the sample use (3.2) in Proposition 5; they are shown in Panel A of Table 5. As expected, they coincide with those in Kline and Walters (2016).

Panel B of Table 5 shows the counterfactual means of test scores for the complier groups, as per Proposition 6. While $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(n)|i \in C_{nh}]$ is negative, $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(c)|i \in C_{ch}]$ is above 0.1 standard deviation—not a negligible value in this field. This suggests that some of the children who enter Head Start would have been at a good preschool otherwise. Kline and Walters (2016) call this pattern the “substitution effect” of Head Start. However, Kline and Walters (2016) do not report estimates of $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(n)|i \in C_{nh}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(c)|i \in C_{ch}]$.

Table 5: Proportions, Counterfactual Means and Treatment Effects by Response Groups

	3-year-olds	4-year-olds	Pooled
Panel A. Proportions of Response Groups via Proposition 5			
Compliers from n to h (C_{nh})	0.505	0.393	0.454
Compliers from c to h (C_{ch})	0.198	0.272	0.232
Panel B. Counterfactual Means of Test Scores via Proposition 6			
$\mathbb{E}[Y_i(n) i \in C_{nh}]$	-0.027	-0.116	-0.062
$\mathbb{E}[Y_i(c) i \in C_{ch}]$	0.112	0.144	0.129
Panel C. Treatment Effects via Corollary 2			
Upper Bound on $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(h) - Y_i(n) i \in C_{nh}]$	0.279 (0.063)	0.285 (0.076)	0.278 (0.050)
Lower Bound on $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(h) - Y_i(c) i \in C_{ch}]$	0.140 (0.089)	0.025 (0.097)	0.087 (0.063)
Upper Bound on $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(h) - Y_i(n) i \in C_{nh}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i(h) - Y_i(c) i \in C_{ch}]$	0.139 (0.098)	0.260 (0.115)	0.191 (0.071)

Notes: Head Start (h), other centers (c), no preschool (n). Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the Head Start center level.

4.2 Treatment Effects

To fully measure the substitution effect, one needs to identify $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(h)|i \in C_{nh}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(h)|i \in C_{ch}]$. However, we know from Proposition 6 that they are only partially identified by

$$\alpha_0 \mathbb{E}[Y_i(h)|i \in C_{ch}] + (1 - \alpha_0) \mathbb{E}[Y_i(h)|i \in C_{nh}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_i \mathbf{1}(T_i = h)|Z_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i \mathbf{1}(T_i = h)|Z_i = 0]}{P(h|1) - P(h|0)}.$$

where $\alpha_0 = (P(c|0) - P(c|1)) / (P(h|1) - P(h|0))$. This is exactly the formula on Kline and Walters (2016, pp.1811): as they point out, the LATE for Head Start is a weighted average of “subLATEs” with weights determined by the proportion of C_{ch} among compliers, which is identified from the data¹⁵.

Kline and Walters (2016) first tried to identify $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(h) - Y_i(c)|i \in C_{ch}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(h) - Y_i(n)|i \in C_{nh}]$ separately using interactions of the instrument with covariates or experimental sites. They acknowledged the limitations of this approach and resorted to a parametric selection model à la Heckman (1979) instead. They report¹⁶ estimates of the local average treatment effects of 0.370 for C_{nh} and -0.093 for C_{ch} , with respective standard errors 0.088 and 0.154. The resulting point estimate of the difference is quite large, at 0.463 standard deviation.

Our Corollary 2 provides an alternative approach to separating the two treatment effects. Given that compliers coming from other preschools (C_{ch}) had better test scores than compliers not originally in preschools (C_{nh}), it seems reasonable to assume that they also have better test scores under Head Start:

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbb{E}[Y_i(h)|i \in C_{ch}] \geq \mathbb{E}[Y_i(h)|i \in C_{nh}].$$

This is exactly the “positive selection” that underlies Corollary 2. The pooled cohort estimates in Panel C of Table 5 indicate that the upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(h) - Y_i(n)|i \in C_{nh}]$ is 0.28 and the lower bound on $\mathbb{E}[Y_i(h) - Y_i(n)|i \in C_{ch}]$ is 0.09. The difference between these two numbers gives an upper bound of 0.19 for the difference of these two LATEs, with a standard error of 0.07. The testable prediction (3.7) implied by positive selection translates here into the non-negativity of the upper bound; we cannot reject it at any reasonable level. Conversely, negative selection (reverting the inequality Equation (4.1)) would make 0.19 a *lower* bound for the difference of the LATEs. At the same time, it would imply that the lower bound is negative; this is soundly rejected by the data.

Our upper bound of 0.19 is much lower than the point estimate reported by Kline and Walters (2016). In fact, our 95% and 99% one-sided confidence intervals for

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_i(h) - Y_i(n)|i \in C_{nh}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i(h) - Y_i(c)|i \in C_{ch}]$$

are $(-\infty, 0.308)$ and $(-\infty, 0.356)$. We conclude that the 0.463 estimate in Kline and Walters (2016) may overstate the difference between the two complier groups: it can only be ratio-

¹⁵Our α_0 is denoted S_c in their paper.

¹⁶See Kline and Walters (2016, Table VIII, column (4), full model).

nalized under negative selection, which is a much less plausible assumption.

4.3 Expanding Access to Head Start

Kline and Walters (2016) sought to evaluate the welfare effect of increasing the number of slots in Head Start, as summarized by the marginal value of public funds (MVPF). They note that any expansion of Head Start will vacate some slots at competing preschools, which are oversubscribed. The relaxation of this rationing must be counted as an effect of Head Start expansions. This is what they call “rationed substitutes”¹⁷.

The children who move from $T_i = n$ to $T_i = c$ when a slot is vacated by a child who moves to Head Start constitute a C_{nc} group that is ruled out by the 2×3 model. These children increase their grades by $Y_i(c) - Y_i(n)$, whose average generates a LATE that we denote LATE_{nc} . Equation (9) in Kline and Walters (2016, p. 1816) shows that the value of LATE_{nc} is a crucial input in the computation of the MVPF of a Head Start expansion. Identifying it requires either data on offers to all preschools, which Kline and Walters (2016) do not have¹⁸, or additional modeling assumptions. They used their parametric selection model to construct an estimate for LATE_{nc} . Their estimate of $\text{LATE}_{nc} = 0.294$ results in a high MVPF estimate of 2.02 (see Table IX in their paper).

We take a different approach by embedding the 2×3 model within a 3×3 model. In this richer model, the instrument can take three values: in addition to the control group ($z = 0$) and those offered admission to Head Start ($z = 1$), we have a new group that is offered admission to competing preschools ($z = 2$), and to them only so that we maintain strict, one-to-one targeting. Figure 6 shows the resulting treatment assignment, using tildes to denote the complier groups of the 3×3 model¹⁹. Using this notation, LATE_{nc} can be written as

$$\text{LATE}_{nc} = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(c) - Y_i(n) | i \in \tilde{C}_{n*c}],$$

where $\tilde{C}_{n*c} = \tilde{C}_{nnc} \cup \tilde{C}_{nhc}$ is the composite group of $n \rightarrow c$ compliers. Comparing Figure 6 with Figure 5 shows that the other complier groups of the two models are linked by


$$\begin{aligned} C_{nh} &= \tilde{C}_{nh*} = \tilde{C}_{nhn} \cup \tilde{C}_{nhc} \\ C_{ch} &= \tilde{C}_{ch*} = \tilde{C}_{chc}. \end{aligned}$$

¹⁷See Kline and Walters (2016, Sections V.D and IX.A) for details.

¹⁸See footnote 19 in their paper.

¹⁹Again, it is just Figure 4 with different notation.

Figure 6: Embedding Preschool Choice in a 3×3 Model



Now consider the new group of $n \rightarrow c$ compliers. It differs from \tilde{C}_{chc} in that its members will not go to a preschool unless they are offered a slot. It seems reasonable to assume that it is at least partly because they tend to get worse grades in preschools than the members \tilde{C}_{chc} :

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_i(c)|i \in \tilde{C}_{n*c}] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_i(c)|i \in \tilde{C}_{chc}].$$

On the other hand, Figure 6 shows that $\tilde{C}_{n*c} = \tilde{C}_{nnc} \cup \tilde{C}_{nhc}$ and $\tilde{C}_{nn*} = \tilde{C}_{nnc} \cup \tilde{C}_{nnn}$ only differ by the substitution of \tilde{C}_{nnn} for \tilde{C}_{nhc} . The former never go to Head Start for another preschool, while the latter are full compliers. It seems likely that the former group has lower grades on average when not in preschool:

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_i(n)|i \in \tilde{C}_{nn*}] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_i(n)|i \in \tilde{C}_{n*c}].$$

These two inequalities correspond exactly to the “positive selection” assumptions that underlie our Corollary 3. Since \tilde{C}_{nn*} coincides with C_{nn} and \tilde{C}_{chc} is C_{ch} , we already know the values of the right-hand sides of both inequalities. Applying the same logic as in Corollary 3 gives us an upper bound for LATE_{nc} :

$$\text{LATE}_{nc} \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_i(c)|i \in \tilde{C}_{chc}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i(n)|i \in \tilde{C}_{nn*}] = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(c)|i \in C_{ch}] - \mathbb{E}[Y_i(n)|i \in C_{nn}].$$

As the MVPF is an increasing function of LATE_{nc} , this gives us in turn an upper bound on its value. We obtain $\text{LATE}_{nc} \leq 0.164$ and $\text{MVPF} \leq 1.55$. These upper bounds are noticeably smaller than the point estimates that result from the parametric selection model of Kline and Walters (2016).

Concluding Remarks

We have shown that the idea of targeting is a useful way to analyze models with multivalued treatments and multivalued instruments. Our paper only analyzed discrete-valued instruments and treatments. Some of the notions we used would extend naturally to continuous instruments and treatments: the definitions of targeting and one-to-one targeting would translate directly. Strict targeting, on the other hand, is less appealing in a context in which continuous values may denote intensities. Our earlier paper (Lee and Salanié, 2018) as well as Mountjoy’s (2022) can be seen as analyzing continuous-instruments/discrete-treatments models. Extending our analysis to models with continuous treatments is an obvious topic for further research. It would also be interesting to apply the partial identification approach of Mogstad, Santos, and Torgovitsky (2018) in our setting. Finally, there has been a surge of recent interest on understanding the properties of OLS and 2SLS estimands when treatment effects vary with the covariates (Blandhol, Bonney, Mogstad, and Torgovitsky, 2022; Słoczyński, 2022; Goldsmith-Pinkham, Hull, and Kolesár, 2022). We believe that the targeting concept and the identifying assumptions explored in this paper should be relevant in this context and that they merit further investigation.

A Proofs for Section 3

Proof of Lemma 1. Consider a virtual marriage market where women correspond to elements of \mathcal{T}^* and men to elements of \mathcal{Z}^* . A woman $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$ can only marry a man in $Z^*(t)$ (“a neighbor”), and each marriage can only consist of one man and one woman. The existence of an injective selection from Z^* translates into the possibility of matching every woman in \mathcal{T}^* to a different man picked from her neighbors. Hall’s marriage theorem states that such a “women-perfect” matching exists if and only if every subset S of women has at least $|S|$ neighbors. The translation to our setting is immediate.

Now assume that all inequalities are equalities and take S to be the singleton $\{t\}$. We obtain $|Z^*(t)| = 1$ and $Z^*(t)$ is a singleton. If $T^*(z)$ has two elements t_1 and t_2 , then $Z^*(t_1) = Z^*(t_2) = \{z\}$ and we must have $|\{t_1, t_2\}| = 1$. Therefore $T^*(z)$ must be a singleton and targeting is one-to-one. The converse is obvious. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. Suppose that for some $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$, $T_i(Z^*(t)) = 0$. Then $u_{i0} > \bar{U}(t) + u_{it}$. However, if $z \neq Z^*(t)$ then $\bar{U}(t) > U_z(t)$ under Assumption 4. Therefore $u_{i0} > U_z(t) + u_{it}$, and $T_i(z)$ cannot be t . \square

Proof of Proposition 2. Recall that $T_i(z)$ maximizes $(U_z(t) + u_{it})$ over $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Under strict

targeting, $U_z(t)$ is $\bar{U}(t)$ if $t \in \mathcal{T}^*(z)$ and $\underline{U}(t)$ otherwise.

Proof of (i): Since $\bar{U}(t) > \underline{U}(t)$ if $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$, we have

$$V_i^*(z) > \max_{t \in \mathcal{T}^*(z)} (\underline{U}(t) + u_{it}).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (U_z(t) + u_{it}) &= \max \left(\max_{t \in \mathcal{T}^*(z)} (\bar{U}(t) + u_{it}), \max_{t \notin \mathcal{T}^*(z)} (\underline{U}(t) + u_{it}) \right) \\ &= \max \left(V_i^*(z), \max_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\underline{U}(t) + u_{it}) \right) \\ &= \max(V_i^*(z), \underline{V}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $\underline{V}_i = \underline{U}_{\underline{t}_i} + u_{i,\underline{t}_i}$ is the maximum and $\underline{t}_i \in \text{calTs}(z)$, then a fortiori $\underline{U}_{\underline{t}_i} + u_{i,\underline{t}_i} > \bar{U}_{\underline{t}_i} + u_{i,\underline{t}_i}$. This gives a contradiction since $\bar{U}_t > \underline{U}_t$ for all strictly targeted t .

Proof of (ii): If $z \notin \mathcal{Z}^*$, then $\mathcal{T}^*(z)$ is empty and $V_i^*(z) = -\infty$. □

Proof of Corollary 1. It follows directly from Proposition 2. □

Proof of Proposition 3. Consider an observation i . The set A_i of Corollary 1 is a possibly empty subset of \mathcal{T}^* . The top alternative treatment \underline{t}_i can be in A_i or in $\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^*$. If A_i has a elements, this allows for $a + |\mathcal{T}| - |\mathcal{T}^*| = a + q$ values of \underline{t}_i . Now every pair (A_i, \underline{t}_i) fully defines a response-type. Since $|\mathcal{Z}^*| = |\mathcal{T}^*| = p$, this gives a total of

$$\sum_{a=0}^p \binom{p}{a} (a + q)$$

response-types. Using the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a=0}^b \binom{b}{a} &= (1 + 1)^b = 2^b \\ \sum_{a=0}^b a \binom{b}{a} &= b \times \sum_{a=0}^{b-1} \binom{b-1}{a} = b \times 2^{b-1}, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain a total of $(p + 2q) \times 2^{p-1}$ types. □

Proof of Proposition 4. Take $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Consider any observation i and the corresponding $A_i \subset \mathcal{T}^*$ and $\underline{t}_i \in A_i \cup (\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^*)$. There are only two ways to obtain $T_i(z) = t$:

- if $z \notin A_i$, then $T_i(z) = \underline{t}_i$; therefore $\underline{t}_i = t$. Summing over all subsets A of \mathcal{T}^* that exclude z gives the first term of (3.1).

- if $z \in A_i$ (which implies $z \in \mathcal{T}^*$), we know that $T_i(z) = z$ no matter what the value of \underline{t}_i is; hence t must equal z . Summing over all subsets A that include z and all values of $\underline{t}_i \in A \cup (\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}^*)$ gives the second line in (3.1).

By construction, each $C(A, t)$ completely defines the mapping from instrument values to treatment values; therefore each $C(A, t)$ is an elemental group. Their union is clearly the set of all observations. If $i \in C(A, t) \cup C(A', t')$, then $A' = A = A_i$ by the definition of A_i , and $t' = t = \underline{t}_i$. Therefore the $C(A, t)$ partition the set of observations. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. Let

$$E_z(t|C) \equiv \mathbb{E}(Y_i \mathbf{1}(T_i = t) | Z_i = z, i \in C).$$

We start from the sum over all response groups:

$$\bar{E}_z(t) = \sum_C E_z(t|C) \Pr(i \in C).$$

First note that if group C does not have treatment t under instrument z , it should not figure in the sum. Now if $C_{(z)} = t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_z(t|C) &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i \mathbf{1}(T_i = t) | Z_i = z, i \in C) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(t) | Z_i = z, i \in C) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(t) | i \in C). \end{aligned}$$

The second part of the Lemma is just adding up. \square

Proof of Proposition 5. The proof is in the text, with the exception of $\Pr(C_{11}) = P(1|0)$ which follows from the fact that the probabilities add up to 1. \square

Proof of Proposition 6. Since Proposition 5 identifies all type probabilities, the first and fourth equations in (3.3) give directly $\mathbb{E}(Y_i(t) | i \in C_{tt})$ for all t . Then the second equation identifies $\mathbb{E}(Y_i(t) | i \in C_{t1})$ for $t \neq 1$.

By subtraction, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(\bar{E}_1(1) - \bar{E}_0(1)) - \sum_{t \neq 1} (\bar{E}_0(t) - \bar{E}_1(t)) \\ &= \sum_{t \neq 1} \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1) - Y_i(t) | i \in C_{t1}] \Pr(i \in C_{t1}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining these results with Proposition 5 and Lemma 2 yields the formula in the Proposition. The denominator

$$\sum_{t \neq 1} (P(t|0) - P(t|1)) = P(1|1) - P(1|0)$$

is positive, since all terms in the sum are positive. It follows that all α_t weights are positive and sum to 1. \square

Proof of Corollary 2. Recall from (3.3) that when $T = 3$,

$$\bar{E}_1(1) - \bar{E}_0(1) = \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{01}] \Pr(i \in C_{01}) + \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{21}] \Pr(i \in C_{21}).$$

Hence, under (3.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{01}] \{\Pr(i \in C_{01}) + \Pr(i \in C_{21})\} \\ & \leq \bar{E}_1(1) - \bar{E}_0(1) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{21}] \{\Pr(i \in C_{01}) + \Pr(i \in C_{21})\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first conclusion of the corollary follows immediately, as

$$\Pr(i \in C_{01}) + \Pr(i \in C_{21}) = P(1|1) - P(1|0).$$

The testable prediction is a direct consequence of this chain of inequalities. \square

Proof of Proposition 7. It is straightforward from Figure 4 and Table 4. \square

Proof of Proposition 8. By Lemma 2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{E}_1(0) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|i \in C_{000} \cup C_{002}] \Pr(i \in C_{000} \cup C_{002}), \\
\bar{E}_2(0) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|i \in C_{000} \cup C_{010}] \Pr(i \in C_{000} \cup C_{010}), \\
\bar{E}_2(1) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{111}] \Pr(i \in C_{111}), \\
\bar{E}_1(2) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(2)|i \in C_{222}] \Pr(i \in C_{222}), \\
\bar{E}_0(0) - \bar{E}_1(0) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012}] \Pr(i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012}), \\
\bar{E}_0(0) - \bar{E}_2(0) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012}] \Pr(i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012}), \\
\bar{E}_1(1) - \bar{E}_0(1) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{212}] \Pr(i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{212}), \\
\bar{E}_0(1) - \bar{E}_2(1) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|i \in C_{112}] \Pr(i \in C_{112}), \\
\bar{E}_2(2) - \bar{E}_0(2) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(2)|i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{112}] \Pr(i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{112}), \\
\bar{E}_0(2) - \bar{E}_1(2) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(2)|i \in C_{212}] \Pr(i \in C_{212}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the results follows from the fact that all group probabilities are identified. \square

Proof of Corollary 3. First note that $C_{01*} = C_{010} \cup C_{012}$. Under (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012})) &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{212})) - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{212})) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{212})) - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)|i \in C_{212}) \Pr(i \in C_{212}) \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)|i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{212}) \times \Pr(i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{212}) \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)|i \in C_{112}) \Pr(i \in C_{212}).
\end{aligned}$$

Replacing the probabilities and conditional expectations with their values from Proposition 7 and Proposition 8, we obtain $\Pr(i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012}) = P(0|0) - P(0|1)$ and

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012})) \geq \bar{E}_1(1) - \bar{E}_0(1) - \frac{\bar{E}_0(1) - \bar{E}_2(1)}{P(1|0) - P(1|2)}(P(2|0) - P(2|1)).$$

Finally, writing

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012}) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y_i(1)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012}))}{\Pr(i \in C_{010} \cup C_{012})} - \frac{\bar{E}_0(0) - \bar{E}_1(0)}{P(0|0) - P(0|1)}$$

gives the result.

The proof under (3.9) is similar: we start from $C_{0*2} = C_{002} \cup C_{012}$. Under (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012})) &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{112})) - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{112})) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{112})) - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2)|i \in C_{112}) \Pr(i \in C_{112}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2)|i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{112}) \times \Pr(i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012} \cup C_{112}) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2)|i \in C_{112}) \Pr(i \in C_{112}). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing the probabilities and conditional expectations with their values from Proposition 7 and Proposition 8, we obtain $\Pr(i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012}) = P(0|0) - P(0|2)$ and

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i(2)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012})) \geq \bar{E}_2(2) - \bar{E}_0(2) - \frac{\bar{E}_0(2) - \bar{E}_1(2)}{P(2|0) - P(2|1)}(P(1|0) - P(1|2)).$$

Finally, writing

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i(2) - Y_i(0)|i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012}) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y_i(2)\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012}))}{\Pr(i \in C_{002} \cup C_{012})} - \frac{\bar{E}_0(0) - \bar{E}_2(0)}{P(0|0) - P(0|2)}$$

gives the result. □

References

- ANGRIST, J. D., AND G. W. IMBENS (1995): “Two-stage least squares estimation of average causal effects in models with variable treatment intensity,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(430), 431–442.
- AO, W., S. CALONICO, AND Y.-Y. LEE (2021): “Multivalued Treatments and Decomposition Analysis: An Application to the WIA Program,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 39(1), 358–371.
- BHULLER, M., AND H. SIGSTAD (2023): “2SLS with Multiple Treatments,” arXiv:2205.07836, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.07836>.
- BLANDHOL, C., J. BONNEY, M. MOGSTAD, AND A. TORGOVITSKY (2022): “When is TSLS Actually LATE?,” Working Paper 29709, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- BUCHINSKY, M., P. GERTLER, AND R. PINTO (2023): “The Economics of Monotonicity Conditions: Exploring Choice Incentives in IV Models,” UCLA, mimeo, <https://www.rodrigopinto.net/>.
- CAETANO, C., AND J. C. ESCANCIANO (2021): “Identifying Multiple Marginal Effects with a Single Instrument,” *Econometric Theory*, 37(3), 464–494.

- CARNEIRO, P., J. J. HECKMAN, AND E. J. VYTLACIL (2011): “Estimating Marginal Returns to Education,” *American Economic Review*, 101(6), 2754–81.
- CATTANEO, M. D. (2010): “Efficient semiparametric estimation of multi-valued treatment effects under ignorability,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 155(2), 138–154.
- D’HAULTFOEUILLE, X., AND P. FÉVRIER (2015): “Identification of Nonseparable Triangular Models With Discrete Instruments,” *Econometrica*, 83(3), 1199–1210.
- FENG, J. (2024): “Matching points: Supplementing instruments with covariates in triangular models,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 238(1), 105579.
- GOFF, L. (2023): “A Vector Monotonicity Assumption for Multiple Instruments,” arXiv:2009.00553, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.00553>.
- GOLDSMITH-PINKHAM, P., P. HULL, AND M. KOLESÁR (2022): “Contamination Bias in Linear Regressions,” Working Paper 30108, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- HECKMAN, J., AND R. PINTO (2018): “Unordered Monotonicity,” *Econometrica*, 86(1), 1–35.
- HECKMAN, J. J. (1979): “Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error,” *Econometrica*, 47(1), 153–161.
- HECKMAN, J. J., S. URZUA, AND E. VYTLACIL (2006): “Understanding instrumental variables in models with essential heterogeneity,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 88(3), 389–432.
- (2008): “Instrumental variables in models with multiple outcomes: The general unordered case,” *Annales d’économie et de statistique*, 91/92, 151–174.
- HECKMAN, J. J., AND E. VYTLACIL (2001): “Policy-relevant treatment effects,” *American Economic Review*, 91(2), 107–111.
- (2005): “Structural Equations, Treatment Effects, and Econometric Policy Evaluation,” *Econometrica*, 73(3), 669–738.
- (2007a): “Econometric Evaluation of Social Programs, Part I: Causal Models, Structural Models and Econometric Policy Evaluation,” in *Handbook of Econometrics*, ed. by J. J. Heckman, and E. Leamer, vol. 6B, chap. 70, pp. 4779–4874. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- (2007b): “Econometric Evaluation of Social Programs, Part II: Using the Marginal Treatment Effect to Organize Alternative Econometric Estimators to Evaluate Social Programs, and to Forecast their Effects in New Environments,” in *Handbook of Econometrics*, ed. by J. J. Heckman, and E. Leamer, vol. 6B, chap. 71, pp. 4875–5143. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- HEINESEN, E., C. HVID, L. J. KIRKEBOEN, E. LEUVEN, AND M. MOGSTAD (2022): “Instrumental Variables with Unordered Treatments: Theory and Evidence from Returns to Fields of Study,” Working Paper 30574, National Bureau of Economic Research.

- HUANG, L., U. KHALIL, AND N. YILDIZ (2019): “Identification and estimation of a triangular model with multiple endogenous variables and insufficiently many instrumental variables,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 208(2), 346–366.
- IMBENS, G. W. (2000): “The role of the propensity score in estimating dose-response functions,” *Biometrika*, 87(3), 706–710.
- IMBENS, G. W., AND J. D. ANGRIST (1994): “Identification and Estimation of Local Average Treatment Effects,” *Econometrica*, 62(2), 467–475.
- KAMAT, V. (2023): “Identification of Program Access Effects with an Application to Head Start,” arXiv:1711.02048, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.02048>.
- KIRKEBOEN, L. J., E. LEUVEN, AND M. MOGSTAD (2016): “Field of study, earnings, and self-selection,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(3), 1057–1111.
- KLINE, P., AND C. R. WALTERS (2016): “Evaluating public programs with close substitutes: The case of Head Start,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(4), 1795–1848.
- LEE, S., AND B. SALANIÉ (2018): “Identifying effects of multivalued treatments,” *Econometrica*, 86(6), 1939–1963.
- MOGSTAD, M., A. SANTOS, AND A. TORGOVITSKY (2018): “Using Instrumental Variables for Inference About Policy Relevant Treatment Parameters,” *Econometrica*, 86(5), 1589–1619.
- MOGSTAD, M., A. TORGOVITSKY, AND C. R. WALTERS (2020): “Policy Evaluation With Multiple Instrumental Variables,” Working Paper 27546, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- MOGSTAD, M., A. TORGOVITSKY, AND C. R. WALTERS (2021): “The Causal Interpretation of Two-Stage Least Squares with Multiple Instrumental Variables,” *American Economic Review*, 111(11), 3663–98.
- MOUNTJOY, J. (2022): “Community Colleges and Upward Mobility,” *American Economic Review*, 112, 2580–2630.
- MURALIDHARAN, K., M. ROMERO, AND K. WÜTHRICH (2023): “Factorial Designs, Model Selection, and (Incorrect) Inference in Randomized Experiments,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, pp. 1–44, Just Accepted.
- NAVJEEVAN, M., AND R. PINTO (2022): “Ordered, Unordered and Minimal Monotonicity Criteria,” UCLA, mimeo, <https://www.rodriiopinto.net/>.
- NIBBERING, D., M. OOSTERVEEN, AND P. L. SILVA (2022): “Clustered local average treatment effects: fields of study and academic student progress,” Discussion Paper No. 15159.

- PINTO, R. (2021): “Beyond Intention to Treat: Using the Incentives in Moving to Opportunity to Identify Neighborhood Effects,” UCLA, mimeo, <https://www.rodrigopinto.net/>.
- ROTH, A., AND M. SOTOMAYOR (1990): *Two-sided Matching*. Cambridge University Press.
- SŁOCZYŃSKI, T. (2022): “Interpreting OLS estimands when treatment effects are heterogeneous: Smaller groups get larger weights,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 104, 1–9.
- TORGOVITSKY, A. (2015): “Identification of Nonseparable Models Using Instruments with Small Support,” *Econometrica*, 83(3), 1185–1197.
- VYTLACIL, E. (2002): “Independence, monotonicity, and latent index models: An equivalence result,” *Econometrica*, 70(1), 331–341.

Online Appendices to “Treatment Effects with Targeting Instruments”

B Proofs for Section 3.3

Let us first translate Kirkeboen, Leuven, and Mogstad’s (2016) assumptions in our notation to show that their assumptions are equivalent to strict one to one targeting.

KLM impose the following in their Assumption 4:

- if $T_i(0) = 1$ then $T_i(1) = 1$
- if $T_i(0) = 2$ then $T_i(2) = 2$.

This can be viewed as a monotonicity assumption. It excludes the twelve response groups C_{10*} , C_{12*} , C_{2*0} , and C_{2*1} .

Their Proposition 2 proves point-identification of response-groups when one of three alternative assumptions is added to their Assumption 4. We focus here on the irrelevance assumption in their Proposition 2 (iii), which is the weakest of the three and the one their application relies on. In our notation, it states that:

- if $(T_i(0) \neq 1 \text{ and } T_i(1) \neq 1)$, then $(T_i(0) = 2 \text{ iff } T_i(1) = 2)$
- if $(T_i(0) \neq 2 \text{ and } T_i(2) \neq 2)$, then $(T_i(0) = 1 \text{ iff } T_i(2) = 1)$.

These complicated statements can be simplified. Take the first part. If both $T_i(0)$ and $T_i(1)$ are not 1, then they can only be 0 or 2. Therefore we are requiring $T_i(0) = T_i(1)$. Applying the same argument to the second part, the irrelevance assumption becomes:

- if $(T_i(0) \neq 1 \text{ and } T_i(1) \neq 1)$, then $T_i(0) = T_i(1)$
- if $(T_i(0) \neq 2 \text{ and } T_i(2) \neq 2)$, then $T_i(0) = T_i(2)$.

It therefore excludes the response-groups C_{02*} , C_{20*} , C_{0*1} , and C_{1*0} . The response-group C_{021} appears twice in this list; and four other response-groups were already ruled out by Assumption 4. The reader can easily check that the $3^3 - 12 - (11 - 4) = 8$ response-groups left are exactly the same as in our Figure 4.

Proof of Proposition 9. The moment conditions that define β_0 , β_1 and β_2 are

$$(B.1) \quad \mathbb{E}[(Y_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1 \mathbf{1}(T_i = 1) - \beta_2 \mathbf{1}(T_i = 2)) \mathbf{1}(Z_i = z)] = 0$$

for $z = 0, 1, 2$.

Using counterfactual notation, we write

$$(B.2) \quad Y_i = Y_i(0) + (Y_i(1) - Y_i(0))\mathbf{1}(T_i = 1) + (Y_i(1) - Y_i(0))\mathbf{1}(T_i = 2),$$

which allows us to write Equation (B.1) as

$$(B.3) \quad \mathbb{E}[(Y_i(0) - \beta_0 + b_i(1)\mathbf{1}(T_i = 1) + b_i(2)\mathbf{1}(T_i = 2))\mathbf{1}(Z_i = z)] = 0,$$

where $b_i(t) \equiv Y_i(t) - Y_i(0) - \beta_t$ for $t = 1, 2$.

Now since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}(T_i = t) &= \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = t) + (\mathbf{1}(T_i(1) = t) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = t))\mathbf{1}(Z_i = 1) \\ &\quad + (\mathbf{1}(T_i(2) = t) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = t))\mathbf{1}(Z_i = 2), \end{aligned}$$

we can expand

$$\begin{aligned} &[Y_i(0) - \beta_0 + b_i(1)\mathbf{1}(T_i = 1) + b_i(2)\mathbf{1}(T_i = 2)] \times \mathbf{1}(Z_i = z) \\ &= [Y_i(0) - \beta_0 + b_i(1)\mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 1) + b_i(2)\mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 2) \\ &\quad + b_i(1)(\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 1) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 1)) + b_i(2)(\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 2) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 2))] \times \mathbf{1}(Z_i = z). \end{aligned}$$

Since Z_i is independent of $\{Y_i(t), T_i(z) : t, z = 0, 1, \dots, T-1\}$, all of the terms that multiply $\mathbf{1}(Z_i = z)$ are independent of it. It follows that for $z = 0, 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[Y_i(0) - \beta_0 + b_i(1)\mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 1) + b_i(2)\mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 2) \\ &\quad + b_i(1)(\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 1) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 1)) + b_i(2)(\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 2) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 2))] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

When $z = 0$, the second line is zero; therefore

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i(0) - \beta_0 + b_i(1)\mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 1) + b_i(2)\mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 2)) = 0.$$

The other two equations become

$$\mathbb{E}(b_i(1)(\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 1) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 1)) + b_i(2)(\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 2) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 2))) = 0$$

for $z = 1, 2$. Remembering that $b_i(t) = Y_i(t) - Y_i(0) - \beta_t$ for $t = 1, 2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0))(\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 1) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 1)) + (Y_i(2) - Y_i(0))(\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 2) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 2))] \\ &= \beta_1 \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 1) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 1)) + \beta_2 \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 2) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 2)). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 9 follows after noting that given Table 4,

- the variable $\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 1) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 1)$ is $\mathbf{1}(i \in \mathcal{C}_1)$ for $z = 1$ and $-\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{112})$ for $z = 2$;
- the variable $\mathbf{1}(T_i(z) = 2) - \mathbf{1}(T_i(0) = 2)$ is $\mathbf{1}(i \in \mathcal{C}_2)$ for $z = 2$ and $-\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{212})$ for $z = 1$.

□

Proof of Corollary 4. Solving the system of equations in Proposition 9 gives, after elementary calculations,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 \mathcal{D} &= \Pr(i \in C_{212}) [\mathbb{E}((Y_i(2) - Y_i(0))\mathbf{1}(i \in \mathcal{C}_2)) - \mathbb{E}((Y_i(1) - Y_i(0))\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{112}))] \\ &\quad + \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_2) [\mathbb{E}((Y_i(1) - Y_i(0))\mathbf{1}(i \in \mathcal{C}_1)) - \mathbb{E}((Y_i(2) - Y_i(0))\mathbf{1}(i \in C_{212}))] \\ &= \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_1) \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_2) \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in \mathcal{C}_1) - \Pr(i \in C_{112}) \Pr(i \in C_{212}) \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in C_{112}) \\ &\quad + \Pr(i \in C_{212}) \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_2) [\mathbb{E}(Y_i(2) - Y_i(0)|i \in \mathcal{C}_2) - \mathbb{E}(Y_i(2) - Y_i(0)|i \in C_{212})]. \end{aligned}$$

The difference of treatment effects in the last line is simply \mathcal{D}_2 ; note that it is multiplied by a non-negative term. Suppose for instance that $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2 \geq 0$. Then

(B.4)

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_1 \mathcal{D} \\ & \geq \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_1) \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_2) \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in \mathcal{C}_1) - \Pr(i \in C_{112}) \Pr(i \in C_{212}) \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)|i \in C_{112}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it is easy to prove the following: define $r = (\alpha a - \beta b)/(a - b)$ with $a, b \geq 0$ and $a \neq b$. Then

1. if $(\alpha - \beta)$ and $(a - b)$ have the same sign, $r \geq \max(\alpha, \beta)$
2. if $(\alpha - \beta)$ and $(a - b)$ have different signs, $r \leq \min(\alpha, \beta)$.

Now take

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_1) \Pr(i \in \mathcal{C}_2) \\
b &= \Pr(i \in C_{112}) \Pr(i \in C_{212}) \\
\alpha &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | i \in \mathcal{C}_1) \\
\beta &= \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | i \in C_{112}).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that a and b are non-negative, and $a - b = \mathcal{D} \neq 0$. Suppose that $\mathcal{D} > 0$ so that Equation (B.4) becomes $\beta_1 \geq r$. Since $\alpha - \beta = \mathcal{D}_1 \geq 0$, we can apply result 1 and we get

$$\beta_1 \geq \max(\alpha, \beta) = \alpha = \mathbb{E}(Y_i(1) - Y_i(0) | i \in \mathcal{C}_1).$$

If on the other hand \mathcal{D} is negative, then we have $\beta_1 \leq r$ and since \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}_1 have different signs result 2 gives

$$\beta_1 \leq \min(\alpha, \beta) = \beta$$

and a fortiori $\beta_1 \leq \alpha$.

Similar arguments apply to β_2 , as well as to the the case when \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 are non-positive. \square

C The 3×3 Model of Pinto (2021)

Pinto (2021) has proposed a 3×3 model of the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) experiment. Here we use our framework to identify response-group probabilities and several counterfactual averages.

We follow the notation in Pinto (2021). Let $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_c, z_e, z_8\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \{t_h, t_l, t_m\}$, where

- z_c refers to control families, z_e those who received the experimental voucher, and z_8 those who received Section 8 voucher;
- t_h refers to families who did not move and chose high-poverty neighborhoods, t_l those who moved to low-poverty neighborhoods, and t_m those who moved to medium-poverty neighborhoods.


There are 7 response types in Pinto (2021): the three always-taker groups C_{hhh} , C_{lll} , and C_{mmm} , and four complier groups:

- C_{hlm} : families who choose high-poverty without vouchers, low-poverty with the experimental voucher, and medium-poverty with Section 8 vouchers (Pinto calls this group

full-compliers);

- C_{hll} : families who choose high-poverty without vouchers, low-poverty with either voucher;
- C_{mlm} : families who choose medium-poverty without the experimental voucher, low-poverty with it;
- C_{hlm} : families who choose high-poverty without Section 8 voucher, medium-poverty with it.

Figure 7: MTO



The seven response groups are illustrated in Figure 7 and in Table 6.

Table 6: Response Groups in MTO

	$T_i(z) = t_h$	$T_i(z) = t_l$	$T_i(z) = t_m$
$z = z_c$	$C_{hhh} \cup C_{ghm} \cup C_{hlm} \cup C_{hll}$	C_{ull}	$C_{mmm} \cup C_{mlm}$
$z = z_e$	$C_{hhh} \cup C_{ghm}$	$C_{ull} \cup C_{mlm} \cup C_{hlm} \cup C_{hll}$	C_{mmm}
$z = z_8$	C_{hhh}	$C_{ull} \cup C_{hll}$	$C_{mmm} \cup C_{ghm} \cup C_{hlm} \cup C_{mlm}$

Proposition 10 (Response-group probabilities in MTO). *The following probabilities are iden-*

tified:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr(C_{hhh}) = P(t_h|z_8), \\
& \Pr(C_{lll}) = P(t_l|z_c), \\
& \Pr(C_{mmm}) = P(t_m|z_e), \\
(C.1) \quad & \Pr(C_{hhm}) = P(t_h|z_e) - P(t_h|z_8), \\
& \Pr(C_{hll}) = P(t_l|z_8) - P(t_l|z_c), \\
& \Pr(C_{mlm}) = P(t_m|z_c) - P(t_m|z_e), \\
& \Pr(C_{hlm}) = 1 - P(t_h|z_e) - P(t_l|z_8) - P(t_m|z_c).
\end{aligned}$$

The model has the following testable implications:

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(t_h|z_e) \geq P(t_h|z_8), \\
(C.2) \quad & P(t_l|z_8) \geq P(t_l|z_c), \\
& P(t_m|z_c) \geq P(t_m|z_e), \\
& 1 \geq P(t_h|z_e) + P(t_l|z_8) + P(t_m|z_c).
\end{aligned}$$

The following proposition identifies a number of group average outcomes.

Proposition 11 (Identification in MTO). *The following group average outcomes are point-*

identified:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(t_h)|i \in C_{hhh}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_{z_8}(t_h)}{P(t_h|z_8)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(t_l)|i \in C_{hhh}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_{z_c}(t_l)}{P(t_l|z_c)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(t_m)|i \in C_{mmm}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_{z_e}(t_m)}{P(t_m|z_e)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(t_h)|i \in C_{hhm}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_{z_e}(t_h) - \bar{E}_{z_8}(t_h)}{P(t_h|z_e) - P(t_h|z_8)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(t_l)|i \in C_{hll}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_{z_8}(t_l) - \bar{E}_{z_c}(t_l)}{P(t_l|z_8) - P(t_l|z_c)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(t_m)|i \in C_{mlm}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_{z_c}(t_m) - \bar{E}_{z_e}(t_m)}{P(t_m|z_c) - P(t_m|z_e)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(t_h)|i \in C_{hll} \cup C_{hlm}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_{z_c}(t_h) - \bar{E}_{z_e}(t_h)}{P(t_h|z_c) - P(t_h|z_e)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(t_l)|i \in C_{mlm} \cup C_{hlm}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_{z_e}(t_l) - \bar{E}_{z_8}(t_l)}{P(t_l|z_e) - P(t_l|z_8)}, \\
\mathbb{E}[Y_i(t_m)|i \in C_{hhm} \cup C_{hlm}] &= \frac{\bar{E}_{z_8}(t_m) - \bar{E}_{z_c}(t_m)}{P(t_m|z_e) - P(t_m|z_c)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proofs of Propositions 10 and 11 are straightforward; we omit the details.