

Testing Instrument Validity with Covariates *

Thomas Carr[†], Toru Kitagawa[‡]

9 December 2021

Abstract

We develop a novel specification test of the instrumental variable identifying assumptions (instrument validity) for heterogeneous treatment effect models with conditioning covariates. Building on the common empirical settings of local average treatment effect and marginal treatment effect analysis, we assume semiparametric dependence between the potential outcomes and conditioning covariates, and show that this allows us to express the testable implications of instrument validity in terms of equality and inequality restrictions among the subdensities of estimable partial residuals. We propose jointly testing these restrictions. To improve power of the test, we propose *distillation*, a process designed to reduce the sample down to the information useful for detecting violations of the instrument validity inequalities. We perform Monte Carlo exercises to demonstrate the gain in power from testing restrictions jointly and distillation. We apply our test procedure to the college proximity instrument of Card (1993), the same-sex instrument of Angrist and Evans (1998), the school leaving age instrument of Oreopoulos (2006), and the mean land gradient instrument of Dinkelman (2011). We find that the null of instrument validity conditional on covariates cannot be rejected for Card (1993) and Dinkelman (2011), but it can be rejected at the 10% level of significance for Angrist and Evans (1998) for some levels of a tuning parameter, and it is rejected at all conventional levels of significance in the case of Oreopoulos (2006).

Keywords: Program evaluation, local average treatment effect, marginal treatment effect.

*The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support from ERC grant (number 715940) and the ESRC Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice (CeMMAP) (grant number RES-589-28-0001).

[†]Department of Economics, University College London. Email: t.carr@ucl.ac.uk

[‡]Department of Economics, Brown University and Department of Economics, University College London. Email: toru.kitagawa@brown.edu

1 Introduction

Instrumental variable (IV) methods are widely used in empirical economics. The credibility of IV estimates relies crucially on the validity of the identifying assumptions, which are often subject to debate. In IV estimation, conditioning covariates are frequently used to enhance the credibility of the identifying assumptions or improve the precision of estimates. For example, when using proximity to college as an instrument to estimate the return to schooling, researchers control for demographic and location characteristics which may otherwise induce dependence between the instrument and the outcome. In panel data settings, the credibility of instruments often relies on controlling for individual fixed effects. The work of Huber and Mellace (2015), Kitagawa (2015), and Mourifié and Wan (2017) offers statistical tests for instrument validity in the heterogeneous treatment effect model of Imbens and Angrist (1994). However, the state of the art literature lacks high-power tests for instrument validity that remain computationally feasible for more than a small number of covariates.

This paper proposes an easy-to-implement test procedure for instrumental validity in the heterogeneous treatment effect model that can accommodate a moderate to large number of conditioning covariates. Building on the semi-parametric approach of Carneiro et al. (2011), we specify that potential outcomes depend linearly on conditioning covariates. Under these restrictions, outcomes follow a partially linear model that depends non-parametrically on the propensity score. This allows the conditioning covariates to be partialled out and partial residuals obtained. Testable implications for the instrumental variable identifying assumptions which hold without conditioning on covariates can be stated for the subdensities of these partial residuals. With partial residuals in hand, testing can be performed without reference to covariate values. Compared with the proposed test with conditioning covariates considered in Kitagawa (2015), this greatly reduces the computational burden. Increasing the number of conditioning covariates increases only the complexity of estimating the partially linear model, but does not increase the number of inequalities to be tested.

With conditioning covariates introduced into the identifying assumptions, two testable implications are available: *index sufficiency* and *nesting inequalities*. Index sufficiency states that partial residual subdensities depend on the instrument value through the propensity score only. The nesting inequalities are monotonicity inequalities for the joint distributions of the partial residuals and treatment status. They state that, for two distinct values of the propensity score, the distribution of partial residuals for treated units with the higher propensity score nests that of units with the lower propensity score, and this inequality is reversed for untreated units. The two testable implications complement each other: index sufficiency holds the propensity score fixed and compares subdensities for different values of the instrument, while the nesting inequalities compare subden-

sities for different propensity scores. To exploit this complementarity, we propose jointly testing the two.

As the subdensity nesting inequalities are ordered with respect to the propensity score, a natural approach to testing them would be to coarsen the propensity score and test the monotonicity of the subdensities conditional on this coarsened propensity score. When the propensity score is strongly correlated with the conditioning covariates, this approach can result in a test with low power. In such cases, classifying observations by propensity score will homogenise the distribution of instrument values across propensity score bins, which can mask violations of instrument validity.

We suggest testing instead monotonicity of the conditional partial residual subdensities given the instrument. This approach ensures that observations with different instrument values are kept separate. We show that, when the identifying assumptions are satisfied, the nesting inequalities hold for the instrument if the conditional distribution of propensity scores is monotonic in the instrument in the sense of first-order stochastic dominance. If first-order stochastic dominance does not hold for the instrument, we propose trimming the sample and testing the nesting inequalities for a subsample where first-order stochastic dominance is satisfied. We refer to this process as *distillation* as it distills the sample down to the observations best able to detect violations.

We perform Monte Carlo exercises to evaluate the size and power of the proposed test procedure and compare it to two alternatives: the Kitagawa (2015) test that does not control for covariates, and the test of nesting inequalities using a coarsened propensity score. We consider processes where the instrument is independent of the covariates, and processes where it is not. In the first case, an instrument that is valid conditional on the covariates will also be valid without conditioning covariates, so the size of the Kitagawa (2015) test will not be distorted. In the second, size will only be controlled if the conditioning covariates are appropriately controlled for. We find that the size of the proposed test is controlled in all cases. For processes where the Kitagawa (2015) test has the correct size, we find our test procedure has comparable power. For all processes, it has higher power than the test of nesting inequalities using a coarsened propensity score. We also investigate the contributions of the index sufficiency and nesting inequality tests to the power of the combined test. These results suggest that index sufficiency is most able to detect violations when the distributions of propensity scores for different instrument values are similar, so that there are observations with different instrument values and a similar propensity score. On the other hand, for the processes considered, rejection probabilities when testing the nesting inequalities do not depend strongly on the similarity of the propensity score distributions across instrument values. This is consistent with the two testable implications being complementary.

To demonstrate the feasibility of the test procedure and illustrate how it can be used to resolve questions of instrument credibility, we present four applications. The first is Card (1993). This in-

strument has been tested by Huber and Mellace (2015), Kitagawa (2015), Mourifié and Wan (2017) and Sun (2021) but, for computational reasons, each of these authors used only a subset of the conditioning covariates of the original specification. The proposed test procedure allows all conditioning covariates to be included without sacrificing computational feasibility. Second, we apply the test to the same-sex instrument of Angrist and Evans (1998). The validity of this instrument has been questioned by, among others, Rosenzweig and Wolpin (2000) and de Chaisemartin (2017), and its validity has been formally tested by Huber (2015) and Mourifié and Wan (2017). As with Card (1993), these authors use only a subset of the conditioning covariates. Our test procedure allows us test its validity while using all conditioning covariates. Next, we turn to identifying strategies that rely on geographical variation in the timing of changes in compulsory schooling laws. Using data for America, Stephens and Yang (2014) present evidence that changes in education laws are correlated with other state-level changes, which suggests that the instrument is not valid. We test its validity in the case of the UK using the data of Oreopoulos (2006). Finally, we consider instruments derived from geographical features, which have been widely used to estimate the effects of infrastructure. In the absence of a formal test for instrument validity, this literature has relied on ad hoc tests to show instrument credibility. To demonstrate that our procedure can provide a formal test for instrument validity, we apply it to the data of Dinkelman (2011) where mean land gradient is used as an instrument for electrification.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows. First, by exploiting semiparametric restrictions on the dependence between the potential outcomes and conditioning covariates, we derive a new set of testable implications for the MTE identifying assumptions (instrument validity). Second, to empirically assess the testable implications, we propose a joint test of index sufficiency and the nesting inequalities. While we primarily view this as a test of instrument validity, the null hypothesis relies also on the functional form specified for the local instrumental variable regression (i.e., the dependence between the potential outcomes and the conditioning covariates), so our test can be also used to check the functional form specification. Third, to improve power when testing the nesting inequalities, we introduce the concept of ‘distillation’ which separates information useful for assessing instrument validity from information used to identify MTEs and other causal parameters. Fourth, we show how the test procedure can be applied in a variety of contexts and provide evidence of the (in)validity of several instruments. The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 discusses the semiparametric testable implications and introduces. Section 3 describes the test procedure. Section 4 presents Monte Carlo exercises. Section 5 discusses four empirical applications. Section 6 concludes.

1.1 Related Literature

This paper contributes to the active literature on the identification and estimation of the local average treatment effect (LATE) model of Angrist et al. (1996) and Imbens and Angrist (1994) and the marginal treatment effect model (MTE) of Heckman and Vytlacil (1999, 2001a,b, 2005). This literature has recently been reviewed by Mogstad and Torgovitsky (2018). A testable implication of the LATE identifying restrictions was derived in Balke and Pearl (1997), Imbens and Rubin (1997) and Heckman and Vytlacil (2005). Kitagawa (2015) shows that this testable implication is sharp, and proposes a test procedure using a Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic. Mourifié and Wan (2017) reformulate this testable implication as a conditional moment inequality, and propose a test based on the intersection bounds framework of Chernozhukov et al. (2013). It is straightforward to generalise this testable implication to incorporate conditioning covariates, but assessing it non-parametrically in a finite sample is limited by the capacity of nonparametric methods to handle multiple conditioning covariates.

To facilitate the estimation of marginal treatment effects while controlling for multiple conditioning covariates, Carneiro et al. (2011) imposes that potential outcomes are linear in the conditioning covariates with additive unobserved heterogeneities, and assumes that these unobservables are statistically independent of the covariates and instrument. The test procedure presented in this paper corresponds to a test for the validity of the identifying assumptions of Carneiro et al. (2011). Carneiro and Lee (2009), Maestas et al. (2013), Eisenhauer et al. (2015), Kline and Walters (2016), Cornelissen et al. (2018), Felfe and Lalive (2018) and Bhuller et al. (2020) among others apply the approach of Carneiro et al. (2011) to recover marginal treatment effects. Our test procedure can be applied in any of these contexts to assess the validity of the identifying assumptions. Furthermore, even if the validity of the instrument is undisputed, the test procedure can still be used to detect errors in the functional form specification for the relationship between potential outcomes and conditioning covariates. Brinch et al. (2017) further develop the approach of Carneiro et al. (2011), and show how marginal treatment effects can be identified in a variety of settings. Mogstad et al. (2018) discuss how to extrapolate marginal treatment effects to set identify policy relevant treatment effects.

Several authors have proposed alternative tests of the LATE identifying assumptions. Huber and Mellace (2015) begin with a weaker set of identifying restrictions than that typically employed in the literature, derive a testable implication, and propose several test procedures. Laffers and Mellace (2017) show that the testable implication of Huber and Mellace (2015) is sharp for the set of assumptions they consider. Sun (2021) derives testable implications when the treatment is an ordered or unordered multi-valued variable, and proposes a power improving refinement of the Kitagawa (2015) test procedure. Arai et al. (forthcoming) extend the Kitagawa (2015) test to

fuzzy regression discontinuity designs. Farbmacher et al. (2020) propose a test procedure that uses random forests and classification and regression trees to find violations of the monotonicity and exclusion assumptions. Kédagni and Mourifié (2020) derive a testable implication of the instrument independence assumption in the form of a set of inequalities. They reformulate these inequalities as a set of conditional expectations and develop a test procedure using the framework of Chernozhukov et al. (2013). Machado et al. (2019) discuss tests for instrument validity in the case of a binary outcome which responds monotonically with respect to the treatment. Frandsen et al. (2019) develop a test of the identifying assumptions of research designs based on the random assignment of judges. The closest paper to ours is Mao and Sant’Anna (2020). They also use the MTE framework of Carneiro et al. (2011), and derive index sufficiency and the nesting inequalities. They propose testing the two implications separately, and focus on the nesting inequalities. They construct a test of the nesting inequalities that considers many possible discretisations of the propensity score. We differ in that we jointly test index sufficiency and the nesting inequalities. In addition, for the nesting inequalities, rather than examining subdensities indexed by the propensity score, we propose constructing a distilled sample so that the inequalities hold for subdensities indexed by the instrument.

We contribute to several empirical literatures by testing the validity of commonly used instruments and identification strategies. The college proximity instrument of Card (1993) has also been employed by Cameron and Taber (2004) to estimate the effects of borrowing constraints on education, Carneiro et al. (2011) to estimate the marginal treatment effect of education, Heckman et al. (2018) to estimate the effects of education on labour market and health outcomes. The same-sex instrument of Angrist and Evans (1998) has been used widely to identify the effects of family size. Black et al. (2010), Conley and Glauber (2006), Angrist et al. (2010) and Becker et al. (2010) use this instrument to empirically investigate the existence of a quantity-quality trade-off for children, while Cruces and Galiani (2007) employs it to investigate the relationship between family size and maternal labour supply. Other than Oreopoulos (2006), geographical variation in schooling laws has been employed by Acemoglu and Angrist (2000) to estimate human capital externalities, Lochner and Moretti (2004) to estimate the effect of education on imprisonment rate, and Clark and Royer (2013) to estimate the effects of education on life expectancy. The identification strategy of Dinkelman (2011) falls within an extensive literature that uses instruments derived from geographical features to identify the effects of infrastructure projects. Examples include Duflo and Pande (2007), who study the effects of irrigation dams, Lipscomb et al. (2013) and Rud (2012), which study electrification, Blakeslee et al. (2020) who study the consequences of loss of access to ground water for agricultural workers in India, and Datta (2012) and Banerjee et al. (2020) which estimate the effects of transportation infrastructure.

2 Model and Testable Implications

2.1 Setting

The data is a random sample (Y, D, X, Z) , where Y is an observed outcome continuously distributed on \mathbb{R} , $D \in \{1, 0\}$ is an observed binary treatment status indicating treated ($D = 1$) or non-treated ($D = 0$), $X \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{k_x}$ is a vector of individual pretreatment observable covariates, and $Z \in \mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^{k_z}$ is a vector of instrumental variables. For the moment, we impose no restriction on the instrument. Let $\{Y_{dz}\}_{d \in \{1, 0\}, z \in \mathcal{Z}}$ be the set of potential outcomes indexed by treatment status $d \in \{1, 0\}$ and instrument value $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. The observed outcome Y can be written as

$$Y = Y_{1Z}D + Y_{0Z}(1 - D).$$

We write a selection equation of unconstrained form as

$$D = 1\{v(X, Z, U_D) \geq 0\}.$$

We interpret this selection equation as follows. With U_D fixed at u_D , $D_{xz} = 1\{v(x, z, u_D) \geq 0\}$ generates the counterfactual selection response for an individual when their pre-treatment characteristics X and instrument Z are exogenously set at x and z .

The following three assumptions constitute instrument validity and identify the marginal treatment effect (MTE):

MTE Identification Assumptions (Heckman and Vytlacil (2005)):

- (A1) *Instrument exclusion restriction:* Potential outcomes do not depend on the instrument in the sense $Y_{1z} = Y_1$ and $Y_{0z} = Y_0$ for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ with probability one.
- (A2) *Random assignment:* $(\{Y_{1z}\}_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}, \{Y_{0z}\}_{z \in \mathcal{Z}}, U_D)$ are statistically independent of Z conditional on X , and U_D is statistically independent of X .
- (A3) *Instrument monotonicity:* For every $z, z' \in \mathcal{Z}$, $v(x, z, u_D) \geq v(x, z', u_D)$ holds for all $u_D \in \mathcal{U}$ or $v(x, z, u_D) \leq v(x, z', u_D)$ holds for all $u_D \in \mathcal{U}$.

The instrument exclusion restriction (A1) precludes the instrument from having a direct causal impact on the outcome for any member of the population. With instrument exclusion imposed, an individual's potential outcomes are reduced to a pair indexed only by their treatment status, i.e. Y_1

denotes their potential outcome with treatment and Y_0 their potential outcome without treatment. The observed outcome Y can then be written as $Y = Y_1D + Y_0(1 - D)$.

Assumption (A2) states that, conditional on X , the instrument Z is assigned irrespective of underlying potential outcomes and unobserved heterogeneity in selection response. This corresponds to the conventional assumption of instrument exogeneity. In the heterogeneous treatment effect model, however, it should be noted that instrument exogeneity takes the form of joint statistical independence of potential outcomes and selection heterogeneities, rather than the zero-correlation exogeneity restriction. Assumption (A3) states that a hypothetical change in the instrument from z' to z can induce some individuals to opt in to treatment or some individuals to opt out of treatment, but never both simultaneously. Equivalently, there is a sub-population of compliers associated with this hypothetical change, but no sub-population of defiers. Instrument monotonicity of the form (A3) allows for multiple instrumental variables. Mogstad et al. (2020) argue that, in the presence of multiple instruments, (A3) implies restrictions on individual selection responses that are quite restrictive in some context. Our test procedure allows for multiple instruments and can be used to assess a necessary testable implication of (A3) jointly with the exclusion and random assignment restrictions. Section 3.3 discusses in detail the implications of multiple instruments for instrument validity testing.

Following Heckman and Vytlacil (2001a, 2005), assumptions (A1) - (A3) imply a heterogeneous treatment effect model of the following form:

$$\begin{cases} Y_1 = m_1(X) + \tilde{U}_1; \\ Y_0 = m_0(X) + \tilde{U}_0; \\ Y = DY_1 + (1 - D)Y_0; \\ D = 1\{p(X, Z) - V \geq 0\}, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with

$$(Y_1, Y_0, V) \perp Z|X \quad \text{and} \quad V \perp X. \quad (2)$$

Here, $E[Y_1|X = x] = m_1(x)$ and $E[Y_0|X = x] = m_0(x)$ are regression equations of potential outcomes (Y_1, Y_0) on the control covariates, \tilde{U}_1 and \tilde{U}_0 are unobserved heterogeneities in the potential outcomes (Y_1, Y_0) , $p(x, z) = \Pr(D = 1|X = x, Z = z)$ is the propensity score, and V is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$ and is independent of (X, Z) .

2.2 Semiparametric Testable Implications

The MTE identifying assumptions introduced above involve counterfactual variables that are never jointly observed for the same individual, so cannot be directly verified using the distribution of observables. However, *necessary* testable implications have been established. These conditions

relate to the distribution of observables, so may be examined empirically. They consist of *single index sufficiency* and *nesting inequalities*. We present a proof in Appendix for completeness.

Proposition 1 (Heckman and Vytlačil 2005) *Assume (A1) - (A3) and that, conditional on $X = x$, the propensity score $p(Z, X)$ has a nondegenerate distribution. Then, at any such x , the following two conditions hold:*

(i) **Index sufficiency:** *The conditional distribution of (Y, D) given (X, Z) depends on Z only through the propensity score $p(X, Z)$, i.e., for any measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{Y}$ and $d \in \{0, 1\}$,*

$$\Pr(Y \in A, D = d | X = x, Z = z) = \Pr(Y \in A, D = d | p(X, Z) = p, X = x) \quad (3)$$

holds for any (x, z) where $p = p(x, z)$.

(ii) **Nesting inequalities:** *The following inequalities hold for every $p \geq p'$ in the support of $p(Z, X)$ and every measurable subset $A \subset \mathcal{Y}$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(Y \in A, D = 1 | p(X, Z) = p, X = x) &\geq \Pr(Y \in A, D = 1 | p(X, Z) = p', X = x), \\ \Pr(Y \in A, D = 0 | p(X, Z) = p, X = x) &\leq \Pr(Y \in A, D = 0 | p(X, Z) = p', X = x). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Condition (i), index sufficiency, restricts the conditional distribution of (Y, D) given (X, Z) to depend on Z through the propensity score $p(X, Z)$ only. That is, if there are multiple values of Z , say $z \neq z' \in \mathcal{Z}$ that yield the same value of the propensity score given $X = x$, the conditional distributions of (Y, D) given $(X = x, Z = z)$ and $(X = x, Z = z')$ must be identical. Condition (ii) provides distributional monotonicity inequalities among the conditional distributions of (Y, D) given (p, x) with respect to $p = p(X, Z)$. This corresponds to the testable monotonicity shown by Heckman and Vytlačil (2005). The difference between the two sides of (4) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr(Y_1 \in A, p' < U_D \leq p | X = x) \\ &= \Pr(Y_1 \in A | p' < U_D \leq p, X = x) \times \Pr(p' < U_D \leq p | X = x). \end{aligned}$$

Individuals whose selection heterogeneity U_D falls in $(p', p]$ can be viewed as compliers conditional on $X = x$. (4) imposes non-negativity of the treated outcome probability density function for these conditional compliers. Detecting any violation of the conditions of Proposition 1 allows the joint restrictions of (A1) - (A3) to be refuted. Neither of these testable implications restrict the support of the instrument Z , i.e., Z can be discrete, continuous, or multi-dimensional. The testable implications of Proposition 1 are known to be sharp (Mao and Sant'Anna (2020)) in the sense that any distribution of observables satisfying them can be generated by a model (1) satisfying (A1) - (A3).

The two testable implications shown in Proposition 1 are distinct and assess different aspects of the distribution of observables. Holding X fixed, index sufficiency compares conditional distributions of (Y, D) given $(p(X, Z), X)$ at a *fixed* value of the propensity score, while the nesting inequalities compare conditional distributions across *different* values of the propensity score. Consequently, there are scenarios in which one testable implication is useful for assessing instrument validity but the other is not. For instance, if Z is a scalar and $p(x, z)$ is monotonic in z at every x , instrument validity cannot be assessed through index sufficiency since there is no variation in the instrument conditional on $(p(X, Z), X)$, whereas it can be assessed using the nesting inequalities. Conversely, when the propensity score does not vary with the instrument conditional on X (i.e. the instrument is irrelevant), index sufficiency does have content for assessing instrument validity while the nesting inequalities do not. As such, the two testable implications complement each other and joint assessment of them is desirable.

When the dimension of X is moderate to high, nonparametrically testing the implications listed in Proposition 1 is challenging. Kitagawa (2015) proposes testing the inequalities of Proposition 1 (ii) with a Kolmogorov-Smirnov type test statistic where a supremum is taken over a large class of instrument functions defined on the product space of Y and X . Similar to optimization in the empirical risk minimizing classification problem, the computational complexity of searching for this supremum increases with the dimension of X . Due to this computational barrier, the finite sample power of this test is unknown, and it has rarely been implemented in practice. Furthermore, accommodating a continuous instrument in this procedure remains an open problem.

We develop a test for instrument validity which circumvents the implementation issues that arise due to conditioning covariates. This test *jointly* assesses index sufficiency and the nesting inequalities. In addition, the test procedure can accommodate continuous instruments.

To achieve this, we impose the semiparametric restrictions proposed by Carneiro et al. (2011), which have since been used in many empirical studies of marginal treatment effects.

(A4) Linear Functional Form: The regression equations for potential outcomes have the parametric form

$$\begin{cases} Y_1 = \alpha_1 + X'\theta_1 + \tilde{U}_1; \\ Y_0 = \alpha_0 + X'\theta_0 + \tilde{U}_0, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

In addition, strengthen the exogeneity restriction (A2) to:

(A5) Strong Exogeneity: Let $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_0)$ be the residuals of the potential outcome regression equations defined in (5). $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_0, V)$ is independent of (Z, X) .

(A4) restricts the conditional mean potential outcomes to depend linearly on the covariates. (A5) implies that the mean zero unobserved terms $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_0)$ are independent of the covariates. (A4) and (A5) jointly imply that covariates affect the potential outcomes only through their conditional means. Note that this assumption does not imply that the treatment effect is homogeneous, since the individual causal effect $Y_1 - Y_0$ remains random even conditional on X . Note also that, while only conditional mean treatment effects may depend on X , the distribution of treatment effects remains otherwise unconstrained.

In general, under (A1) - (A3), the MTE at $X = x$ and $V = p \in \mathcal{P}$ is nonparametrically identified by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p} E[Y|p(X, Z) = p, X = x].$$

Carneiro et al. (2011) show that imposing the parametric functional forms of (A4) together with strengthening the exogeneity assumption of (A2) to (A5), yields the following partially linear regression equation for the observed outcome Y :

$$E[Y|p(X, Z) = p, X = x] = x'\theta_0 + px'(\theta_1 - \theta_0) + \phi(p), \quad (6)$$

where $\phi(\cdot)$ is a unknown function of the propensity score, which absorbs the intercept term $p\alpha_1 + (1-p)\alpha_0$. As a result, the MTE at $X = x$ and $V = p$ is identified by

$$MTE(x, p) \equiv E[Y_1 - Y_0|X = x, V = p] = x'(\theta_1 - \theta_0) + \phi'(p). \quad (7)$$

Since the only nonparametric component in this regression equation is $\phi(\cdot)$, which is a function of the scalar-valued propensity score, the computational complexity of estimation does not explode as the dimension of X increases. Carneiro et al. (2011) argue that this is a practical advantage of the functional form specification (A4) and the stronger instrument exogeneity assumption (A5).

Since the partial linear regression (6) identifies (θ_1, θ_0) , it is possible to compute

$$U_1 \equiv \alpha_1 + \tilde{U}_1 = Y_1 - X'\theta_1$$

for every treated observation, and

$$U_0 \equiv \alpha_0 + \tilde{U}_0 = Y_0 - X'\theta_0$$

for every untreated observation.

The joint restrictions (A1), (A3), (A4) and (A5) simplify not only estimation of MTE, but also the testable implications of MTE identifying assumption. To see how, consider the distribution of U_1 conditional on $(D = 1, p(X, Z) = p, X = x)$. Under (A1), (A3) and (A4),

$$\begin{aligned} U_1| (D = 1, X = x, p(X, Z) = p) &\sim U_1| (V \leq p, p(X, Z) = p, X = x) \\ &\sim U_1| (V \leq p), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} U_0 | (D = 0, X = x, p(X, Z) = p) &\sim U_0 | (V > p, p(X, Z) = p, X = x) \\ &\sim U_0 | (V > p). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

That is, for $d = 0, 1$, the distribution of the residual, $U_d = Y_d - X'\theta_d$, conditional on $(D = d, p(X, Z), X)$ depends only on $p(X, Z)$. Exploiting this single index sufficiency for the distributions of U_1 and U_0 , we obtain the following necessary testable implications for the joint restrictions (A1), (A3), (A4) and (A5).

Proposition 2 *Let $U = DU_1 + (1 - D)U_0$. Assume the linear specification of the potential outcome regressions 5 and that the propensity score $p(Z, X)$ has a nondegenerate distribution. If (A1), (A3), (A4) and (A5) hold, then the following two conditions hold:*

(i) **Index sufficiency:** *The conditional distribution of (U, D) given (X, Z) depends only on the propensity score $p(X, Z)$, i.e., for any measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $d \in \{0, 1\}$*

$$\Pr(U \in A, D = d | X = x, Z = z) = \Pr(U \in A, D = d | p(X, Z) = p) \quad (10)$$

holds for any (x, z) where $p = p(x, z)$.

(ii) **Nesting inequalities:** *For every $p \geq p'$ in the support of the propensity score distribution and every measurable subset $A \subset \mathcal{Y}$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(U \in A, D = 1 | p(X, Z) = p) &\geq \Pr(U \in A, D = 1 | p(X, Z) = p'), \\ \Pr(U \in A, D = 0 | p(X, Z) = p) &\leq \Pr(U \in A, D = 0 | p(X, Z) = p'). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We refer to the joint restrictions of (A1), (A3), (A4), and (A5) as *instrument validity* and base our test on the testable implications of Proposition 2. Compared to Proposition 1, Proposition 2 replaces the outcome variable Y with the outcome residuals U , and removes the requirement to condition on X . Index sufficiency is strengthened such that the distribution of (U, D) depends on (X, Z) only through the propensity score $p(X, Z)$. The nesting inequalities are strengthened to imply distributional monotonicity with respect to changes in $p(X, Z)$ regardless of the underlying variation in (X, Z) .

As the testable implications of Proposition 2 follow from assumptions (A1), (A3), (A4) and (A5), any test based on them is a joint test of these assumptions. That is, in addition to the conventional exclusion, random assignment and monotonicity, we will be testing the functional form assumption of (A4) and strong exogeneity assumption of (A5). Violation of testable implications can be due to misspecification in the functional form (5) or the restricted heterogeneity of MTEs with respect to the observable characteristics, i.e., additive separability of MTEs in (7).

2.3 Potential Difficulties Detecting Violation of Instrument Validity

In this section we show how the conditional distribution of the propensity score given Z affects the usefulness of each of the testable implications characterized in Proposition 2. We use the simple case of a single binary instrument to illustrate this point. We also discuss how to improve the power to detect violation of the nesting inequalities in the presence of conditioning covariates X .

Consider first index sufficiency. (10) can be tested by examining whether the difference

$$\Pr(U \in A, D = d | p(X, Z) = p, Z = 1) - \Pr(U \in A, D = d | p(X, Z) = p, Z = 0) \quad (12)$$

is zero.

If the conditioning events are not supported by the distribution of (X, Z) , i.e., $\Pr(p(X, Z) = p, Z = 0) = 0$ or $\Pr(p(X, Z) = p, Z = 1) = 0$, then index sufficiency cannot be tested at the given p . This occurs if, for instance, we cannot find covariate values $x \neq x'$ such that $p(x, 1) = p(x', 0)$. In general, if the distributions of propensity score conditional on $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$ do not have overlapping support, then there will exist no p for which observations with both $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$ are available, and thus no p at which (12) can be calculated. In other words, whether a data generating process has empirical content to assess index sufficiency or not depends on the extent of overlap between the propensity score distributions conditional on $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$.

Now consider the nesting inequalities(11). These can be viewed as analogous to those tested in Kitagawa (2015) with the observed outcome Y replaced by the outcome residual U and the instrument replaced by the propensity score $p(X, Z)$. If the propensity score were discretized, e.g., by binning, the test procedure with no conditioning covariates and a discrete instrument of Kitagawa (2015) could be applied. Although this approach would attain an asymptotically valid test size¹, there may be circumstances where conditioning on the propensity score has a detrimental effect on power.

Maintain the simplifying assumption of a single binary instrument. Assume that the conditioning covariates X are statistically independent of the unobservables $(\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_0, V)$, as required by (A5). Furthermore, assume that they are also independent of Z .

Then, if $\Pr(Z = 1 | p(X, Z) = p)$ is bounded away from 0 and 1, the additive separability of the selection equation and the independence of X leads to the following decomposition:

¹Assuming the estimation errors in U and $p(X, Z)$ asymptotically vanish

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p) &= \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p, Z = 0) \Pr(Z = 0|p(X, Z) = p) \\
&\quad + \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p, Z = 1) \Pr(Z = 1|p(X, Z) = p) \\
&= \Pr(U_1 \in A, V \leq p|Z = 0) \Pr(Z = 0|p(X, Z) = p) \\
&\quad + \Pr(U_1 \in A, V \leq p|p(X, Z) = p, Z = 1) \Pr(Z = 1|p(X, Z) = p),
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The first line states that, for a given p where $\Pr(Z = 1|p(X, Z) = p)$ is bounded away from 0 and 1, we have a mixture of observations with $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$ with conditioning covariates implicitly adjusting to hold the propensity score constant. The second equality uses the simplifying assumption that X is independent of Z .

Consider a violation of (A5) such that the residuals of the potential outcome regressions depend on Z , and for some $A \subset \mathcal{Y}$ and $p' < p$ the following inequality holds:

$$\Pr(U_1 \in A, V \leq p'|Z = 0) - \Pr(U_1 \in A, V \leq p|Z = 1) > 0. \tag{14}$$

Notice that if the instrument were valid the reverse inequality would hold.

To see how (14) can drive a violation of the first nesting inequality (11), decompose the difference between the left and right side of (11) as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p') - \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p) \\
&= [(\Pr(Z = 1|p) - \Pr(Z = 1|p'))] [\Pr(U_1 \in A, V \leq p'|Z = 0) - \Pr(U_1 \in A, V \leq p|Z = 1)] \\
&\quad - \Pr(Z = 0|p) \cdot \Pr(U_1 \in A, p' < V \leq p|Z = 1) - \Pr(Z = 1|p') \cdot \Pr(U_1 \in A, p' < V \leq p|Z = 0).
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

In this expression, the violation (14) appears in the second line of (15) multiplied by $(\Pr(Z = 1|p) - \Pr(Z = 1|p'))$. The remaining terms in the third line are all negative. In order for (14) to result in a violation of the nesting inequality (i.e., for (15) to be positive), it is desirable that $(\Pr(Z = 1|p) - \Pr(Z = 1|p'))$ is of large magnitude.

This magnitude depends on the strength of the relationship between the covariates X and the propensity score. If variation in the propensity scores is driven mainly by X , $\Pr(Z = 1|p)$ will change little in p , and the magnitude of $(\Pr(Z = 1|p) - \Pr(Z = 1|p'))$ will be small. This will result in limited detectability of violations of instrument validity through the nesting inequality (15).

In the Monte Carlo studies in Section 4, we show numerically that tests of the nesting inequalities that directly examine the monotonicity of $\Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p)$ in p suffer from low power if variation in the propensity score is driven by the conditioning covariates X .

2.4 Distillation

To improve power when testing nesting inequalities, we consider conditioning on Z rather than conditioning on the propensity score. Consider the difference between the probabilities of $\{U \in A, D = 1\}$ conditional on Z ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|Z = 0) - \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|Z = 1) \\ &= \int_0^1 [\Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p, Z = 0)f(p|Z = 0) - \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p, Z = 1)f(p|Z = 1)] dp, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $f(p|Z = z)$ denotes the conditional probability density (or probability mass function) of the propensity score $p(X, Z)$ given $Z = z$. This can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 [\Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p, Z = 0) - \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p, Z = 1)] f(p|Z = 0) dp \\ & \quad - \int_0^1 \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p, Z = 0) [f(p|Z = 1) - f(p|Z = 0)] dp \end{aligned}$$

If index sufficiency holds, the first term is zero. If the nesting inequalities hold, $\Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p, Z = 0)$ is weakly increasing in p . However, the sign of the second term depends also on the difference between conditional propensity score distributions $f(p|Z = 1) - f(p|Z = 0)$. If $p(X, Z)|Z = 0$ is first-order stochastically dominated by $p(X, Z)|Z = 1$ then, under the null, the second integral is weakly positive², and the difference overall is weakly negative.

Observing a positive sign for (16) can thus imply three possibilities:

- Case 1:** If the distribution of $p(X, Z)|Z = 0$ is first-order stochastically dominated by the distribution of $p(X, Z)|Z = 1$, a positive sign implies index sufficiency is violated, the nesting inequalities are violated, or both. In particular, if index sufficiency holds it implies violation of the nesting inequalities, i.e., monotonicity of $\Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p)$ in p fails for some value of $p \in (0, 1)$ with a positive measure.
- Case 2:** If $f(p|Z = 0) = f(p|Z = 1)$, a positive sign for (16) implies violation of index sufficiency at some value of $p \in (0, 1)$ with a positive measure.
- Case 3:** If the distribution of $p(X, Z)|Z = 0$ is not first-order stochastically dominated by the distribution of $p(X, Z)|Z = 1$, a positive sign does *not* imply violation of index sufficiency or the nesting inequalities. i.e., (16) can be positive even under the null.

²Under the null, $\Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p, Z = 0) = \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p)$ (index sufficiency) holds, and $\Pr(U \in A, D = 1|p(X, Z) = p)$ is weakly increasing in p (nesting inequalities). The integral being positive follows from the definition of first-order stochastic dominance.

Hence, (16) is informative for detecting violations of instrument validity if first-order stochastic ordering holds between the distributions of $p(X, Z)|Z = 0$ and $p(X, Z)|Z = 1$. First-order stochastic dominance holds, for instance, if the propensity score is given by a probit function $p(X, Z) = \Phi(X'\beta + \gamma Z)$ with $\gamma > 0$ and X and Z uncorrelated. However, first-order stochastic dominance is not implied by (A1), (A3), (A4) and (A5). If $\gamma > 0$, $\beta > 0$ and X and Z are negatively correlated, first-order stochastic dominance can fail despite (A1) - (A5) holding. In general, a positive value of (16) cannot be taken as evidence against instrument validity.

Case 3 renders a positive sign of (16) inconclusive about the violation of instrument validity. To rule out Case 3, first-order stochastic dominance can be checked as part of the test procedure. In cases where it does not hold, we consider trimming the sample so that the conditional distribution of the propensity score $p(X, Z)$ given Z is stochastically monotonic in Z . We then assess the sign of an inequality analogous to (16) using the potentially trimmed sample. We refer to this process as *distillation*.

Formally, given an instrument, $Z \in \mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}$, we define a binary indicator $S_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $S_1 = 1$ indicates that an observation is included in the sample used for testing nesting inequalities, and $S_1 = 0$ indicates that the observation is trimmed and discarded. The distribution of $S_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ can depend on (X, Z) , but we require S_1 to be independent of (U_1, U_0, V) .

Under the assumptions of Proposition 2, index sufficiency of the propensity score for the distribution of (U_d, V) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr(U \in A, D = 1 | Z = z, S_1 = 1) \\
&= \int_0^1 \Pr(U_1 \in A, D = 1 | p(X, Z) = p, Z = z, S_1 = 1) dP_{p|ZS_1}(p|z, S_1 = 1) \\
&= \int_0^1 \Pr(U_1 \in A, V \leq p | p(X, Z) = p, Z = z, S_1 = 1) dP_{p|ZS_1}(p|z, S_1 = 1) \\
&= \int_0^1 \Pr(U_1 \in A, V \leq p) dP_{p|ZS_1}(p|z, S_1 = 1), \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

where $P_{p|ZS_1}$ is the conditional distribution of the propensity score $p(X, Z)$ given $Z = z$ and $S_1 = 1$. The third equality follows by (A5) and S_1 being independent of (U_1, U_0, V) . Since the integrand in (17) is monotonic in p by Proposition 2, $\Pr(U \in A, D = 1 | Z = z, S_1 = 1)$ is monotonically increasing in z if $P_{p|ZS_1}(\cdot|z, S_1 = 1)$ is monotonic in z in terms of first-order stochastic dominance. Similarly, the stochastic monotonicity of $P_{p|ZS_1}(\cdot|z, S_1 = 1)$ in z implies

$$\Pr(U \in A, D = 0 | Z = z, S_1 = 1) = \int_0^1 \Pr(U_0 \in A, V > p) dP_{p|ZS_1}(p|z, S_1 = 1)$$

is monotonically decreasing in z .

We now formally define distillation

Definition 3 (Distillation) Let $S_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ be an indicator for inclusion in the sample. (Z, S_1) is a distilled sample if $(U_1, U_0, V) \perp S_1$ and the conditional distribution of the propensity score given $\{Z, S_1\}$, $P_{p|ZS_1}(\cdot|z, S_1 = 1)$, is stochastically increasing in $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ in terms of the first-order stochastic dominance.

As discussed in Case 1, the nesting inequalities shown in Proposition 2 remain valid even when we replace the propensity score $p(X, Z)$ with the instrument Z and restrict the sample to a subsample with $S_1 = 1$. We hence obtain the next proposition.

Proposition 4 Suppose the assumptions of Proposition 2 holds. Let $(Z, S_1) \in \mathcal{Z} \times \{0, 1\}$ be a distilled sample as defined in Definition 3. For any $z \leq z' \in \mathcal{Z}$ and every measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{Y}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|Z = z, S_1 = 1) &\geq \Pr(U \in A, D = 1|Z = z', S_1 = 1), \\ \Pr(U \in A, D = 0|Z = z, S_1 = 1) &\leq \Pr(U \in A, D = 0|Z = z', S_1 = 1). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

While we only discuss trimming the sample here, the nesting inequalities hold for a broader class of transformations of the data. In particular, let $Z^* = g(X, Z, \epsilon)$ be a real-valued measurable function that maps $(X, Z, \epsilon) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{E}$ to $\mathcal{Z}^* \subset \mathbb{R}$ and S_1 be the sample inclusion indicator defined above. The nesting inequalities hold for any (Z^*, S_1) such that $(U_1, U_0, V) \perp (\epsilon, S_1)$ and the conditional distribution of the propensity score given $\{Z^*, S_1\}$, $P_{p|Z^*S_1}(\cdot|z^*, S_1 = 1)$, is stochastically increasing in $z^* \in \mathcal{Z}^*$ in terms of the first-order stochastic dominance. While we do not investigate the possibility here, an appropriate choice of $g(X, Z, \epsilon)$ may further improve the power of the test.

2.5 A Distillation Procedure

Definition 3 imposes that the sample is trimmed without reference to (U_1, U_0, V) and that first-order stochastic dominance holds. The stochastic dominance requirement can be represented as a set of N constraints. Sort observations $i = 1, \dots, N$ into ascending order by propensity score, so that observation $i = 1$ has the lowest propensity score and observation $i = N$ the highest. In the case of a tie, observations with $Z = 0$ are ordered before observations with $Z = 1$. First-order stochastic dominance holds when

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^j S_{1,i} Z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n S_{1,i} Z_i} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^j S_{1,i} (1 - Z_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n S_{1,i} (1 - Z_i)} \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, N \quad (19)$$

These constraints restrict the empirical CDF for $Z = 1$ to be (weakly) below the empirical CDF for $Z = 0$.

Notice that there may be many trimmed samples that satisfy the constraints (19). An additional criterion is required to select one of these samples. For example, maximising the number of

observations included in the trimmed sample. This criterion implies an objective function, and the distillation procedure corresponds to maximising this objective function subject to the constraints (19). For the remainder of this section, we set our objective function to be

$$\max \left(\min \left(\sum_{i=1}^N S_{1,i} Z_i, \sum_{i=1}^N S_{1,i} (1 - Z_i) \right) \right) \quad (20)$$

This objective function imposes that the trimmed sample should be more balanced in terms of instrument value than the original sample. This objective function is motivated by the Monte Carlo results of Kitagawa (2015), which found that, in a sample which is unbalanced in terms of instrument value, power is determined by size of the group with the scarcer instrument value. In our Monte Carlo exercises we find that distilling the sample in this way leads to large power gains relative to discretising the propensity score. However, a characterisation of the optimal distillation is beyond the scope of this paper.

Irrespective of the choice of objective function, the following is immediate from the constraints (19)

1. $S_{1,i} = 0$ for all i with $Z_i = 1$ and $p(X_i, Z_i) < \min_j (p(X_j, Z_j) | Z_j = 0)$
2. $S_{1,i} = 0$ for all i with $Z_i = 0$ and $p(X_i, Z_i) > \max_j (p(X_j, Z_j) | Z_j = 1)$

That is, the observation(s) in the trimmed sample with the lowest propensity score must have $Z = 0$ and the observation(s) with the highest propensity score must have $Z = 1$. In all the applications considered in Section 5, this no further trimming is required beyond this step.

If further trimming is required, the following algorithm implements the solution to the distillation problem with objective (20). Assume that we begin with a sample where $Z_i = 0$ for $i = 1$ and $Z_i = 1$ for $i = N$. That is, any observations that are necessarily excluded by the constraints have already been trimmed. Let n_0 be the total number of observations with $Z = 0$ and n_1 be the total number with $Z = 1$ in this sample.

- If $n_1 > n_0$

1. Set $S_{1,i} = 0$ for all i where $Z_i = 1$ and $S_{1,i} = 1$ for all i where $Z_i = 0$
2. Calculate

$$\delta = \max_j \left(n_1 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^j Z_i / n_1 - \sum_{i=1}^j (1 - Z_i) / n_0}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^j (1 - Z_i) / n_0} \right) \quad (21)$$

3. Loop over $j = 1, \dots, N$
 - (a) If $Z_j = 1$ calculate

$$\epsilon = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} S_{1,i} Z_i + 1}{n_1 - \delta} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^j S_{1,i} (1 - Z_i)}{n_0}$$

- (b) If $\epsilon < 0$, set $S_{1,j} = 1$.
 - (c) Advance to observation $j + 1$
- If $n_0 > n_1$
 1. Set $S_{1,i} = 0$ for all i where $Z_i = 0$ and $S_{1,i} = 1$ for all i where $Z_i = 1$
 2. Calculate

$$\delta = \max_j n_0 \frac{\sum_{i=1}^j Z_i/n_1 - \sum_{i=1}^j (1 - Z_i)/n_0}{\sum_{i=1}^j Z_i/n_1} \quad (22)$$
 3. Loop over $j = N, \dots, 1$
 - (a) If $Z_j = 0$ calculate

$$\epsilon = \frac{\sum_{i=j+1}^N S_{1,i}(1 - Z_i) + 1}{n_0 - \delta} - \frac{\sum_{i=j}^N S_{1,i}Z_i}{n_1}$$
 - (b) If $\epsilon < 0$, set $S_{1,j} = 1$.
 - (c) Advance to observation $j - 1$

Consider the case where $n_1 > n_0$, so that we only trim observations with $Z = 1$. The empirical distribution conditional on $Z = 0$ is then fixed, and any violation of first-order stochastic dominance can only be rectified by shifting the distribution conditional on $Z = 1$ down. For any j , trimming observations with $i < j$ leads the empirical distribution at j to shift down. δ gives the total number of observations with $Z = 1$ that must be removed. The included observations are then chosen to be those closest to, but not below, the corresponding observations with $Z = 0$. The algorithm is similar for $n_0 > n_1$, but here observations with high rather than low propensity score are excluded.

3 Test Statistics and Procedure

We set the null hypothesis for our test to be the joint restrictions of index sufficiency (10) and the nesting inequalities with the distilled instrument (18) shown in Proposition 4. This section presents the construction of our test statistics and an implementation procedure with a bootstrap algorithm for computing p-values. Our exposition of the test is restricted to a binary instrument $Z \in \{1, 0\}$, while the support of covariates \mathcal{X} is unconstrained.

3.1 Test statistics and bootstrap algorithm

Let $\lambda = \Pr(Z = 1) \in (0, 1)$ and $(Z, S_1) \in \{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\}$ be a binary instrument and a sample inclusion indicator as defined in Definition 3. With binary Z , we can rewrite the nesting inequalities with a distilled sample (18) and index sufficiency of Proposition 2 as the following moment

inequalities and equalities: for every measurable subset $A \subset \mathcal{Y}$,

$$E[1\{U_i \in A\}D_i|Z = 0, S_1 = 1] - E[1\{U_i \in A\}D_i|Z = 1, S_1 = 1] \leq 0, \quad (23)$$

$$E[1\{U_i \in A\}(1 - D_i)|Z = 1, S_1 = 1] - E[1\{U_i \in A\}(1 - D_i)|Z = 0, S_1 = 1] \leq 0, \quad (24)$$

$$E \left[\frac{1\{U_i \in A\}D_i(1 - \lambda)}{\Pr(Z = 0|p(X_i, Z_i))} \Big| Z = 0, S_2 = 1 \right] - E \left[\frac{1\{U_i \in A\}D_i\lambda}{\Pr(Z = 1|p(X_i, Z_i))} \Big| Z = 1, S_2 = 1 \right] = 0, \quad (25)$$

$$E \left[\frac{1\{U_i \in A\}(1 - D_i)(1 - \lambda)}{\Pr(Z = 0|p(X_i, Z_i))} \Big| Z = 0, S_2 = 1 \right] - E \left[\frac{1\{U_i \in A\}(1 - D_i)\lambda}{\Pr(Z = 1|p(X_i, Z_i))} \Big| Z = 1, S_2 = 1 \right] = 0, \quad (26)$$

where S_2 is a sample inclusion indicator based on the value of the inverse probability weighting term $\Pr(Z = 1|p(X_i, Z_i))$. For example, $S_2 = 1$ if $\Pr(Z = 1|p(X_i, Z_i)) \in [0.05, 0.95]$ and $S_2 = 0$ otherwise. Trimming in this manner avoids dividing by near zero probabilities which regularizes the statistical behaviour of the sample analogues of these expectations.

The inequalities (23) and (24) express the nesting inequalities of Proposition 4 in terms of the conditional expectations given $(Z, S_1 = 1)$. Using Bayes rule, the moment equality hypotheses of (25) and (26) express the index sufficiency restrictions of Proposition 2 in terms of the conditional expectation given $(Z, S_2 = 1)$. Trimming the sample through S_2 does not affect validity of the index sufficiency restrictions insofar as $S_2 = 1$ depends only on the value of the propensity score.

Denote the conditional distributions of (U, D, X, S_1) given $Z = 1$ and $Z = 0$ by P^* and Q^* , respectively, and the corresponding empirical distributions by $P_{n_1}^*$ and $Q_{n_0}^*$, where n_1 and n_0 are the number of observations with $Z = 1$ and $Z = 0$, respectively. Similarly, denote the conditional distributions of (U, D, X, S_2) given $Z = 1$ and $Z = 0$ by P and Q , respectively, and their empirical distributions by P_{n_1} and Q_{n_0} . Following the notational rules of empirical process theory (e.g., Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996)), we denote the expectation of a function of (U, D, X, S_1) , f , with respect to its generic distribution, P^* , by P^*f and the sample analogue (sample average) by $P_{n_1}^*f$. Similarly, for a function g of (U, D, X, S_2) , the expectation with respect to a generic distribution P and its sample analogue are denoted by Pg and $P_{n_1}g$, respectively.

Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y})$ be the class of closed and connected intervals in \mathcal{Y} . Define

$$f_i^z(A, d) = \frac{1\{U_i \in A, D_i = d\}S_{1i}}{\Pr(S_1 = 1|Z = z)},$$

$$g_i^z(A, d) = \frac{1\{U_i \in A, D_i = d\}\lambda^z(1 - \lambda)^{1-z}S_{2i}}{\Pr(Z = z|p(X_i, Z_i))\Pr(S_2 = 1|Z = z)}.$$

Consider the following test statistic,

$$T \equiv \max \left\{ \sup_{A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y}), d \in \{0,1\}} \frac{T_1(A, d)}{\hat{\sigma}_1(A, d)}, \sup_{A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y}), d \in \{0,1\}} \frac{T_2(A, d)}{\sigma_2(A, d)}, \sup_{A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y}), d \in \{0,1\}} \frac{-T_2(A, d)}{\sigma_2(A, d)} \right\}, \text{ where}$$

$$T_1(A, d) = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 n_0}{n_1 + n_0}} \left[(Q_{n_0}^* f_i^0(A, 1) - P_{n_1}^* f_i^1(A, 1)) d + (P_{n_1}^* f_i^1(A, 0) - Q_{n_0}^* f_i^0(A, 0))(1 - d) \right]$$

$$T_2(A, d) = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 n_0}{n_1 + n_0}} (Q_{n_0} g_i^0(A, d) - P_{n_1} g_i^1(A, d))$$

$$\sigma_1^2(A, d) = \left\{ \lambda [Q_{n_0}^* (f_i^0(A, 1))^2 - (Q_{n_0}^* f_i^0(A, 1))^2] + (1 - \lambda) [P_{n_1}^* (f_i^1(A, 1))^2 - (P_{n_1}^* f_i^1(A, 1))^2] \right\} d$$

$$+ \left\{ \lambda [Q_{n_0}^* (f_i^0(A, 0))^2 - (Q_{n_0}^* f_i^0(A, 0))^2] + (1 - \lambda) [P_{n_1}^* (f_i^1(A, 0))^2 - (P_{n_1}^* f_i^1(A, 0))^2] \right\} (1 - d),$$

$$\sigma_2^2(A, d) = \lambda [Q_{n_0} (g_i^0(A, d))^2 - (Q_{n_0} g_i^0(A, d))^2] + (1 - \lambda) [P_{n_1} (g_i^1(A, d))^2 - (P_{n_1} g_i^1(A, d))^2].$$

Statistic T is a variance-weighted Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic that jointly tests (23) - (26) by searching for a maximal violation of their variance-weighted sample analogues. Here, the denominators of the terms appearing in the max operator are consistent estimators for the asymptotic standard deviations of the numerators. Similar to the test of Kitagawa (2015), searching over the closed and connected intervals $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y})$ suffices for detecting violations in any measurable set in \mathcal{Y} .

Keeping the standard deviation estimators fixed, we want to resample $T_1(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $T_2(\cdot, \cdot)$ from a distribution such that the null hypothesis holds and their variance-covariance structure is preserved. Specifically, we consider a multiplier bootstrap: let $(\hat{M}_1, \dots, \hat{M}_n)$ be iid random bootstrap multipliers such that they are independent of the original sample and satisfy $E(\hat{M}_i) = 0$ and $Var(\hat{M}_i) = 1$. A bootstrap analogue of T under a least favorable null can be constructed as

$$\hat{T} \equiv \max \left\{ \sup_{A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y}), d \in \{0,1\}} \frac{\hat{T}_1(A, d)}{\sigma_1(A, d)}, \sup_{A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y}), d \in \{0,1\}} \frac{\hat{T}_2(A, d)}{\sigma_2(A, d)}, \sup_{A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{Y}), d \in \{0,1\}} \frac{-\hat{T}_2(A, d)}{\sigma_2(A, d)} \right\}, \text{ where}$$

$$\hat{T}_1(A, d) = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 n_0}{n_1 + n_0}} \left((\hat{Q}_{n_0}^* - Q_{n_0}^*) f_i^0(A, 1) - (\hat{P}_{n_1}^* - P_{n_1}^*) f_i^1(A, 1) \right) d$$

$$+ \sqrt{\frac{n_1 n_0}{n_1 + n_0}} \left((\hat{P}_{n_1}^* - P_{n_1}^*) f_i^1(A, 0) - (\hat{Q}_{n_0}^* - Q_{n_0}^*) f_i^0(A, 0) \right) (1 - d)$$

$$\hat{T}_2(A, d) = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 n_0}{n_1 + n_0}} \left[(\hat{Q}_{n_0} - Q_{n_0}) g_i^0(A, d) - (\hat{P}_{n_1} - P_{n_1}) g_i^1(A, d) \right],$$

where, for the random variable $(a_i : i = 1, \dots, n)$, we define

$$(\hat{Q}_{n_0}^* - Q_{n_0}^*) a_i = \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i: Z_i=0} \hat{M}_i a_i, \quad (\hat{P}_{n_1}^* - P_{n_1}^*) a_i = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i: Z_i=1} \hat{M}_i a_i.$$

$$(\hat{Q}_{n_0} - Q_{n_0}) a_i = \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i: Z_i=0} \hat{M}_i a_i, \quad (\hat{P}_{n_1} - P_{n_1}) a_i = \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i: Z_i=1} \hat{M}_i a_i.$$

3.2 Proposed Test Procedure

For the testable implication given in Proposition 4, an implementation of the test is as follows.

1. Estimate the propensity scores $\Pr(D = 1|Z, X)$ using either parametric or nonparametric methods, and obtain the fitted values $\hat{p}(x_i, z_i)$.
2. Estimate the partially linear regression model (6) and obtain an estimates of θ_1 and θ_0 . Specifically, let $\hat{\mu}_{x,i} = \hat{E}(x_i|\hat{p}(x_i, z_i))$ be nonparametric regression estimates (e.g. local linear predicted values) of the covariate vector x_i onto the estimated propensity scores, $\hat{p}_i \equiv \hat{p}(x_i, z_i)$, and let $\hat{\mu}_{y,i} = \hat{E}(y_i|\hat{p}(x_i, z_i))$ be a nonparametric regression estimate of the outcome onto the estimated propensity scores. (θ_0, θ_1) can be estimated by running OLS on

$$y_i - \hat{\mu}_{y,i} = \hat{p}_i (x_i - \hat{\mu}_{x,i}) \theta_1 + (1 - \hat{p}_i) (x_i - \hat{\mu}_{x,i}) \theta_0 + \epsilon_i.$$

3. Construct the residual observations by $\hat{u}_i = D_i (y_i - x_i' \hat{\theta}_1) + (1 - D_i) (y_i - x_i' \hat{\theta}_0)$.
4. Construct the inclusion indicators S_1 . This can be done using the algorithm of section 2.5.
5. Estimate $\Pr(Z = 1|p(X, Z))$ and generate the inclusion indicators S_2
6. Using $(\hat{u}_i, D_i, z, \hat{\Pr}(Z = 1|p(X, Z)), S_{1,i}, S_{2,i})$ as data, calculate the test statistic of 3.1

The test procedure described above involves semi-parametric estimation of a partially linear model where each conditioning covariate and the outcome are non-parametrically regressed on the propensity score. While non-parametric estimation can be computationally taxing, this step is only performed once and the main determinant of the computational burden is the sample size rather than the number of conditioning covariates. In cases where this non-parametric estimation step is infeasible, the test procedure can still be implemented by specifying a parametric functional form for $\phi(p)$, such as a quadratic polynomial in the propensity score.

3.3 Multiple Instruments

The discussion to this point has considered scalar Z , here consider the case of multiple instruments where Z is a vector. Propositions 1 and 2 hold irrespective of the number of instruments. Hence, a test for instrument validity can be performed by discretising the propensity score. However, this would be subject to the same concerns regarding power as the single instrument case.

One approach is to aggregate the multiple instruments into a single index, and then use this index as the basis of a distilled instrument. Suppose the propensity score has a generalised linear form with a probit link

$$p(X, Z) = \Phi(\rho X + \varphi(Z)) \tag{27}$$

where $\varphi(\cdot)$ reflects the researchers assumptions about the relationship between the instruments and Z and ρ is a vector of coefficients. In this case, we view $\varphi(Z)$ as an aggregated index of instruments, and propose constructing a distilled instrument by sorting observations by $\varphi(Z)$. The test procedure above can then be implemented without modification. If the researcher is unwilling to assume separability between X and Z , observations could instead be sorted by fixing X at its mean value \bar{X} and ordering by $\bar{X}\varphi(Z)$.

Our testing approach can be extended to the setting of Mogstad et al. (2019, 2020) where the monotonicity assumption Imbens and Angrist (1994) is replaced by partial monotonicity. Mogstad et al. (2019, 2020) show that inference using a single instrument remains valid as long as the remaining instruments are controlled for. In the context of our test procedure, the estimation of the propensity score and residuals would be performed using the entire set of instruments, but the final step performed separately for each instrument. That is, for every instrument a distilled instrument is constructed and the Kitagawa (2015) test performed. A Bonferroni correction can be applied to P-values to correct for multiple tests.

4 Monte Carlo

We perform two sets of Monte Carlo exercises. The first evaluates the size and power of the joint test of nesting inequalities and index sufficiency, and compares it to the Kitagawa (2015) test which does not control for covariates and a test of the nesting inequalities using a coarsened propensity score. The second looks separately at the power of the tests of index sufficiency and nesting inequalities.

All exercises use processes of the form

$$X \sim N_3(0_3, I_3) \tag{28}$$

$$Z = \mathbb{1}\{X\gamma + U_Z \geq 0\} \tag{29}$$

$$D = \mathbb{1}\{\alpha_0(1 - Z) + \alpha_1 Z + X\delta + U_D \geq 0\} \tag{30}$$

$$Y(0) = X\beta + U_Y \tag{31}$$

$$U_Z \sim N(0, 1) \tag{32}$$

$$(U_Y, U_D) \sim N(0_2, \Sigma) \tag{33}$$

Diagonal entries of Σ are set to 1 and off-diagonal entries to 0.3. α_0 , α_1 , and the equation for $Y(1)$ are chosen jointly. When checking size, we use

$$\alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = 0 \tag{34}$$

$$Y(1) = X\beta + 1 + U_Y \tag{35}$$

Here, conditional on the propensity score, the joint distribution of (U, D) is identical for $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$. To check power, we use four specifications. They all share

$$\alpha_0 = \Phi^{-1}(0.45) \tag{36}$$

$$\alpha_1 = \Phi^{-1}(0.55) \tag{37}$$

$$\tag{38}$$

but $Y(1)$ differs

$$\text{DGP1: } Y(1) = X\beta + Z \times U_Y + (1 - Z) \times (-0.7 + U_Y)$$

$$\text{DGP2: } Y(1) = X\beta + Z \times U_Y + (1 - Z) \times 1.675 \times U_Y$$

$$\text{DGP3: } Y(1) = X\beta + Z \times U_Y + (1 - Z) \times 0.515 \times U_Y$$

$$\text{DGP4: } Y(1) = X\beta + Z \times U_Y + (1 - Z) \times (\mu_l + 0.125 \times U_Y)$$

where μ_l takes values $(-1, -0.5, 0, 0.5, 1)$ with probabilities $(0.15, 0.2, 0.3, 0.2, 0.15)$. In all cases, for a given propensity score, the distribution of U when $D = 1$ does not coincide for $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$. Figure 1 plots each of the four $f(U_Y)$ for one draw of parameters. In the case of DGP1 the distribution for $Z = 0$ is shifted, with DGP2 it has thicker tails, with DGP3 it is more concentrated, and with DGP4 there are violations at each value of μ_l .

The vectors γ , δ and β govern the correlations between the covariates and instrument, treatment and outcome. Elements of β are drawn from the $U(-1, 1)$ distribution. We vary the distributions for γ and β from exercise to exercise. For each process, we generate 1,000 samples. The proposed test procedure requires estimating propensity scores, a partially linear model for outcomes, and $\Pr(Z = 1|p(X, Z))$. The propensity score is estimated by probit and the partially linear model is estimated semiparametrically. In both cases the correct specification is used. $\Pr(Z = 1|p(X, Z))$ is estimated nonparametrically. The sample inclusion indicator for the index sufficiency test S_2 is set to 1 when $\Pr(Z = 1|p(X, Z)) \in [0.05, 0.95]$. Results are reported for a range of values of the trimming parameter ξ . P-values are calculated using 500 bootstrap samples.

4.1 Size and Power

Here we evaluate the size and power of the proposed test procedure, and compare it to the Kitagawa (2015) test that does not control for covariates and the test of nesting inequalities with a binarised propensity score.

The δ are drawn from the $U(-1, 1)$ distribution. As the δ govern the influence of the covariates on the propensity score, depending on the draw of δ , there can be a large degree of overlap between conditional propensity score distributions. For γ , we consider two cases. The first sets all elements

of γ to 0. X and Z are then independent, so an instrument that is valid conditional on the covariates will also be valid without conditioning on covariates and failure to control appropriately for X should not affect size. In the second case each element of γ is drawn from the $U(-1, 1)$ distribution. X and Z will not, in general, be independent, and the instrument will only be valid conditional on X .

The same simulated samples are used for all three test procedures, and p-values are calculated with 500 bootstrap samples in all cases. Tables 1 and 2 present rejection rate for the size and power processes.

Turning first to the proposed test procedure, rejection rates for the size process are below nominal size irrespective of whether X and Z are independent. For the four power DGPs, the majority of rejection rates are well above the nominal size. The only exception to this is the smaller sample sizes for DGP4. Similar rejection rates are obtained when X and Z are independent and when they are allowed to covary.

Next consider the test with a binarised propensity score. This test performs well in terms of size: rejection rates for the size processes are below nominal size. However, there is a considerable loss in power compared to the proposed test procedure. Rejection rates above nominal size are obtained only for DGP1. For all other DGPs, rejection rates are low and change little as the sample size increases. Figure 3 illustrates why this is the case. For a single draw of parameters, it plots the asymptotic $D = 1$ subdensities for the binarised propensity score Z^* . Observations with $Z^* = 0$ have a below median propensity score, observations with $Z^* = 1$ have an above median propensity score. The $Z^* = 0$ subdensities lie below those for $Z^* = 1$, and the two subdensities have a similar shape. Each value of Z^* mixes observations with $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$. Subdensities are then a mixture of those in Figure 1, and differences in shape disappear. Furthermore, by construction, all observations with $Z^* = 0$ have a lower propensity score than observations with $Z^* = 1$, so the $D = 1$ subdensity for $Z^* = 0$ is guaranteed to have less total mass than the subdensity for $Z^* = 1$.

The Kitagawa (2015), which does not control for covariates, performs reasonably well when the instrument is independent of the covariates. The size of the test is controlled, but power is lower than the proposed test procedure. This is for two reasons. First, the Kitagawa (2015) test essentially tests the nesting inequalities only, and some violations are more easily detected by index sufficiency. Second, failure to control for covariates adds noise to the outcome and which makes violations of the nesting inequalities more difficult to detect. Figure 9a plots asymptotic $D = 1$ outcome subdensities for each DGP. Compared to the residual subdensities in Figure 1, violations are either reduced or have vanished entirely. As expected, when Z and X are not independent, this test procedure has rejection rates above nominal size for an instrument that is valid conditional on covariates.

[Table 1 about here.]

[Table 2 about here.]

4.2 Comparison of Index Sufficiency and Nesting Inequalities

Our second set of exercises compares the nesting inequality and index sufficiency tests. Section 2 argued that the relative power of testing nesting inequalities and index sufficiency will depend on similarity between propensity score distributions conditional on Z . To examine this more formally, we consider two DGPs. Both set all elements of γ to 0, so that the instrument and covariates are independent. In the first δ are drawn from the $U(-1, 1)$ distribution, in the second they are drawn from the $U(-0.1, 0.1)$ distribution. Figure 4 plots conditional propensity score densities for different values of δ . As the elements of δ grow larger in magnitude, the distributions overlap more. Figure 5 plots the $\Pr(Z = 1|p(X, Z))$ function associated with each of these draws. For the smallest δ this function is close to a step function but, as the elements of δ grow in magnitude, it becomes flatter.

Table 3 presents rejection rates. When δ is drawn from the $U(-1, 1)$ distribution, index sufficiency has higher rejection rates in all cases. When δ is drawn from the $U(-0.1, 0.1)$ distribution, index sufficiency loses power in all cases. Nesting inequalities now have considerably higher power for DGP1, slightly higher power for DGP2 and DGP3, while index sufficiency still exhibits more power for DGP4. In all cases, the overall rejection rate is close to the maximum of the rejection rate for the nesting inequalities and index sufficiency.

[Table 3 about here.]

[Figure 1 about here.]

[Figure 2 about here.]

[Figure 3 about here.]

[Figure 4 about here.]

[Figure 5 about here.]

5 Applications

In this section we apply the proposed test procedure to the instruments of Card (1993), Angrist and Evans (1998), Oreopoulos (2006), and Dinkelman (2011). In all cases we maintain the outcome,

treatment, instrument and conditioning covariates of the original design, but not functional forms. Instead, we estimate a potential outcome model of the form described in Section 2. For the propensity score, we estimate a probit with the instrument, conditioning covariates and interactions between the two as controls. For the outcome, we allow coefficients on the covariates to depend on the treatment.

Table 4 presents p-values. A p-value below 0.05 corresponds to a rejection of the null hypothesis at the 5% level of significance. p-values are reported for a range of values of the trimming parameter ξ .

[Table 4 about here.]

5.1 Card (1993)

Card (1993) estimates returns to education. The outcome Y is the logarithm of weekly earnings, D is years of education, and Z is growing up in a local labour market with an accredited four year college. The headline specification for the paper uses four ordered discrete, three categorical and six binary conditioning covariates. These include potential experience, parental education, and residence in a standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA). The sample consists of 3,010 observations.

The validity of this instrument has previously been tested by Huber and Mellace (2015), Kitagawa (2015), Mourifié and Wan (2017) and Sun (2021). However, for computational reasons, at most only a subset of the conditioning covariates have been used. Sun (2021) does not control for covariates, Huber and Mellace (2015) conditions on two covariates, Mourifié and Wan (2017) three, and Kitagawa (2015) five. In addition, all of the conditioning covariates that have been used are binary. The proposed test procedure allows us to include all conditioning covariates.

As the treatment is not a binary variable, we binarize it. The binarized treatment is defined to be 1 if years of education is at least 16. Angrist and Imbens (1995) and Marshall (2016) show that coarsening the treatment variable in this way can lead the instrument to violate the exclusion restriction through coarsening bias.³ This occurs when the instrument induces changes in the underlying continuous treatment which are not captured by the discretised treatment. We verify that, conditional on the binarised treatment, the distribution of the continuous treatment is the similar for both values of the instrument so the binarized treatment does appear to capture any change in the underlying continuous treatment.

Figure 7a plots joint (Y, D) subdensities for $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$. Kitagawa (2015) finds that, without conditioning on covariates, the null of instrument validity can be rejected. This violation

³Section 5 of Sun (2021) discusses coarsening bias in the context of testing for instrument validity

can be seen in the $Y(0)$ subdensities. Figure 6 plots the conditional distributions for the estimated propensity score and estimated densities. The distribution for $Z = 1$ lies below the distribution for $Z = 0$, which indicates that first-order stochastic dominance holds, and there is considerable overlap between the densities. No observations are removed for either the test of nesting inequalities or the test of index sufficiency. Figure 7b plots estimated partial residual subdensities for the sample used to test nesting inequalities. After controlling for covariates, the violation in the $D = 0$ subdensities is no longer evident. Figure 7c plots the reweighted densities used to test index sufficiency. These are similar to those in 7b. p-values are presented in the top panel of 4. p-values are lower for the index sufficiency test than the test of nesting inequalities, but the null is not rejected at any conventional level of significance.

[Figure 6 about here.]

[Figure 7 about here.]

5.2 Angrist and Evans (1998)

Angrist and Evans (1998) estimate the effect of family size on parental labour supply using the same-sex instrument, which takes a value of one when the two eldest children are the same sex and zero otherwise. Their justification for this instrument is that the sex of children is randomly determined and that there is a parental preference for mixed sex children, so parents whose first two children are the same sex are more likely to have a third. The validity of this instrument was subsequently challenged by Rosenzweig and Wolpin (2000). Using a simple model of labour supply choice, they show that additional restrictions on preferences are needed for this instrument to satisfy the exclusion restriction. Dahl and Moretti (2008) present evidence of a parental preference for male children, and find that the sex composition of children directly affects family structure. In addition, de Chaisemartin (2017) argues that the same-sex instrument violates monotonicity.

In response to this debate, the validity of the instrument has been tested by Huber (2015) and Mourifié and Wan (2017). In both cases, the Angrist and Evans (1998) sample is split into subgroups based on values of a subset of the covariates, and then test instrument validity is tested for each subgroup. Huber (2015) define 66 subgroups, and find that the Huber and Mellace (2015) test rejects the null in a small number of them, but the Kitagawa (2015) test never rejects the null. Mourifié and Wan (2017) report no rejections at the 10% level of significance in 24 subgroups. Neither Huber (2015) or Mourifié and Wan (2017) use the full set of covariates from the original specification of Angrist and Evans (1998), and they coarsen some of the variables they do use.

We use the replication files for Angrist and Evans (1998) to construct the sample and variables. We focus on the 1980 sample of married mothers. This consists of married mothers aged between

21 and 35 who have at least two children and were at least 15 years old at the time of their first birth. The sample is drawn from the 1980 Census, and contains 254,652 observations. For computational reasons, we use a randomly chosen 1 / 20 subsample of this data, which results in 12,732 observations. Z is the same-sex instrument. D is an indicator set to 1 for mothers with more than two children. Angrist and Evans (1998) present results for several measures of labour supply. Here we set Y to be the logarithm of annual family labour income. The headline specification controls for demographic characteristics of the mother, the sex of the first child, and the sex of the second child.

Figure 9a plots subdensities for the outcomes without controlling for covariates. In this case there is no visual evidence of violation of the instrument validity. Angrist and Evans (1998) show that the same-sex instrument almost exactly balances covariate values. As discussed in Section 4, when the instrument and covariates are independent, failure to control for covariates can mask violations of instrument validity.

Figure 8 plots the conditional distributions and densities of the estimated propensity scores. There is no obvious violation of first order stochastic dominance, and the propensity score densities overlap. One observation is removed when testing the nesting inequalities, and eight are removed when testing index sufficiency. Figures 9b and 9c plot the subdensities used to calculate the nesting and index sufficiency tests. There is no visual evidence of a violation of the nesting inequalities, but the $U(1)$ subdensities for index sufficiency appear to have different means. The results in Table 4 show that the null would be rejected at the 10% level of significance for some values of ξ , with the test of index sufficiency accounting for the low p-value. It is possible that the test is detecting misspecification of function form. Angrist and Evans (1998) specify a linear relationship between log family earnings and mother's age, whereas a quadratic polynomial is often used.

[Figure 8 about here.]

[Figure 9 about here.]

5.3 Oreopoulos (2006)

Changes in schooling laws have been used as an instrument to estimate the effects of education for a variety of outcomes. Acemoglu and Angrist (2000) use this instrument to estimate human capital externalities, Lochner and Moretti (2004) estimate effects on crime, Lleras-Muney (2005) effects on health, and Oreopoulos (2006) the returns to education. These designs exploit variation in schooling laws over time across locations, for example US states. Conditional on covariates, this variation is assumed to be unrelated to other location level factors. Stephens and Yang (2014) investigate the validity of this assumption for US states. They estimate specifications similar to those of Acemoglu

and Angrist (2000) and Lochner and Moretti (2004), but allow for differing trends in the four US census regions. They find that, when census region is controlled for, estimates of treatment effects become insignificant or even change sign. The instrument of Oreopoulos (2006) is the legal minimum school leaving age for the UK. This was increased from 14 to 15 in 1947 in Great Britain and in 1957 in Northern Ireland. Unlike US states, there is no intermediate level of aggregation, so instrument validity cannot be tested using the approach of Stephens and Yang (2014). The test procedure proposed in this paper can, however, be used.

The data of Oreopoulos (2006) consists of individuals aged between 16 and 65. It is constructed by combining the UK General Household Survey for years 1984 through to 2006 and the North Ireland Continuous Household Survey for years 1985 through to 2006.⁴ Y is log real earnings, D is age of leaving full-time education, and Z is a dummy for the legal minimum leaving age faced at age 14 being 15. Conditioning covariates are year aged 14, current age, sex, survey year and residence in Northern Ireland. As with Card (1993), the treatment variable must be binarized. Here we define the treatment to be one if the age of leaving education is at least 15. We investigate the possibility that this induces coarsening bias, but the binarised treatment seems to capture well the variation in the underlying treatment induced by the instrument.

The data consists of 82,908 observations which are aggregated into 30,587 cells. Each cell consists of individuals with common values of the treatment, instrument and conditioning covariates. The outcome variable is averaged at the cell level, and each cell is assigned a weight equal to the number of individuals it contains. The identifying assumptions stated in Section 2.2 were not for data that has been aggregated in this way. However, the aggregation procedure preserves all variables apart from the outcome, which implies that the propensity score is also preserved. The identifying assumptions may then be simply restated in terms of the averaged outcome, and the same testable implications derived.⁵

Figure 11a plots subdensities for the outcome variable. It is immediately noticeable that there are very few observations with $Z = 1$ and $D = 0$. Figure 10 plots the conditional distributions and densities for the propensity score. First order stochastic dominance clearly holds, but the distributions barely overlap⁶. The estimated $\Pr(Z = 1|p(X, Z))$ is either 1 or 0 for all cells. The test of nesting inequalities can be performed using the entire sample, but there are no observations

⁴The published paper Oreopoulos (2006) used data from the UK General Household Survey for 1983-1998, and data from the Northern Ireland Continuous Household Survey for 1985-1998. A corrigendum with subsequent editions of each survey incorporated into the data was later published online. We use the revised data.

⁵Note, however, that failure to reject the LATE assumptions for the aggregated data does not imply that they would not be rejected for the unaggregated data and vice versa.

⁶The minimum estimated propensity score for a cell with $Z = 1$ is 0.678, and the estimated maximum propensity score with $Z = 0$ is 0.683. The overlap contains 8 cells (21 observations) with $Z = 0$ and 12 cells (94 observations) with $Z = 1$.

for which to perform the test of index sufficiency. Table 4 therefore present p-values for the test of nesting inequalities only. We find that the null is rejected at even the 1% level of significance. The violation is in the lower tail of the $U(1)$ subdensities, which are plotted in 11b. The subdensity of $U(1)$ for $Z = 0$ does not lie entirely within the support of the subdensity for $Z = 1$. This is potentially due to the aggregated nature of the data.

[Figure 10 about here.]

[Figure 11 about here.]

5.4 Dinkelman (2011)

A growing literature uses instruments derived from geographical features to estimate the effects of infrastructure projects. Duflo and Pande (2007) estimates the effects of irrigation dams on agricultural production and development using river gradient as an instrument for dam construction. Dinkelman (2011) estimates the effect of electrification on employment using land gradient as an instrument for receipt of an electrification project. Lipscomb et al. (2013) use geographical information to construct the cost minimising path of expansion for the electricity grid, and then employ this as an instrument for electrification. The identifying assumption is that, conditional on control variables, geographical features do not directly affect outcomes. In each case the authors present suggestive evidence for instrument validity. Dinkelman (2011) shows that there is no statistically significant relationship between land gradient and the outcome for communities that are electrified before the start of the sample period. Lipscomb et al. (2013) check whether changes in their instrument are predicted by trends in their outcome variable. The procedure proposed in this paper complements such indirect approaches by providing a direct test for instrument validity that requires no additional data and can detect violations without a specific hypothesis as to their cause.

We apply our test to the data of Dinkelman (2011). This data covers a panel of communities in the KwaZulu-Natal province of South Africa. It is constructed by combining two years of census data with project data from the electricity utility Eskom and consists of 1,816 observations.⁷ The outcome variables are the five year change in community level employment rate for men and women. D is receipt of an electrification project within this five year period, and Z is community mean land gradient. Dinkelman (2011) describes that electrification projects were financed internally by Eskom, so cost was a concern, and that the cost of laying distribution lines and constructing transmission poles is increasing with the gradient. Hence, holding all else equal, the propensity

⁷Dinkelman (2011) has a second data set constructed from household survey data. However, this data is not used in instrumental variable estimation, so it is not relevant.

score should be monotonically decreasing in land gradient. As this instrument is continuous, we discretise it into a binary variable which takes a value of one for communities whose mean land gradient is *below* the sample median. That is, the instrument takes a value of one for communities where the cost of electrification is believed to be lower.

Dinkelman (2011) employs a large number of conditioning covariates, including education levels, distance to the nearest town, and the household poverty rate. Most of these covariates are only weakly correlated with the instrument. Dinkelman (2011) shows that the instrument balances means for the majority of them covariates. As with Angrist and Evans (1998), despite this, it is still important to control for covariates as they could otherwise mask violations of the null.

Figures 13a and 14a plot subdensities for the change in male and female employment without conditioning on covariates. Figure 12 presents conditional distributions and densities for the estimated propensity score. Figures 13b and 13c plot the nesting and index sufficiency subdensities for the residual change in female employment, figures 14b and 14c for the residual change in male employment. Although there is some visual evidence of violations p-values in Table 4 show that the null is not rejected at any conventional level of significance. Given the sample size, these violations most likely represent noise in the sampling process.

[Figure 12 about here.]

[Figure 13 about here.]

[Figure 14 about here.]

6 Conclusion

This paper develops a test for instrument validity in the LATE/MTE framework that can accommodate conditioning covariates without becoming computationally infeasible. We follow Carneiro et al. (2011), and assume a linear relationship between potential outcomes and conditioning covariates. Outcomes then follow a partially linear model, depending linearly on conditioning covariates and non-parametrically on the propensity score. With this functional form, partial residuals can be obtained by partialing out the conditioning covariates. We derive testable implication for the subdensities of these partial residuals: index sufficiency and the nesting inequalities. We propose a test procedure consisting of an initial step where the partially linear model is estimated and partial residuals obtained, followed by a joint test of index sufficiency and the nesting inequalities. Crucially, as conditioning covariates are partialled out, they increase only the complexity of estimating the partially linear model. In this way, the test procedure overcomes computational hurdles that have stymied other tests for instrument validity.

The testable implications are complementary. Index sufficiency holds the propensity score fixed and compares subdensities for different values of the instrument, whereas the nesting inequalities are distributional monotonicity relations ordered with respect to the propensity score. A straightforward approach to testing the nesting inequalities is to coarsen the propensity score and check the inequalities for subdensities indexed by this coarsened variable. However, in cases where the propensity score is strongly correlated with the conditioning covariates, the distribution of instrument values can become homogenised across propensity score bins, leading to a lack of power. We showed that the nesting inequalities hold with the original instrument in place of the propensity score if the conditional distribution of the propensity score given the instrument is stochastically monotonic in the sense of first-order stochastic dominance. Since first-order stochastic dominance is not implied by the identifying assumptions, we proposed testing the nesting inequalities using a trimmed sample where first-order stochastic dominance does hold. We refer to this process as distillation, and presented an algorithm for constructing distilled samples.

We performed Monte Carlo exercises to check the size and power of our proposed test procedure, and compare it to the Kitagawa (2015) test without controlling for covariates and the test of nesting inequalities with a coarsened propensity score. We found that, irrespective of the dependence between the instrument and covariates, the size of test procedure is controlled. For processes where the size of the Kitagawa (2015) test is controlled, the power of our proposed test is comparable. The size of the test using a coarsened propensity score is also controlled, but our proposed test procedure has greater power. We also investigated the power of index sufficiency and nesting inequalities separately, and found that the power of index sufficiency depending on the similarity of the conditional propensity score distributions.

We apply our procedure to four instruments. The first is the college proximity instrument of Card (1993). For computational reasons, previous tests of the validity of this instrument have used only a subset of the conditioning covariates contained in the data set. Using the full set of conditioning covariates, we did not reject the null of instrument validity. The second instrument is the same-sex instrument of Angrist and Evans (1998). The validity of this instrument has been disputed by Rosenzweig and Wolpin (2000) and de Chaisemartin (2017) among others. We found that the null would be rejected at the 10% level of significance for some values of the trimming parameter ξ . Our third application is Oreopoulos (2006), where variation in the timing of changes in the minimum schooling age for the UK was used to identify the effect of education on income. We found that the null of instrument validity was rejected at the 1% level of significance. Our final application is Dinkelman (2011). In this example, mean land gradient was employed as an instrument to estimate the effect of electrification on male and female employment. We did not reject instrument validity for either outcome variable.

The focus of this paper is the construction of a test for instrumental variables that overcomes the computational hurdles of including conditioning covariates without sacrificing power. We believe that there is scope for additional research in this area. In particular, there are two areas which future research could address. First, formal characterisation of the size and power of this test was beyond the scope of this paper, but could be addressed. Second, as noted in Section 2, in general there will be many possible distilled samples that satisfy the first-order stochastic dominance condition. We provide an algorithm to construct distilled samples with the trimmed sample chosen to be more balanced than the original sample, but other possibilities exist, and the optimal choice of distillation process is an open question.

A Appendix

A.1 Omitted proofs

Proof of Proposition 1. Fix the value of the conditioning variable X at x , and consider an arbitrary Borel subset $A \subset \mathcal{Y}$. Then, the additive error representation of the selection equation in (1) implies that the event $\{Y \in A, D = 1 | X = x, Z = z\}$ is equivalent to $\{Y_1 \in A, V \leq p | p(X, Z) = p, X = x, Z = z\}$. We therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(Y \in A, D = 1 | X = x, Z = z) &= \Pr(Y_1 \in A, V \leq p | p(X, Z) = p, X = x, Z = z) \\ &= \Pr(Y_1 \in A, V \leq p | X = x), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the random assignment condition (A2). Similarly, for $D = 0$ case, we have

$$\Pr(Y \in A, D = 0 | X = x, Z = z) = \Pr(Y_0 \in A, V > p | X = x).$$

These prove index sufficiency, i.e., conditional on X , the distribution of (Y, D) depends on Z through the propensity score $p(X, Z)$ only.

To obtain the nesting inequalities, we note

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr(Y \in A, D = 1 | p(Z, X) = p, X = x) - \Pr(Y \in A, D = 1 | p(Z, X) = p', X = x) \\ &= \Pr(Y_1 \in A, V \leq p | X = x) - \Pr(Y_1 \in A, V \leq p' | X = x) \\ &= \Pr(Y_1 \in A, p' < V \leq p | X = x) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

follows. The inequality for $D = 0$ case is proven in a similar manner. ■

Proof of Proposition 2. Noting that the event $\{U \in A, D = 1 | X = x, Z = z\}$ is equivalent to

$\{U \in A, V \leq p | p(X, Z) = p, X = x, Z = z\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(U \in A, D = 1 | X = x, Z = z) &= \Pr(U_1 \in A, V \leq p | p(X, Z) = p, X = x, Z = z) \\ &= \Pr(U_1 \in A, V \leq p), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the strong exogeneity condition of (A4). A similar argument gives

$$\Pr(U \in A, D = 0 | X = x, Z = z) = \Pr(U_0 \in A, V > p)$$

Hence, we obtain index sufficiency: the distribution of (U, D) depends on (X, Z) through the propensity score $p(X, Z)$ only.

To obtain the nesting inequalities, by (8) and recalling that V is uniformly distributed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr(U \in A, D = 1 | p(X, Z) = p) - \Pr(U \in A, D = 1 | p(X, Z) = p') \\ &= \Pr(U_1 \in A, U_D \leq p) - \Pr(U_1 \in A, U_D \leq p') \\ &= \Pr(U_1 \in A, p' < U_D \leq p) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

The other inequality of the proposition can be shown similarly. ■

References

- ACEMOGLU, D. AND J. ANGRIST (2000): “How Large Are Human-Capital Externalities? Evidence from Compulsory Schooling Laws,” *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 15, 9–59.
- ANGRIST, J., V. LAVY, AND A. SCHLOSSER (2010): “Multiple Experiments for the Causal Link between the Quantity and Quality of Children,” *Journal of Labor Economics*, 28, 773–824.
- ANGRIST, J. D. AND W. N. EVANS (1998): “Children and Their Parents’ Labor Supply: Evidence from Exogenous Variation in Family Size,” *The American Economic Review*, 88, 450–477.
- 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, 431–442.
- ANGRIST, J. D., G. W. IMBENS, AND D. B. RUBIN (1996): “Identification of causal effects using instrumental variables,” *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 91, 444–455.
- ARAI, S., Y.-C. HSU, T. KITAGAWA, I. MOURIFIÉ, AND Y. WAN (forthcoming): “Testing Identifying Assumptions in Fuzzy Regression Discontinuity Designs,” *Quantitative Economics*.

- BALKE, A. AND J. PEARL (1997): “Bounds on treatment effects from studies with imperfect compliance,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 92, 1171–1176.
- BANERJEE, A., E. DUFLO, AND N. QIAN (2020): “On the road: Access to transportation infrastructure and economic growth in China,” *Journal of Development Economics*, 145, 102442.
- BECKER, S. O., F. CINNIRELLA, AND L. WOESSMANN (2010): “The trade-off between fertility and education: evidence from before the demographic transition,” *Journal of Economic Growth*, 15, 177–204.
- BHULLER, M., G. B. DAHL, K. V. LØKEN, AND M. MOGSTAD (2020): “Incarceration, Recidivism, and Employment,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 128, 1269–1324.
- BLACK, S. E., P. J. DEVEREUX, AND K. G. SALVANES (2010): “Small Family, Smart Family? Family Size and the IQ Scores of Young Men,” *The Journal of Human Resources*, 45, 33–58.
- BLAKESLEE, D., R. FISHMAN, AND V. SRINIVASAN (2020): “Way Down in the Hole: Adaptation to Long-Term Water Loss in Rural India,” *American Economic Review*, 110, 200–224.
- BRINCH, C. N., M. MOGSTAD, AND M. WISWALL (2017): “Beyond LATE with a Discrete Instrument,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 125, 985–1039.
- CAMERON, S. AND C. TABER (2004): “Estimation of Educational Borrowing Constraints Using Returns to Schooling,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 112, 132–182.
- CARD, D. (1993): “Using Geographic Variation in College Proximity to Estimate the Return to Schooling,” Working Paper 4483, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- CARNEIRO, P., J. J. HECKMAN, AND E. J. VYTLACIL (2011): “Estimating Marginal Returns to Education,” *American Economic Review*, 101, 2754–81.
- CARNEIRO, P. AND S. LEE (2009): “Estimating distributions of potential outcomes using local instrumental variables with an application to changes in college enrollment and wage inequality,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 149, 191 – 208.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., S. LEE, AND A. M. ROSEN (2013): “Intersection Bounds: Estimation and Inference,” *Econometrica*, 81, 667–737.
- CLARK, D. AND H. ROYER (2013): “The Effect of Education on Adult Mortality and Health: Evidence from Britain,” *The American Economic Review*, 103, 2087–2120.

- CONLEY, D. AND R. GLAUBER (2006): “Parental Educational Investment and Children’s Academic Risk: Estimates of the Impact of Sibship Size and Birth Order from Exogenous Variation in Fertility,” *The Journal of Human Resources*, 41, 722–737.
- CORNELISSEN, T., C. DUSTMANN, A. RAUTE, AND U. SCHÖNBERG (2018): “Who Benefits from Universal Child Care? Estimating Marginal Returns to Early Child Care Attendance,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 126, 2356–2409.
- CRUCES, G. AND S. GALIANI (2007): “Fertility and female labor supply in Latin America: New causal evidence,” *Labour Economics*, 14, 565 – 573.
- DAHL, G. B. AND E. MORETTI (2008): “The Demand for Sons,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 75, 1085–1120.
- DATTA, S. (2012): “The impact of improved highways on Indian firms,” *Journal of Development Economics*, 99, 46 – 57.
- DE CHAISEMARTIN, C. (2017): “Tolerating defiance? Local average treatment effects without monotonicity,” *Quantitative Economics*, 8, 367–396.
- DINKELMAN, T. (2011): “The Effects of Rural Electrification on Employment: New Evidence from South Africa,” *American Economic Review*, 101, 3078–3108.
- DUFLO, E. AND R. PANDE (2007): “Dams.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122, 601–646.
- EISENHAUER, P., J. J. HECKMAN, AND E. VYTLACIL (2015): “The Generalized Roy Model and the Cost-Benefit Analysis of Social Programs,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 123, 413–443.
- FARBMACHER, H., R. GUBER, AND S. KLAASSEN (2020): “Instrument Validity Tests with Causal Forests,” Working paper, Munich Center for the Economics of Aging, Munich.
- FELFE, C. AND R. LALIVE (2018): “Does early child care affect children’s development?” *Journal of Public Economics*, 159, 33 – 53.
- FRANDSEN, B. R., L. J. LEFGREN, AND E. C. LESLIE (2019): “Judging Judge Fixed Effects,” Working Paper 25528, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- HECKMAN, J. J., J. E. HUMPHRIES, AND G. VERAMENDI (2018): “Returns to Education: The Causal Effects of Education on Earnings, Health, and Smoking,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 126, S197–S246.

- HECKMAN, J. J. AND E. VYTLACIL (2005): “Structural equations, treatment effects, and econometric policy evaluation,” *Econometrica*, 73, 669–738.
- HECKMAN, J. J. AND E. J. VYTLACIL (1999): “Local instrumental variables and latent variable models for identifying and bounding treatment effects,” *Proceedings of the national Academy of Sciences*, 96, 4730–4734.
- (2001a): “Instrumental variables, selection models, and tight bounds on the average treatment effect,” in *Econometric Evaluation of Labour Market Policies*, Springer, 1–15.
- (2001b): *Local instrumental variables*, Cambridge University Press, 1–46, International Symposia in Economic Theory and Econometrics.
- HUBER, M. (2015): “Testing the Validity of the Sibling Sex Ratio Instrument,” *LABOUR*, 29, 1–14.
- HUBER, M. AND G. MELLACE (2015): “Testing instrument validity for LATE identification based on inequality moment constraints,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97, 398–411.
- IMBENS, G. W. AND J. D. ANGRIST (1994): “Identification and Estimation of Local Average Treatment Effects,” *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 467–475.
- IMBENS, G. W. AND D. B. RUBIN (1997): “Estimating outcome distributions for compliers in instrumental variables models,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 64, 555–574.
- KITAGAWA, T. (2015): “A Test for Instrument Validity,” *Econometrica*, 83, 2043–2063.
- KLINE, P. AND C. R. WALTERS (2016): “Evaluating Public Programs with Close Substitutes: The Case of Head Start*,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131, 1795–1848.
- KÉDAGNI, D. AND I. MOURIFIÉ (2020): “Generalized instrumental inequalities: testing the instrumental variable independence assumption,” *Biometrika*, 107, 661–675.
- LAFFERS, L. AND G. MELLACE (2017): “A note on testing instrument validity for the identification of LATE.” *Empirical Economics*, 53, 1281 – 1286.
- LIPSCOMB, M., A. M. MOBARAK, AND T. BARHAM (2013): “Development Effects of Electrification: Evidence from the Topographic Placement of Hydropower Plants in Brazil,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 5, 200–231.
- LLERAS-MUNEY, A. (2005): “The Relationship between Education and Adult Mortality in the United States,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 72, 189–221.

- LOCHNER, L. AND E. MORETTI (2004): “The Effect of Education on Crime: Evidence from Prison Inmates, Arrests, and Self-Reports,” *American Economic Review*, 94, 155–189.
- MACHADO, C., A. M. SHAIKH, AND E. J. VYTLACIL (2019): “Instrumental variables and the sign of the average treatment effect,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 212, 522–555.
- MAESTAS, N., K. J. MULLEN, AND A. STRAND (2013): “Does Disability Insurance Receipt Discourage Work? Using Examiner Assignment to Estimate Causal Effects of SSDI Receipt,” *American Economic Review*, 103, 1797–1829.
- MAO, M. AND P. H. C. SANT’ANNA (2020): “Testing instrument validity in marginal treatment effects models,” *unpublished manuscript*.
- MARSHALL, J. (2016): “Coarsening Bias: How Coarse Treatment Measurement Upwardly Biases Instrumental Variable Estimates,” *Political Analysis*, 24, 157–171.
- MOGSTAD, M., A. SANTOS, AND A. TORGOVITSKY (2018): “Using instrumental variables for inference about policy relevant treatment parameters,” *Econometrica*, 86, 1589–1619.
- MOGSTAD, M. AND A. TORGOVITSKY (2018): “Identification and Extrapolation of Causal Effects with Instrumental Variables,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 10, 577–613.
- MOGSTAD, M., A. TORGOVITSKY, AND C. R. WALTERS (2019): “The Causal Interpretation of Two-Stage Least Squares with Multiple Instrumental Variables,” Working Paper 25691, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- (2020): “Policy Evaluation with Multiple Instrumental Variables,” Tech. rep.
- MOURIFIÉ, I. AND Y. WAN (2017): “Testing local average treatment effect assumptions,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 99, 305–313.
- OREOPOULOS, P. (2006): “Estimating Average and Local Average Treatment Effects of Education when Compulsory Schooling Laws Really Matter,” *American Economic Review*, 96, 152–175.
- ROSENZWEIG, M. R. AND K. I. WOLPIN (2000): “Natural ”Natural Experiments” in Economics,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38, 827–874.
- RUD, J. P. (2012): “Electricity provision and industrial development: Evidence from India,” *Journal of Development Economics*, 97, 352 – 367.
- STEPHENS, MELVIN, J. AND D.-Y. YANG (2014): “Compulsory Education and the Benefits of Schooling,” *American Economic Review*, 104, 1777–92.

SUN, Z. (2021): “Instrument Validity for Heterogeneous Causal Effects,” .

VAN DER VAART, A. W. AND J. WELLNER (1996): *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*, Springer Science & Business Media.




Figure 1: Partial residual subdensities for DGPs 1 - 4, $D = 1$. β, δ are drawn from the $U(-1, 1)$ distribution, γ are set to 0. Subdensities are constructed by generating one million simulated observations and applying the second order Gaussian kernel density estimator with the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 2: Outcome variable subdensities for DGPs 1 - 4, $D = 1$. β, δ are drawn from the $U(-1, 1)$ distribution, γ are set to 0. Subdensities are constructed by generating one million simulated observations and applying the second order Gaussian kernel density estimator with the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 3: DGP1 - 4 subdensities conditional on the binarised propensity score, $D = 1$. β, δ are drawn from the $U(-1, 1)$ distribution, γ are set to 0. Subdensities are constructed by generating one million simulated observations and applying the second order Gaussian kernel density estimator with the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 4: Density of $p(X, Z)$ conditional on Z in four cases




Figure 5: $\Pr(Z = 1|p(X, Z))$ in four cases




Figure 6: Card (1993) distribution and density of the estimated propensity score. The propensity score is estimated by probit with controls consisting of the instrument, the conditioning covariates, and interactions between the two. Conditioning covariates consist of residence in the South, residence in a standard metropolitan statistical area in 1966, residence in a standard metropolitan statistical area in 1976, race, potential experience and its square, living in a single mother household at age 14, living with both parents at age 14, father's and mother's years of education, indicators for when father's and mother's years of indication are missing, a nine value categorical variable constructed by interacting father's and mother's education class, and a category for region of residence in 1966. The distribution is the simple empirical distribution of estimated propensity scores. The density is an estimated kernel density using the Gaussian kernel and the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 7: Card (1993) subdensities. 7a plots conditional (Y, D) subdensities for $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$ where the outcome Y is log weekly earnings. 7b and 7c plot conditional subdensities for (U, D) , where U are the partial residuals obtained by controlling for residence in the South, residence in a standard metropolitan statistical area in 1966, residence in a standard metropolitan statistical area in 1976, race, potential experience and its square, living in a single mother household at age 14, living with both parents at age 14, father's and mother's years of education, indicators for when father's and mother's years of indication are missing, a nine value categorical variable constructed by interacting father's and mother's education class, and a category for region of residence in 1966. 7b are nesting inequality subdensities which are trimmed to ensure first order stochastic dominance. 7c are index sufficiency subdensities which are reweighted by $P(Z = 1|p(X, Z))$. Densities use the Gaussian kernel with the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 8: Angrist and Evans (1998) distribution and density of the estimated propensity score. The propensity score is estimated by probit with controls consisting of the instrument, the conditioning covariates, and interactions between the two. Conditioning covariates consist of mother’s current age, mother’s age at the time of the birth of their first child, the sex of the first child, and two dummies for race. The distribution is the simple empirical distribution of estimated propensity scores. The density is an estimated kernel density using the Gaussian kernel and the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 9: Angrist and Evans (1998) subdensities. 9a plots conditional (Y, D) subdensities for $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$ where the outcome Y is log annual family earnings. 9b and 9c plot conditional subdensities for (U, D) , where U are the partial residuals obtained by controlling for mother's age, mother's age at the time of the first birth, two dummies for mother's race, and dummies for the first and second child being a boy. 9b are nesting inequality subdensities which are trimmed to ensure first order stochastic dominance. 9c are index sufficiency subdensities which are reweighted by $P(Z = 1|p(X, Z))$. Densities use the Gaussian kernel with the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 10: Oreopoulos (2006) distribution and density of the estimated propensity score. The propensity score is estimated by probit with controls consisting of the instrument, the conditioning covariates, and interactions between the two. Conditioning covariates consist of year aged 14 fixed effects, a quartic polynomial for current age, sex, survey year fixed effects and residence in Northern Ireland⁶. The distribution is the simple empirical distribution of estimated propensity scores. The density is an estimated kernel density using the Gaussian kernel and the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 11: Oreopoulos (2006) subdensities. 11a plots conditional (Y, D) subdensities for $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$ where the outcome Y is log real earnings. 11b plots conditional subdensities for (U, D) , where U are the partial residuals obtained by controlling for year aged 14 fixed effects, a quartic polynomial for current age, sex, survey year fixed effects and residence in Northern Ireland. 11b are nesting inequality subdensities which are trimmed to ensure first order stochastic dominance. Densities use the Gaussian kernel with the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 12: Dinkelman (2011) distribution and density of the estimated propensity score. The propensity score is estimated by probit with controls consisting of the instrument, the conditioning covariates, and interactions between the two. Conditioning covariates consist of district fixed effects, distance from to the nearest electricity grid point, household density, household poverty rate, the fraction of households headed by a male, the sex ratio, the fraction of households with an Indian or white head, distance from the nearest road, distance from the nearest town, the fraction of African men with a matric, the change in the fraction of households with a nearby water source, and the change in the fraction of households with a flushing toilet. The distribution is the simple empirical distribution of estimated propensity scores. The density is an estimated kernel density using the Gaussian kernel and the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 13: Dinkelman (2011) subdensities when the outcome is the change in female employment. 13a plots conditional (Y, D) subdensities for $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$ where the outcome Y . 13b and 13c plot conditional subdensities for (U, D) , where U are the partial residuals obtained by controlling for district fixed effects, distance from to the nearest electricity grid point, household density, household poverty rate, the fraction of households headed by a female, the sex ratio, the fraction of households with an Indian or white head, distance from the nearest road, distance from the nearest town, the fraction of African men with a matric, the change in the fraction of households with a nearby water source, and the change in the fraction of households with a flushing toilet. 13b are nesting inequality subdensities which are trimmed to ensure first order stochastic dominance. 13c are index sufficiency subdensities which are reweighted by $P(Z = 1|p(X, Z))$. Densities use the Gaussian kernel with the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.




Figure 14: Dinkelman (2011) subdensities when the outcome is the change in male employment. 14a plots conditional (Y, D) subdensities for $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$ where the outcome Y . 14b and 14c plot conditional subdensities for (U, D) , where U are the partial residuals obtained by controlling for district fixed effects, distance from to the nearest electricity grid point, household density, household poverty rate, the fraction of households headed by a male, the sex ratio, the fraction of households with an Indian or white head, distance from the nearest road, distance from the nearest town, the fraction of African men with a matric, the change in the fraction of households with a nearby water source, and the change in the fraction of households with a flushing toilet. 14b are nesting inequality subdensities which are trimmed to ensure first order stochastic dominance. 14c are index sufficiency subdensities which are reweighted by $P(Z = 1|p(X, Z))$. Densities use the Gaussian kernel with the rule-of-thumb bandwidth.

| Trimming Constant: | $\gamma_k = 0$ | | | | | | $\gamma_k \sim U(-1, 1)$ | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|--------------------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|
| | $\xi \approx 0.21$ | | | $\xi = 0.30$ | | | $\xi \approx 0.21$ | | | $\xi = 0.30$ | | |
| Nominal Size: | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 |
| Proposed test procedure | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.026 | 0.007 | 0.000 | 0.017 | 0.007 | 0.000 | 0.085 | 0.041 | 0.012 | 0.049 | 0.022 | 0.008 |
| 500 | 0.022 | 0.005 | 0.001 | 0.017 | 0.002 | 0.000 | 0.087 | 0.052 | 0.014 | 0.055 | 0.033 | 0.007 |
| 1000 | 0.023 | 0.006 | 0.000 | 0.012 | 0.003 | 0.000 | 0.062 | 0.031 | 0.002 | 0.039 | 0.012 | 0.002 |
| Binarised $p(X, Z)$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.043 | 0.024 | 0.013 | 0.031 | 0.023 | 0.013 | 0.046 | 0.033 | 0.017 | 0.044 | 0.030 | 0.017 |
| 500 | 0.080 | 0.066 | 0.039 | 0.066 | 0.049 | 0.029 | 0.070 | 0.050 | 0.031 | 0.053 | 0.042 | 0.027 |
| 1000 | 0.085 | 0.073 | 0.053 | 0.070 | 0.057 | 0.041 | 0.094 | 0.080 | 0.057 | 0.076 | 0.062 | 0.045 |
| Kitagawa (2015) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.131 | 0.070 | 0.016 | 0.134 | 0.067 | 0.017 | 0.454 | 0.384 | 0.262 | 0.453 | 0.403 | 0.268 |
| 500 | 0.146 | 0.078 | 0.017 | 0.127 | 0.073 | 0.014 | 0.547 | 0.495 | 0.406 | 0.558 | 0.508 | 0.413 |
| 1000 | 0.120 | 0.063 | 0.013 | 0.112 | 0.057 | 0.011 | 0.631 | 0.596 | 0.538 | 0.638 | 0.604 | 0.542 |

Table 1: Size

| Trimming Constant: Nominal Size: | $\gamma_k = 0$ | | | | | | $\gamma_k \sim U(-1, 1)$ | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|--------------------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|
| | $\xi \approx 0.21$ | | | $\xi = 0.30$ | | | $\xi \approx 0.21$ | | | $\xi = 0.30$ | | |
| | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 |
| Power DGP1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed test procedure | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.162 | 0.081 | 0.022 | 0.164 | 0.079 | 0.020 | 0.227 | 0.141 | 0.058 | 0.188 | 0.110 | 0.042 |
| 500 | 0.449 | 0.310 | 0.107 | 0.440 | 0.305 | 0.111 | 0.454 | 0.326 | 0.154 | 0.410 | 0.290 | 0.121 |
| 1000 | 0.723 | 0.590 | 0.348 | 0.719 | 0.591 | 0.336 | 0.708 | 0.570 | 0.323 | 0.679 | 0.547 | 0.298 |
| Binarised Propensity Score | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.053 | 0.040 | 0.012 | 0.050 | 0.040 | 0.011 | 0.049 | 0.035 | 0.013 | 0.044 | 0.028 | 0.013 |
| 500 | 0.153 | 0.128 | 0.074 | 0.131 | 0.104 | 0.064 | 0.127 | 0.096 | 0.051 | 0.096 | 0.079 | 0.045 |
| 1000 | 0.313 | 0.263 | 0.192 | 0.251 | 0.214 | 0.150 | 0.266 | 0.232 | 0.158 | 0.225 | 0.183 | 0.114 |
| Kitagawa (2015) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.205 | 0.134 | 0.039 | 0.198 | 0.123 | 0.033 | 0.419 | 0.354 | 0.249 | 0.417 | 0.358 | 0.251 |
| 500 | 0.359 | 0.257 | 0.122 | 0.354 | 0.255 | 0.118 | 0.583 | 0.535 | 0.450 | 0.577 | 0.530 | 0.448 |
| 1000 | 0.637 | 0.545 | 0.362 | 0.652 | 0.548 | 0.342 | 0.699 | 0.668 | 0.604 | 0.690 | 0.656 | 0.591 |
| Power DGP2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed test procedure | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.198 | 0.115 | 0.027 | 0.203 | 0.119 | 0.033 | 0.227 | 0.144 | 0.039 | 0.193 | 0.122 | 0.034 |
| 500 | 0.639 | 0.490 | 0.193 | 0.650 | 0.507 | 0.191 | 0.581 | 0.422 | 0.165 | 0.524 | 0.377 | 0.140 |
| 1000 | 0.954 | 0.907 | 0.697 | 0.954 | 0.900 | 0.683 | 0.922 | 0.857 | 0.640 | 0.883 | 0.793 | 0.529 |
| Binarised Propensity Score | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.026 | 0.018 | 0.008 | 0.023 | 0.019 | 0.009 | 0.039 | 0.029 | 0.014 | 0.041 | 0.026 | 0.016 |
| 500 | 0.036 | 0.027 | 0.017 | 0.025 | 0.021 | 0.012 | 0.043 | 0.033 | 0.020 | 0.035 | 0.029 | 0.018 |
| 1000 | 0.040 | 0.032 | 0.018 | 0.029 | 0.021 | 0.012 | 0.047 | 0.038 | 0.025 | 0.039 | 0.032 | 0.015 |
| Kitagawa (2015) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.105 | 0.054 | 0.011 | 0.079 | 0.033 | 0.009 | 0.369 | 0.313 | 0.196 | 0.372 | 0.303 | 0.190 |
| 500 | 0.214 | 0.141 | 0.054 | 0.118 | 0.070 | 0.027 | 0.582 | 0.526 | 0.404 | 0.533 | 0.477 | 0.381 |
| 1000 | 0.470 | 0.366 | 0.215 | 0.290 | 0.200 | 0.082 | 0.720 | 0.680 | 0.592 | 0.650 | 0.602 | 0.518 |
| Power DGP3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed test procedure | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.211 | 0.116 | 0.025 | 0.186 | 0.100 | 0.021 | 0.298 | 0.191 | 0.057 | 0.223 | 0.144 | 0.047 |
| 500 | 0.775 | 0.641 | 0.304 | 0.651 | 0.501 | 0.183 | 0.772 | 0.656 | 0.363 | 0.672 | 0.535 | 0.265 |
| 1000 | 0.991 | 0.980 | 0.925 | 0.976 | 0.953 | 0.825 | 0.988 | 0.977 | 0.899 | 0.968 | 0.944 | 0.784 |
| Binarised Propensity Score | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.028 | 0.020 | 0.008 | 0.027 | 0.018 | 0.007 | 0.027 | 0.016 | 0.007 | 0.025 | 0.015 | 0.007 |
| 500 | 0.018 | 0.016 | 0.012 | 0.018 | 0.015 | 0.010 | 0.025 | 0.016 | 0.010 | 0.019 | 0.016 | 0.009 |
| 1000 | 0.006 | 0.004 | 0.003 | 0.005 | 0.005 | 0.002 | 0.013 | 0.010 | 0.006 | 0.012 | 0.009 | 0.003 |
| Kitagawa (2015) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.115 | 0.061 | 0.013 | 0.105 | 0.058 | 0.014 | 0.359 | 0.301 | 0.200 | 0.352 | 0.294 | 0.204 |
| 500 | 0.118 | 0.073 | 0.022 | 0.126 | 0.076 | 0.027 | 0.497 | 0.437 | 0.338 | 0.508 | 0.456 | 0.349 |
| 1000 | 0.163 | 0.108 | 0.039 | 0.180 | 0.125 | 0.042 | 0.582 | 0.547 | 0.475 | 0.582 | 0.545 | 0.478 |
| Power DGP4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposed test procedure | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.051 | 0.017 | 0.002 | 0.031 | 0.011 | 0.001 | 0.131 | 0.069 | 0.013 | 0.080 | 0.040 | 0.007 |
| 500 | 0.281 | 0.170 | 0.033 | 0.124 | 0.054 | 0.004 | 0.328 | 0.214 | 0.061 | 0.198 | 0.111 | 0.027 |
| 1000 | 0.744 | 0.620 | 0.347 | 0.420 | 0.259 | 0.054 | 0.705 | 0.602 | 0.341 | 0.467 | 0.314 | 0.094 |
| Binarised Propensity Score | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.020 | 0.015 | 0.006 | 0.017 | 0.012 | 0.006 | 0.023 | 0.017 | 0.009 | 0.021 | 0.014 | 0.009 |
| 500 | 0.023 | 0.014 | 0.004 | 0.013 | 0.007 | 0.002 | 0.040 | 0.028 | 0.015 | 0.022 | 0.019 | 0.012 |
| 1000 | 0.011 | 0.011 | 0.006 | 0.008 | 0.004 | 0.002 | 0.028 | 0.021 | 0.016 | 0.019 | 0.015 | 0.012 |
| Kitagawa (2015) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.084 | 0.034 | 0.003 | 0.069 | 0.026 | 0.004 | 0.346 | 0.288 | 0.176 | 0.358 | 0.291 | 0.186 |
| 500 | 0.080 | 0.043 | 0.013 | 0.077 | 0.042 | 0.012 | 0.451 | 0.399 | 0.318 | 0.453 | 0.406 | 0.328 |
| 1000 | 0.074 | 0.038 | 0.008 | 0.063 | 0.035 | 0.006 | 0.527 | 0.485 | 0.418 | 0.532 | 0.494 | 0.424 |

Table 2: Power

| Trimming Constant: Nominal Size: | $\delta_k \sim U(-1, 1)$ | | | | | | $\delta_k \sim U(-0.1, 0.1)$ | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|------------------------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|
| | $\xi \approx 0.21$ | | | $\xi = 0.30$ | | | $\xi \approx 0.21$ | | | $\xi = 0.30$ | | |
| | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.1 | 0.05 | 0.01 |
| Power DGP 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nesting: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.073 | 0.032 | 0.003 | 0.081 | 0.033 | 0.004 | 0.085 | 0.038 | 0.006 | 0.076 | 0.034 | 0.002 |
| 500 | 0.265 | 0.168 | 0.044 | 0.271 | 0.162 | 0.042 | 0.376 | 0.244 | 0.080 | 0.377 | 0.228 | 0.072 |
| 1000 | 0.560 | 0.439 | 0.240 | 0.530 | 0.411 | 0.224 | 0.832 | 0.731 | 0.458 | 0.829 | 0.711 | 0.413 |
| Index Sufficiency: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.174 | 0.088 | 0.024 | 0.177 | 0.087 | 0.023 | 0.103 | 0.050 | 0.012 | 0.084 | 0.043 | 0.008 |
| 500 | 0.455 | 0.316 | 0.114 | 0.445 | 0.308 | 0.120 | 0.192 | 0.097 | 0.020 | 0.161 | 0.090 | 0.014 |
| 1000 | 0.709 | 0.577 | 0.350 | 0.715 | 0.576 | 0.333 | 0.284 | 0.192 | 0.079 | 0.272 | 0.181 | 0.063 |
| Overall: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.162 | 0.081 | 0.022 | 0.164 | 0.079 | 0.020 | 0.096 | 0.054 | 0.007 | 0.077 | 0.044 | 0.003 |
| 500 | 0.449 | 0.310 | 0.107 | 0.440 | 0.305 | 0.111 | 0.331 | 0.208 | 0.061 | 0.311 | 0.196 | 0.053 |
| 1000 | 0.723 | 0.590 | 0.348 | 0.719 | 0.591 | 0.336 | 0.773 | 0.675 | 0.422 | 0.753 | 0.640 | 0.386 |
| Power DGP 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nesting: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.053 | 0.023 | 0.000 | 0.030 | 0.012 | 0.001 | 0.055 | 0.022 | 0.000 | 0.024 | 0.005 | 0.000 |
| 500 | 0.333 | 0.197 | 0.056 | 0.154 | 0.082 | 0.012 | 0.382 | 0.256 | 0.063 | 0.193 | 0.096 | 0.017 |
| 1000 | 0.829 | 0.697 | 0.402 | 0.507 | 0.330 | 0.096 | 0.858 | 0.783 | 0.504 | 0.616 | 0.447 | 0.186 |
| Index Sufficiency: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.222 | 0.127 | 0.033 | 0.227 | 0.132 | 0.035 | 0.147 | 0.075 | 0.011 | 0.157 | 0.074 | 0.010 |
| 500 | 0.658 | 0.510 | 0.211 | 0.665 | 0.522 | 0.208 | 0.425 | 0.293 | 0.110 | 0.419 | 0.295 | 0.116 |
| 1000 | 0.952 | 0.911 | 0.707 | 0.962 | 0.914 | 0.703 | 0.771 | 0.676 | 0.424 | 0.764 | 0.659 | 0.401 |
| Overall: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.198 | 0.115 | 0.027 | 0.203 | 0.119 | 0.033 | 0.125 | 0.049 | 0.006 | 0.115 | 0.057 | 0.005 |
| 500 | 0.639 | 0.490 | 0.193 | 0.650 | 0.507 | 0.191 | 0.446 | 0.307 | 0.104 | 0.377 | 0.245 | 0.084 |
| 1000 | 0.954 | 0.907 | 0.697 | 0.954 | 0.900 | 0.683 | 0.883 | 0.812 | 0.527 | 0.766 | 0.660 | 0.362 |
| Power DGP 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nesting: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.120 | 0.065 | 0.010 | 0.151 | 0.076 | 0.012 | 0.117 | 0.054 | 0.008 | 0.124 | 0.063 | 0.009 |
| 500 | 0.437 | 0.290 | 0.091 | 0.480 | 0.326 | 0.098 | 0.425 | 0.287 | 0.085 | 0.459 | 0.324 | 0.101 |
| 1000 | 0.839 | 0.752 | 0.501 | 0.864 | 0.791 | 0.524 | 0.761 | 0.654 | 0.376 | 0.802 | 0.694 | 0.400 |
| Index Sufficiency: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.233 | 0.132 | 0.028 | 0.199 | 0.110 | 0.023 | 0.156 | 0.070 | 0.014 | 0.136 | 0.068 | 0.015 |
| 500 | 0.790 | 0.661 | 0.327 | 0.674 | 0.522 | 0.199 | 0.471 | 0.380 | 0.178 | 0.421 | 0.308 | 0.128 |
| 1000 | 0.991 | 0.981 | 0.927 | 0.977 | 0.958 | 0.834 | 0.667 | 0.599 | 0.438 | 0.668 | 0.581 | 0.394 |
| Overall: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.211 | 0.116 | 0.025 | 0.186 | 0.100 | 0.021 | 0.130 | 0.062 | 0.007 | 0.116 | 0.058 | 0.008 |
| 500 | 0.775 | 0.641 | 0.304 | 0.651 | 0.501 | 0.183 | 0.520 | 0.379 | 0.152 | 0.475 | 0.335 | 0.120 |
| 1000 | 0.991 | 0.980 | 0.925 | 0.976 | 0.953 | 0.825 | 0.808 | 0.726 | 0.501 | 0.813 | 0.721 | 0.475 |
| Power DGP 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nesting: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.032 | 0.010 | 0.001 | 0.032 | 0.007 | 0.001 | 0.034 | 0.018 | 0.001 | 0.024 | 0.012 | 0.001 |
| 500 | 0.081 | 0.035 | 0.004 | 0.080 | 0.039 | 0.005 | 0.087 | 0.045 | 0.007 | 0.070 | 0.029 | 0.004 |
| 1000 | 0.184 | 0.100 | 0.025 | 0.169 | 0.091 | 0.024 | 0.236 | 0.136 | 0.038 | 0.165 | 0.081 | 0.026 |
| Index Sufficiency: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.065 | 0.022 | 0.003 | 0.040 | 0.016 | 0.002 | 0.053 | 0.026 | 0.001 | 0.049 | 0.024 | 0.002 |
| 500 | 0.304 | 0.179 | 0.039 | 0.143 | 0.059 | 0.004 | 0.188 | 0.116 | 0.039 | 0.104 | 0.049 | 0.008 |
| 1000 | 0.757 | 0.641 | 0.362 | 0.438 | 0.275 | 0.064 | 0.506 | 0.397 | 0.205 | 0.326 | 0.209 | 0.065 |
| Overall: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200 | 0.051 | 0.017 | 0.002 | 0.031 | 0.011 | 0.001 | 0.055 | 0.018 | 0.002 | 0.035 | 0.017 | 0.001 |
| 500 | 0.281 | 0.170 | 0.033 | 0.124 | 0.054 | 0.004 | 0.172 | 0.093 | 0.029 | 0.088 | 0.038 | 0.004 |
| 1000 | 0.744 | 0.620 | 0.347 | 0.420 | 0.259 | 0.054 | 0.492 | 0.356 | 0.169 | 0.277 | 0.168 | 0.047 |

Table 3: Comparison of index sufficiency and nesting inequalities

| | $\xi \approx 0.07$ | $\xi \approx 0.21$ | $\xi = 0.30$ | $\xi = 1$ |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------|
| Card (1993) | | | | |
| Nesting inequalities | 0.360 | 0.996 | 0.998 | 0.998 |
| Index sufficiency | 0.190 | 0.328 | 0.248 | 0.180 |
| Overall | 0.210 | 0.354 | 0.268 | 0.198 |
| N | 3010 | 3010 | 3010 | 3010 |
| Angrist and Evans (1998) | | | | |
| Nesting inequalities | 0.986 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Index sufficiency | 0.276 | 0.096 | 0.072 | 0.328 |
| Overall | 0.306 | 0.100 | 0.076 | 0.348 |
| N | 12732 | 12732 | 12732 | 12732 |
| Oreopoulos (2006) | | | | |
| Nesting inequalities | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.006 |
| N | 82908 | 82908 | 82908 | 82908 |
| Dinkelman (2011) | | | | |
| Δ_t female employment | | | | |
| Nesting inequalities | 0.718 | 0.540 | 0.422 | 0.676 |
| Index sufficiency | 0.598 | 0.526 | 0.402 | 0.822 |
| Overall | 0.668 | 0.580 | 0.446 | 0.836 |
| N | 1816 | 1816 | 1816 | 1816 |
| Δ_t male employment | | | | |
| Nesting inequalities | 0.972 | 0.894 | 0.844 | 0.916 |
| Index sufficiency | 0.300 | 0.870 | 0.812 | 0.880 |
| Overall | 0.382 | 0.902 | 0.862 | 0.886 |
| N | 1816 | 1816 | 1816 | 1816 |

Table 4: P-values for the test of nesting inequalities, the test of index sufficiency, and the combined test of both. A P-value below 0.05 indicates that the null hypothesis would be at the 5% level of significance. ξ is a user specified trimming parameter as described in Kitagawa (2015). For Card (1993) conditioning covariates are residence in the South, residence in a standard metropolitan statistical area in 1966, residence in a standard metropolitan statistical area in 1976, race, a quadratic in potential experience, living in a single mother household at age 14, living with both parents at age 14, mother’s and father’s years of education, dummies for mother’s and father’s years of education being missing, a nine value categorical variable constructed by interacting father’s and mother’s education class, and a categorical variable for region of residence in 1966. Covariates for Angrist and Evans (1998) are mother’s current age, mother’s age at the time of the birth of their first child, the sex of the first child, and two dummies for race. Conditioning covariates for Oreopoulos (2006) are a quartic in age, survey year fixed effects, year aged 14 fixed effects, sex and a dummy for residence in Northern Ireland. Covariates for Dinkelman (2011) are district fixed effects, distance from to the nearest electricity grid point, household density, household poverty rate, the fraction of households headed by a male, the sex ratio, the fraction of households with an Indian or white head, distance from the nearest road, distance from the nearest town, the fraction of African men with a matric, the change in the fraction of households with a nearby water source, and the change in the fraction of households with a flushing toilet