

Bounds for Treatment Effects in the Presence of Anticipatory Behavior*

Aibo Gong[†]

November 15, 2021

Abstract

It is often the case in program evaluation that units will often anticipate the implementation of a new policy before it occurs. Such anticipatory behavior can lead to units' outcomes becoming dependent on their future treatment assignments. In this paper, I employ a potential outcomes framework to analyze the treatment effect with anticipation. I start with a classical difference-in-differences model with two time periods and provide partially identified sets with easy-to-implement estimation and inference strategies for causal parameters. I consider generalizations on including covariates and longitudinal models. I also analyze cases with imperfect anticipation and nonlinear outcomes. I further illustrate my results by analyzing the effect of an early retirement incentive program for teachers, which was likely to be anticipated by the target units, on student achievement. The empirical results demonstrate the potential pitfalls of failing to consider anticipation in policy evaluation.

*I am deeply grateful to Matias Cattaneo for continued advice and encouragement. I thank Yuehao Bai, Ming Fang, Max Farrell, Yingjie Feng, Zheng Gong, Florian Gunsilius, Andreas Hagemann, Xuming He, Michael Jansson, Shaowei Ke, Xinwei Ma, Kenichi Nagasawa, Mel Stephens, Gonzalo Vazquez-Bare and seminar participants at University of Michigan for their valuable feedbacks. All errors are my own.

[†]Department of Economics, University of Michigan

1 Introduction

This paper accommodates the matter of anticipation in the analysis of treatment effects by employing a potential outcomes framework (see e.g. [Neyman \(1923\)](#), [Rubin \(1974\)](#), [Rubin \(1978\)](#)) in a difference-in-differences model. The concept of anticipation is not unfamiliar to researchers in economics and social sciences, as seen in the work of [Malani and Reif \(2015\)](#), as well as [Bošković and Nøstbakken \(2018\)](#), for example. When anticipation occurs, forward-looking units change their behavior in reaction to the possibility of a new policy, and thus a treatment has an impact before its implementation. Therefore, it is crucial to consider the role of anticipation when evaluating an economic process and its outcome. However, despite its importance, most available published studies do not formally consider anticipation. A ‘no anticipation’ assumption is made, combined with a procedure of dropping data closely before the treatment if it is possibly violated, based on the argument that anticipation occurs only within a fixed time period prior to the introduction of a policy. Even in the few cases where anticipation is taken into account, the anticipatory behavior is accounted for in a restricted manner, such as an *ad hoc* restriction on units’ forward-looking behavior, such as rational or adaptive expectations.

When anticipatory behavior takes place, the identification strategies commonly used with multiple periods, such as the difference-in-differences model, fall apart. Consider an early retirement incentive program for teachers nearing the age of retirement. If those teachers foresee the possibility of retiring early, their behavior might change before the program is introduced. Due to the effect of future treatment status on pre-treatment periods, the observable pre-treatment outcomes are no longer drawn from the distribution of potential outcomes, if the treatment never takes place. Individuals will change their responses according to how they expect to be treated in the future. Thus, further information about units’ anticipatory behavior is required. But such information is usually unattainable, since it is generally impossible to observe.

This paper provides novel strategies to build identified sets for treatment effects under

assumptions restricting anticipatory behavior. Easy-to-implement estimation and inference strategies are also provided. I start from a difference-in-differences model with two time periods, and then generalize it to incorporate more complex models. I provide conditions for partial identification results of causal parameters when the anticipation status is unknown and incorporate anticipation in many widely used empirical designs. Employing a potential outcome framework, I analyze the treatment and the effects of anticipation based on the treatment rules, the anticipation assignments, and outcomes.

The departure from point identification starts with formulating restrictions on anticipatory behavior. In most cases, I do not have additional information, such as proxy variables, that helps us identify which participants have anticipated the policy change. As a result, I can say nothing about the pre-treatment distortion caused by anticipation. In this paper, I introduce a two-period difference-in-differences model where anticipation occurs in the first period and the treatment occurs in the second period. Further, I introduce two natural assumptions to help construct bounds for the treatment effect in the absence of such additional information. The first is a bound for the proportion of anticipators within the treatment group. This bound should be available from observed data. It can be a constant, or a parameter that can be estimated. This is common practice in the literature, such as the work of [Manski and Pepper \(2013\)](#). The selection of this bound can vary from application to application, with one possible example being the treatment ratio. I provide models to motivate specific choices of the bound under various circumstances. The second assumption restricts the magnitude of the anticipatory effect. It requires that the absolute value of the anticipatory effect is no larger than that of the actual treatment effect. By doing so I build a link between the magnitude of an anticipator's reaction and the response to the implementation of the policy. Based on this an inequality between the average pre-treatment bias caused by anticipation and the treatment effect can be constructed with the help of the proportion of anticipators discussed above. Therefore, I can find a corresponding treatment effect range for the anticipators by characterizing how they react and linking that anticipatory effect to the actual treatment effect. Under these two assumptions, the fraction

of units that anticipate the policy change may vary, but the average distortion caused by anticipation is successfully bounded and the parameter of interest is set identified.

As for the implementation purpose, I propose estimation and inference strategies based on easy-to-implement modifications to existing methods. The identification strategy provides an identified set with perfectly correlated and proportional upper and lower bounds. I propose a uniformly valid confidence set for my estimators with some modifications to [Imbens and Manski \(2004\)](#) under this specific setup. In their method, the upper and lower bounds of the confidence set are found by extending both sides of the identified set. The extension lengths are proportional to the standard errors of the bound estimators, and differ between upper and lower bounds. However, suppose this method is applied directly here. In that case, it may run into a counterintuitive situation where the confidence set for the treatment effect is shorter when the parameter is partially identified than when it is point-identified. I propose modifying this approach by extending both sides of the identified set by the same length proportional to the larger standard error of the two, which is a natural way to ensure the uniform validity. Analyzing this confidence set also provides researchers with further empirical implications. I find a specific range of t-statistics when the null hypothesis is zero treatment effect. If the t-statistic obtained when anticipation is ignored falls out of this range, the conclusion of whether rejecting the null hypothesis does not change when considering anticipation. This confidence set also helps to build a framework for sensitivity analysis on certain conclusions of interest by choosing different bounds for anticipation possibility.

I apply the results of this paper to examine the effect of an early retirement incentive program on student achievement. This program is aimed at teachers near the age of retirement, and offers them financial incentives to retire before becoming eligible for full pension benefits. If the program is anticipated, eligible teachers may react in advance of its introduction, and such behavior might affect students' grades. The empirical results illustrate the potential pitfalls of failing to consider anticipation in program evaluation: the effect can be greatly overestimated in the worst case. I also conduct a sensitivity check by

analyzing the level of anticipation probability one is willing to tolerate while maintaining the consistency of the original conclusion. It shows the conclusion is robust even when about three fourths of target units anticipate.

Various generalizations are also provided, to permit the incorporation of anticipation in other common empirical methods. Starting from the two-period difference-in-differences model, I generalize the benchmark model to include covariates and multiple periods, which are very common empirical approaches. Modifications to imperfect anticipation cases, where individuals make mistakes while anticipating, are also provided by differentiating between anticipated treatment status and treatments received. To incorporate nonlinear potential outcomes and relax the parallel trends assumptions, I also analyze generalizations to accommodate anticipation based on change-in-changes models.

This paper contributes to the literature on causal inference and program evaluation ([Abadie and Cattaneo \(2018\)](#), [Athey and Imbens \(2017\)](#)). Among them, my paper is most closely related to the work of [Malani and Reif \(2015\)](#), which discusses anticipatory behavior by interpreting the pre-trend phenomenon as a result of anticipation. Its authors propose a parametric time series model in which anticipation is an expectation of the future treatment for everybody by relying on the rational or adaptive expectation assumption. I incorporate the idea of anticipation in a difference-in-differences framework with potential outcomes to remove parametric restrictions and allow heterogeneous anticipatory behavior among units. [Heckman and Navarro \(2007\)](#), under a different scenario, present a reduced form dynamic treatment effect model that also permits anticipation, but at the price of imposing further assumptions on the functional structure of the outcome equation.

This paper also contributes to the literature on difference-in-differences and event-study designs by considering anticipatory behavior. The additional anticipation could have impact prior to the introduction of a policy. Therefore, the present research is related to the literature aiming at more robust inference and identification strategies that allow for non-parallel trends assumptions, and to papers focusing on pre-trend analysis.

To interpret and deal with observed changes in outcomes prior to a treatment, [Manski and Pepper](#)

(2018) propose a result on partial identification for the average treatment effect under “bounded variation” assumptions. This relaxes the parallel trends assumption by allowing for differences within a certain magnitude. Roth and Rambachan (2020) follow the idea that pre-treatment differences in trends are informative about counterfactual post-treatment differences and provide identification and inference results based on several common restrictions of this relationship. Freyaldenhoven, Hansen, and Shapiro (2019) propose a method that includes an additional covariate that is correlated with the outcomes through confounds only, and not treatments. Ye, Keele, Hasegawa, and Small (2021) propose a partial identification method for treatment effects with two groups of control units whose outcomes exhibit a negative correlation relative to the treated units. In this paper I interpret pre-trends as a result of unobservable anticipation activities. It is possible that people change their behavior because of their anticipation of future treatment. If people have information and may benefit by acting on it before a treatment, anticipation is a reasonable explanation for an observed pre-treatment effect, even when the parallel trends assumption is valid.

This paper is also complementary to the causal interpretation of event study coefficients, see Borusyak and Jaravel (2017), Sun and Abraham (2020), De Chaisemartin and d’Haultfoeuille (2020), and Goodman-Bacon (2021). With a generalization to the longitudinal data, this paper can be regarded as relaxation of the ‘no anticipation’ assumption of these papers. This paper is also related more generally to the partial identification literature. In the present study, partial identification is obtained through moment inequalities, a method that is discussed in the handbook chapter of Molinari (2020). The sign restriction I impose is popular in time series literature to set-identify structural vector autoregressions (SVARs); see Kilian and Lütkepohl (2017).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the basic setup and defines the parameter of interest; Section 3 provides extra assumptions and shows readers how to build the identified sets; Section 4 describes estimation and inference; Section 5 provides an empirical application; Section 6 discusses several generalizations; and Section 7 concludes. The mathematical proofs, together with some additional results, are collected

in the supplemental appendix.

2 Setup and Assumptions

To illustrate anticipation in program evaluation, I consider an early retirement incentive program available for teachers, which offers experienced teachers financial incentives to retire before they would be eligible for full pension benefits. Suppose that one is interested in the effect of this early retirement incentive program on students' grades. There are several reasons to expect anticipation from teachers, whether treated or not, in this program. Teachers who anticipate may have received inside information from others, and it is also possible for them to speculate based on changes that have already happened. Younger teachers ineligible for the program won't react to it regardless of the anticipation status in both cases. However, teachers who anticipate the program and decide to retire early may put in less effort than younger teachers. Such behavior may harm students' grades before the implementation of the early retirement incentive program, and ignoring anticipation can lead to a bias while analyzing the effect of this program. The fact that teachers can anticipate based on unobservable information and adjust their behavior accordingly to gain benefits implies that the future treatment will have an effect before its adoption and distort the treatment effect estimation if ignored. An accurate assessment of anticipation is therefore essential for the program evaluation.

2.1 Notation and Parameter of Interest

In light of the motivating example, consider a difference-in-differences model with two periods $t \in \{0, 1\}$ and n units, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. This model can be relaxed to incorporate multiple periods later. Each unit is assigned an observable binary treatment D_i that takes value $d \in \{0, 1\}$ in the second period. Suppose that in the first period, each unit has an unobservable binary anticipation status A_i that takes value $a \in \{0, 1\}$. Here $a = 1$ means this unit anticipates the future, and $a = 0$ means this unit does not anticipate the

future. Introducing a second index in the expression of potential outcome is commonly used when analyzing indirect effects, for example, analysis of spillover effects in [Vazquez-Bare \(2021\)](#). By now I do not distinguish between the anticipated treatment status and the actual treatment status by implicitly assuming perfect anticipation, which means the anticipated treatment status should be the same as the actual treatment. The generalization that considers imperfect anticipation will be discussed later. Potential outcomes, defined below, can depend on the binary treatment and anticipation status. I refer to the existence of the latent treatment in the first period as *anticipation* and the effect of the anticipatory behavior on unit i 's potential outcome before the treatment occurs as the *anticipatory effect*.

The potential outcome for unit i in period t depends on both anticipation and treatment (a, d) and is denoted by the random variable $Y_{it}(a, d)$. Given a vector of implemented (a, d) , the observed outcome of unit i at period t , Y_{it} can be written as

$$Y_{it} = \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{d \in \{0,1\}} Y_{it}(a, d) \mathbb{I}(A_i = a) \mathbb{I}(D_i = d)$$

The following assumptions establish the relationship between treatments, anticipation status, and potential outcomes.

Assumption 1 (Sampling) The potential outcomes $\{Y_{i0}(a, d), Y_{i1}(a, d), D_i, A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are independently and identically distributed across i for $(a, d) \in \{0, 1\}^2$.

Assumption 1 models the sampling process and states the potential outcomes, treatments, and unobservable anticipation status to be independent and identically distributed across units so that expectations, for instance $\mathbb{E}[Y_{it}(a, d)]$, are not indexed by i . This is also true for other moments of potential outcomes.

Assumption 2 (Potential Outcomes Restrictions) The potential outcomes satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad Y_{i0}(0, 0) &= Y_{i0}(0, 1), \\ (b) \quad Y_{i0}(0, 0) &= Y_{i0}(1, 0), \\ (c) \quad Y_{i1}(0, d) &= Y_{i1}(1, d) \quad \text{for } d \in \{0, 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of notation simplicity, I define

$$Y_{i0}(a, 0) = Y_{i0}(0, 1) = Y_{i0}(0), \quad Y_{i1}(a, d) = Y_{i1}(d), \quad \text{for } a, d \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Assumption 2 (a) states that if the unit does not anticipate, then the treatment status will not affect the potential outcomes in the first period, implying anticipation as the only channel through which future events affect the present. In the early retirement incentive program example, this assumption implies that the pre-treatment grades for students taught by the same teacher are indifferent regardless of the teacher's decision about early retirement if he has no anticipation of the program.

Assumption 2 (b) ensures that if unit i does not get treated in the second period, he will not react in the first period regardless of the anticipation status. This unit either anticipates the future and realizes he will not get treated so he will not be affected, or does not anticipate and makes no reaction to it. In these cases, anticipation makes no difference. In the early retirement incentive program example, this assumption states that whether one teacher anticipates he will not be eligible for the program or makes no anticipation does not change his behavior because he knows this policy has nothing to do with him. This assumption is related to the 'perfect anticipation' argument as here I assume the anticipated treatment status is the same as the actual treatment status. I implicitly assume that people can correctly anticipate their future. This assumption can be relaxed by distinguishing between anticipated treatment status and actual treatment status.

Assumption 2 (c) imposes that the potential outcomes in the second period will only be affected by the treatment status. Anticipation is pre-treatment behavior, and once the treatment status is revealed in the second period, units will behave based on the acquired information. Anticipation in the first period will not affect potential outcomes. In the early retirement example, this requires that the behavior in the second period only depends on the decision to retire early or not regardless of anticipation in the first period.

Based on the two assumptions above, I can make a table for potential outcomes in the

difference-in-differences model with two periods.

| | $t=0$ | $t=1$ |
|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| $D_i = 0$ | $Y_{i0}(a, 0) = Y_{i0}(0)$ | $Y_{i1}(a, 0) = Y_{i1}(0)$ |
| $A_i = 0, D_i = 1$ | $Y_{i0}(0, 1)$ | $Y_{i1}(0, 1) = Y_{i1}(1)$ |
| $A_i = 1, D_i = 1$ | $Y_{i0}(1, 1)$ | $Y_{i1}(1, 1) = Y_{i1}(1)$ |

The equalities in the second column depend on Assumption 2(c), while the equality in the first column depends on Assumption 2(b). Compared with the commonly used difference-in-differences framework, the critical difference is that the observed pre-treatment outcome Y_{i0} for the treated group is a mixture of the potential outcomes for those who do not anticipate $Y_{i0}(0, 1)$ and those who anticipate $Y_{i0}(1, 1)$ in the treated group in the pre-treatment period. $\mathbb{E}[Y_{i0}|D_i = 1]$ is no longer a good measure for the first period potential outcome without treatment for the treated group.

Under this setup, the parameter of interest I focus on is

$$\mu_g = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(a, 1)) - g(Y_{i1}(a, 0))|D_i = 1] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(1)) - g(Y_{i1}(0))|D_i = 1] \quad a \in \{0, 1\},$$

where $g(\cdot)$ is a known measurable real function with $\mathbb{E}|g(Y)| < \infty$. The equality uses the assumption $Y_{i1}(0, d) = Y_{i1}(1, d)$. Define the corresponding anticipatory effect for anticipators as

$$\tau_g = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(1, 1)) - g(Y_{i0}(0, 1))|D_i = 1, A_i = 1].$$

The $g(\cdot)$ function is slightly generalized from the commonly defined average treatment effect for treated (ATT). When $g(\cdot)$ is the identity function, μ_g is the widely used ATT. If $g(\cdot)$ is an indicator function like $g_u(Y) = \mathbb{I}(Y \leq u)$, then μ_g can be interpreted as the change in the probability for the outcomes to be no more than a specific cutoff u and can be used to help identify the distribution of potential outcomes. Different choices of this $g(\cdot)$ function lead to different estimators. Introducing the g function helps handle some nonlinear structures for parameters I am interested in. For the simplicity of notation, I will write μ_g as μ and τ_g as τ when $g(\cdot)$ is the identity function.

Assumption 3 (Parallel Trends) For $a \in \{0, 1\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(a, 0)) - g(Y_{i0}(a, 0))|D_i = 1] &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(a, 0)) - g(Y_{i0}(a, 0))|D_i = 0], \\ \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0))|D_i = 1] &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0))|D_i = 0].\end{aligned}$$

The switch from two indexes (a, d) to single index d relies on Assumption 2(b) $Y_{i0}(0, 0) = Y_{i0}(1, 0) = Y_{i0}(0)$ and Assumption 2(c) $Y_{i1}(0, 0) = Y_{i1}(1, 0) = Y_{i1}(0)$.

Assumption 3 is the parallel trends assumption in difference-in-differences models under our anticipation setup. Although the single index expression seems the same as the parallel trends assumption in the difference-in-differences model, this assumption requires that the treatment and control group follow parallel trends before and after the treatment in the absence of both anticipation and the treatment.

2.2 Difference-In-Differences Design

In this section, I briefly discuss what the commonly used difference-in-differences estimator estimates without considering anticipation and compare it with the parameter that I am interested in. Throughout this section, I will choose $g(\cdot)$ to be the identity function.

In the difference-in-differences regression model with two periods

$$Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 t + \beta_2 D_i + \beta_3 t D_i + \varepsilon_{it}$$

Under Assumptions 1-3, the coefficient of interest, β_3 , can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_3 &= \mathbb{E}[Y_{i1}|D_i = 1, t = 1] - \mathbb{E}[Y_{i0}|D_i = 1, t = 0] - \mathbb{E}[Y_{i1}|D_i = 0, t = 1] + \mathbb{E}[Y_{i0}|D_i = 0, t = 0] \\ &= \mu - \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1]\tau \\ &= \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1](\mu - \tau) + (1 - \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1])\mu\end{aligned}$$

If the difference-in-differences estimator is used directly, it will suffer from a bias equal to the average distortion caused by anticipation. This bias arises from the fact that the

observable pre-treatment outcomes for the treated group do not reflect the potential outcomes for them without the treatment. Those who anticipate have already reacted in the first period and deviated from the parallel-trends benchmark. Thus, applying the difference-in-differences estimator directly suffers from a bias determined by both the proportion of those who anticipate and the magnitude of anticipatory effects. The last equality points out that this parameter can also be written as a weighted average of the treatment effect μ for those who do not anticipate and the net treatment effect after the adoption of the policy for those who do anticipate $\mu - \tau$. In general, the relationship between this estimand and the treatment effect depends on the sign of the anticipatory effects. Suppose the treatment and anticipatory effects have the same sign. In that case, anticipation will drive the difference-in-differences estimator towards zero relative to the treatment effect because of contamination. The idea of this distortion is captured in the graphs below. The first graph shows the result obtained by applying the difference-in-differences estimator directly while the second one describes the situation that considers anticipation. The distortion between β_3 and μ is caused by anticipation.




Figure 1: Difference-In-Differences without Anticipation




Figure 2: With Anticipation

3 Upper and Lower Bounds for Treatment Effects

3.1 Main Results

Anticipation makes the commonly used difference-in-differences estimator a mixture of anticipatory and treatment effects. The fundamental difficulty in obtaining identification is distinguishing between those who anticipate and those who do not. This section introduces several assumptions to build upper and lower bounds for treatment effects under different circumstances. Motivations for specific assumptions are provided. The following results link observed outcomes, potential outcomes, treatment assignments, and anticipation status and are used in further discussions.

From the analysis above, it is clear that two unobservable variables are contributing to the pre-treatment distortion. One is the possibility for treated units to anticipate, $\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1]$, and the other is the anticipatory effect for anticipators τ_g . These two variables both need to be analyzed to recover the treatment effect. If there is a reasonable proxy available for the anticipation treatment, then one can use this proxy variable to measure the anticipation status for each unit. However, such a proxy variable is not always available. To overcome the difficulty of not being able to tell people who anticipate from others, I introduce a bounding parameter $\pi \in (0, 1)$ that summarizes how the anticipation probability can be bounded. Here π is a parameter that can be derived from available information, including the treatment assignment and outcomes of units, and it can be either constant or at least estimated from observables. Researchers can choose a π based on their empirical setups, and I will discuss possible choices of π in the next section.

Assumption 4 $\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1] \leq \pi$.

For the anticipatory effect τ_g , although I cannot observe it directly, I can build a relationship between it and the treatment effect for treated μ_g . τ_g is caused by people's anticipation of a possible future treatment and behavior before the treatment to gain benefit. People's reactions and behavior are guided by their own guesses of the future policy. On the other hand, μ_g measures the treatment effect treated people receive when the policy is

adopted. This effect happens based on revealed policy and treatment status. For example, suppose someone is going to sell his property at a lower than usual price because of anticipation of possible negative price shock in the future. In that case there is no reason for him to accept a price that is even lower than the price when the shock really comes. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that the magnitude of treatment effects should be no smaller than that of the anticipatory effect as the former is a reaction based on known information while the latter one is based on uncertain information. Even when they anticipate the future, they may be reluctant to it. In the example of the early retirement incentive program, this statement requires that the effect caused by teachers who put less effort because of anticipating a possible early retirement opportunity is no larger than the treatment effect when the early retirement incentive program is implemented. Furthermore, as the anticipatory effect and treatment effect may not be in the same direction, I only impose restrictions on the magnitude and assume that

Assumption 5 $|\tau_g| \leq |\mu_g|$.

Assumption 4 and Assumption 5 help build bounds for the two unobservable terms, the proportion of anticipators among treated and the magnitude of anticipatory effect separately and based on the above assumptions, the parameter of interest μ_g is partially identified using observed variables, especially with the help of the commonly used difference-in-differences estimand.

Theorem 1 *Under Assumptions 1-5, the parameter of interest μ_g is partially identified via a closed interval in the following form.*

$$\mu_g \in m_g \left[\min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{1 - \text{sgn}(\tau_g \mu_g) \pi} \right\}, \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{1 - \text{sgn}(\tau_g \mu_g) \pi} \right\} \right]$$

with $m_g = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 0]$.

Theorem 1 points out that the treatment effect is located in an interval where the difference-in-differences parameter without anticipation is one of its bounds. The other bound is obtained by enlarging or reducing it by a specific ratio depending on the bounding

parameter π and signs of treatment and anticipation effects. As shown in Figures 1 and 2, the distortion only happens within the group of treated and anticipate units, so once the sign of the anticipatory effect is determined, the sign of the bias is also determined. The difference-in-differences parameter without anticipation is by design one side of the interval. In the imperfect anticipation case I introduce later, distortions happen in both groups, and the sign of the bias is ambiguous. The distortion bias has a limited magnitude restricted by both the bounding parameter π and the treatment effect magnitude, so I can build partial identification results for the parameter of interest based on observables.

Although I impose the bounds for anticipation probability and magnitude restrictions, these assumptions are not the only way to build partial identification results for the parameter of interest with anticipation. There might be empirical setups where these assumptions are not reasonable, and researchers would like to impose alternative assumptions, such as bounded outcomes or further conditional independent restrictions. These assumptions are also reasonable under specific situations, such as when the $g(\cdot)$ function I am interested in is bounded by itself. It is not the case that identified set under one assumption is tighter than the other so I should pick one of them, but different sets of assumptions may be reasonable under different empirical circumstances. Incorporating more combinations of alternative assumptions and providing identification results allow us to incorporate anticipation in more situations and give researchers the freedom to modify assumptions based on the empirical setup. I propose several different combinations of assumptions as well as corresponding upper and lower bounds expression of the treatment effects in the supplemental appendix.

3.2 Choice of π

This section discusses several possible choices of the bounding parameter π for the anticipation probability among anticipators under different setups.

Example 1 $\pi = \pi_0$ where π_0 is a constant number. If π is a constant number, this implies that there is a common upper bound for the possibility of anticipation. This choice of π may be consistent with the setup where people get treated randomly receive private

information that helps with anticipation. Then the overall anticipation possibility should be no more than the proportion of people that have access to this private information.

Example 2 $\pi = \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]$. Example 2 states that the possibility for people within the treatment group to anticipate does not exceed the proportion of people treated at last. This argument follows the idea that anticipation will happen when a future treatment sends some signals and unobservable information in advance. These are the bases for someone to anticipate a treatment. Suppose the density of these signals caused by future adoptions of policies is related to the overall scope of the treatment. In that case, it is reasonable to use the treated probability to help bound the proportion of people who anticipate. I will explain this choice later in a model where people anticipate from public information.

Example 3 The univariate bound can be modified to incorporate the idea of stratification. Suppose researchers are willing to divide units into several subgroups and allow anticipation behavior to differ among subgroups. In that case, I can pick π as a k dimensional vector if I have k subgroups in total. For instance, the vector of assignment can be summarized according to genders or geographical areas, and researchers can get a bound separately for each subgroup. This can also be regarded as a bound conditional on a discrete variable that divides the group based on several categories.

Example 4 Suppose anticipation behavior happens among known reference groups for each unit, as mentioned in [Manski \(2013\)](#). In that case, I can pick π based on subgroup information. For example, if researchers would like to use the treatment ratio to capture the density of information and on the other hand they also believe this kind of interaction only happens among units within a specific geographical distance, they can pick π as the treatment ratio for each subgroup defined by the given geographical distance.

Besides, the choice of π can also play the role of sensitivity analysis. The expression of the bounds should be monotonic in π , and researchers can use different choices of π to explore the robustness of obtained conclusions by checking the specific cutoff under which the consistency of conclusion can be maintained. This sensitivity analysis also helps us understand to what extent the conclusion depends on the choice of bounds, and researchers

can report the range of anticipation probability that rejects a particular null hypothesis.

3.2.1 A Toy Economic Behavior Model

This section provides a toy economic behavior model that motivates the choice of $\pi = \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]$ and explains what assumptions one needs to imply this choice of bounding parameter. Consider a setup where a future policy has led to some public information prior to its implementation, and people can take advantage of this kind of signals to anticipate. For example, there might be rumors and changes in teaching assignments before the early retirement incentive program occurs and teachers may anticipate based on them. The density of the signals is correlated with the overall treatment ratio as a higher ratio of experienced teachers that are eligible for the program implies more people are interested in the policy, and they may talk more about it. There will be more information about this program.

For simplicity, consider a case where $\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 0] = \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1]$, which means the probability to anticipate is the same between the control and treatment groups. Suppose the density of information generated by the future implementation of the treatment, denoted by u , is proportional to the treatment ratio $\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]$ in the form

$$u = \alpha \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1] \quad \alpha > 0,$$

and that this information is known to both treated and control groups. This formula captures the idea that a higher treatment ratio will lead to a case where the information needed for anticipation is more explicit for people.

For each unit i , I introduce a random variable U_i that represents the level of information to which one needs to be exposed for anticipation to occur. A higher U_i means this unit needs more signals to realize the possible treatment. In contrast, a lower U_i indicates that this unit has a keen observation and can reach a conclusion with less information. I will use $F(\cdot)$ to represent the c.d.f of U_i across the population. For any single unit i , the anticipatory

behavior follows

$$A_i = \mathbb{I}[U_i \leq u],$$

which means the density of information needs to be larger than the cutoff U_i for unit i to anticipate, and I have

$$\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1] = \mathbb{P}[U_i \leq u] = F(\alpha\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]).$$

I further assume that $f'(\cdot) \geq 0$ where $f(\cdot)$ is the probability density function of the random variable U_i . This assumption states that the fraction of people who can marginally anticipate increases with the level of information needed to form anticipation, consistent with the intuition that people who can anticipate based on little information should be small.

Based on the assumptions above, I can conclude that

$$\frac{\partial^2 \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1]}{\partial \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]^2} = \alpha^2 f'(\alpha\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]) \geq 0,$$

which means $\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1]$ should be a convex function on interval $[0, 1]$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]$. If $\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1] = 0$, I conclude $\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1] = 0$ as there is nothing to anticipate. I also know that when $\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1] = 1$, $\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1] \leq 1$. This combined with the convex function argument shows

$$\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1] \leq \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1] \times 1 + 0 = \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1].$$

The above model illustrates that under a setup where units can get information public among all the groups but unobservable to econometricians and anticipate future treatments, Assumption 4 will be satisfied by choosing $\pi = \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]$ as long as one is willing to assume fewer people can anticipate from less information and as information accumulates, the number of people who marginally learn it increases.

4 Estimation and Inference

The previous section illustrates that by using a difference-in-differences approach, the treatment effect for treated with anticipation is partially identified under certain assumptions. The population average expressions of the interval bounds lead to straightforward estimators using sample means under independent assumptions. This section builds uniformly effective confidence sets for the partially identified parameters.

Assume that researchers observe data from a distribution $P \in \mathbf{P}$ with the unobservable parameter, $\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1] \in [0, \pi]$. \mathbf{P} refers to the family of distributions that satisfy the sampling, potential outcomes restrictions. For the inferential goal under partial identification, I would like to build a confidence set that is uniformly consistent in level α i.e.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathbf{P}, \mathbb{P}[A_i=1|D_i=1] \in [0, \pi]} \mathbb{P}[\mu_g \in CS_\alpha^\mu] \geq \alpha,$$

where CS_α^μ is the α level confidence set for the parameter of interest μ_g . If the confidence set exceeds the sign restriction set Θ , the confidence set can be modified by taking $\Theta \cap CS_\alpha^\mu$.

Here I provide confidence sets based on [Imbens and Manski \(2004\)](#), [Stoye \(2009\)](#), and [Stoye \(2020\)](#). The upper and lower bounds for the identified set are estimated using the same sample and thus highly correlated. I can build an easy-to-implement confidence set by modifying the method addressed above. For notation simplicity, call the upper and lower bounds of parameter μ_g as $\mu_{g,u}$ and $\mu_{g,l}$. If the corresponding estimators $\hat{\mu}_{g,u}$ and $\hat{\mu}_{g,l}$ exist and satisfy

$$(i) \sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}_{g,l} - \mu_{g,l} \\ \hat{\mu}_{g,u} - \mu_{g,u} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_l^2 & \rho\sigma_l\sigma_u \\ \rho\sigma_l\sigma_u & \sigma_u^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \text{ uniformly in } P \in \mathbf{P}, \text{ and there}$$

are estimators $(\hat{\sigma}_l^2, \hat{\sigma}_u^2, \hat{\rho})$ converge to their population values uniformly in $P \in \mathbf{P}$,

(ii) For all $P \in \mathbf{P}$, $\underline{\sigma}^2 \leq \sigma_l^2, \sigma_u^2 \leq \bar{\sigma}^2$ for some positive and finite $\underline{\sigma}^2$ and $\bar{\sigma}^2$ and $\mu_{g,u} - \mu_{g,l} = \Delta \leq \bar{\Delta} < \infty$,

then a uniformly effective confidence set can be built.

Theorem 2 *Under Assumption (i) and (ii), define $\hat{\sigma} = \max\{\hat{\sigma}_l, \hat{\sigma}_u\}$ and find C_n that*

satisfies

$$\Phi \left(C_n + \sqrt{n} \frac{\hat{\mu}_{g,u} - \hat{\mu}_{g,l}}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) - \Phi(-C_n) = \alpha.$$

Φ represents the cumulative distribution function for standard normal distribution.

Then I have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathbf{P}, \mathbb{P}[A_i=1|D_i=1] \in [0, \pi]} \mathbb{P} \left(\mu_g \in \left[\hat{\mu}_{g,l} - C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}}, \hat{\mu}_{g,u} + C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} \right] \right) \geq \alpha.$$

To be consistent with the setup in the empirical application, I focus on the case $\tau_g \leq 0 \leq \mu_g$, and I have $\mu_g \in m_g \left[\frac{1}{1+\pi}, 1 \right]$. Corresponding bound estimators will be

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_{g,u} &= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n [g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0})] D_i - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n [g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0})] (1 - D_i) \\ \hat{\mu}_{g,l} &= \frac{\hat{\mu}_{g,u}}{1 + \hat{\pi}} \quad n_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \quad n_0 = n - n_1 \quad \hat{\pi} \text{ is a consistent estimator for } \pi \end{aligned}$$

If one would like to pick $\pi = \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]$ then a straightforward $\hat{\pi}$ will be $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i$. The standard errors can be found in the supplemental appendix.

The assumptions and results mainly follow [Imbens and Manski \(2004\)](#) and [Stoye \(2009\)](#). When compared with the [Imbens and Manski \(2004\)](#) approach, the confidence set I construct has a slight difference that I choose to extend along with the upper and lower bounds by the same length $C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}}$, while in [Imbens and Manski \(2004\)](#) the same critical value is picked but the standard errors are different. An intuitive explanation is that although the estimators of the upper and lower bounds are ordered by construction, which is an important assumption mentioned in [Stoye \(2009\)](#), the upper and lower bounds can have reverse order and the interval changes from $[\frac{m_g}{1+\pi}, m_g]$ to $[m_g, \frac{m_g}{1+\pi}]$ when the confidence set contains both positive and negative values. Therefore the corresponding variances for the estimators of upper and lower bound need to be accommodated to use the larger one for both bounds. This modification works for the construction of confidence sets with perfectly correlated and proportional upper and lower bounds, especially when the confidence set contains zero.

The proof is discussed in the appendix.

The change in the expression of confidence sets changes the significance level of rejecting specific null hypothesis, $H_0 : \mu_g = 0$ in many cases. Given that C_n lies between the $\frac{1+\alpha}{2} - th$ and $\alpha - th$ quantile of standard normal distribution, this change in whether rejecting null hypothesis $H_0 : \mu_g = 0$ at level α is one-sided. When μ_g and τ_g have different signs, it only changes from significant to insignificant and vice versa if they have the same signs. This is consistent with the intuition that if μ_g and τ_g have different signs, the magnitude of the treatment effect is underestimated and if these two effects have the same sign, the magnitude is overestimated because of anticipation. What is more, for the specific null hypothesis $H_0 = 0$, I can calculate the value of t-statistics that guarantee the conclusion of whether rejecting it or not unchanged.

Corollary 1 *Suppose t^* satisfies*

$$\Phi(t^*) - \Phi(-t^*/2) = \alpha.$$

Φ represents the cumulative distribution function for standard normal distribution and the inferential goal is to test $H_0 : \mu_g = 0$ at level α . Suppose confidence set CS_α^μ is constructed following the procedure in Theorem 2. If μ_g and τ_g have the same sign and the t-statistic from the difference-in-differences model without anticipation \tilde{t} satisfies $|\tilde{t}| < \frac{t^}{2}$, then for any π , $0 \in CS_\alpha^\mu$. If μ_g and τ_g have different signs and the t-statistic from the difference-in-differences model without anticipation \tilde{t} satisfies $|\tilde{t}| > t^*$, then for any π , $0 \notin CS_\alpha^\mu$.*

Corollary 1 gives empirical researchers a specific cutoff t^* for the most common case of testing $H_0 : \mu_g = 0$. If the absolute value of t-statistic does not lie between $\frac{t^*}{2}$ and t^* , then taking anticipation into consideration will not change the conclusion of rejecting the null hypothesis or not. For example, when $\alpha = 0.95$, the corresponding t^* is 3.3. This means if the absolute value of t-statistic is larger than 3.3 without anticipation, you can still reject zero hypothesis for treatment effect regardless of the anticipation probability and if the absolute value of t-statistic is smaller than 1.65, even incorporating anticipation cannot

help you reach a conclusion of rejecting null hypothesis. This corollary gives empirical researchers a cutoff where they can claim the effectiveness of their conclusions even with anticipation as long as the t-statistics is large enough.

5 Empirical Application

In this section, I illustrate the results of this paper in the environment established by [Fitzpatrick and Lovenheim \(2014\)](#), which analyzes the effects of an early retirement incentive program on students' achievement. The authors conducted a difference-in-differences based analysis using exogenous variations from the the early retirement incentive (ERI) program targeting on teachers in Illinois during the mid-1990s to evaluate the effect of large-scale teacher retirements on student achievement. The Teacher Retirement System in Illinois requires retired members who are at least 55 years old and have 20 years of service experience to collect pension benefits at a 6% discount rate below age 60. If both the employer and employee pay a one-time fee, an Early Retirement Option allows eligible members to collect their full benefit. In 1992-1993 and 1993-1994, an early retirement incentive (ERI) program was offered as an alternative to ERO, which allowed employees to buy five extra years of age and experience as long as they retired immediately, and this allowed those with at least 50 years old and 15 years of service credit to increase their retirement benefits.

Notably, the ERI programs may impact students' learning as this might lead to a change in teachers' experience and age structure, which will eventually influence students' grades. In their paper, the authors used a difference-in-differences approach to analyze how promoting the ERI program affected the students' grades. It turned out that they found no evidence of an adverse effect and even a positive effect on grades in some circumstances. I analyze the average treatment effect for treated by taking anticipation into consideration. The outcome of interest is students' grades, and the major difference is now teachers might anticipate the program in advance and make benefit from it.

The authors collected data from several sources. Teacher Service Record is an administrative dataset that contains information of employees from Illinois Public Schools. The second set of data provides school-level information on test scores for given subjects and grades. The third source contains demographic information of students in schools. The analysis is restricted to teachers of third, sixth and eighth grades as standardized testing in Illinois focuses on these grades. One major issue for the data is the ERI take-up is not observed directly. The authors exploited the fact that teachers with 15 or more years of experience were most likely to take up the program and used it as a proxy for the intensity of treatment by the ERI program.

Consider the restrictions I impose on potential outcomes for the case with anticipation. It requires that the students' grades of teachers that are ineligible or choose not to retire early should not be affected, and it also requires if teachers are not aware of this program in advance, there should be no change in the grades. Further, it restricts once the ERI program is implemented, whether teachers anticipate or not should no longer affect the students' grades. The parallel trends assumption requires that trends in students' grades among schools with fewer treated teachers are precise counterfactuals for trends among schools with more treated teachers without anticipation.

Following the idea that teachers, whether eligible or not, may have some information from a third party before the implementation of the ERI program so that they may have anticipated something, I pick $\pi = \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]$ and the probability of getting treated is estimated by calculating the proportion of experienced teachers with more than 15 years of service credit and I get corresponding $\hat{\pi}$. Recall that this bound is used to capture the intensity of potential unobservable information, which is proportional to the intensity of treatment, and I can use the proportion of teachers with more than 15 years of teaching experience to bound the anticipation probability. The magnitude effect assumption requires that the anticipatory effect, τ , which is the result of potential behavior changes of teachers who think it is possible for them to retire early, has a smaller magnitude compared with the treatment effect, μ , which is the change in students grades caused by the ERI program after

its implementation. Even under a perfect anticipation setup from econometricians' view, the teachers themselves do not have the confidence that they would definitely be eligible for the policy and take it up so it is reasonable to expect the anticipatory effect does not have a larger magnitude than the treatment effect when the policy occurs. Further, it is reasonable to expect the treatment effect μ to have the same sign as the non-negative difference-in-differences estimator from [Fitzpatrick and Lovenheim \(2014\)](#). On the other hand, I follow the argument in the same paper that claims teachers near the retirement age and anticipate the possibility of early retirement may put less effort than younger teachers. Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that the anticipatory effect τ is non-positive.

With all the assumptions discussed above, I can analyze the treatment effect with anticipation starting from the following equation in [Fitzpatrick and Lovenheim \(2014\)](#) that estimates the difference-in-differences estimator.

$$Y_{igt}^s = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Teachers} \geq 15)_{ig} \times \text{Post}_t + \beta_2 \text{Teachers}_{ig} \times \text{Post}_t + \gamma \mathbf{X}_{it} + \delta_{ig} + \varphi_{tg} + \varepsilon_{itg}^s$$

Y_{igt}^s is the test score of grade g for subject s in school i and year t . $\text{Teachers} \geq 15$ is the number of teachers with at least 15 years of experience before 1994 and thus eligible for the program. Teachers is the average total numbers of teachers. Post serves as the period, an indicator variable that equals one after the school year of 1993. The vector \mathbf{X} contains demographic information while δ and φ are corresponding fixed effect terms. Although covariates are included here, the parametric assumption that it enters the outcome linearly implies that the treatment effect is homogeneous across different values of controls. The intensity of information related to the choice of π has already been captured by the proportion of experienced teachers. If there is no anticipation, β_1 from this equation estimates the effect of the ERI program on students' grades. Based on the estimator for β_1 and π I choose, I can analyze the results with anticipation. I check the results for different grades and subjects and compare the cases for all teachers. Results are shown in Table 1. The results using data from subject-specific teachers are listed in the supplemental appendix.

Table 1: Effects of the Early Retirement Incentive Program on Test Scores: All Teachers

| | Original Results | | With Anticipation | |
|-----------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|
| | Math | Reading | Math | Reading |
| All Grade | 0.003 (0.004) [-0.003,0.010] | 0.009 (0.003) [0.002,0.015] | [0.002,0.003] | [0.006,0.009] |
| Grade 3 | 0.002 (0.01) [-0.017,0.021] | -0.009 (0.008) [-0.025,0.008] | [0.001,0.002] | [-0.018,-0.009] |
| Grade 6 | -0.0001 (0.005) [-0.01,0.01] | 0.006 (0.004) [-0.003,0.015] | [-0.0002,-0.0001] | [0.004,0.006] |
| Grade 8 | 0.005 (0.005) [-0.005,0.015] | 0.013 (0.005) [0.004,0.022] | [0.003,0.005] | [-0.004,0.014] [0.008,0.013] [-0.006,0.014] |

Notes: Each column presents results from a separate regression. Teachers who teach multiple grades are included in each grade. Teachers who teach in self-contained classrooms are assumed to teach both math and English. I list identified sets in the first row and 95% level confidence sets in the third row for each result with anticipation. For comparison purposes, I also provide estimators, standard errors and 95% confidence intervals for results from [Fitzpatrick and Lovenheim \(2014\)](#). Standard errors are displayed with parentheses.

For the partial identification results, I provide identified sets as well as the 95% confidence sets. For comparison purposes, I do not truncate at point 0 based on sign restrictions. I notice that the estimate is at times negative from the initial results in [Fitzpatrick and Lovenheim \(2014\)](#). As these negative estimates are insignificant at the 95% level, I conclude that this distortion error is due to the finite sample bias. For these estimators, I adjust my way to get the identified sets and confidence sets by changing the sign restriction and find that the confidence sets, after incorporating anticipation, still cannot reject the null hypothesis $\mu = 0$ no matter which sign I choose. The changes in the result are mainly in two aspects. On the one hand, the results with anticipation suggest the treatment effect can be smaller than the one we get directly from the difference-in-differences approach as the DID estimator also captures the pre-treatment negative effect caused by anticipation. The effect can be overestimated up to about 30% because of anticipation. On the other hand, the confidence sets, compared with the difference-in-differences approach, are slightly shifted leftwards and this result also reminds people to be more careful when interpreting the non-negative treatment effect. Despite these differences, results incorporating anticipation still support the conclusion that the ERI programs have a non-negative effect on students' grades. These results imply that incorporating anticipation can make the result more robust and still support our idea of the non-negative effect of ERI programs on student achievement.

I conduct a robustness check to see the range of choices for π that keeps the significance of the estimator at a 95% level and show the result in Figure 3. I focus on the effect of the early retirement incentive program on the reading grade in grade 8. I present the identified set as well as the 95% confidence set for a sequence of π , including 0.1, 0.25, 0.5, $\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]$, 0.75 and 0.9. The smaller interval represents the identified set while the larger one represents the confidence set. I observe that at an anticipation probability of 0.75, the confidence set marginally contains point 0, which means this positive treatment effect is quite robust even when taking anticipation into consideration. The null hypothesis will only be rejected when about three fourths of the target teachers anticipate it.




Figure 3: Robustness Analysis

6 Generalizations

This section discusses several generalizations from the two-period difference-in-differences model to incorporate anticipation in broader setups. These generalizations build the anticipation framework on more empirical related assumptions and cover problems researchers encounter in applied work.

6.1 Including Covariates

In practice, almost all empirical studies include covariates in the estimation, at least as a robustness check. There are several reasons why one may want to include covariates while analyzing treatment effects and considering anticipation. Including control variables to reduce the variability and improve finite-sample performance is a standard practice in empirical work. It is also helpful in capturing the treatment heterogeneity if interaction terms between treatment effect and covariates are included.

Besides, in a difference-in-differences model, it is possible that differences in observed characteristics create non-parallel trends between treated and control groups as pointed out in [Abadie \(2005\)](#). Covariates can be used to explain observable differences and make the conclusion more reliable by relaxing the parallel trends assumption. To be more precise, if \mathbf{X}_i is a vector of covariates and similar potential outcomes restrictions are still imposed, a conditional parallel trends assumption can be stated as for $a \in \{0, 1\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(a, 0)) - g(Y_{i0}(a, 0)) | D_i = 1, \mathbf{X}_i] &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(a, 0)) - g(Y_{i0}(a, 0)) | D_i = 0, \mathbf{X}_i] \\ \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0)) | D_i = 1, \mathbf{X}_i] &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0)) | D_i = 0, \mathbf{X}_i]\end{aligned}$$

Last, including covariates while considering anticipation provides us with a more precise and specific choice of π . In certain circumstances, it is reasonable to believe the bound for anticipation probability varies for different values of covariates, and researchers want to choose π as a function of observable variables $\pi(\mathbf{x})$ instead of a fixed value across all observations. For example, for a policy that needs knowledge in specific areas to understand, like increasing or decreasing interest rate, it is reasonable to expect people with different educational backgrounds have different bounds for anticipation probability. For discrete covariates, it is possible to pick different bounds for different categories. For example, if one would like to pick π capturing the intensity of information through treatment, it is also a good idea to pick $\pi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1 | \mathbf{X}_i]$. All the identification results in the paper can be adapted to hold after conditioning on covariates. I introduce the following modified assumptions.

Assumption-C 3 (Conditional Parallel Trends) For $a \in \{0, 1\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(a, 0)) - g(Y_{i0}(a, 0)) | D_i = 1, \mathbf{X}_i] &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(a, 0)) - g(Y_{i0}(a, 0)) | D_i = 0, \mathbf{X}_i] \\ \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0)) | D_i = 1, \mathbf{X}_i] &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0)) | D_i = 0, \mathbf{X}_i].\end{aligned}$$

Assumption-C 4 $\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1 | D_i = 1, \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq \pi(\mathbf{x})$.

As I have already introduced in the unconditional case, I need to pick a bound π for the anticipation probability. The difference is now I can pick π as a function of the observable covariates \mathbf{X} to incorporate difference in anticipation probability characterized by observables.

Define the parameter of interest

$$\mu_g(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(1)) - g(Y_{i1}(0)) | D_i = 1, \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}]$$

and corresponding anticipatory effects for anticipators

$$\tau_g(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(1,1)) - g(Y_{i0}(0,1)) | D_i = 1, A_i = 1, \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}]$$

as before and impose magnitude restriction.

Assumption-C 5 $|\tau_g(\mathbf{x})| \leq |\mu_g(\mathbf{x})|$.

Theorem 3 *Under Assumptions 1-2 and Assumptions-C 3-5, the parameter $\mu_g(\mathbf{x})$ is partially identified via a closed conditional interval. For each given \mathbf{x} , I have $\mu_g(\mathbf{x}) \in$*

$$m_g(\mathbf{x}) \left[\min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{1 - \text{sgn}(\tau_g(\mathbf{x})\mu_g(\mathbf{x}))\pi(\mathbf{x})} \right\}, \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{1 - \text{sgn}(\tau_g(\mathbf{x})\mu_g(\mathbf{x}))\pi(\mathbf{x})} \right\} \right]$$

with $m_g(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 1, \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 0, \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}] = \mathbb{E}[\rho_0(g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0})) | \mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}]$ and $\rho_0 = \frac{D_i - \mathbb{P}[D_i=1 | \mathbf{X}_i]}{\mathbb{P}[D_i=1 | \mathbf{X}_i](1 - \mathbb{P}[D_i=1 | \mathbf{X}_i])}$.

The identification results hold after conditioning on covariates and interpreting the parameter for a specific value of control variables. If one is interested in the average treatment effect across different values of covariates, it can be achieved by taking the average across covariates. For implementation issues, the procedure largely depends on the structure of covariates and the parametric assumptions one would like to impose on how the covariates enter the outcomes. For discrete covariates with different levels, the parameter of interest can be obtained separately for each category by dividing data into several subgroups. If one would like to impose parametric assumptions like the covariates affect the potential

outcomes linearly, then adding regression terms will be fine. If no more parametric assumptions are imposed, the semiparametric difference-in-differences approach introduced in [Abadie \(2005\)](#) achieves the identified set.

For inference procedures, [Chernozhukov et al. \(2013\)](#) offered an intersection bound approach. For simplicity, write the upper and lower bounds for $\mu_g(\mathbf{x})$ as $\mu_{g,l}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mu_{g,u}(\mathbf{x})$. The identification region for μ_g should be written as

$$\left[\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mu_{g,l}(\mathbf{x}), \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mu_{g,u}(\mathbf{x}) \right],$$

and \mathcal{X} is the support for covariate \mathbf{x} . With explicit expression for conditional upper and lower bounds, Algorithm 1 in [Chernozhukov et al. \(2013\)](#) provides standard procedures as well as required assumptions to get confidence sets that use parametric and nonparametric estimations.

6.2 Imperfect Anticipation

In our discussion about Assumption 2, I implicitly assume ‘perfect anticipation’, which implies that units that make anticipation will get the anticipated treatment status in the future. However, this might be too strong in some circumstances. For example, sometimes people may anticipate the existence of a specific policy but they are not clear whether or not they will get treated. In the early retirement incentive program example, it is possible for teachers to anticipate the possibility of early retirement but they are not sure about the exact amount of service credit they can buy and thus cannot anticipate their future treatment status perfectly. I consider the consequences if a mistake is made when anticipating a future treatment in this section. Furthermore, it is essential to explore the robustness of our conclusion by checking the error rate under which consistent conclusions can still be obtained. If researchers aim to test a particular null hypothesis, they can also report the lowest error rate at which the null hypothesis is no longer rejected.

In order to distinguish between anticipated treatment status and the actual treatment

units receive and incorporate imperfect anticipation, I define the anticipation status variable A_i as a random variable that takes three values $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. The difference between $A_i = 0$ and $A_i \neq 0$ distinguishes between those who anticipate and those who don't. However, among those who anticipate, $A_i = 1$ indicates that this unit makes correct anticipation while $A_i = -1$ indicates a wrong one. The potential outcome for unit i in period t still depends on both anticipation and treatment (a, d) and is denoted by the random variable $Y_{it}(a, d)$. The only difference is now $a \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and A_i is no longer a binary treatment. Therefore outcomes of unit i at period t can be written as

$$Y_{it} = \sum_{a \in \{-1, 0, 1\}} \sum_{d \in \{0, 1\}} Y_{it}(a, d) \mathbb{I}(A_i = a) \mathbb{I}(D_i = d)$$

The following assumptions are established by modifying assumptions in perfect anticipation situations.

Assumption-IA 1 The potential outcomes $\{Y_{i0}(a, d), Y_{i1}(a, d), D_i, A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are independently and identically distributed across i for $(a, d) \in \{-1, 0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\}$.

Assumption-IA 2 The potential outcomes satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad Y_{i0}(0, 0) &= Y_{i0}(0, 1) \\ (b) \quad Y_{i0}(0, 0) &= Y_{i0}(1, 0) = Y_{i0}(-1, 1) \quad Y_{i0}(-1, 0) = Y_{i0}(1, 1) \\ (c) \quad Y_{i1}(0, d) &= Y_{i1}(1, d) = Y_{i1}(-1, d) \quad \text{for } d \in \{0, 1\} \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 2 that restricts potential outcomes needs some modifications under the imperfect anticipation setup. Assumption 2 (a) and 2 (c) are almost the same as before, and they address that the future treatment only affects the pre-treatment outcome through anticipation, and the post-treatment outcomes are determined by the treatment status they receive regardless of the anticipation situation. The key change happens on Assumption 2 (b). In the 'perfect anticipation' setup, this assumption restricts those who will not get treated to behave in the same way in the first period, whether they anticipate or not. Now

this assumption states that people in the first period behave based on their anticipated treatment status. A treated person with the wrong anticipation should have the same anticipated treatment status as an untreated person who anticipates correctly and thus they should behave in the same way as those who do not anticipate. All these three groups are not affected by the treatment in the future as they are either unaware of it or believe they will not be covered. However, those who will get treated and anticipate correctly should behave in the same way as those who won't be treated but anticipate wrongly pre-treatment as they all think they will be covered. This assumption points out that what drives people's behavior pre-treatment is their beliefs of the treatment status. Trying to distinguish between anticipated treatment status and real treatment received is important in the case where people make mistakes while anticipating.

One may argue that in the situation of imperfect anticipation, it is possible that people no longer make clear anticipation about the future treatment and they believe they will get treated at a probability. Different people hold different beliefs about their treatment possibilities and behave differently. This situation can be regarded as a case where anticipation is a multivalued treatment and people with different beliefs receive different levels of anticipation treatment. As all the things related to anticipation are unobservable, introducing more levels of different anticipation treatments also requires more assumptions regarding each group. Therefore I still focus on the case where people's anticipation about the future is whether he is treated or not.

The parameter of interest μ_g is still

$$\mu_g = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(a, 1)) - g(Y_{i1}(a, 0)) | D_i = 1] \quad a \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$$

with similar restrictions on $g(\cdot)$ function and the anticipatory effect is modified as

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_g &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(1, 1)) - g(Y_{i0}(0, 0)) | D_i = 1, A_i = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(-1, 0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0, 0)) | D_i = 1, A_i = -1] \end{aligned}$$

where I implicitly require that the anticipatory effect for those who anticipate correctly and wrongly are the same.

Assumption-IA 3

$$\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(a, 0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0, 0)) | D_i = 1] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(a, 0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0, 0)) | D_i = 0] \quad a \in \{-1, 0, 1\}.$$

The key idea of the parallel trend is to require those who get treated and not get treated should behave the same without the treatment. Following this idea, I need to pick those who have an anticipated untreated status when compared with the outcome in the first period and this is why we can no longer write $g(Y_{i0}(0))$ like what we did in the ‘perfect anticipation’ situation as part of those who will not get treated have already behaved if they anticipate wrongly.

Assumption-IA 4

$$\mathbb{P}[A_i \neq 0 | D_i = 1], \mathbb{P}[A_i \neq 0 | D_i = 0] \leq \pi$$

$$\mathbb{P}[A_i = -1 | D_i = 1, A_i \neq 0] = \mathbb{P}[A_i = -1 | D_i = 0, A_i \neq 0] = \varepsilon.$$

The first part of Assumption-IA 4 requires us to pick a π as the bound for the probability of anticipation among treated and control groups. This is straightforward as under the ‘perfect anticipation’ situation, units that won’t get treated will not react to the anticipation but now they may react to it because of the wrong anticipation. If one would like to argue there is a specific relationship between the possibility of anticipation within treated and control groups, this assumption might be relaxed. For now I am assuming a common bound π for two probabilities is picked. In the second part, I assume the fraction of units that make wrong anticipation is known as ε across treated and control groups. Recall that in the discussion about the bias caused by anticipation, I point out that the bias is driven by those who anticipate and react to it in the first period. Under the setup of imperfect anticipation, the proportion of units that cause the bias is determined by anticipated treatment status and thus related to both the proportion of those who anticipate and the accurate rate among

anticipators.

Assumption-IA 5 $|\tau_g| \leq |\mu_g|$.

Assumption 5 is the same magnitude restriction as before. Based on the assumptions above, now we are able to partially identify the parameter of interest μ_g .

Theorem 4 *Under Assumptions-IA 1-5, the parameter of interest μ_g is partially identified via a closed interval based on $m_g = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0})|D_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0})|D_i = 0]$, π and ε in the form $\mu_g \in$*

$$m_g \left[\min \left\{ \frac{1}{1 + \text{sgn}(\tau_g \mu_g) \pi \varepsilon}, \frac{1}{1 - \text{sgn}(\tau_g \mu_g) \pi (1 - \varepsilon)} \right\}, \max \left\{ \frac{1}{1 + \text{sgn}(\tau_g \mu_g) \pi \varepsilon}, \frac{1}{1 - \text{sgn}(\tau_g \mu_g) \pi (1 - \varepsilon)} \right\} \right]$$

If $\varepsilon = 0$, which represents the situation of perfect anticipation, this interval degenerates to the interval we get in section 3 for the treatment effect. Compared with the interval I get for the treatment effect in section 3, one significant difference is now the treatment effect is not bounded by the difference-in-differences estimator from one side. That difference derives from the fact that both the control group and the treated group deviate in the first period. For a perfect anticipation setup, those in the control group will not react to the anticipation and only the treated group is moving either upward or downward depending on the signs of anticipatory effect. When imperfect anticipation is allowed and both control and treated groups react to it, the distortion in the first period can be either positive or negative depending on the anticipation possibility in different groups. To accommodate this framework in more empirical settings, I don't impose specific assumptions on the relationship between the possibility to anticipate in different groups. If in specific situations, for example, a case where those who get treated receive private information, researchers are comfortable to decide the relationship between these two possibilities, it is possible to improve the identified set based on further assumptions.

Although I start with the case where ε is known, a better explanation for including the error rate of anticipation is to understand this procedure as a sensitivity check. Researchers can pick different possible error rates ε and analyze the region where their conclusions

are robust to the pick of error rate. Further, if a specific null hypothesis is tested, the error rate among which the conclusion holds consistently can also be reported. This helps people to understand to what extent the conclusion is affected by the assumption of perfect anticipation.

6.3 Multiple Periods

In applied work, the standard two periods difference-in-differences model is not the majority and people would like to incorporate data from multiple periods to support their conclusions. It is crucial to consider the case with multiple periods besides the two-period model to accommodate anticipation in longitudinal data. I will follow the framework of [Sun and Abraham \(2020\)](#) and consider anticipation in a staggered adoption case with multiple periods and possibly different treatment times. [Sun and Abraham \(2020\)](#) analyzes this framework to address the effect of treatment effect heterogeneity in two fixed effects model and propose a difference-in-differences form estimator. My focus is on how to incorporate anticipation in a multiple-periods model and if homogeneity assumptions are imposed and researchers use an alternative approach, a similar logic can be applied to incorporate anticipation.

Suppose the potential outcome for unit i at period t is represented by $Y_{it}(a, e)$. $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ indexes the unit and $e \in \text{supp}(E_i) = \{1, 2, \dots, T, \infty\}$ denotes the date when this unit gets the first treatment and E_i is one realization of e . In a setting with staggered adoption, one unit will always get treated after the first treatment. A binary random variable A_{it} that takes value $a \in \{0, 1\}$ represents the unobservable anticipation status for unit i at period t . $e = \infty$ implies this unit has never been treated and thus belongs to the control group. I have

$$Y_{it} = A_{it}Y_{it}(1, \infty) + (1 - A_{it})Y_{it}(0, \infty) + \sum_{0 \leq e \leq T} [A_{it}(Y_{it}(1, e) - Y_{it}(1, \infty)) + (1 - A_{it})(Y_{it}(0, e) - Y_{it}(0, \infty))] \mathbb{I}(E_i = e)$$

In order to incorporate anticipation in the multiple periods model, I modify the assumptions

in the two-period difference-in-differences model in the following way.

Assumption-M 1 The potential outcomes $\{Y_{it}(a, e), E_i, A_{it}\}_{t=1}^T$ are independently and identically distributed across i for $(a, e) \in \{0, 1\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, T, \infty\}$.

Assumption-M 2 The potential outcomes satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}
 (a) \quad & Y_{it}(0, e) = Y_{it}(0, e') \quad \text{for } t < \min\{e, e'\} \\
 (b) \quad & Y_{it}(1, \infty) = Y_{it}(0, \infty) \\
 (c) \quad & Y_{it}(1, e) = Y_{it}(0, e) \quad \text{for } t \geq e
 \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of notation simplicity, I define $Y_{it}(1, e) = Y_{it}(0, e) = Y_{it}(e)$ for $t \geq e$. Assumption-M 1 restricts the sampling process in the same way as in the two-period difference-in-differences model by imposing i.i.d. restrictions. Assumption-M 2 restricts the distribution of potential outcomes from three aspects. Assumption-M 2 (a) states that if the unit does not anticipate the future, then the future treatment status will not affect what happens now. No matter when this unit receives the treatment, it makes no difference as long as this unit has no anticipation. Assumption-M 2 (b) restricts that for units in the control group that will not get treated in the future, whether anticipate or not makes no difference on the potential outcome as anticipation reveals the untreated result and there is no need to react to it. Assumption-M 2 (c) requires that once the actual treatment status is revealed and this unit has already received treatment, anticipation makes no difference as there is no need to rely on it. These three aspects are the same as the restrictions I impose in two-period difference-in-differences models and written under the setup of multiple periods.

Under this setup, the parameter of interest I focus on is

$$\mu_g(e, t) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}(0, e)) - g(Y_{it}(0, \infty)) | E_i = e]$$

with similar restrictions on function $g(\cdot)$. Define the corresponding anticipatory effect for

anticipators as

$$\tau_g(e, t) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}(1, e)) - g(Y_{it}(0, e)) | E_i = e, A_i = 1]$$

and write $\mu_g(e, t)$ as $\mu(e, t)$ and $\tau_g(e, t)$ as $\tau(e, t)$ if $g(\cdot)$ is the identity function.

Assumption-M 3 For all $t_1 \neq t_2$

$$\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it_1}(0, \infty)) - g(Y_{it_2}(0, \infty)) | E_i = e] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it_1}(0, \infty)) - g(Y_{it_2}(0, \infty)) | E_i = \infty] \quad \text{for all } e.$$

Parallel trends assumption is imposed and it implies potential outcomes without anticipation and treatment will change in the same way among different groups who get treated at different times.

Following [Sun and Abraham \(2020\)](#), I build a difference-in-differences form variable to help us analyze the parameter of interest while considering anticipation. Unlike the two periods model, I do not have a natural period 0 to compare with and need to pick one by myself. Consider the following term for $t \geq e$ and $s < e$,

$$m_g(e, s, t) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}) - g(Y_{is}) | E_i = e] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}) - g(Y_{is}) | E_i = \infty].$$

For simplicity I define $\mathbb{P}[A_{is} = 1 | E_i = e] = h(e, s)$ which denotes the probability to anticipate in period s before the treatment happens at period e . t is a post-treatment period that I am interested in, e is the period when unit i receives the treatment and s is a chosen pre-treatment period that helps us build the difference-in-differences estimator as introduced in [Sun and Abraham \(2020\)](#). I will discuss the choice of period s later. Impose assumptions as in the two-period difference-in-differences model to get the bounds for the treatment effect.

Assumption-M 4 $0 \leq h(e, s) \leq \pi(e, s)$.

Based on the discussion in the two-period difference-in-differences model, I know that the source of distortion is those who anticipate and react to it before the treatment. In the multiple periods model, it is important to think about the probability for those who will be treated at period e to anticipate at period s chosen as the benchmark. Further, magnitude

restrictions on anticipatory effect and treatment effect at different periods are also imposed.

Assumption-M 5 $|\tau_g(e, s)| \leq |\mu_g(e, t)|$.

In the Assumption-M 4, I can choose $\pi(e, s)$ not only based on the treatment period, but also based on the benchmark period s I pick. One common strategy in empirical work to deal with anticipation is to argue that anticipation only exists within a certain time length before the treatment and if people have rich enough data they can always drop data when people might anticipate. This is equivalent to saying pick a far enough period s and pick $\pi(e, s) = 0$ for that period in our setup. However, it is not always reasonable to drop a subset of data and claim anticipation disappears after this. When I need to consider the bound $\pi(e, s)$, one analogy to the choice of $\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]$ in the two-period model that measures the intensity of treatment is given by the proportion of the group that receives treatment no later than period e , $\mathbb{P}[E_i \leq e]$, which also captures the idea that people might anticipate from information produced by prior implementations of treatment besides their own future treatments. On the other hand, researchers may want to take the time gap between the benchmark period s and the treatment period e into consideration to capture the idea that the further from the treatment, the more difficult for people to anticipate and multiply a time discount factor, for example, δ^{e-s} , for a known discounting factor $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Thus one possible choice of $\pi(e, s) = \delta^{e-s}\mathbb{P}[E_i \leq e]$. Researchers can pick different $\pi(e, s)$ based on their situations and empirical backgrounds.

The choice of s also affects the validity of Assumption M-5 as the relative time gap for the period t and s to e might differ and this possibly affect the strength of this magnitude assumption. Although it seems fascinating to pick an s that is really far from the treatment period to reduce the anticipation probability and restrict the anticipatory effect magnitude, it is not cost-free. Sometimes a long period of pre-treatment data is not available. Even when it is possible to do this, picking a benchmark period s that is far from the treatment period requires the parallel trends assumption to sustain in a relatively long period and increases the risk of violation.

Based on the assumptions above, I can get the following result.

Theorem 5 Under Assumptions-M 1-5 and a chosen s satisfying $s < e$, the parameter of interest $\mu_g(e, t)$ is partially identified via a closed interval in the following form, $\mu_g(e, t) \in$

$$m_g(e, s, t) \left[\min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{1 - \text{sgn}(\tau_g(e, s)\mu_g(e, t))\pi(e, s)} \right\}, \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{1 - \text{sgn}(\tau_g(e, s)\mu_g(e, t))\pi(e, s)} \right\} \right]$$

with $m_g(e, s, t) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}) - g(Y_{is})|E_i = e] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}) - g(Y_{is})|E_i = \infty]$.

In the multiple periods model, I end up with an expression similar to the two periods model with one side being the difference-in-differences form estimator proposed by [Sun and Abraham \(2020\)](#) and the other side enlarging or reducing by a specific ratio depending on the signs of the treatment and anticipatory effect and the bound for anticipation probability. Researchers can still implement a sensitivity check by changing the choice of $\pi(e, s)$ and period s to examine whether the conclusion is robust.

6.4 Change-In-Changes Design

As an alternative approach to the difference-in-differences model, [Athey and Imbens \(2006\)](#) proposes a change-in-changes model that does not depend on the scale of dependent variables and recovers the entire counterfactual distribution of effects of the treatment on the treatment group. The change-in-changes model also incorporates nonlinear potential outcomes. The key identifying assumption is a time-invariant distribution of the unobservable variable across different groups. In this section, I generalize the change-in-changes model to incorporate anticipation.

Following the two-period difference-in-differences setup, suppose there are n units $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with two periods $t \in \{0, 1\}$. Each unit is assigned a binary treatment D_i in the second period and has an unobservable binary anticipation status A_i in the first period. The sampling process and potential outcomes have the same restriction as before. However, to incorporate nonlinear outcomes and not use the parallel trends assumption, I follow the assumptions introduced in [Athey and Imbens \(2006\)](#).

Assumption-CIC 3 The potential outcome of a unit in the absence of both anticipation

and treatment for unit i at period t is affected by an unobservable random variable U_i that represents the unit i 's characteristic and satisfy

$$Y_{it}(0,0) = \varphi(U_i, t) \quad \text{with} \quad \varphi(u, t) \quad \text{strictly increasing in } u \quad \text{for} \quad t \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Assumption-CIC 4 $U \perp\!\!\!\perp t|D$ and $\mathbb{U}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{U}_0$ where \mathbb{U}_t represents the support of random variable U in period t .

Assumption CIC-3 and 4 build the change-in-changes model. Assumption CIC-3 requires that the potential outcomes can be captured in a single unobservable random variable U and a higher value of random variable leads to a strictly higher potential outcome. Assumption CIC-4 restricts that the population does not change over time as the random variable that determines the potential outcome is independent of time period conditional on the group it belongs, which is an analogy to the parallel trends assumption in difference-in-differences model. Based on this assumption, the trend in one group can be used to recover the unobservable potential trend of the other group and comparison is possible. For this nonlinear setup where one can recover the distribution information of the potential outcomes, the parameter of interest I focus on is the quantile treatment effect for the treated group at a given quantile q , for $a \in \{0, 1\}$

$$\mu(q) = F_{Y_{i1}^1(a,1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^1(a,0)}^{-1}(q) = F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^1(0)}^{-1}(q)$$

F_Y represents the cumulative distribution function for the random variable Y and $F_Y^{-1}(q)$ represents the q -th quantile of the random variable Y . The switch from two indexes to one index is based on potential outcome restrictions I impose as the potential outcomes in the second period should not depend on the anticipation status. For notation simplicity, I use Y_{it}^d to represent the distribution of the random variable $Y_{it}|D_i = d$, and $Y_{it}^{d_2}(d_1)$ for the random variable $Y_{it}(d_1)|D_i = d_2$, and $Y_{it}^{d_2}(a, d_1)$ for the random variable $Y_{it}(a, d_1)|D_i = d_2$. Under this setup, [Athey and Imbens \(2006\)](#) proposes the following identification result.

Lemma 1 (Athey and Imbens (2006) Theorem 3.1) *Suppose Assumptions 1,2, Assumption-CIC 3 and Assumption-CIC 4 hold. The distribution of $Y_{i1}^1(0)$ can be written as*

$$F_{Y_{i1}^1(0)}(y) = F_{Y_{i0}^1(0,0)}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i1}^0}(y)\right)\right).$$

The potential outcome $Y_{i0}^1(0,0)$ should have the same distribution as Y_{i0}^1 without anticipation, and thus the quantile of $Y_{i1}^1(0)$ and $\mu(q)$ are identified. However, it is known from the previous discussion that the existence of anticipation causes pre-treatment distortions, and the outcomes observed are no longer good measures of potential outcomes if there is no treatment and anticipation. Following the logic in the previous section, I need some extra assumptions to help bound the quantile treatment effect:

$$\mu(q) = F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^1(0)}^{-1}(q) = F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^1(0,0)}^{-1}(q)\right)$$

The first term can be estimated from the treated group, while the second term $F_{Y_{i0}^1(0,0)}^{-1}(q)$ is not identified from the data. Here I introduce the corresponding quantile anticipatory effect

$$\tau(q) = F_{Y_{i0}^1(1,1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i0}^1(0,0)}^{-1}(q)$$

and use a similar strategy.

Assumption-CIC 5 $\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1] \leq \pi$.

Assumption-CIC 6 $|\tau(q)| \leq |\mu(q)|$.

Assumption-CIC 5 is identical to the assumption I impose in the two periods difference-in-differences model. Assumption CIC-6 is also similar to what has been imposed and the only difference is now I am restricting the magnitude relationship between the quantile anticipatory effect and quantile treatment effect. Based on the assumptions above, I can build bounds for the quantile treatment effect in the change-in-changes model while incorporating anticipation.

Theorem 6 *Under Assumptions 1, 2 and Assumptions-CIC 3-6, the parameter of interest,*

$\mu(q)$, is partially identified via a closed interval. For the sake of notation simplicity, let us define

$$m(q) = F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^0}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q)\right)\right)$$

$\phi_u(q)$ is the closest to zero solution for $F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^0}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q) - x\right)\right) - x = 0$

$\phi_l(q)$ is the closest to zero solution for $F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^0}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q) + x\right)\right) - x = 0$

With the restriction that $\phi_u(q)$ and $\phi_l(q)$ have the same signs as $\mu(q)$. Further define

$$\tilde{\phi}_u(q) = \begin{cases} F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^0}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q - \pi)\right)\right) & q > \pi \\ +\infty & q \leq \pi \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{\phi}_l(q) = \begin{cases} F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^0}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q + \pi)\right)\right) & q < 1 - \pi \\ -\infty & q \geq 1 - \pi \end{cases}$$

Then we have:

$$0 \leq \tau(q) \leq \mu(q) \quad \mu(q) \in [m(q), \min\{\phi_u(q), \tilde{\phi}_u(q)\}]$$

$$\tau(q) \leq 0 \leq \mu(q) \quad \mu(q) \in [\max\{\phi_l(q), \tilde{\phi}_l(q)\}, m(q)]$$

$$\mu(q) \leq 0 \leq \tau(q) \quad \mu(q) \in [m(q), \min\{\phi_l(q), \tilde{\phi}_u(q)\}]$$

$$\mu(q) \leq \tau(q) \leq 0 \quad \mu(q) \in [\max\{\phi_u(q), \tilde{\phi}_l(q)\}, m(q)]$$

From the form of the intervals, one can find that the way to build bounds for the quantile treatment effect is different from what I have done in the linear outcome case. The key difference is that I need both of these two assumptions to build the identified set in the difference-in-differences model while in the change-in-changes setup, either restriction on anticipation probability or magnitude anticipation is possible to provide an identified set. $\phi_u(q)$ and $\phi_l(q)$ are possible bounds based on the magnitude restrictions following the idea that to the maximum extent, the pre-treatment potential outcomes without anticipation

and treatment deviate from the observed pre-treatment outcomes up to a magnitude that is equal to the treatment effect. If one can find a solution to the formula, then the solution will be the corresponding bounds for the treatment effect. $\tilde{\phi}_u(q)$ and $\tilde{\phi}_l(q)$ are bounds obtained from the restrictions on anticipation probability. The intuition for the bounds is that if one is interested in the performance of q -th quantile treatment effect and the proportion of those anticipate is up to π , then at least $(q - \pi)$ of the observation is not affected by anticipation. For example, if the anticipation effect is positive, then the q -th quantile of potential outcomes without anticipation and treatment should be no less than $(q - \pi)$ -th quantile of observed outcomes as at least this part of units don't anticipate and there is no distortion. Similar logic can be used to analyze other cases. Although it seems that relying on fewer assumptions represents an advantage over the difference-in-differences model and having two approaches can provide a tighter bound if researchers are willing to impose both assumptions, this approach has its own problem. Either the solution to the formula or the effectiveness of the bound achieved from the probability restriction is not guaranteed. The former one depends on the specific distribution properties of the potential outcomes and support of random variables while the latter one depends on the relationship between q one is interested in and π one picks. For example if $q \leq \pi$ a negative quantile does not provide any useful information and this bound is useless. For the purpose of covering more cases, I suggest imposing two assumptions and picking the tighter one as the identified set while applying this method.

7 Conclusion

This paper proposes a potential outcome framework for analyzing treatment effects with the presence of anticipatory behavior. Based on a two-period difference-in-differences model, the findings of this paper show how the standard estimator can be biased and provide a weighted average of the treatment and the anticipatory effect. I also provide conditions under which I can obtain upper and lower bounds for the treatment effects. The motiva-

tion and implication of each assumption are discussed to accommodate empirical research backgrounds. This paper contributes to the empirical research by introducing anticipation in a practical and easy to generalize way starting from the classical difference-in-differences model. An easy-to-implement estimation and inference strategy is also provided. I propose a sensitivity analysis approach based on it that discusses the validity of conclusions under different restrictions on the anticipation possibility, and this approach suggests a specific range of t-statistics that guarantee the effectiveness of the conclusion got without anticipation. I illustrate the results in this paper by examining the effect of early retirement incentive programs on student achievement while considering anticipation and show potential pitfalls if anticipation is ignored. To make this framework more general and less restrictive, I generalize the two-period difference-in-differences model to include covariates and analyze longitudinal datasets with multiple periods, which are common empirical setups. I also consider imperfect anticipation scenarios where units can make mistakes when they anticipate and take nonlinear outcomes into account by carrying the same logic in the change-in-changes design to relax the parallel trends assumption.

The analysis for this paper still leaves some open questions, with some of them discussed in the supplemental appendix. I provide several alternative combinations of assumptions that can be used to obtain partial identification results for treatment effects with anticipation. For example, bounded outcomes assumptions and further conditional independence restrictions on potential outcomes and treatments. The choice of these assumptions depends on the empirical backgrounds researchers are working on. Alternative assumptions combined with available bounds provide applied workers with more choices that fit into broad applied circumstances. Further work can focus on some frequent issues in empirical studies, for example, anticipation effects related to instrumental variables. When a time gap exists between the instrumental variable and the treatment, the instrumental variable can cause people to anticipate future treatment and thus react to it before the treatment occurs. This setup is also related to cases with imperfect compliance and situations where anticipation will affect people's future selections into treatments. Another possible extension is

to incorporate the anticipation phenomenon in the synthetic control framework. It makes sense as the treatments in typical synthetic control applications are often big policy changes that would naturally be anticipated. Following [Ferman and Pinto \(2019\)](#) the anticipation treatment can be regarded as an unobservable confounder that is correlated with treatment because only those get treated in the future will react to anticipation. In that case, the pre-treatment weight that fits well may not construct good counterfactual post-treatment outcomes for the treated unit and thus causes problem. Trying to analyze the behavior of synthetic control estimator and difference-in-difference estimator with anticipation and compare the performance of these two approaches will be of interest for applied work. By taking these situations into consideration, I am more likely to incorporate anticipation in more diverse empirically relevant situations and introduce it to more applied models.

References

- Abadie, A. (2005). Semiparametric difference-in-differences estimators. *The Review of Economic Studies* 72(1), 1–19.
- Abadie, A. and M. D. Cattaneo (2018). Econometric methods for program evaluation. *Annual Review of Economics* 10, 465–503.
- Athey, S. and G. W. Imbens (2006). Identification and inference in nonlinear difference-in-differences models. *Econometrica* 74(2), 431–497.
- Athey, S. and G. W. Imbens (2017). The econometrics of randomized experiments. In *Handbook of economic field experiments*, Volume 1, pp. 73–140. Elsevier.
- Borusyak, K. and X. Jaravel (2017). Revisiting event study designs. *Available at SSRN 2826228*.
- Bošković, B. and L. Nøstbakken (2018). How much does anticipation matter? evidence from anticipated regulation and land prices.
- Chernozhukov, V., S. Lee, and A. M. Rosen (2013). Intersection bounds: estimation and inference. *Econometrica* 81(2), 667–737.
- De Chaisemartin, C. and X. d’Haultfoeuille (2020). Two-way fixed effects estimators with heterogeneous treatment effects. *American Economic Review* 110(9), 2964–96.
- Ferman, B. and C. Pinto (2019). Synthetic controls with imperfect pre-treatment fit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.08521*.
- Fitzpatrick, M. D. and M. F. Lovenheim (2014). Early retirement incentives and student achievement. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 6(3), 120–54.
- Freyaldenhoven, S., C. Hansen, and J. M. Shapiro (2019). Pre-event trends in the panel event-study design. *American Economic Review* 109(9), 3307–38.

- Goodman-Bacon, A. (2021). Difference-in-differences with variation in treatment timing. *Journal of Econometrics*.
- Heckman, J. J. and S. Navarro (2007). Dynamic discrete choice and dynamic treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics* 136(2), 341–396.
- Imbens, G. W. and C. F. Manski (2004). Confidence intervals for partially identified parameters. *Econometrica* 72(6), 1845–1857.
- Kilian, L. and H. Lütkepohl (2017). *Structural vector autoregressive analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Malani, A. and J. Reif (2015). Interpreting pre-trends as anticipation: Impact on estimated treatment effects from tort reform. *Journal of Public Economics* 124, 1–17.
- Manski, C. F. (2013). Identification of treatment response with social interactions. *The Econometrics Journal* 16(1), S1–S23.
- Manski, C. F. and J. V. Pepper (2013). Deterrence and the death penalty: Partial identification analysis using repeated cross sections. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 29(1), 123–141.
- Manski, C. F. and J. V. Pepper (2018). How do right-to-carry laws affect crime rates? coping with ambiguity using bounded-variation assumptions. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 100(2), 232–244.
- Molinari, F. (2020). Microeconometrics with partial identification. *Handbook of econometrics* 7, 355–486.
- Neyman, J. S. (1923). On the application of probability theory to agricultural experiments. essay on principles. section 9.(translated and edited by dm dabrowska and tp speed, statistical science (1990), 5, 465-480). *Annals of Agricultural Sciences* 10, 1–51.
- Roth, A. and J. Rambachan (2020). An honest approach to parallel trends. *Working Paper*.

- Rubin, D. B. (1974). Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of educational Psychology* 66(5), 688.
- Rubin, D. B. (1978). Bayesian inference for causal effects: The role of randomization. *The Annals of statistics*, 34–58.
- Stoye, J. (2009). More on confidence intervals for partially identified parameters. *Econometrica* 77(4), 1299–1315.
- Stoye, J. (2020). A simple, short, but never-empty confidence interval for partially identified parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.10484*.
- Sun, L. and S. Abraham (2020). Estimating dynamic treatment effects in event studies with heterogeneous treatment effects. *Journal of Econometrics*.
- Vazquez-Bare, G. (2021). Identification and estimation of spillover effects in randomized experiments. *Journal of Econometrics*.
- Ye, T., L. Keele, R. Hasegawa, and D. S. Small (2021). A negative correlation strategy for bracketing in difference-in-differences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.02423*.

A Appendix

A.1 Proof of Main Results

Proof of Theorem 1. Based on different signs of μ_g and τ_g , the expression of the upper and lower bounds of the closed intervals might be different. However, the critical logic to get the identified set is the same. Here I take the case where $0 \leq \tau_g \leq \mu_g$, for example, and all the other cases can be analyzed based on similar logic.

I know that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_g &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0,1)) - g(Y_{i1}(0,0)) | D_i = 1] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0,1)) - g(Y_{i0}(0,0)) - (g(Y_{i1}(0,0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0,0)))] | D_i = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(1)) | D_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0)) | D_i = 1] - (\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0)) | D_i = 0] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0)) | D_i = 0]) \end{aligned}$$

The first, third and the fourth terms are observable while for the second one

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 1] &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0,1)) | D_i = 1] + \mathbb{E}[A_i(g(Y_{i0}(1,1)) - g(Y_{i0}(0,1))) | D_i = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0,1)) | D_i = 1] + \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1 | D_i = 1] \tau_g \leq \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0)) | D = 1] + \pi \tau_g \end{aligned}$$

I further apply the inequality that $0 \leq \tau_g \leq \mu_g$ and get

$$\tau_g \leq \mu_g \leq \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(1)) | D_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 1] - (\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0)) | D_i = 0] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0)) | D_i = 0]) + \pi \tau_g$$

For simplicity I call $m_g = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 0]$, and I can conclude that

$$0 \leq \tau_g \leq \frac{m_g}{1 - \pi} \quad \tau_g \leq \mu_g \leq \frac{m_g}{1 - \pi}$$

From the equation above I notice that $\mu_g = \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1 | D_i = 1] \tau_g + m_g \geq m_g$. I can conclude that $\mu \in \left[m_g, \frac{m_g}{1 - \pi} \right]$. ■

Proof of Theorem 3. Following similar argument in Theorem 1, I focus on the case

where $0 \leq \tau_g(x) \leq \mu_g(x)$. From proof of theorem 1 I know that

$$\mu_g(x) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(1))|D_i = 1, X] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0))|D_i = 1, X] - (\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0))|D_i = 0, X] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0))|D_i = 0, X])$$

The first, third and the fourth term are observable while for the second one

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0})|D_i = 1, X] &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0, 1))|D_i = 1, X] + \mathbb{E}[A_i(g(Y_{i0}(1, 1)) - g(Y_{i0}(0, 1)))|D_i = 1, X] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0, 1))|D_i = 1, X] + \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1, X]\tau_g(x) \leq \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0))|D_i = 1, X] + \pi(x)\tau_g(x) \end{aligned}$$

I further apply the inequality that $0 \leq \tau_g(x) \leq \mu_g(x)$, and call $m_g(x) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0})|D_i = 1, X] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0})|D_i = 0, X]$. I get

$$\tau_g(x) \leq \mu_g(x) \leq m_g(x) + \pi(x)\tau_g(x)$$

, and I can conclude that

$$0 \leq \tau_g(x) \leq \frac{m_g(x)}{1 - \pi(x)} \quad \tau_g(x) \leq \mu_g(x) \leq \frac{m_g(x)}{1 - \pi(x)}$$

I notice that $\mu_g(x) = \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1, X]\tau_g(x) + m_g(x) \geq m_g(x)$ and can conclude that $\mu_g(x) \in \left[m_g(x), \frac{m_g(x)}{1 - \pi(x)} \right]$ or I can write it in the way

$$\mathbb{E}[\mu_g - m_g|X] \geq 0 \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\mu_g - \frac{m_g}{1 - \pi(x)} \middle| X \right] \leq 0$$

To avoid calculating so many conditional expectations, I follow [Abadie \(2005\)](#) and write

$$m_g(x) = \mathbb{E}[\rho_0(g(Y_1) - g(Y_0))|X = x] \quad \rho_0 = \frac{D_i - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1|X]}{\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1|X](1 - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1|X])}$$

. ■

Proof of Theorem 4. Like in the previous situation, I will take the situation $0 \leq \tau_g \leq \mu_g$

as an example.

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_g &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0, 1)) - g(Y_{i1}(0, 0)) | D_i = 1] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0, 1)) - g(Y_{i0}(0, 0)) - (g(Y_{i1}(0, 0)) - g(Y_{i0}(0, 0))) | D_i = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(1)) | D_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0, 0)) | D_i = 1] - (\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0)) | D_i = 0] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0, 0)) | D_i = 0])\end{aligned}$$

The first and the third term are observable as $\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) | D_i = 1]$ and $\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}) | D_i = 0]$. For the second one, those who anticipate their treatment status correctly will make a difference

$$\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 1] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0, 0)) | D_i = 1] + \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1 | D_i = 1] \tau_g$$

while for the fourth term, those who wrongly anticipate their future will react to it

$$\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 0] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0, 0)) | D_i = 0] + \mathbb{P}[A_i = -1 | D_i = 0] \tau_g$$

Then I will have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_g &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(1)) | D_i = 1] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 1] + \mathbb{P}[A_i = 1 | D_i = 1] \tau_g \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i1}(0)) | D_i = 0] + \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 0] - \mathbb{P}[A_i = -1 | D_i = 0] \tau_g \\ \mu_g &= m_g + (\mathbb{P}[A_i \neq 0 | D_i = 1](1 - \varepsilon) - \mathbb{P}[A_i \neq 0 | D_i = 0] \varepsilon) \tau_g\end{aligned}$$

Use the bound from Assumption-IA 4 I can get that the coefficient before τ_g belongs to the interval $[-\pi\varepsilon, \pi(1 - \varepsilon)]$ and follow the same approach from the proof of theorem 1, I will have that $\mu_g \in \left[\frac{m_g}{1 + \pi\varepsilon}, \frac{m_g}{1 - (1 - \varepsilon)\pi} \right]$ ■

Proof of Theorem 5. The proof strategy carries from two periods model and I am still taking the case where $0 \leq \tau(e, s) \leq \mu(e, t)$ as an example. For the difference-in-differences

estimand $m_g(e, s, t)$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}) - g(Y_{is})|E_i = e] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}) - g(Y_{is})|E_i = \infty] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it})|E_i = e] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{is})|E_i = e] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}(0, \infty)) - g(Y_{is}(0, \infty))|E_i = \infty] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}(0, e)) + A_{it}(g(Y_{it}(1, e)) - g(Y_{it}(0, e)))|E_i = e] \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{is}(0, e)) + A_{is}(g(Y_{is}(1, e)) - g(Y_{is}(0, e)))|E_i = e] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}(0, \infty)) - g(Y_{is}(0, \infty))|E_i = \infty] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}(0, e))|E_i = e] + h(e, t)\tau(e, t) - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{is}(0, e))|E_i = e] - h(e, s)\tau(e, s) \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}(0, \infty)) - g(Y_{is}(0, \infty))|E_i = e] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{it}(0, e)) - g(Y_{is}(0, e))|E_i = e] - h(e, s)\tau(e, s) \\
&= \mu_g(e, t) - h(e, s)\tau_g(e, s)
\end{aligned}$$

From the equation above, I can introduce Assumption-M 4 and 5, and then get

$$m_g(e, s, t) \leq \mu_g(e, t) \leq \frac{m_g(e, s, t)}{1 - \pi(e, s)}$$

■

Proof of Theorem 6.

Like before, I am taking the case $0 \leq \tau(q) \leq \mu(q)$ for example. For the lower bound, I know that $\tau(q) \geq 0$ so I can conclude that $F_{Y_{i0}^1(0,0)}^{-1}(q) \leq F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q)$ and will have

$$\mu(q) \geq F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^0}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q)\right)\right)$$

which is identifiable from observable variables. On the other hand, I can build the upper bound for $\mu(q)$ through that $F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q) \leq F_{Y_{i0}^1(0,0)}^{-1}(q) + \tau(q) \leq F_{Y_{i0}^1(0,0)}^{-1}(q) + \mu(q)$ using magnitude restriction. Then the upper bound for $\mu(q)$, represented by $\phi_u(q)$ can be solved by the equation

$$\phi_u(q) = F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^0}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q) - \phi_u(q)\right)\right)$$

when $\phi_u(q) = 0$, left is smaller or equal than the right hand side. Both side are increasing functions so the minimum nonnegative solution should be $\phi_u(q)$. It is worth mentioning that

$\phi_u(q)$ is not guaranteed to exist in this approach and it depends on the distribution of all these random variables. For this approach, I do not use the information from Assumption-C 5. If I would like to introduce that assumption, I can make an improvement on $\phi_u(q)$ for some circumstances.

If $q \leq \pi$, then there is not much thing I can do to improve as the worst case is that all the people who anticipate lies in the lowest q percentage and you gain no information about the original distribution without anticipation. If $q > \pi$, then at most π of the people exceed the original q -th quantile of $Y_{i0}^1(0,0)$ after the anticipation so I should have that $F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q - \pi) \leq F_{Y_{i0}^1(0,0)}^{-1}(q)$ and then I have

$$\mu(q) \leq F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^0}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q - \pi)\right)\right) = \tilde{\phi}_u(q)$$

For the case $0 \leq \tau(q) \leq \mu(q)$, I will have the lower and upper bound for $\mu(q)$ as

$$\theta_l(q) = F_{Y_{i1}^1(1)}^{-1}(q) - F_{Y_{i1}^0}^{-1}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^0}\left(F_{Y_{i0}^1}^{-1}(q)\right)\right) \quad \theta_u(q) = \min\{\phi_u(q), \tilde{\phi}_u(q)\}$$

■

A.2 Empirical Related Tables

This section provides an extra empirical results for the empirical application using data from subject specific teachers.

A.3 Estimation and Inference

Here I will calculate these estimators for inference explicitly. To be consistent with the setup in empirical application, I work on the case where $\tau_g \leq 0 \leq \mu_g$ as an example and the other cases can be analyzed similarly. When I have these assumptions I know that $\mu_g \in [\mu_{g,l}, \mu_{g,u}]$ where $\mu_{g,l} = \frac{m_g}{1+\pi}$ while $\theta_u = m_g$. Corresponding estimators for lower and

Table 2: Effects of the Early Retirement Incentive Program on Test Scores: Subject Specific

| | Original Results | | With Anticipation | |
|-----------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Math | Reading | Math | Reading |
| All Grade | 0.013 (0.008) [-0.002,0.028] | 0.013 (0.007) [-0.001,0.027] | [0.008,0.013] | [0.008,0.013] |
| Grade 3 | 0.01 (0.013) [-0.015,0.035] | -0.003 (0.01) [-0.024,0.017] | [0.007,0.010] | [-0.007,-0.003] |
| Grade 6 | 0.004 (0.01) [-0.016,0.024] | 0.016 (0.009) [-0.002,0.035] | [0.002,0.004] | [0.010,0.016] |
| Grade 8 | 0.032 (0.018) [-0.004,0.067] | 0.03 (0.017) [-0.003,0.063] | [0.020,0.032] | [-0.006,0.033] [0.019,0.03] |

Notes: Each column presents results from a separate regression. Teachers who teach multiple grades are included in each grade. Teachers who teach in self-contained classrooms are assumed to teach both math and English. I list identified sets in the first row and 95% level confidence sets in the third row for each result with anticipation. For comparison purposes, I also provide estimators, standard errors and 95% confidence intervals for results from [Fitzpatrick and Lovenheim \(2014\)](#). Standard errors are displayed with parentheses.

upper bound of the interval will be

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}_{g,u} &= \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^n [g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0})] D_i - \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n [g(Y_{i1}) - g(Y_{i0})] (1 - D_i) \\ \hat{\mu}_{g,l} &= \frac{\hat{\mu}_{g,u}}{1 + \hat{\pi}} \quad n_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \quad n_0 = n - n_1 \quad \hat{\pi} \text{ is a consistent estimator for } \pi\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity let me define $\hat{\delta}_{dt} = \frac{1}{n_d} \sum_{k=1}^n g(Y_{kt}) \mathbb{I}[D_k = d]$ for $(d, t) \in \{0, 1\}^2$. I use d to index the group and t for time period here. I can also define

$$\hat{\sigma}_{dt}^2 = \frac{1}{n_d - 1} \sum_{k=1}^n [g(Y_{kt}) - \hat{\delta}_{dt}]^2 \mathbb{I}[D_k = d] \quad \text{cov}_d = \frac{1}{n_d - 1} \sum_{k=1}^n [g(Y_{k1}) - \hat{\delta}_{d1}] [g(Y_{k0}) - \hat{\delta}_{d0}] \mathbb{I}[D_k = d]$$

which measure the variance for group d at period t and covariance between two time periods for group d . For well behaved function $g(\cdot)$, which guarantee the asymptotic normality of average, I will have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}_u^2 &= \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{11}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{10}^2 - 2\text{cov}_1}{\hat{p}} + \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{01}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{00}^2 - 2\text{cov}_0}{1 - \hat{p}} \\ \hat{\sigma}_l^2 &= \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{11}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{10}^2 - 2\text{cov}_1}{\hat{p}(1 + \hat{\pi})^2} + \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{01}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{00}^2 - 2\text{cov}_0}{(1 - \hat{p})(1 + \hat{\pi})^2}\end{aligned}$$

with $\hat{p} = \frac{n_1}{n}$.

For the validity of the inference procedure, when Assumption (i) and (ii) are satisfied and the upper and lower bound estimators are ordered by construction, the procedure of [Imbens and Manski \(2004\)](#) is valid by [Stoye \(2009\)](#). The only thing need to be addressed is that now the variance of the lower and upper bounds might change so to guarantee the effectiveness of the confidence set, one needs to choose the larger variance for both bounds.

Proof of Theorem 2. To keep consistency with the estimation procedure, concentrate on the case

$$\mu_g \in \left[\min \left\{ m_g, \frac{m_g}{1 + \pi} \right\}, \max \left\{ m_g, \frac{m_g}{1 + \pi} \right\} \right] \quad \hat{\mu}_{g,u} = \hat{m}_g \quad \hat{\mu}_{g,l} = \frac{\hat{\mu}_{g,u}}{1 + \hat{\pi}}$$

If $m_g > 0$ thus $\mu_g > 0$, then based on Assumption (i) and (ii) plus the ordered upper and lower bounds estimators, the proposed interval is effective automatically following [Imbens and Manski \(2004\)](#) and [Stoye \(2009\)](#). However, when $m_g < 0$ thus $\mu_g < 0$ but I get $\hat{m}_g > 0$, then although $\hat{\mu}_{g,u}$ is still larger, now it is the estimator for the lower bound. For notation simplicity, use λ to represent $\mathbb{P}[A_i = 1|D_i = 1]$ and I know $\lambda \in [0, \pi]$. Define $\sigma = \max\{\sigma_l, \sigma_u\}$, in this setup, σ is the standard deviation of m_g .

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\hat{m}_g}{1 + \hat{\pi}} - C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{m_g}{1 + \lambda} \leq \hat{m}_g + C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ = & \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} \frac{\hat{m}_g(\lambda - \hat{\pi})}{1 + \hat{\pi}} - C_n \hat{\sigma}(1 + \lambda)}{\sigma} \leq \sqrt{n} \frac{m_g - \hat{m}_g}{\sigma} \leq \frac{\sqrt{n} \lambda \hat{m}_g + C_n \hat{\sigma}(1 + \lambda)}{\sigma} \right) \end{aligned}$$

For $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N_0 such that $N > N_0$ I have $|\frac{\hat{\sigma} - \sigma}{\sigma}| < \varepsilon$ and thus $\varepsilon > 1 - \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sigma}$. Then I have the probability satisfies

$$\geq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} \frac{\hat{m}_g(\lambda - \hat{\pi})}{1 + \hat{\pi}} - C_n \sigma(1 + \lambda)(1 - \varepsilon)}{\sigma} \leq \sqrt{n} \frac{m_g - \hat{m}_g}{\sigma} \leq \frac{\sqrt{n} \lambda \hat{m}_g + C_n \sigma(1 + \lambda)(1 - \varepsilon)}{\sigma} \right)$$

Use Φ to represent the cumulative value of standard normal distribution and ϕ to represent the p.d.f for standard normal here. By Berry-Essen central limit theorem, this term is arbitrarily close to

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} \lambda \hat{m}_g}{\sigma} + C_n(1 + \lambda)(1 - \varepsilon) \right) - \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} \frac{\hat{m}_g(\lambda - \hat{\pi})}{1 + \hat{\pi}} - C_n(1 + \lambda)(1 - \varepsilon)}{\sigma} \right) \\ = & \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} \lambda \hat{m}_g}{\sigma} + C_n(1 + \lambda) \right) - \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} \frac{\hat{m}_g(\lambda - \hat{\pi})}{1 + \hat{\pi}} - C_n(1 + \lambda)}{\sigma} \right) + 2\varepsilon C_n \phi(\omega) \end{aligned}$$

for some ω . C_n is bounded and ε can be arbitrarily small so the last term can be ignored.

Using similar logic, the left term can be written as

$$\geq \Phi \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} \lambda \hat{m}_g}{\hat{\sigma}} + C_n(1 + \lambda) \right) - \Phi \left(-\frac{\sqrt{n} \frac{\hat{m}_g(\hat{\pi} - \lambda)}{1 + \hat{\pi}} - C_n(1 + \lambda)}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) - 2\varepsilon \lambda \left(\sqrt{n} \frac{\hat{m}_g - m_g}{\hat{\sigma}} + \sqrt{n} \frac{m_g}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) \phi(\omega')$$

for some other ω' . The first term within bracket is normally distributed and the second

term is negative and I can take ε arbitrarily small. Recall that $\lambda \in [0, \pi]$ and the smallest value is taken at $\lambda = 0$. I have at last

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\hat{m}_g}{1 + \hat{\pi}} - C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{m_g}{1 + \lambda} \leq \hat{m}_g + C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ & \geq \Phi(C_n) - \Phi \left(-\frac{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mu}_{g,u} - \hat{\mu}_{g,l})}{\hat{\sigma}} - C_n \right) = \alpha \end{aligned}$$

■

Proof of Corollary 1. Take the case $\tau_g \leq 0 \leq \mu_g$ for example. The new confidence set has the form

$$\left[\frac{\hat{\mu}_{g,u}}{1 + \hat{\pi}} - C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}}, \hat{\mu}_{g,u} + C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} \right]$$

with

$$\Phi \left(C_n + \sqrt{n} \frac{\hat{\mu}_{g,u} - \hat{\mu}_{g,l}}{\hat{\sigma}} \right) - \Phi(-C_n) = \Phi \left(C_n + \frac{\hat{\pi}}{1 + \hat{\pi}} \tilde{t} \right) - \Phi(-C_n) = \alpha.$$

Given that the right hand side of the confidence set is always positive, I only need to compare $\frac{\hat{\mu}_{g,u}}{1 + \hat{\pi}} - C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}}$ and 0.

$$\frac{\hat{\mu}_{g,u}}{1 + \hat{\pi}} - C_n \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{(1 + \hat{\pi})\sqrt{n}} (\tilde{t} - C_n(1 + \hat{\pi}))$$

I know that $\Phi \left(C_n + \frac{\hat{\pi}}{1 + \hat{\pi}} \tilde{t} \right) - \Phi(-C_n)$ is increasing in both C_n and \tilde{t} so the solution for C_n is a decreasing function for \tilde{t} at any given π . For any specific π , the smallest \tilde{t} that guarantees $\frac{\tilde{t}}{1 + \pi} \geq C_n$ is the value that solves

$$\Phi(\tilde{t}) - \Phi \left(-\frac{\tilde{t}}{1 + \pi} \right) = \alpha.$$

The left handside is an increasing function in \tilde{t} and a decreasing function in π so the worst case happens at $\pi = 1$ and that gives you the expression $\Phi(t^*) - \Phi(-t^*/2) = \alpha$. As long as $\tilde{t} > t^*$ then $\frac{\tilde{t}}{1 + \pi} > C_n$ is guaranteed and I can conclude that $0 \notin CS_\alpha^\mu$. ■

A.4 Alternative Assumptions and Corresponding Bounds

Sometimes, it might be reasonable to propose specific assumptions other than what have already been assumed. In this part, I will try to discuss several alternative assumptions that will also give partial identification results under different circumstances.

A.4.1 Bounded Outcomes

The first alternative approach mentioned here identifies the parameter of interest through a boundary on the outcomes. The advantage is that it falls naturally to certain setups, for example, binary outcomes and setups when the outcomes are scores and does not need to make discussions based on different signs of the treatment effects and do not need to bound the magnitude of effect. It will also benefit from a certain choice of bounded $g(\cdot)$ function. However, I may need some other assumptions to validate it.

Assumption SA-1 $\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0,0))|D_i = 1, A_i = 0] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0,0))|D_i = 1, A_i = 1]$

This assumption states that for those who will get treated, their potential outcome without treatment in the first period should be the same across those who anticipate and those who do not. This is a weaker assumption compared with independent anticipation, and I only restrict this for the treated group.

Assumption SA-2 The outcome variable in the first period is bounded, which means $g(Y_{i0}) \in [a, b]$.

The bounded outcome assumption is not quite restrictive and fits into different situations, for example, the binary outcome case. It will naturally have a bounded outcome between 0 and 1. For example, in other cases, when the outcome is grade score or the $g(\cdot)$ function itself is bounded, this assumption is automatically satisfied.

Theorem-SA 1 *Under Assumptions 1-3, Assumption SA-1 and 2, the parameter of interest μ_g is partially identified in a closed interval. The lower bound and upper bounds of that*

interval $\mu_{g,l}$, $\mu_{g,u}$ have the following form

$$\mu_{g,l} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{D_i - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]}{\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1](1 - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1])} g(Y_{i1}) + \frac{1 - D_i}{1 - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]} g(Y_{i0}) - b \right]$$

$$\mu_{g,u} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{D_i - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]}{\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1](1 - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1])} g(Y_{i1}) + \frac{1 - D_i}{1 - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]} g(Y_{i0}) - a \right]$$

The proof is relatively straightforward as I can see that for the unobserved term, I will have

$$\mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}(0,0))|D_i = 1] = \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0})|D_i = 1, A_i = 0]$$

under Assumption SA-1, which can help build a bound by conditional expectation. The case with covariates is similar after making all the things conditionally and is skipped here.

A.4.2 Extreme Treatment Assignment

One may argue that the identified set given by bounded outcome might be too loose in some circumstances as it just used the upper and lower bound of the outcome itself. If people do not like to put restrictions on the signs and magnitudes of treatment effects, I can also provide a corresponding identification result under some other assumptions. The idea is that, I may not observe the anticipation status for everybody, however, if I have a bound for the anticipation probability among the group I am interested in, I can get an bound about it by assigning anticipation treatment to those with highest or lowest outcomes. As among all possible anticipation treatment status satisfying the proportion restriction, I am picking the worst and best one based on the observed outcomes so I can get corresponding upper and lower bounds.

Theorem-SA 2 *Under Assumption 1-4 and Assumption SA-1, I can build a closed interval for the parameter of interest μ_g with upper and lower bounds $\mu_{g,l}$ and $\mu_{g,u}$ satisfying*

$$\mu_{g,l} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{D_i - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]}{\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1](1 - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1])} g(Y_{i1}) + \frac{1 - D_i}{1 - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]} g(Y_{i0}) \right] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0})|D_i = 1, g(Y_{i0}) \geq g(Y_{i0})_\eta]$$

$$\mu_{g,u} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{D_i - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]}{\mathbb{P}[D_i = 1](1 - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1])} g(Y_{i1}) + \frac{1 - D_i}{1 - \mathbb{P}[D_i = 1]} g(Y_{i0}) \right] - \mathbb{E}[g(Y_{i0}) | D_i = 1, g(Y_{i0}) \leq g(Y_{i0})_{1-\eta}]$$

$g(Y_{i0})_\alpha$ denotes the α -th quantile of $g(Y_{i0})$ conditional on $D_i = 1$ and $\eta = \pi$.

The proof for this theorem follows the idea that I can assign the anticipation treatment group to those with highest or lowest outcomes under a bounded proportion and this will provide bounds for the purpose of partial identification. For these bounds, all the items are observable and can be estimated and I do not need to put restrictions on signs and magnitudes of the treatment effect.