

# Design-Based Uncertainty for Quasi-Experiments\*

Ashesh Rambachan<sup>†</sup>      Jonathan Roth<sup>‡</sup>

February 14, 2024

## Abstract

This paper develops a finite-population, design-based theory of uncertainty for studying quasi-experimental settings in the social sciences. In our framework, treatment is determined by stochastic idiosyncratic factors, but individuals may differ in their probability of receiving treatment in ways unknown to the researcher, thus allowing for rich selection into treatment. We derive formulas for the bias of common estimators (including difference-in-means and difference-in-differences), and provide conditions under which they are unbiased for an interpretable causal estimand (e.g. analogs to the ATE or ATT). We further show that when the finite population is large, conventional standard errors are valid but typically conservative for the variance of the estimator over the randomization distribution. An interesting feature of our framework is that conventional standard errors tend to become more conservative when treatment probabilities vary more across units, i.e. when there is more selection into treatment. This conservativeness can (at least partially) mitigate undercoverage of conventional confidence intervals when the estimator is biased because of selection. Our results also have implications for the appropriate level to cluster standard errors, and for the analysis of linear covariate adjustment and instrumental variables in quasi-experimental settings.

arXiv:2008.00602v6 [econ.EM] 13 Feb 2024

---

\*We thank Alberto Abadie, Isaiah Andrews, Josh Angrist, Iavor Bojinov, Kirill Borusyak, Kevin Chen, Peng Ding, Avi Feller, Peter Hull, Chuck Manski, Evan Rose, Pedro Sant'Anna, Yotam Shem-Tov, Neil Shephard, Tymon Słoczyński, Chris Walker, Ruonan Xu, Davide Viviano, and seminar/conference participants at Brown, Ohio State, Cornell, Northwestern, Sciences Po, Toulouse School of Economics, SEA, NASMES, and the CEME Young Econometrician's Conference for helpful comments and suggestions. Rambachan gratefully acknowledges support from the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant DGE1745303.

<sup>†</sup>Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Email: [asheshr@mit.edu](mailto:asheshr@mit.edu)

<sup>‡</sup>Brown University. Email: [jonathanroth@brown.edu](mailto:jonathanroth@brown.edu)

# 1 Introduction

In economics and other social sciences, researchers often have data on the full population of interest. For example, the researcher may have aggregate data on all 50 US States, or administrative data on all individuals in Denmark. Traditional approaches to inference that view the sample as being drawn from an infinite super-population may be unnatural in such settings (Manski and Pepper, 2018). A literature on randomized experiments dating to Neyman (1923) has proposed an alternative *design-based* approach to inference in which the finite population is viewed as fixed, and the assignment of treatment is considered stochastic. In many social science applications, however, it is unreasonable to assume that the treatment is as good as randomly assigned, as units may select into treatment in ways unobserved to the researcher. Researchers therefore often use alternative “quasi-experimental” strategies such as difference-in-differences or instrumental variables to deal with this unobserved selection.

In this paper, we develop a design-based theory of uncertainty that is useful for analyzing such settings in which there is selection into treatment. We introduce a data-generating process where the treatment assignment is stochastic, and each unit has an idiosyncratic marginal probability of receiving the treatment. The stochastic nature of the treatment in our framework reflects the fact that although the treatment is not literally randomized as in an experiment, social scientists often discuss idiosyncratic, random factors that (at least partially) determine the treatment. For example, researchers motivate difference-in-differences or instrumental variables by idiosyncratic delays in court systems that affect the timing of state-level policy changes (e.g., Jackson, Johnson and Persico, 2016), fluctuations in local weather patterns (e.g., Madestam, Shoag, Veuger and Yanagizawa-Drott, 2013; Deryugina, Heutel, Miller, Molitor and Reif, 2019), or exposure to natural disasters (e.g., Hornbeck, 2012; Hornbeck and Naidu, 2014; Deryugina, 2017; Nakamura, Sigurdsson and Steinsson, 2021). We thus view the stochastic nature of the treatment as arising from the realization of these idiosyncratic shocks. Importantly, however, we do not assume that the treatment probabilities arising from the realizations of these shocks are known to the researcher. Instead, we allow the treatment probabilities to be arbitrarily related to the potential outcomes, thus allowing for rich forms of selection into treatment.

We begin by analyzing the properties of the difference-in-means (DIM) estimator, which compares the average outcome for the treated and untreated units, under this data-generating process. Analyzing the DIM is a useful building block towards popular quasi-experimental estimators. For example, the difference-in-differences (DID) estimator can be viewed as the DIM estimator using a first-differenced outcome, and so our results apply immediately to the DID estimator. In Section 5, we further show that our results for the DIM generalize to instrumental variables estimators and ordinary least squares regression adjustment. Focusing on the DIM estimator also allows us to connect our results to existing design-based results for randomized experiments (which often focus on this estimator).

We derive design-based analogs to the familiar omitted variable bias formula for the DIM estimator in Section 3. We show that the expectation of the DIM can be written as the sum of two terms: a design-based analog to the average treatment effect on the treated, which we call the “expected” average treatment effect (EATT), and a bias term that depends on the finite-population covariance between the (unknown) treatment probabilities and the untreated potential outcomes. Hence, the DIM is unbiased for the EATT when the idiosyncratic treatment probabilities are orthogonal to the untreated potential outcomes in the finite population. It is further unbiased for the average treatment effect (ATE) if the treatment probabilities are also orthogonal to the treated potential outcomes as well. Since the DID estimator is equivalent to the DIM estimator for a first-differenced outcome, our results imply that it is unbiased for the EATT under a design-based analogue to the parallel trends assumption, which imposes that the treatment probabilities are orthogonal to the trends in untreated potential outcomes in the finite population.

We next analyze the distribution of the DIM estimator and properties of conventional confidence intervals, establishing that the DIM is approximately normally distributed with a particular variance that depends on the finite-population variances of the potential outcomes and treatment effects. Formally, we establish a finite-population central limit theorem and a novel Berry-Esseen bound, which implies that the DIM is approximately normally distributed when the finite population is large. Our analysis generalizes classic finite-population central limit theorems for randomized experiments, such as those established in [Freedman \(2008\)](#); [Lin \(2013\)](#); [Li and](#)

Ding (2017), to the non-experimental setting with treatment probabilities that are unknown and vary arbitrarily with potential outcomes. We show that the usual heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator is consistent for an upper bound on the variance of the DIM. When the finite population is large, confidence intervals based on the limiting normal approximation therefore yield valid but potentially conservative inference for the expectation of the difference in means (which corresponds with a causal estimand under the orthogonality conditions described above). By applying these results to the DID estimator, we immediately obtain that cluster-robust standard errors (Bertrand, Duflo and Mullainathan, 2004) yield valid but potentially conservative inference for the EATT under a design-based analogue to the parallel trends assumption.

An interesting feature of this setting with unknown treatment probabilities is that conventional standard errors tend to overstate the variance of the DIM when the treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  are heterogeneous across units. For example, when treatment effects are constant, the conventional standard errors are strictly conservative when the  $\pi_i$  differ across units, except in knife-edge cases (see Corollary 3.1). Since selection into treatment implies that the  $\pi_i$  differ across units, conventional standard errors will typically overstate the variance of the DIM when there is selection, even under constant treatment effects. This contrasts with the celebrated result from Neyman (1923) for completely randomized experiments that conventional standard errors are strictly conservative if and only if treatment effects are heterogeneous.

An important implication of this variance conservativeness result is that conventional confidence intervals for the EATT or ATE need not necessarily undercover even when the DIM is biased. Rather, there is a tradeoff between two forces: as the treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  differ across units, this (i) may induce bias if the  $\pi_i$  covary with the potential outcomes, but (ii) induces the usual standard errors to become more conservative. Depending on which effect dominates, coverage of conventional confidence intervals can be either above or below the nominal level even when the estimator is biased for the EATT or ATE (see Proposition 3.4). Thus, for example, conventional confidence intervals for the DID estimator can have correct coverage for the EATT under certain violations of the design-based analog to the parallel trends assumption.

We highlight these tradeoffs in Monte Carlo simulations in Section 4, where we consider DID analyses of simulated treatments using state-level Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics

(LEHD) data, and allow the state-level treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  to depend on a state’s voting results in the 2016 presidential election. Remarkably, for log employment as the outcome, strengthening the relationship between the  $\pi_i$  and state-level voting patterns *increases* the coverage rate of conventional confidence intervals, despite the fact that doing so leads to more severe violations of the design-based analog to the parallel trends assumption. This is because the induced conservativeness of conventional confidence intervals dominates the bias from the violation of parallel trends. By contrast, when log earnings is the outcome, the bias effect dominates, and so coverage decreases as selection is made stronger, although undercoverage is substantially less severe than it would be with a consistent estimate of the variance (e.g. coverage of 89% vs. 52% in one specification).

In Section 5, we present three extensions that further illustrate our design-based framework for quasi-experimental estimators. First, we consider instrumental variable (IV) settings, where we now view the assignment of the instrument as stochastic. Our framework allows the instrument assignment probabilities to vary across units in ways unknown to the researcher, thus relaxing the independence assumption in typical analyses of IV (Angrist and Imbens, 1994; Kang, Peck and Keele, 2018). We show that traditional standard errors yield correct but potentially conservative estimates of the variance of the IV estimator over the randomization distribution, and that the IV estimand corresponds to a reweighted local average treatment effect under orthogonality conditions on the instrument probabilities that are weaker than the usual independence assumption. Second, we consider the properties of ordinary least-squares regression adjustment, generalizing the results for randomized experiments in Freedman (2008); Lin (2013). We provide two decompositions of the OLS estimand in terms of the treatment probabilities, and show that conventional approaches to inference yield an upper bound on the variance of the estimator. Finally, we extend our results on inference to the setting of clustered treatment assignment where, for example, we observe individual-level data but treatment is determined at the regional level (e.g. states or counties) in an unknown manner. When the number of regions in the finite population is large, the cluster-robust variance estimator at the region level is valid but potentially conservative for the variance of the DIM estimator. These results provide formal justification for the useful heuristic that in quasi-experimental settings, standard errors should be clustered at the level at

which treatment assignment is determined.

Our analysis builds on the literature on design-based inference, which dates to [Neyman \(1923\)](#) and [Fisher \(1935\)](#) and has received substantial attention recently. See, for example, [Freedman \(2008\)](#); [Lin \(2013\)](#); [Aronow and Middleton \(2015\)](#); [Li and Ding \(2017\)](#); [Bojinov and Shephard \(2019\)](#); [Wu and Ding \(2021\)](#); [Guo and Basse \(2023\)](#) in statistics and [Abadie, Athey, Imbens and Wooldridge \(2020\)](#); [Xu \(2021\)](#); [Bojinov, Rambachan and Shephard \(2021\)](#); [Roth and Sant’Anna \(2021\)](#); [Abadie, Athey, Imbens and Wooldridge \(2022\)](#) in econometrics, among many others. The existing work on design-based inference in statistics has focused primarily on settings where treatment probabilities are known to the researcher, as in completely randomized experiments or more complex experimental designs. By contrast, we analyze a setting in which treatment probabilities are unknown to the researcher and may richly depend on potential outcomes.

Our framework that allows for idiosyncratic treatment probabilities is thus related to the design-based framework in [Abadie et al. \(2020\)](#), who in Section 3 of their paper consider a setting where treatment assignments are i.n.i.d., and thus can differ across units. [Xu \(2021\)](#) extends these results to non-linear estimators. However, the causal interpretation of the parameters in [Abadie et al. \(2020\)](#) relies on the assumption that treatment probabilities are linear in observable characteristics, whereas we consider estimation and inference for analogs to the ATE or ATT under arbitrary forms of selection. We also provide a novel analysis of the factors determining the conservativeness of the variance when there is selection into treatment. Finally, a technical difference between our framework and that in [Abadie et al. \(2020\)](#) is that, as in [Neyman \(1923\)](#) and much of the statistics literature that followed, we view the number of treated units  $N_1$  as fixed, whereas [Abadie et al. \(2020\)](#) view  $N_1$  as stochastic.

## 2 Data-generating process

Consider a finite population of  $N$  units. Each unit is associated with potential outcomes  $Y_i(\cdot) := (Y_i(0), Y_i(1))$ , which correspond to their outcomes under the control and treatment conditions. The observed outcome is  $Y_i = D_i Y_i(1) + (1 - D_i) Y_i(0)$ , where  $D_i \in \{0, 1\}$  denotes the treatment status of unit  $i$ . Both the  $N$  units and their collection of potential outcomes

$Y(\cdot) := \{Y_i(\cdot) : i = 1, \dots, N\}$  are fixed (or conditioned on). The stochastic nature of the data arises from the treatment assignment vector,  $D := (D_1, \dots, D_N)$ .

Each unit is independently assigned to treatment according to  $D_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_i)$ , where  $p_i$  is an *unknown*, individual-specific probability of treatment that may be arbitrarily related to the potential outcomes or other fixed covariates. We analyze the distribution of the treatment assignment vector  $D$  conditional on the number of treated units and the potential outcomes, yielding the following data-generating process:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(D = d \mid \sum_{i=1}^N D_i = N_1, Y(\cdot)\right) \propto \prod_i p_i^{d_i} (1 - p_i)^{1-d_i} \quad (1)$$

for all  $d \in \{0, 1\}^N$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^N d_i = N_1$ , and zero otherwise.<sup>1</sup> The special case with  $p_i = \bar{p}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$  nests the completely randomized experiment in which any treatment assignment vector with  $N_1$  treated units is equally likely (e.g., [Neyman, 1923](#); [Freedman, 2008](#); [Lin, 2013](#)).

The assignment mechanism (1) reflects the fact that in “quasi-experimental” settings, researchers often argue that treatment status is partially determined by random factors beyond the control of individual units. As a motivating example, researchers employing a difference-in-differences design to analyze school finance reforms ([Jackson et al., 2016](#)) or duty-to-bargain laws ([Lovenheim and Willen, 2019](#)) have argued that the timing of these laws is determined by idiosyncratic factors causing delays in state courts and legislatures. If we view these idiosyncratic factors as realizations of a stochastic process, then each unit has some probability of being treated based on the realization of these idiosyncratic factors: the individual probability  $p_i$  then corresponds to the probability that the random factors are such that unit  $i$  is treated (before conditioning on  $N_1$ ). The fact that the  $p_i$  differ across units reflects the fact that the probability that a unit gets a shock that induces the treatment may relate to their potential outcomes—e.g. states with higher potential outcomes may be more likely to realize court delays.

---

<sup>1</sup>It is often desirable to conduct inference as-if the number of treated units  $N_1$  is fixed, even if this is not guaranteed by the assignment mechanism. The precision of treatment effect estimates typically depends on the number of treated units, and so conditioning on  $N_1$  yields inference more relevant to the observed data. [Pashley, Basse and Miratrix \(2021\)](#) show, for example, that a confidence interval that is valid unconditionally, but not conditional on  $N_1$ , will fail to be “bet-proof” in the sense considered by, e.g., [Buehler \(1959\)](#) and [Müller and Norets \(2016\)](#).

**Interpreting the assignment mechanism as non-random selection:** The assignment mechanism (1) is compatible with a rich model of self-selection into treatment (e.g., Heckman, 1976, 1978), in which each unit’s decision to select into treatment may depend flexibly on their own potential outcomes and other fixed characteristics, as well as other random factors beyond its control. For example, suppose units select into treatment based on

$$D_i = 1\{g(W_i, Y_i(1), Y_i(0)) + \epsilon_i \geq 0\},$$

where  $W_i$  are fixed individual characteristics and  $g(\cdot)$  is some link function. The random variable  $\epsilon_i$  summarizes exogenous noise (independent across  $i$ ) that produces random variation in treatment decisions (e.g. the realization of court delays in our earlier example). In this case, we have  $p_i = P(\epsilon_i \geq -g(W_i, Y_i(1), Y_i(0)) \mid Y_i(\cdot), W_i)$ .<sup>2</sup>

**Notation:** Let  $N_1 := \sum_i D_i$  and  $N_0 := \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - D_i)$  respectively denote the number of treated and untreated units. We refer to the distribution of  $D$  given in (1) as the “randomization distribution”, and we denote probabilities over the randomization distribution by  $\mathbb{P}_R(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid \sum_{i=1}^N D_i = N_1, Y(\cdot))$ . We define expectations and variances,  $\mathbb{E}_R[\cdot]$  and  $\mathbb{V}_R[\cdot]$ , analogously. The unknown, marginal probability of treatment for unit  $i$  is  $\pi_i := \mathbb{P}_R(D_i = 1)$ , which is a function of the unconditional probabilities  $p_i$  introduced above.<sup>3</sup>

For non-stochastic weights  $w_i$  and a non-stochastic attribute  $X_i$  (such as a potential outcome), we define

$$\mathbb{E}_w[X_i] := \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i X_i \text{ and } \mathbb{V}_w[X_i] := \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i (X_i - \mathbb{E}_w[X_i])^2$$

to be the finite-population weighted expectation and variance respectively. The finite-population

---

<sup>2</sup>This interpretation connects our analysis to motivations for regression discontinuity designs that appeal to local randomization in the running variable (e.g., Cattaneo, Frandsen and Titiunik, 2015; Sekhon and Titiunik, 2017; Eckles, Ignatiadis, Wager and Wu, 2022). Empirical researchers often provide similar qualitative justifications based on implicit randomization for a wide variety of other quasi-experimental estimators such as difference-in-differences and instrumental variables estimators.

<sup>3</sup>When the finite population is large, Hajek (1964, Theorem 5) showed that the  $\pi_i$  are approximately equal to the  $p_i$  under a normalization so that  $\sum_i p_i = N_1$ . For our results, some of which are exact in finite-sample, it will typically be more useful to work with the marginal probabilities  $\pi_i$ .



weighted covariance  $\text{Cov}_w[\cdot, \cdot]$  is defined analogously. So, for example,  $\mathbb{E}_1[Y_i(0)] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(0)$  is the equal-weighted average of the untreated potential outcome across the  $N$  units in the finite population.

### 3 Difference in means estimator with unknown treatment probabilities

We first analyze the difference in means (DIM) estimator

$$\hat{\tau} := \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^N D_i Y_i - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - D_i) Y_i. \quad (2)$$

Since it has been extensively studied in completely randomized experiments, our results for the DIM enable us to draw connections to existing results in the design-based literature. Our analysis of the DIM directly applies to popular quasi-experimental estimators like the two-period difference-in-differences estimator (e.g., [Card and Krueger, 1994](#); [Bertrand et al., 2004](#)).

**Special case: difference-in-differences.** Suppose we observe aggregate outcomes of U.S. states over two periods  $t \in \{1, 2\}$ . Some states ( $D_i = 1$ ) are treated beginning in period 2, whereas other states ( $D_i = 0$ ) are untreated in both periods. The observed outcome for state  $i$  in period  $t$  is  $Y_{it} = D_i Y_{it}(1) + (1 - D_i) Y_{it}(0)$ . The DIM estimator for the first-differenced outcome  $Y_i := Y_{i2} - Y_{i1}$  is equivalent to the DID estimator between treated and control states,

$$\hat{\tau}_{DID} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i:D_i=1} (Y_{i2} - Y_{i1}) - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i:D_i=0} (Y_{i2} - Y_{i1})$$

Our analysis of the DIM estimator thus has immediate implications for the DID estimator, and we return to this special case throughout this section.  $\blacktriangle$

In [Section 5](#), we extend our analysis of the DIM to instrumental variable estimators (which can be viewed as the ratio of a reduced-form DIM and a first-stage DIM), and ordinary least squares regression adjustment (which can be viewed as a DIM with a covariate-adjusted outcome).

Appendix C generalizes our analysis to vector-valued outcomes, extending our results to difference-in-differences with multiple time periods and non-staggered adoption.

### 3.1 Expectation of the difference in means estimator

We next characterize the expectation of the DIM over the randomization distribution, analyzing its bias for design-based analogs to the average treatment effect and average treatment effect on the treated.

**Proposition 3.1.**

$$\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}] = \tau_{ATE} + \frac{N}{N_0} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(0)] + \frac{N}{N_1} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(1)] \quad (3)$$

$$= \tau_{EATT} + \frac{N}{N_0} \frac{N}{N_1} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(0)] \quad (4)$$

where, for  $\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$ ,  $\tau_{ATE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tau_i$  and  $\tau_{EATT} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i \tau_i = \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^N D_i \tau_i \right]$ .

The first line of Proposition 3.1 shows that the expectation of the DIM equals the finite-population average treatment effect,  $\tau_{ATE}$ , plus a bias term that depends on the finite-population covariances between the idiosyncratic treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  and the potential outcomes. The second line of Proposition 3.1 gives an alternative decomposition in terms of a design-based analog to the average treatment effect on the treated, which we refer to as the *expected* ATT (EATT). In particular,  $\tau_{EATT}$  is the expected value of what Imbens (2004) and Sekhon and Shem-Tov (2020) refer to as the “sample average treatment effect on the treated” (SATT) — i.e., the average treatment effect for the treated units in the sample — where the expectation is taken over the stochastic realization of which units are treated. This is a convex weighted average of the treatment effects  $\tau_i$ , where the weights are proportional to the idiosyncratic treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$ .

Proposition 3.1 immediately implies that the DIM will be unbiased over the randomization distribution if the finite-population covariance between idiosyncratic treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  and the untreated potential outcomes  $Y_i(0)$  is equal to zero, i.e.  $\sum_{i=1}^N (\pi_i - \frac{N_1}{N}) Y_i(0) = 0$ . This is, of course, satisfied in a completely randomized experiment with  $\pi_i \equiv \frac{N_1}{N}$ . It can also be

satisfied if the idiosyncratic treatment probabilities vary across units but in a way that is not systematically related to the untreated potential outcomes on average in the finite population. Proposition 3.1 analogously implies the DIM will be unbiased for the finite-population ATE if the finite-population covariance between  $\pi_i$  and both potential outcomes is zero.

**Special case: DID (continued).** Consider the two-period DID example introduced above. Impose the standard “no-anticipation” assumption that  $Y_{i1}(0) = Y_{i1}(1)$ , so that treatment status in period 2 has no impact on the outcome in period 1. Proposition 3.1 implies

$$\mathbb{E}_R [\hat{\tau}_{DID}] = \underbrace{\frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i \tau_{i2}}_{\tau_{EATT,2}} + \underbrace{\frac{N}{N_1} \frac{N}{N_0} \text{Cov}_1 [\pi_i, Y_{i2}(0) - Y_{i1}(0)]}_{\delta}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\tau_{i2} = Y_{i2}(1) - Y_{i2}(0)$  is unit  $i$ 's treatment effect in period 2. The expectation of the DID estimator is thus the sum of two terms. The first is the EATT in period 2,  $\tau_{EATT,2}$ . The second term,  $\delta$ , is proportional to the finite-population covariance between idiosyncratic treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  and trends in the untreated potential outcomes. Thus, the DID estimator is unbiased for  $\tau_{EATT}$  under the assumption that  $\delta = 0$ , which can be viewed as a finite-population analog to the parallel trends assumption — i.e., if idiosyncratic treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  are uncorrelated in the finite-population with changes in potential outcomes  $Y_{i2}(0) - Y_{i1}(0)$ .  $\blacktriangle$

**Remark 1** (Connection to omitted-variable bias formula). Proposition 3.1 can also be interpreted as a finite population version of the classic omitted variables bias formula for regression analyses. Focusing on  $\tau_{EATT}$ , define the errors  $\varepsilon_i^{Y(0)} = Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]$  and  $\varepsilon_i^\tau = \tau_i - \tau_{EATT}$  and rewrite the observed outcome for unit  $i$  as

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + D_i \tau_{EATT} + u_i, \quad (6)$$

where  $\beta_0 = \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]$  and  $u_i = \varepsilon_i^{Y(0)} + D_i \varepsilon_i^\tau$ . One can then show that the bias term for  $\tau_{EATT}$  given in Proposition 3.1 is equal to  $\mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{\text{Cov}_1 [D_i, u_i]}{\text{Var}_1 [D_i]} \right]$ , which in light of equation (6) coincides with the omitted variable bias formula for the coefficient on  $D_i$  in an OLS regression of  $Y_i$  on  $D_i$  and a constant.  $\blacksquare$

**Remark 2** (Sensitivity analysis). Proposition 3.1 can be used to conduct sensitivity analysis. For example, researchers could report how large  $\text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(0)]$  would need to be to produce a bias of a magnitude large enough to change a particular conclusion (e.g., the EATT is positive). Such a sensitivity analysis is related to, but different from existing finite population sensitivity analyses. Rosenbaum (1987, 2002, 2005) places bounds on the relative odds ratio of treatment between two units (i.e.,  $\frac{\pi_i(1-\pi_j)}{\pi_j(1-\pi_i)}$  for  $i \neq j$ ) and examines the extent to which the relative odds ratio must vary across units such that we no longer reject a particular sharp (Fisher) null of interest. Sensitivity analysis based on Proposition 3.1 thus differs from those proposed by Rosenbaum in two ways: first, it considers sensitivity of conclusions about a weak null hypothesis about an *average* treatment effect, rather than a sharp null; and second, it only requires the researcher to restrict a finite-population covariance, rather than restricting individual-level treatment probabilities. Sensitivity analysis based on Proposition 3.1 is also similar in spirit to that in Aronow and Lee (2013); Miratrix, Wager and Zubizarreta (2018), who consider bounds on a finite-population mean under unequal-probability sampling, where the sampling probabilities (analogous to  $p_i$ ) are restricted to an interval  $[p_{lb}, p_{ub}]$ . Their focus, however, is on the finite-population mean, rather than casual effects, and like with Rosenbaum sensitivity analyses their restrictions are on individual-level probabilities.<sup>4</sup> ■

## 3.2 Distribution of the difference in means estimator

We next analyze the behavior of  $\hat{\tau}$  over the randomization distribution. We show that when the finite population is large,  $\hat{\tau}$  is approximately normally distributed with a particular variance, and that the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator is a conservative estimator for this variance.

As a first step, we connect the problem of estimating treatment effects under the assignment mechanism (1) to that of sampling from a finite population with unequal probabilities, which was previously studied by Hajek (1964), Aronow and Lee (2013), and Miratrix et al. (2018). Specifically, the DIM estimator may be re-written as  $\hat{\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{D_i}{\pi_i} (\pi_i \tilde{Y}_i) - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(0)$ , where

---

<sup>4</sup>Proposition 3.1 could also be used for sensitivity analysis or partial identification of the EATT in DID designs, as in Manski and Pepper (2018) and Rambachan and Roth (2023).

$\tilde{Y}_i := \frac{1}{N_1}Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0}Y_i(0)$ .<sup>5</sup> The second term,  $\frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(0)$ , is non-stochastic, and therefore does not affect the variance (or higher-order moments) of the distribution of  $\hat{\tau}$ . The first term,  $\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{D_i}{\pi_i} (\pi_i \tilde{Y}_i)$ , is a Horvitz-Thompson estimator for the population total  $\sum_{i=1}^N (\pi_i \tilde{Y}_i)$  under what Hajek (1964) refers to as “rejective sampling,” where  $D$  follows (1) and  $D_i = 1$  corresponds with the event that unit  $i$  is included in the sample (rather than treated). We can therefore make use of results from Hajek (1964) on the distribution of the Horvitz-Thompson estimator under rejective sampling to analyze the behavior of the DIM over the randomization distribution.

### 3.2.1 Comparison of actual and estimated variance

The exact variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  depends on the second-order treatment probabilities,  $\mathbb{P}_R(D_i = 1, D_j = 1)$ , which in general are complicated functions of  $(p_1, \dots, p_N)$ . Fortunately, a simple approximation to the variance is available which becomes accurate when  $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{V}_R[D_i] = \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$  is large. The approximation we derive for the variance should therefore be accurate when the finite population is large and the treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  are not too close to 0 or 1 for all units.<sup>6</sup>

**Lemma 3.1** (Variance of the DIM).

$$\mathbb{V}_R[\hat{\tau}](1 + o(1)) = C \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{V}ar_{\tilde{\pi}}[Y_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0} \mathbb{V}ar_{\tilde{\pi}}[Y_i(0)] - \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{V}ar_{\tilde{\pi}}[\tau_i] \right], \quad (7)$$

where  $o(1) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\tilde{\pi}_i := \pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$ , and  $C := \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \pi_k(1 - \pi_k)}{\frac{N_0}{N} \frac{N_1}{N}} \leq 1$ .

Lemma 3.1 shows that the variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  depends on the weighted finite-population variances of the potential outcomes and the treatment effects, where unit  $i$  is weighted proportionally to the variance of their treatment status,  $\mathbb{V}_R[D_i] = \pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$ . The leading constant term  $C$  is less than or equal to one, with equality when  $\pi_i$  is constant across units. In the special case of a completely randomized experiment, the right-hand side of (7) therefore reduces to  $\left( \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{V}ar_1[Y_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0} \mathbb{V}ar_1[Y_i(0)] - \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{V}ar_1[\tau_i] \right)$ , which matches Neyman (1923)’s celebrated

<sup>5</sup>Our results can accommodate the case where  $\pi_i = 0$  for some  $i$ , if  $\frac{D_i}{\pi_i}$  is defined to be 0 whenever  $\pi_i = 0$ .

<sup>6</sup>Under the strong overlap condition that  $\pi_i \in [\eta, 1 - \eta]$  for some  $\eta > 0$  and all  $i$ , we would have that  $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{V}_R[D_i] = O(N)$ . Our results remain valid even if strong overlap fails and  $\pi_i$  is arbitrarily close to 0 or 1 for some units.

formula for completely randomized experiments up to a degrees-of-freedom correction.<sup>7</sup>

We can further provide an approximate expression for the expectation of the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator  $\hat{s}^2$  for  $\hat{\tau}$  (White, 1980). That is, define  $\hat{s}^2 = \frac{1}{N_1}\hat{s}_1^2 + \frac{1}{N_0}\hat{s}_0^2$ , where  $\hat{s}_1^2 := \frac{1}{N_1}\sum_i D_i(Y_i - \bar{Y}_1)^2$  and  $\hat{s}_0^2 := \frac{1}{N_0}\sum_i (1 - D_i)(Y_i - \bar{Y}_0)^2$  for  $\bar{Y}_1 := \frac{1}{N_1}\sum_i D_i Y_i$ ,  $\bar{Y}_0 := \frac{1}{N_0}\sum_i (1 - D_i)Y_i$ .

**Lemma 3.2.**

$$\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{s}^2](1 + o(1)) = \frac{1}{N_1}\mathbb{V}ar_\pi[Y_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0}\mathbb{V}ar_{1-\pi}[Y_i(0)], \quad (8)$$

where  $o(1)$  is as defined in Lemma 3.1.

Our next result shows that the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator  $\hat{s}^2$  is (weakly) conservative for the true variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  over the randomization distribution, up to the approximation errors described above.

**Proposition 3.2.** Let  $\mathbb{V}_R^{approx}[\hat{\tau}]$  denote the expression on the right-hand side of (7), and  $\mathbb{E}_R^{approx}[\hat{s}^2]$  the expression on the right-hand side of (8). We have that

$$\mathbb{E}_R^{approx}[\hat{s}^2] \geq \mathbb{V}_R^{approx}[\hat{\tau}].$$

Moreover, the inequality holds with equality if and only if

$$Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[Y_i(1)] = \frac{(1 - \pi_i)/\pi_i}{N_0/N_1} (Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi}[Y_i(0)]) \text{ for all } i. \quad (9)$$

In the case of a completely randomized experiment ( $\pi_i \equiv \frac{N_1}{N}$ ), (9) is satisfied if and only if treatment effects are constant, and thus Proposition 3.2 nests the well-known result from Neyman (1923) that in a completely randomized experiment, the usual variance estimator is weakly conservative, and is strictly conservative if and only if there are heterogeneous treatment effects (i.e.  $\mathbb{V}ar_1[\tau_i] > 0$ ).

Interestingly, Proposition 3.2 implies that  $\hat{s}^2$  will generally be strictly conservative whenever the marginal treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  differ across units, except in knife-edge cases. For the

---

<sup>7</sup>Note that  $\mathbb{V}ar_1[Y_i(d)] = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i(d) - \mathbb{E}_1[Y_i(d)])^2$ , which differs from the finite population variance used in Neyman (1923) by the degrees-of-freedom correction factor  $\frac{N}{N-1} = 1 + o(1)$ .

simple case in which treatment effects are constant, the following corollary establishes that the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator is strictly conservative if  $\pi_i \neq \frac{N_1}{N}$  for any unit  $i$  with  $Y_i(0) \neq \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]$ .<sup>8</sup>

**Corollary 3.1.** *If treatment effects are constant, i.e.  $Y_i(1) = \tau + Y_i(0)$  for all  $i$ , and  $\mathbb{E}_R [\hat{\tau}] = \tau$ , then the inequality in Proposition 3.2 holds with equality if and only if  $\pi_i = \frac{N_1}{N}$  for all  $i$  such that  $Y_i(0) \neq \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]$ .*

Thus, the usual variance estimator will typically be conservative even under constant treatment effects if the treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  differ across units. To develop intuition for this result, note that if  $\pi_i$  converges to either zero or one, then  $\mathbb{V}_R [D_i] = \pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$  converges to zero. Thus, when all idiosyncratic treatment probabilities are close to either zero or one, the variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  over the randomization distribution is small. It is perhaps less obvious that the variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  is in fact maximized when all treatment probabilities are equal (as in a randomized experiment) under constant treatment effects. Notice, however, that the sum of the variances of the treatments,  $\sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$ , is maximized when  $\pi_i = N_1/N$  for all  $i$ , by Jensen's inequality.<sup>9</sup> The average variance of the treatments is therefore largest when the idiosyncratic treatment probabilities are equal. The proofs of Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.1 establish that this is sufficient for the variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  to be maximized under equal treatment probabilities.

The proof of Proposition 3.2 suggests that the conservativeness of  $\hat{s}^2$  will tend to be larger when there is more heterogeneity in  $\pi_i$ . For example, under the setting in Corollary 3.1,  $\mathbb{E}_R^{approx} [\hat{s}^2] - \mathbb{V}_R^{approx} [\hat{\tau}]$  is bounded below by a term proportional to  $\mathbb{V}_1[(\pi_i - \frac{N_1}{N}) \cdot (Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)])]$ . Thus,  $\hat{s}^2$  will tend to be quite conservative when the heterogeneity in  $\pi_i$  is large, especially if  $\pi_i - \frac{N_1}{N}$  is large for units with extreme values of  $Y_i(0)$ . The fact that conventional variance estimates tend to become more conservative when the  $\pi_i$  are more heterogeneous has important implications for the coverage of conventional confidence intervals, as we formalize next and explore in Monte Carlo simulations below.

---

<sup>8</sup>If treatment effects are not constant, then it is possible that the estimated variance is non-conservative with heterogeneous  $\pi_i$ . This requires the knife-edge scenario where (9) holds for all  $i$ , i.e. for all units, the distance between  $Y_i(1)$  and its finite-population mean is exactly equal to the product of a term capturing the deviation of  $\pi_i$  from  $\frac{N_1}{N}$  (i.e.  $\frac{(1-\pi_i)/\pi_i}{N_1/N_0}$ ) and the deviation of  $Y_i(0)$  from its finite-population mean.

<sup>9</sup>Specifically, if  $X$  is uniformly distributed on  $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N\}$  and  $g(x) = x(1-x)$ , then  $E[g(X)] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \pi_i(1-\pi_i) \leq g(E[X]) = \frac{N_1}{N} \frac{N_0}{N}$ .

**Special case: DID (continued)** In the running DID example, the variance estimator  $\hat{s}^2$  is equivalent to the cluster-robust (at the unit level) variance estimator for  $\hat{\tau}_{DID}$  from the OLS panel regression

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \lambda_t + D_i \cdot 1[t = 2]\tau_{DID} + \epsilon_{it}. \quad (10)$$

Therefore, Proposition 3.2 implies that the cluster-robust variance estimator for  $\hat{\tau}_{DID}$  is weakly conservative for the variance of the DID estimator over the randomization distribution, and will typically be strictly conservative if treatment probabilities differ across units.  $\blacktriangle$

### 3.2.2 Asymptotic normality, variance consistency, and confidence intervals

Our results so far imply that the typical variance estimator will be conservative in the sense that its expectation is weakly larger than the true variance of  $\hat{\tau}$  (up to an  $o(1)$  approximation error). This suggests that standard confidence intervals based on  $\hat{s}$  will be conservative for  $\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}]$  if (i)  $\hat{\tau}$  is approximately normally distributed, and (ii)  $\hat{s}^2$  is close to its expectation with high probability. Our next results show that both will be true in large finite populations satisfying certain regularity conditions.

To formalize this argument, we consider sequences of finite populations indexed by  $m$  of size  $N_m$ , with  $N_{1m}$  treated units, potential outcomes  $\{Y_{im}(\cdot) : i = 1, \dots, N_m\}$ , and assignment probabilities  $\pi_{1m}, \dots, \pi_{N_m}$ . For brevity, we leave the subscript  $m$  implicit in our notation; all limits are implicitly taken as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . We establish a central limit theorem (CLT) and variance consistency result under mild regularity conditions on the sequence of finite populations. These results provide an approximation to the properties of  $\hat{\tau}$  for finite populations with a sufficiently large number of units (see Remark 3 below for a bound on the approximation quality). Our results extend existing finite population central limit theorems for randomized experiments (e.g. Freedman, 2008; Lin, 2013; Li and Ding, 2017) to our more complicated setting with idiosyncratic treatment probabilities.

We impose the following assumptions on the sequence of finite populations.

**Assumption 3.1.**

$$(a) \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \rightarrow \infty.$$



(b) Let  $\tilde{Y}_i = \frac{1}{N_1}Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0}Y_i(0)$ , and assume  $\sigma_{\tilde{\pi}}^2 = \text{Var}_{\tilde{\pi}}[\tilde{Y}_i] > 0$ . Suppose that for all  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{\tilde{\pi}}^2} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \left( \tilde{Y}_i - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}}[\tilde{Y}_i] \right)^2 \mathbb{1} \left[ \left| \tilde{Y}_i - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}}[\tilde{Y}_i] \right| > \sqrt{\sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i)} \cdot \sigma_{\tilde{\pi}} \epsilon \right] \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

(c) Define  $m_N(1) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} (Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[Y_i(1)])^2$  and  $m_N(0) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} (Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi}[Y_i(0)])^2$ .

Assume that,

$$\frac{1}{N_1} \frac{m_N(1)}{\text{Var}_{\pi}[Y_i(1)]} \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \frac{1}{N_0} \frac{m_N(0)}{\text{Var}_{1-\pi}[Y_i(0)]} \rightarrow 0.$$

Recall  $\pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$  is the variance of the Bernoulli random variable  $D_i$ , so Assumption 3.1(a) implies that the sum of the variances of the  $D_i$  grows large. It also implies that both  $N_1$  and  $N_0$  go to infinity, since  $\sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \leq \min\{\sum_i \pi_i, \sum_i (1 - \pi_i)\} = \min\{N_1, N_0\}$ . Assumption 3.1(b) is similar to the condition for the Lindeberg central limit theorem, and imposes that the weighted finite-population variance of  $\tilde{Y}_i$  is not dominated by a small number of observations. Assumption 3.1(c) bounds the influence that any single observation has on the  $\pi$ - and  $(1 - \pi)$ -weighted variances of the potential outcomes. This generalizes the assumptions in Theorem 1 in Li and Ding (2017), which establishes consistency of the Neyman variance under equal-probability sampling from a finite population.

Under the conditions introduced above, we establish a finite-population CLT and a consistency result for the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Suppose Assumptions 3.1(a) and 3.1(b) hold. Then,*

$$\frac{\hat{\tau} - \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}]}{\sqrt{\overline{\text{Var}}_R^{\text{approx}}[\hat{\tau}]}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Further, under Assumptions 3.1(a) and 3.1(c),

$$\frac{\hat{s}^2}{\frac{1}{N_1} \text{Var}_{\pi}[Y_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0} \text{Var}_{1-\pi}[Y_i(0)]} \xrightarrow{p} 1.$$

These results allow us to formalize the conditions under which conventional confidence intervals of the form  $\hat{\tau} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \cdot \hat{s}$  will be valid for  $\tau_{EATT}$  (or  $\tau_{ATE}$ ) when the finite population is

large, where  $z_{1-\alpha/2}$  is the  $1 - \alpha/2$  quantile of the standard normal distribution.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Suppose Assumptions 3.1(a)-(c) hold, and that (i)  $\frac{b}{\sqrt{\mathbb{V}_R^{approx}[\hat{\tau}]}} \rightarrow b^* \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $b = \frac{N}{N_1} \frac{N}{N_0} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(0)]$  is the bias of  $\hat{\tau}$  for the EATT; and (ii)  $\sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{V}_R^{approx}[\hat{\tau}]}{\mathbb{E}_R^{approx}[\hat{s}^2]}} \rightarrow r \in (0, 1]$ .*

Then,

$$\frac{\hat{\tau} - \tau_{EATT}}{\hat{s}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(b^* \cdot r, r^2),$$

and  $\hat{\tau} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \cdot \hat{s}$  has asymptotic coverage for  $\tau_{EATT}$  approaching

$$\Phi\left(\frac{z_{1-\alpha/2}}{r} - b^*\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{-z_{1-\alpha/2}}{r} - b^*\right). \quad (11)$$

The analogous result holds for  $\tau_{ATE}$ , replacing  $b$  with  $\frac{N}{N_1} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(1)] + \frac{N}{N_0} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(0)]$ .

Condition (i) of Proposition 3.4 imposes that the sequence of finite populations is such that the bias of  $\hat{\tau}$  is of the same order of magnitude as its standard deviation over the randomization distribution (i.e. local to zero). Condition (ii) of the proposition imposes that the conservativeness of the typical variance estimator stabilizes asymptotically (recall  $\mathbb{E}_R^{approx}[\hat{s}^2] \geq \mathbb{V}_R^{approx}[\hat{\tau}]$  by Proposition 3.2).

When  $\hat{\tau}$  is unbiased, so that  $b^* = 0$ , Proposition 3.4 shows that confidence intervals based on the normal approximation will have correct but generally conservative coverage. Thus, in the running DID example, confidence intervals based on cluster-robust standard-errors for the OLS specification (10) will have asymptotically correct but typically conservative coverage for  $\tau_{EATT,2}$  under the design-based analog to the parallel trends assumption ( $\delta = 0$ ) discussed in Section 3.1.

Proposition 3.4 also implies that conventional confidence intervals will have correct coverage when the bias of  $\hat{\tau}$  is sufficiently small relative to the conservativeness of the variance estimator. Since the expression for coverage in (11) is continuous in  $b^*$  and is strictly above the nominal level when  $r < 1$  and  $b^* = 0$ , it follows that coverage will still be correct when  $b^*$  is non-zero but sufficiently small. A sufficient condition to ensure at least 95% coverage is that  $|b^*| \leq z_{0.975} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{r} - 1\right)$ . Conventional confidence intervals can therefore accommodate some bias owing to the fact that heterogeneity in treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  or heterogeneous effects  $\tau_i$  typically induces conservativeness of the variance estimator.

**Remark 3.** In Appendix B, we show that these asymptotic results translate to Berry-Esseen type bounds on the approximation quality of the CLT in any finite population of fixed size. This result establishes that the distribution of  $\hat{\tau}$  will be approximately normally distributed in finite populations that are sufficiently large (relative to the fourth moment of the potential outcomes), without appealing to arguments involving a sequence of finite populations of increasing size. This result may be of independent interest.

## 4 Monte Carlo simulations

In this section, we conduct Monte Carlo simulations based on the Quarterly Workforce Indicators (QWI) from the Longitudinal Household-Employer Dynamics (LEHD) Program at the U.S. Census (United States Bureau of the Census, 2022). The QWI provides aggregate statistics from the LEHD linked employer-employee microdata, which covers over 95% of all private sector jobs in the United States. It is therefore more natural to view the uncertainty in analyses of the QWI as arising from the stochastic nature of treatment assignment rather than sampling from a super-population.<sup>10</sup> In our simulations, we view uncertainty as arising from the stochastic realization of state-level policy changes and consider a researcher that reports causal estimates based on a DID estimator between treated and untreated states.

**Simulation design:** Our simulation design mimics a state-level DID analysis. We use aggregate data on the 50 U.S. states and Washington D.C. from the QWI (indexed by  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) for the first quarter of 2012 and 2016 (indexed by  $t = 1, 2$ ). In our baseline specification, for each state and year, we set the potential outcomes  $Y_{it}(1)$  and  $Y_{it}(0)$  equal to the state’s observed outcome in the QWI ( $Y_{it}$ ). This imposes the sharp null that our simulated treatments have no effect for any state, and so  $\tau_{EATT,2} = \tau_{ATE,2} = 0$ . See below for an extension with heterogeneous treatment effects. The potential outcomes are held fixed throughout our simulations; the simulation draws differ in that each corresponds with a different realization of the generated placebo laws  $D = (D_1, \dots, D_N)'$ .

---

<sup>10</sup>The LEHD program even writes, “Because the estimates are not derived from a probability-based sample, no sampling error measures are applicable” (United States Bureau of the Census, 2022).

We simulate  $D$  from the assignment mechanism (1). We draw  $D_1, \dots, D_N$  as independent Bernoulli random variables with (unconditional) state-level treatment probabilities  $p_i$ , discarding any draws where  $\sum_i D_i \neq N_1$ . The state-level treatment probabilities  $p_i$  are chosen such that, for some  $p^1 \in [0, 1]$ , states that voted for Clinton in the 2016 presidential election have  $p_i = p^1$ , and states that voted for Trump have  $p_i = 1 - p^1$ .<sup>11</sup> Thus, when  $p^1 = 0.5$ , all states have the same probability of adopting treatment, as in a completely randomized experiment, whereas when  $p^1 > 0.5$ , Democratic states are more likely to adopt the treatment. We report results as  $p^1$  varies over  $p^1 \in \{0.50, 0.75, 0.90\}$  and fix the number of treated and untreated states at  $N_1 = 25$  and  $N_0 = 26$ , respectively.

For each draw of the assignment vector, we calculate the DID estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{DID}$  and a nominal 95% confidence interval of the form  $\hat{\tau}_{DID} \pm z_{0.975} \cdot \hat{s}$ , where  $\hat{s}$  is the heteroskedasticity-robust standard error for the first-differenced outcome (equivalently, the cluster-robust standard error for specification (10)). We report results for two choices of the outcome  $Y_{it}$ . The first outcome is when  $Y_{it}$  corresponds with the log employment level for state  $i$  in period  $t$ . The second is when  $Y_{it}$  is the log of state-level average monthly earnings for state  $i$  in year  $t$ .

**Simulation results:** We first report the bias of the DID estimator. While the placebo law has no treatment effect for any state, the change in untreated potential outcomes  $Y_{i2}(0) - Y_{i1}(0)$  varies across states in a way that is related to state-level voting patterns in the 2016 presidential election. As a result, the design-based parallel trends assumption,  $\text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_{i2}(0) - Y_{i1}(0)] = 0$ , is violated when  $p^1 \neq 0.5$ , and hence the DID estimator is biased for the EATT over the randomization distribution in these simulations. The first row of Table 1 reports the normalized bias of the DID estimator (i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}] / \sqrt{\text{Var}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]}$ ) as  $p^1$  varies for both of these two outcomes. The case  $p^1 = 0.5$  corresponds with a completely randomized experiment, and thus the bias is zero up to simulation error. The magnitude of the bias increases as we increase  $p^1$ , since the average value of  $Y_{i2}(0) - Y_{i1}(0)$  differs between Democratic and Republican states for both of our outcomes. The magnitude of the bias (relative to the standard deviation of the DID estimator) is smaller for the log employment outcome than for the log earnings outcome.

---

<sup>11</sup>We collect the state-level results from the 2016 presidential election from the MIT Election Data and Science Lab (MIT Election Data and Science Lab, 2022).

	p <sub>1</sub>				p <sub>1</sub>		
	0.50	0.75	0.90		0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	0.013	0.250	0.525	Normalized bias	0.004	0.882	1.871
Variance conservativeness	0.976	1.315	2.303	Variance conservativeness	0.987	1.383	2.541
Coverage	0.939	0.967	0.991	Coverage	0.944	0.917	0.888
Oracle coverage	0.949	0.943	0.917	Oracle coverage	0.952	0.854	0.516


(a) Log employment

(b) Log earnings

Table 1: Normalized bias, variance conservativeness, and coverage in Monte Carlo simulations.

Notes: Row 1 reports the normalized bias of the DID estimator ( $\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]/\sqrt{\text{Var}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]}$ ) for the EATT over the randomization distribution. Row 2 reports the estimated ratio  $\frac{\mathbb{E}_R[s^2]}{\text{Var}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]}$  across simulations, which measures the conservativeness of the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator. Row 3 reports the coverage rate of a nominal 95% confidence interval of the form  $\hat{\tau}_{DID} \pm z_{0.975} \hat{s}$ . The columns report results as the idiosyncratic treatment probability for Democratic states,  $p^1$ , varies over  $\{0.5, 0.75, 0.9\}$ . Row 4 reports the coverage rate of an “oracle” 95% confidence interval that uses the true variance rather than an estimated one,  $\hat{\tau}_{DID} \pm z_{0.975} \sqrt{\text{Var}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]}$ . The results are computed over 5,000 simulations with  $N_1 = 25$ .

Figure 1: Behavior of DID estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{DID}$  over the randomization distribution.



Notes: This figure plots the behavior of the DID estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{DID}$  over the randomization distribution. The idiosyncratic treatment probability for Democratic states,  $p^1$ , varies over  $\{0.5, 0.75, 0.9\}$  (colors), holding fixed the number of treated units  $N_1 = 25$ . The results are computed over 5,000 simulations. The vertical dashed lines show the mean of the  $t$ -statistic for the relevant parameter values.

Figure 1 plots the distribution of the DID estimator over the randomization distribution. As we increase  $p^1$ , (i) the DID estimator becomes more biased, but (ii) the distribution of the DID estimator is less-dispersed, which leads the usual variance estimator to be conservative. The distributions are also approximately normally distributed, illustrating the CLT from Section 3.2.

The conservativeness of the usual heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator is captured more directly in the second row of Table 1, which shows the ratio of the average estimated variance for  $\hat{\tau}$  to the actual variance of the estimator,  $\frac{\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{s}^2]}{\text{Var}_R[\hat{\tau}]}$ . Recall Proposition 3.2 and Corollary 3.1 established that  $\hat{s}^2$  will typically be conservative for the true variance of the DID estimator over the randomization distribution (in the sense that  $\frac{\mathbb{E}_R^{approx}[\hat{s}^2]}{\text{Var}_R^{approx}[\hat{\tau}]} > 1$ ) when there is heterogeneity in the idiosyncratic treatment probabilities. Indeed, this is exactly what we observe. For simulations with  $p^1 = 0.5$  (i.e., no heterogeneity in idiosyncratic treatment probabilities),  $\hat{s}^2$  is, on average, approximately equal to the true variance of the DID estimator. As  $p^1$  increases, however, it becomes more conservative: in the most extreme case when  $p^1 = 0.9$ , the average estimated variance is approximately 2.5 times as large as the true variance. Recall that in our baseline specification, treatment effects are zero for all units, and thus this conservativeness is the result of heterogeneity in the  $\pi_i$  rather than in treatment effects.

The third row of Table 1 reports the coverage of a standard 95% confidence interval (i.e., the fraction of simulations in which the confidence interval covers the true EATT of zero). For the case with  $p^1 = 0.5$ , which corresponds with a completely randomized experiment, the standard confidence intervals have approximately 95% coverage for both outcomes. As we increase  $p^1$ , there is a tradeoff between the fact that the estimator is biased (which leads to lower coverage) and the fact that the variance estimator is conservative (which leads to higher coverage), as formalized in Proposition 3.4. For the log earnings outcome, the bias dominates and coverage decreases in  $p^1$  — coverage of the EATT is only about 88.8% when  $p^1 = 0.9$ . By contrast, for the state-level log average employment outcome, the bias is smaller, and so the conservativeness of the variance estimator dominates. Remarkably, when  $p^1 = 0.9$ , the coverage rate is 99.1% owing to the conservativeness of the variance estimator, despite the fact that the design-based analog to parallel trends does not hold exactly.

Finally, the last row of Table 1 reports the coverage of an “oracle” 95% confidence interval

that uses the true variance of the DID estimator over the randomization distribution instead of the estimated variance  $\hat{s}^2$ , which enables us to examine the impact of the conservative variance estimator on coverage. When  $p^1 = 0.9$  for log-earnings, for example, coverage would be only 51.6% using the oracle variance, but is 88.8% using the conventional conservative variance estimator. The conservativeness of the variance estimator thus helps to mitigate the undercoverage caused by the bias from selection in this example.

Appendix E presents several extensions to these simulations. We consider simulation designs that vary the number of treated units, with similar results. We also consider designs with treatment effect heterogeneity, which we find leads conventional confidence intervals to be even more conservative. Finally, we consider designs with varying population sizes, and find that the normal approximation works fairly well with as few as 26 states, but becomes less accurate with only 10.

## 5 Extensions

In this section, we present three brief extensions. First, we analyze instrumental variable estimators, where the stochastic nature of the data now arises from some instrument. Applying our omitted variables bias formula, we provide conditions under which the IV estimand has a causal interpretation as an instrument-propensity weighted local average treatment effect. Second, we consider whether OLS regression adjustment can address the bias of the DIM estimator derived in Proposition 3.1, providing two characterizations of the covariate-adjusted DIM estimand with unknown treatment probabilities. Third, we consider settings where treatment is assigned at the cluster level, and show that the cluster-robust variance estimator (clustered at the level at which treatment is assigned) is valid but potentially conservative from the design-based perspective when the number of clusters is large.

These extensions are direct consequences of our general results for vector-valued outcomes and OLS estimators under clustered treatment assignments that we present in Appendix C and Appendix D respectively.

## 5.1 Instrumental variables

In empirical research, researchers often argue that there exists an instrumental variable  $Z_i$  for the treatment that is at least partially determined by random factors. For example, Angrist and Evans (1998) consider having twins at a woman’s second birth as an instrument for whether the woman has a third child. The birth of twins is generated at least in part by idiosyncratic biological factors, such as whether a fertilized egg splits in two. However, in many contexts we might be concerned that although the instrument is determined by idiosyncratic factors, different individuals may have different probabilities of realizing idiosyncratic factors such that  $Z_i = 1$ . For example, individuals attempting in-vitro fertilization have a higher probability of giving birth to twins.<sup>12</sup> In this section, we consider a design-based analysis of two-stage least squares instrumental variables (IV) in which the probability of receiving  $Z_i = 1$  differs across units, thus relaxing the usual independence assumption made in IV contexts.

Let  $Z_i \in \{0, 1\}$  be an instrument,  $D_i(z) \in \{0, 1\}$  be the potential treatment status for  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ , and  $Y_i(d)$  be the potential outcome for  $d \in \{0, 1\}$ . The notation  $Y_i(d)$  encodes the exclusion restriction that the instrument  $Z_i$  only causally affects the outcome through the treatment  $D_i$ . We also maintain the typical monotonicity assumption:  $D_i(1) \geq D_i(0)$  for all units  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . The observed data is  $(Y_i, D_i, Z_i)$ , where  $Y_i = Y_i(D_i(Z_i))$  and  $D_i = D_i(Z_i)$  for each unit.

We now view the instrument as stochastic, holding fixed (i.e. conditioning on) the potential treatments  $D(\cdot) = \{D_i(\cdot) : i = 1, \dots, N\}$  and potential outcomes  $Y(\cdot) = \{Y_i(\cdot) : i = 1, \dots, N\}$ . In canonical IV frameworks, the instrument is typically assumed to be independent of the potential treatments and outcomes (see, e.g., Angrist and Imbens (1994) for a sampling-based setting, and Kang et al. (2018) for a design-based setting).<sup>13</sup> We instead allow the probability that  $Z_i = 1$  to vary across units and to be arbitrarily related to the potential treatments and outcomes. Let  $N_1^Z$  be the number of units with  $Z_i = 1$  and  $N_0^Z$  be the number of units with  $Z_i = 0$ . We conduct our analysis conditional on  $N_1^Z$ . The assignment of the instrument  $Z_i$  mimics the assignment

---

<sup>12</sup>A second motivating example is where an offer to participate in the treatment was initially assigned by randomization, but administrators non-randomly override the initial assignment, as occurred in the Perry Preschool experiment (Heckman, Moon, Pinto, Savelyev and Yavitz, 2010).

<sup>13</sup>Hong, Leung and Li (2020) consider a design-based IV setting where the instrument is randomly assigned within strata defined by observable characteristics.



mechanism in (1) and satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z = z \mid \sum_i Z_i = N_1^Z, D(\cdot), Y(\cdot)\right) \propto \prod_i p_i^{z_i} (1 - p_i)^{1 - z_i} \quad (12)$$

for all  $Z \in \{0, 1\}^N$  such that  $\sum_i z_i = N_1^Z$ , and zero otherwise. To avoid additional notation, let  $\mathbb{P}_R(\cdot)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_R[\cdot]$ ,  $\mathbb{V}_R[\cdot]$  now denote probabilities, expectations, and variances respectively under the randomization distribution (12). Denote the marginal instrument probability as  $\pi_i^Z := \mathbb{P}_R(Z_i = 1)$ . Our framework thus nests the design-based IV setting studied in Kang et al. (2018) as the special case where  $\pi_i^Z = \frac{N_1^Z}{N}$  for all  $i$ .

Consider the popular two-stage least-squares (2SLS) estimator, defined as  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} := \hat{\tau}_{RF}/\hat{\tau}_{FS}$  with

$$\hat{\tau}_{RF} = \frac{1}{N_1^Z} \sum_i Z_i Y_i - \frac{1}{N_0^Z} \sum_i (1 - Z_i) Y_i \text{ and } \hat{\tau}_{FS} := \frac{1}{N_1^Z} \sum_i Z_i D_i - \frac{1}{N_0^Z} \sum_i (1 - Z_i) D_i.$$

In order to analyze the behavior of  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  over the randomization distribution, observe that  $\hat{\tau}_{RF}$  is a DIM estimator for the “reduced-form” effect of  $Z_i$  on  $Y_i$ , whereas  $\hat{\tau}_{FS}$  is a DIM estimator for the “first-stage” effect of  $Z_i$  on  $D_i$ . Proposition 3.1 and the monotonicity assumption therefore together imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{RF}] &= \frac{1}{N_1^Z} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \pi_i^Z (Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)) + \frac{N}{N_1^Z} \frac{N}{N_0^Z} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i^Z, Y_i(D_i(0))] \\ \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{FS}] &= \frac{1}{N_1^Z} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \pi_i^Z + \frac{N}{N_1^Z} \frac{N}{N_0^Z} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i^Z, D_i(0)], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{C} := \{i: D_i(1) > D_i(0)\}$  is the set of complier units. The 2SLS estimand is  $\beta_{2SLS} := \frac{\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{RF}]}{\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{FS}]}$ .

The generalization of our results to vector-valued outcomes in Appendix C implies that  $\hat{\beta}_{2SLS}$  is normally distributed around  $\beta_{2SLS}$  in large finite-populations. Concretely, if the sequence of finite-populations satisfies the assumptions in Proposition C.1(4), then

$$\sqrt{N} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}_{RF} - \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{RF}] \\ \hat{\tau}_{FS} - \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{FS}] \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_\tau),$$

where  $\Sigma_\tau = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N \mathbb{V}_R \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\tau}_{RF} \\ \hat{\tau}_{FS} \end{pmatrix} \right]$ . Assuming further that the sequence of finite-populations satisfies  $(\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{RF}], \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{FS}]) \rightarrow (\tau_{RF}^*, \tau_{FS}^*)$  with  $\tau_{FS}^* > 0$ , then the uniform delta method (e.g., Theorem 3.8 in van der Vaart (2000)) implies that<sup>14</sup>

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\beta}_{2SLS} - \beta_{2SLS}) \rightarrow_d N(0, g' \Sigma_\tau g),$$

where  $g$  is the gradient of  $h(x, y) = x/y$  evaluated at  $(\tau_{RF}^*, \tau_{FS}^*)$ . Typical standard errors for IV will therefore be correct for  $\beta_{2SLS}$  but potentially conservative from the design-based view in large finite-populations with a strong first-stage.

What is the causal interpretation of the estimand  $\beta_{2SLS}$ ? Notice that if  $\pi_i^Z \equiv \frac{N_i^Z}{N}$ , so that all units receive  $Z = 1$  with equal probability, then  $\beta_{2SLS} = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{i \in C} (Y_i(1) - Y_i(0))$ , which is a design-based analog to the canonical local average treatment effect (LATE) for compliers (Angrist, Imbens and Rubin, 1996; Kang et al., 2018). Our results also imply that  $\beta_{2SLS}$  maintains a causal interpretation under the weaker restriction  $\text{Cov}_1[\pi_i^Z, Y_i(D_i(0))] = \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i^Z, D_i(0)] = 0$ , which only requires the probability that  $Z_i = 1$  to be orthogonal to the potential outcomes and potential treatments associated with  $Z_i = 0$ . Under this assumption,

$$\beta_{2SLS} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i \in C} \pi_i^Z} \sum_{i \in C} \pi_i^Z (Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)),$$

and thus the parameter  $\beta_{2SLS}$  is a weighted average treatment effect among the compliers. The weights given to each complier are proportional to  $\pi_i^Z$ , the probability that  $Z_i = 1$  under the assignment mechanism (12).

---

<sup>14</sup>It is well-known in sampling-based instrumental variables settings that the delta method fails under “weak-instrument asymptotics” in which  $\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{FS}]$  drifts towards zero (Staiger and Stock, 1997). Similar issues apply here. However, the test static used to form Anderson-Rubin confidence intervals, which are robust to weak identification, can be written as a quadratic form in a DIM statistic (see, e.g., Li and Ding (2017)). Our results could thus also be applied to analyze the properties of Anderson-Rubin based CIs under weak identification asymptotics.

## 5.2 Linear regression adjustment

Suppose each unit  $i$  is associated with a vector of fixed covariates  $W_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$  that are unaffected by the treatment. We consider the ordinary least squares estimator that adjusts for these fixed covariates, i.e. the OLS regression of the observed outcome on a constant, the treatment indicator  $D_i$ , and the fixed covariates  $W_i$ . Our next result provides two characterizations of the causal interpretation of the estimand associated with the OLS coefficient on the treatment indicator in such a regression. This is sometimes referred to as the “covariate-adjusted” DIM, and was studied in the case of completely randomized experiments by [Freedman \(2008\)](#) and [Lin \(2013\)](#), among others; our results extend the study of this estimator to settings where treatment probabilities are unknown and may differ across units.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Assume  $\mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (1, D_i, W_i)' (1, D_i, W_i) \right]$  is invertible. Let  $\beta_D$  denote the coefficient on  $D_i$  in the best linear projection of  $Y_i$  on  $(1, D_i, X_i)'$  over the randomization distribution. Then,*

(1)

$$\beta_D = \tau_{EATT} + \frac{N}{N_1} \frac{N}{N_0} \text{Cov}_1 [\pi_i, Y_i(0) - \gamma' W_i],$$

where  $\gamma = \theta \gamma(1) + (1 - \theta) \gamma(0)$  for  $\theta = \left( \frac{N_1}{N} \text{Var}_\pi [W_i] + \frac{N_0}{N} \text{Var}_{1-\pi} [W_i] \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{N_1}{N} \text{Var}_\pi [W_i] \right)$ ,  $\gamma(1) = \text{Var}_\pi [W_i]^{-1} \text{Cov}_\pi [W_i, Y_i(1)]$ , and  $\gamma(0) = \text{Var}_{1-\pi} [W_i]^{-1} \text{Cov}_{1-\pi} [W_i, Y_i(0)]$ .

(2)

$$\beta_D = \tau_{OLS} + \mathbb{E}_1 [\pi_i (1 - \hat{\pi}_i)]^{-1} \text{Cov}_1 [\pi_i - \hat{\pi}_i, Y_i(0)]$$

where  $\bar{W}_i = (1, W_i)'$  and  $\hat{\pi}_i = \omega' \bar{W}_i$  for  $\omega = \mathbb{E}_1 [\bar{W}_i \bar{W}_i']^{-1} \mathbb{E}_1 [\bar{W}_i \pi_i]$ , and  $\tau_{OLS} = \mathbb{E}_1 [\pi_i (1 - \hat{\pi}_i)]^{-1} \mathbb{E}_1 [\pi_i (1 - \hat{\pi}_i) \tau_i]$ .

Proposition 5.1(1) establishes that the estimand associated with the regression adjusted DIM estimator can be decomposed into the EATT plus a bias term that depends on the finite-population covariance between the treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  and a covariate-adjusted untreated potential outcome  $Y_i(0) - \gamma' W_i$ . The coefficient  $\gamma$  is a weighted average of the ( $\pi$ -weighted) projection of  $Y_i(1)$  onto  $W_i$  and the corresponding ( $(1 - \pi)$ -weighted) projection of  $Y_i(0)$  on  $W_i$ .

This characterization of the regression adjusted DIM estimator’s bias can therefore be again interpreted as a omitted variable type formula.

Proposition 5.1(2) provides an alternative decomposition for the regression adjusted DIM estimator. In particular, it establishes that  $\beta_D$  is the sum of two terms. The first,  $\tau_{OLS}$ , is a weighted average of treatment effects with weights proportional to  $\pi_i(1 - \hat{\pi}_i)$ , where  $\hat{\pi}_i$  is the prediction of the best linear predictor of  $\pi_i$  given the covariates  $\bar{W}_i$ . The second term is a bias term that depends on the covariance between  $Y_i(0)$  and  $\pi_i - \hat{\pi}_i$ , i.e. the difference between the actual treatment probability  $\pi_i$  and the best linear prediction given the covariates  $\hat{\pi}_i$ . In the special case where the  $\pi_i$  are linear in observed covariates, we have that  $\hat{\pi}_i = \pi_i$ , in which case Proposition 5.1(2) implies  $\beta_D = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}}[\tau_i]$ . This is a weighted average of treatment effects with weights proportional to the variance of the treatment indicator,  $\tilde{\pi}_i = \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) = \mathbb{V}_R[D_i]$ . This result thus nests as a special case the finding that when the propensity score is linear, OLS gives a variance-weighted average of treatment effects; see Angrist (1998) and Abadie et al. (2020) for similar results in a super-population and design-based setting, respectively. Our more general results, however, provide an interpretation of the OLS estimand even when the propensity score is non-linear.

In Appendix D, we provide regularity conditions under which  $\sqrt{N}(\hat{\beta}_D - \beta_D)$  is asymptotically normally distributed, and show that the typical heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are consistent for an upper bound on the asymptotic variance.<sup>15</sup>

### 5.3 Clustered treatment assignment

Suppose each unit  $i = 1, \dots, N$  belongs to one of  $C$  clusters, where  $c(i)$  denotes the cluster membership of unit  $i$  and  $N_c$  is the number of units in cluster  $c$ . We now assume treatment is assigned at the cluster level, and  $D := (D_1, \dots, D_C)'$  collects the cluster-level treatment assignments. For example, units  $i$  may be individuals living in states  $c(i)$ , while policy is determined at the state level. Now let  $C_1 := \sum_c D_c$  and  $C_0 := \sum_c (1 - D_c)$  denote the number of treated and untreated clusters respectively. We assume the clustered treatment assignments

---

<sup>15</sup>Although OLS is consistent in an experiment (i.e., when  $\pi_i = \frac{N_i}{N}$  for all  $i$ ), Freedman (2008) and Lin (2013) showed that the OLS estimator is biased for the ATE over the randomization distribution. This bias, however, is  $O(N^{-1})$ , and thus is second-order under conventional asymptotics.

follows the data-generating process

$$\mathbb{P}\left(D = d \mid \sum_c D_c = N_1^C, Y(\cdot)\right) \propto \prod_c p_c^{d_c} (1 - p_c)^{1 - d_c}. \quad (13)$$

Let  $\pi_c := \mathbb{P}_R(D_c = 1)$  denote the marginal treatment probability for cluster  $c$  under (13). Let  $D_i = D_{c(i)}$  denote unit  $i$ 's treatment assignment. Note that we now hold the total number of treated clusters  $N_1^C$  fixed; this means that the total number of treated units  $N_1 = \sum_i D_i$  is now stochastic if the number of units varies across clusters.

Suppose we estimate  $\hat{\tau}$  based on individual-level data on outcomes and treatments. We analyze the behavior of  $\hat{\tau}$  over the randomization distribution of the clustered treatment assignments (13). Since the regularity conditions for many of our results are natural extensions of those in Section 3.2 to the clustered design, we defer them to Appendix D in the interest of brevity.

**Proposition 5.2.**

- (1) If Assumption D.1(i)-(iii) holds with  $X_i(d) = (1, d)'$ , and  $\sum_c \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\hat{\tau} - (\tau_{EATT}^{cluster} + \delta_{cluster}) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ , where

$$\tau_{EATT}^{cluster} = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{c(i)}}[\tau_i] \text{ and } \delta_{cluster} = \frac{N}{N - \sum_i \pi_{c(i)}} \frac{N}{\sum_i \pi_{c(i)}} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_{c(i)}, Y_i(0)].$$

- (2) If Assumption D.1 holds with  $X_i(d) = (1, d)'$ , and  $\sum_c \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) \rightarrow \infty$ , then

$$\frac{\sqrt{C}(\hat{\tau} - \tau_{EATT}^{cluster} - \delta_{cluster})}{\sqrt{\Omega_{cluster}(2, 2)}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where  $\Omega_{cluster}(2, 2)$  is the (2, 2)-th element of the matrix

$$\Omega_{cluster} := \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right]^{-1} V_{cluster} \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right]^{-1},$$

for  $X_i := (1, D_i)'$  and  $V_{cluster}$  as defined in Proposition D.1.

- (3) Let  $\hat{\Omega}_{cluster}$  be the cluster-robust variance estimator (Liang and Zeger, 1986) for the coefficients from the regression of  $Y_i$  on  $X_i = (1, D_i)'$ . If Assumption D.1(i)-(iii) and Assumption

*D.2* hold with  $X_i(d) = (1, d)'$ , and  $\sum_c \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\hat{\Omega}_{cluster} - \Omega_{cluster}^{est} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ , for a matrix  $\Omega_{cluster}^{est}$  such that  $\Omega_{cluster}^{est} - \Omega_{cluster} \geq 0$  (i.e.,  $\Omega_{cluster}^{est} - \Omega_{cluster}$  is positive semi-definite).

Proposition 5.2(1) shows that  $\hat{\tau}$  is consistent for  $\tau_{EATT}^{cluster} + \delta_{cluster}$ , where  $\tau_{EATT}^{cluster}$  is an analog to the EATT (i.e. a weighted average of  $\tau_i$ , with weights proportional to the probability that an individual's cluster is treated), and  $\delta_{cluster}$  is a bias term related to the covariance between treatment probabilities and potential outcomes. Proposition 5.2(2) shows that  $\hat{\tau}$  is also asymptotically normally distributed as the number of clusters grows large. Finally, Propositions 5.2(2)-(3) together imply that standard confidence intervals based on the cluster-robust variance estimator will have asymptotically correct but possibly conservative coverage for  $\tau_{EATT}^{cluster} + \delta_{cluster}$ .

A practically useful implication of our results is that if the need for clustering arises from the stochastic assignment of treatment, then the researcher should cluster at the level at which treatment is assigned.<sup>16</sup> Our analysis relates to Abadie et al. (2022), who study a two-step data-generating process in which cluster-level treatment probabilities are initially drawn according to some fixed distribution that is unrelated to potential outcomes. Each cluster therefore has the same treatment probability marginalized over the two-step process, and hence the ATE is consistently estimable in their framework. Consequently, their variance calculations are not directly applicable to quasi-experimental settings, such as DID, where units may have different treatment probabilities and the causal estimand may be the ATT rather than the ATE. Likewise, Xu (2021) and Xu and Wooldridge (2022) study clustered standard errors for non-linear estimators from a design-based perspective. Their results cover inference on a finite-population argmin that is well-defined if units have varying treatment probabilities, although existing results giving a causal interpretation to this argmin require the propensity score to be linear in observable covariates to give a causal interpretation to this parameter, whereas our results apply in settings where the  $\pi_c$  are not linear in observable characteristics.

---

<sup>16</sup>In Appendix D, we further characterize the probability limit of the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator that ignores clustering (see Proposition D.3). An immediate implication is that the sign of the asymptotic bias of the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator is ambiguous, and so confidence intervals based on the conventional heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator may not be valid even in finite populations with a large number of clusters.

## 6 Conclusion

We develop a design-based framework for analyzing quasi-experimental settings that are popular in empirical research in economics and other social sciences. We consider an assignment mechanism in which the individual-specific treatment probabilities are unknown and may be arbitrarily related to potential outcomes, allowing for rich forms of selection. This captures that social scientists often refer to their treatments (or instruments) as being generated by idiosyncratic stochastic factors, but we might worry that the treatment probabilities differ systematically across units. Under this assignment mechanism, we derive simple formulas for the bias of common estimators such as the DIM and DID estimators as a function of the idiosyncratic treatment probabilities. We show further that common estimators of the variance tend to be conservative when there is heterogeneity in the treatment probabilities  $\pi_i$  (even under constant treatment effects). This conservativeness helps to mitigate undercoverage of conventional confidence intervals when the estimator is biased owing to selection. Thus, for example, confidence intervals for DID may have correct coverage of the EATT even if the design-based analog to parallel trends does not hold exactly. Our framework also has useful implications for the choice of the appropriate level of clustering and the interpretation of IV estimators when the instrument is not completely randomly assigned with unknown assignment probabilities.

## References

- Abadie, Alberto, Susan Athey, Guido Imbens, and Jeffrey Wooldridge, “When Should You Adjust Standard Errors for Clustering?,” Technical Report 2022. arXiv:1710.02926.
- , – , **Guido W. Imbens, and Jeffrey M. Wooldridge**, “Sampling-Based versus Design-Based Uncertainty in Regression Analysis,” *Econometrica*, 2020, *88* (1), 265–296.
- Angrist, Joshua and Guido Imbens**, “Identification and Estimation of Local Average Treatment Effects,” *Econometrica*, 1994, *62* (2), 467–475.
- Angrist, Joshua D.**, “Estimating the Labor Market Impact of Voluntary Military Service Using Social Security Data on Military Applicants,” *Econometrica*, 1998, *66* (2), 249–288. Publisher: [Wiley, Econometric Society].
- **and Jorn-Steffen Pischke**, *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist’s Companion*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- **and William N. Evans**, “Children and Their Parents’ Labor Supply: Evidence from Exogenous Variation in Family Size,” *The American Economic Review*, 1998, *88* (3), 450–477. Publisher: American Economic Association.
- , **Guido W. Imbens, and Donald B. Rubin**, “Identification of Causal Effects Using Instrumental Variables,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1996, *91* (434), 444–455.
- Aronow, Peter M. and Donald K. K. Lee**, “Interval estimation of population means under unknown but bounded probabilities of sample selection,” *Biometrika*, 2013, *100* (1), 235–240.
- **and Joel A. Middleton**, “A class of unbiased estimators of the average treatment effect in randomized experiments,” *Journal of Causal Inference*, 2015, *1* (1), 135–154.
- Athey, Susan and Guido W. Imbens**, “Design-based analysis in Difference-In-Differences settings with staggered adoption,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 2022, *226* (1), 62–79. Annals Issue in Honor of Gary Chamberlain.
- Berger, Yves G.**, “Rate of convergence to normal distribution for the Horvitz-Thompson estimator,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, April 1998, *67* (2), 209–226.
- Bertrand, Marianne, Esther Duflo, and Sendhil Mullainathan**, “How Much Should We Trust Differences-In-Differences Estimates?,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, February 2004, *119* (1), 249–275.
- Bojinov, Iavor and Neil Shephard**, “Time series experiments and causal estimands: exact randomization tests and trading,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2019, *114* (528), 1665–1682.
- , **Ashesh Rambachan, and Neil Shephard**, “Panel Experiments and Dynamic Causal Effects: A Finite Population Perspective,” *Quantitative Economics*, 2021, *12* (4), 1171–1196.
- Borusyak, Kirill and Xavier Jaravel**, “Revisiting Event Study Designs,” SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 2826228, Social Science Research Network, Rochester, NY August 2016.



- Buehler, Robert J.**, “Some Validity Criteria for Statistical Inferences,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 1959, 30 (4), 845–863. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Callaway, Brantly and Pedro H.C. Sant’Anna**, “Difference-in-Differences with multiple time periods,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 2021, 225 (2), 200–230. Themed Issue: Treatment Effect 1.
- Card, David and Alan Krueger**, “Minimum Wages and Employment: A Case Study of the Fast-Food Industry in New Jersey and Pennsylvania,” *American Economic Review*, 1994, 84 (4), 772–793.
- Cattaneo, Matias D., Brigham R. Frandsen, and Rocío Titiunik**, *Journal of Causal Inference*, 2015, 3 (1), 1–24.
- de Chaisemartin, Clément and Xavier D’Haultfoeulle**, “Two-Way Fixed Effects Estimators with Heterogeneous Treatment Effects,” *American Economic Review*, September 2020, 110 (9), 2964–96.
- Deryugina, Tatyana**, “The Fiscal Cost of Hurricanes: Disaster Aid versus Social Insurance,” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, August 2017, 9 (3), 168–98.
- , **Garth Heutel, Nolan H. Miller, David Molitor, and Julian Reif**, “The Mortality and Medical Costs of Air Pollution: Evidence from Changes in Wind Direction,” *American Economic Review*, 2019, 109 (12), 4178–4219.
- Eckles, Dean, Nikolaos Ignatiadis, Stefan Wager, and Han Wu**, “Noise-Induced Randomization in Regression Discontinuity Designs,” 2022.
- Fisher, R. A.**, *The Design of Experiments*, Oxford, England: Oliver & Boyd, 1935.
- Freedman, David A.**, “On regression adjustments to experimental data,” *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 2008, 40 (2), 180–193.
- Goodman-Bacon, Andrew**, “Difference-in-differences with variation in treatment timing,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 2021, 225 (2), 254–277. Themed Issue: Treatment Effect 1.
- Guo, Kevin and Guillaume Basse**, “The Generalized Oaxaca-Blinder Estimator,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 01 2023, 118 (541), 524–536.
- Hajek, Jaroslav**, “Asymptotic Theory of Rejective Sampling with Varying Probabilities from a Finite Population,” *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, December 1964, 35 (4), 1491–1523. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Heckman, James**, “The Common Structure of Statistical Models of Truncation, Sample Selection and Limited Dependent Variables and a Simple Estimator for Such Models,” NBER Chapters, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc 1976.
- Heckman, James J.**, “Dummy Endogenous Variables in a Simultaneous Equation System,” *Econometrica*, 1978, 46 (4), 931–959.
- , **Seong Hyeok Moon, Rodrigo Pinto, Peter A. Savelyev, and Adam Yavitz**, “The Rate of Return to the High/Scope Perry Preschool Program,” *Journal of public economics*, February 2010, 94 (1-2), 114–128.

- Hong, Han, Michael P Leung, and Jessie Li**, “Inference on finite-population treatment effects under limited overlap,” *The Econometrics Journal*, January 2020, *23* (1), 32–47.
- Hornbeck, Richard**, “The Enduring Impact of the American Dust Bowl: Short- and Long-Run Adjustments to Environmental Catastrophe,” *American Economic Review*, June 2012, *102* (4), 1477–1507.
- **and Suresh Naidu**, “When the Levee Breaks: Black Migration and Economic Development in the American South,” *American Economic Review*, March 2014, *104* (3), 963–90.
- Imbens, Guido W.**, “Nonparametric Estimation of Average Treatment Effects Under Exogeneity: A Review,” *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, February 2004, *86* (1), 4–29. Publisher: MIT Press.
- **and Donald B. Rubin**, *Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences: An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Jackson, C. Kirabo, Rucker C. Johnson, and Claudia Persico**, “The Effects of School Spending on Educational and Economic Outcomes: Evidence from School Finance Reforms,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, February 2016, *131* (1), 157–218.
- Kang, Hyunseung, Laura Peck, and Luke Keele**, “Inference for instrumental variables: a randomization inference approach,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 2018, *181* (4), 1231–1254.
- Li, Xinran and Peng Ding**, “General Forms of Finite Population Central Limit Theorems with Applications to Causal Inference,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, October 2017, *112* (520), 1759–1769.
- Liang, Kung-Yee and Scott L. Zeger**, “Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models,” *Biometrika*, 1986, *73* (1), 13–22.
- Lin, Winston**, “Agnostic Notes on Regression Adjustments to Experimental Data: Reexamining Freedman’s critique,” *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 2013, *7* (1), 295–318.
- Lovenheim, Michael F. and Alexander Willen**, “The Long-Run Effects of Teacher Collective Bargaining,” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 2019, *11* (3), 292–324.
- Madestam, Andreas, Daniel Shoag, Stan Veuger, and David Yanagizawa-Drott**, “Do Political Protests Matter? Evidence from the Tea Party Movement,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 09 2013, *128* (4), 1633–1685.
- Manski, Charles F. and John V. Pepper**, “How Do Right-to-Carry Laws Affect Crime Rates? Coping with Ambiguity Using Bounded-Variation Assumptions,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2018, *100* (2), 232–244.
- Miratrix, Luke W., Stefan Wager, and Jose R. Zubizarreta**, “Shape-constrained partial identification of a population mean under unknown probabilities of sample selection,” *Biometrika*, 2018, *105* (1), 103–114.
- MIT Election Data and Science Lab**, “U.S. President 1976–2020,” 2022.

- Müller, Ulrich K. and Andriy Norets**, “Credibility of Confidence Sets in Nonstandard Econometric Problems,” *Econometrica*, 2016, 84 (6), 2183–2213.
- Nakamura, Emi, Jósef Sigurdsson, and Jón Steinsson**, “The Gift of Moving: Intergenerational Consequences of a Mobility Shock,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 09 2021, 89 (3), 1557–1592.
- Neyman, Jerzy**, “On the Application of Probability Theory to Agricultural Experiments. Essay on Principles. Section 9.,” *Statistical Science*, 1923, 5 (4), 465–472. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Pashley, Nicole E., Guillaume W. Basse, and Luke W. Miratrix**, “Conditional as-if analyses in randomized experiments,” *Journal of Causal Inference*, January 2021, 9 (1), 264–284. Publisher: De Gruyter.
- Rambachan, Ashesh and Jonathan Roth**, “A More Credible Approach to Parallel Trends,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, October 2023, 90 (5), 2555–2591.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R.**, “Sensitivity Analysis for Certain Permutation Inferences in Matched Observational Studies,” *Biometrika*, 1987, 74 (1), 13–26. Publisher: [Oxford University Press, Biometrika Trust].
- , *Observational Studies*, Springer Science & Business Media, January 2002. Google-Books-ID: K0OglGXtpGMC.
- , “Sensitivity Analysis in Observational Studies,” in B. S. Everitt and D. C. Howell, eds., *Encyclopedia of Statistics in Behavioral Science*, 2005.
- Roth, Jonathan**, “Pretest with Caution: Event-Study Estimates after Testing for Parallel Trends,” *American Economic Review: Insights*, September 2022, 4 (3), 305–322.
- and **Pedro H. C. Sant’Anna**, “Efficient Estimation for Staggered Rollout Designs,” *arXiv:2102.01291 [econ, math, stat]*, June 2021. arXiv: 2102.01291.
- Sekhon, Jasjeet S. and Rocio Titiunik**, “On Interpreting the Regression Discontinuity Design as a Local Experiment,” in “Advances in Econometrics,” Vol. 38, Emerald Publishing Limited, 2017, pp. 1–28.
- and **Yotam Shem-Tov**, “Inference on a New Class of Sample Average Treatment Effects,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, February 2020, pp. 1–18. Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- Staiger, Douglas and James H. Stock**, “Instrumental Variables Regression with Weak Instruments,” *Econometrica*, 1997, 65 (3), 557–586. Publisher: [Wiley, Econometric Society].
- Sun, Liyang and Sarah Abraham**, “Estimating dynamic treatment effects in event studies with heterogeneous treatment effects,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 2021, 225 (2), 175–199.
- United States Bureau of the Census**, “Quarterly Workforce Indicators,” Technical Report 2022.
- van der Vaart, A. W.**, *Asymptotic Statistics*, Cambridge University Press, June 2000.

- White, Halbert**, “Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and a Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity,” 1980, *48* (4), 817–838.
- Wu, Jason and Peng Ding**, “Randomization Tests for Weak Null Hypotheses in Randomized Experiments,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 10 2021, *116* (536), 1898–1913.
- Xu, Ruonan**, “Potential outcomes and finite-population inference for M-estimators,” *The Econometrics Journal*, January 2021, *24* (1), 162–176.
- **and Jeffrey M Wooldridge**, “A Design-Based Approach to Spatial Correlation,” 2022, p. 70.

# Design-Based Uncertainty for Quasi-Experiments

## Online Appendix

Ashesh Rambachan   Jonathan Roth

February 14, 2024

### A Proofs for results in main text

#### Proof of Proposition 3.1

*Proof.* Recall  $\mathbb{E}_R[D_i] = \pi_i$  and  $\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$ . Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}] &= \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_i D_i Y_i(0) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i \pi_i \underbrace{(Y_i(0) + \tau_i)}_{=Y_i(1)} - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_i (1 - \pi_i) Y_i(0) \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i \pi_i \tau_i}_{=: \tau_{EATT}} + \frac{N}{N_0} \frac{N}{N_1} \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \left( \pi_i - \frac{N_1}{N} \right) Y_i(0) \right)}_{= \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(0)]}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which yields the second expression in the Proposition. To derive the first expression, note that

$$\tau_{EATT} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i \left( \pi_i - \frac{N_1}{N} \right) \tau_i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \tau_i = \frac{N}{N_1} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, \tau_i] + \tau_{ATE}.$$

Further, since  $\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)$ , we have that  $\text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, \tau_i] = \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(1)] - \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(0)]$ , and hence

$$\tau_{EATT} = \tau_{ATE} + \frac{N}{N_1} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(1)] - \frac{N}{N_1} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(0)].$$

Substituting this expression into (14) and simplifying then yields

$$\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}] = \tau_{ATE} + \frac{N}{N_1} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(1)] + \frac{N}{N_0} \text{Cov}_1[\pi_i, Y_i(0)],$$

as needed. □

#### Proof of Lemma 3.1

*Proof.* Since  $\hat{\tau}$  can be represented as a Horvitz-Thompson estimator under rejective sampling, Theorem 6.1 in Hajek (1964) implies

$$\mathbb{V}_R[\hat{\tau}] [1 + o(1)] = \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \pi_k (1 - \pi_k) \right] \mathbb{V}_{\tilde{\pi}}[\tilde{Y}_i] = \left[ \sum_{k=1}^N \pi_k (1 - \pi_k) \right] \mathbb{V}_{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) \right]. \quad (15)$$

Standard decomposition arguments for completely randomized experiments (e.g. [Imbens and Rubin \(2015\)](#)), modified to replace unweighted variances with weighted variances, yield

$$\mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) \right] = \frac{N}{N_1 N_0} \left( \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\tilde{\pi}} [Y_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0} \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\tilde{\pi}} [Y_i(0)] - \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\tilde{\pi}} [\tau_i] \right),$$

which together with the previous display yields the desired result.  $\square$

### Proof of Lemma 3.2

*Proof.* We will show that  $\mathbb{E}_R [\hat{s}_1^2] (1 + o(1)) = \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]$ . The equality  $\mathbb{E}_R [\hat{s}_0^2] (1 + o(1)) = \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]$  can be obtained analogously, from which the result is immediate. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_R [\hat{s}_1^2] &= \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i Y_i^2 - \bar{Y}_1^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i Y_i^2 - (\bar{Y}_1 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] + \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i Y_i^2 \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]^2 - 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] \mathbb{E}_R [\bar{Y}_1 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]] - \mathbb{E}_R [(\bar{Y}_1 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2] \\ &= \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] - \mathbb{V}_R [\bar{Y}_1], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is obtained using the fact that  $\mathbb{E}_R [D_i] = \pi_i$ , and hence  $\mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i Y_i^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)^2]$  and  $\mathbb{E}_R [\bar{Y}_1 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]] = 0$ . Applying Theorem 6.1 in [Hajek \(1964\)](#) as in the proof to Lemma 3.1, we see that

$$\mathbb{V}_R [\bar{Y}_1] (1 + o(1)) = \left[ \sum_k \pi_k (1 - \pi_k) \right] \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\tilde{\pi}} [Y_i(1)/N_1].$$

Next, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \sum_k \pi_k (1 - \pi_k) \right] \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\tilde{\pi}} [Y_i(1)/N_1] &= \frac{1}{N_1^2} \sum_i \pi_i (1 - \pi_i) (Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}} [Y_i(1)])^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N_1^2} \sum_i \pi_i (1 - \pi_i) (Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N_1^2} \sum_i \pi_i (Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2 = \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] \\ &\leq \left[ \sum_k \pi_k (1 - \pi_k) \right]^{-1} \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] = o(1) \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality uses the fact that  $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}} [Y_i(1)] = \arg \min_u \sum_i \pi_i (1 - \pi_i) (Y_i(1) - u)^2$ , the second inequality uses the fact that  $\pi_i (1 - \pi_i) \leq \pi_i$ , and the third inequality uses the fact that  $N_1 = \sum_i \pi_i \geq \sum_i \pi_i (1 - \pi_i)$ . Combining the previous three displays, we see that  $\mathbb{E}_R [\hat{s}_1^2] = (1 + o(1)) \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]$ , as we wished to show.  $\square$

### Proof of Proposition 3.2

*Proof.* From (15), we see that the right-hand side of (7) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \left( \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) \right] \right)^2.$$

Since for any  $X$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}} [X_i] = \arg \min_{\mu} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i(1 - \pi_i)(X_i - \mu)^2$ , it follows that this is bounded above by

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \left( \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) - \left( \mathbb{E}_{\pi} \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} \left[ \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) \right] \right) \right)^2, \quad (16)$$

and the bound holds with equality if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) \right] = \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]. \quad (17)$$

Let  $\dot{Y}_i(1) = Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]$  and  $\dot{Y}_i(0) = Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]$ . Then the expression in (16) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \left( \frac{1}{N_1} \dot{Y}_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} \dot{Y}_i(0) \right)^2 \\ &= \left[ \frac{1}{N_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i \dot{Y}_i(1)^2 + \frac{1}{N_0^2} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - \pi_i) \dot{Y}_i(0)^2 - \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{1}{N_1^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i^2 \dot{Y}_i(1)^2 - \frac{1}{N_0^2} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - \pi_i)^2 \dot{Y}_i(0)^2 + \frac{2}{N_1 N_0} \sum_{i=1}^N \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \dot{Y}_i(1) \dot{Y}_i(0) \right] \\ &= \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \text{Var}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0} \text{Var}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)] - \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\pi_i}{N_1/N} \dot{Y}_i(1) - \frac{1 - \pi_i}{N_0/N} \dot{Y}_i(0) \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

from which the first claim is immediate. Furthermore, we immediately observe that  $\frac{\mathbb{V}_R^{\text{approx}}[\hat{\tau}]}{\mathbb{E}_R^{\text{approx}}[\hat{s}^2]} = 1$  if and only if both (17) holds and

$$\frac{\pi_i}{N_1/N} Y_i(1) - \frac{1 - \pi_i}{N_0/N} Y_i(0) = \frac{\pi_i}{N_1/N} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] - \frac{1 - \pi_i}{N_0/N} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)] \text{ for all } i. \quad (18)$$

Note that equation (9) is just a re-arrangement of the terms in (18). To complete the proof, it thus suffices to show that (18) actually implies (17). To do this, we multiply both sides of (18) by  $(1 - \pi_i)/N$  and sum across  $i$  to obtain that

$$s \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)] = \frac{s}{N_1} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_i (1 - \pi_i)^2 \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)],$$

where  $s = \sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i)$ . Re-arranging terms, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) \right] = \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0} \frac{1}{s} \left( N_0 - \sum_i (1 - \pi_i)^2 \right) \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)].$$

Note, however, that

$$N_0 - \sum_i (1 - \pi_i)^2 = N_0 - \sum_i (1 - \pi_i) + \sum_i \pi_i (1 - \pi_i) = s,$$

and thus,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\pi}} \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) \right] = \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)],$$

as needed.  $\square$

### Proof of Corollary 3.1

*Proof.* Note that we can re-write (18) as

$$\frac{\pi_i}{N_1} (Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]) - \frac{1 - \pi_i}{N_0} (Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]) = 0 \text{ for all } i.$$

Under constant effects,  $\tau_{EATT} = \tau$ . Further, from display (14), we see that  $\mathbb{E}_R [\hat{\tau}] = \tau_{EATT} + \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(0)] - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]$ , and thus if  $\mathbb{E}_R [\hat{\tau}] = \tau_{EATT}$ , then  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(0)] = \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]$ . Additionally, under the constant effects assumption,  $Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] = Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(0)]$ , and hence  $Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] = Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]$ . Substituting into the previous display and re-arranging terms, we obtain that

$$\left( \frac{\pi_i}{N_1} - \frac{1 - \pi_i}{N_0} \right) (Y_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]) = 0 \text{ for all } i,$$

from which the result follows.  $\square$

### Proof of Proposition 3.3

*Proof.* First, viewing  $\hat{\tau}$  as a Horvitz-Thompson estimator under rejective sampling as in Section 3.2, the central limit theorem follows immediately from Theorem 1 in Berger (1998).<sup>17</sup>

Second, to show convergence of  $\hat{s}^2 / \mathbb{E}_R^{approx} [\hat{s}^2]$ , it suffices to show that  $\frac{\hat{s}_1^2}{\text{Var}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]} \rightarrow_p 1$  and  $\frac{\hat{s}_0^2}{\text{Var}_{1-\pi} [Y_i(0)]} \rightarrow_p 1$ . We provide a proof for the former; the latter proof is analogous. For notational convenience, let  $v_1 = \text{Var}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]$ . From the definition of  $\hat{s}_1^2$ , we can write

$$\frac{\hat{s}_1^2}{v_1} = \frac{1}{v_1} \left( \left( \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i (Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2 \right) - (\bar{Y}_1 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2 \right).$$

Now,  $\frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i (Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2$  can be viewed as a Horvitz-Thompson estimator of  $\frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i \pi_i (Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2 = v_1$ , and thus by Theorem 6.1 in Hajek (1964), its variance is equal to

$$(1 + o(1)) \left( \frac{1}{N_1^2} \sum_i \pi_i (1 - \pi_i) \right) \cdot \text{Var}_{\bar{\pi}} [(Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2].$$

---

<sup>17</sup>Hajek (1964) states a similar result where the Horvitz-Thompson estimator uses an approximation to the marginal probabilities  $\pi_i = \mathbb{E}_R [D_i]$  in terms of the underlying idiosyncratic probabilities  $p_i$ .



Note further that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left( \frac{1}{N_1^2} \sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \right) \cdot \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}} [(Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2] &\leq \frac{1}{N_1^2} \sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i)(Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^4 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N_1^2} m_N(1) \sum_i \pi_i(Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{N_1} m_N(1) \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)].
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Chebychev's inequality, we have

$$\frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i (D_i(Y_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)])^2 - v_1) = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_1} m_N(1) \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]} \right).$$

Next, viewing  $\bar{Y}_1$  as a Horvitz-Thomson estimator, we see that its variance is  $(1+o(1)) \left( \frac{1}{N_1^2} \sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \right) \cdot \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}} [Y_i(1)]$ , which by similar logic to that above is bounded above by  $(1+o(1)) \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]$ . Thus, by Chebychev's inequality,

$$\bar{Y}_1 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)] = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [Y_i(1)]} \right).$$

Combining the results above, it follows that

$$\frac{\hat{s}_1^2}{v_1} = \frac{1}{v_1} \left( v_1 + O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{m_N(1)v_1}{N_1}} \right) + O_p \left( \frac{1}{N_1} v_1 \right) \right) = 1 + O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{m_N(1)}{v_1 N_1}} \right) + O_p \left( \frac{1}{N_1} \right).$$

However, the first  $O_p$  term converges to 0 by assumption, and since Assumption 3.1(a) implies that  $N_1 \rightarrow \infty$ , the second  $O_p$  term converges to 0 as well.  $\square$

### Proof of Proposition 3.4

*Proof.* From Proposition 3.3, we have that  $\frac{\hat{\tau} - \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{V}_R^{\text{approx}}[\hat{\tau}]}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Observe that we can write

$$\frac{\hat{\tau} - \tau_{EATT}}{\hat{s}} = \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_R^{\text{approx}}[\hat{s}^2]}}{\hat{s}} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{V}_R^{\text{approx}}[\hat{\tau}]}{\mathbb{E}_R^{\text{approx}}[\hat{s}^2]}} \left( \frac{\hat{\tau} - \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{V}_R^{\text{approx}}[\hat{\tau}]}} + \frac{b}{\sqrt{\mathbb{V}_R^{\text{approx}}[\hat{\tau}]}} \right),$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}] = \tau_{EATT} + b$  by Proposition 3.1. However, by Proposition 3.3 and the continuous mapping theorem,

$$\frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_R^{\text{approx}}[\hat{s}^2]}}{\hat{s}} \xrightarrow{p} 1.$$

It then follows from Slutsky's lemma and the assumptions of the proposition that

$$\frac{\hat{\tau} - \tau_{EATT}}{\hat{s}} \xrightarrow{d} r \cdot (\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + b^*) = \mathcal{N}(b^* \cdot r, r^2).$$

$\square$

### Proof of Proposition 5.1

*Proof.* Let  $E_R^*[\cdot | \cdot]$  denote the best linear projection under the randomization distribution with covariates. That is, for unit-level variables  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $E_R^*[A_i | B_i] = \beta'_B B_i$  for

$$\beta_B := \arg \min_{\beta} \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (A_i - \beta' B_i)^2 \right].$$

Define  $\beta = (\beta_0, \beta_D, \beta'_W)'$  as the coefficients in the best linear projection of  $Y_i$  on  $(1, D_i, W_i)'$

$$\beta := \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{k+2}} \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (Y_i - (1, D_i, W_i')\beta')^2 \right]. \quad (19)$$

To prove the first claim, observe that

$$E_R^*[W_i | 1, D_i] = D_i \mathbb{E}_\pi [W_i] + (1 - D_i) \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [W_i].$$

By the Frisch-Waugh-Lovell Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_W &= \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (W_i - E^*[W_i | 1, D_i])(W_i - E^*[W_i | 1, D_i])' \right]^{-1} \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (W_i - E^*[W_i | 1, D_i]) Y_i \right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_i D_i (W_i - \mathbb{E}_\pi [W_i])(W_i - \mathbb{E}_\pi [W_i])' + \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (1 - D_i) (W_i - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [W_i])(W_i - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [W_i])' \right]^{-1} \times \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_i D_i (W_i - \mathbb{E}_\pi [W_i]) Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (1 - D_i) (W_i - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [W_i]) Y_i(0) \right] = \\ &= \left( \frac{N_1}{N} \text{Var}_\pi [W_i] + \frac{N_0}{N} \text{Var}_{1-\pi} [W_i] \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{N_1}{N} \mathbb{E}_\pi [(W_i - \mathbb{E}_\pi [W_i]) Y_i(1)] + \frac{N_0}{N} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [(W_i - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [W_i]) Y_i(0)] \right) = \\ &\quad \theta \gamma(1) + (1 - \theta) \gamma(0) = \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Note, however, that  $E_R^*[Y_i | 1, D, W] = E_R^*[Y_i - \beta'_W W_i | 1, D]$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_D &= \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i (Y_i - \gamma' W_i) - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_i (1 - D_i) (Y_i - \gamma' W_i) \right] \\ &= \tau_{EATT} + \frac{N_1}{N} \frac{N_0}{N} \text{Cov}_1 [\pi_i, Y_i(0) - \gamma' W_i], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is obtained from applying Proposition 3.1 to the transformed outcome  $Y_i - \gamma' W_i$ .

To prove the second claim, by the Frisch-Waugh-Lovell Theorem,

$$E_R^*[Y_i | D_i - \hat{\pi}_i] = \beta_D (D_i - \hat{\pi}_i),$$

and so

$$\beta_D = \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (D_i - \hat{\pi}_i)^2 \right]^{-1} \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (D_i - \hat{\pi}_i) Y_i \right].$$

Writing  $(D_i - \hat{\pi}_i)^2 = D_i - 2D_i\hat{\pi}_i + \hat{\pi}_i^2$  and  $Y_i = Y_i(0) + D_i\tau_i$  and evaluating the expectation over the randomization distribution yields

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_D &= \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \pi_i - 2\pi_i\hat{\pi}_i + \hat{\pi}_i^2 \right]^{-1} \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (D_i - \hat{\pi}_i) Y_i(0) \right] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \pi_i - 2\pi_i\hat{\pi}_i + \hat{\pi}_i^2 \right]^{-1} \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_i D_i(1 - \hat{\pi}_i) \tau_i \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \pi_i - 2\pi_i\hat{\pi}_i + \hat{\pi}_i^2 \right]^{-1} \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ (\pi_i - \hat{\pi}_i) Y_i(0) \right] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \pi_i - 2\pi_i\hat{\pi}_i + \hat{\pi}_i^2 \right]^{-1} \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \pi_i(1 - \hat{\pi}_i) \tau_i \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Note, however, that  $\mathbb{E}_1 [\pi_i - \hat{\pi}_i] = 0$ , since a constant is included in  $W_i$  and thus the regression residuals average to 0, and hence  $\mathbb{E}_1 [(\pi_i - \hat{\pi}_i) Y_i(0)] = \text{Cov}_1 [\pi_i - \hat{\pi}_i, Y_i(0)]$ . Additionally,

$$\mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \pi_i - 2\pi_i\hat{\pi}_i + \hat{\pi}_i^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \pi_i(1 - \hat{\pi}_i) \right] + \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \hat{\pi}_i(\hat{\pi}_i - \pi_i) \right] = \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \pi_i(1 - \hat{\pi}_i) \right],$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_1 [\hat{\pi}_i(\hat{\pi}_i - \pi_i)] = 0$  since by construction regression residuals are orthogonal to the regressors. Substituting these expressions into (20) yields the desired result.  $\square$

## Proof of Proposition 5.2

*Proof.* To prove these results, we will show that the second-element of  $\beta_{cluster}$  defined in Proposition D.1 equals  $\tau_{cluster}^{EATT} + \delta_{cluster}$  when  $X_i(d) = (1, d)'$ . The stated claims then immediately follow by applying Proposition D.1. Defining  $N_1^C = \sum_c \pi_c N_c = \sum_i \pi_{c(i)}$ ,  $N_0^C = N - N_1^C = \sum_i (1 - \pi_{c(i)})$ , observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) \right] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(0) \right] \right)^{-1} &= \frac{C}{N_0^C N_1^C} \begin{pmatrix} N_1^C & -N_1^C \\ -N_1^C & N \end{pmatrix}, \\ \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X Y}_c(1) \right] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X Y}_c(0) \right] &= C^{-1} \sum_i \begin{pmatrix} Y_i(0) + \pi_{c(i)} \tau_i \\ \pi_{c(i)} (Y_i(0) + \tau_i) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying out, we therefore arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{cluster} &= \left( \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) \right] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(0) \right] \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X Y}_c(1) \right] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X Y}_c(0) \right] \right) = \\ &\frac{1}{N_0^C N_1^C} \begin{pmatrix} N_1^C & -N_1^C \\ -N_1^C & N \end{pmatrix} \sum_i \begin{pmatrix} Y_i(0) + \pi_{c(i)} \tau_i \\ \pi_{c(i)} (Y_i(0) + \tau_i) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{N_0^C} \sum_i (1 - \pi_{c(i)}) Y_i(0) \\ \frac{1}{N_1^C} \sum_i \pi_{c(i)} \tau_i + \sum_i \left( \frac{\pi_{c(i)}}{N_1^C} - \frac{1 - \pi_{c(i)}}{N_0^C} \right) Y_i(0) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Re-arranging the second element then yields

$$\beta_{cluster,2} = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{c(i)}} [\tau_i] + \frac{N}{\sum_i \pi_{c(i)}} \frac{N}{N - \sum_i \pi_{c(i)}} \text{Cov}_1 [\pi_{c(i)}, Y_i(0)]$$

as desired.

The final claim is a special case of Proposition D.2 below with  $X_i(d) = (1, d)'$ .  $\square$

## B Berry-Esseen type bound on quality of normal approximation

In addition to the asymptotic results shown in Section 3.2 for the DIM estimator, we can also obtain Berry-Esseen type bounds on the quality of the normal approximation (using the approximate variance  $\mathbb{V}_R^{approx}[\hat{\tau}]$ ) for a fixed finite population. This result is attractive in the sense that it shows that the distribution of  $\hat{\tau}$  will be approximately normally distributed in finite populations that are sufficiently large (relative to the fourth moment of the potential outcomes), without appealing to arguments involving a sequence of finite populations of increasing size.

**Proposition B.1.** *Let  $b_1, b_2$  be positive constants, and define  $t = (\hat{\tau} - \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}])/\sqrt{\mathbb{V}_R^{approx}[\hat{\tau}]}$ . Then there exist constants  $k$  and  $\bar{N}$  such that*

$$\sup_y |P(t \leq y) - \Phi(y)| \leq \frac{k}{\sqrt{\bar{N}}}$$

for any finite population of size  $N \geq \bar{N}$  such that  $\mathbb{V}_R^{approx}[\hat{\tau}] = Nb_1$  and  $\mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N_1} Y_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0} Y_i(0) \right)^4 \right] < b_2$ .

*Proof.* Viewing  $\hat{\tau}$  as a Horvitz-Thompson estimator under rejective sampling once again, the result follows immediately from Theorem 3 in Berger (1998).  $\square$

## C Extension to vector-valued outcomes

In this appendix, we generalize our results for the DIM estimator in Sections 3.1-3.2 to the vector-valued outcomes case. We apply these results to analyze IV estimators from a design-based perspective in Section 5.1 of the main text, and non-staggered DID estimators with multiple time periods below.

We extend our notation from the main text, so that  $\mathbf{Y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$  is the vector-valued outcome. For a fixed vector-valued characteristic  $\mathbf{X}_i$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_w[\mathbf{X}_i] := \frac{1}{\sum_i w_i} \sum_i w_i \mathbf{X}_i$  and  $\mathbb{V}_w[\mathbf{X}_i] = \frac{1}{\sum_i w_i} \sum_i (\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbb{E}_w[\mathbf{X}_i])(\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbb{E}_w[\mathbf{X}_i])'$ . Further, as shorthand, define  $S_{1,w} := \mathbb{V}_w[\mathbf{Y}_i(1)]$ ,  $S_{0,w} := \mathbb{V}_w[\mathbf{Y}_i(0)]$ ,  $S_{10,w} := \mathbb{E}_w[(\mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_w[\mathbf{Y}_i(1)])(\mathbf{Y}_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_w[\mathbf{Y}_i(0)])']$  to be the weighted finite-population variances and covariance of  $\mathbf{Y}_i(1)$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_i(0)$ . Finally, the vector-valued ATE is  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{ATE} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (\mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbf{Y}_i(0))$ , and the vector-valued EATT is  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{EATT} := \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i \pi_i (\mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbf{Y}_i(0))$ .

We analyze the behavior over the randomization distribution (1) of the vector-valued DIM estimator  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i \mathbf{Y}_i - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_i (1 - D_i) \mathbf{Y}_i$  and associated variance estimators

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{s}} &:= \frac{1}{N_1} \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 + \frac{1}{N_0} \hat{\mathbf{s}}_0, \\ \hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 &:= \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i (\mathbf{Y}_i - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_1)(\mathbf{Y}_i - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_1)', \quad \hat{\mathbf{s}}_0 := \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_i (1 - D_i) (\mathbf{Y}_i - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_0)(\mathbf{Y}_i - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}_0)', \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_1 := \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i \mathbf{Y}_i$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{Y}}_0 := \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_i (1 - D_i) \mathbf{Y}_i$ .

We introduce the following regularity conditions on the sequence of finite populations.

**Assumption C.1.** Suppose  $N_1/N \rightarrow p_1 \in (0, 1)$ , and  $S_{1,w}, S_{0,w}, S_{10,w}$  have finite limits for  $w \in \{\pi, 1 - \pi, \tilde{\pi}\}$ .

**Assumption C.2.**  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|\mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[\mathbf{Y}_i(1)]\|^2/N \rightarrow 0$  and  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|\mathbf{Y}_i(0) - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi}[\mathbf{Y}_i(0)]\|^2/N \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the Euclidean norm.

**Assumption C.3.** Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i = \frac{1}{N_1}\mathbf{Y}_i(1) + \frac{1}{N_0}\mathbf{Y}_i(0)$ , and let  $\lambda_{\min}$  be the minimal eigenvalue of  $\Sigma_{\tilde{\pi}} = \mathbb{V}ar_{\tilde{\pi}}[\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i]$ . Assume  $\lambda_{\min} > 0$  and for all  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}} \left[ \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}}[\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i] \right\|^2 \cdot \mathbb{1} \left[ \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}}[\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i] \right\| > \sqrt{\sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \cdot \lambda_{\min} \cdot \epsilon} \right] \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

Assumption C.1 requires that the fraction of treated units and the (weighted) variance and covariances of the potential outcomes have finite limits along the sequence of finite populations. Assumption C.2 is a multivariate analog of Assumption 3.1(c) in that it requires that no single observation dominate the  $\pi$  or  $(1 - \pi)$ -weighted variance of the potential outcomes. Assumption C.3 is a multivariate generalization of the Lindeberg-type condition in Assumption 3.1(b).

**Proposition C.1** (Results for vector-valued outcomes).

1.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}] &= \boldsymbol{\tau}_{ATE} + \frac{N}{N_0} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \left( \pi_i - \frac{N_1}{N} \right) \mathbf{Y}_i(0) \right) + \frac{N}{N_1} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \left( \pi_i - \frac{N_1}{N} \right) \mathbf{Y}_i(1) \right), \\ &= \boldsymbol{\tau}_{EATT} + \frac{N}{N_0} \frac{N}{N_1} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \left( \pi_i - \frac{N_1}{N} \right) \mathbf{Y}_i(0) \right). \end{aligned}$$

2. Under Assumptions 3.1(a) and C.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_R[\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}] + o(N^{-1}) &= \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \pi_k(1 - \pi_k)}{\frac{N_0}{N} \frac{N_1}{N}} \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{V}ar_{\tilde{\pi}}[\mathbf{Y}_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0} \mathbb{V}ar_{\tilde{\pi}}[\mathbf{Y}_i(0)] - \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{V}ar_{\tilde{\pi}}[\boldsymbol{\tau}_i] \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{V}ar_{\pi}[\mathbf{Y}_i(1)] + \frac{1}{N_0} \mathbb{V}ar_{1-\pi}[\mathbf{Y}_i(0)], \end{aligned}$$

where  $A \leq B$  if  $B - A$  is positive semi-definite.

3. Under Assumptions 3.1(a), C.1, and C.2,

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1 - \mathbb{V}ar_{\pi}[\mathbf{Y}_i(1)] \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_0 - \mathbb{V}ar_{1-\pi}[\mathbf{Y}_i(0)] \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

4. Under Assumptions 3.1(a), C.1, and C.3,

$$\mathbb{V}_R[\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}]^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, I).$$

Assumption C.1 implies  $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N \mathbb{V}_R[\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}]$  exists, so the previous display can alternatively be written as

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}).$$

*Proof.* The proof of claim (1) is analogous to the proof of Proposition 3.1 in the scalar case.

We next prove claim (2). For simplicity, let  $A_n = \mathbb{V}_R[\hat{\tau}]$ , let  $B_n$  be the right-hand-side of the first equality in claim (2), and let  $C_n$  be the right-hand side of the inequality in claim (2). We first prove the inequality. Note that by the definition of a semi-definite matrix, it suffices to show that  $l'B_n l \leq l'C_n l$  for all  $l \in \mathbb{R}^K$ . However, letting  $Y_i(d) = l'\mathbf{Y}_i(d)$ , the desired inequality follows from Proposition 3.2. Next, observe that  $A_n - B_n = o(N^{-1})$  if and only if  $D_n := NA_n - NB_n = o(1)$ , which holds if and only if  $l'D_n l = o(1)$  for all  $l \in L := \{e_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq K\} \cup \{e_j - e_{j'} \mid 1 \leq j, j' \leq K\}$ , where  $e_j$  is the  $j$ th basis vector in  $\mathbb{R}^K$ . To obtain the last equivalence, note that  $e_j'D_n e_j = [D_n]_{jj}$  (the  $(j, j)$  element of  $D_n$ ), whereas exploiting the fact that  $D_n$  is symmetric,  $(e_j - e_{j'})'D_n(e_j - e_{j'}) = [D_n]_{jj} + [D_n]_{j'j'} - 2[D_n]_{jj'}$ , and so convergence of  $l'D_n l$  to zero for all  $l \in L$  is equivalent to convergence of each of the elements of  $D_n$ . Next, note that if  $Y_i(d) = l'\mathbf{Y}_i(d)$ , then  $\hat{\tau}$  as defined in (2) is equal to  $l'\hat{\tau}$  and  $\mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}}[Y_i(d)] = l'\mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathbf{Y}_i(d)]l$ . It follows from Proposition 3.1 that

$$N \cdot l'\mathbb{V}_R[\hat{\tau}]l[1 + o(1)] = \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \pi_k(1 - \pi_k)}{\frac{N_0}{N} \frac{N_1}{N}} l' \left[ \frac{N}{N_1} \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathbf{Y}_i(1)] + \frac{N}{N_0} \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathbf{Y}_i(0)] - \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}}[\tau_i] \right] l, \quad (21)$$

which implies that  $l'D_n l = l'(NA_n)l \cdot o(1)$ . However, Assumption C.1, together with the inequality in claim (2), implies that the right-hand side of the previous display is  $O(1)$ , and thus  $l'(NA_n)l = O(1)$ , from which the desired result follows.

The proof of claim (3) is similar to the proof of Lemma A3 in Li and Ding (2017), which gives a similar result in the case of completely randomized experiments. We provide a proof for the convergence of  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1$ ; the convergence of  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_0$  is similar. As in the proof to claim (2), it suffices to show that  $l'\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 l - l'\mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}}[\mathbf{Y}_i(1)]l \rightarrow_p 0$  for all  $l \in L$ . Let  $Y_i(d) = l'\mathbf{Y}_i(1)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} l'\hat{\mathbf{s}}_1 l &= \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i (l'\mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_j D_j l'\mathbf{Y}_j(1))^2 \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i (l'\mathbf{Y}_i(1) - l'\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\mathbf{Y}_i(1)])^2 \right) + \left( \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i l'\mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[l'\mathbf{Y}_i(1)] \right)^2, \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

where the second line uses the bias variance decomposition. The first term can be viewed as a Horvitz-Thompson estimator of  $\frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i \pi_i (l'\mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[l'\mathbf{Y}_i(1)])^2 = \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi}[l'\mathbf{Y}_i(1)]$  under rejective sampling, and thus has variance equal to

$$(1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{N_1^2} \left( \sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \right) \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}} [(l'\mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[l'\mathbf{Y}_i(1)])^2].$$

Further, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N_1^2} \left( \sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \right) \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}} [(l' \mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [l' \mathbf{Y}_i(1)])^2] \leq \\
& \frac{1}{N_1} \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [(l' \mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [l' \mathbf{Y}_i(1)])^4] \leq \\
& \frac{1}{N_1} \max_i \{(l' \mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [l' \mathbf{Y}_i(1)])^2\} \cdot \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [l' \mathbf{Y}_i(1)] \leq \\
& \left[ \|l\|^2 \frac{N}{N_1} \right] \left[ \max_i \|\mathbf{Y}_i(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\mathbf{Y}_i(1)]\|^2 / N \right] \cdot [l' \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [\mathbf{Y}_i(1)] l] = o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is obtained using the fact that  $\mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\hat{\pi}} [X] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [X^2]$ , expanding the definition of  $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\cdot]$ , and using the inequality  $\pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \leq \pi_i$ , analogous to the argument in the proof to Proposition 3.3 in the scalar case; the final inequality uses the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and factors out  $l$ ; and we obtain that the final term is  $o(1)$  by noting that the first and final bracketed terms are  $O(1)$  by Assumption C.1 and the middle term is  $o(1)$  by Assumption C.2. Applying Chebychev's inequality, it follows that the first term in (22) is equal to  $\mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [l' \mathbf{Y}_i(1)] + o(1)$ .

To complete the proof of the claim, we show that the second term in (22) is  $o(1)$ . Note that we can view  $\frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i l' \mathbf{Y}_i(1)$  as a Horvitz-Thompson estimator of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi} [l' \mathbf{Y}_i]$ . Following similar arguments to that in the proceeding paragraph, we have that its variance is bounded above by  $\frac{1}{N_1} l' \mathbb{V}\text{ar}_{\pi} [\mathbf{Y}_i(1)] l$ , which is  $o(1)$  by Assumption C.1 combined with the fact that Assumption 3.1(a) implies  $N_1 \rightarrow \infty$ . Applying Chebychev's inequality again, we obtain that the second term in (22) is  $o(1)$ , as needed.

To prove claim (4), appealing to the Cramer-Wold device, it suffices to show that for any  $l \in \mathbb{R}^K \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $Y_i = l' \mathbf{Y}_i$ , and  $\hat{\tau}$  as defined in (2),  $\mathbb{V}_R [\hat{\tau}]^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{\tau} - \tau) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . This follows from Proposition 3.3, provided that we can show that Assumption 3.1C.3 implies that Assumption (b) holds when  $Y_i = l' \mathbf{Y}_i$  for any conformable vector  $l$ . Indeed, recall that  $\sigma_{\hat{\pi}}^2 = l' \Sigma_{\hat{\pi}} l \geq \lambda_{\min} \|l\|^2$ , and hence  $\frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}} \geq \frac{1}{\|l\|^2} \frac{1}{\sigma_{\hat{\pi}}^2}$ . From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i] \right\|^2 \cdot \|l\|^2 \geq (\tilde{Y}_i - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\tilde{Y}_i])^2.$$

Together with the previous inequality, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i] \right\|^2 \cdot 1 \left[ \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_i] \right\| \geq \sqrt{\sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \cdot \lambda_{\min} \cdot \epsilon} \right] \right] \geq \\
& \frac{1}{\sigma_{\hat{\pi}}^2} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} \left[ (\tilde{Y}_i - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\tilde{Y}_i])^2 \cdot 1 \left[ |\tilde{Y}_i - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\pi}} [\tilde{Y}_i]| \geq \sqrt{\sum_i \pi_i(1 - \pi_i) \cdot \sigma_{\hat{\pi}} \epsilon} \right] \right],
\end{aligned}$$

from which the result follows. □

## C.1 Non-staggered difference-in-differences

We apply the multiple outcomes results to provide a design-based analysis of non-staggered difference-in-differences (DID) estimators with more than two periods (e.g., Chapter 5 of Angrist and Pischke (2009)), extending those for the two-period DID model in the main text.

**Set-up:** Suppose we observe panel data for a finite-population of  $N$  units for periods  $t = -\underline{T}, \dots, \bar{T}$ . Units with  $D_i = 1$  receive a treatment of interest beginning at period  $t = 1$ .<sup>18</sup> The observed outcome for unit  $i$  at period  $t$  is  $Y_{it} = Y_{it}(D_i)$ . We assume the treatment has no effect prior to implementation, so that  $Y_{it}(1) = Y_{it}(0)$  for all  $t < 1$  (i.e., “no-anticipation”). It is common to estimate the ATT in period  $t$  by the difference-in-differences estimator

$$\hat{\beta}_t = \hat{\tau}_t - \hat{\tau}_0 \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{\tau}_t = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i Y_{it} - \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_i (1 - D_i) Y_{it}. \quad (23)$$

The DID estimators  $\{\hat{\beta}_t : t = 1, \dots, \bar{T}\}$  correspond to the coefficients from the dynamic two-way fixed effects (TWFE) or “event-study” regression specification

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \phi_t + \sum_{s \neq 0} D_i \times 1[s = t] \times \beta_s + \epsilon_{it}. \quad (24)$$

From equation (23), we see that  $\hat{\beta}_t$  is the difference in the DIM estimators for the outcome in period  $t$  and period 0. Letting  $\mathbf{Y}_i = (Y_{i,-\underline{T}}, \dots, Y_{i,\bar{T}})'$ , claim (1) of Proposition C.1 implies

$$\mathbb{E}_R \left[ \hat{\beta}_t \right] = \tau_{EATT,t} + \frac{N}{N_0} \frac{N}{N_1} \text{Cov}_1 [\pi_i, Y_{it}(0) - Y_{i0}(0)],$$

where  $\tau_{EATT,t} = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i \pi_i (Y_{it}(1) - Y_{it}(0))$  is the EATT in period  $t$ , and we use the fact that  $\tau_0 = 0$  by the no-anticipation assumption. Thus, the bias in  $\hat{\beta}_t$  is proportional to the finite population covariance between  $\pi_i$  and trends in the untreated potential outcomes,  $Y_{it}(0) - Y_{i0}(0)$ . It follows that  $\hat{\beta}_t$  is unbiased for  $\tau_t$  over the randomization distribution if  $\text{Cov}_1 [\pi_i, Y_{it}(0) - Y_{i0}(0)] = 0$ , or equivalently, if

$$\mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_i D_i (Y_{it}(0) - Y_{i0}(0)) \right] = \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_i (1 - D_i) (Y_{it}(0) - Y_{i0}(0)) \right],$$

which mimics the familiar “parallel trends” assumption from the sampling-based model.

Additionally, if the sequence of populations satisfies the assumptions in claim (4) of Proposition C.1, then

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - (\boldsymbol{\tau}_{EATT} + \boldsymbol{\delta})) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), \quad (25)$$

where  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  is the vector that stacks the period-specific estimators  $\hat{\beta}_t$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N \text{V}_R \left[ \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right]$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_{EATT}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$  are the vectors that stack  $\tau_{EATT,t}$  and  $\delta_t = \frac{N}{N_0} \frac{N}{N_1} \text{Cov}_1 [\pi_i, Y_{it}(0) - Y_{i0}(0)]$ . Claim (3)

<sup>18</sup>We focus on the case with non-staggered treatment timing since it may be difficult to causally interpret the estimand of standard two-way fixed effects models under treatment effect heterogeneity and staggered treatment timing (Borusyak and Jaravel, 2016; de Chaisemartin and D’Haultfœuille, 2020; Goodman-Bacon, 2021; Athey and Imbens, 2022). Nonetheless, the results discussed in this section could potentially be extended to other estimators with a more sensible causal interpretation under staggered timing e.g. Callaway and Sant’Anna (2021); Sun and Abraham (2021).



implies that the variance estimator  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$  is asymptotically conservative for  $\hat{\beta}$ . It is easily verified that  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}$  corresponds with the cluster-robust variance estimator for (24) that clusters at level  $i$  (up to degrees of freedom corrections). The resulting normal limiting model in (25) has been studied by Roth (2022) and Rambachan and Roth (2023) from a sampling-based perspective in which parallel trends may fail.<sup>19</sup> These results show that it also has a sensible interpretation from a design-based perspective.

## D Extension to general OLS estimators with clustered assignment

This section extends our analysis of the DIM estimator under the rejective assignment mechanism in two ways. First, we consider general regression estimators beyond the simple DIM. Second, we allow for clustered treatment assignment. This nests our results in the main text on the DIM under individual-level treatment assignment as a special case where (i) the regression estimator is the DIM, and (ii) each cluster corresponds with exactly 1 unit.

As in Section 5.3, suppose each unit  $i = 1, \dots, N$  belongs to one of  $c = 1, \dots, C$  clusters, where  $c(i)$  denotes the cluster membership of unit  $i$ . The treatment is assigned at the cluster level, where the cluster level treatment assignments  $D := (D_1, \dots, D_C)'$  follow a rejective assignment mechanism (13). Suppose that the researcher estimates the ordinary least squares (OLS) coefficients  $\hat{\beta}$  from the regression  $Y_i = X_i'\beta + \epsilon_i$ , where  $X_i = D_i X_i(1) + (1 - D_i) X_i(0)$  is a vector of covariates potentially depending on  $D_i$ . Note that if  $X_i(d) = (1, d)'$ , then the second element of  $\hat{\beta}$  corresponds with the DIM.

We analyze the properties of the OLS estimator along a sequence of finite-populations along which the number of clusters  $C$  grows large, similar to the asymptotics in Section 3.2. Before stating our results, we introduce some notation. Let  $\widetilde{X X}'_c(d) = \sum_{i:c(i)=c} X_i(d) X_i(d)'$  and  $\widetilde{X Y}_c(d) = \sum_{i:c(i)=c} X_i(d) Y_i(d)$ . Analogous to the notation in the main text, for a cluster-level function of the potential outcome  $A_c(d)$ , we will write,  $\mathbb{E}_{w_c} [A_c(d)]$  to denote the sum  $\frac{1}{\sum_c w_c} \sum_c A_c(d)$ . Using this notation,  $\hat{\beta}$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta} &= \left( \sum_i X_i X_i' \right)^{-1} \left( \sum_i X_i Y_i \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{C_1}{C} \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) + \frac{C_0}{C} \frac{1}{C_0} \sum_c (1 - D_c) \widetilde{X X}'_c(0) \right)^{-1} \times \\ &\quad \left( \frac{C_1}{C} \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X Y}_c(1) + \frac{C_0}{C} \frac{1}{C_0} \sum_c (1 - D_c) \widetilde{X Y}_c(0) \right) \end{aligned}$$

We provide the proofs of all results in Section D.1.

Our first result shows  $\hat{\beta}$  is consistent for

$$\beta_{cluster} := \left( \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [\widetilde{X X}'_c(1)] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} [\widetilde{X X}'_c(0)] \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [\widetilde{X Y}_c(1)] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} [\widetilde{X Y}_c(0)] \right),$$

---

<sup>19</sup>One difference from the design-based view is that  $\Sigma$  is only conservatively estimable.

and asymptotically normally distributed under the clustered randomization distribution.

**Assumption D.1.**

- (a) (Moments have limits)  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [\widetilde{X}\widetilde{Y}_c(1)]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} [\widetilde{X}\widetilde{Y}_c(0)]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} [\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(0)]$ , and  $\frac{C_1}{C}$  have finite limits, with  $\lim \frac{C_1}{C} \in (0, 1)$ .
- (b) (Full-rank regressors)  $\frac{C_1}{C}\mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)] + \frac{C_0}{C}\mathbb{E}_{1-\pi} [\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(0)]$  has a full-rank limit.
- (c) (Bounded variances) There exists  $M < \infty$  such that  $\text{Var}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [(\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(d))_{jk}] < M$  and  $\text{Var}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [(\widetilde{X}\widetilde{Y}_c(d))_j] < M$  for  $d = 0, 1$  and  $j, k = 1, \dots, \dim(X_i)$ .
- (d) (Lindeberg condition) Assumption C.3 is satisfied for  $\mathbf{Y}_i = \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1) - \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(0) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1) - \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(0)]$ , where  $\epsilon_i(d) = Y_i(d) - X_i(d)'\beta_{cluster}$  and  $\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(d) = \sum_{i:c(i)=c} X_i(d)\epsilon_i(d)$ .

**Proposition D.1** (Consistency and asymptotic normality).

- (1) If  $\sum_c \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) \rightarrow \infty$  and Assumption D.1 parts (i)-(iii) hold,  $\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ .
- (2) Define  $V_{cluster} := C^{-1}(\sum_c \tilde{\pi}_c) \text{Var}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [\sum_{i:c(i)=c} X_i(1)\epsilon_i(1) - X_i(0)\epsilon_i(0)]$ . If  $\sum_c \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) \rightarrow \infty$  and Assumption D.1 holds,

$$\Omega_{cluster}^{-1/2} \sqrt{C} \left( \hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, I),$$

where  $\Omega_{cluster} := \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right]^{-1} V_{cluster} \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right]^{-1}$ .

We next analyze the cluster-robust variance estimator (Liang and Zeger, 1986),

$$\hat{\Omega}_{cluster} := \left( \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right)^{-1} \hat{V}_{cluster} \left( \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right)^{-1}, \quad (26)$$

where

$$\hat{V}_{cluster} := \frac{1}{C} \sum_c \widetilde{X}\hat{\epsilon}_c\widetilde{X}\hat{\epsilon}_c' \quad (27)$$

for  $\hat{\epsilon}_i = Y_i - X_i'\hat{\beta}$  and  $\widetilde{X}\hat{\epsilon}_c = \sum_{i:c(i)=c} X_i\hat{\epsilon}_i$ . In the case with an individual-level treatment assignment (i.e.,  $C = N$ ), the cluster-robust variance estimator is equivalent to the Eicker-Huber-White heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator. Our next result establishes that  $\hat{V}_{cluster}$  is consistent for an upper bound of  $V_{cluster}$  defined in Proposition D.1 in finite populations with a large number of clusters.

**Assumption D.2.**

- (a)  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)']$  and  $\mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} [\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(0)\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(0)']$  have limits.
- (b) There exists  $\tilde{M}_1 > 0$  such that  $\|\text{Var}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(d)\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(d)']\| < \tilde{M}_1$  for  $d = 0, 1$ , where  $\|A\|$  denotes the Frobenius norm of a matrix  $A$ .

(c) There exists  $\tilde{M}_2 > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \|\widetilde{X\epsilon}_c(d)\|^2 \right] < \tilde{M}_2$  and  $\mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \|\widetilde{XX}'_c(d)\|^2 \right] < \tilde{M}_2$  for  $d = 0, 1$ .

**Proposition D.2** (Variance consistency). *If Assumption D.1(i)-(iii) and Assumption D.2 hold, and  $\sum_c \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\hat{V}_{cluster} - V_{cluster}^{est} \xrightarrow{p} 0$  for*

$$V_{cluster}^{est} := \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X\epsilon}_c(1) \widetilde{X\epsilon}_c(1)' \right] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X\epsilon}_c(0) \widetilde{X\epsilon}_c(0)' \right]$$

Furthermore,  $V_{cluster}^{est} \geq V_{cluster}$  (i.e.,  $V_{cluster}^{est} - V_{cluster}$  is positive semi-definite).

**Corollary D.1.** *Define  $\Omega_{cluster}^{est} := \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \sum_i X_i X_i \right]^{-1} V_{cluster}^{est} \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \sum_i X_i X_i \right]$ . Under the same conditions as Proposition D.2,  $\hat{\Omega}_{cluster} - \Omega_{cluster}^{est} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ , and  $\Omega_{cluster}^{est} \geq \Omega_{cluster}$ .*

Finally, we show that the Eicker-Huber-White (EHW) covariance estimator need not be valid under the clustered treatment assignment mechanism considered here. Specifically, consider the Eicker-Huber-White variance estimator  $\hat{V}_{EHW} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i X_i X_i' \hat{\epsilon}_i^2$ . Under the clustered treatment assignment mechanism, it can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\hat{V}_{EHW} = \frac{C_1}{N} \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \left( \widetilde{XX'\hat{\epsilon}_c^2}(1) \right) + \frac{C_0}{N} \frac{1}{C_0} \sum_c (1 - D_c) \left( \widetilde{XX'\hat{\epsilon}_c^2}(0) \right),$$

where  $\widetilde{XX'\hat{\epsilon}_c^2}(d) = \sum_{i: c(i)=c} X_i(d) X_i(d)' \hat{\epsilon}_i^2$ . Define  $\widetilde{XX'\epsilon_c^2}(d) = \sum_{i: c(i)=c} X_i(d) X_i(d)' \epsilon_i(d)^2$  analogously. Our next result characterizes the probability limit of  $\hat{V}_{EHW}$ .

**Assumption D.3.**

(i)  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{XX'\epsilon_c^2}(1) \right]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{XX'\epsilon_c^2}(0) \right]$ ,  $N/C$ ,  $C_1/C$  have finite limits with  $\lim C_1/C \in (0, 1)$  and  $\lim N/C < \infty$ .

(ii) There exists  $\tilde{M}_3$  such that  $\|\text{Var}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} \left[ \widetilde{XX'\epsilon_c^2}(d) \right]\| \leq \tilde{M}_3$  for  $d = 0, 1$ .

(iii) There exists  $\tilde{M}_4$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \widetilde{W}(d)_c \right] < \tilde{M}_4$  and  $\mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \widetilde{V}(d)_c \right] < \tilde{M}_4$  for  $d = 0, 1$ , where  $\widetilde{W}(d)_c = \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \|X_i(1)\epsilon_i(d)\|^2$  and  $\widetilde{V}(d)_c = \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \|X_i(d)X_i(d)'\|^2$ .

**Proposition D.3.** *If Assumptions D.1 and D.3(i)-(iii) hold, and  $\sum_c \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\hat{V}_{EHW} - V_{cluster}^{EHW} \xrightarrow{p} 0$  for*

$$V_{cluster}^{EHW} := \frac{C_1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{XX'\epsilon_c^2}(1) \right] + \frac{C_0}{N} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{XX'\epsilon_c^2}(0) \right].$$

Furthermore,  $V_{cluster} - \frac{N}{C} V_{cluster}^{EHW}$  equals

$$\frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \sum_{i \neq j: c(i), c(j)=c} \eta_i(1) \eta_j(1)' \right] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \sum_{i \neq j: c(i), c(j)=c} \eta_i(0) \eta_j(0)' \right] -$$

$\mathbb{E}_1 \left[ (\pi_c \eta_c(1) + (1 - \pi_c) \eta_c(0)) (\pi_c \eta_c(1) + (1 - \pi_c) \eta_c(0))' \right] - \mathbb{E}_1 \left[ \tilde{\pi}_c \right] \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} \left[ \eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0) \right] \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} \left[ \eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0) \right]'$

where  $\eta_i(d) = X_i(d) \epsilon_i(d)$  and  $\eta_c(d) = \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \eta_i(d)$ .

Proposition D.3 implies that the usual heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator can be invalid in large populations if there is clustered treatment assignment (i.e. if  $N \neq C$ ). To see this, consider the DIM, which corresponds with  $X_i = (1, D_i)'$ . Suppose there is no within-cluster heterogeneity in potential outcomes (i.e.,  $Y_i(d) = Y_{c(i)}(d)$  for all  $i$  and  $d \in \{0, 1\}$ ) and all clusters are the same size (i.e.,  $N_c = N/C$ ). In this case,  $V_{cluster}^{est} = \frac{N}{C} V_{cluster}^{EHW}$ . If further there is no across-cluster treatment effect heterogeneity nor heterogeneity in cluster-specific treatment probabilities,  $V_{cluster} = V_{cluster}^{est}$  by the same logic as Corollary 3.1 in the main text for the non-clustered case, and the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator is thus too small whenever  $N/C > 1$ . If there is either treatment effect heterogeneity or heterogeneity in cluster-specific treatment probabilities, then  $V_{cluster} \leq V_{cluster}^{est}$  (generally with strict inequality), in which case the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator is valid whenever  $C/N \geq V_{cluster}/V_{cluster}^{est}$ . Abadie et al. (2022) establish a similar result for a setting in which units have the same probability of receiving treatment marginalized over a two-stage assignment process; thus treatment probabilities in Abadie et al. (2022) are not related to potential outcomes, and so their calculations are not directly applicable to quasi-experimental settings.

## D.1 Proofs of results for general OLS estimators under clustering

### Proof of Proposition D.1

*Proof.* To establish claim (1), let  $p_c^*$  be the limit of  $\frac{C_1}{C}$ , let  $\mu_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) \right]$  be the limit of  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) \right]$ , and define  $\mu_{\pi_c} [\cdot]$  and  $\mu_{1-\pi_c} [\cdot]$  of other variables analogously. Let

$$\beta_{cluster}^* = \left( p_c^* \mu_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(1)' \right] + (1 - p_c^*) \mu_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(0)' \right] \right)^{-1} \left( p_c^* \mu_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X Y}_c(1) \right] + (1 - p_c^*) \mu_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X Y}_c(0) \right] \right).$$

It is immediate from Assumption D.1(i)-(ii) that  $\beta_{cluster} \rightarrow \beta_{cluster}^*$ , so it suffices to show that  $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{P} \beta_{cluster}^*$ . Note that we can write  $\hat{\beta}$  as

$$\left( \frac{C_1}{C} \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) + \frac{C_0}{C} \frac{1}{C_0} \sum_c (1 - D_c) \widetilde{X X}'_c(0) \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{C_1}{C} \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X Y}_c(1) + \frac{C_0}{C} \frac{1}{C_0} \sum_c (1 - D_c) \widetilde{X Y}_c(0) \right).$$

Using Theorem 6.1 in Hajek (1964) as in the proof to Lemma 3.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c (\widetilde{X X}'_c(1))_{jk} \right] &= (1 + o(1)) C_1^{-2} \left( \sum_c \tilde{\pi}_c \right) \text{Var}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} \left[ (\widetilde{X X}'_c(1))_{jk} \right] \\ &\leq (1 + o(1)) C_1^{-1} M \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we obtain the inequality from Assumption D.1(iii) combined with the fact that  $\tilde{\pi}_c \leq \pi_c$  for all  $c$  and thus  $\sum_c \tilde{\pi}_c \leq \sum_c \pi_c = C_1$ . Combining the previous display with Chebychev's inequality, we obtain that  $\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) - \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) \right] \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . But  $\mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) \right] \rightarrow \mu_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) \right]$ , and hence  $\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) \xrightarrow{P} \mu_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(1) \right]$ . An analogous argument yields that  $\frac{1}{C_0} \sum_c (1 - D_c) \widetilde{X X}'_c(0) \xrightarrow{P} \mu_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X X}'_c(0) \right]$ ,  $\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X Y}_c(1) \xrightarrow{P} \mu_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X Y}_c(1) \right]$ , and  $\frac{1}{C_0} \sum_c (1 - D_c) \widetilde{X Y}_c(0) \xrightarrow{P} \mu_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X Y}_c(0) \right]$ . These convergences together with the continuous

mapping theorem yield that  $\hat{\beta} \xrightarrow{p} \beta_{cluster}^*$ , as we wished to show.

To show the second claim, define  $\epsilon_i = D_i\epsilon_i(1) + (1 - D_i)\epsilon_i(0)$  (and recall that  $\epsilon_i(d) = Y_i(d) - X_i(d)'\beta_{cluster}$ ), so that

$$\hat{\beta} = \beta_{cluster} + \left( \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i \epsilon_i \right).$$

and

$$\sqrt{C}(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster}) = \left( \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{C}} \sum_i X_i \epsilon_i \right).$$

In the proof of claim (1), we established that  $\left( \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right)^{-1}$  is consistent for  $\mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right]^{-1}$ . We therefore focus on establishing the asymptotic normality of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{C}} \sum_i X_i \epsilon_i$ . Towards this, notice that standard arguments for linear projections imply that

$$\mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i \epsilon_i \right] = \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(1) \right] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(0) \right] = 0, \quad (28)$$

where  $\widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(d) = \sum_{i: c(i)=c} X_i(d) \epsilon_i(d)$  as before. By adding/subtracting  $C_1 \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(0) \right]$  from the previous display and applying the identity  $C_1 \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [v_c] + C_0 \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} [v_c] = C \mathbb{E}_1 [v_c]$  for any cluster-level attribute  $v_c$ , we obtain that

$$C_1 \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(1) - \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(0) \right] + \sum_c \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(0) = 0.$$

It therefore follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i X_i \epsilon_i &= \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(1) + \sum_c (1 - D_c) \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(0) \\ &= \sum_c D_c \left( \left( \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(1) - \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(0) \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(1) - \widetilde{X} \epsilon_c(0) \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\sum_i X_i \epsilon_i$  can be represented as Horvitz-Thompson estimator under clustered rejective sampling. Applying the multivariate generalization of Theorem 1 in Berger (1998) as in the proof to Proposition 4, we therefore conclude that

$$V_{cluster}^{-1/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{C}} \sum_i X_i \epsilon_i \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, I),$$

where  $V_{cluster}$  is defined in the statement of claim (2). Claim (2) follows by applying Slutsky's lemma.  $\square$

## Proof of Proposition D.2

*Proof.* To show the first claim, observe that

$$\hat{V}_{cluster} = \frac{C_1}{C} \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X} \hat{\epsilon}_c(1) \widetilde{X} \hat{\epsilon}_c(1)' + \frac{C_0}{C} \frac{1}{C_0} \sum_c (1 - D_c) \widetilde{X} \hat{\epsilon}_c(0) \widetilde{X} \hat{\epsilon}_c(0)'$$

Furthermore,  $\widetilde{X}\widehat{\epsilon}_c(d) = \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(d) - \widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(d)(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X}\widehat{\epsilon}_c(1)\widetilde{X}\widehat{\epsilon}_c(1)' &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)'}_{=(A)} - \\
&\underbrace{\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)'}_{=(B)} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \left( \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)' \right)'}_{=(B')} + \\
&\underbrace{\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)'}_{=(C)} \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the term labeled (A) in (29) and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \mathbb{V}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)' \right] \right\| &= (1 + o(1))C_1^{-2} \left( \sum_c \tilde{\pi}_c \right) \left\| \mathbb{V}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} \left[ \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)' \right] \right\| \\
&\leq (1 + o(1))C_1^{-1} \tilde{M}_1 \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use Assumption D.2(ii) to bound  $\|\mathbb{V}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)']\|$ . Hence, by Chebychev's inequality,  $\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)' \xrightarrow{p} \mu_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)']$ , where we define  $\mu_{\tilde{\pi}_c}[\cdot]$  as in the proof to Proposition D.1. Next, consider the term labeled (C) in (29). Recall that the Frobenius norm is sub-multiplicative, so that  $\|QR\| \leq \|Q\|\|R\|$  for any matrices  $Q, R$ . Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(C)\| &\leq \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \|\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)'\| \\
&\leq \|(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\| \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \|\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)\|^2 \\
&\leq \|(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\| \frac{C}{C_1} \frac{1}{C} \sum_c \|\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)\|^2 \\
&\leq \|(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\| \frac{C}{C_1} \tilde{M}_2 \xrightarrow{p} 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses Assumption D.2(iii), and we use the fact that  $C/C_1$  has a finite

limit by Assumption **D.1**(i) and  $\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster} \xrightarrow{p} 0$  by Proposition **D.1**. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(B)\| &\leq \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \|\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})' \widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)'\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \|\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)\| \cdot \|\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)\| \cdot \|(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})\| \\
&\leq \frac{C}{C_1} \frac{1}{C} \sum_c \|\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)\| \cdot \|\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)\| \cdot \|(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})\| \\
&\leq \frac{C_1}{C} \sqrt{\frac{1}{C} \sum_c \|\widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)\|^2} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{C} \sum_c \|\widetilde{X}\widetilde{X}'_c(1)\|^2} \cdot \|(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})\| \\
&\leq \frac{C_1}{C} \tilde{M}_2 \|\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster}\| \xrightarrow{p} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the fourth inequality uses Cauchy-Schwarz, the fifth inequality uses Assumption **D.2**(iii) and we use the fact that  $\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster} \xrightarrow{p} 0$  as shown above. We have thus shown that  $\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1) \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)' \xrightarrow{p} \mu_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1) \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(1)' \right]$ . By analogous argument, we can show that  $\frac{1}{C_0} \sum_c (1 - D_c) \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(0) \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(0)' \xrightarrow{p} \mu_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(0) \widetilde{X}\epsilon_c(0)' \right]$ . The first part of the result then follows from the continuous mapping theorem.

To show the second claim, let  $\eta_c(d) = \sum_{i:c(i)=c} X_i(d)\epsilon_i(d)$ ,  $\dot{\eta}_c(1) = \dot{\eta}_c(1) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [\eta_c(1)]$ , and  $\dot{\eta}_c(0) = \dot{\eta}_c(0) - \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} [\eta_c(0)]$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{cluster} &= \frac{1}{C} \sum_c \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) (\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0)]) (\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0)])' \\
&\leq \frac{1}{C} \sum_c \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) (\dot{\eta}_c(1) - \dot{\eta}_c(0)) (\dot{\eta}_c(1) - \dot{\eta}_c(0))' \\
&= \frac{1}{C} \left( \sum_c \pi_c \dot{\eta}_c(1) \dot{\eta}_c(1)' + \sum_c (1 - \pi_c) \dot{\eta}_c(0) \dot{\eta}_c(0)' - \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left( \sum_c \pi_c^2 \dot{\eta}_c(1) \dot{\eta}_c(1)' + \sum_c (1 - \pi_c)^2 \dot{\eta}_c(0) \dot{\eta}_c(0)' + \sum_c \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) (\dot{\eta}_c(1) \dot{\eta}_c(0)' + \dot{\eta}_c(0) \dot{\eta}_c(1)') \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{C_1}{C} \text{Var}_{\pi_c} [\eta_c(1)] + \frac{C_0}{C} \text{Var}_{1-\pi_c} [\eta_c(0)] - \frac{1}{C} \sum_c (\pi_c \dot{\eta}_c(1) + (1 - \pi_c) \dot{\eta}_c(0)) (\pi_c \dot{\eta}_c(1) + (1 - \pi_c) \dot{\eta}_c(0))' \\
&\leq \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} [\eta_c(1) \eta_c(1)'] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} [\eta_c(0) \eta_c(0)'] = V_{cluster}^{est}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

### Proof of Corollary **D.1**

*Proof.* The proof is immediate from Proposition **D.2** combined with the fact that  $\frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' - \mathbb{E}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C} \sum_i X_i X_i' \right] \xrightarrow{p} 0$  as shown in the proof to Proposition **D.1**. □

### Proof of Proposition **D.3**

*Proof.* To show the first claim, it is immediate from Assumption D.3(i) that  $V_{cluster}^{EHW}$  converges to

$$(1/n_c^*)p_c^*\mu_{\pi_c}[\widetilde{XX}'\epsilon^2_c(1)] + (1/n_c^*)(1-p_c^*)\mu_{1-\pi_c}[\widetilde{XX}'\epsilon^2_c(0)],$$

where  $n_c^* = \lim N/C$ ,  $p_c^* = \lim C_1/C$ , and  $\mu_{\pi_c}[\cdot]$  is defined as in the proof to Proposition D.1. It therefore suffices to show that  $\hat{V}_{EHW}$  converges in probability to the same limit. To show this, recall that  $\hat{\epsilon}_i = D_i\hat{\epsilon}_i(1) + (1-D_i)\hat{\epsilon}_i(0)$  for  $\hat{\epsilon}_i(d) = \epsilon_i(d) - X_i(d)'(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})$  and  $X_i(d)\hat{\epsilon}_i(d) = X_i(d)\epsilon_i(d) - X_i(d)X_i(d)'(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})$ . Therefore, we can write  $\frac{C_1}{N} \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \left( \widetilde{XX}'\epsilon^2_c(1) \right)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{\frac{C}{N} \frac{C_1}{C} \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{XX}'\epsilon^2_c(1)}_{(A)} + \underbrace{\frac{C}{N} \frac{1}{C} \sum_c D_c \sum_{i: c(i)=c} X_i(1)\epsilon_i(1)(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})' X_i(1)X_i(1)'}_{(B)} + \\ & \underbrace{\frac{C}{N} \frac{1}{C} \sum_c D_c \sum_{i: c(i)=c} X_i(1)X_i(1)'(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})X_i(1)\epsilon_i(1)}_{(B)} + \\ & \underbrace{\frac{C}{N} \frac{1}{C} \sum_c D_c \left( \sum_{i: c(i)=c} X_i(1)X_i(1)'(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})' X_i(1)X_i(1) \right)}_{(C)}. \end{aligned}$$

First, consider the term (A), and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{V}_R \left[ \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{XX}'\epsilon^2_c(1) \right] \right\| &= (1+o(1))C_1^{-2} \left( \sum_c \tilde{\pi}_c \right) \left\| \mathbb{V}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} \left[ \widetilde{XX}'\epsilon^2_c(1) \right] \right\| \\ &\leq (1+o(1))C_1^{-1} \tilde{M}_3 \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Assumption D.3(ii) to bound  $\left\| \mathbb{V}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} \left[ \widetilde{XX}'\epsilon^2_c(1) \right] \right\|$ . Hence,  $\frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{XX}'\epsilon^2_c(1) \xrightarrow{p} \mu_{\pi_c} \left[ \widetilde{XX}'\epsilon^2_c \right]$  by Chebyshev's Inequality. Next, consider term (B) and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(B)\| &\leq \frac{1}{C} \sum_c D_c \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \|X_i(1)\epsilon_i(1)(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})' X_i(1)X_i(1)'\| \\ &\leq \|\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster}\| \left( \frac{1}{C} \sum_c D_c \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \|X_i(1)\epsilon_i(1)\| \|X_i(1)X_i(1)'\| \right) \\ &\leq \|\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster}\| \left( C^{-1} \sum_c \widetilde{W}(1)_c \widetilde{V}(1)_c \right) \\ &\leq \|\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster}\| \sqrt{C^{-1} \sum_c \widetilde{W}(1)_c} \sqrt{C^{-1} \sum_c \widetilde{V}(1)_c} \\ &\leq \|\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster}\| \tilde{M}_4 \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality applies the triangle inequality, the second inequality applies the



submultiplicative property of the Frobenius norm, the third inequality uses the positivity of the norm, and the fourth inequality uses the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Since  $\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster} \xrightarrow{0}$ , it follows that  $\|(B)\| \xrightarrow{p} 0$  by Assumption D.3(iii). The analogous argument gives that (B') converges in probability to zero. Finally, consider term (C) and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(C)\| &\leq \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \|X_i(1)X_i'(1)(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'X_i(1)X_i'(1)\| \\
&\leq \|(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\| \left( \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \|X_i(1)X_i'(1)\|^2 \right) \\
&= \|(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\| \left( \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \widetilde{V}(d)_c \right) \\
&\leq \|(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\| \frac{C}{C_1} \left( \frac{1}{C} \sum_c \widetilde{V}(d)_c \right) \\
&\leq \|(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})(\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster})'\| \frac{C}{C_1} \tilde{M}_4,
\end{aligned}$$

which converges in probability to zero since  $\hat{\beta} - \beta_{cluster} \xrightarrow{p} 0$  and  $\frac{C}{C_1}$  has a finite limit. Putting this together, it follows that  $\frac{C}{N} \frac{C_1}{C} \frac{1}{C_1} \sum_c D_c \left( \widetilde{X\tilde{\epsilon}}_c^2(1) \right) \xrightarrow{p} (1/n_c^*) p_c^* \mu_{\pi_c} [\widetilde{X\tilde{\epsilon}}_c^2(1)]$  by the continuous mapping theorem. By the same argument, we can show  $\frac{C}{N} \frac{C_0}{C} \frac{1}{C_0} \sum_c (1 - D_c) \left( \widetilde{X\tilde{\epsilon}}_c^2(0) \right) \xrightarrow{p} (1/n_c^*) (1 - p_c^*) \mu_{1-\pi_c} [\widetilde{X\tilde{\epsilon}}_c^2(0)]$ . The first claim then follows by another application of the continuous mapping theorem.

To show the second claim, we first observe that  $V_{cluster}$  can be expanded into

$$\begin{aligned}
&C^{-1} \sum_c \pi_c (1 - \pi_c) (\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0)]) (\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0)])' = \\
&\underbrace{C^{-1} \sum_c \pi_c (1 - \pi_c) (\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0)) (\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0))'}_{(a)} - \left( C^{-1} \sum_c \tilde{\pi}_c \right) \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0)] \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0)]'.
\end{aligned}$$

Further expanding out, notice that (a) equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&C^{-1} \sum_c \pi_c (1 - \pi_c) (\eta_c(1)\eta_c(1)' + \eta_c(0)\eta_c(0)' - \eta_c(1)\eta_c(0)' - \eta_c(0)\eta_c(1)') = \\
&C^{-1} \sum_c \pi_c \eta_c(1)\eta_c(1)' + C^{-1} \sum_c (1 - \pi_c) \eta_c(0)\eta_c(0)' - \\
&C^{-1} \sum_c (\pi_c^2 \eta_c(1)\eta_c(1)' + (1 - \pi_c)^2 \eta_c(0)\eta_c(0)' + \pi_c(1 - \pi_c) (\eta_c(1)\eta_c(0)' + \eta_c(0)\eta_c(1)')) = \\
&\underbrace{C^{-1} \sum_c \pi_c \eta_c(1)\eta_c(1)' + C^{-1} \sum_c (1 - \pi_c) \eta_c(0)\eta_c(0)'}_{(b)} - C^{-1} \sum_c (\pi_c \eta_c(1) + (1 - \pi_c) \eta_c(0)) (\pi_c \eta_c(1) + (1 - \pi_c) \eta_c(0))'.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, using the identity  $\eta_c(d)\eta_c(d)' = \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \sum_{j: c(j)=c} \eta_i(d)\eta_j(d)' = \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \eta_i(d)\eta_i(d)' + \sum_{i \neq j: c(i), c(j)=c} \eta_i(d)\eta_j(d)'$ , we further expand out (b) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& C^{-1} \sum_c \pi_c \eta_c(1)\eta_c(1)' + C^{-1} \sum_c (1 - \pi_c) \eta_c(0)\eta_c(0)' = \\
& C^{-1} \sum_c \pi_c \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \eta_i(1)\eta_i(1)' + C^{-1} \sum_c (1 - \pi_c) \sum_{i: c(i)=c} \eta_i(0)\eta_i(0)' + \\
& C^{-1} \sum_c \pi_c \sum_{i \neq j: c(i), c(j)=c} \eta_i(1)\eta_j(1)' + C^{-1} \sum_c (1 - \pi_c) \sum_{i \neq j: c(i), c(j)=c} \eta_i(0)\eta_j(0)' = \\
& \frac{N}{C} V_{cluster}^{EHW} + \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \sum_{i \neq j: c(i), c(j)=c} \eta_i(1)\eta_j(1)' \right] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \sum_{i \neq j: c(i), c(j)=c} \eta_i(0)\eta_j(0)' \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Putting this altogether, we therefore have shown that  $V_{cluster}$  equals

$$\frac{N}{C} V_{cluster}^{EHW} + \frac{C_1}{C} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_c} \left[ \sum_{i \neq j: c(i), c(j)=c} \eta_i(1)\eta_j(1)' \right] + \frac{C_0}{C} \mathbb{E}_{1-\pi_c} \left[ \sum_{i \neq j: c(i), c(j)=c} \eta_i(0)\eta_j(0)' \right] -$$

$$\mathbb{E}_1 [(\pi_c \eta_c(1) + (1 - \pi_c) \eta_c(0))(\pi_c \eta_c(1) + (1 - \pi_c) \eta_c(0))'] - \mathbb{E}_1 [\tilde{\pi}_c] \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0)] \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\pi}_c} [\eta_c(1) - \eta_c(0)]'.$$

□

## E Additional Monte Carlo simulations

This appendix considers extensions to the simulations in Section 4, where (i) the number of treated units varies, (ii) there is treatment effect heterogeneity, and (iii) the size of the finite population varies.

### E.1 Varying the number of treated units

In Section 4 of the main text, we report Monte Carlo simulations that documented the behavior of DID estimates for the effect of a placebo law on state-level log average employment and state-level log average monthly earnings from the QWI when the number of treated and untreated units was approximately equal ( $\frac{N_1}{N} = \frac{25}{51}$ ). We now report the same results for the fraction of treated units varying over  $N_1 \in \{[0.4N], [0.6N]\}$  in Table 2, where  $[\cdot]$  is the floor function. The results are qualitatively similar as the case with  $N_1 = [0.5N]$  in the main text.

### E.2 Treatment effect heterogeneity

In Section 4 of the main text, we report Monte Carlo simulations that documented the behavior of DID estimators for the effect of a placebo law on state-level average employment and state-level log average monthly earnings from the QWI. These simulations were conducted without treatment effect heterogeneity, setting  $Y_{it}(1) = Y_{it}(0)$  both to equal the observed state-level outcomes  $Y_{it}$ .

We now report results from Monte Carlo simulations that incorporate treatment effect heterogeneity. As in the main text, we use aggregate data on the 50 U.S. states and Washington

	$p_1$		
	0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	-0.008	0.249	0.629
Variance conservativeness	1.035	1.316	2.910
Coverage	0.943	0.968	0.995
Oracle coverage	0.946	0.944	0.909

(a) Log employment with  $N_1 = [0.4 N]$ 

	$p_1$		
	0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	-0.001	0.850	2.016
Variance conservativeness	0.981	1.311	2.713
Coverage	0.945	0.914	0.897
Oracle coverage	0.952	0.863	0.438

(b) Log earnings with  $N_1 = [0.4 N]$ 

	$p_1$		
	0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	0.008	0.250	0.394
Variance conservativeness	0.989	1.257	1.648
Coverage	0.942	0.963	0.979
Oracle coverage	0.948	0.947	0.932

(c) Log employment with  $N_1 = [0.6 N]$ 

	$p_1$		
	0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	-0.015	0.819	1.405
Variance conservativeness	1.005	1.265	1.886
Coverage	0.944	0.903	0.891
Oracle coverage	0.949	0.866	0.701

(d) Log earnings with  $N_1 = [0.6 N]$ 

Table 2: Normalized bias, variance conservativeness, and coverage in Monte Carlo simulations with  $N_1 \in \{[0.4 N], [0.6 N]\}$ .

*Notes:* Row 1 reports the normalized bias of the DID estimator ( $\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]/\sqrt{\mathbb{V}\text{ar}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]}$ ) for the EATT over the randomization distribution. Row 2 reports the estimated ratio  $\frac{\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{s}^2]}{\mathbb{V}\text{ar}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]}$  across simulations, which measures the conservativeness of the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator. Row 3 reports the estimated coverage rate of a 95% confidence interval for the EATT based on the limiting normal approximation of the randomization distribution of the DID estimator and the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator  $\hat{s}^2$ . Row 4 reports the coverage rate of an “oracle” 95% confidence interval of the form  $\hat{\tau}_{DID} \pm z_{0.975} \sqrt{\mathbb{V}\text{ar}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]}$ . The columns report results as the idiosyncratic treatment probability  $p^1$  varies over  $\{0.5, 0.75, 0.9\}$ . The results are computed over 5,000 simulations with  $N = 51$ .


D.C. from the QWI (indexed by  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) for the years 2012 and 2016 (indexed by  $t = 1, 2$ ). For each state and year, we set the untreated potential outcome  $Y_{it}(0)$  equal to the state's observed outcome in the QWI. We impose "no-anticipation" by setting  $Y_{i1}(1) = Y_{i1}(0)$ . We draw the treated potential outcome at  $t = 2$  as  $Y_{i2}(1) = Y_{i1}(0) + \lambda \sqrt{\text{Var}_1 [Y_{i2}(0) - Y_{i1}(0)]} Z_i$ , where  $Z_i$  is drawn from a standard normal distribution and  $\lambda \in \{0.5, 1\}$ . We draw the  $Z_i$  once and hold them fixed throughout the simulations. To ease interpretation, we recenter the draws of the unit-specific treatment effects  $\lambda \sqrt{\text{Var}_1 [Y_{i2}(0) - Y_{i1}(0)]} Z_i$  so that the EATT  $\tau_{EATT,2}$  equals zero.

We simulate  $D$  from the rejective assignment mechanism using the state-level results in the 2016 presidential election as in the main text, and we fix the number of treated states at  $N_1 = \lfloor 0.5 N \rfloor$ . We again report results for two choices of the outcome  $Y_{it}$ : the log employment level for state  $i$  in period  $t$ , and the log of state-level average quarterly earnings for state  $i$  in year  $t$ .

**Simulation results:** Table 3 summarizes the normalized bias, variance conservativeness, and coverage in the Monte Carlo simulations. The first row reproduces the results in Table 1 without treatment effect heterogeneity (i.e.,  $\lambda = 0$ ). For a particular choice of the idiosyncratic treatment probabilities  $p^1$ , the bias of the DID estimator for the EATT is fixed as the standard deviation of unit-specific treatment effects varies in these simulations. But, as the standard deviation of unit-specific treatment effects increases, the standard errors become noticeably more conservative. For example, for the log earnings outcome and  $p^1 = 0.75$ , the variance estimator is approximately 1.4 times too large when  $\lambda = 0$ , approximately 1.5 times too large when  $\lambda = 0.5$ , and approximately 2 times too large when  $\lambda = 1$ . As a result of this conservativeness, coverage rates increase for both outcomes as  $\lambda$  increases: e.g., for log-earnings with  $p^1 = 0.75$ , coverage is 91.7% with  $\lambda = 0$ , 93.5% with  $\lambda = 0.5$ , and 97.4% with  $\lambda = 1$ .

In Figure 2, we plot how the randomization distribution of the DID estimator varies as we vary both the idiosyncratic treatment probabilities and the standard deviation of unit-specific treatment effects.

Figure 2: Behavior of DID estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{DID}$  over the randomization distribution with treatment effect heterogeneity.



*Notes:* This figure plots the behavior of the DID estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{DID}$  over the randomization distribution. The idiosyncratic treatment probabilities  $p^1$  varies over  $\{0.5, 0.75, 0.9\}$  (colors), and the standard deviation of unit-specific treatment effects  $\lambda$  varies over  $\{0.5, 1\}$  (columns). The results are computed over 5,000 simulations with  $N_1 = \lfloor 0.5 N \rfloor$  and  $N = 51$ .

	0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	0.013	0.250	0.525
Variance conservativeness	0.976	1.315	2.303
Coverage	0.939	0.967	0.991
Oracle coverage	0.949	0.943	0.917

(a) Log employment with  $\lambda = 0$ 

	0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	0.004	0.882	1.871
Variance conservativeness	0.987	1.383	2.541
Coverage	0.944	0.917	0.888
Oracle coverage	0.952	0.854	0.516

(b) Log earnings with  $\lambda = 0$ 

	$p_1$		
	0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	0.008	0.263	0.486
Variance conservativeness	1.071	1.495	2.761
Coverage	0.953	0.977	0.996
Oracle coverage	0.953	0.943	0.924

(c) Log employment with  $\lambda = 0.5$ 

	$p_1$		
	0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	0.015	0.882	1.856
Variance conservativeness	1.068	1.517	2.925
Coverage	0.956	0.935	0.930
Oracle coverage	0.956	0.861	0.531

(d) Log earnings with  $\lambda = 0.5$ 

	$p_1$		
	0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	0.000	0.225	0.453
Variance conservativeness	1.238	1.594	2.794
Coverage	0.967	0.980	0.999
Oracle coverage	0.952	0.944	0.924

(e) Log employment with  $\lambda = 1$ 

	$p_1$		
	0.50	0.75	0.90
Normalized bias	-0.033	0.857	1.910
Variance conservativeness	1.269	1.959	4.052
Coverage	0.965	0.974	0.981
Oracle coverage	0.951	0.861	0.513

(f) Log earnings with  $\lambda = 1$ 

Table 3: Normalized bias, variance conservativeness, and coverage in Monte Carlo simulations.


*Notes:* Within a particular table, Row 1 reports the normalized bias of the DID estimator ( $\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]/\sqrt{\text{Var}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]}$ ) for the EATT over the randomization distribution; Row 2 reports the estimated ratio  $\frac{\mathbb{E}_R[\hat{s}^2]}{\text{Var}_R[\hat{\tau}_{DID}]}$  across simulations, which measures the conservativeness of the heteroskedasticity-robust variance estimator; Row 3 reports the coverage rate of a nominal 95% confidence interval of the form  $\hat{\tau}_{DID} \pm z_{0.975} \hat{s}$ ; and Row 4 reports coverage of an oracle confidence interval that uses the true variance rather than an estimated one. The columns report results as the idiosyncratic treatment probability  $p^1$  varies over  $\{0.5, 0.75, 0.9\}$ . The results are computed over 5,000 simulations with  $N_1 = \lfloor 0.5N \rfloor$  and  $N = 51$ . Panels (a)-(f) vary the outcome and the degree of treatment heterogeneity ( $\lambda$ ).

### E.3 Varying Population Sizes

In Section 4, we reported results where the finite population was the 50 U.S. states and Washington D.C. We now report simulations where the size of the finite population varies. Specifically, we consider simulations designs with  $N \in \{10, 26, 51\}$ , where the smaller populations are obtained by choosing a subset of the 51 units in ascending order of their associated FIPS codes.

In Figure 3, we fix the standard deviation of unit-specific treatment effects to be  $\lambda = 0$ , and plot how the randomization distribution of the DID estimator varies as we vary both the idiosyncratic treatment probabilities  $p^1$  and the total number of states  $N$ . For  $N = 10$ , the distributions appear to be symmetric, but have oscillations that are not characteristic of a normal distribution (particularly for  $p^1 = 0.9$ ). But, as  $N$  is increased to 26 (or 51), the distributions appear to be approximately normally distributed, illustrating the finite-population central limit theorem in Proposition 3.3. Table 4 summarizes how the coverage rate of a nominal 95% confidence interval of the form  $\hat{\tau}_{DID} \pm z_{0.975} \hat{s}$  varies. Interestingly, for  $N_c = 10$ , despite the non-normal distribution we find that the coverage rate never drops below 91.9% for the log employment outcome and 92.3% for the log earnings outcome, although of course this finding may not generalize beyond the specific data-generating process studied here.

Figure 3: Behavior of DID estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{DID}$  over the randomization distribution varying the size of the finite population.



*Notes:* This figure plots the behavior of the DID estimator  $\hat{\tau}_{DID}$  over the randomization distribution. The idiosyncratic treatment probabilities  $p^1$  varies over  $\{0.5, 0.75, 0.9\}$  (colors), and the total number of units  $N$  varies over  $\{10, 26, 51\}$  (columns). The results are computed over 5,000 simulations with  $N_1 = \lfloor 0.5N \rfloor$  and  $\lambda = 0$ .

	p <sub>1</sub>		
	0.5	0.75	0.90
N = 10	0.919	0.932	0.982
N = 26	0.935	0.966	0.995
N = 51	0.937	0.965	0.990

(a) Log employment with  $\lambda = 0$

	p <sub>1</sub>		
	0.5	0.75	0.90
N = 10	0.923	0.976	0.999
N = 26	0.938	0.929	0.946
N = 51	0.945	0.911	0.889

(b) Log earnings with  $\lambda = 0$

Table 4: Coverage in Monte Carlo simulations varying the size of the finite population.

*Notes:* This table reports the coverage rate of a nominal 95% confidence interval of the form  $\hat{\tau}_{DID} \pm z_{0.975} \hat{s}$  as the size of the finite population  $N$  varies over  $\{10, 26, 51\}$  (rows) and the idiosyncratic treatment probability  $p^1$  varies over  $\{0.5, 0.75, 0.9\}$  (columns) The results are computed over 5,000 simulations with with  $N_1 = \lfloor 0.5 N \rfloor$  and  $\lambda = 0$ .