

Instrument-based estimation of full treatment effects with movers

Didier Nibbering* Matthijs Oosterveen[†]

June 13, 2023

Abstract

The effect of the full treatment is a primary parameter of interest in policy evaluation, while often only the effect of a subset of treatment is estimated. We partially identify the local average treatment effect of receiving full treatment (LAFTE) using an instrumental variable that may induce individuals into only a subset of treatment (movers). We show that movers violate the standard exclusion restriction, necessary conditions on the presence of movers are testable, and partial identification holds under a double exclusion restriction. We identify movers in four empirical applications and estimate informative bounds on the LAFTE in three of them.

JEL: C36, D04

Keywords: Instrumental variables, Local average treatment effects, Movers, Exclusion restriction

*Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia. dieder.nibbering@monash.edu

[†]Department of Economics, Lisbon School of Economics and Management, and Advance/CSG, University of Lisbon, Lisbon 1200-781, Portugal. oosterveen@iseg.ulisboa.pt

[‡]We thank Massimo Anelli, Akanksha Negi, Denni Tommasi, and Dinand Webbink for valuable comments. The authors have no relevant or material financial interests that relate to the research described in this paper. All omissions and errors are our own.

1 Introduction

This paper develops an instrumental variable (IV) framework that partially identifies the local average treatment effect (LATE) of receiving full treatment compared to no treatment. The effect of the full treatment program is a primary parameter of interest in policy evaluation. However, in many instances, policy evaluations yield estimates of only a subset of the treatment program. For instance, when the effect of college completion may be of interest, the effect of college enrollment is estimated. This is a problem for two main reasons. First, most treatment programs are designed to be received in full and the effects of separate treatment parts may be less informative. Second, there is often non-compliance with randomized treatment assignment and hence identification of treatment effects in an IV framework requires an exclusion restriction. This restriction may be violated by individuals moving in or out of treatment after the start of the program.

Individuals that move in or out of treatment are present in many policy evaluation settings. For instance, [Leu \(2017\)](#) reports that approximately 30% of college students changes major, [Sugar et al. \(2021\)](#) describe the high prevalence of Medicaid coverage disruptions, often referred to as churning, due to income fluctuations, and [Heckman et al. \(2000\)](#) discuss the incidence of control group substitution and treatment group dropout across various job market training programs. This implies that instead of staying in or out of treatment during the whole program, there are late-adopters missing the first part of treatment or dropouts missing the final part of treatment.

The IV exclusion restriction rules out certain types of movers depending on the definition of the treatment variable. For instance, [Silliman and Virtanen \(2022\)](#), [Grosz \(2020\)](#), [Burde and Linden \(2013\)](#), and [Hoekstra \(2009\)](#) take enrollment at the start of an educational program as treatment indicator. In this case, the exclusion restriction does not allow for movers that are induced by the instrument to only take the second part of the treatment. [Ketel et al. \(2016\)](#) and [Zimmerman \(2014\)](#) use enrollment at the end of an educational program as treatment indicator. In this case, the exclusion restriction does not allow for movers that are induced by the instrument to only take the first part of the treatment.

Researchers are familiar with the challenging restrictions imposed by the exclusion restriction. For instance, [Silliman and Virtanen \(2022\)](#) estimate the returns to vocational secondary education enrollment, and discuss how student dropout may violate the exclusion restriction. [Grosz \(2020\)](#) discusses how movers in and out of a nursing program affect the exclusion restriction with different definitions of treatment, such as enrolling at the start or ever enrolling, in the nursing program. [Finkelstein et al. \(2012\)](#) suggest that different definitions for the treatment variable of medicaid insurance can be used to provide a lower and

upper bound for a LATE using the largest and smallest first stage, respectively.

This paper partially identifies the LATE of receiving full treatment compared to no treatment under a double exclusion restriction. This parameter is referred to as the local average full treatment effect (LAFTE). Our IV framework includes the binary potential treatment status for the first and second part of treatment with only one binary instrument. The instrument may induce individuals to obtain full treatment, or only the first or second part of the treatment. We refer to the latter group of individuals as movers. Within this framework, movers do not violate the IV exclusion restriction and LATEs are only identified under additional assumptions. The proposed double exclusion restriction extends this exclusion restriction –the instrument can only affect the outcome variable through treatment enrollment– with the condition that the instrument can only affect treatment enrollment in the second part through enrollment in the first part. We provide a procedure for testing necessary conditions of the presence of movers and of the double exclusion restriction.

The partial identification of the LAFTE is achieved with nonparametric sharp bounds. The bounds formalize the intuition that different definitions for the treatment variable can be utilized to identify the effect of receiving a full treatment program, while allowing for movers. We show that the bounds can be tightened using the monotone treatment response and monotone treatment selection assumptions of [Manski \(1997\)](#) and [Manski and Pepper \(2000\)](#) in addition to the double exclusion restriction. Less informative bounds rely solely on double exclusion and a bounded response.

The double exclusion restriction holds if a delayed treatment response to treatment assignment is absent, as it rules out the movers that are induced by the instrument to only take the second part of treatment. It now follows that the common practice of using IV with enrollment in the first part of treatment as treatment indicator identifies the LATE of taking the first part of the treatment. Our double exclusion restriction is similar to, albeit weaker than, the dynamic exclusion restriction of [Angrist et al. \(2022\)](#). The dynamic exclusion restriction imposes the additional condition that treatment enrollment in the first part can only affect the outcome variable through enrollment in the second part. This either rules out movers, restricts treatment effect heterogeneity, or a combination of these two. In this case, LAFTE can be point-identified using the IV method of [Imbens and Angrist \(1994\)](#).

The policy relevance of the LAFTE is illustrated with four empirical applications from different fields of applied economics: a health program by [Finkelstein et al. \(2012, 2016\)](#), a labour program by [Wheeler et al. \(2022\)](#), an educational program by [Anelli \(2020\)](#), and a development program by [Burde and Linden \(2013\)](#). For instance, [Finkelstein et al. \(2016\)](#) use a randomized opportunity to apply for Medicaid as an instrument for Medicaid enrollment.

They find that half a year of Medicaid enrollment increases the probability of an emergency department visit by 0.088 percentage points for the compliers. However, the short-term impact of Medicaid on health care utilization may be small, and hence policymakers make efforts to reduce Medicaid coverage disruptions (Sugar et al., 2021). Indeed, our estimated LAFTE shows that continuous Medicaid enrollment for two years increases the probability of an emergency department visit between 0.081 and 0.224 percentage points for the compliers. This suggests that policies encouraging continuous enrollment result in larger effects on health care utilization. We discuss similar policy implications in the other applications.

The applications also underline the empirical applicability of our methods. The four studies all fit our IV framework, with data available on both enrollment in the first and second part of the treatment. By testing the necessary conditions, we find evidence for the presence of movers in all four studies. In the health program, the movers even establish the majority of the compliers, consistent with the high prevalence of Medicaid coverage disruptions. Except for the development program, the necessary conditions for the double exclusion restriction cannot be rejected. In these three applications, the lower bounds on the LAFTEs are statistically significantly different from zero, and two of the three upper bounds are informative on the size of the LAFTE.

There is an extensive literature that bounds LATEs under violations of the exclusion restriction. For instance, Flores and Flores-Lagunes (2013) establishes partial identification using one treatment variable. Instead of our approach of using treatment indicators for the first and second part of the treatment, Mealli and Pacini (2013) use two outcome variables to construct bounds. Conley et al. (2012) propose Bayesian approaches for identification under relaxed exclusion restrictions. Swanson et al. (2018) provide an overview on treatment bounds for settings with a binary instrument, binary treatment, and a binary outcome. Heckman et al. (2000) bound average treatment effects in the presence of control group substitution and treatment group dropping out, without employing instrumental variables.

The identification of causal parameters with multiple treatment parts has been studied in similar settings. First, we study the identification of the LAFTE by indexing the potential outcomes with the full treatment history. Similar potential outcome models are considered in the dynamic treatment literature. For instance, Lechner (2009) identifies treatment effects using conditional independence assumptions and Ding and Lehrer (2010) employ a structural economic model. Blackwell (2017) identifies the treatment effects for different types of movers between two sequential treatments with one instrument for each treatment. Heckman et al. (2016) also identify dynamic treatment effects using multiple instruments. In contrast, our identification approach relies on only one instrument and does not require

a conditionally exogenous treatment or an underlying structural model.

Second, instead of estimating LATEs, recent difference-in-differences techniques are used to estimate the intention to treat in the presence of movers. For instance, [Hull \(2018\)](#) identifies mover average treatment effects for the individuals that move in or out of treatment. [Verdier \(2020\)](#) extrapolates treatment effects for movers to stayers: individuals whose treatment status does not change. Specific types of movers are studied in, for example, [Athey and Imbens \(2022\)](#) who only allow for late-adopters in a staggered adoption framework.

Third, instead of estimating the LAFTE, causal mediation analysis identifies the direct and indirect effects of enrollment in the first part of treatment. Our proposed double exclusion restriction imposes that all effects of the instrument on the outcome variable go only through enrollment in the first part of treatment. However, the effect of enrollment in the first part on the outcome can either be direct or via treatment enrollment in the second part of the treatment. Hence, enrollment in the second part can be considered a mediator, and [Huber \(2019\)](#) provides an overview of estimation methods for direct and indirect effects of enrollment in the first part of treatment.

The outline of this paper is as follows. Section 2 defines the causal parameter of interest. Section 3 discusses our IV framework with movers. Section 4 introduces the double exclusion restriction, partial identification of the LAFTE, and testable necessary conditions for the presence of movers and the double exclusion restriction. Section 5 applies the proposed methods to four empirical treatment evaluation settings. Section 6 concludes.

2 Full treatment effect and instrumental variables

Assume a setting in which individuals are randomly assigned to treatment, after which full treatment or only a subset of treatment can be received. The binary instrumental variable $Z \in \{0, 1\}$ equals one if an individual is randomly assigned to treatment. The treatment indicator $D_t \in \{0, 1\}$ equals one if treatment part t is received, where $t = 1$ corresponds to, for instance, college enrollment and $t = 2$ to college graduation. When compliance with the treatment assignment is not mandatory, the treatment indicators may take different values than the instrument. After assignment, individuals may obtain full treatment $\{D_1 = 1, D_2 = 1\}$ or no treatment $\{D_1 = 0, D_2 = 0\}$. Moreover, D_1 may be different from D_2 in settings that allow for late enrollment into treatment $\{D_1 = 0, D_2 = 1\}$ and/or dropping out of treatment $\{D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0\}$. Finally, let the variable Y be the observed outcome of interest.

2.1 Causal parameters of interest

A causal parameter of interest to policy makers is the average treatment effect (ATE) of receiving full treatment $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)]$, where $Y(D_1, D_2)$ is an individual's potential outcome for values of D_1 and D_2 . This ATE is the average difference between receiving both parts of the treatment ($Y(1, 1)$) compared to no treatment at all ($Y(0, 0)$). The ATE of the first part of treatment $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, d_2) - Y(0, d_2)]$ or the second part $\mathbb{E}[Y(d_1, 1) - Y(d_1, 0)]$ may be of interest for the evaluation of which treatment period is most effective. However, most treatments are designed to be received in full. For instance, the first part of a training program builds knowledge that prepares for the second part, and the second part builds upon the knowledge obtained in the first. Hence, the average treatment effect of receiving full treatment is often of primary interest to policy makers.

Since we only observe one Y for each individual and individuals may not comply with their assigned treatment, ATEs are in general not identified. In this case it is common to report local ATEs (LATEs) that can be identified by using the random treatment assignment as an instrumental variable for treatment enrollment. The LATE equals the average treatment effect for the individuals who are induced into treatment by the instrument, and is therefore the ATE for a subpopulation.

2.2 The standard IV framework

The standard IV framework introduced by [Imbens and Angrist \(1994\)](#) defines an IV estimand and shows that it identifies a LATE of a treatment variable D on the outcome of interest Y using the potential outcome framework and four assumptions on the instrumental variable Z . The IV estimand is defined as

$$\beta_{IV}(D) = \frac{\Delta \mathbb{E}[Y|Z]}{\Delta \mathbb{E}[D|Z]}, \quad (1)$$

where $\Delta \mathbb{E}[A|Z] = \mathbb{E}[A|Z = 1] - \mathbb{E}[A|Z = 0]$. The potential outcome framework links the observed treatment indicator D to the potential treatment status $D(Z)$ as $D = D(1)Z + D(0)(1 - Z)$, and the observed outcome Y to the potential outcomes $Y(Z, D)$ as $Y = Y(1, 1)ZD + Y(1, 0)Z(1 - D) + Y(0, 1)(1 - Z)D + Y(0, 0)(1 - Z)(1 - D)$.

The four instrumental variable assumptions are:

Assumption 1 (Instrumental variable assumptions).

1. (*Independence*) $Y(z, d), D(z) \perp Z$ for all z, d .
2. (*Relevance*) $\Delta \mathbb{E}[D|Z] > 0$.

Table 1: Treatment indicator specifications

Definition D	Treatment indicator for enrollment in ...	Examples in empirical work
D_1	first part	Silliman and Virtanen (2022), Grosz (2020), Zimmerman (2014), Burde and Linden (2013), Hoekstra (2009)
D_2	second part	Ketel et al. (2016), Zimmerman (2014)
$D_{\wedge} = D_1 D_2$	both parts	
$D_{\vee} = D_1 + D_2 - D_1 D_2$	at least one part	Wheeler et al. (2022), Anelli (2020), Finkelstein et al. (2012)

Notes: this table provides an overview of four treatment indicators that can be constructed when $\{D_1, D_2\}$ is observed and gives examples of research articles using each treatment indicator.

3. (Monotonicity) $D(1) \geq D(0)$.

4. (Exclusion) $Y(z, d) = Y(d)$ for all z, d .

Under Assumption 1, the IV estimand in (1) identifies a LATE if the treatment can be summarized by a single binary variable D : $\beta_{IV} = E[Y(1) - Y(0)|C]$, where $C = \{D(1) - D(0) = 1\}$ defines the individuals induced into treatment by the instrument. These individuals are referred to as compliers.

Table 1 shows four ways the treatment indicator D can be constructed when $\{Z, D_1, D_2, Y\}$ is observed. The treatment indicator can be defined as enrollment at the start of the treatment (D_1), enrollment at the end of the treatment (D_2), received full treatment (D_{\wedge}), or received at least one part of the treatment (D_{\vee}). The third column in Table 1 shows that different definitions of the treatment indicator are used in the applied economics literature.

3 Instrumental variables with movers

When the instrument induces individuals to obtain only a subset of the treatment, all four definitions for D may result in violations of the exclusion restriction made by Assumption 1.4. These violations arise when Z affects Y while D remains constant. For instance, if the researcher uses $D = D_1$ and the instrument induces some individuals into only the second part of treatment, Z may affect Y through D_2 whereas D_1 is not affected. Similarly, if the researcher uses $D = D_2$, the exclusion restriction may be violated if the instrument induces

some individuals into only the first part of treatment. An instrument inducing individuals from no treatment at all to only part of the treatment, or an instrument inducing individuals from only part of the treatment to full treatment, may run into problems with $D = D_\wedge$ or $D = D_\vee$ respectively.

This section extends the standard IV framework to include the potential treatment status at the first and second part of the treatment. Within this framework, five different groups of compliers can be distinguished. The four additional groups of compliers cause the violations of the exclusion restriction described above. We show that in the presence of these four groups, LATEs can only be point identified under additional strict assumptions.

3.1 Model and notation

We extend the potential outcome model to include two potential treatments $D_1(Z)$ and $D_2(Z, D_1)$ and a potential outcome $Y(Z, D_1, D_2)$. Potential and observed treatments and outcomes are linked as follows,

$$D_1 = D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z), \quad (2)$$

$$D_2 = [D_2(1, 1)D_1 + D_2(1, 0)(1 - D_1)]Z + [D_2(0, 1)D_1 + D_2(0, 0)(1 - D_1)](1 - Z), \quad (3)$$

$$Y = [Y(1, 1, 1)D_1D_2 + Y(1, 0, 1)(1 - D_1)D_2 + Y(1, 1, 0)D_1(1 - D_2) + Y(1, 0, 0)(1 - D_1)(1 - D_2)]Z + [Y(0, 1, 1)D_1D_2 + Y(0, 0, 1)(1 - D_1)D_2 + Y(0, 1, 0)D_1(1 - D_2) + Y(0, 0, 0)(1 - D_1)(1 - D_2)](1 - Z). \quad (4)$$

Assumption 2 replaces Assumption 1 for the potential outcome framework defined above:

Assumption 2 (Instrumental variable assumptions).

1. (*Independence*) $Y(z, d_1, d_2), D_1(z), D_2(z, d_1) \perp Z$ for all z, d_1, d_2 .
2. (*Relevance*) $\Delta E[D|Z] > 0$ for $D = D_1, D_2, D_\wedge, D_\vee$.
3. (*Monotonicity*) $D_1(1) \geq D_1(0)$ and $D_2(1, D_1(1)) \geq D_2(0, D_1(0))$.
4. (*Exclusion*) $Y(z, d_1, d_2) = Y(d_1, d_2)$ for all z, d_1, d_2 .

These assumptions hold if Z is randomly assigned (2.1), if there are individuals that are induced into full treatment by the instrument (2.2), and there are no individuals induced to move out of any part of treatment by the instrument (2.3). Assumption 2.4 implies that

$$Y = Y(1, 1)D_1D_2 + Y(0, 1)(1 - D_1)D_2 + Y(1, 0)D_1(1 - D_2) + Y(0, 0)(1 - D_1)(1 - D_2), \quad (5)$$

which shows that Y is a function of the two treatment parts, as defined in Section 2.1.

In contrast, the exclusion restriction in Assumption 1.4 imposes that $Y(z, d_1, d_2) = Y(d)$ for all z, d_1, d_2 , which only depends on one summary of the treatment $D = d$. Assumption 1.4 is more restrictive as it does not allow Z to affect Y through both treatment parts, whereas Assumption 2.4 does. For instance, with $D = D_1$, Assumption 1.4 imposes that $Y(z, d_1, d_2) = Y(d_1)$ and therefore Y does not depend on the second treatment part.

The potential outcome model in (5) implies that there are different types of compliers. Since individuals can comply with the instrument in the first part, the second part, or the full treatment, the group of compliers C consists of five different complier groups: $C = \{\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}, \{N_1, C_2\}, \{A_1, C_2\}\}$. These groups are defined as follows:

1. $\{C_1, C_2\} = \{D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1, D_2(1, 1) - D_2(0, 0) = 1\}$,
2. $\{C_1, N_2\} = \{D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1, D_2(1, 1) = D_2(0, 0) = 0\}$,
3. $\{C_1, A_2\} = \{D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1, D_2(1, 1) = D_2(0, 0) = 1\}$,
4. $\{N_1, C_2\} = \{D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 0, D_2(1, 0) - D_2(0, 0) = 1\}$,
5. $\{A_1, C_2\} = \{D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 1, D_2(1, 1) - D_2(0, 1) = 1\}$,

where C_t , N_t , and A_t refer to respectively compliers, never-takers, and always-takers in treatment part t . The first group of compliers $\{C_1, C_2\}$ is induced into full treatment by the instrument, and we refer to this group as *full compliers*. We define the individuals that are induced to obtain only part of the treatment by the instrument as *movers*. Hence, there are four types of movers: $\{C_1, N_2\}$ and $\{C_1, A_2\}$ are induced into only the first part of treatment, whereas $\{N_1, C_2\}$ and $\{A_1, C_2\}$ are induced into only the second part of treatment.

Our definition of movers concerns individuals who change treatment status after the start of the program depending on the value of the instrument. The two mover types $\{C_1, N_2\}$ and $\{A_1, C_2\}$ dropout from treatment and miss the second part of the program when $Z = 1$ and $Z = 0$, respectively. The two mover types $\{C_1, A_2\}$ and $\{N_1, C_2\}$ are late-adopters and miss the first part of the program when $Z = 0$ and $Z = 1$, respectively. Individuals with $\{N_1, A_2\}$ or $\{A_1, N_2\}$ are not included, as they do not affect the LATE identification. Hence, our mover group is different from the more general definition of movers as the set of all individuals with $D_1 \neq D_2$, as used by, for instance, [Hull \(2018\)](#) in difference-in-differences estimation.

Using the potential outcome framework in (5) and the definition of the complier group C , the local average full treatment effect (LAFTE) can now be expressed as $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) | C]$.

3.2 What IV can identify with movers

The following lemma shows what the first stages $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D|Z]$ for different definitions of D and the reduced form $\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z]$ identify when the potential outcome framework takes both treatment parts into account.

Lemma 1 (First stages and reduced form).

Under Assumption 2 it holds that

1. $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]$.
2. $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]$.
3. $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]$.
4. $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\vee|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2]$.
5. $\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] +$
 $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0)|N_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] +$
 $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|A_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]$.

The proof is deferred to Appendix A.

Lemma 1 shows that the first stages represent the proportion of different complier types depending on the definition of D . Each first stage captures the proportion of the full compliers plus the proportions of two mover types that comply with the corresponding D . For instance, with $D = D_1$, the movers $\{C_1, N_2\}$ and $\{C_1, A_2\}$ comply in the first part of treatment.


The reduced form coefficient $\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z]$ equals a weighted sum of LATEs, in which each weight corresponds to the proportion of one of the five complier types. Each LATE corresponds to a different treatment effect for a complier type. The first term of the reduced form in Lemma 1 corresponds to the LAFTE, but only for the full compliers $\{C_1, C_2\}$.

For each of the definitions of D in Table 1, the IV estimand in (1) identifies a weighted average of LATEs plus a bias term. For instance, for $D = D_1$ we have

$$\beta_{IV}(D_1) = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, C_2]w(C_1, C_2) + \left. \begin{array}{l} \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, N_2]w(C_1, N_2) + \\ \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)|C_1, A_2]w(C_1, A_2) + \end{array} \right\} \text{weighted LATEs} \quad (6)$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|N_1, C_2]w(N_1, C_2) + \\ \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0)|A_1, C_2]w(A_1, C_2), \end{array} \right\} \text{bias}$$

Figure 1: An overview of the possible effects in IV with movers.



Notes: under Assumption 2, Z cannot be affected by any variable, $D_1(z)$ can only be affected by Z , $D_2(z, d_1)$ can only be affected by both Z and D_1 , and $Y(d_1, d_2)$ can only be affected by both D_1 and D_2 . The dashed arrow represents the effect prevented by Assumption 3.

with $w(G_1, G_2) = \frac{\mathbb{P}[G_1, G_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]}$, and where $\{G_1, G_2\}$ can represent any of the five complier groups. The bias terms reflect the effect of D_2 on Y while keeping D_1 constant. It follows that the IV estimand does not have a clear causal interpretation:

Proposition 1 (No causal interpretation of $\beta_{IV}(D)$).

Under Assumption 2 it holds that the IV estimand in (1) has no causal interpretation with either $D = D_1, D_2, D_\wedge, D_\vee$ as defined in Table 1.

The proof follows directly from Lemma 1.

Figure 1 visualizes the identification problem, where each arrow represents a possible effect among $\{Z, D_1, D_2, Y\}$ under Assumption 2. The instrument induces the full compliers $\{C_1, C_2\}$ into full treatment, but also induces the mover groups into only a subset of the treatment. The figure suggests that the LAFTE can be identified under two different additional assumptions. The first assumption rules out the presence of all mover groups. The second assumes that the treatment effects for movers are identical to their full treatment effect. Corollary 1 and 2 below formalize this intuition.

Corollary 1 (No movers).

Under Assumption 2 and $\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] = \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] = \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] = 0$, it holds that

$$\beta_{IV}(D) = \frac{\Delta \mathbb{E}[Y|Z]}{\Delta \mathbb{E}[D|Z]} = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C], \quad (7)$$

for $D = D_1, D_2, D_\wedge, D_\vee$.

The proof follows directly from Lemma 1. Corollary 1 may suit a setting in which, for instance, treatment completion is mandatory after treatment enrollment and treatment completion is impossible without treatment enrollment. It follows that all compliers are full compliers $C = \{C_1, C_2\}$.

Corollary 2 (Homogeneous treatment effects movers).

Under Assumption 2 and the treatment effect homogeneity assumptions in Appendix B, it holds that the IV estimand in (1) with $D = D_1, D_2, D_\wedge, D_\vee$ identifies the LAFTE for three complier groups.

The proof is deferred to Appendix B. Corollary 2 may suit a setting in which, for instance, $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, d_2) - Y(0, d_2) | G_1, G_2]$ does not depend on d_2 for the movers $\{G_1, G_2\}$. This setting implies homogeneous treatment effects within mover types.

The LAFTE can also be identified by a combination of assumptions on the presence of certain mover types and the homogeneity of certain treatment effects. This is formalized by the dynamic exclusion model discussed by [Angrist et al. \(2022\)](#):

$$D_1 = \delta + \pi Z + \eta, \tag{8}$$

$$D_2 = \alpha + \psi D_1 + \xi, \tag{9}$$

$$Y = \beta + \mu D_2 + \varepsilon, \tag{10}$$

where $\delta, \pi, \alpha, \psi, \beta$, and μ are coefficients, η, ξ , and ε are error terms, and we exclude additional covariates. From (9) follows that D_2 does not depend on Z , and consequently the movers $\{N_1, C_2\}$ and $\{A_1, C_2\}$ in Figure 1 do not exist. Similarly, (10) shows that Y does not depend on D_1 . Figure 1 shows that this is the case if either $\{C_1, N_2\}$ and $\{C_1, A_2\}$ do not exist, or if $Y(0, d_2) = Y(1, d_2)$ for all d_2 .

4 Movers with a double exclusion restriction

This section proposes a partial identification strategy for the LAFTE. We replace the single exclusion restriction in Assumption 2.4, by a double exclusion restriction:

Assumption 3 (Double exclusion).

$$Y(z, d_1, d_2) = Y(d_1, d_2) \text{ for all } z, d_1, d_2 \text{ and } D_2(z, d_1) = D_2(d_1) \text{ for all } z, d_1.$$

The first part of Assumption 3 is identical to Assumption 2.4, and the second part states that Z must not have a direct effect on D_2 other than through D_1 . These two parts together impose a double exclusion restriction on Z .

Figure 1 shows that the double exclusion allows for Z to have a direct effect on D_1 , and for Z to have an effect on D_2 through D_1 . Hence, compliers in the second part of treatment have to be compliers in the first part, and the group of compliers now consists of only three types: $C = \{\{C_1, A_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, C_2\}\}$. Assumption 3 holds under (9), but does not impose (10), and hence does not exclude all mover types or imposes homogeneous treatment effects.

The double exclusion restriction imposes that Z randomly assigns individuals to the first part of treatment but not the second part of treatment if the first part stays constant. This holds in settings in which a delayed treatment response to treatment assignment can be ruled out. For instance, in the Medicaid experiment analysed by [Finkelstein et al. \(2012\)](#), individuals with a lottery draw of $Z = 1$ could only obtain Medicaid at the start of the treatment, and hence mover type $\{N_1, C_2\}$ is likely to be absent. Since individuals with $Z = 0$ had little to no opportunity to obtain medicaid coverage at the start of the treatment, mover type $\{A_1, C_2\}$ is also likely to be absent. In case the first stage estimate for enrollment at the start of treatment is close to one, for instance in a carefully conducted randomized controlled trial ([Duflo et al., 2007](#); [De Ree et al., 2023](#)), the double exclusion may also hold.

4.1 Partial identification of the LAFTE

Since the double exclusion restriction rules out two complier types, $\{A_1, C_2\}$ and $\{N_1, C_2\}$, the first stages and reduced form in Lemma 1 can be simplified.

Lemma 2 (First stages and reduced form with double exclusion).

Under Assumption 2.1-2.3 and 3 it holds that

1. $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]$.
2. $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2]$.
3. $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]$.
4. $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\vee|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2]$.
5. $\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]$.

The proof is deferred to Appendix C. Lemma 2 shows that under the double exclusion restriction the proportions of all three complier groups are identified.

The identification of the proportions of the complier groups allows for the partial identification of LAFTE under additional assumptions:

Theorem 1 (Partial identification LAFTE).

Under Assumption 2.1-2.3 and 3, positive response $\mathbb{E}[Y(0, 0)|C_1, A_2] \geq 0$, monotone treatment responses $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|C_1, N_2] \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, A_2] \geq 0$, and monotone treatment selections $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, A_2] \geq \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, N_2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, C_2] \geq \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, N_2]$, it holds that

$$\frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z]} \leq \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C] \leq \frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z]} + \frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[(1 - D_1)(1 - D_2)Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z]}. \quad (11)$$

The proof is deferred to Appendix D. Since the bounds in Theorem 1 collapse to the LAFTE for the full compliers in absence of movers, the bounds are sharp.

Assuming that the LATEs $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|C_1, N_2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, A_2]$ are non-negative, the difference between the reduced form of the LAFTE and the reduced form in Lemma 2 is positive. Hence, the latter can be used as a lower bound on the LAFTE. The assumption of positive expected treatment effects have been used by, for instance, [Flores and Flores-Lagunes \(2013\)](#) for the partial identification of LATEs with a single treatment indicator. [Manski \(1997\)](#) introduces the monotone treatment response (MTR) assumption on the individual level instead of in expectation.

The reduced form in Lemma 2 only differs from the reduced form of the LAFTE by the two potential outcomes $\mathbb{E}[Y(0, 0)|C_1, A_2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, N_2]$. The upper bound on the LAFTE can be obtained by bounding these potential outcomes using the following assumptions: The potential outcome $\mathbb{E}[Y(0, 0)|C_1, A_2]$ is non-negative, and the potential outcome of obtaining full treatment $Y(1, 1)$ is smaller for $\{C_1, N_2\}$ than for $\{C_1, C_2\}$ and $\{C_1, A_2\}$. Outcomes can generally be rescaled so that the assumption of a non-negative potential outcome is harmless, for instance when the response has a lower bound. The second assumption is invoked in expectation, and therefore weaker than the monotone treatment selection (MTS) assumption of [Manski and Pepper \(2000\)](#).

A combination of assumptions similar to the ones in Theorem 1 have been used for the partial identification of treatment effects by, for instance, [Molinari \(2010\)](#), [De Haan \(2011\)](#), and [Kreider et al. \(2012\)](#). In general, partial identification is common in the analysis of treatment effect identification problems. For instance, [Kreider and Pepper \(2007\)](#), [Battistin and Sianesi \(2011\)](#), [Tommasi and Zhang \(2020\)](#), and [Calvi et al. \(2022\)](#) derive bounds on treatment effects when the treatment is misreported.

When the MTR and MTS assumptions are considered too strong, the following bounds can be derived assuming only a bounded response:

Corollary 3 (Partial identification LAFTE with bounded response).

Under Assumption 2.1-2.3 and 3, with bounded response: $Y \in [Y_{\min}, Y_{\max}]$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[(1 - D_1 - D_2 + 2D_1D_2)Y|Z] + Y_{\min}\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_{\vee} - D_2|Z] - Y_{\max}\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_{\wedge} - D_2|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z]} & (12) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C] \leq \\ & \frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[(1 - D_1 - D_2 + 2D_1D_2)Y|Z] + Y_{\max}\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_{\vee} - D_2|Z] - Y_{\min}\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_{\wedge} - D_2|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z]}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is deferred to Appendix E.

The bounded response allows us to replace $Y(1, 0)$ for $\{C_1, N_2\}$ and $Y(0, 1)$ for $\{C_1, A_2\}$ with respectively Y_{\min} and Y_{\max} (Y_{\max} and Y_{\min}) to construct a lower (upper) bound on the LAFTE.

The difference between the bounds equals $(y_{\max} - y_{\min})(\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]) / (\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2])$. The bounds equal $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) | C_1, C_2]$ when no movers are present, but can be wide when the response bounds are wide and the proportion of movers is large.

A complier group that may be of particular interest are the full compliers $\{C_1, C_2\}$. This group is induced to obtain both parts of the treatment by the instrument. However, with only one instrument, it is not possible to affect the full compliers without also affecting the other complier types. Hence, the full compliers are mostly relevant for settings in which the policymaker has an instrument for both the first and second part of treatment. [Blackwell \(2017\)](#) shows that with two binary instruments, and an additional treatment exclusion restriction that each instrument only affects its own treatment, the LAFTE for the full compliers can be identified.

4.2 Testing assumptions

Our identification strategy for the LAFTE relies on restrictions on the presence of mover types. This section derives testable necessary conditions for these restrictions.

First, Corollary 1 shows that the IV method introduced by [Imbens and Angrist \(1994\)](#) point-identifies the LAFTE when no movers are present. This assumption results in the following necessary conditions.

Proposition 2 (Necessary conditions no movers).

Under Assumption 2 it holds that

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_{\vee} - D_2 | Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] - \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2], \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_{\wedge} - D_2 | Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] - \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2], \quad (14)$$

which both equal zero if $\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] = \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]$ and $\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] = \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2]$.

Under Assumption 2 and $p_1 = \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] = \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]$ and $p_2 = \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] = \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2]$, it holds that

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[(D_{\vee} - D_2)Y | Z] = (\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) | C_1, N_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) | A_1, C_2])p_1, \quad (15)$$

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[(D_{\wedge} - D_2)Y | Z] = (\mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) | C_1, A_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) | N_1, C_2])p_2, \quad (16)$$

which both equal zero if $\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] = \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] = \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] = 0$ and/or $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) | C_1, N_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) | A_1, C_2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) | C_1, A_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) | N_1, C_2]$.

The proof is deferred to Appendix F.

The first two necessary conditions (13) and (14) in Proposition 2 can be used to test the null-hypothesis that $\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] = \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]$ and $\mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]$. A failure to reject this

null-hypothesis does not necessarily imply the absence of movers, as it may also indicate mover types with identical proportions. Hence, in case of a failure to reject (13) and (14), the necessary conditions (15) and (16) can be considered. These conditions are equal to zero if there are no movers or if potential outcomes are homogeneous.

Provided that potential outcomes are heterogeneous, Proposition 2 provides a two-step testing procedure for the presence of movers. If the null-hypothesis that (13) and (14) both equal zero is rejected, movers may be present. If this null-hypothesis cannot be rejected, the null-hypothesis that (15) and (16) both equal zero has to be tested. In case of a rejection, we still conclude that there may be movers. However, a failure to reject indicates that there are no movers. So if both sets of necessary conditions cannot be rejected, we recommend using standard IV approaches to identify the LAFTE for the full compliers $\{C_1, C_2\}$.

Second, Theorem 1 shows that in the absence of certain mover types, the LAFTE is partially identified. In particular, the double exclusion restriction in Assumption 3 only allows for $\{C_1, A_2\}$ and $\{C_1, N_2\}$. This has sign implications for (13) and (14):

Proposition 3 (Necessary condition double exclusion restriction).

Under Assumption 2 it holds that

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\vee - D_2|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] - \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2], \quad (17)$$

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge - D_2|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] - \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2], \quad (18)$$

which are both nonnegative if Assumption 3 holds.

The proof follows directly from Proposition 2.

The sign conditions in Proposition 3 are necessary for the absence of the movers ruled out by the double exclusion restriction. Since it could be the case that $\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] > \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] > 0$ and $\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] > \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] > 0$, the conditions are not sufficient for the double exclusion restriction to hold. Hence, a failure to reject the null-hypothesis that the sign restrictions hold need not imply the double exclusion restriction, but a rejection implies that the double exclusion restriction cannot be invoked.

4.3 Causal estimands under weaker assumptions

Theorem 1 provides sharp nonparametric bounds for the LAFTE. However, point-identification may be required or in some empirical settings the assumptions may be deemed too strong. For these cases, we discuss three alternative causal objects that can be identified under weaker assumptions, and from which two can be point-identified.

First, Lemma 2 shows that under Assumption 2.1-2.3 and 3, the IV estimand in (1) with $D = D_1$ identifies the LATE of taking the first part of the treatment:

$$\beta_{IV}(D_1) = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|C_1, C_2]w[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, C_2]w[C_1, C_2] + \quad (19)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, N_2]w[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)|C_1, A_2]w[C_1, A_2],$$

with $w[G_1, G_2] = \frac{\mathbb{P}[G_1, G_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]}$.

The weighted average of LATEs in (19) can be interpreted as a decomposition of the total effect of D_1 on Y using D_2 as a mediator. The mediation literature, see [Huber \(2019\)](#) for a review, defines the direct effect as the effect of D_1 on Y while the mediator D_2 is constant, and the indirect effect as the effect of D_2 on Y while D_1 is constant. Hence, the first term in (19) is the indirect effect, and the remaining terms are direct effects.

Table 1 shows that the IV estimand in (19) is often used in the literature. This paper shows that this is a valid estimator of the effect of D_1 under the double exclusion restriction. In addition, we argue that the effect of receiving full treatment is also a causal parameter of interest. Adding $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|C_1, N_2]w[C_1, N_2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, A_2]w[C_1, A_2]$ to (19) results in the effect of receiving full treatment. The additional MTR assumptions in Theorem 1 guarantee that these two average treatment effects of receiving the second part of treatment are positive. It follows that the lower bound on the LAFTE equals (19) and the LAFTE is equal to or larger than the LATE of taking the first part of the treatment.

Second, the double exclusion restriction may be considered too strong, or its necessary conditions may be rejected for the setting at hand. Lemma 2 shows that under only Assumption 2, the IV estimand in (1) with the multivalued treatment $D = D_1 + D_2 \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ equals

$$\beta_{IV}(D_1 + D_2) = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|C_1, C_2]w[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, C_2]w[C_1, C_2] \quad (20)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, N_2]w[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0)|N_1, C_2]w[N_1, C_2]$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)|C_1, A_2]w[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|A_1, C_2]w[A_1, C_2],$$

with $w[G_1, G_2] = \frac{\mathbb{P}[G_1, G_2]}{2\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]}$. This results in a causal interpretation of a weighted average of causal effects of receiving one part of the treatment, instead of the causal effect of receiving full treatment.

The IV estimand $\beta_{IV}(D_1 + D_2)$ is related to the average causal response (ACR) as introduced by [Angrist and Imbens \(1995\)](#). The ACR is also a weighted average of the effects of unit changes in treatment, but considers a multivalued treatment that does not distinguish between $\{D_1 = 1, D_2 = 0\}$ and $\{D_1 = 0, D_2 = 1\}$. Without late-adopters who miss the first part of the program, the mover types $\{C_1, A_2\}$ and $\{N_1, C_2\}$ are absent and (20) is equal to the ACR.

Summarising the multivalued treatment by one binary treatment indicator may also lead to violations of the exclusion restriction similar to the ones discussed in Section 3. [Andresen](#)

and Huber (2021) show that these violations can also be ruled out by restricting treatment effect heterogeneity or mover types, where movers with a multivalued treatment are defined by the individuals induced by the instrument to change treatment status from and to treatment values that are both below or above the binarisation threshold.

The ACR type estimand in (20) considers shifting from no treatment to the first part and from the first part to full treatment, as separate treatment effects for the full compliers. Therefore, it double counts the full compliers in the denominator of the weighting function $w[G_1, G_2]$. An alternative is to combine the two effects for the full compliers and to interpret it as the full treatment effect. Assumption 2 allows for the partial identification of this alternative weighted average of LATEs:

Corollary 4 (Partial identification weighted average of LATEs).

Under Assumption 2 a weighted average of LATEs denoted by τ is bounded by

$$\frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1 + D_2|Z]} \leq \tau \leq \frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z]}{\max(\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z], \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2|Z], \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z], \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\vee|Z])}, \quad (21)$$

where τ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \tau = & \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, C_2]w[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, N_2]w[C_1, N_2] + \\ & \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)|C_1, A_2]w[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0)|N_1, C_2]w[N_1, C_2] + \\ & \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|A_1, C_2]w[A_1, C_2], \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$\text{with } w(G_1, G_2) = \frac{\mathbb{P}[G_1, G_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]}.$$

The proof is based on Lemma 1 and deferred to Appendix G. The weights in (22) are nonnegative and add up to one. Hence τ is a convex combination of LATEs and has a causal interpretation. However, this interpretation may not directly be policy relevant as it measures an average across different treatment effects and different groups.

Intuitively, the treatment indicator with the largest (smallest) first stage estimate may provide a lower (upper) bound on a treatment effect of interest. For instance, Finkelstein et al. (2012) apply this intuition to bound the effects of Medicaid insurance. Corollary 4 shows that this intuition does not apply to τ : Instead of bounding τ from below, the treatment indicator with the largest first stage is an upper bound on τ .

5 Empirical applications

This section illustrates the empirical relevance of our methods for treatment evaluation. We consider the LAFTE of a health program, a labour program, an educational program, and

a development program. Additional details on the empirical specifications are deferred to Appendix H. This section focuses on the main results following from Theorem 1 and Proposition 2 and 3. Appendix I shows additional empirical results, such as the bounds in Corollary 3, which are in general wide and cannot reject that the LAFTEs are equal to zero.

5.1 The Oregon health insurance experiment

This application studies the LAFTE of medicaid coverage on health care utilization. Policy makers actively aim to reduce coverage disruptions by continuous enrollment policies. As a recent example, the Families First Coronavirus Recovery Act requires Medicaid programs to keep individuals enrolled for the duration of the public health emergency (Sugar et al., 2021). To better understand the impact of such policies, the effect of continuous Medicaid coverage across the full study period is of particular interest.

5.1.1 Context and empirical specification

In 2008, a group of uninsured low-income adults in Oregon was randomly given the opportunity to apply for Medicaid. The state opened a waiting list for 10,000 Medicaid spots and subsequently drew names by lottery from the 89,924 individuals that placed themselves on this list. The Medicaid program provided comprehensive benefits with no consumer cost sharing. The monthly enrollment premiums ranged from \$0 to \$20 depending on income.

Finkelstein et al. (2012) use the randomized opportunity to apply for Medicaid as an instrument for Medicaid enrollment and analyze the effects on health care utilization, financial strain, and health. The Oregon Health Insurance Experiment (OHIE) was subsequently used in a series of papers to study the effects of Medicaid on other outcomes. For example, Finkelstein et al. (2016) study the impact on emergency department use over time.

The data in Finkelstein et al. (2016) contains Medicaid coverage and emergency department use for 24,646 individuals with Portland-area zip codes across four time periods: day 0 to 180, 181 to 360, 361 to 540, and 541 to 720 after lottery notification. Our D_1 equals one if an individual was enrolled in Medicaid in the first year after lottery notification, and D_2 equals one if an individual was enrolled in the second year after lottery notification. The instrument equals one if an individual was randomly given the opportunity to apply for Medicaid. The binary outcome variable Y equals one if an individual had any emergency department visit during the two years after the lottery notification.

Table 2: Necessary conditions for the double exclusion restriction and no movers

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	$D_V - D_2$	$D_\Lambda - D_2$	$(D_V - D_2)Y$	$(D_\Lambda - D_2)Y$	D_2
Panel A: The Oregon health insurance experiment, $N = 24646$					
Z	0.078 (0.003)	0.060 (0.003)	0.032 (0.002)	0.029 (0.002)	0.115 (0.006)
Panel B: The LinkedIn job opportunities experiment, $N = 988$					
Z	0.036 (0.039)	0.042 (0.011)	0.027 (0.032)	0.023 (0.006)	0.315 (0.077)
Panel C: The elite university education natural experiment, $N = 645$					
Z	0.047 (0.012)	0.537 (0.043)	0.446 (0.116)	4.772 (0.387)	0.095 (0.061)
Panel D: The village-based schools experiment, $N = 1181$					
Z	0.000 (.)	-0.041 (0.008)	0.000 (.)	0.016 (0.006)	0.483 (0.080)

Notes: columns (1) to (4) show the estimates for the necessary conditions in Proposition 2 and 3, corresponding to (13)-(16) respectively. Column (5) shows the estimate of a regression from D_2 upon Z . The standard errors are in parentheses. The panels correspond to the empirical applications in Section 5, where N indicates the number of observations.

5.1.2 Results

Table 2 reports the estimated necessary conditions for the presence of movers and the validity of Assumption 3. Column (1) and (2) in Panel A show, respectively, the results of a regression from $D_V - D_2$ and $D_\Lambda - D_2$ upon Z . First, since both estimates are significantly different from zero at the 1% level, we reject that movers are absent. Second, since both estimates are positive, we do not reject the necessary conditions of Assumption 3.

Under the double exclusion restriction, column (1) implies that $\mathbb{P}[\widehat{C_1, N_2}] = 0.078$. This group includes movers who drop out of treatment. Since individuals had to recertify eligibility every six months, they could have lost coverage due to, for instance, income fluctuations. Column (2) implies that $\mathbb{P}[\widehat{C_1, A_2}] = 0.060$. These movers likely used the opportunity to gain eligibility in the second time period: 14 months after the lottery, Oregon took lottery draws from a new Medicaid waiting list. Column (5) reports the results of a regression from D_2 upon Z . Under the double exclusion restriction this estimate equals $\mathbb{P}[\widehat{C_1, C_2}] = 0.115$, and

hence the movers compose a larger proportion of the data than the full compliers.

The double exclusion restriction imposes that $\mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] = \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] = 0$. The first mover type is likely absent since individuals with $Z = 1$ had to apply for Medicaid within 45 days after the state made them aware of the lottery draw. Individuals that did not apply during this window could not apply after. In general, [Finkelstein et al. \(2012\)](#) describe that the mechanisms to obtain Medicaid coverage are limited to the initial lottery and the lottery 14 months later. They also show that only 2% of the individuals with $Z = 0$ obtained Medicaid coverage up unto one year after the lottery. This may explain the absence of the second mover type.

Figure 2 shows the estimated bounds for the LAFTE from Theorem 1. Panel A identifies a statistically significant LAFTE: The 95% confidence interval of the lower bound, $[0.035, 0.128]$, does not include zero. The bounds rely on the assumption that the effect of Medicaid in the second year on emergency department use is non-negative (MTR), and that always takers and compliers of Medicaid in the second year are not less likely to use the emergency department than never takers (MTS). Based on these bounds, we conclude that Medicaid enrollment during both years increases the probability of an emergency department visit between 0.081 and 0.224 percentage points for the individuals induced to enroll by the lottery.

The estimated bounds imply that the LAFTE may be up to three times as large as the LATE of Medicaid enrollment in the first period. Hence, policy makers may expect larger treatment effects in combination with continuous enrollment requirements, which may inform the design of future Medicaid enrollment policies.


5.2 The LinkedIn job opportunities experiment

This application studies the LAFTE of a LinkedIn training on employment. Job market training programs, such as a training that stimulates LinkedIn usage, are often characterized by high incidence of control group substitution and treatment group dropout ([Heckman et al., 2000](#)). Since the programs are carefully designed to receive and follow in full, the treatment effect of LinkedIn usage for a longer period should be of particular interest to policy makers.

5.2.1 Context and empirical specification

[Wheeler et al. \(2022\)](#) run and evaluate a randomly assigned program that trains work seekers to join and use LinkedIn. Their study sample includes 30 cohorts from existing job readiness training programs in four large South African cities. They randomly assign 15 cohorts to four hours of LinkedIn training during their job readiness training program. The intervention trains participants, among others, to open accounts, build their profiles, and search

Figure 2: Estimated bounds on the LAFTE



Notes: this figure shows the lower and upper bound from Theorem 1 for the LAFTE. The lines are 95% confidence intervals. The precise estimates and standard errors are reported in Table 4 of Appendix I.

and apply for jobs. The study examines the effect of the LinkedIn training on a range of outcomes. Although the experiment is not specifically designed to identify the causal effect of LinkedIn usage, one of the analysis uses the random assignment to LinkedIn training as an instrument for LinkedIn usage to study its effect on employment.

The data includes LinkedIn usage and employment outcomes across three time periods: directly, six months, and twelve months after the end of the job readiness training program. Our D_1 equals one if a participant has a LinkedIn account at the end of the job training and D_2 equals one if a participant has a LinkedIn account six months later. The instrument Z equals one if the participant is randomly assigned to the LinkedIn training. The binary outcome variable Y equals one if the participant is employed twelve months after the program ended. The estimation sample includes 988 of the 1,638 participants across the 30 cohorts.

5.2.2 Results

The estimated necessary conditions in column (1) and (2) of Panel B in Table 2 are positive, and the latter estimate is also significantly different from zero at the 1% level. Hence, we reject that movers are absent and do not reject the necessary conditions of Assumption 3.

Under the double exclusion restriction, column (1) implies that $\widehat{\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2]} = 0.036$, which is not significantly different from zero. This estimate refers to individuals that were induced to open a LinkedIn account by the LinkedIn training but deleted it after the job training program. Column (2) implies that $\widehat{\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]} = 0.042$. This suggests that several treated individuals would have also opened a LinkedIn account after the job training program if assigned to the control. Hence, the LinkedIn training only accelerated them to create an account. Column (5) implies that the two groups of movers are small compared to the full compliers.

The double exclusion restriction imposes that $\mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] = \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] = 0$. Since the treatment group was incentivized to immediately open a LinkedIn account in the first week of the job training program, the first mover type can be absent. However, if the LinkedIn training succeeds in explaining the benefits of LinkedIn in the long term, both mover types could be present. Hence, even though they are not detected by the necessary conditions, this empirical setting may include movers that violate the double exclusion restriction.

Panel B of Figure 2 shows a statistically significant LAFTE: The 95% confidence interval of the lower bound, $[0.047, 0.305]$, does not include zero. The bounds rely on the assumption that the effect of a LinkedIn account six months after the job training program on employment is non-negative (MTR), and that always takers and compliers of a LinkedIn account six months after the job training are not less likely to find a job than never takers (MTS). Based on these bounds, we conclude that having a LinkedIn account in both time periods increases the probability to find a job between 0.176 and 0.235 percentage points for individuals induced to open an account due to the LinkedIn training. The estimated bounds imply that the LAFTE is similar to the LATE of the first part of the LinkedIn training, which suggests that having a LinkedIn account is most effective shortly after the job training program.

5.3 The elite university education natural experiment

This application studies the LAFTE of a university education on income. School curricula, including the design and sequencing of learning content, are developed to receive in full. Moreover, students enroll in a program with the aim to graduate, which makes the LAFTE a valuable piece of information for their study choice. Hence, for both university educators and students the effect of following a full university program is of interest.

5.3.1 Context and empirical specification

[Anelli \(2020\)](#) studies the returns to a selective, expensive, and private university offering business, economics, and law degrees in a large Italian city. Admission to the elite university is based on a uni-dimensional application score. Every year, the number of admitted

students is fixed, and the university strictly offers admission to the students with the highest application score. This procedure generates a cutoff in the application score, where students above the cutoff are offered admission. A score above the cutoff is used as an instrument for ever enrolled at the elite university to study the effect of ever enrolled on income.

The main sample is restricted to the elite university applicants between 1995 and 2000. For 645 of these applicants the dataset contains information on the application score, ever being enrolled at the elite university between 1995 and 2005, graduation from any university up unto the year 2005, and yearly income in the year 2005. If an applicant retook the admission test, the score refers to the first observed application.

Our D_1 equals one if an applicant was ever enrolled at the elite university between 1995 and 2005. This is the treatment variable in [Anelli \(2020\)](#). Our D_2 equals one if an applicant graduated from any university up unto the year 2005. The dataset does not contain information on whether the applicant graduated from the elite university. The instrument Z equals one if the applicant scores above to application score cutoff. The outcome variable Y is the logarithm of taxable income in 2005, measured before taxes and after deductions.

5.3.2 Results

The estimated necessary conditions in column (1) and (2) of Panel C in Table 2 are positive and significantly different from zero at the 1% level. Hence, we can reject that movers are absent and do not reject the necessary conditions of Assumption 3.

Under the double exclusion restriction, column (1) implies that $\mathbb{P}[\widehat{C_1, N_2}] = 0.047$. This mover type may refer to students who were induced to enroll at the elite university but never graduate. Column (2) implies that $\mathbb{P}[\widehat{C_1, A_2}] = 0.537$. Recall that our D_2 equals one if a student graduated from any university, not just the elite institution, and so this group is relatively large because students with $Z = 0$ may graduate from other universities.

The double exclusion restriction imposes that $\mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] = \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] = 0$. The first mover type is absent if university graduation for the never takers of elite university enrollment is not affected by scoring above or below the cutoff. This group of movers could be present if scoring above the cutoff has some positive psychological effect that persists even if a student does not enroll at the elite institution. The large estimate in column (2) of Table 2 suggests that such psychological effects are close to zero. The second mover type is likely to be absent since [Anelli \(2020\)](#) reports that across all application rounds only 23 students retook the admission test after scoring below the cutoff. Hence the possible number of always takers with enrollment in the elite university is small.

Panel C of Figure 2 shows a statistically significant LAFTE: the estimated bounds equal

0.532 and 7.545, and the 95% confidence interval of the lower bound, [0.076, 0.988], does not include zero. The bounds rely on the assumption that the effect of university graduation on income is non-negative, and that always takers and compliers of university graduation have higher wages than never takers. The upper bound is large due to the large group of movers $\{C_1, A_2\}$. Based on the bounds, we conclude that the full treatment of enrolling at the elite and graduating at any university increases annual income between 53 and 750 log points for the individuals induced to enroll by scoring above the cutoff. The estimated bounds imply that the LAFTE may be much larger than the LATE of university enrollment. This suggests that consecutive parts of a university degree are complements and students may particularly benefit from fully completing a degree.

5.4 The village-based schools experiment

This application aims to study the LAFTE of a development program. The implementation of development programs often requires careful design, planning, and coordination with local partners, and can be expensive (Duflo et al., 2007). Hence, the full treatment effect is of interest to the stakeholders.

5.4.1 Context and empirical specification

Burde and Linden (2013) conduct and evaluate the randomized opening of village-based schools in Afghanistan, where primary-school participation rates are low. Their study sample includes 31 villages in rural Afghanistan. In the summer of 2007, they randomly opened schools in 13 of these villages. Village-based schools are public schools that are designed to deliver the official national curriculum to children living in close proximity to the school. They use the random assignment of village-based schools as an instrument for school enrollment to estimate the effect of enrollment on academic performance.

Their household survey data contains information on school enrollment and math and language test scores in two time periods: four months after and eight months after opening the village-based schools. Our D_1 equals one if a child was enrolled in school four months after the opening and D_2 equals one if a child was enrolled in school eight months after the opening. The binary instrument Z equals one if a child lives in a village that randomly received a school. The outcome variable Y is the standardized test score eight months after the opening of the schools. The final estimation sample includes 1,181 children, of in total 1,490 school-age children across the 31 villages.

5.4.2 Results

Panel D in Table 2 shows the estimated necessary conditions. Since the observed $D_2 = 1$ if $D_1 = 1$, the variable $D_v - D_2$ is zero for each individual, and hence the estimates in column (1) and (3) are zero. This indicates the absence of the mover types $\{C_1, N_2\}$ and $\{A_1, C_2\}$. The estimate in column (2) is negative and statistically significant at the 1% level. This estimate implies that $\mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] > 0$, which violates the double exclusion restriction. This mover type may arise if households need time to change their beliefs towards allowing their children to enroll in school. [Burde and Linden \(2013\)](#) discuss that the conservative beliefs in Afghanistan may be an impediment for school enrollment, in particular for girls.

Appendix I shows the estimates for the parameters that can be identified when the double exclusion restriction is violated: the ACR type estimand in (20) and the weighted average of LATEs in Corollary 4. To conclude, this application shows that it depends on the empirical context whether the double exclusion restriction holds, and that the testable necessary conditions are able to help researchers detect violations of this assumption.

6 Conclusion

Policy evaluation has to deal with individuals that only take a subset of a treatment program. This poses the question: Which treatment effect is of interest to the policymaker? For instance, are the outcomes of the individuals receiving the full treatment or any individual that came in contact with the treatment of interest? Does the control group consists of individuals who obtained zero treatment or did not complete the full treatment? This paper defines the effect of full treatment versus no treatment at all as the parameter of interest.

We develop an IV framework in the presence of individuals that are induced by the instrument to obtain only a subset of the treatment, and refer to these individuals as movers. We show that these movers violate the exclusion restriction in the standard IV framework, that necessary conditions on the presence of movers are testable, and that under a double exclusion restriction the average treatment effect of receiving full treatment for the individuals induced into treatment by the instrument is partially identifiable. We refer to this treatment effect as the local average full treatment effect (LAFTE).

We study the LAFTE in empirical applications from four different fields of applied economics. Our methods find evidence for the presence of movers in all four studies. These types of movers align with the intuition provided by the setting at hand. In three of these applications, the necessary conditions for the double exclusion restriction cannot be rejected, and the bounds identify a statistically significant LAFTE. We discuss the potential policy im-

plications within the empirical context of the applications.

We allow the instrument to induce individuals into dropping out or late-adoption of treatment by taking into account two treatment parts. In settings in which the instrument additionally affects dropping out or late-adoption across more treatment parts, the exclusion restriction in our IV framework may also be violated. In case these settings include the observed treatment status across these treatment parts, our framework can be extended to more specific mover types that also take these violations into account.

References

- Andresen, M. E. and M. Huber (2021). Instrument-based estimation with binarised treatments: issues and tests for the exclusion restriction. *The Econometrics Journal* 24(3), 536–558.
- Anelli, M. (2020). The returns to elite university education: A quasi-experimental analysis. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 18(6), 2824–2868.
- Angrist, J., D. Autor, and A. Pallais (2022). Marginal effects of merit aid for low-income students. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 137(2), 1039–1090.
- Angrist, J. D. and G. W. Imbens (1995). Two-stage least squares estimation of average causal effects in models with variable treatment intensity. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90(430), 431–442.
- Athey, S. and G. W. Imbens (2022). Design-based analysis in difference-in-differences settings with staggered adoption. *Journal of Econometrics* 226(1), 62–79.
- Battistin, E. and B. Sianesi (2011). Misclassified treatment status and treatment effects: an application to returns to education in the United Kingdom. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 93(2), 495–509.
- Blackwell, M. (2017). Instrumental variable methods for conditional effects and causal interaction in voter mobilization experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 112(518), 590–599.
- Burde, D. and L. L. Linden (2013). Bringing education to Afghan girls: A randomized controlled trial of village-based schools. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 5(3), 27–40.
- Calvi, R., A. Lewbel, and D. Tommasi (2022). LATE with missing or mismeasured treatment. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 40(4), 1701–1717.
- Cattaneo, M. D., N. Idrobo, and R. Titiunik (2023). A practical introduction to regression discontinuity designs: Extensions. Working paper, arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08958.
- Conley, T. G., C. B. Hansen, and P. E. Rossi (2012). Plausibly exogenous. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 94(1), 260–272.

- De Haan, M. (2011). The effect of parents' schooling on child's schooling: a nonparametric bounds analysis. *Journal of Labor Economics* 29(4), 859–892.
- De Ree, J., M. A. Maggioni, B. Paulle, D. Rossignoli, N. Ruijs, and D. Walentek (2023). Closing the income-achievement gap? Experimental evidence from high-dosage tutoring in Dutch primary education. *Economics of Education Review* 94, 102383.
- Ding, W. and S. F. Lehrer (2010). Estimating treatment effects from contaminated multi-period education experiments: The dynamic impacts of class size reductions. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 92(1), 31–42.
- Duflo, E., R. Glennerster, and M. Kremer (2007). Using randomization in development economics research: A toolkit. *Handbook of development economics* 4, 3895–3962.
- Finkelstein, A., S. Taubman, B. Wright, M. Bernstein, J. Gruber, J. P. Newhouse, H. Allen, K. Baicker, and O. H. S. Group (2012). The oregon health insurance experiment: evidence from the first year. *The Quarterly journal of economics* 127(3), 1057–1106.
- Finkelstein, A. N., S. L. Taubman, H. L. Allen, B. J. Wright, and K. Baicker (2016). Effect of medicaid coverage on ED use — further evidence from Oregon's experiment. *New England Journal of Medicine* 375(16), 1505–1507.
- Flores, C. A. and A. Flores-Lagunes (2013). Partial identification of local average treatment effects with an invalid instrument. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 31(4), 534–545.
- Grosz, M. (2020). The returns to a large community college program: Evidence from admissions lotteries. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 12(1), 226–53.
- Heckman, J., N. Hohmann, J. Smith, and M. Khoo (2000). Substitution and dropout bias in social experiments: A study of an influential social experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 115(2), 651–694.
- Heckman, J. J., J. E. Humphries, and G. Veramendi (2016). Dynamic treatment effects. *Journal of econometrics* 191(2), 276–292.
- Hoekstra, M. (2009, 11). The Effect of Attending the Flagship State University on Earnings: A Discontinuity-Based Approach. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 91(4), 717–724.
- Huber, M. (2019). A review of causal mediation analysis for assessing direct and indirect treatment effects. Working paper, Uni Fri Working Paper Series. No. 500.
- Hull, P. (2018). Estimating treatment effects in mover designs. Working paper, arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.06721.
- Imbens, G. W. and J. D. Angrist (1994). Identification and estimation of local average treatment effects. *Econometrica* 62(2), 467–475.
- Ketel, N., E. Leuven, H. Oosterbeek, and B. van der Klaauw (2016). The returns to medical school: Evidence from admission lotteries. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 8(2), 225–54.

- Kreider, B. and J. V. Pepper (2007). Disability and employment: Reevaluating the evidence in light of reporting errors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 102(478), 432–441.
- Kreider, B., J. V. Pepper, C. Gundersen, and D. Jolliffe (2012). Identifying the effects of snap (food stamps) on child health outcomes when participation is endogenous and misreported. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 107(499), 958–975.
- Lechner, M. (2009). Sequential causal models for the evaluation of labor market programs. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 27(1), 71–83.
- Leu, K. (2017). Beginning college students who change their majors within 3 years of enrollment. Data point. NCES 2018-434. Working paper, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Manski, C. F. (1997). Monotone treatment response. *Econometrica* 65(6), 1311–1334.
- Manski, C. F. and J. V. Pepper (2000). Monotone instrumental variables: With an application to the returns to schooling. *Econometrica* 68, 997–1010.
- Mealli, F. and B. Pacini (2013). Using secondary outcomes to sharpen inference in randomized experiments with noncompliance. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 108(503), 1120–1131.
- Molinari, F. (2010). Missing treatments. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 28(1), 82–95.
- Silliman, M. and H. Virtanen (2022). Labor market returns to vocational secondary education. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 14(1), 197–224.
- Sugar, S., C. Peters, N. De Lew, and B. D. Sommers (2021). Medicaid churning and continuity of care: Evidence and policy considerations before and after the covid-19 pandemic. *US Department of health & human services* 10, 2021.
- Swanson, S. A., M. A. Hernán, M. Miller, J. M. Robins, and T. S. Richardson (2018). Partial identification of the average treatment effect using instrumental variables: review of methods for binary instruments, treatments, and outcomes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 113(522), 933–947.
- Tommasi, D. and L. Zhang (2020). Bounding program benefits when participation is misreported. Working paper, IZA Discussion Paper No. 13430.
- Verdier, V. (2020). Average treatment effects for stayers with correlated random coefficient models of panel data. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 35(7), 917–939.
- Wheeler, L., R. Garlick, E. Johnson, P. Shaw, and M. Gargano (2022). LinkedIn (to) job opportunities: Experimental evidence from job readiness training. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 14(2), 101–25.
- Zimmerman, S. D. (2014). The returns to college admission for academically marginal students. *Journal of Labor Economics* 32(4), 711–754.

A Proof Lemma 1

The first stage with $D = D_1$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[D_1(1)|Z=1] - \mathbb{E}[D_1(0)|Z=0] = \mathbb{E}[D_1(1) - D_1(0)] = \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1] \quad (23) \\
&= \mathbb{P}[C_1] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, D_2(1,1) - D_2(0,0) = 1] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, D_2(1,1) = D_2(0,0) = 0] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{P}[C_1, D_2(1,1) = D_2(0,0) = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2],
\end{aligned}$$

using (2), Assumption 2.1 and 2.3, respectively.

The first stage with $D = D_2$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[D_2(1,1)D_1 + D_2(1,0)(1 - D_1)|Z=1] - \quad (24) \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[D_2(0,1)D_1 + D_2(0,0)(1 - D_1)|Z=0] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[D_2(1,1)D_1(1) + D_2(1,0)(1 - D_1(1))|Z=1] - \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[D_2(0,1)D_1(0) + D_2(0,0)(1 - D_1(0))|Z=0] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[D_2(1,1)D_1(1) + D_2(1,0)(1 - D_1(1)) - D_2(0,1)D_1(0) - D_2(0,0)(1 - D_1(0))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[D_2(1,1) - D_2(0,0)|D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1] \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[D_2(1,0) - D_2(0,0)|D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 0] \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 0] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[D_2(1,1) - D_2(0,1)|D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 1] \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[D_2(1,1) - D_2(0,0) = 1|D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1] \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{P}[D_2(1,0) - D_2(0,0) = 1|D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 0] \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 0] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{P}[D_2(1,1) - D_2(0,1) = 1|D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 1] \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[D_2(1,1) - D_2(0,0) = 1, D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{P}[D_2(1,0) - D_2(0,0) = 1, D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 0] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{P}[D_2(1,1) - D_2(0,1) = 1, D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2],
\end{aligned}$$

using (3), (2), Assumption 2.1 and 2.3, respectively.

The first stage with $D = D_\wedge = D_1 D_2$ can be rewritten using (2) and (3):

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\wedge &= [D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z)] \times [D_2(1,1)(D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z))Z + \quad (25) \\
&\quad D_2(1,0)(1 - D_1(1)Z - D_1(0)(1 - Z))Z + \\
&\quad D_2(0,1)(D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z))(1 - Z) + \\
&\quad D_2(0,0)(1 - D_1(1)Z - D_1(0)(1 - Z))(1 - Z)] \\
&= [D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z)] \times [D_2(1,1)D_1(1)Z + D_2(1,0)(1 - D_1(1))Z + \\
&\quad D_2(0,1)D_1(0)(1 - Z) + D_2(0,0)(1 - D_1(0))(1 - Z)] \\
&= D_1(1)D_2(1,1)Z + D_1(0)D_2(0,1)(1 - Z),
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[D_1(1)D_2(1,1)|Z=1] - \mathbb{E}[D_1(0)D_2(0,1)|Z=0] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[D_1(1)D_2(1,1) - D_1(0)D_2(0,1)] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[D_1(1)D_2(1,1) - D_1(0)D_2(0,1) = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1, D_2(1,1) - D_2(0,1) = 1] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1, D_2(1,1) = D_2(0,1) = 1] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) = D_1(0) = 1, D_2(1,1) - D_2(0,1) = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2],
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

using Assumption 2.1 and 2.3, respectively.

The first stage with $D = D_v = D_1 + D_2 - D_1D_2$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_v|Z] &= \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] + \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2].
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

For the reduced form, we use Assumption 2.4 and rewrite (5) to

$$\begin{aligned}
Y &= [Y(1,1) - Y(0,1) - Y(1,0) + Y(0,0)]D_1D_2 + \\
&\quad [Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)]D_1 + [Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)]D_2 + Y(0,0),
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

to write

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] &= \Delta\mathbb{E}[[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1) - Y(1,0) + Y(0,0)]D_1D_2|Z] + \\
&\quad \Delta\mathbb{E}[[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)]D_1|Z] + \Delta\mathbb{E}[[Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)]D_2|Z] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(Y(1,1) - Y(0,1) - Y(1,0) + Y(0,0))D_1D_2|Z=1] - \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[(Y(1,1) - Y(0,1) - Y(1,0) + Y(0,0))D_1D_2|Z=0] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[(Y(1,0) - Y(0,0))D_1|Z=1] - \mathbb{E}[(Y(1,0) - Y(0,0))D_1|Z=0] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[(Y(0,1) - Y(0,0))D_2|Z=1] - \mathbb{E}[(Y(0,1) - Y(0,0))D_2|Z=0].
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

It follows from the results in (23), (24), and (26) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1) - Y(1,0) + Y(0,0)|\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}, \{A_1, C_2\}] \times \\
&\quad \mathbb{P}[\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}, \{A_1, C_2\}] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)|\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}] \times \\
&\quad \mathbb{P}[\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)|\{C_1, C_2\}, \{N_1, C_2\}, \{A_1, C_2\}] \times \\
&\quad \mathbb{P}[\{C_1, C_2\}, \{N_1, C_2\}, \{A_1, C_2\}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1) - Y(1,0) + Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1) - Y(1,0) + Y(0,0)|C_1, A_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1) - Y(1,0) + Y(0,0)|A_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)|C_1, A_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)|N_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)|A_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1)|C_1, A_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)|N_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(1,0)|A_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2].
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

B Proof Corollary 2

For an instrumental variable analysis with treatment indicator $D = D_1$, it follows from Lemma 1 that the first stage and reduced form is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] &= \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] \\
\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1)|C_1, A_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)|N_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(1,0)|A_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2].
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

We write the reduced form as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1)|C_1, A_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|N_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1)|N_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|A_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)|A_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2],
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

and substitute in the homogeneity assumptions for $D = D_1$ in Table 3:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, A_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|N_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|N_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|A_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|A_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, A_2] \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2].
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Table 3: Treatment effect homogeneity assumptions for movers

D	Homogeneity assumption	IV estimand
D_1	$\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) C_1, N_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0) C_1, N_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) C_1, A_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1) C_1, A_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) N_1, C_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1) N_1, C_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) A_1, C_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0) A_1, C_2]$	$\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) \{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}]$
D_2	$\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) C_1, N_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0) C_1, N_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) C_1, A_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0) C_1, A_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) N_1, C_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0) N_1, C_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) A_1, C_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0) A_1, C_2]$	$\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) \{C_1, C_2\}, \{N_1, C_2\}, \{A_1, C_2\}]$
D_\wedge	$\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) C_1, N_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0) C_1, N_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) C_1, A_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1) C_1, A_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) N_1, C_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1) N_1, C_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) A_1, C_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0) A_1, C_2]$	$\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) \{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}, \{A_1, C_2\}]$
D_\vee	$\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) C_1, N_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0) C_1, N_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) C_1, A_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0) C_1, A_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) N_1, C_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0) N_1, C_2]$ $\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) A_1, C_2] = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0) A_1, C_2]$	$\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0) \{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{N_1, C_2\}]$

Notes: this table provides an overview of the homogeneity assumptions in column (2) that are required for the IV estimand in Equation (1) to identify the causal parameter in column (3) when the treatment indicator in column (1) is used as endogenous treatment variable.

Then we can write

$$\beta_{IV}(D_1) = \frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z]} = \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}]. \quad (34)$$

The proofs for $D = D_2, D_\wedge, D_\vee$ use the same strategy.

C Proof Lemma 2

Since Assumption 3 only applies to D_2 , $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z]$ is equal to (23):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] &= \mathbb{P}[C_1] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, D_2(1) - D_2(0) = 1] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, D_2(1) = D_2(0) = 0] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{P}[C_1, D_2(1) = D_2(0) = 1] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2], \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

using Assumption 2.1 and 2.3.

Assumption 3 allows us to link observed to potential outcomes for D_2 as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 &= D_2(1)D_1 + D_2(0)(1 - D_1) \\ &= D_2(1)[D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z)] + D_2(0)[1 - D_1(1)Z - D_1(0)(1 - Z)] \\ &= D_2(0) + (D_2(1) - D_2(0))(D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z)), \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

so that the first stage with $D = D_2$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta E[D_2|Z] &= E[D_2(0) + (D_2(1) - D_2(0))(D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z))|Z = 1] - \\
&\quad E[D_2(0) + (D_2(1) - D_2(0))(D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z))|Z = 0] \\
&= E[(D_1(1) - D_1(0))(D_2(1) - D_2(0))] = \mathbb{P}[(D_1(1) - D_1(0))(D_2(1) - D_2(0)) = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1, D_2(1) - D_2(0) = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2],
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

using Assumption 2.1 and 2.3.

The first stage with $D = D_1 D_2 = D_\wedge$ uses that under Assumption 3

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\wedge &= [D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z)] \times [D_2(0) + (D_2(1) - D_2(0))(D_1(1)Z + D_1(0)(1 - Z))] \\
&= D_1(1)D_2(0)Z + (D_2(1) - D_2(0))D_1(1)Z + \\
&\quad D_1(0)D_2(0)(1 - Z) + (D_2(1) - D_2(0))D_1(0)(1 - Z) \\
&= D_1(1)D_2(1)Z + D_1(0)D_2(1)(1 - Z),
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

so that the first stage equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta E[D_\wedge|Z] &= E[D_1(1)D_2(1)Z + D_1(0)D_2(1)(1 - Z)|Z = 1] - \\
&\quad E[D_1(1)D_2(1)Z + D_1(0)D_2(1)(1 - Z)|Z = 0] \\
&= E[(D_1(1) - D_1(0))D_2(1)] = \mathbb{P}[(D_1(1) - D_1(0))D_2(1) = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1, D_2(1) - D_2(0) = 1] + \mathbb{P}[D_1(1) - D_1(0) = 1, D_2(1) = D_2(0) = 1] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2],
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

using Assumption 2.1 and 2.3.

The first stage with $D = D_\vee = D_1 + D_2 - D_1 D_2$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta E[D_\vee|Z] &= \Delta E[D_1|Z] + \Delta E[D_2|Z] - \Delta E[D_\wedge|Z] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2].
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

For the reduced form, the proof of Lemma 1 shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta E[Y|Z] &= E[(Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1) - Y(1, 0) + Y(0, 0))D_1 D_2|Z = 1] - \\
&\quad E[(Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1) - Y(1, 0) + Y(0, 0))D_1 D_2|Z = 0] + \\
&\quad E[(Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0))D_1|Z = 1] - E[(Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0))D_1|Z = 0] + \\
&\quad E[(Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0))D_2|Z = 1] - E[(Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0))D_2|Z = 0],
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

using Assumption 2.4. It follows from the results above in (23), (37), and (39) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta E[Y|Z] &= E[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1) - Y(1, 0) + Y(0, 0)]\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}\mathbb{P}\{\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}\} + \\
&\quad E[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)]\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}\mathbb{P}\{\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}\} + \\
&\quad E[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0)]C_1, C_2\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] \\
&= E[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1) - Y(1, 0) + Y(0, 0)]C_1, C_2\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \\
&\quad E[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1) - Y(1, 0) + Y(0, 0)]C_1, A_2\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \\
&\quad E[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)]C_1, C_2\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + E[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)]C_1, N_2\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\
&\quad E[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)]C_1, A_2\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + E[Y(0, 1) - Y(0, 0)]C_1, C_2\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] \\
&= E[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)]C_1, C_2\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \\
&\quad E[Y(1, 0) - Y(0, 0)]C_1, N_2\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + E[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)]C_1, A_2\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2].
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

D Proof Theorem 1

First, we collect some relations that will be useful for this proof and the proof of Corollary 3. Note that from Lemma 2 we have the following relations:

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\vee - D_2|Z] = \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2]. \quad (43)$$

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge - D_2|Z] = \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]. \quad (44)$$

Using (5), we can write

$$D_1 Y = [Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)]D_1 D_2 + Y(1, 0)D_1, \quad (45)$$

$$D_2 Y = [Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)]D_1 D_2 + Y(0, 1)D_2, \quad (46)$$

$$D_1 D_2 Y = Y(1, 1)D_1 D_2, \quad (47)$$

and it follows from the results in Lemma 2 that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1 Y|Z] &= \Delta\mathbb{E}[[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)]D_1 D_2|Z] + \Delta\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0)D_1|Z] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0))D_1 D_2|Z = 1] - \mathbb{E}[(Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0))D_1 D_2|Z = 0] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0)D_1|Z = 1] - \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0)D_1|Z = 0] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2], \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2 Y|Z] &= \Delta\mathbb{E}[[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)]D_1 D_2|Z] + \Delta\mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1)D_2|Z] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1))D_1 D_2|Z = 1] - \mathbb{E}[(Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1))D_1 D_2|Z = 0] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1)D_2|Z = 1] - \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1)D_2|Z = 0] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2], \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge Y|Z] &= \Delta\mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)D_1 D_2|Z] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)D_1 D_2|Z = 1] - \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)D_1 D_2|Z = 0] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

From this we can construct,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathbb{E}[(D_\vee - D_2)Y|Z] &= \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1 Y|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge Y|Z] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2], \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathbb{E}[(D_\wedge - D_2)Y|Z] &= \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge Y|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2 Y|Z] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2], \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathbb{E}[(1 - D_1)(1 - D_2)Y|Z] &= \Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] + \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge Y|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1 Y|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2 Y|Z] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}[Y(0, 0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Second, we construct the lower and upper bounds. Assume the following monotone treatment response: $\mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(1,0)|C_1, N_2] \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, A_2] \geq 0$. Using the result in Lemma 2, we can construct the lower bound as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + & (54) \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] - \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(1,0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}](\mathbb{P}[\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}]).
\end{aligned}$$

And from Lemma 2 follows that $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]$.

Assume the following monotone treatment selection: $\mathbb{E}[Y(1,1)|C_1, A_2] \geq \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1)|C_1, N_2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y(1,1)|C_1, C_2] \geq \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1)|C_1, N_2]$. Using the results above, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z]} &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y(1,1)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]} & (55) \\
&\geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y(1,1)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2]} + \\
&\quad \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y(1,1)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2]}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, assume the following positive response: $\mathbb{E}[Y(0,0)|C_1, A_2] \geq 0$. Using the results above, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[(1 - D_1)(1 - D_2)Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z]} &= \frac{-\mathbb{E}[Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]} & (56) \\
&\geq \frac{-\mathbb{E}[Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]} - \\
&\quad \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y(0,0)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can construct the upper bound as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z]} + \frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[(1 - D_1)(1 - D_2)Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z]} &\geq & (57) \\
\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]} + \\
\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]}.
\end{aligned}$$

E Proof Corollary 3

Using the results in Appendix D, construct the lower bound as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta\mathbb{E}[(1 - D_1 - D_2 + 2D_1D_2)Y|Z] + Y_{\min}\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_V - D_2|Z] - Y_{\max}\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge - D_2|Z] = \quad (58) \\
& \Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] + \Delta\mathbb{E}[(D_\wedge - D_2)Y|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[(D_V - D_2)Y|Z] + \\
& Y_{\min}\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] - Y_{\max}\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] = \\
& \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y_{\min} - Y(0, 0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\
& \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y_{\max}|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] \leq \\
& \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}]\mathbb{P}[\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}].
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the upper bound equals

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Delta\mathbb{E}[(1 - D_1 - D_2 + 2D_1D_2)Y|Z] + Y_{\max}\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_V - D_2|Z] - Y_{\min}\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge - D_2|Z] = \quad (59) \\
& \Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] + \Delta\mathbb{E}[(D_\wedge - D_2)Y|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[(D_V - D_2)Y|Z] + \\
& Y_{\max}\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] - Y_{\min}\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] = \\
& \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y_{\max} - Y(0, 0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\
& \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y_{\min}|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] \geq \\
& \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 0)|\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}]\mathbb{P}[\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}].
\end{aligned}$$

And from Lemma 2 follows that $\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]$.

F Proof Proposition 2

Note that we do not invoke Assumption 3 in this proof. Hence, we use the expressions in Lemma 1 to show that

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_V - D_2|Z] = \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] - \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2], \quad (60)$$

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge - D_2|Z] = \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2|Z] = \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] - \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2]. \quad (61)$$

Using (45), (46), and (47), and using the results in (23) and (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1 Y|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[(Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0))D_1D_2 + Y(1, 0)D_1|Z = 1] - \quad (62) \\
& \mathbb{E}[(Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0))D_1D_2 + Y(1, 0)D_1|Z = 0] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0))|\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}, \{A_1, C_2\}]\mathbb{P}[\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}, \{A_1, C_2\}] + \\
& \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0)|\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}]\mathbb{P}[\{C_1, C_2\}, \{C_1, N_2\}, \{C_1, A_2\}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \\
& \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(1, 0)|A_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2].
\end{aligned}$$

If we additionally use (24), we similarly have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2 Y|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(0, 1)|N_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \quad (63) \\
& \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|A_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1) - Y(0, 1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge Y|Z] &= \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \quad (64) \\
& \mathbb{E}[Y(1, 1)|A_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2],
\end{aligned}$$

from which follows that

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[(D_V - D_2)Y|Z] = \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1 Y|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge Y|Z] \quad (65)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0)|C_1, N_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0)|A_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2],$$

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[(D_\wedge - D_2)Y|Z] = \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_\wedge Y|Z] - \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2 Y|Z] \quad (66)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}[Y(0,1)|C_1, A_2]\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y(0,1)|N_1, C_2]\mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2].$$

G Proof Corollary 4

Corollary 4 defines the weighted average of LATEs

$$\begin{aligned} \tau = & \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,0)|C_1, C_2]w[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(1,0) - Y(0,0)|C_1, N_2]w[C_1, N_2] + \\ & \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(0,1)|C_1, A_2]w[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{E}[Y(0,1) - Y(0,0)|N_1, C_2]w[N_1, C_2] + \\ & \mathbb{E}[Y(1,1) - Y(1,0)|A_1, C_2]w[A_1, C_2], \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

with $w(G_1, G_2) = \frac{\mathbb{P}[G_1, G_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]}$. From Lemma 1 follows that

$$\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z] = \tau(\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]). \quad (68)$$

From this we can construct an upper bound on τ :

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{IV}(D_1) = \frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z]} &= \tau \frac{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]} \\ &= \tau \left(1 + \frac{\mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]}{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2]} \right) \geq \tau. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

However, if other specifications for D give a smaller second stage estimate, this is a tighter upper bound.

From Lemma 1 also follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1 + D_2|Z] &= \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1|Z] + \Delta\mathbb{E}[D_2|Z] \\ &= 2\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

From this we can construct a lower bound on τ :

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{IV}(D_1 + D_2) &= \frac{\Delta\mathbb{E}[Y|Z]}{\Delta\mathbb{E}[D_1 + D_2|Z]} \\ &= \tau \frac{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]}{2\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]} \\ &= \tau \left(1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2]}{2\mathbb{P}[C_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] + \mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] + \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] + \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2]} \right) \leq \tau. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

H Additional details on the empirical specifications

H.1 The Oregon health insurance experiment

Similar to [Finkelstein et al. \(2012, 2016\)](#), the outcome variable Y is measured during the same period as the treatment variables D_1 and D_2 . For IV estimation to be valid in this specification, emergency department use should not affect Medicaid coverage. We find qualitatively similar results if we measure D_1 in the first year, D_2 in the first half of the second year, and Y in the second year after treatment.

We follow the specification of the controls and standard errors in [Finkelstein et al. \(2016\)](#). We include three control variables in our analysis. First, since the entire household of any selected individual had the opportunity to apply for Medicaid, we include household size dummies. Second, since the lottery draws were done in eight rounds, we include lottery round dummies. Third, to improve precision, we control for the outcome variable Y measured during the 14 months prior to the first lottery draw. Standard errors are clustered at the household level.

H.2 The LinkedIn job opportunities experiment

LinkedIn usage is measured via extractions from the LinkedIn administrative data at the end of the job training program and again six (and twelve) months later. Employment six and twelve months after the job training program is measured via phone surveys. The response to the phone survey is, respectively, 68% and 60% six and twelve months after the program ended. This response rate is balanced across the treatment and control group. The final estimation sample is restricted to the 988 participants for whom we observe employment status twelve months after the program.

The random assignment took place on the cohort level. In particular, the 30 cohorts were randomly split into 15 treatment and 15 control groups using within-city, sequentially paired randomization. We follow the specification of the controls and standard errors in [Wheeler et al. \(2022\)](#). We include cohort-pair dummies as control variables. Standard errors are clustered at the cohort level.

H.3 The elite university education natural experiment

The application score equally weighs a combination of high school grades and an admission test score administered by the elite university. Due to the short time span between the admission test and enrollment deadline, the elite university does not have a waiting list but sets the number of admitted students slightly above capacity based upon previous years' enrollment rates.

[Anelli \(2020\)](#) compares applicants just above and below the application score cutoffs via a fuzzy Regression Discontinuity Design (RDD). The number of students, pre-treatment characteristics, and the probability of observing zero or missing income are smooth across the cutoff. The sample minimum and maximum of log income (Y) is equal to 2.398 and 12.441 respectively.

The polynomial and bandwidth are important considerations for an RD analysis. [Anelli \(2020\)](#) uses a polynomial of degree 0, which is often referred to as the local randomization approach ([Cattaneo et al., 2023](#)), and uses four different bandwidths: no bandwidth using all 645 applicants (Table 4, column (2) of [Anelli \(2020\)](#)), the MSE-optimal bandwidth using 162 to 175 applicants depending on the specification (Table 4, column (3)), and twice and three times the MSE-optimal bandwidth using 280 to 303 and 382 to 409 applicants respectively (Table 4, column (4) and (5)). Results are qualitatively similar across the four bandwidths.

Our results are based on the specification without bandwidth. The RD specification, absent polynomial and bandwidth, follows a standard IV setup with a binary instrument Z that equals one if the applicant had a score above the cutoff. We follow the specification of the controls and standard errors in [Anelli \(2020\)](#). We include five control variables: parental

house value, a female dummy, a dummy for students commuting from outside the city, fixed effects for the year of application, and a (potentially endogenous) dummy for whether the individual is enrolled in university in 2005, which is the year when income is observed. Standard errors are clustered at the cohort high-school level.

Ideally our D_2 would measure whether the student graduated from the elite university. In this case, the bounds would partially identify the LAFTE of the elite university. Since students that were induced to enroll at the elite university may never graduate from this institution, it is still likely that $\mathbb{P}[C_1, N_2] > 0$. In turn, with this D_2 it may be that $\mathbb{P}[C_1, A_2] = \mathbb{P}[N_1, C_2] = \mathbb{P}[A_1, C_2] = 0$. The first two mover types would likely be absent since a student cannot graduate from the elite university without ever being enrolled. The third mover type would be absent since there are very few always takers with elite enrollment.

H.4 The village-based schools experiment

The village-based schools were opened in the summer of 2007. The researchers conducted surveys of all available households in the control and treatment villages in the fall of 2007, four months after the opening, and in the spring of 2008, eight months after the opening. Both surveys determined school enrollment status of each school-age child living in the household and administered a short test covering math and language. Survey coverage rates were similar across treatment and control villages.

We follow [Burde and Linden \(2013\)](#) and exclude a small number of extremely large and wealthy households and further restrict the estimation sample to the children for whom we observe enrollment in both surveys and test scores in the spring 2008 survey. The final sample includes 1,181 children, of in total 1,490 school-age children across the 31 villages. The sample minimum and maximum of the standardized test scores in the spring 2008 survey (Y) is equal to -1.263 and 2.662 respectively.

We follow the specification of the controls and standard errors in [Burde and Linden \(2013\)](#). We control for a single dummy variable that equals one if the village is located in the Chagcharan district. Since the 31 villages were grouped into 11 equally sized village groups, randomization took place at the group level, and standard errors are clustered at the village-group level.

H.5 Sensitivity analysis controls

The empirical results in this paper are based on the control specification used in the original papers. Here we analyse the robustness of our results against excluding the controls. We find in all four empirical applications identical mover types and identical results for the necessary conditions of the double exclusion restriction. The bounds of Theorem 1 are qualitatively similar except for inflated standard errors in all applications, and a lower bound close to zero in the Oregon health insurance experiment.

I Additional empirical results

Column (1) and (2) of Table 4 report the precise estimates and standard errors of the bounds from Theorem 1, which are visually reported in Figure 2. Column (3) and (4) show the

Table 4: Estimated bounds on the LAFTE

		Theorem 1 bounds		Corollary 3 bounds	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
		lower	upper	lower	upper
Panel A: Health insurance	Estimate	0.081	0.224	-0.170	0.375
	Std. Error.	0.024	0.026	0.025	0.023
Panel B: LinkedIn training	Estimate	0.176	0.235	0.061	0.260
	Std. Error.	0.066	0.078	0.086	0.082
Panel C: Elite university	Estimate	0.532	7.545	-2.772	5.865
	Std. Error.	0.233	0.760	0.337	0.580

Notes: this table shows the estimated lower and upper bounds from Theorem 1 and Corollary 3 with their corresponding standard errors, for the empirical applications in Section 5 for which the double exclusion restriction cannot be rejected. The upper bound from Theorem 1 is a linear function of two coefficients from two different second stage IV regressions. To obtain the standard error for this upper bound, we use a stacking approach that duplicates the data and estimates the two second stage IV coefficients via a single second stage IV regression. We cluster standard errors on the cluster variable that is similarly duplicated.

bounds from Corollary 3 based on the bounded response. The latter two columns show that, for all four empirical applications, bounds based on the bounded response assumption are wide and cannot reject that the LAFTEs are equal to zero.

Table 5 reports the first stage and second stage estimates corresponding to different treatment variables. Column (1) shows the results for $D_1 + D_2$, corresponding to the IV estimand in (20). Columns (2) to (5) show the results for the treatment indicators D_1 , D_2 , D_\wedge , and D_\vee , respectively. Note that the estimate in column (1) does not require the double exclusion restriction and equals the lower bound for τ from Corollary 4. The upper bound for τ equals the smallest second stage IV estimate in column (2) to (5).

The double exclusion restriction is rejected for the village-based schools experiment in panel D. Column (1) allows us to conclude, however, that four months of education increases test scores by 0.679 standard deviations for the compliers. Subsequently, using the smallest second stage estimate in column (2) to (5), we can conclude that the estimated bounds for τ are [0.679, 1.301].

Table 5: The first and second stage estimates corresponding to different treatment variables

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	$D_1 + D_2$	D_1	D_2	D_\wedge	D_\vee
Panel A: The Oregon health insurance experiment, $N = 24646$					
First stage					
Z	0.369 (0.011)	0.253 (0.006)	0.115 (0.006)	0.176 (0.006)	0.193 (0.006)
Second stage					
D from top row	0.056 (0.016)	0.081 (0.024)	0.179 (0.052)	0.117 (0.034)	0.107 (0.031)
Panel B: The LinkedIn job opportunities experiment, $N = 988$					
First stage					
Z	0.707 (0.148)	0.393 (0.076)	0.315 (0.077)	0.357 (0.079)	0.351 (0.074)
Second stage					
D from top row	0.098 (0.039)	0.176 (0.066)	0.220 (0.096)	0.194 (0.079)	0.197 (0.077)
Panel C: The elite university education natural experiment, $N = 645$					
First stage					
Z	0.775 (0.106)	0.680 (0.053)	0.095 (0.061)	0.633 (0.051)	0.143 (0.063)
Second stage					
D from top row	0.466 (0.215)	0.532 (0.233)	3.796 (3.079)	0.571 (0.254)	2.534 (1.605)
Panel D: The village-based schools experiment, $N = 1181$					
First stage					
Z	0.926 (0.158)	0.443 (0.078)	0.483 (0.080)	0.443 (0.078)	0.483 (0.080)
Second stage					
D from top row	0.679 (0.090)	1.420 (0.191)	1.301 (0.172)	1.420 (0.191)	1.301 (0.172)

Notes: this table provides the first and second stage estimates corresponding to different treatment variables. The numbers represent the estimated coefficients and the numbers in parentheses the corresponding standard errors. The panels correspond to the empirical applications in Section 5, where N indicates the number of observations.