

Inference of Signs of Interaction Effects in Simultaneous Games with Incomplete Information*

Áureo de Paula[†]

Xun Tang[‡]

University of Pennsylvania

University of Pennsylvania

PRELIMINARY

This version: February 8, 2010

*We thank Hanming Fang, Bo Honoré, Aviv Nevo, Frank Schorfheide, Kevin Song, Elie Tamer and participants at CIREQ's Conference on the Econometrics of Social Interactions (October, 2009) for helpful comments.

[†]Department of Economics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104. E-mail: aureo@sas.upenn.edu

[‡]Department of Economics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104. E-mail: xuntang@sas.upenn.edu

Inference of Signs of Interaction Effects in Simultaneous Games with Incomplete Information

Abstract

This paper studies the inference of interaction effects, i.e. the impacts of players' actions on each other's payoffs, in discrete simultaneous games with incomplete information. We propose an easily implementable test for the signs of state-dependent interaction effects which does not require parametric specifications of players' payoffs, the distributions of their private signals or the equilibrium selection mechanism. The test relies on the commonly invoked assumption that players' private signals are independent conditional on observed states. The procedure is valid in the presence of multiple equilibria and as a by-product we propose a formal test for multiple equilibria in the data-generating process. We provide Monte Carlo evidence of the test's good performance in finite samples. We also implement it to infer the direction of interaction effects in couples' joint retirement decisions using data from the Health and Retirement Study.

JEL Codes: C01, C72

1 Introduction

Strategic interaction effects occur when a player’s action choice impacts not only his or her own utility function, but also other players’ payoffs. In simultaneous discrete games of incomplete information, each person has a private signal about his or her payoff, while the joint distribution of such private signals is common knowledge among all players. In a Bayesian Nash equilibrium, individuals act to maximize their expected payoffs given their knowledge of these distributions as well as the payoff structure. Such models have found applications in a wide array of empirical contexts where players are uncertain about their competitors payoffs given their own information set. These include airing commercials at radio stations (Sweeting (2008)) and peer effects in recommendations by financial analysts (Bajari, Hong, Krainer, and Nekipelov (2009)).

Earlier works have studied the identification and estimation of these games using a wide spectrum of restrictions. These include (but are not circumscribed to) the independence of private information variables from observable covariates, parametric specification of relevant distributions or utility functions or constraints on the set of Bayesian Nash equilibria¹ In comparison, in this paper we focus on inference of the signs of interaction effects, which are allowed to be individual-specific and state-dependent, under a minimal set of non-parametric restrictions on private signals and payoff structures or further reductions on the solution concept. Our choice of focus is motivated by two considerations. First, signs of interaction effects alone have important policy implications. For example, consider the context of couples’ joint retirement decisions as studied by Banks, Blundell, and Casanova Rivas (2007) and Casanova Rivas (2009). If spouses enjoy retirement more when their partner is

¹Wan and Xu (2010) for example consider the set of monotone, threshold-crossing Bayesian Nash equilibria. Recent work by Grieco (2010) studies a class of games with flexible information structures which also subsume games with complete information where players know each other’s payoffs for sure. In a similar spirit, Navarro and Takahashi (2009) suggest a test for the information structure which, among other things, relies on a degenerate equilibrium selection rule and independence of residuals and observed covariates.

retired as well (i.e. interaction effects are positive), then any exogenous change in retirement provisions that force the wife to delay her retirement should at the same time also dampen the husband's incentive to retire. Second, while point identification and estimation of the full structure of such games inevitably hinge on stochastic restrictions on private signal distributions (such as perfect knowledge or independence) and parametric specifications of (such as index specification), inference on signs of interaction effects can be done under minimal nonparametric restrictions on the structure. Such inference is valid even in the presence of multiple equilibria, and does not invoke any assumptions on equilibrium choice mechanism in the data-generating process. This feature of our procedure is particularly notable, as almost all previous works have relied on stringent assumptions on equilibrium selection or multiplicity to attain identification (e.g. single-equilibrium assumption in Bajari, Hong, Krainer, and Nekipelov (2009) and Tang (2009), equilibrium uniqueness in Seim (2006) or Aradillas-Lopez (2009) or parametric specification of equilibrium selection mechanism in some other works).

We first show how existence of multiple equilibria in the data can be used to infer *the signs* of strategic interactions. If private signals are independent from each other conditional on observed covariates, the joint probability of a profile of actions must be the product of marginal probabilities for individual actions in any single equilibrium. When multiple equilibria exist in the data, the choice probabilities observed are mixtures of those implied in each single equilibrium. We show in Section 3 that signs of correlations between players' actions are determined by signs of the strategic interaction effects. The assumption of conditional independence of private information is commonly maintained in the literature on estimation and inference in incomplete information static games (see for example Seim (2006), Aradillas-Lopez (2009), Berry and Tamer (2006), Bajari, Hong, Krainer, and Nekipelov (2009), Bajari, Hahn, Hong, and Ridder (2009), Brock and Durlauf (2007), Sweeting (2008) and Tang (2009)).² The assumption is also common in the literature on the estimation of

²A recent exception is Wan and Xu (2010) who nevertheless rely on further restrictions on the solution concept and the environment to obtain identification. To handle the correlation in private types, they rely on monotone, threshold-crossing equilibrium strategies and impose restrictions on the magnitude of the

dynamic games of incomplete information.

When there is only a unique equilibrium in the data, we also indicate how to exploit an exclusion restriction on states to infer signs of interaction effects. The idea relies on the following simple intuition. Suppose that for some player i , there exists a subvector of state variables which affect other players' payoffs or private signals but not his or her own. Then the correlation between actions chosen by i and others across different realizations of such "excluded" states must be solely determined by the direction of others' interaction effects on i 's payoffs, provided private signals are independent given observed states. Such exclusion restrictions on state variables arise naturally in many applications. For example, in a static entry-and-exit game between two firms, it might be plausible to assume that some idiosyncratic factors affecting *Firm A*'s costs (such as geographic locations) may not enter *Firm B*'s profits or private information directly.

Another contribution of our paper is to introduce a formal test for the presence of multiple equilibria in the data-generating process. When the number of players within a game is large, the conditional choice probabilities *within a particular equilibrium* may be consistently estimated from average choices in each game (see for example Brock and Durlauf (2007), p.58). Nevertheless, when the number of players is small (as is typically the case in the empirical games literature) conditional choices probabilities will not be reliably estimated within individual games. In this case, testing for multiple equilibria is of interest in its own right, as most of the known methods for semiparametric estimation of incomplete information games (without explicitly specifying an equilibrium selection rule) has relied on the existence of a single equilibrium in the data (e.g. Aradillas-Lopez (2009), Bajari, Hong, Krainer, and Nekipelov (2009) and Tang (2009)).³ Hence it is *imperative* to devise a formal test for the strategic interaction parameters (see Assumption A in their paper). In a subsection, Aradillas-Lopez (2009) also suggests an estimation procedure to handle cases where the assumption is violated, but relies on the assumption that a single equilibrium is played in the data.

³For an illustration of how misspecification of the equilibrium selection rule can affect inference in a complete information game with a small number of players, see Honoré and de Paula (forthcoming).

assumption of unique equilibrium in data-generating process. The test we propose in this paper exploits the observation (also mentioned in the parametric model by Sweeting (2008)) that, if private signals are i.i.d. across individuals, players' actions must be independent in a single equilibrium but correlated when there are multiple equilibria. An innovation of our test is to use a stepwise multiple testing procedure to infer whether each individual player is switching between strategies in multiple equilibria in the data-generating process. This is of particular interest for structural estimation of games involving more than three players, where a subset of players may stick to the same strategy across multiple equilibria. Semiparametric methods using the assumption of unique equilibrium can still be applied to consistently estimate payoff parameters for these players. Therefore it is useful to infer the identity of such players from observed distributions of actions.

Sweeting (2008) proposed a procedure to check for multiple equilibria in the data by calculating the percentage of pairs of players whose actions are correlated. In comparison, we develop stronger, new results by exploiting and extending this intuition in a more general context where interaction effects may depend on states and the identity of the players in general. First, our test allows both individual-specific interaction effects and private signals to depend on observed states in unrestricted ways. Second, our test for multiple BNE in the data is based on testing whether any individual player's action is correlated with the *total number* of competitors' choosing the same action.⁴ Finally, as mentioned previously, we show that signs of strategic interactions among players are identified from observable distributions.

The paper proceeds as follows. We present our basic model and empirical characterization in the next section. On section 3, we present main results on the identification of the sign of interaction effects. Section 4 outlines general testing procedures for inference. Monte

⁴The procedure used in Sweeting (2008) did not prescribe a decision rule to draw conclusions about existence of multiple BNE. Our test addresses a subtle issue that was not noted previously in Sweeting (2008): multiple BNE may still exist in data even when the percentage of pairs of players with correlated actions is very small (say $1/\binom{N}{2}$).

Carlo experiments and an application to joint retirement are presented in sections 5 and 6. Section 7 concludes.

2 The Model and Empirical Context

We consider a simultaneous discrete game with incomplete information involving N players. Each player i chooses an action D_i from two alternatives $\{1, 0\}$. A vector of states $X \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is common knowledge among all players. A vector of private information (or “types”) $\epsilon \equiv (\epsilon_i)_{i=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is such that ϵ_i is only observed by player i . (Throughout the paper we will use upper case letters for random variables and lower case for their realized values. We use Ω_R to denote the support of any generic random vector R .) Conditional on a given state $X = x$, the private information ϵ is jointly distributed according to the CDF $F_{\epsilon|X}(\cdot|x)$. The payoff for player i from choosing action 1 is $U_{1i}(X, \epsilon_i) \equiv u_i(X) + (\sum_{j \neq i} D_j) \delta_i(X) - \epsilon_i$, while the return from the other action $U_{0i}(X, \epsilon_i)$ is normalized to 0. Intuitively, $u_i(X)$ specifies a base return from action 1 for player i . Meanwhile $\delta_i(X)$ captures interaction effects on i ’s payoff due to another player j who chooses 1. (This specification subsumes that of Sweeting (2008) in the context of binary choices, as it allows the interaction effects to depend on states X and u_i, δ_i to take general forms.) The return functions $(u_i, \delta_i)_{i=1}^N$ and the distribution (though not the realization) of private information $F_{\epsilon|X}$ are common knowledge among all players. We maintain the following major identifying restrictions on $F_{\epsilon|X}$ throughout the paper.

Assumption 1 *Conditional on any $x \in \Omega_X$, ϵ_i is independent of $(\epsilon_j)_{j \neq i}$ for all i and has continuous, positive densities over the support $\Omega_{\epsilon_i|X=x}$.*

Assumption 1 allows X to be correlated with private information of the players, as may be desirable in empirical applications. This is a common assumption in the econometric literature dealing with incomplete information (dynamic and simultaneous) games. A pure strategy for player i in this Bayesian game is a mapping $s_i : \Omega_{X, \epsilon_i} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. Under CI, a Bayesian Nash Equilibrium (BNE) in pure strategies (given state x) can be characterized by

a profile of choice probabilities $p(x) \equiv [p_1(x), \dots, p_N(x)]$ such that for all $x \in \Omega_X$,

$$p_i(x) = F_{\epsilon_i|X} \left(u_i(x) + \delta_i(x) \sum_{j \neq i} p_j(x) \right) \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (1)$$

where $p_i(x)$ is player i 's probability of choosing action 1 conditional on the state x and $F_{\epsilon_i|X}$ is the marginal distribution of ϵ_i conditional on X . Let $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$ denote the set of BNE (as characterized by solutions in p to (1)) for a given x and structure $\theta \equiv \{(u_i, \delta_i)_{i=1,2}, F_{\epsilon|X}\}$. The existence of pure-strategy BNE for any given x follows from Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem and the continuity of $F_{\epsilon_i|X}$ under Assumption 1. In general there may be multiple BNE, depending on the specifications of $F_{\epsilon|X}$, u_i and δ_i .

We assume that econometricians have access to a large cross-section of games between N players. In each game, they observe choices of actions by all players and realized states x , but do not observe $(\epsilon_i)_{i=1}^N$ or know the form of $(u_i, \delta_i)_{i=1}^N$ and $F_{\epsilon|X}$. Our analysis posits (i) that the structure $(u_i, \delta_i)_{i=1}^N$ and $F_{\epsilon|X}$ are fixed across all games observed, and (ii) that the choice data observed is generated by players following pure-strategies prescribed by BNE. Econometricians are interested in learning (at least some features of) the structure $(u_i, \delta_i)_{i=1}^N$ and $F_{\epsilon|X}$ from the observable joint distribution of X and $(D_i)_{i=1}^N$.

Suppose the choices observed in the data are known to be generated from a single BNE in the data generating process for all $x \in \Omega_X$. This may arise either because the solution to (1) is unique or because the equilibrium selection in the data generating process is degenerate in one of the multiple solutions. Then (1) offers a link between observable conditional choice patterns and structural elements $(u_i, \delta_i)_{i=1}^N, F_{\epsilon|X}$. Estimation can be done under various restrictions on u , δ and $F_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2|X}$ (see Aradillas-Lopez (2009), Berry and Tamer (2006), Bajari, Hong, Krainer, and Nekipelov (2009) and (Tang 2009) for more details).

This link may nonetheless break down when there are multiple equilibria in the data generating process. To see this, let $\Lambda_{x,\theta}$ be an equilibrium selection mechanism (i.e. a distribution over $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$) in the data-generating process that may depend on x and θ . This accounts for the possibility that, "in a game with multiple equilibria, anything that tends to focus the players' attention on one particular equilibrium, *in a way that is commonly recognized*,

tends to make this the equilibrium that the players will expect and thus actually implement. The focal equilibrium could be determined by any of a wide range of possible factors, including environmental factors and cultural traditions (which fall beyond the scope of analysis in mathematical game theory), special mathematical properties of the various equilibria, and preplay statements made by the players or an outside arbitrator.” (Myerson (1991), pp.371-2) Since X is commonly recognized, we allow it to affect the equilibrium selection mechanism in accordance. For any x such that $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$ is not a singleton, the conditional choice probability observed in data is a mixture of the conditional choice probabilities implied by each pure-strategy BNE in $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$. That is, $p_i^*(x) = \int_{\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}} p_i^l d\Lambda_{x,\theta}(p^l)$, where $p_i^*(x)$ is the actual marginal probability that i chooses 1 conditional on x observed from data, and $p^l \equiv (p_i^l)_{i=1}^N$ is a generic element in the set of possible BNE $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$, with l indexing the equilibria in $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$ and p_i^l , the marginal probability for i to choose 1 given x and θ implied in equilibrium l . While the fixed point characterization (1) holds for every single BNE $p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$ by definition, it does not necessarily hold for the vector of mixture marginals $p^* \equiv (p_i^*)_{i=1}^N$ observed. Because the data will provide information on the mixtures of equilibria, not on the individual equilibria themselves, there will be limits to what can be learned about the structure from the data without imposing additional assumptions. This point is illustrated in the appendix using results from the literature on identifiability (or lack thereof) in mixture models.

Researchers have taken different approaches to deal the issue of multiple equilibria in empirical works. Such strategies include (a) the use of a parametric equilibrium selection rule; (b) the assumption that only one equilibrium is played in all games; (c) sufficient conditions for uniqueness of the equilibrium; and/or (d) partial identification and estimation of the identified set. Each of these strategies (which can also be combined) has some limitations. We are interested in constructing a robust way to test for the existence of multiple equilibria and to recover the sign of interactions under weak stochastic restrictions on distribution of private information.

3 Identifying Signs of Interaction Effects

In this section, we show how to detect the presence of multiple BNE in the data observed and identify signs of interaction effects $\delta_i(x)$ for any i under a given state x . The sign reveals the nature of strategic incentives among players. Compared with earlier works, our sign identification has several innovations and contributions. First, our test does not invoke any parametric restrictions on players' preferences or distributions of private information. Second, it allows the strategic incentives (as captured by the sign of δ_i) to be a function of states x . Third, our approach is robust to the presence of multiple BNE. If in fact the existence of multiple BNE at first precludes complete identification of the structure, it makes possible the identification of the sign of interaction effects in contrast to states where equilibrium is unique. This intriguing possibility is ventilated for example in Manski (1993)⁵, and clearly observed in Sweeting (2008).

We first show how to detect existence of multiple BNE in data using observed distributions. Define

$$\gamma_i^l(x) \equiv \mathbb{E}_l \left(\sum_{j \neq i} D_j | X = x \right) = \sum_{j \neq i} p_j^l(x)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_l$ denotes the expectation with respect to the distribution of $(D_i)_{i=1}^N$ induced in the equilibrium $p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$. Define $sign(a)$ to be 1 if $a > 0$, -1 if $a < 0$ and 0 if $a = 0$. For any player $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, let $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x)$ denote the conditional expectation of the product $D_i(\sum_{j \neq i} D_j)$ given x observed from the data generating process. That is, $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) \equiv \int_{p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}} p_i^l(x) \gamma_i^l(x) d\Lambda_{x,\theta}(p^l)$, where θ denotes the true structure, and $\Lambda_{x,\theta}$ denotes the equilibrium-selection mechanism in the data generating process. Let $p_i^*(x)$ be the actual probability that i chooses 1 given x observed in the data (i.e. $p_i^*(x) = \int_{p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}} p_i^l(x) d\Lambda_{x,\theta}(p^l)$), and let $\gamma_i^*(x) \equiv \sum_{j \neq i} p_j^*(x)$. $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$ denotes the subset of $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$ that occurs in the data generating process with positive probability (i.e. $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+ \equiv \{p^l : \Lambda_{x,\theta}(p^l) > 0\}$). We say multiple BNE exist in the data generating process whenever $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$ is not a singleton.

⁵“The prospects for identification may improve if $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is non-linear in a manner that generates multiple social equilibria.” (p.539)

Proposition 1 Suppose Assumption 1 holds. (i) For any given x , multiple BNE exist in the data-generating process if and only if $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) \neq p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x)$ at least for some i ; (ii) For all i and x such that $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) \neq p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x)$,

$$\text{sign}(\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) - p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x)) = \text{sign}(\delta_i(x))$$

Proof. Under Assumption 1, D_i must be independent of $\sum_{j \neq i} D_j$ conditional on x in every single BNE p^l in $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$.

(Sufficiency of (i)) Suppose there is a unique BNE in the data generating process. That is, $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$ is a singleton $\{p^l\}$. Then $p_i^*(x) = p_i^l(x)$, $\gamma_i^*(x) = \sum_{j \neq i} p_j^l(x)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) = p_i^l(x) \sum_{j \neq i} p_j^l(x)$ for all i in state x . Hence $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) = p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x)$ for all i .

(Necessity of (i)) Suppose $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$ is not a singleton in state x . Then there exists at least some i and $p^l, p^k \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$ such that $p_i^l \neq p_i^k$.⁶ Also note for such a player i , $\delta_i(x)$ must necessarily be nonzero. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) - p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x) \\ &= \int_{p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+} p_i^l(x)\gamma_i^l(x)d\Lambda_{x,\theta} - \int_{p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+} p_i^l(x)d\Lambda_{x,\theta} \int_{p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+} \gamma_i^l(x)d\Lambda_{x,\theta} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Suppose $\delta_i(x) > 0$. Equilibrium characterization in (1) suggests there exists a strictly increasing function g_i such that $g_i(p_i^l(x)) = \gamma_i^l(x)$ for each single p^l in $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$.⁷ Thus for x given, (2) can be written as

$$\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) - p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x) = \int_0^1 g_i(z)z d\tilde{\Lambda}_{i,x,\theta}(z) - \int_0^1 z d\tilde{\Lambda}_{i,x,\theta}(z) \int_0^1 g_i(z) d\tilde{\Lambda}_{i,x,\theta}(z)$$

where $z \equiv p_i^l(x)$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}_{i,x,\theta}$ is a distribution of $p_i^l(x)$ induced by the equilibrium selection mechanism $\Lambda_{x,\theta}$ defined on $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$. Thus (2) takes the simple form of the covariance of a

⁶The choice of l, k in general may be specific to i . We suppress this dependence for notational ease.

⁷The form of g_i may depend on θ and x in general. We suppress this dependence for notational ease.

random variable z and a strictly increasing function of itself:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{cov}(Z, g_i(Z)) &= \mathbb{E}[(Z - \mathbb{E}(Z))(g_i(Z) - \mathbb{E}(g_i(Z)))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(Z - \mathbb{E}(Z))(g_i(Z) - g_i(\mathbb{E}(Z)))] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}[(Z - \mathbb{E}(Z))(g_i(\mathbb{E}(Z)) - \mathbb{E}(g_i(Z)))] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(Z - \mathbb{E}(Z))(g_i(Z) - g_i(\mathbb{E}(Z)))]
\end{aligned}$$

Because g_i is strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$ for given x , we have $z_1 > z_2 \Rightarrow g_i(z_1) > g_i(z_2)$. Consequently, $(z - \mathbb{E}(Z))(g_i(z) - g_i(\mathbb{E}(Z))) > 0$ for any $z \neq \mathbb{E}(Z)$, and the covariance is strictly positive, provided the distribution $\tilde{\Lambda}_{i,x,\theta}$ is not degenerate on $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$. Hence $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) - p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x) > 0$ if multiple BNE exist in data generating process in state x . The case with $\delta_i(x) < 0$ is proved by symmetric arguments. The proof of (ii) is already included in the proof of (i) above. ■

We exploit the result in part (i) to devise a test for multiple BNE in the data generating process in the section 4. Part (ii) suggests $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) - p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x) > 0$ only if $\delta_i(x) > 0$ and there exist multiple BNE in state x in the data generating process. However, the reverse of this statement only holds when $N = 2$. This is because when $N \geq 3$, there can exist i and x such that multiple BNE exist at x in data generating process and $\delta_i(x) \neq 0$, but $p_i^l = p_i^*$ for all p_i^l in $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$ so that $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) = p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x)$.

Example 1 Consider a simple 3-by-2 game involving three players. Suppress the dependence on x for notational ease. Let $u_1 = 0.5$, $u_2 = u_3 = 0.3611$, $\delta_i = -1$ and $\epsilon_i \sim N(\frac{1}{10}, \sigma = \frac{1}{4})$ for all i . Then there exist two distinct BNE:

$$\begin{aligned}
p^1 \text{ with } p_1^1 &= 0.0611; p_2^1 = 0.7756; p_3^1 = 0.0107 \\
p^2 \text{ with } p_1^2 &= 0.0611; p_2^2 = 0.0107; p_3^2 = 0.7756
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Player 1 chooses alternative 1 with the same probability in both BNE, while both 2 and 3 play different strategies across the two BNE (p^1 and p^2) with $p_i^1 \neq p_i^2$ for $i = 2, 3$. ||

Therefore part (ii) does not guarantee the identification of signs of $\delta_i(x)$ for *all* i and x in general, due to the need to distinguish players who do or do not incur the same probability for choosing 1 across different equilibria. Let $\iota(x) \equiv \{i : p_i^l(x) = \bar{p}_i(x) \text{ for some } \bar{p}_i \text{ in all } p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+\}$. Obviously $\bar{p}_i(x) = p_i^*(x)$ for all $i \in \iota(x)$. Let $\iota^c(x)$ denote the set of players not in $\iota(x)$. When there is a unique BNE at x in the data generating process (i.e. $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$ is a singleton), all players in the game belong to $\iota(x)$. When $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$ is not a singleton, $\iota(x)$ only consists of players who choose 1 with the same probability in *all* $p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$. By construction, $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) = p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x)$ if and only if $i \in \iota(x)$. A corollary to Proposition 1 is that for i and x such that $i \in \iota^c(x)$, the sign of $\delta_i(x)$ is directly identified as the sign of $\tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) - p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x)$. Additional restrictions are needed in order to identify $\text{sign}(\delta_i(x))$ for $i \in \iota(x)$. For any given x and i , define the equivalence class as $\Upsilon_i(x) \equiv \{x' : u_i(x) = u_i(x'), \delta_i(x) = \delta_i(x'), F_{\epsilon_i|X=x} = F_{\epsilon_i|X=x'}\}$. (There is no loss of generality in introducing this notation, as we allow the possibility that $\Upsilon_i(x)$ is a singleton consisting of x only.)

In empirical applications, the equivalence class $\Upsilon_i(x)$ is often a non-singleton set that can happen with positive probability for all i, x . For example, consider entry-exit games involving N firms. The state variables X may include a vector X_0 that consists of market- or sector-wide factors affecting the demand for goods produced. The vector X may also include a group of mutually exclusive vectors $(X_i)_{i=1}^N$ with X_i capturing observable firm-specific factors that only affect i 's profitability but not its rivals (e.g. X_i may include labor costs or local regulations pertaining to the geographic locations of firm i). The vector of private information $(\epsilon_i)_{i=1}^N$ may well capture all other firm-specific factors (such as idiosyncratic costs) affecting profitability and unobservable to opponent firms and econometricians. In situations where, given one's own states, the rival's states (such as their labor costs) have no bearing on one's own profitability. Then ϵ_i is independent of X_{-i} given X_0, X_i . In such an environment, $\Upsilon_i(x) = \{\tilde{x} : (\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{x}_i) = (x_0, x_i)\}$ where $x = (x_0, x_i, x_{-i})$.

Assumption 2 For all i and x s.t. $\delta_i(x) \neq 0$, $\exists \omega_i(x) \subset \Upsilon_i(x)$ with positive probability such

that $\forall x' \in \omega_i(x)$, either (i) $i \in \iota^c(x) \cup \iota^c(x')$ or (ii) $i \in \iota(x) \cap \iota(x')$ and $p_i^*(x) \neq p_i^*(x')$.

More intuitively, the Assumption 2 is satisfied as long as there is enough variation in the equivalence class $\Upsilon_i(x)$ to induce changes in $p_i^l(x')$ in equilibria that happen with positive probability in data. If $\Upsilon_i(x)$ is a singleton (for i), this will happen when x induces multiple equilibria and the $p_i(x)$ is not the same in all equilibria. For non-singleton $\Upsilon_i(x)$, Assumption 2 may hold even when the equilibrium is unique or when $p_i(x)$ is the same across all equilibria. In some empirical contexts, researchers know a priori which i, x satisfy $\delta_i(x) \neq 0$. (For example, when interaction effects are known to be increasing or decreasing in the number of players choosing the same action together, then $\delta_i(x)$ are non-zero for all i, x .) In such cases, Assumption 2 can be checked directly using observable distributions as Proposition 2 suggests below. The following example illustrates in details how more primitive conditions can lead to Assumption 2 in simple examples.

Example 2 Consider a 2-by-2 game with states $X \equiv (X_0, X_1, X_2)$ where Assumption 1 holds and $u_i, \delta_i, F_{\epsilon_i|X}$ only depend on $X_{0i} \equiv (X_0, X_i)$ but not on the other state variables. The probability for choosing action 1 in equilibrium is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} p_1(x) \\ p_2(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F_{\epsilon_1|x_{01}}(u_1(x_{01}) + \delta_1(x_{01})p_2(x)) \\ F_{\epsilon_2|x_{02}}(u_2(x_{02}) + \delta_2(x_{02})p_1(x)) \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

Then $\Upsilon_i(x) \equiv \{x' : x'_{0i} = x_{0i}\}$. Within this framework, the Assumption 2 assumption can be satisfied a given state $x \equiv (x_0, x_1, x_2)$ under several different specifications. First consider the following specification:

For $i = 1, 2$, $\exists \omega_i(x) \subset \Upsilon_i(x)$ with positive probability such that $\forall x' \in \omega_i(x)$,

$$F_{\epsilon_j|x_{0j}}(u_j(x_{0j}) + \delta_j(x_{0j})t) \neq F_{\epsilon_j|x'_{0j}}(u_j(x'_{0j}) + \delta_j(x'_{0j})t)$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ where $j \neq i$ is the identity of the other player. (For example, this inequality can hold if $\delta_j(x_{0j}) = \delta_j(x'_{0j})$, $F_{\epsilon_j|x_{0j}} = F_{\epsilon_j|x'_{0j}}$ but $u_j(x_{0j}) \neq u_j(x'_{0j})$ for all $x' \in \omega_i(x)$.)

The event “ $1 \in \iota(x) \cap \iota(x')$ and $p_1^*(x) = p_1^*(x')$ ” can never happen for any $x' \in \omega_1(x)$ whenever $\delta_1(x) \neq 0$. Suppose it does. Then $p_1^l(z) = p_1^*(z)$ in all $p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{z,\theta}^+$ for $z \in \{x, x'\}$. Therefore (4) implies $p_2^l(z) = p_2^*(z)$ in all $p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{z,\theta}^+$ for $z \in \{x, x'\}$ and $2 \in \iota(x) \cap \iota(x')$. Then $p_1^*(x) = p_1^*(x')$ and the inequality (3) in (S1) suggest $p_2^*(x) \neq p_2^*(x')$ for all $x' \in \omega_1(x)$. This in turn implies $p_1^*(x) \neq p_1^*(x')$ in (4) by definition of $\omega_1(x) \subset \Upsilon_1(x)$ whenever $\delta_1(x) \neq 0$. This contradicts the supposition that $p_1^*(x) = p_1^*(x')$. Hence Assumption 2 holds for $i = 1$ if $\delta_1(x) \neq 0$. Symmetric arguments prove the case with $i = 2$. $\parallel$

Note that when $\delta_i(x) = 0$ for either $i = 1$ or 2 , $i \in \iota(x) \cap \iota(x')$ and $p_i^*(x) = p_i^*(x')$ for all $x' \in \Upsilon_i(x)$. This nevertheless does not violate Assumption 2, which only restricts the case with $\delta_i(x) \neq 0$.

Now we resume our discussion on identification of the sign of $\delta_i(x)$. Define

$$\Psi_i(x) \equiv E\left(D_{i,g} \sum_{j \neq i} D_{j,g} | X_g \in \Upsilon_i(x)\right) - E(D_{i,g} | X_g \in \Upsilon_i(x)) E\left(\sum_{j \neq i} D_{j,g} | X_g \in \Upsilon_i(x)\right)$$

where g indexes the independent games observed in data.

Proposition 2 *Under Assumption 1 and Assumption 2, $\text{sign}(\delta_i(x)) = \text{sign}(\Psi_i(x))$ for all i, x .*

Proof. Let $\Lambda_{x,\theta}$ denote the equilibrium selection mechanism defined over $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^+$ under state x and let $\Lambda_{x,\theta}^*$ denote $\int_{\Upsilon_i(x)} \Lambda_{x',\theta} dF(x' | X' \in \Upsilon_i(x))$ (where $F(\cdot | X \in S)$ is the distribution of X conditional on $X \in S$). Note that this is a distribution over the augmented support $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^* \equiv \cup_{x' \in \Upsilon_i(x)} \mathcal{L}_{x',\theta}^+$. Let $\Lambda_{i,x,\theta}^*$ denote the distribution of $p_i^l(x)$ induced by $\Lambda_{x,\theta}^*$. Then (1) and Assumption 2 implies that there exists an increasing (or decreasing) function g_i s.t. $p_i^l(x') = g_i(\gamma_i^l(x'))$ for all $p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x',\theta}^+$ and all $x' \in \Upsilon_i(x)$ if $\delta_i(x') > 0$ (or < 0 respectively). Specifically, $g_i(t) \equiv F_{\epsilon_i | X=x'}(u_i(x') + \delta_i(x')t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Note that this function is the fixed for all $x' \in \Upsilon_i(x)$ due to Assumption 2. Also since $\omega_i(x)$ happens with a positive probability

under Assumption 2, the distribution $\Lambda_{i,x,\theta}^*$ is non-degenerate. Then note

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_i(x) &= \int_{p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^*} p_i^l(x) \gamma_i^l(x) d\Lambda_{x,\theta}^* - \int_{p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^*} p_i^l(x) d\Lambda_{x,\theta}^* \int_{p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}^*} \gamma_i^l(x) d\Lambda_{x,\theta}^* \\ &= \int_0^1 g_i(z) z d\Lambda_{i,x,\theta}^*(z) - \int_0^1 z d\Lambda_{i,x,\theta}^*(z) \int_0^1 g_i(z) d\Lambda_{i,x,\theta}^*(z)\end{aligned}$$

where $z \equiv p_i^l(x)$. Then the same argument as in Proposition 1 shows $\Psi_i(x) > 0$ (or < 0) whenever $\delta_i(x) > 0$ (or < 0) for all i, x . When $\delta_i(x) = 0$, $p_i^l(x')$ must be the same for all $p^l \in \mathcal{L}_{x',\theta}$ and all $x' \in \Upsilon_i(x)$, and the distribution $\Lambda_{i,x,\theta}^*$ is degenerate. Hence $\Psi_i(x) = 0$. This completes the proof. ■

Finally note that, even when we do not know whether Assumption 2 holds for some $\delta_i(x)$, we can still make conclusions about the sign of $\delta_i(x)$ if $\Psi_i(x) > 0$ or < 0 . If Assumption 2 does not hold, we will have $\Psi_i(x) = 0$ and failing to reject $\Psi_i(x) = 0$ may be either due to $\delta_i(x) = 0$ or the violation of Assumption 2.

4 Testing Multiple BNE and Interaction Signs

4.1 Multiple BNE in Data Generating Process: Wald Test

Below, we propose a test for the presence of multiple equilibria in the data in an empirical context where researchers observe states and players' decisions from a large cross-section of independent games (indexed by $g = 1, \dots, G$), each defined by the same structural elements $(u_i, \delta_i, F_{\epsilon_{i|X}})_{i \leq N}$. Semiparametric estimation of games of incomplete information typically refrains from parametric assumptions on primitives or equilibrium selection mechanism at the cost of assuming that the data observed is rationalized by the same BNE (see Aradillas-Lopez (2009), Bajari, Hong, Krainer, and Nekipelov (2009) and Tang (2009)). The applicability of these semiparametric approaches naturally hinges on validity of the “single equilibrium” assumption.⁸ The procedures below formally test the existence of multiple BNE in the data

⁸As mentioned in the introduction, “social interaction” models do not rely on this assumption, but require the number of agents in each game to be large so that *within equilibrium* choice probabilities can be

observed under the maintained assumption of conditionally independent private signals.

The null hypotheses that “multiple BNE exist in the data for state x ” is equivalently formulated as follows, based on Proposition 1:

$$H_0 : \Delta_i(x) = 0 \forall i \leq N \quad (5)$$

$$H_1 : \exists i \text{ s.t. } \Delta_i(x) \neq 0$$

where $\Delta_i(x) \equiv \tilde{\gamma}_i^*(x) - p_i^*(x)\gamma_i^*(x) = \sum_{j \neq i} \{E[D_i D_j | x] - E(D_i | x)E(D_j | x)\}$. Throughout this and the next section, we focus on a simple case where X only contains discrete coordinates. Then the sample analog of expectations conditional on x are simple sample averages across games with $X = x$. We suppress x for notational ease when there is no ambiguity.

Let g index games observed in the data. For any subset $I \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$, let $D_{I,g} \equiv \Pi_{i \in I} D_{i,g}$ and $\mu_I \equiv E(D_{I,g} 1(X_g = x))$. Let $\mu_0 \equiv \Pr(X_g = x)$. Let μ denote a $\tilde{N} \equiv (N + \binom{N}{2} + 1)$ -vector consisting of μ_0, μ_i and μ_{ij} for all individual i and all pairs $i \neq j$. For example, with $N = 3$, $\mu \equiv (\mu_0, \mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_{12}, \mu_{13}, \mu_{23})'$. Define:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mu}_i &\equiv (G)^{-1} \sum_g D_{i,g} 1(X_g = x) ; \bar{\mu}_{ij} \equiv (G)^{-1} \sum_g D_{ij,g} 1(X_g = x) \\ \bar{\mu}_0 &\equiv (G)^{-1} \sum_g 1(X_g = x) ; \bar{\mu}_G \equiv (\bar{\mu}_0, \bar{\mu}_i, \dots, \bar{\mu}_{ij}, \dots)' \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\mu}_G$ is the vector of sample analogs for μ . By the multivariate central limit theorem, $G^{1/2}(\bar{\mu}_G - \mu) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}_{\tilde{N}}, \Sigma)$ where $\mathbf{0}_{\tilde{N}}$ is a $\tilde{N}$ -vector of zeros and Σ is the corresponding variance-covariance matrix.

Note that $\Delta_i(x) \equiv \sum_{j \neq i} \left(\frac{\mu_{ij}}{\mu_0} - \frac{\mu_i \mu_j}{\mu_0 \mu_0} \right)$. Let $\mathbf{T}_G$ be a N -vector with its i -th coordinate defined as

$$T_{G,i} = \hat{\Delta}_i(x) \equiv \sum_{j \neq i} \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}_{ij}}{\bar{\mu}_0} - \frac{\bar{\mu}_i \bar{\mu}_j}{\bar{\mu}_0 \bar{\mu}_0} \right)$$

Let V denote a N -by- $\tilde{N}$ matrix, with its i -th row V_i defined by the following table (where $\mu_{(m)}, V_{i,(m)}$ denote the m -th coordinates of two $\tilde{N}$ -vectors μ and V_i respectively, and $j, k \neq i$),

consistently estimated from average choices in each game.

$\mu_{(m)}$	μ_0	μ_i	μ_j	μ_{ij}	μ_{jk}
$V_{i,(m)}$	$\sum_{j \neq i} (-\frac{\mu_{ij}}{\mu_0^2} + \frac{2\mu_i\mu_j}{\mu_0^3})$	$-\sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\mu_j}{\mu_0^2}$	$-\frac{\mu_i}{\mu_0^2}$	$\frac{1}{\mu_0}$	0

Then the Delta Method implies

$$G^{1/2}(\mathbf{T}_G - \mathbf{\Delta}) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}_N, \mathbf{V}\mathbf{\Sigma}\mathbf{V}')$$

where $\mathbf{\Delta} \equiv (\Delta_i)_{i=1}^N$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}, \hat{\mathbf{V}}$ be estimates for $\mathbf{\Sigma}, \mathbf{V}$ respectively, constructed by replacing μ_0, μ_I with nonparametric estimates

$$\hat{\mu}_0 = G^{-1} \sum_{g=1}^G 1(X_g = x) \quad \hat{\mu}_I = G^{-1} \sum_{g=1}^G [\Pi_{i \in I} D_{i,g} 1(X_g = x)]$$

Proposition 3 *Suppose the data has G independent games with the same underlying structure. Then*

$$G(\mathbf{T}_G - \mathbf{\Delta})'(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}')^{-1}(\mathbf{T}_G - \mathbf{\Delta}) \xrightarrow{d} \chi_{df=N}^2$$

Under the null hypothesis, $\mathbf{\Delta} = \mathbf{0}_N$ and the chi-squared distribution can be used to obtain critical values for the test statistic $G\mathbf{T}_G'(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}')^{-1}\mathbf{T}_G$.

4.2 Multiple BNE in Data Generating Process: Multiple Comparisons Test

In addition to testing the joint hypothesis that $\mathbf{\Delta} = \mathbf{0}_N$ in (5), one would also be interested in finding out the identities of the set of players i in $\iota^c(x)$, who are actively mixing between strategies across multiple BNE (as indexed by $p_i^l(x)$). To accommodate this possibility we resort to the statistical literature on multiple comparisons (for a recent survey, see Lehmann and Romano (2005)). This literature considers decision strategies that aggregate the individual tests for

$$H_0 : \Delta_i(x) = 0$$

$$H_1 : \Delta_i(x) \neq 0.$$

Given individual test statistics for each of the $i \leq N$ hypotheses, we employ a decision rule controlling the *familywise error rate*: the probability of rejecting at least one of the true null hypotheses. More formally:

$$\text{FWE}_P = \text{Prob}_P\{\text{Reject at least one } H_0 : \Delta_i(x) = 0 : i \in \mathbf{I}_0(P)\}$$

where the subscript P indicates the data generating process and $\mathbf{I}_0(P) \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ is the set of indices i of true null hypotheses under the data generating process P . A multiple testing procedure asymptotically controls the FWE_P at the rate α if $\limsup_G \text{FWE}_P \leq \alpha$ for any P . Well-known methods that asymptotically control for the familywise error rate are Bonferroni and the Holm method. Both methods can be described in terms of the p -values for the individual hypotheses above. We denote these p -values by $\hat{p}_{G,i}$. The Bonferroni method at level α rejects i if $\hat{p}_{G,i} \leq \alpha/N$. The Holm procedure, which is less conservative than the Bonferroni method, follows a stepwise strategy. It starts by ordering the p -values in ascending order: $\hat{p}_{G,(1)} \leq \hat{p}_{G,(2)} \leq \dots \leq \hat{p}_{G,(N)}$. Then $H_0 : \Delta_{(i)} = 0$ is rejected at level α if $\hat{p}_{G,(j)} \leq \alpha/(N - j + 1)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, i$. Operationally, this corresponds to rejecting all hypotheses if $\hat{p}_{G,(1)} \leq \alpha/S$. Otherwise, $H_0 : \Delta_{(1)}(x) = 0$ is accepted. The remaining hypotheses are rejected if $\hat{p}_{G,(2)} \leq \alpha/(S - 1)$. In case $\hat{p}_{G,(2)} > \alpha/(S - 1)$, the hypothesis $H_0 : \Delta_{(2)}(x) = 0$ is accepted and one goes on in a similar fashion until rejection of the remaining hypotheses or all the hypotheses are accepted.

Though less conservative than the Bonferroni method, the Holm procedure can still be improved upon if one takes into account the dependence between the individual test statistics. To achieve this, we follow recent contributions by van der Laan, Dudoit, and Pollard (2004) and Romano and Wolf (2005).⁹ Ordering the test statistics in descending order, let $T_{G,(N)} \geq T_{G,(N-1)} \geq \dots \geq T_{G,(1)}$. In the k -th step, a critical level c_k is obtained and those hypotheses for which $T_{G,\cdot} \geq c_k$ are rejected. Let R_k be the number of hypotheses

⁹The following description closely follows the presentation in Romano and Wolf (2005). For similar strategies controlling generalizations of the familywise error rate, see Romano and Shaikh (2006). A recent application of such generalizations is Moon and Perron (2009).

rejected in the k -th step (but not the $k - 1$ -th step). Ideally, c_1 is obtained as:

$$c_1 \equiv c_1(1 - \alpha, P) = \inf \left\{ y : \text{Prob}_P \left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} T_{G,(i)} - \Delta_{(i)} \leq y \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha \right\}$$

where all statements are implicitly conditional on $X = x$. Subsequently, c_k is taken as

$$c_k \equiv c_k(1 - \alpha, P) = \inf \left\{ y : \text{Prob}_P \left\{ \max_{R_{k-1} \leq i \leq N} T_{G,(i)} - \Delta_{(i)} \leq y \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha \right\}$$

(also conditional on $X = x$). As pointed out in the references cited, because P is unknown in practice, we replace P by an estimate $\hat{P}_G$ and define

$$\hat{c}_k \equiv c_k(1 - \alpha, \hat{P}_G) = \inf \left\{ y : \text{Prob}_{\hat{P}_G} \left\{ \max_{R_{k-1} \leq i \leq N} T_{G,(i)}^* - \Delta_{(i)}^* \leq y \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha \right\}$$

where we follow Romano and Wolf (2005) and use $T_{G,(i)}^*$ and $\Delta_{(i)}^*$ to highlight that the sampling distribution of the test statistics is under $\hat{P}_G$ (not P). We consider three alternative strategies to compute $\hat{c}_k$. We first use the fact that the test statistics have a normal limiting distribution with a consistently estimable variance-covariance matrix.¹⁰ The second and the third constructions use the non-studentized and studentized bootstrap respectively. Because our setting corresponds to the smooth function model with i.i.d. data (Scenario 3.1 in Romano and Wolf (2005)) both strategies yield consistent tests which asymptotically control the familywise error rate at level α (this would obtain from a slight modification in Theorem 3.1 in Romano and Wolf (2005) to accommodate two-sided hypotheses as indicated in Section 5 of that paper).

4.3 Testing Signs of Interaction Effects

This section proposes a simple test for the sign of interaction effects for a player i in a given state x . It relies on the characterization in Proposition 2 and will hold when x induces multiple equilibria and choice probabilities vary across equilibria or when there are excluded regressors as discussed in section 3. To fix ideas, we focus on the simple case with discrete

¹⁰See footnote 21 in Romano and Wolf (2005).

X where any x in the support can happen with strictly positive probabilities. For any i, x , define

$$\hat{\Psi}_i(x) \equiv \hat{\psi}_{i,x,1}^{-1} \hat{\psi}_{i,x,2} - \hat{\psi}_{i,x,1}^{-2} \hat{\psi}_{i,x,3} \hat{\psi}_{i,x,4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}_{i,x,1} &\equiv G^{-1} \sum_g 1\{x_g \in \Upsilon_i(x)\} ; \quad \hat{\psi}_{i,x,2} \equiv G^{-1} \sum_g \left(D_{i,g} \left(\sum_{j \neq i} D_{j,g} \right) 1\{x_g \in \Upsilon_i(x)\} \right), \\ \hat{\psi}_{i,x,3} &\equiv G^{-1} \sum_g (D_{i,g} 1\{x_g \in \Upsilon_i(x)\}) ; \quad \hat{\psi}_{i,x,4} \equiv G^{-1} \sum_g \left(\left(\sum_{j \neq i} D_{j,g} \right) 1\{x_g \in \Upsilon_i(x)\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

When $\Upsilon_i(x) = \{x\}$, $\hat{\Psi}_i$ coincides with $T_{G,i}$ introduced in subsection 4.1. In this sense, $\hat{\Psi}_i$ generalizes $T_{G,i}$ for a non-singleton $\Upsilon_i(x)$. For notational ease, we drop the subscript i, x from the estimators when there is no ambiguity. Define

$$\hat{\Sigma} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\psi}_1(1 - \hat{\psi}_1) & \hat{\psi}_2(1 - \hat{\psi}_1) & \hat{\psi}_3(1 - \hat{\psi}_1) & \hat{\psi}_4(1 - \hat{\psi}_1) \\ \hat{\psi}_2(1 - \hat{\psi}_1) & \hat{\psi}_5 - \hat{\psi}_2^2 & \hat{\psi}_2(1 - \hat{\psi}_3) & \hat{\psi}_5 - \hat{\psi}_2\hat{\psi}_4 \\ \hat{\psi}_3(1 - \hat{\psi}_1) & \hat{\psi}_2(1 - \hat{\psi}_3) & \hat{\psi}_3 - \hat{\psi}_3^2 & \hat{\psi}_2 - \hat{\psi}_3\hat{\psi}_4 \\ \hat{\psi}_4(1 - \hat{\psi}_1) & \hat{\psi}_5 - \hat{\psi}_2\hat{\psi}_4 & \hat{\psi}_2 - \hat{\psi}_3\hat{\psi}_4 & \hat{\psi}_6 - \hat{\psi}_4^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}_5 &\equiv G^{-1} \sum_g \left(D_{i,g} \left(\sum_{j \neq i} D_{j,g} \right)^2 1\{x_g \in \Upsilon_i(x)\} \right) \\ \hat{\psi}_6 &\equiv G^{-1} \sum_g \left(\left(\sum_{j \neq i} D_{j,g} \right)^2 1\{x_g \in \Upsilon_i(x)\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Also define

$$\hat{\mathbf{V}} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} -\hat{\psi}_2\hat{\psi}_1^{-2} + 2\hat{\psi}_3\hat{\psi}_4\hat{\psi}_1^{-3} & \hat{\psi}_1^{-1} & -\hat{\psi}_1^{-2}\hat{\psi}_4 & -\hat{\psi}_1^{-2}\hat{\psi}_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ are analogous the objects defined in subsection 4.1. It is straightforward to verify using the Delta Method and the Slutsky's Theorem that

$$\left(\hat{\mathbf{V}} \hat{\Sigma} \hat{\mathbf{V}}' / G \right)^{-1/2} \left(\hat{\Psi}_i(x) - \Psi_i(x) \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

Testing the sign of $\delta_i(x)$ amounts to testing the following three hypotheses:

$$H_1 : \Psi_i(x) > 0 \quad H_2 : \Psi_i(x) = 0 \quad H_3 : \Psi_i(x) < 0$$

Using the test statistic $\sqrt{G}(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}')^{-1/2}\hat{\Psi}_i(x)$, we can choose critical regions at the two tails, each resulting the rejection of H_2 in favor of either H_1 or H_3 .¹¹ Proofs of consistency and asymptotic levels of the test should follow easily.

5 Monte Carlo Simulations

In this section we explore Monte Carlo experiments to illustrate the strategy presented in the previous section. The first design reproduces Example 1 and displays multiple equilibria. We use it to analyze the inference procedure on the existence of multiple equilibria and on the interaction signs when more than one equilibrium exists. Design 2 displays only one equilibrium and we use to illustrate our procedure when multiple equilibria are absent, but an excluded variable exists.

Design 1 We study the finite sample performance of the tests for multiple equilibria in Section 4 using a simple design of a 3-by-2 game in Example 1. The design is conditional on some state x and this dependence is suppressed for notational convenience. For some fixed state, let the players' baseline payoffs be $u_1 = 0.5$ and $u_2 = u_3 = 0.3611$ respectively, and let $\delta_i = -1$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu = 0.1, \sigma^2 = 0.25^2)$ for all i . Let λ denote the probability with which the first Bayesian Nash Equilibrium in (3) shows up in the data-generating process. We experiment with $\lambda = 0.1, 0.25$ or 0.5 and sample sizes $G = 1000$ or 3000 .

For any (λ, G) , we simulate a dataset of players' binary decisions by letting

$$D_{i,g} = 1 \left\{ u_i - W_g \left(\sum_{j \neq i} p_j^1 \right) - (1 - W_g) \left(\sum_{j \neq i} p_j^2 \right) - \epsilon_{i,g} \geq 0 \right\}$$

where in each game $g \leq G$, W_g is simulated from a Bernoulli distribution with success probability λ , $\epsilon_{i,g}$ from $\mathcal{N}(0.1, 0.25^2)$ and p^l 's are propensity-scores in the two Bayesian Nash

¹¹This is a *directional* hypothesis test. For a recent survey, see Shaffer (2006).

equilibria. For each (λ, G) , we simulate $S = 1000$ datasets. For each of the data set, we employ the stepwise multiple testing procedure as described in Section 4.2, and make a decision to reject or not to reject the null hypothesis that "there is a unique equilibrium in the data-generating process". We experiment with three different approaches for choosing the critical level $\hat{c}_k$ in Section 4.2: (i) simulation using estimated covariance matrix of T_G ; (ii) bootstrap; and (iii) studentized bootstrap (Algorithms 3.2 and 4.2 in Romano and Wolf (2005)). For meaningful comparison between these three approaches, we use the same number of simulated multivariate normal vectors in (i) as the number of bootstrap samples drawn in (ii) and (iii) (which is denoted by B). We experiment with $B = 1000, 2000$. In Table 1 below, we report the probability for making a wrong decision (i.e. rejecting H_0 rejected for $i = 1$ or not rejecting H_0 for $i = 2$ or 3) calculated from the $S = 1000$ simulated datasets in columns *RP* 1, 2, 3.

Table 2 presents the tests of interaction signs for each of the three players. Since player 1 has the same conditional choice probabilities in the two equilibria, the test withholds judgement for most of the simulations. It detects a negative sign for the other two players.

Design 2 In this design, we consider a 3-by-2 game where the Assumption 2 is satisfied. The baseline payoff for player i is $u_i(x_i) = 1 + x_i$ where $x_1 \in \{-1, 2\}$ and $x_2 \in \{-1/2, 3/2\}$ and $x_3 \in \{-1, 3\}$. The state-dependent interaction effect for i is $\delta_i(x_i) = \delta x_i$ where δ is a parameter that controls the scale of the interaction effect. The private information ϵ_i are uniformly distributed over $(-c_i, c_i)$ where $c_i = 2(1 + x_i + |\delta x_i|)$.¹² Table 2 lists the marginal choice probabilities, or propensity scores, $p_i(x) \equiv \Pr(i \text{ chooses } 1|x)$ in the unique Bayesian Nash equilibria for each state $x \equiv (x_1, x_2, x_3)$. It is easy to verify the Bayesian Nash equilibrium is unique for all x from Table 2, as ϵ_i are all uniformly distributed and all propensity scores are strictly between 0 and 1.

In Design 2, strategic interaction effects are state-dependent and individual-specific.

¹²The parameter c_i is chosen this way to ensure there is a unique Bayesian Nash equilibrium under each state.

For player 1, states in the first four rows in Table 2 form an equivalent class while the other four rows form another equivalent class. We simulate $S = 1000$ samples, each with sample size $G = 5000$. For each of these samples, we calculate the test statistics T_G^* as defined in section (4) and apply the following decision rule. If $T_G^* < -1.64$, then reject H_2 (no interaction effect) in favor of H_3 (negative interaction effect). If $T_G^* > 1.64$, then reject H_2 in favor of H_1 (positive interaction effect). Otherwise, do not reject H_2 . Table 3 below summarizes the finite sample performance of our test. The two entries $[q_1, q_3]$ in the brackets report percentages of tests in $S = 1000$ simulations where H_2 is rejected in favor of H_1 (i.e. q_1) and the percentage of rejections in favor of H_3 (i.e. q_3) respectively. Recall that the sign of interaction effects for $\delta_i(x_i)$ is the same as the sign of x_i in our design as $\delta > 0$.

6 Empirical Illustration

As an application for the methodology outlined in the previous sections, we investigate the strategic behavior of couples regarding retirement decisions. A majority of retirees are married and many studies indicate that a significant proportion of individuals retires within a year of their spouse. Among the articles documenting joint retirement of couples (and datasets employed) one could cite Hurd (1990) (New Beneficiary Survey), Blau (1998) (Retirement History Study), Gustman and Steinmeier (1992) (National Longitudinal Survey of Mature Women), Michaud (2004) (Health and Retirement Study) and Banks, Blundell, and Casanova Rivas (2007) (English Longitudinal Study of Ageing). Even though this is especially the case for couples closer in age, a spike in the distribution of retirement time differences at zero typically exists for most couples, regardless of the age difference (see for instance Figure 7 and Table 3 in Casanova Rivas (2009) or evidence below). Following our framework, let δ_H denote the effect of retirement by the wife on the husband and δ_W denote the effect of retirement of the husband on the wife. For a two player game, it is not hard to show that multiple equilibria can only occur when $\text{sign}(\delta_H) = \text{sign}(\delta_W)$.

We use the Health and Retirement Study for this analysis. The HRS is a panel data set, representative of non-institutionalized individuals and their spouses. There are currently 8 available waves, covering every two years from 1992 to 2004. The study originally started with a cohort of individuals born between 1931 and 1941 (otherwise known as the HRS cohort). Soon after, the study added individuals born before 1923 from the Aging and Health Dynamic (AHEAD) Study. This cohort is known as the AHEAD cohort. In 1998, HRS added two extra cohorts: Children of Depression (CODA, born in 1923-1930) and War babies (WB, born in 1942-1947). Finally, in 2004, a cohort of Early Baby Boomers (EBB, born in 1948-1953) was included. The HRS cohort has been the most commonly studied given that there are not only more waves of information available, but also due to the fact that the cohort has been more frequently linked to other databases. We use couples where at least one partner belongs to the so-called HRS cohort (i.e. born in the 1930s). Table 5 presents summary statistics on retirement for this cohort during the eight waves available.

Because there are only two players, the statistic $G^{1/2}(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}')^{-1/2}\mathbf{T}_G$, calculated as prescribed in the first subsection of section 4 is asymptotically standard normal under the null of no multiplicity and can be used to infer the existence of multiple equilibria and, in that case, the sign of the interaction effects. The results conditioning on age differences between husband and wife (husband's age - wife's age) are reported in Table 6. The test statistic is computed as prescribed in the previous sections and positive (negative) values of the statistic correspond to positive (negative) values of both δ_H and δ_W . According to the results in section 4, under the null of a unique equilibrium played in the data, the test statistic we use below should follow a standard normal distribution. We find strong evidence of coordination motives between husband and wife for couples where wives are at most two years older than the husband and husband across all the eight waves of the Health and Retirement Study data. Evidence for couples where the wife is much older than the husband is weaker. Similar findings obtain with the other cohorts in the Health and Retirement Study and conditioning variables.

Since the decision to retire may depend on more than the difference in age we also perform the analysis above for a set of variables typically used in this literature. We focus on the fourth wave of the survey (1998), when respondents are in their early sixties. Following the literature, in addition to age difference, we condition on household wealth (tercile) and whether at least one member is in poor health. Table 7 presents more detailed information for these variables in 1998 (Wave 4).

Table 8 presents the test statistics with the conditioning variables mentioned above. The statistics are inconclusive for couples where at least one of the partners is in poor health but tend to confirm our previous results otherwise.

Of course, another explanation for the coincidence in retirement decisions (aside from taste interactions) is that husband and wife receive correlated shocks (observable or not), driving them to retirement at similar times. Though this is outside the scope of the model we analyze, we try to measure the extent to which these concomitant shocks may matter by looking at observable shocks that affecting the couple. In particular, we look at the those couples for whom self-reported health status shifts from “very good health” in the previous wave to “poor health” for both partners. Across waves 2 to 8, no more than 7 couples experience such shifts.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we have shown how a condition typically employed in the analysis of simultaneous games of incomplete information leads to a simple and easily implementable test for the signs of interaction effects as well as the existence of multiple equilibria in the data generating process. Inference of the signs of state-dependent and individual-specific interaction effects can be done under minimal assumptions that only require conditional independence of private information, and existence of state variables satisfying appropriate exclusion restrictions. Besides, given that many of the suggested methods for estimating and making

inferences in such environments rely on the assumption that only one equilibrium is played in the data, this finding is relevant for the implementation of these techniques. With discrete covariates, such inference is implementable using well-known results in the multiple testing literature. When a continuous covariate is included the testing procedure should account for the boundaries between regions with a different number of equilibria. Finally, the Conditional Independence assumption is also widely used in the dynamic games of incomplete information. We speculate that our results generalize to such games under certain additional assumptions.

References

- ARADILLAS-LOPEZ, A. (2009): “Semi-parametric Estimation of Simultaneous Games with Incomplete Information,” Working Paper, University of Wisconsin.
- BAJARI, P., J. HAHN, H. HONG, AND G. RIDDER (2009): “A Note on Semiparametric Estimation of Finite Mixtures of Discrete Choice Models with Application to Game Theoretic Models,” Working Paper, University of Minnesota.
- BAJARI, P., H. HONG, J. KRAINER, AND D. NEKIPELOV (2009): “Estimating Static Games of Incomplete Information,” *Journal of Business and Economic Studies*.
- BANKS, J., R. BLUNDELL, AND M. CASANOVA RIVAS (2007): “The Dynamics of Retirement Behavior in Couples: Reduced-Form Evidence from England and the US,” Working Paper, University College London (UCL).
- BERRY, S., AND E. TAMER (2006): “Empirical Models of Oligopoly Entry,” in *Advances in Economics and Econometrics, Theory and Applications: Ninth World Congress of the Econometric Society*, ed. by R. Blundell, W. Newey, and T. Persson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BLAU, D. (1998): “Labor Force Dynamics of Older Married Couples,” *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16(3), 595–629.
- BROCK, W., AND S. DURLAUF (2007): “Identification of Binary Choice Models with Social Interactions,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 140(1), 52–75.
- CASANOVA RIVAS, M. (2009): “Happy Together: A Structural Model of Couples’ Joint Retirement Choices,” Working Paper, University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA).
- GRIECO, P. (2010): “Discrete Choice Games with Flexible Information Structure: An Application to Local Grocery Markets,” Working Paper, Northwestern University.

- GUSTMAN, A., AND T. STEINMEIER (1992): “Retirement in Dual-Career Families: A Structural Model,” *Journal of Labor Economics*, 18(3), 503–545.
- HALL, P., A. NEEMAN, R. PAKYARI, AND R. ELMORE (2005): “Nonparametric Inference in Multivariate Mixtures,” *Biometrika*, 92(3).
- HONORÉ, B., AND A. DE PAULA (forthcoming): “Interdependent Durations,” *Review of Economic Studies*.
- HURD, M. (1990): “The Joint Retirement Decisions of Husbands and Wives,” in *Issues in the Economics of Aging*, ed. by D. A. Wise. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LEHMANN, E., AND J. ROMANO (2005): *Testing Statistical Hypotheses*. Springer.
- MANSKI, C. (1993): “Identification of Endogenous Social Effects: The Reflection Problem,” *restud*, 60(3), 531–542.
- MICHAUD, P.-C. (2004): “Labor Force Participation Dynamics and Social Security Claiming Decisions of Elderly Couples,” Working Paper, CentER Tilburn University and IZA.
- MOON, R., AND B. PERRON (2009): “Beyond Panel Unit Root Tests: Using Multiple Testing to Determine the NonStationarity Properties of Individual Series in a Panel,” Working Paper, University of Southern California.
- MYERSON, R. (1991): *Game Theory: The Analysis of Conflict*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- NAVARRO, S., AND Y. TAKAHASHI (2009): “A Semiparametric Test of Agents Information Sets for Games of Incomplete Information,” Working Paper, University of Wisconsin.
- ROMANO, J. P., AND A. M. SHAIKH (2006): “Stepup procedures for control of generalizations of the familywise error rate,” *Annals of Statistics*, 34(4).

- ROMANO, J. P., AND M. WOLF (2005): “Stepwise Multiple Testing as Formalized Data Snooping,” *Econometrica*, 73(4), 1237–1282.
- SEIM, K. (2006): “An Empirical Model of Firm Entry with Endogenous Product-Type Choices,” *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 37(3), 619–640.
- SHAFFER, J. P. (2006): “Recent Developments Towards Optimality in Multiple Hypothesis Testing,” *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, 49, 16–32.
- SWEETING, A. (2008): “The Strategic Timing of Radio Commercials: An Empirical Analysis Using Multiple Equilibria,” Working Paper, Duke University.
- TANG, X. (2009): “Estimating Simultaneous Games with Incomplete Information under Median Restrictions,” Working Paper, University of Pennsylvania.
- VAN DER LAAN, M. J., S. DUDOIT, AND K. S. POLLARD (2004): “Multiple Testing. Part II. Step-Down Procedures for Control of the Family-Wise Error Rate,” *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 3(1).
- WAN, Y., AND H. XU (2010): “Semiparametric Estimation of Binary Decision Games of Incomplete Information with Correlated Private Signals,” Working Paper, Pennsylvania State University.

Appendix:

Let θ denote the structure $(u_i, \delta_i)_{i=1}^N$ and $F_{\epsilon|X}$, and let $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}$ denote the choice probabilities profiles corresponding to BNE for a given x and parameter θ . That is, $\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta} \equiv \{p \in [0, 1]^N : p \text{ solves (1) for } \theta \text{ and the given } x\}$. We let $\Lambda_{x,\theta}$ be an equilibrium selection mechanism. The following proposition illustrates the limits of what can be learned about the structure from the mixture data without imposing additional assumptions. Let $\#A$ denote the cardinality of set A and define $g : [0, 1]^N \rightarrow [0, 1]^N$ as

$$g(p(x); x, \theta) \equiv \left(p_i(x) - F_{\epsilon_i|X}(u_i(x) + \delta_i(x) \sum_{j \neq i} p_j(x)) \right)_{i=1, \dots, N}. \quad (6)$$

Proposition 4 *Assume*

$$\det \left(\frac{\partial g(p(x); x, \theta)}{\partial p(x)} \right) \neq 0$$

Then the structure is not identified if $\#\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta} > \frac{2^N - 2}{N}$.

Proof. We first show that, for given x , the number of equilibria is finite. An equilibrium vector $p(x)$ is a fixed point to the mapping depicted on display (1). Equivalently, we represent it as a solution to the following equation:

$$g(p(x); x, \theta) = 0.$$

Notice that $\{0, 1\} \cap F_{\epsilon_i|X}(\mathbb{R}) = \emptyset$ for any i , given the full support of ϵ_i . Consequently, for a solution vector, $p_i(x) \notin \{0, 1\}$ and $p(x) \in (0, 1)^N$. Since

$$\det \left(\frac{\partial g(p(x); x, \theta)}{\partial p(x)} \right) \neq 0$$

the Implicit Function Theorem directly implies that the set of fixed points to (6) is discrete (i.e. its elements are isolated points: each element is contained in a neighborhood with no other solutions to the system). Infinitesimal changes in $p(x)$ will imply a displacement of $g(\cdot; x, \theta)$ from zero, so local perturbations in $p(x)$ cannot be solutions to the system of equations. Since $p(x) \in [0, 1]^N$, the set of solutions is a bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. In $\mathbb{R}^N$, every

bounded infinite subset has a limit point (i.e. an element for which every neighborhood contains another element in the set) (Theorem 2.42 in Rudin (1976)). Consequently, a discrete set, having no limit points, cannot be both bounded and infinite. Being bounded and discrete, the set of solutions is finite.

In this case, the observed joint distribution of equilibrium actions is a finite mixture. Given Assumption 1, the cumulative distribution function for the observed actions is given by

$$\Phi(y_1, \dots, y_N; x, \theta) = \sum_{\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta}} \Lambda_{x,\theta}(p^l(x)) \prod_{i \in \{1, \dots, N\}} (1 - p_i^l(x))^{1-y_i}$$

For a given x , the problem of retrieving this cdf and mixing probabilities from observed data is analyzed by Hall, Neeman, Pakyari, and Elmore (2005). In that paper, the authors show that the choice and mixing probabilities ($p_i^l(x)$ and $\Lambda_{x,\theta}$) cannot be obtained from observation of $\Phi(y_1, \dots, y_N; x, \theta)$ if $\#\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta} > \frac{2^N - 2}{N}$. Consequently, it is necessary for identifiability of the relevant probabilities that $\#\mathcal{L}_{x,\theta} \leq \frac{2^N - 2}{N}$. Finally, if the equilibrium specific choice probabilities cannot be identified, the utility function and the distribution of private components cannot be identified either (or else one could obtain the equilibrium specific choice probabilities and use those to obtain the mixing distribution from the data).

■

The condition that $\det \left(\frac{\partial g(p(x); x, \theta)}{\partial p(x)} \right) \neq 0$ is likely to be satisfied. With two players, for example, this determinant equals

$$1 - \delta_1(x)\delta_2(x)f_{\epsilon_1|X}(u_1(x) + \delta_1(x)p_2(x))f_{\epsilon_2|X}(u_2(x) + \delta_2(x)p_1(x)).$$

Also when there are two players, the bound on the number of equilibria implies that, without further assumptions, the existence of more than one equilibrium precludes identification.

Table 1: Finite Sample Performance: Tests for Multiple Equilibria*(Target probability for FWE: $\alpha = 0.10$)*

		$B = 1000$			$B = 2000$		
G	λ	$RP1$	$RP2$	$RP3$	$RP1$	$RP2$	$RP3$
1000	0.50	0.101	0.101	0.095	0.112	0.109	0.111
	0.25	0.093	0.094	0.085	0.094	0.096	0.089
	0.10	0.107	0.107	0.102	0.114	0.119	0.112
3000	0.50	0.108	0.109	0.105	0.087	0.089	0.083
	0.25	0.096	0.097	0.094	0.102	0.105	0.103
	0.10	0.093	0.090	0.092	0.111	0.107	0.108

NOTE: Design 1: Number of simulations $S = 1000$. G is the sample size. λ specifies the probability that an equilibrium is chosen. $RP1$, 2 and 3 are rejection probabilities calculated from simulated dataset, with each corresponding to one of the three approaches for choosing critical levels.

Table 2: Finite Sample Performance: Test of Signs of Interaction Effects*Brackets include $[q_1, q_3]$.*

G	λ	$i = 1$	$i = 2$	$i = 3$
1000	0.50	[0.036, 0.076]	[1.000,0.000]	[1.000,0.000]
	0.25	[0.035, 0.072]	[1.000,0.000]	[1.000,0.000]
	0.10	[0.040, 0.072]	[1.000,0.000]	[1.000,0.000]
3000	0.50	[0.054, 0.067]	[1.000,0.000]	[1.000,0.000]
	0.25	[0.048, 0.048]	[1.000,0.000]	[1.000,0.000]
	0.10	[0.049, 0.053]	[1.000,0.000]	[1.000,0.000]

NOTE: Design 1. S is 1000. G is the sample size. λ is the equilibrium selection probability. q_1 is the frequency of rejection H_2 in favor of H_1 . q_3 is the frequency of rejection of H_2 in favor of H_3 .

Table 3: Propensity Scores in Bayesian Nash Equilibria*(p_1, p_2, p_3 in brackets)*

x_1	x_2	x_3	$\delta = 0.8$	$\delta = 0.9$	$\delta = 1$
-1	-1/2	-1	[0.3233, 0.5603, 0.3233]	[0.3060, 0.5561, 0.3060]	[0.2895, 0.5526, 0.2895]
-1	-1/2	3	[0.2523, 0.5288, 0.7098]	[0.2223, 0.5196, 0.7144]	[0.1927, 0.5111, 0.7183]
-1	3/2	-1	[0.2998, 0.7012, 0.2998]	[0.2790, 0.7033, 0.2790]	[0.2590, 0.7048, 0.2590]
-1	3/2	3	[0.2101, 0.7262, 0.7231]	[0.1710, 0.7323, 0.7300]	[0.1316, 0.7376, 0.7360]
2	-1/2	-1	[0.7124, 0.5286, 0.2518]	[0.7167, 0.5194, 0.2219]	[0.7203, 0.5109, 0.1922]
2	-1/2	3	[0.7479, 0.4754, 0.7477]	[0.7593, 0.4541, 0.7599]	[0.7704, 0.4322, 0.7717]
2	3/2	-1	[0.7249, 0.7263, 0.2098]	[0.7313, 0.7324, 0.1707]	[0.7369, 0.7376, 0.1314]
2	3/2	3	[0.7738, 0.7724, 0.7754]	[0.7927, 0.7903, 0.7955]	[0.8126, 0.8090, 0.8166]

Table 4: Finite Sample Performance: Test of Signs of Interaction Effects*(No. of simulations: $S = 1000$. Brackets include $[q_1, q_3]$.)*

	$G = 5000$			$G = 10000$		
	$\delta = 0.8$	$\delta = 0.9$	$\delta = 1.0$	$\delta = 0.8$	$\delta = 0.9$	$\delta = 1.0$
$X_1 = -1$	[0.000, 0.469]	[0.001, 0.628]	[0.000, 0.854]	[0.000, 0.717]	[0.000, 0.890]	[0.000, 0.986]
$X_2 = -1/2$	[0.003, 0.359]	[0.000, 0.520]	[0.000, 0.714]	[0.000, 0.577]	[0.000, 0.790]	[0.000, 0.925]
$X_3 = -1$	[0.000, 0.483]	[0.000, 0.643]	[0.000, 0.834]	[0.000, 0.702]	[0.000, 0.888]	[0.000, 0.986]
$X_1 = 2$	[0.323, 0.004]	[0.459, 0.000]	[0.667, 0.000]	[0.484, 0.000]	[0.736, 0.000]	[0.910, 0.000]
$X_2 = 3/2$	[0.400, 0.000]	[0.617, 0.000]	[0.817, 0.000]	[0.665, 0.000]	[0.867, 0.000]	[0.979, 0.000]
$X_3 = 3$	[0.300, 0.004]	[0.496, 0.000]	[0.735, 0.000]	[0.545, 0.000]	[0.764, 0.000]	[0.930, 0.000]

NOTE: q_1 is the frequency of rejection H_2 in favor of H_1 . q_3 is the frequency of rejection of H_2 in favor of H_3 .

Table 5: Summary Statistics (HRS Cohort)

Variable	Wave 1 (1992)		Wave 2 (1994)		Wave 3 (1996)		Wave 4 (1998)	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Joint Ret	0.055	4,754	0.102	4,260	0.139	4,057	0.165	3,834
Only Husband Ret	0.150	0.166	2.13	4,260	0.193	4,057	0.229	3,834
Only Wife Ret	0.064	4,754	0.086	4,260	0.096	4,057	0.097	3,834

Variable	Wave 5 (2000)		Wave 6 (2002)		Wave 7 (2004)		Wave 8 (2006)	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Joint Ret	0.202	3,589	0.256	3,405	0.325	3,185	0.394	2,920
Only Husband Ret	0.259	3,589	0.265	3,405	0.265	3,185	0.259	2,920
Only Wife Ret	0.102	3,589	0.113	3,405	0.096	3,185	0.132	2,920

NOTE: The sample includes couples from the Health and Retirement Study with at least one partner in the “HRS Cohort”, i.e. born between 1931 and 1941.

Table 6: Test of Multiplicity and Interaction Signs

	Wave 1		Wave 2		Wave 3		Wave 4	
Age Dif (Yrs)	Test Stat	N	Test Stat	N	Test Stat	N	Test Stat	N
< -5	1.78	155	0.96	145	1.22	137	0.84	123
-5 to -2	1.77	175	2.13	160	1.58	146	2.40	137
-2 to 2	4.38	1,536	6.30	1,407	5.80	1,316	4.94	1,245
2 to 5	4.35	1,305	5.51	1,196	5.05	1,114	4.18	1,038
> 5	5.33	1,870	4.83	1,645	5.73	1,546	5.01	1,468

	Wave 5		Wave 6		Wave 7		Wave 8	
Age Dif (Yrs)	Test Stat	N	Test Stat	N	Test Stat	N	Test Stat	N
< -5	1.12	117	0.65	109	0.94	103	0.79	87
-5 to -2	1.23	132	1.67	123	1.03	120	0.66	104
-2 to 2	4.83	1,167	3.91	1,105	3.43	1051	1.87	995
2 to 5	3.39	955	3.47	901	2.48	845	1.74	786
> 5	1.30	1,324	0.92	1,256	2.96	1,166	2.60	1,050

NOTE: The sample includes couples from the Health and Retirement Study with at least one partner in the “HRS Cohort”, i.e. born between 1931 and 1941. Age difference is husband’s age minus wife’s age. The test statistic is $G^{1/2}(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}')^{-1/2}\mathbf{T}_G$.

Table 7: Wave 4 (1998)

Variable	N	Mean
At least one with college or above	4,011	0.306
Total Household Wealth (Dollars)	4,011	378,591.2
Age (Husband) (Yrs.)	3,919	62.8
Age (Wife) (Yrs.)	3,926	58.8
Poor Health (Husband)	3,919	0.271
Poor Health (Wife)	3,926	0.240

NOTE: The sample includes couples from the Health and Retirement Study with at least one partner in the “HRS Cohort”, i.e. born between 1931 and 1941.

Table 8: Test of Multiplicity and Interaction Signs

			Poor Health (At Least One)			
			No		Yes	
Age Diff	Total Wealth Tercile	College	Test Stat	N	Test Stat	N
[−2yrs., 2yrs.]	1	Yes	1.64	145	1.05	205
		No	1.51	69	1.02	17
	2	Yes	2.53	203	1.27	87
		No	2	95	0.82	29
	3	Yes	2.42	156	1.14	56
		No	1.91	162	0.38	21
(2yrs., 5yrs]	1	Yes	2.07	149	1.75	209
		No	1.67	35	-0.08	20
	2	Yes	1.4	152	1.52	96
		No	0.98	74	0.74	14
	3	Yes	1.13	106	1.34	46
		No	1.23	115	0.8	22
> 5yrs.	1	Yes	2.6	223	1.22	337
		No	1.74	75	0.83	59
	2	Yes	2.55	156	0.88	98
		No	2.28	113	0.62	39
	3	Yes	1.64	113	0.74	55
		No	3.1	159	1.33	41

NOTE: The sample includes couples from the Health and Retirement Study with at least one partner in the “HRS Cohort”, i.e. born between 1931 and 1941. Age difference is husband’s age minus wife’s age. Tercile 1 is the one with highest total wealth. The test statistic is $G^{1/2}(\hat{\mathbf{V}}\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}\hat{\mathbf{V}}')^{-1/2}\mathbf{T}_G$.