

# Not Linearly Correlated, But Dependent: A Family of Normal Mode Copulas

Kentaro Fukumoto\*

August 8, 2023

## Abstract

When scholars study joint distributions of multiple variables, copulas are useful. However, if the variables are not linearly correlated with each other yet are still not independent, most of conventional copulas are not up to the task. Examples include (inversed) U-shaped relationships and heteroskedasticity. To fill this gap, this manuscript sheds new light on a little-known copula, which I call the ‘normal mode copula.’ I characterize the copula’s properties and show that the copula is asymmetric and nonmonotonic under certain conditions. I also apply the copula to a dataset about U.S. House vote share and campaign expenditure to demonstrate that the normal mode copula has better performance than other conventional copulas.

**Keywords:** asymmetry, nonmonotonicity, sine function, trigonometric function, uncorrelatedness.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification Code:** 62H05

---

\*Professor, Department of Political Science, Gakushuin University. Mailing address: 1-5-1 Mejiro, Toshima, Tokyo 171-8588, Japan. Telephone: +81-3-5904-9258. Fax: +81-3-5992-1006. Email address: Kentaro.Fukumoto@gakushuin.ac.jp. ORCID: 0000-0003-3704-9054. Twitter: @000fukumoto.

# 1 Introduction

It becomes hard to analyze multiple variables when they are generated at the same time. For example, it is not straightforward to regress one variable (as an outcome) on another (as a cause) without assuming the causal direction from the latter variable to the former. One approach is analyzing the joint distribution. Typically, scholars employ Heckman’s sample selection models and the seemingly unrelated regression. However, a problem of these models is that they assume the bivariate normal distribution alone. By contrast, copula functions are able to represent a variety of dependence structures flexibly. (I will explain the copula shortly.)

Nonetheless, if the variables are not linearly correlated with each other yet are still not independent, most of conventional copulas are not up to the task. Examples include (inversed) U-shaped relationships and heteroskedasticity. Figure 1 shows a case of inversed U-shaped relationship. This is based on the data about U.S. House elections, 1946–2014 (Jacobson 2015). Each dot corresponds to a unit of observation, namely, a district in a year ( $N = 6,509$ ). The horizontal axis represents the Democratic candidate’s share of the two-party vote by percentage. The vertical axis indicates the total amount of expenditure by both candidates (in million dollars).<sup>1</sup> Here is a clear inverse U-shape. When the race is competitive, both camps spend a lot, and the vote share is almost half and half. Otherwise, vote sharing is lopsided, and thus, neither candidate does not (have to) raise much campaign funding (Erikson and Palfrey 2000; Jacobson and Kernell 1983). The Kendall’s correlation coefficient between the two variables is  $-0.076$ . That is, the two variables have a linearly negative correlation significantly but only slightly. Obviously, the two are far from independent of each other.

[Figure 1 about here]

---

<sup>1</sup>I only include conventional units where one Democratic candidate and one Republican candidate ran and one of them was the incumbent (but not both). The amount of expenditure is adjusted for inflation (2014 = 1.00). On both axes, I do not include extreme units where the value of either variable is smaller than the corresponding 1% quantile value or larger than the corresponding 99% quantile value.

In many situations like this case, underlying copulas are likely to be asymmetric and/or nonmonotonic, although conventional copulas are not. To fill this gap, I shed new light on a little-known copula with trigonometric functions, which I call the ‘normal mode copula’ (Fukumoto Nd).

This manuscript is organized as follows. In the next section, I provide the definition of the normal mode copula, characterize its properties, and present statistical tools for copulas in general. The third section applies a normal mode copula to the above data about vote share and campaign expenditure to demonstrate that the normal mode copula models the data better than other conventional copulas. Finally, I offer discussion.

## 2 Materials and Methods

### 2.1 Definition

#### 2.1.1 Bivariate Copula

Suppose  $0 \leq u_d \leq 1$  for  $d \in \{1, 2\}$ . A function  $C(u_1, u_2) : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is said to be a copula if it satisfies the following two conditions (Nelsen 2006, 10):

**Boundary conditions:**  $C(u_1, 0) = C(0, u_2) = 0$ ,  $C(u_1, 1) = u_1$ , and  $C(1, u_2) = u_2$ .

**Two-increasing Condition:** If  $u_1^L \leq u_1^H$  and  $u_2^L \leq u_2^H$ , it follows that  $C(u_1^H, u_2^H) - C(u_1^L, u_2^H) - C(u_1^H, u_2^L) + C(u_1^L, u_2^L) \geq 0$ .

Here is the motivation for copulas. For two random variables,  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , I denote the value of the  $d$ -th variable  $X_d$  by  $x_d$ , the marginal cumulative distribution function (CDF) of  $X_d$  by  $F_d(x_d) \equiv u_d$ , and the joint CDF of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  by  $F_{12}(x_1, x_2)$ . Then, according to Sklar’s theorem (Nelsen 2006, 18 and 24–25), there is a copula  $C$  such that

$$F_{12}(x_1, x_2) = C\{F_1(x_1), F_2(x_2)\}.$$

If  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are continuous,  $C$  is unique.

There are dozens of copulas (Hofert et al. 2018; Nelsen 2006; Trivedi and Zimmer 2007). One of the well-known copulas is the Gaussian copula:

$$C_G(u_1, u_2) \equiv \Phi^2\{\Phi^{-1}(u_1), \Phi^{-1}(u_2) \mid \theta\},$$

where  $\Phi$  and  $\Phi^2$  are univariate and bivariate standard normal distributions, respectively, and  $-1 \leq \theta \leq 1$  is the correlation parameter. Unless  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are univariate normal distributions,  $F_{12}$  is not a bivariate normal distribution. However, even if  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are univariate normal distributions,  $F_{12}$  is not a bivariate normal distribution unless  $C$  is a Gaussian copula.

Now I introduce a family of copulas studied in this manuscript:

**Proposition 1** (Bivariate Normal Mode Copula). *Let  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$  be positive integers,  $\theta$  be a real number, and*

$$C_{\text{NM}}(u_1, u_2) \equiv u_1 u_2 + \frac{1}{\kappa_1 \kappa_2 \pi^2} \theta \sin(u_1 \kappa_1 \pi) \sin(u_2 \kappa_2 \pi).$$

*Then,  $C_{\text{NM}}$  is a copula if and only if  $-1 \leq \theta \leq 1$ .*

Proof of all propositions are in the Supplementary Material. For  $-1 \leq \theta \leq 1$ , I call  $C_{\text{NM}}$  the normal mode copula (Fukumoto Nd),  $\theta$  the amplitude, and  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$  mode numbers.

Figure 2 shows three-dimensional plots of densities for normal mode copulas,

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\text{NM}}(u_1, u_2) &\equiv \frac{\partial^2}{\partial u_1 \partial u_2} C_{\text{NM}}(u_1, u_2) \\ &= 1 + \theta \cos(u_1 \kappa_1 \pi) \cos(u_2 \kappa_2 \pi), \end{aligned}$$

where the horizontal and vertical axes are  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , respectively. The first to fourth panels correspond to the cases where  $(\theta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2)$  is equal to  $(1, 1, 1)$ ,  $(-1, 1, 1)$ ,  $(1, 1, 2)$  and  $(1, 2, 2)$ , respectively. In all panels except for the third, the normal mode copulas are (radially)

symmetric. (I elaborate on the exact definition of copula's properties shortly.) The normal mode copulas in the first and second cases have a linearly positive and negative correlation, respectively, although those in the first and second cases have no linear correlation. In the third panel, for  $U_2 \equiv F_2(X_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $U_1 \equiv F_1(X_1)$  and  $U_2$  have a linearly positive correlation, while they have a linearly negative correlation for  $U_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}$ ; thus, in sum, both correlation structures are canceled out, and  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are not linearly correlated. However, the two variables are still not independent. Accordingly, the copula represents a typical situation of interest for this manuscript (cf., Figure 1).

[Figure 2 about here]

### 2.1.2 Multivariate Copula

It is straightforward to extend the definition of a bivariate copula to its multivariate version. Let  $0 \leq u_d \leq 1$  for  $d \in \{1, 2, \dots, D\}$  and  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_D)$ . A function  $C(\mathbf{u}) : [0, 1]^D \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that is continuous in  $\mathbf{u}$  is called a copula if the following two conditions are met (c.f., Nelsen 2006, 45):

**Multivariate Boundary Conditions:**  $C(\mathbf{u}) = 0$  if  $u_d = 0$  for some  $d$  and  $C(\mathbf{u}) = u_d$  if  $u_{\tilde{d}} = 1$  for all  $\tilde{d}$  such that  $\tilde{d} \neq d$ .

**$D$ -increasing Condition:**  $C(\mathbf{u})$  is  $D$  times differentiable and  $c(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \frac{\partial^D}{\partial u_1 \partial u_2 \dots \partial u_D} C(\mathbf{u}) \geq 0$ .

I extend a bivariate normal mode copula to a multivariate normal mode copula as follows.

**Proposition 2** (Multivariate Normal Mode Copula). *Let  $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_D$  be positive integers for  $d \in \{1, 2, \dots, D\}$ , and*

$$C_{\text{NM}}(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \prod_{d=1}^D u_d + \theta \prod_{d=1}^D \frac{1}{\kappa_d \pi} \sin(u_d \kappa_d \pi).$$

*Then,  $C_{\text{NM}}$  is a copula if and only if  $-1 \leq \theta \leq 1$ .*

A merit of the multivariate normal mode copula is that it is faster to calculate its value,  $C_{\text{NM}}(\mathbf{u})$ , and its density,

$$c_{\text{NM}}(\mathbf{u}) \equiv 1 + \theta \prod_{d=1}^D \cos(u_d \kappa_d \pi),$$

than other multivariate copulas, for instance, the multivariate Gaussian copula.

## 2.2 Properties

Below, I focus on the bivariate normal mode copula and characterize its properties. For an introduction to copulas in general, refer to Nelsen (2006).

### 2.2.1 Symmetricity

In general, a copula  $C$  is symmetric if  $C(u_1, u_2) = C(u_2, u_1)$  for all  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  (Nelsen 2006, 38).

**Proposition 3** (Symmetricity). *A normal mode copula is symmetric if and only if  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2$ .*

In general, for a copula, the following three copulas are called associated copulas (Trivedi and Zimmer 2007, 13–14):

$$\overline{C}^{(1)}(u_1, u_2) \equiv u_2 - C(1 - u_1, u_2)$$

$$\overline{C}^{(2)}(u_1, u_2) \equiv u_1 - C(u_1, 1 - u_2)$$

$$\overline{C}^{(12)}(u_1, u_2) \equiv u_1 + u_2 - 1 + C(1 - u_1, 1 - u_2).$$

In particular,  $\overline{C}^{(12)}(u_1, u_2)$  is called the survival copula (Nelsen 2006, 32).

**Proposition 4** (Associated Copula). *(1) For  $d \in \{1, 2\}$ ,*

$$\overline{C}_{\text{NM}}^{(d)}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta) = \begin{cases} C_{\text{NM}}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta) & \text{if } \kappa_d \text{ is even} \\ C_{\text{NM}}(\cdot, \cdot | -\theta) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(2)

$$\overline{C}_{\text{NM}}^{(12)}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta) = \begin{cases} C_{\text{NM}}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta) & \text{if } \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 \text{ is even} \\ C_{\text{NM}}(\cdot, \cdot | -\theta) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, unless either  $\kappa_1$  or  $\kappa_2$ , but not both, are odd, a normal mode copula is radially symmetric ( $\overline{C}^{(12)} = C$ ) (Nelsen 2006, 37). If  $\kappa_d$  is even, a normal mode copula is symmetric in  $u_d$  ( $\overline{C}^{(d)} = C$ ).

### 2.2.2 Dependence

Monotonicity. In general, I introduce six ways of defining monotonicity. I denote  $X_{-d} \equiv X_{3-d}$ .

(i)  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are positive quadrant dependent (PQD( $X_1, X_2$ )) if  $\Pr(X_1 \leq x_1, X_2 \leq x_2) \geq \Pr(X_1 \leq x_1) \Pr(X_2 \leq x_2)$ .  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are negative quadrant dependent (NQD( $X_1, X_2$ )) if  $\Pr(X_1 \leq x_1, X_2 \leq x_2) \leq \Pr(X_1 \leq x_1) \Pr(X_2 \leq x_2)$  (Nelsen 2006, 187). (ii)  $X_d$  is left tail decreasing (or increasing) in  $X_{-d}$  (LTD ( $X_d | X_{-d}$ ) (or LTI ( $X_d | X_{-d}$ ))) if  $\Pr(X_d \leq x_d | X_{-d} \leq x_{-d})$  is a nonincreasing (or nondecreasing) function of  $x_{-d}$  for all  $x_d$  (Nelsen 2006, 191). (iii)  $X_d$  is right tail increasing (or decreasing) in  $X_{-d}$  (RTI( $X_d | X_{-d}$ ) (or RTD( $X_d | X_{-d}$ ))) if  $\Pr(X_d > x_d | X_{-d} > x_{-d})$  is a nondecreasing (or nonincreasing) function of  $x_{-d}$  for all  $x_d$  (Nelsen 2006, 191). (iv)  $X_d$  is stochastically increasing (or decreasing) in  $X_{-d}$  (SI( $X_d | X_{-d}$ ) (or SD( $X_d | X_{-d}$ ))) if  $\Pr(X_d \leq x_d | X_{-d} = x_{-d})$  is a nonincreasing (or nondecreasing) function of  $x_{-d}$  for all  $x_d$  (Nelsen 2006, 196). (v)  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are left corner set decreasing (or increasing) (LCSD( $X_1, X_2$ ) (or LCSi( $X_1, X_2$ ))) if  $\Pr(X_1 \leq x_1, X_2 \leq x_2 | X_1 \leq \tilde{x}_1, X_2 \leq \tilde{x}_2)$  is nonincreasing (or nondecreasing) in  $\tilde{x}_1$  and  $\tilde{x}_2$  for all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  (Nelsen 2006, 198). (vi)  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are right corner set increasing (or decreasing) (RCSI( $X_1, X_2$ ) (or RCSD( $X_1, X_2$ ))) if  $\Pr(X_1 > x_1, X_2 > x_2 | X_1 > \tilde{x}_1, X_2 > \tilde{x}_2)$  is nondecreasing (or nonincreasing) in  $\tilde{x}_1$  and  $\tilde{x}_2$  for all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  (Nelsen 2006, 198).

**Proposition 5** (Monotonicity). *Suppose the copula of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is a normal mode copula.*

**(1) Positive Dependence:** For  $d \in \{1, 2\}$ , if and only if  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 1, \theta > 0$  or  $\theta = 0$ ,

(i)  $PQD(X_1, X_2)$ , (ii)  $LTD(X_d | X_{-d})$ , (iii)  $RTI(X_d | X_{-d})$ , (iv)  $SI(X_d | X_{-d})$ , (v)  $LCSD(X_1, X_2)$ , and (vi)  $RCSI(X_1, X_2)$ .

**(2) Negative Dependence:** For  $d \in \{1, 2\}$ , if and only if  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 1$  and  $\theta < 0$  or  $\theta = 0$ ,

(i)  $NQD(X_1, X_2)$ , (ii)  $LTI(X_d | X_{-d})$ , (iii)  $RTD(X_d | X_{-d})$ , (iv)  $SD(X_d | X_{-d})$ , (v)  $LCSI(X_1, X_2)$ , and (vi)  $RCSD(X_1, X_2)$ .

Therefore, unless  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 1$  or  $\theta = 0$ , the dependence between  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is nonmonotonic.

In general, if  $C^{(1)}(u_1, u_2) \leq C^{(2)}(u_1, u_2)$  for all  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ ,  $C^{(2)}$  is said to be more PQD (or concordant) than  $C^{(1)}$ , and I note that  $C^{(1)} \prec_C C^{(2)}$ . A family of copulas  $C(\cdot, \cdot | \theta)$  indexed by  $\theta$  is ordered in concordance if  $\theta^L \leq \theta^H$  implies  $C(\cdot, \cdot | \theta^L) \prec_C C(\cdot, \cdot | \theta^H)$  (Amblard and Girard 2002; Nelsen 2006, 39).

It holds that (Nelsen 2006, 41)

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X_d \leq x_d | X_{-d} = x_{-d}) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial u_{-d}} C(u_1, u_2) \\ &\equiv C'_{d|-d}(u_d | u_{-d}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $u_{-d} \equiv u_{3-d}$ . If  $C_{2|1}^{(2)'} \{C_{2|1}^{(1)'}(u_2 | u_1) | u_1\}$  is nondecreasing in  $u_1$ ,  $C^{(2)}$  is said to be more SI than  $C^{(1)}$ , and I note that  $C^{(1)} \prec_{SI} C^{(2)}$ . A family of copulas  $C(\cdot, \cdot | \theta)$  indexed by  $\theta$  is SI ordered if  $\theta^L \leq \theta^H$  implies  $C(\cdot, \cdot | \theta^L) \prec_{SI} C(\cdot, \cdot | \theta^H)$  (Amblard and Girard 2002).

**Proposition 6** (Ordering within Normal Mode Copulas). (1) *The family of normal mode copulas is ordered in concordance if and only if  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 1$ .*

(2) *The family of normal mode copulas is SI ordered if and only if  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 1$ .*



Tail Dependence. In general, the lower and upper tail dependence parameters are defined as

$$\lambda_L \equiv \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} \Pr\{X_2 \leq F_2^{-1}(u) \mid X_1 \leq F_1^{-1}(u)\}$$

$$\lambda_H \equiv \lim_{u \rightarrow 1^-} \Pr\{X_2 > F_2^{-1}(u) \mid X_1 > F_1^{-1}(u)\},$$

respectively, if they exist (Nelsen 2006, 214). In some disciplines, such as finance, reliance analysis, and disaster studies, scholars are interested in how often one variable goes extreme when the other does so.

**Proposition 7** (Tail Dependence). *Suppose the copula of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is a normal mode copula. Then,  $\lambda_L = \lambda_H = 0$ .*

This proposition implies that even if  $X_d$  takes an extremely large or small value,  $X_{-d}$  does not take an extreme value. In this case,  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are said to be lower and upper tail independent.

Measures of Association. In general, I introduce six measures of association that scale the degree to which  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are dependent on each other. I suppose that

$$X_1, X_1^{(1)}, X_1^{(2)} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_1(x_1)$$

$$X_2, X_2^{(1)}, X_2^{(2)} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} F_2(x_2)$$

$$(X_1, X_2) \sim C\{F_1(x_1), F_2(x_2)\}$$

$$(X_1^{(1)}, X_2^{(1)}) \sim C^{(1)}\{F_1(x_1^{(1)}), F_2(x_2^{(1)})\}$$

$$(X_1^{(2)}, X_2^{(2)}) \sim C^{(2)}\{F_1(x_1^{(2)}), F_2(x_2^{(2)})\}.$$

I denote

$$\Omega(C^{(1)}, C^{(2)}) \equiv \Pr\{(X_1^{(1)} - X_1^{(2)})(X_2^{(1)} - X_2^{(2)}) > 0\} - \Pr\{(X_1^{(1)} - X_1^{(2)})(X_2^{(1)} - X_2^{(2)}) < 0\},$$

where the first and second terms correspond to the probabilities of concordance and discordance, respectively (Nelsen 2006, 159).

Kendall's  $\tau$  for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is defined as (Nelsen 2006, 161 and 164)

$$\begin{aligned}\tau &\equiv \Omega(C, C) \\ &= 1 - 4 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial u_1} C(u_1, u_2) \frac{\partial}{\partial u_2} C(u_1, u_2) du_1 du_2.\end{aligned}$$

The product (or independence) copula is denoted by  $C_I(u_1, u_2) \equiv u_1 u_2$ , where  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are independent of each other (Nelsen 2006, 25). Spearman's  $\rho$  for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is defined as (Nelsen 2006, 167 and 170)

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &\equiv \Omega(C, C_I) \\ &= 12 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \{C(u_1, u_2) - C_I(u_1, u_2)\} du_1 du_2.\end{aligned}$$

By replacing the term inside integration by its absolute value, we obtain Schweizer and Wolff's  $\sigma$  (or the normalized volume) for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  (Nelsen 2006, Nelsen:06),

$$\sigma \equiv 12 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 |C(u_1, u_2) - C_I(u_1, u_2)| du_1 du_2.$$

Fréchet lower and upper bound copulas are defined as

$$C_L(u_1, u_2) \equiv \max(u_1 + u_2 - 1, 0)$$

$$C_H(u_1, u_2) \equiv \min(u_1, u_2),$$

respectively. For any copula  $C$ , it holds that  $C_L \prec_C C \prec_C C_H$  (Nelsen 2006, 11). Gini's  $\gamma$  for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is defined as (Nelsen 2006, 180 and 181)

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma &\equiv \Omega(C, C_L) + \Omega(C, C_H) \\ &= 4 \left[ \int_0^1 C(u, 1 - u) du - \int_0^1 \{u - C(u, u)\} du \right].\end{aligned}$$

Spearman's foot-rule  $\phi$  for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is defined as (Nelsen 2006, 186)

$$\begin{aligned}\phi &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\{3\Omega(C, C_H) - 1\} \\ &= 6 \int_0^1 C(u, u)du - 2.\end{aligned}$$

Blomqvist's  $\beta$  (or the medial correlation coefficient) for  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is defined as (Nelsen 2006, 182)

$$\begin{aligned}\beta &\equiv Pr \left[ \left\{ X_1 - F_1^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\} \left\{ X_2 - F_2^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\} > 0 \right] \\ &\quad - Pr \left[ \left\{ X_1 - F_1^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\} \left\{ X_2 - F_2^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\} < 0 \right] \\ &= 4C \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right) - 1.\end{aligned}$$

Since all information of the dependence between  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is concentrated on  $C$ , these measures of association are functions of  $C$  and have nothing to do with marginal distributions,  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ .

**Proposition 8** (Measures of Association). *Suppose the copula of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is a normal mode copula. For  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ ,*

- (1) *Schweizer and Wolff's  $\sigma$  is equal to  $\frac{48}{\kappa_1 \kappa_2 \pi^4} |\theta|$ .*
- (2) *Spearman's  $\rho$  is equal to  $\frac{48}{\kappa_1^2 \kappa_2^2 \pi^4} \theta$  if both  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$  are odd and 0 otherwise.*
- (3) *Kendall's  $\tau$  is equal to  $\frac{32}{\kappa_1^2 \kappa_2^2 \pi^4} \theta$  if both  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$  are odd and 0 otherwise.*
- (4) *Blomqvist's  $\beta$  is equal to*

$$\beta = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\kappa_1 \kappa_2 \pi^2} \theta & \text{if } \kappa_1 \bmod 4 = 1, \kappa_2 \bmod 4 = 1 \text{ or } \kappa_1 \bmod 4 = 3, \kappa_2 \bmod 4 = 3 \\ -\frac{1}{\kappa_1 \kappa_2 \pi^2} \theta & \text{if } \kappa_1 \bmod 4 = 1, \kappa_2 \bmod 4 = 3 \text{ or } \kappa_1 \bmod 4 = 3, \kappa_2 \bmod 4 = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (5) *Gini's  $\gamma$  is equal to zero.*

(6) Spearman's foot-rule  $\phi$  is equal to zero.

For instance, when  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 1$ ,  $\rho \approx 0.49\theta$ , which is modest. If both  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$  are odd, then

$$\frac{1}{|\rho|}\sigma = \kappa_1\kappa_2, \quad \frac{1}{\rho}\tau = \frac{2}{3}, \quad \left| \frac{1}{\rho}\beta \right| = \frac{1}{48}\kappa_1\kappa_2\pi^2.$$

In addition, the sizes of the four measures of association ( $\sigma$ ,  $|\rho|$ ,  $|\tau|$ , and  $|\beta|$ ) decrease in  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$ . Otherwise, importantly,  $\tau$ ,  $\rho$ , and  $\beta$  are equal to zero, even when  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are not independent of each other ( $\theta \neq 0$ ).

### 2.2.3 Relation with Other Copulas

Product Copula. When the copula of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is  $C_1$ ,  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are independent of each other (Nelsen 2006, 25). This is because  $C'_{1,d|-d}(u_d | u_{-d}) = u_d$ .

**Proposition 9** (Independence).  $C_{\text{NM}} = C_1$  if and only if  $\theta = 0$ .

Thus, the normal mode copula contains the product copula as a special case.

Fréchet Bound Copulas. I repeat that for any copula  $C$ ,  $C_L \prec_C C \prec_C C_H$ .

**Proposition 10** (Bounds). *There are no  $\theta$ ,  $\kappa_1$ , and  $\kappa_2$  such that*

$$(1) C_{\text{NM}}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2) = C_L(\cdot, \cdot)$$

$$(2) C_{\text{NM}}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2) = C_H(\cdot, \cdot).$$

This proposition implies that Fréchet lower and upper bound copulas do not belong to the family of normal mode copulas. In this sense, the family is said not to be comprehensive; that is, the degree of association between  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  does not reach the permissible range (as Proposition 8 suggests).

FGM Copulas. The Farlie-Gumbel-Morgenstein (FGM) copula is defined as (Nelsen 2006, 77)

$$C_{\text{FGM}}(u_1, u_2) \equiv u_1u_2 + \theta u_1(1 - u_1)u_2(1 - u_2),$$

where  $-1 \leq \theta \leq 1$ .

**Proposition 11** (Ordering with FGM Copulas). *Define*

**Condition (i):**  $\kappa_1 \bmod 4 = \kappa_2 \bmod 4 = 1$  or  $\kappa_1 \bmod 4 = \kappa_2 \bmod 4 = 3$

**Condition (ii):**  $\kappa_1 \bmod 4 = 1, \kappa_2 \bmod 4 = 3$  or  $\kappa_1 \bmod 4 = 3, \kappa_2 \bmod 4 = 1$ .

*Denote*

$$\theta^* \equiv \frac{1}{4} |\theta| \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \pi^2.$$

*If Condition (i),  $\theta \geq 0, \theta_{\text{FGM}} \geq \theta^*$  or Condition (ii),  $\theta \leq 0, \theta_{\text{FGM}} \geq \theta^*$ ,*

$$C_{\text{NM}}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta) \prec_{\text{C}} C_{\text{FGM}}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta_{\text{FGM}}).$$

*If Condition (i),  $\theta \leq 0, \theta_{\text{FGM}} \leq -\theta^*$  or Condition (ii),  $\theta \geq 0, \theta_{\text{FGM}} \leq -\theta^*$ ,*

$$C_{\text{NM}}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta) \succ_{\text{C}} C_{\text{FGM}}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta_{\text{FGM}}).$$

This proposition implies that an FGM copula can be either more PQD or NQD than some normal mode copulas when the parameter of the FGM copula is sufficiently large or small.

Archimedean Copulas. Let generator function  $\varphi(u) : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  be a continuous, convex, strictly decreasing function, where  $\varphi(1) = 0$ . I define the pseudoinverse function of  $\varphi(u)$  as  $\varphi^{[-1]}(z) = \varphi^{-1}(z)$  for  $0 \leq z \leq \varphi(0)$  and  $\varphi^{[-1]}(z) = 0$  for  $\varphi(0) \leq z \leq \infty$ . Then, the following function

$$C_{\text{A}}(u_1, u_2 | \varphi) \equiv \varphi^{[-1]} \{ \varphi(u_1) + \varphi(u_2) \}$$

meets the two conditions of a copula and is called an Archimedean copula (Nelsen 2006, 110–112). Archimedean copulas are one of the most studied, large classes of copulas.

**Proposition 12** (Archimedean). *There are no  $\theta \neq 0, \kappa_1, \kappa_2$ , and  $\varphi$  such that  $C_{\text{NM}}(\cdot, \cdot | \theta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2) = C_{\text{A}}(\cdot, \cdot | \varphi)$ .*

This proposition implies that a normal mode copula is not an Archimedean copula except when  $\theta = 0$ .

Circular Copulas. I suppose  $X_1$  is a circular variable (e.g., direction, the date of the year) such that its conditional ‘density,’  $f_{1|2}(x_1 | x_2)$ , is continuous in  $x_1$ ,  $f_{1|2}(x_1+2\pi | x_2) = f_{1|2}(x_1 | x_2)$ , and  $\int_0^{2\pi} f_{1|2}(x_1 | x_2)dx_1 = 1$  (Gill and Hangartner 2010). Only in this underline, I redefine  $F_1(x_1) \equiv \int_0^{x_1^*} f_1(x)dx$ , where  $x_1 \bmod 2\pi = x_1^*$  and  $0 \leq x_1^* < 2\pi$ . Since  $f_{1|2}(x_1 | x_2) = c\{F_1(x_1), F_2(x_2)\}f_1(x_1)$ ,  $f_{1|2}(0 | x_2) = f_{1|2}(2\pi | x_2)$ , and thus  $f_1(0) = f_1(2\pi)$ , it follows that

$$c(0, u_2) = \lim_{u_1 \rightarrow 1} c(u_1, u_2).$$

Hodel and Fieberg (2022) call this type of copula a circular-linear copula. Most of conventional copulas do not satisfy this condition. In the case of normal mode copulas, this condition holds if and only if  $\kappa_1$  is even. Furthermore, if  $X_2$  is also a circular variable (where the corresponding copula is a circular-circular copula, or ‘circulas’ according to Jones et al. (2015)),  $\kappa_2$  should be even as well.

Other Copulas with Trigonometric Functions. Recently, scholars have proposed many copulas with trigonometric functions. I review them in the Supplementary Material.

Chesneau (2021) refers to an extended version of the normal mode copula but only in passing,

$$C_{\text{ENM}}(\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{d=1}^D u_d + \theta \prod_{d=1}^D \frac{1}{p_d \kappa_d \pi} \{\sin(u_d \kappa_d \pi)\}^{p_d},$$

where  $p_d \geq 1$  and  $-1 \leq \theta \leq 1$ . This class of copulas includes the multivariate normal mode copulas if  $p_d = 1$  for all  $d$ . Nonetheless, Chesneau (2021) mentions that ‘[t]his copula *can* be asymmetric, orthant-dependent (positively or negatively) [i.e., PQD or NQD], radially symmetric, and with no tail dependence’ (emphasis added) but neither considers the conditions of these properties nor examines other properties (such as monotonicity, measures of association, and relation with other copulas) in detail, nor applies it to any real data, leaving a comment, ‘this generalization remains unexplored.’

Other proposed copulas are different from the normal mode copulas unless a special case of them is the same as the normal mode copulas with  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 (= 1)$ , whose properties are distinct from normal mode copulas with other values of  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$  as detailed above. Most of the other proposed copulas cannot model the target of this manuscript, that is, variables that are not linearly correlated with, but still dependent on, each other. Some proposed copulas are Archimedean copulas, although the normal mode copulas are not (Proposition 12).

## 2.3 Estimation and Evaluation

This section briefly overviews methods of estimation and evaluation for copulas that I use in the following section, referring to Hofert et al. (2018).

### 2.3.1 Maximum Pseudolikelihood Estimator

I suppose there are  $N$  units. For  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  and  $d \in \{1, 2\}$ , unit  $i$ 's value of the  $d$ -th variable  $X_d$  is denoted by  $x_{d,i}$ .

I also suppose we are agnostic about  $F_d(x)$ .<sup>2</sup> Then, a consistent estimate of  $u_{d,i} \equiv F_d(x_{d,i})$  is its empirical quantile value (Hofert et al. 2018, 139 and 199):

$$\hat{u}_{d,i} \equiv \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \{I(x_{d,j} \leq x_{d,i}) + I(x_{d,j} < x_{d,i}) + 1\},$$

where the summand is unit  $i$ 's rank and  $I(\cdot)$  denotes the indicator function.<sup>3</sup> We call  $(\hat{u}_{1,i}, \hat{u}_{2,i})$  pseudoobservation.

I assume that  $(U_{1,i}, U_{2,i})$  follows  $C(u_{1,i}, u_{2,i} \mid \theta)$ . I estimate  $\theta$  by finding  $\theta$  that maximizes

---

<sup>2</sup>Instead, if we assume a parametric model of  $F_d$  (sometimes with covariates), we may employ the maximum (nonpseudo) likelihood estimator or the inference functions for margins estimator (Hofert et al. 2018, 134–138).

<sup>3</sup>I handle tied units by using their average rank. I add one and divide the summation by  $N+1$  rather than  $N$  so that  $0 < \hat{u}_{d,i} < 1$ .

the pseudolog-likelihood (Hofert et al. 2018, 145):

$$\hat{\theta} \equiv \arg \max_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N \log\{c(\hat{u}_{1,i}, \hat{u}_{2,i} \mid \theta)\}.$$

### 2.3.2 Goodness-of-fit: Cramér-von Mises Criterion

For the goodness-of-fit of  $C(\cdot, \cdot \mid \hat{\theta})$  to the data, we see the Cramér-von Mises criterion (CvMC) (Hofert et al. 2018, 182):

$$\text{CvMC} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \{C(\hat{u}_{1,i}, \hat{u}_{2,i} \mid \hat{\theta}) - \hat{C}(\hat{u}_{1,i}, \hat{u}_{2,i})\}^2,$$

where the summand is the square of the distance between the estimated copula and the empirical copula (Hofert et al. 2018, 158),

$$\hat{C}(u_1, u_2) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N I(\hat{u}_{1,j} \leq u_1) I(\hat{u}_{2,j} \leq u_2),$$

evaluated at every pseudoobservation.

### 2.3.3 Model Selection: Cross-validation Copula Information Criterion

When scholars compare models, they usually pay attention to the Akaike information criterion (AIC). However, since we estimate  $(u_{1,i}, u_{2,i})$  nonparametrically, and thus our estimation is not fully parametric, AIC is not necessarily the best option. Thus, we also employ the cross-validation copula information criterion (CIC), which is a natural adaptation of leave-one-out cross validation (Hofert et al. 2018, 192),

$$\text{CIC} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log\{c(\hat{u}_{1,-i}, \hat{u}_{2,-i} \mid \hat{\theta}_{-i})\},$$



where for all  $d$ ,

$$\hat{u}_{d,-i} \equiv \begin{cases} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{-i}} I(\hat{u}_{d,j} \leq \hat{u}_{d,i}) & \text{if } \hat{u}_{d,i} \geq \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{-i}} \hat{u}_{d,j} \\ \frac{1}{N} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{J}_{-i} \equiv \{1, 2, \dots, N\} \setminus \{i\},$$

and  $\hat{\theta}_{-i}$  is the maximum pseudolikelihood estimate computed from the sample except for  $i$ 's unit:

$$\hat{\theta}_{-i} \equiv \arg \max_{\theta} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{-i}} \log\{c(\hat{u}_{1,j}, \hat{u}_{2,j} \mid \theta)\}.$$

The larger CIC is, the better.

### 3 Results

As an example set of variables that follow a normal mode copula, I focus on Jacobson's (2015) dataset about the Democratic vote share ( $X_1$ ) and the total campaign expenditure ( $X_2$ ) that we saw in the introduction. In general, before analysts apply a normal mode copula to any data, they have to nail down the values of  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$ , which are model choice indicators rather than parameters to be estimated. In our case, a visual inspection of the scatter plot of the pseudoobservations  $\hat{u}_{1,i}$  and  $\hat{u}_{2,i}$  (Figure 3) suggests that they follow the normal mode copula with  $\kappa_1 = 2$  and  $\kappa_2 = 1$  (cf., the third panel of Figure 2). For the purpose of comparison, I also consider five conventional copulas: Ali-Mikhail-Haq (AMH), Clayton, FGM, Frank, and Gaussian. The Gaussian and FGM copulas have already been defined above (Sections 2.1.1 and 2.2.3). The other three are Archimedean copulas have

generator functions

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\text{AMH}}(u) &\equiv \log \left[ \frac{1}{u} \{1 - \theta(1 - u)\} \right] && \text{for } -1 \leq \theta \leq 1 \\ \varphi_{\text{Clayton}}(u) &\equiv \theta^{-1}(u^{-\theta} - 1) && \text{for } \theta > 0 \\ \varphi_{\text{Frank}}(u) &\equiv -\log \left[ \frac{1}{\exp(-\theta) - 1} \{\exp(-\theta u) - 1\} \right] && \text{for } \theta \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Unless these copulas are reduced to the product copula (where variables are independent of each other), their linear correlation is not equal to zero.

[Figure 3 about here]

Table 1 reports the results of the analysis.<sup>4</sup> The first column presents  $\hat{\theta}$ . In the second column, we find CvMC. The normal mode copula achieves the lowest CvMC and thus is the best in terms of goodness-of-fit. The third and fourth columns show AIC and CIC, respectively. I multiply CIC by  $-2N$  so that AIC and CIC are comparable. No doubt, in terms of either criterion, the normal mode copula is most preferred. Taken together, as I guess at first sight, the normal mode copula with  $\kappa_1 = 2$  and  $\kappa_2 = 1$  is the best modeling approach to the data among the six copulas that I study.

[Table 1 about here]

## 4 Discussion

This study focuses on an overlooked family of copulas, normal mode copulas, and characterizes its properties (Section 2.2). The most important feature is that normal mode copulas

---

<sup>4</sup>I use the statistical computational environment R (R Core Team 2022). For estimation of  $\theta$  of the five conventional copulas, I use the `copula` library (Hofert et al. 2022). For estimation of  $\theta$  of the normal mode copula and calculation of CvMC, AIC, and CIC of all six copulas, I write my own script, which is available at Harvard Dataverse upon acceptance.

can model a joint distribution where multiple variables are not linearly correlated with each other but are still dependent. Most measures of association are equal to zero when a mode number  $\kappa_d$  is even (Proposition 8). Relatedly, the dependence structure that a normal mode copula represents is not monotonic unless  $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 1$  (Propositions 5 and 6). Furthermore, I apply a normal mode copula to a dataset of vote share and campaign expenditure to show that the normal mode copula achieves higher performance than other conventional copulas (Section 3).

There remain future research agenda. Scholars can apply normal mode copulas to various data to find interesting dependence structures. In my companion paper, Fukumoto (Nd) analyzes the relationship between government formation and duration by taking into account some covariates to model parameters of marginal distributions ( $F_d$ ). Multivariate normal mode copulas (Section 2.1.2) as well as extended normal mode copulas (Section 2.2.3) are worth exploring. I hope normal mode copulas help us to deeply understand mutually dependent variables.

## Acknowledgments

Earlier versions of this paper were presented on November 5, 2013, June 23, 2015, and September 16, 2022, at the Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tokyo, Japan, and on January 6–7, 2023, at the 10th Asian Political Methodology Meeting, National University of Singapore. I thank Toshikazu Kitano and Dean Knox for their helpful comments.

## Declaration of Interest Statement

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

## Funding Details

This work was supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science [grant number KAKENHI JP19K21683].

## Data Availability Statement

The replication materials will be hosted on the Harvard Dataverse site (<https://dataverse.harvard.edu/>) upon acceptance.

## References

- Amblard, C. and S. Girard (2002). Symmetry and Dependence Properties within a Semiparametric Family of Bivariate Copulas. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* 14(6), 715–727.
- Chesneau, C. (2021). On New Types of Multivariate Trigonometric Copulas. *Applied Math* 1(1), 3–17.
- Erikson, R. S. and T. R. Palfrey (2000). Equilibria in Campaign Spending Games: Theory and Data. *American Political Science Review* 94(3), 595–609.
- Fukumoto, K. (N.d.). Normal Mode Copulas for Nonmonotonic Dependence. Under review.
- Gill, J. and D. Hangartner (2010). Circular Data in Political Science and How to Handle It. *Political Analysis* 18(3), 316–336.
- Hodel, F. H. and J. R. Fieberg (2022). Circular–Linear Copulae for Animal Movement Data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 13(5), 1001–1013.
- Hofert, M., I. Kojadinovic, M. Maechler, and J. Yan (2018). *Elements of Copula Modeling with R*. Gewerbestrasse, Switzerland: Springer.

- Hofert, M., I. Kojadinovic, M. Maechler, and J. Yan (2022). *copula: Multivariate Dependence with Copulas*. R package version 1.1-0.
- Jacobson, G. (2015). It's Nothing Personal: The Decline of the Incumbency Advantage in U.S. House Elections. <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/29559>, Harvard Dataverse, V1, accessed on August 28, 2022.
- Jacobson, G. C. and S. Kernell (1983). *Strategy and Choice in Congressional Elections* (2nd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Jones, M. C., A. Pewsey, and S. Kato (2015). On a Class of Circulars: Copulas for Circular Distributions. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 67, 843–862.
- Nelsen, R. B. (2006). *An Introduction to Copulas* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer.
- R Core Team (2022). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. version 4.1.3.
- Trivedi, P. K. and D. M. Zimmer (2007). *Copula Modeling: An Introduction for Practitioners*. Boston, MA: Publishers Inc.

Table 1: Results for Applying Six Copulas to the Data of Vote Share and Expenditure

Copula	$\hat{\theta}$	CvMC	AIC	$-2N \times \text{CIC}$
Normal Mode	1.00	1.12	-1842.22	-1847.02
AMH	-0.87	6.06	-190.61	-189.53
Clayton	0.02	6.50	-1.31	-1.28
FGM	-0.36	5.51	-89.43	-89.43
Frank	-0.70	5.51	-86.84	-86.92
Gaussian	-0.11	5.54	-83.25	-83.80




Figure 1: Joint Distribution of Vote Share and Expenditure, U.S. House Elections, 1946-2014




Figure 2: Example Plots of Normal Mode Copulas






Figure 3: Joint Distribution of Pseudoobservations: Vote Share and Expenditure, U.S. House Elections, 1946-2014

## Figure Captions

- Figure 1: Joint Distribution of Vote Share and Expenditure, U.S. House Elections, 1946-2014
- Figure 2: Example Plots of Normal Mode Copulas
- Figure 3: Joint Distribution of Pseudoobservations: Vote Share and Expenditure, U.S. House Elections, 1946-2014