Expectated vs Realized Income Growth in A Standard Life Cycle Model This notebook uses the income process in Cocco, Gomes & Maenhout (2005) to demonstrate that estimates of a regression of expected income changes on realized income changes are sensitive to the size of transitory shocks.

We first load some tools from the HARK toolkit. In [1]: from HARK.ConsumptionSaving.ConsIndShockModel import ( IndShockConsumerType,

from HARK.datasets.life tables.us ssa.SSATools import parse ssa life table

# We need survival probabilities only up to death age-1, because survival

# Parameters related to the number of periods implied by the calibration time params = parse time params(age birth=birth age, age death=death age)

"track vars": ["pLvl", "t age", "PermShk", "TranShk"],

a predictable factor  $\Gamma$  and is subject to an unpredictable multiplicative shock  $E_t[\psi_{t+1}] = 1$ ,

female=True, cross sec=True, year=2004, min age=birth age, max age=death age - 1

from HARK.datasets.SCF.WealthIncomeDist.SCFDistTools import income wealth dists from scf

CGM income,

import pandas as pd from copy import copy

calibration in the toolkit.

adjust infl to = 1992income calib = CGM income

# Income specification

age min=birth age, age max=death age,

SabelhausSong=True

income params = parse income spec(

# probability at death age is 1. liv prb = parse ssa life table(

# Update all the new parameters params = copy(init lifecycle) params.update(time params) # params.update(dist params) params.update(income params)

> "LivPrb": liv prb, "pLvlInitStd": 0.0, "PermGroFacAgg": 1.0, "UnempPrb": 0.0, "UnempPrbRet": 0.0,

"AgentCount": 200, "T sim": 500,

Agent = IndShockConsumerType(\*\*params)

Define  $y = \log Y$ ,  $p = \log P$  and similarly for other variables.

a detailed account of how these objects map to CGM's notation.

from HARK.distribution import calc expectation

"PermGroFac": Agent.PermGroFac,

"pLvl": Agent.history["pLvl"].T.flatten(),

Data["id"] = (Data["Age"].diff(1) < 0).cumsum()

Data["Y change"] = Data.groupby("id")["Y"].diff(1)

We now estimate an analogous regression in our simulated population.

from linearmodels.panel.model import PanelOLS

Data.loc[Data["ExpIncChange"] > 0, "ExpBin"] = 1 Data.loc[Data["ExpIncChange"] < 0, "ExpBin"] = -1</pre>

Data.loc[Data["Y change"] > 0, "ChangeBin"] = 1 Data.loc[Data["Y change"] < 0, "ChangeBin"] = -1</pre>

mod = PanelOLS(Data.ExpBin, sm.add constant(Data.ChangeBin), entity effects=True)

\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Dep. Variable:
 ExpBin
 R-squared:
 0.1928

 Estimator:
 PanelOLS
 R-squared (Between):
 -0.0671

 No. Observations:
 100000
 R-squared (Within):
 0.1928

 Date:
 Tue, Feb 22 2022
 R-squared (Overall):
 0.1863

 Time:
 14:48:42
 Log-likelihood
 -1.282e+05

 Cov. Estimator:
 Unadjusted

 F-statistic:
 2.332e+04

2334 P-value

Parameter Std. Err. T-stat P-value Lower CI Upper CI

PanelOLS Estimation Summary

1857.0

2339.0

transitory fluctuations is a stronger force than persistent trends in income age-profiles.

shocks, simulating another population of agents, and re-running the regression.

"TranShkStd": [0.0] \* len(params["TranShkStd"])

calc\_expectation(Agent\_nt.IncShkDstn[i], func=lambda x: x[0] \* x[1])

"Age": [x + birth\_age for x in range(Agent.T\_cycle)],

"Age": Agent\_nt.history["t\_age"].T.flatten() + birth\_age - 1,

Agent nt = IndShockConsumerType(\*\*params no transitory)

Parameter Estimates \_\_\_\_\_\_

 

 const
 0.1249
 0.0028
 44.751
 0.0000
 0.1195
 0.1304

 ChangeBin
 -0.4336
 0.0028
 -152.72
 0.0000
 -0.4392
 -0.4281

 \_\_\_\_\_\_

import statsmodels.api as sm

Data["ExpBin"] = 0

Data["ChangeBin"] = 0

fe res = mod.fit() print(fe res)

Entities:

Avg Obs: Min Obs: Max Obs:

Min Obs:

Max Obs:

Time periods:
Avg Obs:

P-value: 0.0000

In [6]: %%capture

In [7]:

In [8]:

F-test for Poolability: 1.2382

params\_no\_transitory = copy(params)

for i in range(Agent\_nt.T\_cycle)

"PermGroFac": Agent\_nt.PermGroFac,

"pLvl": Agent\_nt.history["pLvl"].T.flatten(),

Data["id"] = (Data["Age"].diff(1) < 0).cumsum()</pre>

Data["Y change"] = Data.groupby("id")["Y"].diff(1)

Data.loc[Data["ExpIncChange"] > 0, "ExpBin"] = 1 Data.loc[Data["ExpIncChange"] < 0, "ExpBin"] = -1</pre>

Data.loc[Data["Y change"] > 0, "ChangeBin"] = 1 Data.loc[Data["Y change"] < 0, "ChangeBin"] = -1</pre>

Data = Data.set index(["id", "Age"])

Time: 14:48:46
Cov. Estimator: Unadjusted

F-test for Poolability: 0.9781

The estimated  $\hat{\beta}$  when there are no transitory shocks is positive.

Distribution: F(2333,97665)

Included effects: Entity

"PermShk": Agent nt.history["PermShk"].T.flatten(), "TranShk": Agent\_nt.history["TranShk"].T.flatten(),

Data = Data.join(exp\_df.set\_index("Age"), on="Age", how="left")

Data["PermGroFac"] \* Data["exp\_prod"] - Data["TranShk"]

mod = PanelOLS(Data.ExpBin, sm.add constant(Data.ChangeBin), entity effects=True)

ExpBin R-squared:

F-statistic:

47.000 F-statistic (robust):

46 Distribution: F(1,97665)

2334 P-value

42.845 Distribution:

P-value

Parameter Std. Err. T-stat P-value Lower CI Upper CI

-4.494e-05

0.0076

710.03

0.0000

0.0000

F(1,97665)

0.0072 0.0076 -1.389e+05

PanelOLS Estimation Summary

Estimator: PanelOLS R-squared (Between):
No. Observations: 100000 R-squared (Within):
Date: Tue, Feb 22 2022 R-squared (Overall):
Time: 14:48:46 Log-likelihood

2.0000

2173.9

1857.0

2339.0

Parameter Estimates

 

 const
 0.1083
 0.0031
 34.819
 0.0000
 0.1022
 0.1144

 ChangeBin
 0.0848
 0.0032
 26.646
 0.0000
 0.0786
 0.0911

 \_\_\_\_\_\_

params\_no\_transitory.update(

Agent nt.solve() # Run the simulations Agent nt.initialize sim()

exp = [

raw\_data = {

Agent nt.simulate()

exp\_df = pd.DataFrame(

"exp\_prod": exp,

Data = pd.DataFrame(raw\_data)

Data["Y"] = Data.pLvl \* Data.TranShk

Data["ExpIncChange"] = Data["pLvl"] \* (

# Create an individual id

# Find Et[Yt+1 - Yt]

# Create variables Data["ExpBin"] = 0

Data["ChangeBin"] = 0

fe res = mod.fit() print(fe res)

Dep. Variable:

Entities:

Avg Obs:

Min Obs:

Max Obs:

Avg Obs: Min Obs:

Max Obs:

Time periods:

P-value: 0.7692

Distribution: F(2333,97665)

Included effects: Entity

Data = Data.set index(["id", "Age"])

# Create the variables they actually use

"PermShk": Agent.history["PermShk"].T.flatten(), "TranShk": Agent.history["TranShk"].T.flatten(),

for i in range(Agent.T cycle)

"exp prod": exp,

Data = pd.DataFrame(raw data)

Data["Y"] = Data.pLvl \* Data.TranShk

Data["ExpIncChange"] = Data["pLvl"] \* (

The authors run an "index" version of the regression

# Create an individual id

# Find Et[Yt+1 - Yt]

exp df = pd.DataFrame(

calc expectation(Agent.IncShkDstn[i], func=lambda x: x[0] \* x[1])

"Age": [x + birth age for x in range(Agent.T cycle)],

"Age": Agent.history["t age"].T.flatten() + birth age - 1,

Data = Data.join(exp df.set index("Age"), on="Age", how="left")

Data["PermGroFac"] \* Data["exp prod"] - Data["TranShk"]

We simulate a population of agents

# Run the simulations Agent.initialize sim()

Agent.simulate()

period, which is given by

params.update(

Agent.solve()

%%capture

In [3]:

In [4]:

In [5]:

exp = [

raw data = {

adjust infl to=adjust infl to, \*\*income calib[education],

birth age = 21 death age = 66

education = "HS"

In [2]:

import matplotlib.pyplot as plt

init lifecycle, from HARK.Calibration.Income.IncomeTools import ( parse income spec,

parse time params,

We now create a population of agents with the income process of Cocco, Gomes & Maenhout (2005), which is implemented as a default

We assume a standard income process with transitory and permanent shocks: The consumer's permanent noncapital income P grows by

 $P_{t+1} = P_t \Gamma_{t+1} \psi_{t+1},$ 

 $Y_{t+1} = \ P_{t+1} \Gamma_{t+1} \theta_{t+1},$ 

 $\Gamma_{t}$  captures the predictable life cycle profile of income growth (faster when young, slower when old). See our replication of CGM-2005 for

Now we construct all the necessary inputs to the regressors. The main input is the expected income growth of every agent at every time

 $E_t[Y_{t+1}/Y_t] = E_t\left[\left(\frac{\theta_{t+1}P_t\Gamma_{t+1}\psi_{t+1}}{\theta_tP_t}\right)\right]$ 

 $= \left(\frac{\Gamma_{t+1}}{\theta_t}\right)$ 

 $E_t[\Delta Y_{i,t+1}] = \alpha + \beta \Delta Y_{i,t} + f_i + \epsilon_{i,t}$ 

F-statistic:

F(1,97665)

2.0000
47.000 F-statistic (robust): 2.332e+04
P-value 0.0000
46 Distribution: F(1,97665)

2173.9

The estimated  $\hat{\beta}$  is negative because in usual life-cycle calibrations, transitory shocks are volatile enough that mean reversion of

However, with less volatile transitory shocks, the regression coefficient would be positive. We demonstrate this by shutting off transitory

2.332e+04

F(1,97665)

0.0000

 $E_t[y_{t+1} - y_t] = \log \Gamma_{t+1} - \log \theta_t$ 

and, if the consumer is employed, actual income Y is permanent income multiplied by a transitory shock  $E_t[\theta_{t+1}] = 1$ ,