

Dynamic Programming and Structural Estimation

Thomas H. Jørgensen

2023

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Stochastic DP
- 3 Structural Estimation

Stochastic Dynamic Programming

- **Last time:** Dynamic Programming
 - Backwards induction
 - Grids
 - Interpolation

Stochastic Dynamic Programming

- **Last time:** Dynamic Programming
 - Backwards induction
 - Grids
 - Interpolation
- **Today:**
 - **Uncertainty:**
 - Future income is uncertain
 - + Another state variable: Permanent income
 - + “Normalization” of one state variable.

Stochastic Dynamic Programming

- **Last time:** Dynamic Programming
 - Backwards induction
 - Grids
 - Interpolation
- **Today:**
 - **Uncertainty:**
 - Future income is uncertain
 - + Another state variable: Permanent income
 - + “Normalization” of one state variable.
 - **Estimation:**
 - Simulated Method of Moments (SMM/SMD)
 - Relate to “reduced-form”
 - Can we combine approaches?

Stochastic Dynamic Programming

- **Last time:** Dynamic Programming
 - Backwards induction
 - Grids
 - Interpolation
- **Today:**
 - **Uncertainty:**
 - Future income is uncertain
 - + Another state variable: Permanent income
 - + “Normalization” of one state variable.
 - **Estimation:**
 - Simulated Method of Moments (SMM/SMD)
 - Relate to “reduced-form”
 - Can we combine approaches?
- **Example:** Buffer Stock model of Deaton (1991); Carroll (1992)
 - Estimated in Gourinchas and Parker (2002)

Gourinchas and Parker (2002)

- **Research question:** “Which savings motives dominate across life?”

Gourinchas and Parker (2002)

- **Research question:** “Which savings motives dominate across life?”
- **Approach:**
 1. **Estimate model** with 2+ motives:
 - Buffer-stock motive: Income risk while working.
 - Life cycle motive: Consumption in retirement.

Gourinchas and Parker (2002)

- **Research question:** “Which savings motives dominate across life?”
- **Approach:**
 1. **Estimate model** with 2+ motives:
Buffer-stock motive: Income risk while working.
Life cycle motive: Consumption in retirement.
 2. **Quantify importance** of these motives over life
Counterfactual simulations




FIGURE 7.—The role of risk in saving and wealth accumulation.

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Stochastic DP
- 3 Structural Estimation

Buffer-stock model (Deaton-Carroll) Bellman equation

- **Simplest version** of the buffer-stock model is

$$V_t(M_t, P_t) = \max_{C_t} \frac{C_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [V_{t+1}(M_{t+1}, P_{t+1})]$$

s.t.

$$M_{t+1} = R(M_t - C_t) + Y_{t+1} \quad (\text{resources/cash-on-hand})$$

$$Y_{t+1} = P_{t+1} \zeta_{t+1} \quad (\text{income})$$

$$P_{t+1} = G P_t \psi_{t+1} \quad (\text{perm. income})$$

$$M_t - C_t \geq 0, \forall t \quad (\text{no borrowing})$$

where $\mathbb{E}_t [V_{t+1}(M_{t+1}, P_{t+1})] = \mathbb{E} [V_{t+1}(M_{t+1}, P_{t+1}) | M_t, P_t, C_t]$
are expectations over perm. and trans. income shocks,

$$\log \zeta_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\zeta}, \sigma_{\zeta}^2), \log \psi_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\psi}, \sigma_{\psi}^2)$$

Buffer-stock model (Deaton-Carroll) Bellman equation

- **Simplest version** of the buffer-stock model is

$$V_t(M_t, P_t) = \max_{C_t} \frac{C_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [V_{t+1}(M_{t+1}, P_{t+1})]$$

s.t.

$$M_{t+1} = R(M_t - C_t) + Y_{t+1} \quad (\text{resources/cash-on-hand})$$

$$Y_{t+1} = P_{t+1} \xi_{t+1} \quad (\text{income})$$

$$P_{t+1} = G P_t \psi_{t+1} \quad (\text{perm. income})$$

$$M_t - C_t \geq 0, \forall t \quad (\text{no borrowing})$$

where $\mathbb{E}_t [V_{t+1}(M_{t+1}, P_{t+1})] = \mathbb{E} [V_{t+1}(M_{t+1}, P_{t+1}) | M_t, P_t, C_t]$
are expectations over perm. and trans. income shocks,

$$\log \xi_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\xi}, \sigma_{\xi}^2), \log \psi_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\psi}, \sigma_{\psi}^2)$$

- Gourinchas and Parker (2002): “natural” borrowing constraint.
mass-point at zero in trans. income shock distribution, ξ_{t+1}

Buffer-stock model (Deaton-Carroll) Bellman equation

- **Last period:** Everything is consumed,

$$C_T^*(M_T, P_T) = M_T$$

$$V_T(M_T, P_T) = \frac{M_T^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho}$$

Buffer-stock model (Deaton-Carroll) Bellman equation

- **Last period:** Everything is consumed,

$$C_T^*(M_T, P_T) = M_T$$

$$V_T(M_T, P_T) = \frac{M_T^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho}$$

- **Gourinchas and Parker (2002):** Retirement-periods
Assumes a linear post-retirement value (w. $P_{T+1} = P_T$)

$$V_{T+1}(M_{T+1}, P_{T+1}) = \kappa \cdot (M_{T+1} + h \cdot P_{T+1})$$

Motivated by a deterministic perfect credit market solution (estimate κ and h , through γ_0 and γ_1 – see e.g. Jørgensen and Tô, 2020)

- They also allow for time-varying taste-shifters, $v_t(Z_t)$.

Normalization I

- Defining $c_t \equiv C_t/P_t$, $m_t \equiv M_t/P_t$ etc. implies

$$A_t = M_t - C_t$$

$$A_t/P_t = M_t/P_t - C_t/P_t$$

$$a_t = m_t - c_t$$

Normalization I

- Defining $c_t \equiv C_t/P_t$, $m_t \equiv M_t/P_t$ etc. implies

$$A_t = M_t - C_t$$

$$A_t/P_t = M_t/P_t - C_t/P_t$$

$$a_t = m_t - c_t$$

and state transition

$$M_{t+1} = RA_t + Y_{t+1}$$

$$M_{t+1}/P_{t+1} = RA_t/P_{t+1} + Y_{t+1}/P_{t+1}$$

$$m_{t+1} = R a_t P_t / P_{t+1} + \tilde{\zeta}_{t+1}$$

$$m_{t+1} = \frac{R}{G\psi_{t+1}} a_t + \tilde{\zeta}_{t+1}$$

The **adjustment factor** $\frac{1}{G\psi_{t+1}}$ is due to changes in permanent income

Normalization II

- Defining $v_t(m_t) = V_t(M_t, P_t) / P_t^{1-\rho}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_t(M_t, P_t) &= \max_{c_t} \frac{C_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [V_{t+1}(M_{t+1}, P_{t+1})] \\
 &= \max_{c_t} \frac{(c_t P_t)^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [V_{t+1}(M_{t+1}, P_{t+1})] \Leftrightarrow \\
 V_t(M_t, P_t) / P_t^{1-\rho} &= \max_{c_t} \frac{(c_t P_t)^{1-\rho} / P_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t \left[V_{t+1}(M_{t+1}, P_{t+1}) / P_t^{1-\rho} \right] \Leftrightarrow \\
 v_t(m_t) &= \max_{c_t} \frac{c_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t \left[\underbrace{V_{t+1}(M_{t+1}, P_{t+1}) / P_{t+1}^{1-\rho}}_{=v_{t+1}(m_{t+1})} \cdot \underbrace{P_{t+1}^{1-\rho} / P_t^{1-\rho}}_{=(G\psi_{t+1})^{1-\rho}} \right] \\
 &= \max_{c_t} \frac{c_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t \left[(G\psi_{t+1})^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) \right]
 \end{aligned}$$

Bellman equation in ratio form

$$\begin{aligned}v_t(m_t) &= \max_{c_t} \frac{c_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [(G\psi_{t+1})^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(m_{t+1})] \\&\text{s.t.} \\a_t &= m_t - c_t \\m_{t+1} &= \frac{1}{G\psi_{t+1}} Ra_t + \xi_{t+1} \\a_t &\geq 0\end{aligned}$$

- **Benefit:** Dimensionality of state space reduced, $2 \rightarrow 1$.
Can this always be done?

Bellman equation in ratio form

$$\begin{aligned}v_t(m_t) &= \max_{c_t} \frac{c_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [(G\psi_{t+1})^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(m_{t+1})] \\&\text{s.t.} \\a_t &= m_t - c_t \\m_{t+1} &= \frac{1}{G\psi_{t+1}} Ra_t + \xi_{t+1} \\a_t &\geq 0\end{aligned}$$

- **Benefit:** Dimensionality of state space reduced, $2 \rightarrow 1$.
Can this always be done?
- No... Uses that utility is homothetic (budget constraint also important)

$$V_T(M_T, P_T) = \frac{M_T^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} = \frac{(\textcolor{blue}{m}_T P_T)^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} = \frac{\textcolor{blue}{m}_T^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} P_T^{1-\rho}$$

such that $v_T(m_T) = V_T(M_T, P_T) / P_T^{1-\rho}$ holds!

Solving the model: Numerical Integration

- Solved by **backwards induction**

Terminal period:

$$v_T(m_T) = \frac{m_T^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho}$$

For $t < T$:

$$v_t(m_t) = \max_{c_t} \frac{c_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [(G\psi_{t+1})^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(m_{t+1})]$$

Solving the model: Numerical Integration

- Solved by **backwards induction**

Terminal period:

$$v_T(m_T) = \frac{m_T^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho}$$

For $t < T$:

$$v_t(m_t) = \max_{c_t} \frac{c_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [(G\psi_{t+1})^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(m_{t+1})]$$

- **How to evaluate expectations?**

$$\mathbb{E}_t [\bullet] = \int_{\psi_{t+1}} \int_{\tilde{\xi}_{t+1}} [(G\psi_{t+1})^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(m_{t+1})] f(d\psi_{t+1}, d\tilde{\xi}_{t+1})$$

Solving the model: Numerical Integration

- Solved by **backwards induction**

Terminal period:

$$v_T(m_T) = \frac{m_T^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho}$$

For $t < T$:

$$v_t(m_t) = \max_{c_t} \frac{c_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [(G\psi_{t+1})^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(m_{t+1})]$$

- How to evaluate expectations?**

$$\mathbb{E}_t[\bullet] = \int_{\psi_{t+1}} \int_{\tilde{\xi}_{t+1}} [(G\psi_{t+1})^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(m_{t+1})] f(d\psi_{t+1}, d\tilde{\xi}_{t+1})$$

- Numerical Integration:** Discretize into sum (Gauss-Hermite)

$$\mathbb{E}_t[\bullet] \approx \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^K [(G\psi^{(j)})^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(m^{(j,k)})] \omega_j \omega_k$$

and interpolate $v_{t+1}(\bullet)$ for values $m^{(j,k)} = \frac{1}{G\psi^{(j)}} Ra_t + \tilde{\xi}^{(k)}$ of \vec{m} grid.

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Stochastic DP
- 3 Structural Estimation

Structural vs. Reduced-Form Estimation

- **Critique** of structural estimation: Requires many assumptions

Structural vs. Reduced-Form Estimation

- **Critique** of structural estimation: Requires many assumptions
- **Alternative:** Estimate reduced-form equations “derived” from model

Structural vs. Reduced-Form Estimation

- **Critique** of structural estimation: Requires many assumptions
- **Alternative:** Estimate reduced-form equations “derived” from model
- **My (and others) claim:** To turn reduced form parameter estimates into policy advice *requires a lot of assumptions*

“All econometric work relies heavily on a priori assumptions. The main difference between structural and experimental (or “atheoretic”) approaches is not in the number of assumptions but the extent to which they are made explicit.” (Keane, 2010)

Structural vs. Reduced-Form Estimation

- **Critique** of structural estimation: Requires many assumptions
- **Alternative:** Estimate reduced-form equations “derived” from model
- **My (and others) claim:** To turn reduced form parameter estimates into policy advice *requires a lot of assumptions*
“All econometric work relies heavily on a priori assumptions. The main difference between structural and experimental (or “atheoretic”) approaches is not in the number of assumptions but the extent to which they are made explicit.” (Keane, 2010)
- **Benefit of models:**
 1. Ensure *consistent* world view
 2. Assumptions are clear: Better models are well defined.
 3. Hopefully “deep” policy-invariant parameters (Lucas critique).

Structural vs. Reduced-Form Estimation


- **Critique** of structural estimation: Requires many assumptions
- **Alternative:** Estimate reduced-form equations “derived” from model
- **My (and others) claim:** To turn reduced form parameter estimates into policy advice *requires a lot of assumptions*
“All econometric work relies heavily on a priori assumptions. The main difference between structural and experimental (or “atheoretic”) approaches is not in the number of assumptions but the extent to which they are made explicit.” (Keane, 2010)
- **Benefit of models:**
 1. Ensure *consistent* world view
 2. Assumptions are clear: Better models are well defined.
 3. Hopefully “deep” policy-invariant parameters (Lucas critique).
- **Frontier:** Use exogenous variation to estimate structural model.

Structural vs. Reduced-Form Estimation

- **Example:** Event-studies (child-birth, Kleven, Landais and Sørensen, 2019)

- **Reduced-form** to be *causal*:
“statistical” assumptions
 - No self-selection (timing)
 - No anticipation effects.
 - Parallel trends.

Panel A. Earnings




Structural vs. Reduced-Form Estimation

- **Example:** Event-studies (child-birth, Kleven, Landais and Sørensen, 2019)

- **Reduced-form** to be *causal*:
“statistical” assumptions

- No self-selection (timing)
- No anticipation effects.
- Parallel trends.

Panel A. Earnings



- **A model can allow** for these assumptions to be violated
But only through the chosen functional forms and mechanisms
 - “Economic” assumptions
 - Easier to debate and approve upon (?)

Structural Estimation

- We know how to **solve dynamic programming models**
- **How can we estimate them?** We need
 1. Data on (some) *states*
 2. Data on (some) *choices*

Structural Estimation

- We know how to **solve dynamic programming models**
- **How can we estimate them?** We need
 1. Data on (some) *states*
 2. Data on (some) *choices*
- Two **standard approaches**
 1. Maximum likelihood (ML)
 2. General Method of Moments (GMM)

Structural Estimation

- We know how to **solve dynamic programming models**
- **How can we estimate them?** We need
 1. Data on (some) *states*
 2. Data on (some) *choices*
- Two **standard approaches**
 1. Maximum likelihood (ML)
 2. General Method of Moments (GMM)
- **Simulated versions:** (integrate over unobserved states)
 1. Maximum Simulated Likelihood (MSL, SML)
 2. Method of Simulated Moments (MSM, SMM, **SMD**)

Structural Estimation

- We know how to **solve dynamic programming models**
- **How can we estimate them?** We need
 1. Data on (some) *states*
 2. Data on (some) *choices*
- Two **standard approaches**
 1. Maximum likelihood (ML)
 2. General Method of Moments (GMM)
- **Simulated versions:** (integrate over unobserved states)
 1. Maximum Simulated Likelihood (MSL, SML)
 2. Method of Simulated Moments (MSM, SMM, **SMD**)
- **Example model:** Life-cycle buffer-stock model
 - States: M_{it}, P_{it}
 - Choice: C_{it}
- **Parameters** to estimate: $\theta = \{\beta, \rho\}$
 - Calibration: $G, \sigma_\psi, \sigma_\xi, R$, and λ ("known")

Simulated Method of Moments (SMM/SMD)

- $\Lambda^d = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Lambda_i^d$ are some **moments in the data**
Could be avg., var, cov, regression-coefs, etc.




FIGURE 5.—The fitted consumption profile.

Simulated Method of Moments (SMM/SMD)

- $\Lambda^d = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Lambda_i^d$ are some **moments in the data**
Could be avg., var, cov, regression-coefs, etc.
- $\Lambda^m(\theta)$ are the **same moments** calculated on **simulated data**




FIGURE 5.—The fitted consumption profile.

Simulated Method of Moments (SMM/SMD)

- $\Lambda^d = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Lambda_i^d$ are some **moments in the data**
Could be avg., var, cov, regression-coefs, etc.
- $\Lambda^m(\theta)$ are the **same moments** calculated on **simulated data**
- The **difference** is then

$$g(\theta) = \Lambda^d - \Lambda^m(\theta)$$




FIGURE 5.—The fitted consumption profile.

Simulated Method of Moments (SMM/SMD)

- $\Lambda^d = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Lambda_i^d$ are some **moments in the data**
Could be avg., var, cov, regression-coefs, etc.
- $\Lambda^m(\theta)$ are the **same moments** calculated on **simulated data**
- The **difference** is then

$$g(\theta) = \Lambda^d - \Lambda^m(\theta)$$

- **SMM** then is

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} g(\theta)' W g(\theta)$$

where W is **weighting matrix**.




FIGURE 5.—The fitted consumption profile.

Weighting Matrix

- Common weighting matrices, W , are (should be positive-definite)
 1. **Theoretically optimal**
Inverse of covariance matrix of empirical moments
Can cause problems in finite samples
 2. **Identity, I**
Equal weighting.
Does not take level-differences out of moments
 3. **Diagonal matrix** with *inverse* of empirical moment *variances*
Removes “level” differences.
Scales with uncertainty about empirical moments
Popular
 4. **Freely chosen**
Focus on fitting some specific dimensions of the data

Estimation experiment

1. **Solve** the buffer-stock model and **simulate** a full panel
2. Construct a **data set** from the simulated data
3. Try to **estimate** $\theta = \{\beta, \rho\}$
using as moments the **average wealth for each age between 40 and 55**
 $\Lambda^d = (A_{40}, A_{41}, \dots, A_{55})$

Estimation experiment

1. **Solve** the buffer-stock model and **simulate** a full panel
2. Construct a **data set** from the simulated data
3. Try to **estimate** $\theta = \{\beta, \rho\}$
using as moments the **average wealth for each age between 40 and 55**
 $\Lambda^d = (A_{40}, A_{41}, \dots, A_{55})$

- I will now describe how to calculate the objective function

$$Q(\theta) = \left(\Lambda^d - \Lambda^m(\theta) \right)' W \left(\Lambda^d - \Lambda^m(\theta) \right)$$

for a given value of θ .

- This function should then be minimized to get

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} Q(\theta)$$

Implementation, $\hat{\theta}_{MSM} = \arg \min_{\theta} Q(\theta)$

1. Solve model to get $c_t^*(m; \theta)$ for all t on a grid of m (2-dim array)

Implementation, $\hat{\theta}_{MSM} = \arg \min_{\theta} Q(\theta)$

1. Solve model to get $\check{c}_t^*(m; \theta)$ for all t on a grid of m (2-dim array)
2. For $s = 1, \dots, S$:

2.1 Simulate N agents for T periods to get

$$C_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) = P_{it}^{(s)} \cdot \check{c}_t^*(M_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) / P_{it}^{(s)}; \theta)$$

$$M_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) = RA_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) + Y_{it}^{(s)}$$

$$A_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) = M_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) - C_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta)$$

$$Y_{it}^{(s)} = P_{it}^{(s)} \zeta_{it}^{(s)}$$

$$P_{it}^{(s)} = GP_{it-1}^{(s)} \psi_{it}^{(s)}$$

for some initial A_{i0} and P_{i0} and draws of ?

Implementation, $\hat{\theta}_{MSM} = \arg \min_{\theta} Q(\theta)$

1. Solve model to get $\check{c}_t^*(m; \theta)$ for all t on a grid of m (2-dim array)
2. For $s = 1, \dots, S$:

2.1 Simulate N agents for T periods to get

$$C_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) = P_{it}^{(s)} \cdot \check{c}_t^*(M_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) / P_{it}^{(s)}; \theta)$$

$$M_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) = RA_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) + Y_{it}^{(s)}$$

$$A_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) = M_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) - C_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta)$$

$$Y_{it}^{(s)} = P_{it}^{(s)} \zeta_{it}^{(s)}$$

$$P_{it}^{(s)} = GP_{it-1}^{(s)} \psi_{it}^{(s)}$$

for some initial A_{i0} and P_{i0} and draws of $\zeta_{it}^{(s)}$ and $\psi_{it}^{(s)}$.

Implementation, $\hat{\theta}_{MSM} = \arg \min_{\theta} Q(\theta)$

1. Solve model to get $\check{c}_t^*(m; \theta)$ for all t on a grid of m (2-dim array)
2. For $s = 1, \dots, S$:

2.1 Simulate N agents for T periods to get

$$C_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) = P_{it}^{(s)} \cdot \check{c}_t^*(M_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) / P_{it}^{(s)}; \theta)$$

$$M_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) = RA_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) + Y_{it}^{(s)}$$

$$A_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) = M_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) - C_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta)$$

$$Y_{it}^{(s)} = P_{it}^{(s)} \zeta_{it}^{(s)}$$

$$P_{it}^{(s)} = GP_{it-1}^{(s)} \psi_{it}^{(s)}$$

for some initial A_{i0} and P_{i0} and draws of $\zeta_{it}^{(s)}$ and $\psi_{it}^{(s)}$.

2.2 Calculate moments using simulated data, $\Lambda_s(\theta) = \{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N A_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) \}_{t=40}^{55}$

Implementation, $\hat{\theta}_{MSM} = \arg \min_{\theta} Q(\theta)$

1. Solve model to get $\check{c}_t^*(m; \theta)$ for all t on a grid of m (2-dim array)
2. For $s = 1, \dots, S$:

2.1 Simulate N agents for T periods to get

$$C_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) = P_{it}^{(s)} \cdot \check{c}_t^*(M_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) / P_{it}^{(s)}; \theta)$$

$$M_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) = RA_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) + Y_{it}^{(s)}$$

$$A_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) = M_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta) - C_{it-1}^{(s)}(\theta)$$

$$Y_{it}^{(s)} = P_{it}^{(s)} \zeta_{it}^{(s)}$$

$$P_{it}^{(s)} = GP_{it-1}^{(s)} \psi_{it}^{(s)}$$

for some initial A_{i0} and P_{i0} and draws of $\zeta_{it}^{(s)}$ and $\psi_{it}^{(s)}$.

- 2.2 Calculate moments using simulated data, $\Lambda_s(\theta) = \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N A_{it}^{(s)}(\theta) \right\}_{t=40}^{55}$
3. Calculate the objective function with $\Lambda^m(\theta) = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \Lambda_s(\theta)$

$$Q(\theta) = \left(\Lambda^d - \Lambda^m(\theta) \right)' W \left(\Lambda^d - \Lambda^m(\theta) \right)$$

Alt. Implementation, $\hat{\theta}_{MSM} = \arg \min_{\theta} Q(\theta)$

1. Solve model to get $c_t^*(m; \theta)$ for all t on a grid of m (2-dim array)

Alt. Implementation, $\hat{\theta}_{MSM} = \arg \min_{\theta} Q(\theta)$

1. Solve model to get $\check{c}_t^*(m; \theta)$ for all t on a grid of m (2-dim array)
2. Simulate $\tilde{S} = SN$ agents for T periods to get

$$C_t^{(s)}(\theta) = P_t^{(s)} \cdot \check{c}_t^*(M_i^{(s)}(\theta) / P_t^{(s)}; \theta)$$

$$M_t^{(s)}(\theta) = RA_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta) + Y_t^{(s)}$$

$$A_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta) = M_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta) - C_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta)$$

$$Y_t^{(s)} = P_t^{(s)} \tilde{\zeta}_t^{(s)}$$

$$P_t^{(s)} = GP_{t-1}^{(s)} \psi_t^{(s)}$$

for some initial A_0 and P_0 and draws of $\tilde{\zeta}_t^{(s)}$ and $\psi_t^{(s)}$.

Alt. Implementation, $\hat{\theta}_{MSM} = \arg \min_{\theta} Q(\theta)$

1. Solve model to get $\check{c}_t^*(m; \theta)$ for all t on a grid of m (2-dim array)
2. Simulate $\tilde{S} = SN$ agents for T periods to get

$$C_t^{(s)}(\theta) = P_t^{(s)} \cdot \check{c}_t^*(M_t^{(s)}(\theta) / P_t^{(s)}; \theta)$$

$$M_t^{(s)}(\theta) = RA_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta) + Y_t^{(s)}$$

$$A_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta) = M_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta) - C_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta)$$

$$Y_t^{(s)} = P_t^{(s)} \tilde{\zeta}_t^{(s)}$$

$$P_t^{(s)} = GP_{t-1}^{(s)} \psi_t^{(s)}$$

for some initial A_0 and P_0 and draws of $\tilde{\zeta}_t^{(s)}$ and $\psi_t^{(s)}$.

3. Calculate simulated moments, $\Lambda^m(\theta) = \{\frac{1}{\tilde{S}} \sum_{s=1}^{\tilde{S}} A_t^{(s)}(\theta)\}_{t=40}^{55}$ now

Alt. Implementation, $\hat{\theta}_{MSM} = \arg \min_{\theta} Q(\theta)$

1. Solve model to get $\check{c}_t^*(m; \theta)$ for all t on a grid of m (2-dim array)
2. Simulate $\tilde{S} = SN$ agents for T periods to get

$$C_t^{(s)}(\theta) = P_t^{(s)} \cdot \check{c}_t^*(M_t^{(s)}(\theta) / P_t^{(s)}; \theta)$$

$$M_t^{(s)}(\theta) = RA_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta) + Y_t^{(s)}$$

$$A_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta) = M_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta) - C_{t-1}^{(s)}(\theta)$$

$$Y_t^{(s)} = P_t^{(s)} \tilde{\zeta}_t^{(s)}$$


$$P_t^{(s)} = GP_{t-1}^{(s)} \psi_t^{(s)}$$

for some initial A_0 and P_0 and draws of $\tilde{\zeta}_t^{(s)}$ and $\psi_t^{(s)}$.

3. Calculate simulated moments, $\Lambda^m(\theta) = \{\frac{1}{\tilde{S}} \sum_{s=1}^{\tilde{S}} A_t^{(s)}(\theta)\}_{t=40}^{55}$ now
4. Calculate the objective function

$$Q(\theta) = \left(\Lambda^d - \Lambda^m(\theta) \right)' W \left(\Lambda^d - \Lambda^m(\theta) \right)$$

Buffer-stock: MSM



Indirect inference / minimum distance

- Many different names for very similar approaches
 - McFadden (1989): Method of Simulated Moments (MSM)
 - Duffie and Singleton (1993): Simulated Minimum Distance (SMD)
 - Gouriéroux, Monfort and Renault (1993) + Smith (1993): Indirect Inference (II)

Indirect inference / minimum distance

- Many different names for very similar approaches
 - McFadden (1989): Method of Simulated Moments (MSM)
 - Duffie and Singleton (1993): Simulated Minimum Distance (SMD)
 - Gouriéroux, Monfort and Renault (1993) + Smith (1993): Indirect Inference (II)
- SMD/II rely on an **auxillary statistical model**
 - Let Λ^d be the parameters of the auxillary model when estimated on the *actual* data
 - Let $\Lambda_s(\theta)$ be the parameters of the auxillary model when estimated on *simulated* data
- **Note:** The auxillary statistical model is *misspecified* and its parameters are thus typically *not interpretable*

Simulation Pitfalls

- **FIX the seed (or draws!)**
- **Flat** objective function!
 - Discrete choices: Taking a mean of an **indicator function**
- **Gradient** based numerical optimization will likely FAIL!
 - Use, e.g., `scipy.optimize.minimize(fun , method='Nelder-Mead')` (Nelder-Mead)
 - Or some smoothing device (e.g. Logit)
- As $N, S \rightarrow \infty$ this problem vanishes
- The problem is also less severe around θ_0
- Continuous outcomes do not have this problem

Asymptotics

- **MSM** is **consistent** and **asymptotically normal** under standard assumptions

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, (1 + S^{-1})V)$$

where θ_0 is vector of true parameters

- **Standard formulas for V:**

$$V = (G'WG)^{-1}G'W\Omega W'G(G'WG)^{-1}$$

where $G = -\frac{\partial \Lambda^m(\theta)}{\partial \theta}$ is the Jacobian of the objective function.

$\Omega = \text{Var}(\Lambda_i^d)$ is the variance of the (individual) moments in the data.

Remember: Standard errors are large if large changes in θ imply small changes in the objective function

Identification

- **Is there enough variation in the data to identify θ ?**

Very hard to *prove* anything because the model is typically strongly non-linear

Identification

- **Is there enough variation in the data to identify θ ?**
Very hard to *prove* anything because the model is typically strongly non-linear
- **MSM:** At least the same number of moments as parameters

Identification

- **Is there enough variation in the data to identify θ ?**

Very hard to *prove* anything because the model is typically strongly non-linear

- **MSM:** At least the same number of moments as parameters
- “Informativeness of estimation moments” (Honoré, Jørgensen and de Paula, 2020)

“How much does the variance of θ increase if we drop a (set of) moments?”

Identification

- **Is there enough variation in the data to identify θ ?**
Very hard to *prove* anything because the model is typically strongly non-linear
- **MSM:** At least the same number of moments as parameters
- “Informativeness of estimation moments” (Honoré, Jørgensen and de Paula, 2020)
“How much does the variance of θ increase if we drop a (set of) moments?”
- **Graphical inspection is useful:** Plot the objective function in the neighborhood of the found optimum

Identification

- **Is there enough variation in the data to identify θ ?**

Very hard to *prove* anything because the model is typically strongly non-linear

- **MSM:** At least the same number of moments as parameters
- “Informativeness of estimation moments” (Honoré, Jørgensen and de Paula, 2020)

“How much does the variance of θ increase if we drop a (set of) moments?”

- **Graphical inspection is useful:** Plot the objective function in the neighborhood of the found optimum

- **Problems:**

1. The objective function might have multiple minima (*no global solver exists*)
2. The objective function could be very flat in some directions (*increasing S might help*)



Robustness/Sensitivity

- **Curse of dimensionality and lack of identification**
 - ⇒ we cannot estimate all the parameters of the model
 - ⇒ *first step estimation/calibration is often necessary*
 1. Calculations on own data (e.g. exogenous processes)
 2. References to previous estimates
 3. Standard choices

Robustness/Sensitivity

- **Curse of dimensionality and lack of identification**

⇒ we cannot estimate all the parameters of the model

⇒ *first step estimation/calibration is often necessary*

1. Calculations on own data (e.g. exogenous processes)
2. References to previous estimates
3. Standard choices

- **Robustness:** Can we vary the calibration choices without changing the result substantially?

“Sensitivity to Calibration”: (Jørgensen, forthcoming)

“*How much does estimates of θ change when 1. step calibrations change?*”

Calibration vs. Estimation

- **Estimation** or **calibration**: What is the difference?
(my take)

Calibration vs. Estimation

- **Estimation or calibration:** What is the difference?
(my take)
- **Estimation:** “systematic”
Use a solver to minimize a criteria function wrt. θ
Report standard errors on $\hat{\theta}$
Time-consuming!

Calibration vs. Estimation

- **Estimation or calibration:** What is the difference?
(my take)
- **Estimation:** “systematic”
Use a solver to minimize a criteria function wrt. θ
Report standard errors on $\hat{\theta}$
Time-consuming!
- **Calibration:** “hand-held”
Use a (small) grid of values for θ
to minimize some moment(s). Sometimes eyeballing, sequentially for each parameter.
Do not report standard errors
Less time-consuming!

Next Time

- **Next time:**

Static and dynamic labor supply

Recap for some + new stuff for most.

- **Literature:**

Keane (2011, sections 1–5): “Labor Supply and Taxes: A Survey”

- **Read** before lecture

- **Reading guide:**

Section 1: short Introduction

Section 2: Optimal Taxation, Motivation. Skim fast.

Section 3: Basic model. *Key, focus here.*

Section 4: Econometric issues. Skim.

Section 5: Roadmap of empirical literature. *Short, read.*

(Remaining: empirical literature.)

References I

- CARROLL, C. D. (1992): "The Buffer-Stock Theory of Saving: Some Macroeconomic Evidence," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2, 61–135.
- DEATON, A. (1991): "Saving and Liquidity Constraints," *Econometrica*, 59(5), 1221–1248.
- DUFFIE, D. AND K. J. SINGLETON (1993): "Simulated Moments Estimation of Markov Models of Asset Prices," *Econometrica*, 61(4), 929–952.
- GOURIÉROUX, C., A. MONFORT AND E. RENAULT (1993): "Indirect Inference," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 8, 85–118.
- GOURINCHAS, P.-O. AND J. A. PARKER (2002): "Consumption Over the Life Cycle," *Econometrica*, 70(1), 47–89.

References II

- HONORÉ, B. E., T. H. JØRGENSEN AND A. DE PAULA (2020): “The Informativeness of Estimation Moments,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 35(7), 797–813.
- JØRGENSEN, T. AND M. TÔ (2020): “Robust Estimation of Finite Horizon Dynamic Economic Models,” *Computational Economics*, 55(2), 499–509.
- JØRGENSEN, T. H. (forthcoming): “Sensitivity to Calibrated Parameters,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*.
- KEANE, M. P. (2010): “Structural vs. atheoretic approaches to econometrics,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 156(1), 3–20.
- (2011): “Labor Supply and Taxes: A Survey,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 49(4), 961–1075.
- KLEVEN, H. J., C. LANDAIS AND J. E. SØGAARD (2019): “Children and gender inequality: Evidence from Denmark,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 11, 181–209.

References III

- McFADDEN, D. (1989): "A Method of Simulated Moments for Estimation of Discrete Response Models Without Numerical Integration," *Econometrica*, 47(5), 995–1026.
- SMITH, A. A. (1993): "Estimating nonlinear time-series models using simulated vector autoregressions," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 8, 63–84.