Prescott's RBC Model

Brian C. Jenkins

University of California, Irvine

February 25, 2019

Introduction

- Finn Kydland and Edward Prescott were awarded the 2004
 Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics, in part, for their
 contribution to our understanding of the driving forces behind
 business cycles.
- They pioneered a new approach to studying business cycles that became known as *real business cycle* or *RBC* theory.

Introduction

- Edward Prescott's 1986 article "Theory Ahead of Business Cycle Measurement" provides an overview of models he developed with Kydland.
- The model described on pages 11-17 which I'll call Prescott's model – explains the endogenous co-movement of output, employment, consumption, and investment over the business cycle.

Introduction

- Prescott's model is decentralized: the household makes some decisions and profit-maximizing firms make others and allocations are settled in markets with prices.
- Below, I describe a centralized version of Prescott's model: the representative household owns all resources and makes all allocation decisions
- The only consequence of the difference is that Prescott is able to model the equilibrium prices of labor and capital.

- A representative household lives for an infinite number of periods.
- Each period: consumes C_t and allocates share of available time L_t to labor activities.
- Flow of utility in period *t*:

$$\log(C_t) + \varphi \log(1 - L_t), \tag{1}$$

where $1 - L_t$ is the share of the household's time spent enjoying leisure.

• The expected present value of lifetime utility to the household from consuming $C_0, C_1, C_2, ...$ is denoted by U_0 :

$$U_{0} = \log(C_{0}) + \varphi \log(1 - L_{0}) + \beta [E_{0} \log(C_{1}) + \varphi \log(1 - L_{1})] + \beta^{2} [E_{0} \log(C_{2}) + \varphi \log(1 - L_{2})] + \cdots$$
(2)

$$= E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \big[\log(C_t) + \varphi \log(1 - L_t) \big], \qquad (3)$$

- The household enters period 0 with capital $K_0 > 0$.
- Production in period t:

$$F(A_t, K_t, L_t) = A_t K_t^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha}$$
 (4)

where TFP A_t is stochastic:

$$\log A_{t+1} = \rho \log A_t + \epsilon_{t+1} \tag{5}$$

• The household's resource constraint is:

$$C_t + K_{t+1} = A_t K_t^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha} + (1-\delta)K_t, \tag{6}$$

for $t = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$

- Optimization problem: Each period the household chooses:
 - Consumption for the current period
 - 2 Labor the current period
 - Capital for the subsequent period

to maximize its expected present value of lifetime utility.

• We'll solve the problem for period 0 and then generalize the solution to apply to all periods 0, 1, 2, ...

• In period 0, the household solves:

$$\max_{C_0, L_0, K_1} E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left[\log(C_t) + \varphi \log(1 - L_t) \right]$$
s.t.
$$C_t + K_{t+1} = A_t K_t^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha} + (1 - \delta) K_t$$

• The problem can be written as a choice of L_0 and K_1 only:

$$\max_{L_0, K_1} E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left[\log(A_t K_t^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha} + (1-\delta) K_t - K_{t+1}) + \varphi \log(1 - L_t) \right]$$
(8)

• The first-order condition with respect to L_0 is:

$$\frac{(1-\alpha)A_0K_0^{\alpha}L_0^{-\alpha}}{C_0} = \frac{\varphi}{1-L_0}$$
 (9)

• The first-order condition with respect to K_1 is:

$$\frac{1}{C_0} = \beta E_0 \left[\frac{\alpha A_1 K_1^{\alpha - 1} L_1^{1 - \alpha} + 1 - \delta}{C_1} \right]$$
 (10)

- ullet The household solves the same problem in periods $1,2,3,\ldots$
- So given $K_0 > 0$ and A_0 , the equilibrium paths for labor, consumption, capital, and TFP are described described by:

$$\frac{\varphi}{1 - L_t} = \frac{(1 - \alpha)A_t K_t^{\alpha} L_t^{-\alpha}}{C_t} \tag{11}$$

$$\frac{1}{C_t} = \beta E_t \left[\frac{\alpha A_{t+1} K_{t+1}^{\alpha - 1} L_{t+1}^{1 - \alpha} + 1 - \delta}{C_{t+1}} \right]$$
(12)

$$C_t + K_{t+1} = A_t K_t^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha} + (1-\delta)K_t$$
 (13)

$$\log A_{t+1} = \rho \log A_t + \epsilon_{t+1} \tag{14}$$

 Computing numeric values for consumption and capital is not trivial. Recall the Euler equation:

$$\frac{1}{C_t} = \beta E_t \left[\frac{\alpha A_{t+1} K_{t+1}^{\alpha - 1} L_{t+1}^{1 - \alpha} + 1 - \delta}{C_{t+1}} \right]$$
(15)

- Consumption at date t depends on the expectation of consumption at date t+1 which in turn depends on the expectation of consumption at date t+2 and so on.
- Solving the problem requires numerical methods like those employed in the linearsolve Python package.

Figure 1: **Kydland and Prescott RBC model with labor.** Impulse responses to a one percent shock to TFP in period 5.




Figure 2: **GDP.** Actual and simulated data from Prescott's RBC model for the US from April 1948 to July 2018. Source: FRED.




Figure 3: **Consumption.** Actual and simulated data from Prescott's RBC model for the US from April 1948 to July 2018. Source: FRED.




Figure 4: **Investment.** Actual and simulated data from Prescott's RBC model for the US from April 1948 to July 2018. Source: FRED.




Figure 5: Labor. Actual and simulated data from Prescott's RBC model for the US from April 1948 to July 2018. Source: FRED.




Table 1: **Standard deviations.** Actual data and data simulated from RBC models with and without labor. Units are percent deviations from trend. Source: FRED.

	Actual	RBC (w/o labor)	RBC (w/ labor)
Output	1.62	0.94	1.52
Consumption	1.16	0.22	0.32
Investment	7.50	3.39	5.56
Labor	1.89	_	0.90

Table 2: Correlations with GDP. Actual data and simulated data. Source: FRED.

	Actual	RBC (w/o labor)	RBC (w/ labor)
Consumption	0.79	0.62	0.59
Investment	0.85	0.99	0.99
Labor	0.87	_	0.98

- Summary analysis of the Prescott RBC Model with labor:
 - Substantial improvement in explaining output, consumption, investment, and labor volatility
 - Still under-predicts consumption-GDP correlation and over-predicts investment-GDP correlation
- Criticisms
 - Attributes all business cycle fluctuations to TFP shocks
 - Attributes all labor fluctuations to voluntary changes in labor supply.

References

Prescott, Edward C., "Theory Ahead of Business Cycle Measurement," Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Quarterly Review, Fall 1986, 10 (4).