

INSURANCE VERSUS MORAL HAZARD IN INCOME-CONTINGENT STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT

Tim de Silva
MIT Sloan

November 7, 2023

Disclaimer: The results of these studies are based, in part, on Australian Business Registrar (ABR) data supplied by the Registrar to the ABS under A New Tax System (Australian Business Number) Act 1999 and tax data supplied by the ATO to the ABS under the Taxation Administration Act 1953. These require that such data is only used for the purpose of carrying out functions of the ABS. No individual information collected under the Census and Statistics Act 1905 is provided back to the Registrar or ATO for administrative or regulatory purposes. Any discussion of data limitations or weaknesses is in the context of using the data for statistical purposes, and is not related to the ability of the data to support the ABR or ATO's core operational requirements. Legislative requirements to ensure privacy and secrecy of these data have been followed. Source data are de-identified and so data about specific individuals or firms has not been viewed in conducting this analysis. In accordance with the Census and Statistics Act 1905, results have been treated where necessary to ensure that they are not likely to enable identification of a particular person or organisation.

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED HIGHER EDUCATION

- Governments often provide subsidized financing for higher education
 - Student loans = \$1.6 trillion in US and 10% of household debt in US and UK

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED HIGHER EDUCATION

- Governments often provide subsidized financing for higher education
 - Student loans = \$1.6 trillion in US and 10% of household debt in US and UK

Debt

- Standard contract
in US
- Hard to discharge

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED HIGHER EDUCATION

- Governments often provide subsidized financing for higher education
 - Student loans = \$1.6 trillion in US and 10% of household debt in US and UK

Debt

- Standard contract in US
- Hard to discharge

Equity

- Share of earnings
- Limited successful examples

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED HIGHER EDUCATION

- Governments often provide subsidized financing for higher education
 - Student loans = \$1.6 trillion in US and 10% of household debt in US and UK

Debt	Income-Contingent Loan	Equity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standard contract in US• Hard to discharge	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Used in US, UK, Australia, Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Share of earnings• Limited successful examples

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED HIGHER EDUCATION

- Governments often provide subsidized financing for higher education
 - Student loans = \$1.6 trillion in US and 10% of household debt in US and UK

Debt	Income-Contingent Loan	Equity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standard contract in US• Hard to discharge	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Used in US, UK, Australia, Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Share of earnings• Limited successful examples
<p>✗ Borrowers bear most of risk</p>	<p>✓ Insurance</p>	<p>✗ Disincentivize labor supply</p>

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED HIGHER EDUCATION

- Governments often provide subsidized financing for higher education
 - Student loans = \$1.6 trillion in US and 10% of household debt in US and UK

Debt	Income-Contingent Loan	Equity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standard contract in US• Hard to discharge	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Used in US, UK, Australia, Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Share of earnings• Limited successful examples
<ul style="list-style-type: none">✗ Borrowers bear most of risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Insurance✗ Disincentivize labor supply✓ Encourage risk-taking✗ Incentivize over-borrowing	

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED HIGHER EDUCATION

- Governments often provide subsidized financing for higher education
 - Student loans = \$1.6 trillion in US and 10% of household debt in US and UK

Debt	Income-Contingent Loan	Equity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standard contract in US• Hard to discharge✗ Borrowers bear most of risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Used in US, UK, Australia, Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Share of earnings• Limited successful examples

Debt:

- Standard contract in US
- Hard to discharge
- ✗ Borrowers bear most of risk

Income-Contingent Loan:

- Used in US, UK, Australia, Canada

Equity:

- Share of earnings
- Limited successful examples

Debt:

- ✓ Insurance
- ✗ Disincentivize labor supply
- ✓ Encourage risk-taking
- ✗ Incentivize over-borrowing
- ✗ Adverse selection

GOVERNMENT-FINANCED HIGHER EDUCATION

- Governments often provide subsidized financing for higher education
 - Student loans = \$1.6 trillion in US and 10% of household debt in US and UK

Debt	Income-Contingent Loan	Equity
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standard contract in US• Hard to discharge	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Used in US, UK, Australia, Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Share of earnings• Limited successful examples
<p>X Borrowers bear most of risk</p>	<p>✓ Insurance</p> <p>X Disincentivize labor supply</p> <p>✓ Encourage risk-taking</p>	<p>X Incentivize over-borrowing</p> <p>X Adverse selection</p>
This Paper: Insurance vs. Moral Hazard		

Conditional on borrowing, how does income-contingent repayment affect **labor supply** and welfare?

① **Setting:** Australia's Higher Education Loan Program

- **Variation:** discontinuities in repayment rates + policy change to these rates
- **Identification:** limited room for selection and ex-ante responses

② **Research design:** bunching at discontinuities before and after policy change

- **Data:** universe of income tax returns + student debt balances

Conditional on borrowing, how does income-contingent repayment
affect labor supply and **welfare**?

- ① Setting: Australia's Higher Education Loan Program
- ② Research design: bunching at discontinuities before and after policy change
- ③ **Model**: life cycle model with endogenous labor supply + uninsurable wage risk
 - **Positive**: translate responses into preference parameters
 - **Normative**: characterize optimal amount of income-contingent repayment

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

① **Empirics:** borrowers adjust labor supply to ↓ income-contingent repayments

- Larger responses in occupations with more hourly flexibility
- Responses increase with liquidity constraints and decrease with $P(\text{repayment})$

② **Structural estimation:** responses inconsistent with frictionless model

- Model replicates evidence with Frisch elasticity of **0.11** & adjustment frictions
- Important drivers of responses: liquidity constraints and dynamics

③ **Welfare:** gains to increasing insurance with income-contingent repayment

- Moral hazard reduces optimal amount of insurance
- Fixed repayment → optimal income-contingent loan $\Rightarrow \uparrow$ **1.3%** lifetime consumption
- Forbearance + fixed repayment does worse because of slower repayment

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

① Empirics: borrowers adjust labor supply to ↓ income-contingent repayments

- Larger responses in occupations with more hourly flexibility
- Responses increase with liquidity constraints and decrease with $P(\text{repayment})$

② Structural estimation: responses inconsistent with frictionless model

- Model replicates evidence with Frisch elasticity of **0.11** & adjustment frictions
- Important drivers of responses: liquidity constraints and dynamics

③ Welfare: gains to increasing insurance with income-contingent repayment

- Moral hazard reduces optimal amount of insurance
- Fixed repayment → optimal income-contingent loan $\Rightarrow \uparrow 1.3\%$ lifetime consumption
- Forbearance + fixed repayment does worse because of slower repayment

Takeaway: Income-contingent repayment creates **moral hazard** that changes optimal contract, but **too small** to justify fixed repayment

- ① Optimal financing of human capital Lochner-Monge-Naranjo 2016, Stantcheva 2017
- ② Empirical effects of student loans
 - Debt overhang: \uparrow debt \Rightarrow \uparrow delinquencies, \downarrow income Di Maggio et al. 2021,
 \downarrow homeownership Mezza et al. 2020, Δ occupation Luo-Mongey 2019, Δ major Hampole 2022
 - Benefits of income-contingent repayment: \downarrow delinquencies Herbst 2023, \downarrow mortgage defaults Mueller-Yannelis 2019

RELATED LITERATURE & CONTRIBUTIONS

- ① Optimal financing of human capital Lochner-Monge-Naranjo 2016, Stantcheva 2017
- ② Empirical effects of student loans
 - Debt overhang: ↑ debt ⇒ ↑ delinquencies, ↓ income Di Maggio et al. 2021,
↓ homeownership Mezza et al. 2020, Δoccupation Luo-Mongey 2019, Δmajor Hampole 2022
 - Benefits of income-contingent repayment: ↓ delinquencies Herbst 2023, ↓ mortgage defaults Mueller-Yannelis 2019

Contributions:

- ① Empirical **evidence** of moral hazard from income-contingent repayment
Britton-Gruber 2020, Herbst et al. 2023
- ② **Dynamic model** of labor supply that replicates these responses
- ③ Quantification of how moral hazard affects **optimal policy**

RELATED LITERATURE & CONTRIBUTIONS

- ③ Insurance vs. moral hazard in social insurance: unemployment Gruber 1997, Chetty 2006, 2008, Ganong-Noel 2019, bankruptcy Dobbie-Song 2015, Indarte 2023, health Einav et al. 2015
- ④ State-contingent securities to reduce household debt overhang Shiller 2004, Caplin et al. 2007, Mian-Sufi 2014, Hartman-Glaser-Hebert 2020, Greenwald et al. 2021, Campbell et al. 2021
- ⑤ Bunching at tax discontinuities Saez 2010, Chetty et al. 2011, Kleven-Waseem 2013
- ⑥ Labor supply in micro and macro Blundell-MaCurdy 1999, Keane 2011, Chetty 2012, ...

OUTLINE

- 1 Institutional Background and Data
- 2 Labor Supply Responses to Income-Contingent Repayment
- 3 Life Cycle Model with Endogenous Labor Supply
- 4 Welfare and Fiscal Impacts of Income-Contingent Repayment
- 5 Conclusion

OUTLINE

- 1 Institutional Background and Data
- 2 Labor Supply Responses to Income-Contingent Repayment
- 3 Life Cycle Model with Endogenous Labor Supply
- 4 Welfare and Fiscal Impacts of Income-Contingent Repayment
- 5 Conclusion

WHY STUDY INCOME-CONTINGENT REPAYMENT IN AUSTRALIA?

- Benefit #1: only one government contract + no (domestic) private market
 - Choice is between HELP and paying up-front, with former heavily subsidized
 - ✓ Limited scope for **adverse selection** (or selection on moral hazard)
- Benefit #2: debt can only be used for tuition
 - Tuition is government-controlled at 39/42 universities (public)
 - ✓ Less room for **ex-ante** moral hazard from changes in borrowing
- Benefit #3: first nationwide provider of income-contingent loans in 1989
 - ✓ Borrowers likely **understand** structure of repayment

WHY STUDY INCOME-CONTINGENT REPAYMENT IN AUSTRALIA?

- Benefit #1: only one government contract + no (domestic) private market
 - Choice is between HELP and paying up-front, with former heavily subsidized
 - ✓ Limited scope for **adverse selection** (or selection on moral hazard)
- Benefit #2: debt can only be used for tuition
 - Tuition is government-controlled at 39/42 universities (public)
 - ✓ Less room for **ex-ante** moral hazard from changes in borrowing
- Benefit #3: first nationwide provider of income-contingent loans in 1989
 - ✓ Borrowers likely **understand** structure of repayment

Good setting to identify **labor supply responses** to income-contingent repayment

STUDENT LOANS IN AUSTRALIA: HELP

- Australian citizens eligible for government-provided student loans through **HELP**
- **Initial debt** = tuition – up-front payment – govt. contribution (mean = \$18K USD in 2023)
- Debt grows at CPI net of **income-contingent repayments**:

$$\text{Repayment}_{it} = \text{HELP Rate}_t (\text{HELP Income}_{it}) \times \text{HELP Income}_{it}$$

$$\text{HELP Income}_{it} = \text{Labor Income}_{it} + \text{Capital Income}_{it} - \text{Deductions}_{it}$$

- Repayments continue until remaining debt balance equals zero or death
 - ✗ Cannot be cancelled or discharged in bankruptcy
 - Note: collection done from individual (not household) tax returns

▶ Options

▶ Definitions

▶ Other Countries

- ① Universe of individual tax returns from ATO (~ US Form 1040)
 - Income components to construct HELP Income and superannuation balances
- ② Administrative HELP data: debt balances, repayments, and flag for new debt
- ③ 2016 Household Census: self-reported hours and mortgage + rent payments
- ④ HILDA: survey data on hours worked and asset holdings


- ① Universe of individual tax returns from ATO (~ US Form 1040)
 - Income components to construct HELP Income and superannuation balances
- ② Administrative HELP data: debt balances, repayments, and flag for new debt
- ③ 2016 Household Census: self-reported hours and mortgage + rent payments
- ④ HILDA: survey data on hours worked and asset holdings

Sample: ~ 4 million **unique** debtholders between ages 20-64 from 1991-2018


- At age 26, mean HELP Income = \$34K (98% labor income), mean debt = \$13K

Limitation: cannot identify anything about borrowing choice (e.g. degree, institution)


IDENTIFYING VARIATION: DISCONTINUITIES IN REPAYMENT RATES




IDENTIFYING VARIATION: POLICY CHANGE TO REPAYMENT RATES



REPAYMENT THRESHOLD INCREASES AVERAGE REPAYMENT RATE




REPAYMENT THRESHOLD INCREASES LIQUIDITY MORE THAN WEALTH




OUTLINE

- 1 Institutional Background and Data
- 2 Labor Supply Responses to Income-Contingent Repayment
- 3 Life Cycle Model with Endogenous Labor Supply
- 4 Welfare and Fiscal Impacts of Income-Contingent Repayment
- 5 Conclusion


BORROWERS ADJUST INCOME TO REDUCE REPAYMENTS




BORROWERS ADJUST INCOME TO REDUCE REPAYMENTS




BORROWERS ADJUST INCOME TO REDUCE REPAYMENTS




BORROWERS ADJUST INCOME TO REDUCE REPAYMENTS




BORROWERS ADJUST INCOME TO REDUCE REPAYMENTS




BORROWERS ADJUST INCOME TO REDUCE REPAYMENTS



BORROWERS ADJUST INCOME TO REDUCE REPAYMENTS




BORROWERS ADJUST INCOME TO REDUCE REPAYMENTS



- Next: does bunching reflect labor supply or evasion?


Labor Non-Debt

BORROWERS BELOW REPAYMENT THRESHOLD WORK FEWER HOURS



- In 2016, reduction is around **1** hour/week = 2.6% of standard workweek


MORE BUNCHING IN OCCUPATIONS WITH GREATER HOURLY FLEXIBILITY



Sample: All wage-earners between 2005-2018

▶ Alt. Measure ▶ Evasion ▶ Table ▶ Profiles


MORE BUNCHING IN OCCUPATIONS WITH GREATER HOURLY FLEXIBILITY



Sample: All wage-earners between 2005-2018

▶ Alt. Measure ▶ Evasion ▶ Table ▶ Profiles


BUNCHING INCREASES WITH DEBT



Note: Confidence intervals omitted due to small size

► *b* Details


BUNCHING INCREASES WITH DEBT AND DECREASES WITH AGE



Note: Confidence intervals omitted due to small size



► b Details

BUNCHING INCREASES WITH PROXIES FOR LIQUIDITY CONSTRAINTS



► Within Age ► House Prices

BUNCHING INCREASES WITH PROXIES FOR LIQUIDITY CONSTRAINTS



► Within Age ► House Prices

Facts about moral hazard:

- ① Borrowers reduce labor income in response to income-contingent repayment
 - Reflects labor supply: “bunchers” work fewer hours and in more flexible occupations
- ② Size of responses depends on
 - **Liquidity**: increases with liquidity demands, decreases with retirement wealth
 - **Dynamics**: increases with debt, decreases with lifetime income 
- ③ Limited evidence of future wage reductions from reducing labor supply 

Facts about moral hazard:

- ① Borrowers reduce labor income in response to income-contingent repayment
 - Reflects labor supply: “bunchers” work fewer hours and in more flexible occupations
- ② Size of responses depends on
 - **Liquidity**: increases with liquidity demands, decreases with retirement wealth
 - **Dynamics**: increases with debt, decreases with lifetime income 
- ③ Limited evidence of future wage reductions from reducing labor supply 

Questions for model:

- ① How large are these labor supply responses quantitatively?
- ② Do they imply the costs of income-contingent repayment exceed the benefits?

OUTLINE

- 1 Institutional Background and Data
- 2 Labor Supply Responses to Income-Contingent Repayment
- 3 Life Cycle Model with Endogenous Labor Supply
- 4 Welfare and Fiscal Impacts of Income-Contingent Repayment
- 5 Conclusion

MODEL DESCRIPTION

OVERVIEW


Life cycle model with debt + incomplete markets + endogenous labor supply

- Overlapping generations born at 22 with heterogeneous assets, wage, and debt
- From 22 to 64, individuals choose consumption, c_a , and labor supply, ℓ_a
 - Wage rate subject to idiosyncratic shocks (no agg. risk, partial eq.)
 - Shocks are **uninsurable**: borrowing allowed up to age-dependent limit with interest
- After age 64, individuals retire and choose consumption c_a


Life cycle model with debt + incomplete markets + endogenous labor supply

- Overlapping generations born at 22 with heterogeneous assets, wage, and debt
- From 22 to 64, individuals choose consumption, c_a , and labor supply, ℓ_a
 - Wage rate subject to idiosyncratic shocks (no agg. risk, partial eq.)
 - Shocks are **uninsurable**: borrowing allowed up to age-dependent limit with interest
- After age 64, individuals retire and choose consumption c_a
- **Government**
 - Revenues: progressive income taxes, debt repayments
 - Expenses: means-tested unemployment benefits & retirement pension, initial debt

BUNCHING CONSISTENT WITH POSITIVE LABOR SUPPLY ELASTICITY



MASS ABOVE THRESHOLD INCONSISTENT WITH FRICTIONLESS MODEL



- Moving above to below threshold \Rightarrow more leisure **and** \$1400 more cash-on-hand

- Choice of ℓ_a subject to two **optimization frictions** to give mass above threshold
- **Time**-dependent adjustment (Calvo):
 - Fraction λ hit by shock and adjust ℓ_a , other $1 - \lambda$ set $\ell_a = \ell_{a-1}$
 - E.g. inattention, arrival of opportunities to change hours/jobs
- **State**-dependent adjustment (sS):
 - Individuals hit by **Calvo shock** incur utility cost f , if they choose $\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}$
 - E.g. real or psychological costs of changing hours/jobs

LABOR SUPPLY OPTIMIZATION FRICTIONS

- Choice of ℓ_a subject to two **optimization frictions** to give mass above threshold
- **Time**-dependent adjustment (Calvo):
 - Fraction λ hit by shock and adjust ℓ_a , other $1 - \lambda$ set $\ell_a = \ell_{a-1}$
 - E.g. inattention, arrival of opportunities to change hours/jobs
- **State**-dependent adjustment (sS):
 - Individuals hit by **Calvo shock** incur utility cost f , if they choose $\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}$
 - E.g. real or psychological costs of changing hours/jobs
- Extension: add learning-by-doing to generate long-run cost of bunching

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) =$$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}}$$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq \underline{A}_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \underbrace{c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}}}_{\text{utility of consumption} \\ \& \text{disutility of labor}}$$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \underbrace{c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}}}_{\text{utility of consumption} \\ \& \text{disutility of labor}} - \underbrace{f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}}}_{\text{adjustment} \\ \text{cost}}$$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} c_a - \kappa \underbrace{\frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}}}_{\text{utility of consumption} \\ \& \text{disutility of labor}} - f * \underbrace{\mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}}}_{\text{adjustment cost}} + \beta m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} \underbrace{V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})}_{\text{continuation value}}$$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} c_a - \underbrace{\kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}}}_{\text{utility of consumption} \\ \& \text{disutility of labor}} - \underbrace{f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}}}_{\text{adjustment cost}} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} \left(\underbrace{V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})}_{\text{continuation value}}^{1-\gamma} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}$$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \left\{ \left[\underbrace{c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}}}_{\text{utility of consumption} \\ \& \text{disutility of labor}} - \underbrace{f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}}}_{\text{adjustment cost}} \right]^{1-\sigma} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} \left(\underbrace{V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})}_{\text{continuation value}}^{1-\gamma} \right) \right]^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \left\{ \left[c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}} - f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}} \right]^{1-\sigma} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} (V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})^{1-\gamma}) \right]^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

$$c_a + A_{a+1} + \underbrace{d(y_a, D_a, t)}_{\text{debt repayment}} + \underbrace{\tau(y_a)}_{\text{taxes + ui}} = \underbrace{y_a}_{\text{labor income}} + \underbrace{A_a R}_{\text{capital income}}$$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \left\{ \left[c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}} - f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}} \right]^{1-\sigma} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} (V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})^{1-\gamma}) \right]^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

$$c_a + A_{a+1} + d(y_a, D_a, t) + \tau(y_a) = y_a + A_a R$$

$$y_a = \ell_a w_a, \quad \log w_a = \underbrace{g_a}_{\text{age profile}} + \underbrace{\theta_a}_{\text{permanent income}} + \underbrace{\epsilon_a}_{\text{transitory shock}}$$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \left\{ \left[c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}} - f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}} \right]^{1-\sigma} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} (V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})^{1-\gamma}) \right]^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

$$c_a + A_{a+1} + d(y_a, D_a, t) + \tau(y_a) = y_a + A_a R$$

$$y_a = \ell_a w_a, \quad \log w_a = g_a + \theta_a + \epsilon_a$$

$$\mathbf{s}_a = (a \quad t \quad A_a \quad D_a \quad \theta_a \quad \epsilon_a \quad \ell_{a-1} \quad \omega_a)$$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq \underline{A}_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \left\{ \left[c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}} - f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}} \right]^{1-\sigma} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_a (V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})^{1-\gamma}) \right]^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

$$c_a + A_{a+1} + d(y_a, D_a, \textcolor{blue}{t}) + \tau(y_a) = y_a + A_a R$$

$$y_a = \ell_a w_a, \quad \log w_a = \textcolor{blue}{g}_a + \theta_a + \epsilon_a$$

$$\mathbf{s}_a = (\textcolor{blue}{a} \quad \textcolor{blue}{t} \quad A_a \quad D_a \quad \theta_a \quad \epsilon_a \quad \ell_{a-1} \quad \omega_a)$$

- a = age
- t = year to keep track of policy change

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \left\{ \left[c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}} - f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}} \right]^{1-\sigma} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} (V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})^{1-\gamma}) \right]^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

$$c_a + A_{a+1} + d(y_a, D_a, t) + \tau(y_a) = y_a + A_a R$$

$$y_a = \ell_a w_a, \quad \log w_a = g_a + \theta_a + \epsilon_a$$

$$\mathbf{s}_a = (a \quad t \quad A_a \quad D_a \quad \theta_a \quad \epsilon_a \quad \ell_{a-1} \quad \omega_a)$$

- A_a = savings from previous period
- D_a = debt = $R_d D_{a-1} - d(y_{a-1}, D_{a-1}, t)$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \left\{ \left[c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}} - f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}} \right]^{1-\sigma} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} (V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})^{1-\gamma}) \right]^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

$$c_a + A_{a+1} + d(y_a, D_a, t) + \tau(y_a) = y_a + A_a R$$

$$y_a = \ell_a w_a, \quad \log w_a = g_a + \theta_a + \epsilon_a$$

$$\mathbf{s}_a = (a \quad t \quad A_a \quad D_a \quad \theta_a \quad \epsilon_a \quad \ell_{a-1} \quad \omega_a)$$

- θ_a = permanent income = $\rho \theta_{a-1} + \nu_a$ $\nu_a \sim N(0, \sigma_\nu^2)$
- ϵ_a = transitory shock $\sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \left\{ \left[c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}} - f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}} \right]^{1-\sigma} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} (V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})^{1-\gamma}) \right]^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

$$c_a + A_{a+1} + d(y_a, D_a, t) + \tau(y_a) = y_a + A_a R$$

$$y_a = \ell_a w_a, \quad \log w_a = g_a + \theta_a + \epsilon_a$$

$$\mathbf{s}_a = (a \quad t \quad A_a \quad D_a \quad \theta_a \quad \epsilon_a \quad \ell_{a-1} \quad \omega_a)$$

- θ_a = permanent income = $\rho \theta_{a-1} + \nu_a + \alpha \log \ell_{a-1}$ $\nu_a \sim N(0, \sigma_\nu^2)$
- ϵ_a = transitory shock $\sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ Extension: learning-by-doing

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \left\{ \left[c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}} - f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}} \right]^{1-\sigma} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} (V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})^{1-\gamma}) \right]^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

$$c_a + A_{a+1} + d(y_a, D_a, t) + \tau(y_a) = y_a + A_a R$$

$$y_a = \ell_a w_a, \quad \log w_a = g_a + \theta_a + \epsilon_a$$

$$\mathbf{s}_a = (a \quad t \quad A_a \quad D_a \quad \theta_a \quad \epsilon_a \quad \ell_{a-1} \quad \omega_a)$$

- ℓ_{a-1} = labor supply from previous period
- ω_a = Calvo shock that determines whether ℓ_a can be adjusted \sim Bernoulli(λ)

OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM OF INDIVIDUALS HIT BY CALVO SHOCK

$$V_a(\mathbf{s}_a) = \max_{\substack{A_{a+1} \geq A_{a+1}, \\ \ell_a}} \left\{ \left[c_a - \kappa \frac{\ell_a^{1+\phi^{-1}}}{1 + \phi^{-1}} - f * \mathbf{1}_{\ell_a \neq \ell_{a-1}} \right]^{1-\sigma} + \beta \left[m_a \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{a}} (V_{a+1}(\mathbf{s}_{a+1})^{1-\gamma}) \right]^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\gamma}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

$$c_a + A_{a+1} + d(y_a, D_a, t) + \tau(y_a) = y_a + A_a R$$

$$y_a = \ell_a w_a, \quad \log w_a = g_a + \theta_a + \epsilon_a$$

$$\mathbf{s}_a = (a \quad t \quad A_a \quad D_a \quad \theta_a \quad \epsilon_a \quad \ell_{a-1} \quad \omega_a)$$

- Sources of ex-ante heterogeneity:
 - θ_0 = initial permanent income $\sim N(0, \sigma_i^2)$
 - D_0 = initial debt, A_0 = initial assets

ESTIMATION

- **Interest rates and borrowing:**
 - Interest rate = 1.84%, borrowing rate = CC rate, debt interest rate = 0%
 - Borrowing limit = average CC limit by age
- **Demographics:** cohort birth rates and mortality risk taken from life tables
 - Consumption adjusted for equivalence scale using HH size (Lusardi et al. 2017)
- **Government:** use exact (non-smooth) formulas provided by ATO
- **Initial conditions:** assets and debt distributions taken from data at age 22
- **Baseline RRA and EIS:** $\gamma = \frac{1}{\sigma} = 2.23$ (Choukhmane-de Silva 2023)
 - Welfare analysis: consider alternative values + preference for early resolution

- **Interest rates and borrowing:**
 - Interest rate = 1.84%, borrowing rate = CC rate, debt interest rate = 0%
 - Borrowing limit = average CC limit by age
- **Demographics:** cohort birth rates and mortality risk taken from life tables
 - Consumption adjusted for equivalence scale using HH size (Lusardi et al. 2017)
- **Government:** use exact (non-smooth) formulas provided by ATO
- **Initial conditions:** assets and debt distributions taken from data at age 22
- **Baseline RRA and EIS:** $\gamma = \frac{1}{\sigma} = 2.23$ (Choukhmane-de Silva 2023)
 - Welfare analysis: consider alternative values + preference for early resolution
- **Learning-by-doing extension:** $\alpha = 0.24$ (median value from Best-Kleven 2013)

SECOND-STAGE SIMULATED METHOD OF MOMENTS

$$\text{Parameters} = \begin{pmatrix} & \\ & \\ & \end{pmatrix}$$

- **Estimation** via SMM with 47 moments + 14 parameters
 - Find parameters that minimize % difference between data & model moments
 - **Simulated policy change:** unanticipated change in HELP formula at $t = 2005$

SECOND-STAGE SIMULATED METHOD OF MOMENTS: IDENTIFICATION

$$\text{Parameters} = \left(\begin{array}{c} \overbrace{\phi \ f \ \lambda}^{\text{labor supply}} \\ \end{array} \right)$$

- **Labor supply elasticity:** identified by bunching below repayment threshold
- **Frictions:** identified by mass above repayment threshold

SECOND-STAGE SIMULATED METHOD OF MOMENTS: IDENTIFICATION

$$\text{Parameters} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{labor supply} \\ \phi \ f \ \lambda \end{pmatrix}$$

- **Labor supply elasticity:** identified by bunching below repayment threshold
- **Frictions:** identified by mass above repayment threshold
- Separate identification of **frictions**
 - Moments: heterogeneity in bunching with **debt**, bunching at **0.5%** threshold
 - **Intuition:** with $f = 0$, decision to bunch depends on Calvo shock not incentives

SECOND-STAGE SIMULATED METHOD OF MOMENTS: IDENTIFICATION

$$\text{Parameters} = \left(\underbrace{\phi, f, \lambda}_{\text{preferences}} \quad \underbrace{\kappa, \beta}_{\text{labor supply}} \quad \underbrace{\delta_0, \delta_1, \delta_2}_{\text{wage profile}} \quad \underbrace{\delta_0^E, \delta_1^E}_{\text{wage profile}} \quad \underbrace{\rho, \sigma_\nu, \sigma_\epsilon, \sigma_i}_{\text{wage risk}} \right)$$

- **Labor supply elasticity**: identified by bunching below repayment threshold
- **Frictions**: identified by mass above repayment threshold
- Separate identification of **frictions**
 - Moments: heterogeneity in bunching with **debt**, bunching at **0.5%** threshold
 - **Intuition**: with $f = 0$, decision to bunch depends on Calvo shock not incentives
- Note: wage profile & risk cannot be estimated separately in first-stage

▶ Other Parameters

▶ Elasticities

▶ SMM Objective

PARAMETER ESTIMATES

Parameter	Estimation	
		Baseline
Labor supply elasticity	ϕ	0.114
Fixed adjustment cost	f	\$377
Calvo parameter	λ	0.183
Labor supply scaling parameter	κ	0.560
Time discount factor	β	0.973
Wage profile parameters	δ_0	8.922
	δ_1	0.073
	δ_2	-0.001
	δ_0^E	-0.487
	δ_1^E	0.020
Persistence of permanent shock	ρ	0.930
Standard deviation of permanent shock	σ_ν	0.236
Standard deviation of transitory shock	σ_ϵ	0.130
Standard deviation of individual FE	σ_i	0.599

► Comparison with Literature ► Standard Errors

PARAMETER ESTIMATES

Parameter		Estimation	
		Baseline	No Frictions
Labor supply elasticity	ϕ	0.114	0.005
Fixed adjustment cost	f	\$377	.
Calvo parameter	λ	0.183	.
Labor supply scaling parameter	κ	0.560	0.030
Time discount factor	β	0.973	0.996
Wage profile parameters	δ_0	8.922	9.862
	δ_1	0.073	0.111
	δ_2	-0.001	-0.002
	δ_0^E	-0.487	-0.294
	δ_1^E	0.020	0.032
Persistence of permanent shock	ρ	0.930	0.914
Standard deviation of permanent shock	σ_ν	0.236	0.076
Standard deviation of transitory shock	σ_ϵ	0.130	0.504
Standard deviation of individual FE	σ_i	0.599	0.101

► Comparison with Literature

► Standard Errors



PARAMETER ESTIMATES

Parameter		Estimation		
		Baseline	No Frictions	LBD
Labor supply elasticity	ϕ	0.114	0.005	0.082
Fixed adjustment cost	f	\$377	.	\$762
Calvo parameter	λ	0.183	.	0.346
Labor supply scaling parameter	κ	0.560	0.030	1.242
Time discount factor	β	0.973	0.996	0.951
Wage profile parameters	δ_0	8.922	9.862	9.197
	δ_1	0.073	0.111	0.070
	δ_2	-0.001	-0.002	-0.001
	δ_0^E	-0.487	-0.294	-0.480
	δ_1^E	0.020	0.032	0.018
Persistence of permanent shock	ρ	0.930	0.914	0.889
Standard deviation of permanent shock	σ_ν	0.236	0.076	0.288
Standard deviation of transitory shock	σ_ϵ	0.130	0.504	0.064
Standard deviation of individual FE	σ_i	0.599	0.101	0.625



▶ Comparison with Literature

▶ Standard Errors


MODEL FIT: BUNCHING BEFORE AND AFTER POLICY CHANGE



MODEL FIT: BUNCHING BEFORE AND AFTER POLICY CHANGE




MODEL FIT: BUNCHING HETEROGENEITY



► Other Moments ► Liquidity ► Dynamics

MODEL FIT: BUNCHING HETEROGENEITY



► Other Moments ► Liquidity ► Dynamics

OUTLINE

- 1 Institutional Background and Data
- 2 Labor Supply Responses to Income-Contingent Repayment
- 3 Life Cycle Model with Endogenous Labor Supply
- 4 Welfare and Fiscal Impacts of Income-Contingent Repayment
- 5 Conclusion

What repayment contract best balances **insurance** with **moral hazard**?

- Consider social planner that maximizes borrower welfare with **one** contract
 - Problem faced by governments with one contract (e.g. Australia, UK)
 - Contract is subsidized with zero interest rate, borrowing & prices held fixed

What repayment contract best balances **insurance** with **moral hazard**?

- Consider social planner that maximizes borrower welfare with **one** contract
 - Problem faced by governments with one contract (e.g. Australia, UK)
 - Contract is subsidized with zero interest rate, borrowing & prices held fixed
- **Step 1: Existing** income-contingent loans vs. fixed repayment (not budget-neutral)
 - Four contracts: HELP 2004, HELP 2005, US Old & New IBR = $\psi * \max\{y - K, 0\}$
- **Step 2: Optimal** income-contingent contracts vs. fixed repayment (budget-neutral)

What repayment contract best balances **insurance** with **moral hazard**?

- Consider social planner that maximizes borrower welfare with **one** contract
 - Problem faced by governments with one contract (e.g. Australia, UK)
 - Contract is subsidized with zero interest rate, borrowing & prices held fixed
- **Step 1: Existing** income-contingent loans vs. fixed repayment (not budget-neutral)
 - Four contracts: HELP 2004, HELP 2005, US Old & New IBR = $\psi * \max\{y - K, 0\}$
- **Step 2: Optimal** income-contingent contracts vs. fixed repayment (budget-neutral)
- Note: consider effect of forgiveness in Step 2

GOVERNMENT BUDGET = EXPECTED DISCOUNTED VALUE OF PAYMENTS


- **Government budget** defined as:

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathbf{E}_0 \sum_{a=a_0}^{a_T} \frac{\text{Repayments}_a + \text{Taxes}_a - \text{Transfers}_a}{\mathcal{R}_a}$$


$$\mathcal{R}_a = \underbrace{\beta^{-(a-a_0)}}_{\text{individual time preference}} * \underbrace{\prod_{s=0}^{a-a_0} m_s}_{\text{mortality}}$$

- **Benchmark:** 25-Year Fixed Repayment = similar duration, not income-contingent
- Robustness with \mathcal{R}_a = risk-free rate & \mathcal{R}_a = risk-free rate + 4%


EXISTING INCOME-CONTINGENT LOANS VS. FIXED REPAYMENT



EXISTING INCOME-CONTINGENT LOANS VS. FIXED REPAYMENT



EXISTING INCOME-CONTINGENT LOANS VS. FIXED REPAYMENT



► Decomposition

► MVPF

CONSTRAINED-OPTIMAL INCOME-CONTINGENT LOANS

- Contracts have different fiscal costs \Rightarrow need to balance government budget
- **Next:** solve **constrained** planner's problem to construct contracts with **same cost**


$$\max_{\psi, K} \mathbf{E}_0 \left(V_{a_0}^{1-\gamma} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}$$

subject to:

$$\mathbf{E}_0 \sum_{a=a_0}^{a_T} \frac{\text{Repayments}_a + \text{Taxes}_a - \text{Transfers}_a}{\mathcal{R}_a} \geq \mathcal{G}_{\text{25-Year Fixed}} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Repayments}_a = \min \{ \psi * \max \{ y_a - K, 0 \}, D_a \} \quad (2)$$


SOLUTION TO CONSTRAINED PLANNER'S PROBLEM



▶ Smooth


▶ vs. Existing

SOLUTION TO CONSTRAINED PLANNER'S PROBLEM




▶ Smooth ▶ vs. Existing


CONSTRAINED-OPTIMUM = 1.3% INCREASE IN LIFETIME CONSUMPTION



CONSTRAINED-OPTIMUM = 1.3% INCREASE IN LIFETIME CONSUMPTION




CONSTRAINED-OPTIMUM = 1.3% INCREASE IN LIFETIME CONSUMPTION





► Alt. Models ► Distribution ► Restrict $\psi \leq 10\%$ ► Forgiveness



WELFARE GAIN IS POSITIVE AS LONG AS $\phi < 0.37$



NEXT: OTHER BUDGET-NEUTRAL CONTRACTS...





JUST PROVIDING FORBEARANCE GIVES SMALLER GAINS





- **Benefit** of income-contingent loan: accelerate payments from high-income ► ICL+UI

PURE EQUITY CONTRACT GIVES SMALLER GAINS





- Losses to transferring payments from (low-income) young → (high-income) old

EQUITY + THRESHOLD GIVES LARGER GAINS



- **Benefit of ISA:** uncapped payments from high-income \Rightarrow 70% higher threshold

EQUITY + THRESHOLD GIVES LARGER GAINS, BUT MORE DISPERSED



- **Cost of ISA:** gains more dispersed \Rightarrow likely to cause **ex-ante** responses

Distribution

OUTLINE

- 1 Institutional Background and Data
- 2 Labor Supply Responses to Income-Contingent Repayment
- 3 Life Cycle Model with Endogenous Labor Supply
- 4 Welfare and Fiscal Impacts of Income-Contingent Repayment
- 5 Conclusion

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

① **Empirics:** borrowers adjust labor supply to ↓ income-contingent repayments

- Larger responses in occupations with more hourly flexibility
- Responses increase with liquidity constraints and decrease with $P(\text{repayment})$

② **Structural estimation:** responses inconsistent with frictionless model

- Model replicates evidence with Frisch elasticity of **0.11** & adjustment frictions
- Important drivers of responses: liquidity constraints and dynamics

③ **Welfare:** gains to increasing insurance with income-contingent repayment

- Moral hazard reduces optimal amount of insurance
- Fixed repayment → optimal income-contingent loan $\Rightarrow \uparrow$ **1.3%** lifetime consumption
- Forbearance + fixed repayment does worse because of slower repayment

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

① Empirics: borrowers adjust labor supply to ↓ income-contingent repayments

- Larger responses in occupations with more hourly flexibility
- Responses increase with liquidity constraints and decrease with $P(\text{repayment})$

② Structural estimation: responses inconsistent with frictionless model

- Model replicates evidence with Frisch elasticity of **0.11** & adjustment frictions
- Important drivers of responses: liquidity constraints and dynamics

③ Welfare: gains to increasing insurance with income-contingent repayment

- Moral hazard reduces optimal amount of insurance
- Fixed repayment → optimal income-contingent loan $\Rightarrow \uparrow 1.3\%$ lifetime consumption
- Forbearance + fixed repayment does worse because of slower repayment

Takeaway: Income-contingent repayment creates **moral hazard** that changes optimal contract, but **too small** to justify fixed repayment

- US “student debt crisis”: **25%** of borrowers default within 5 years of graduation
 - Possible solution = put borrowers on income-contingent repayment (e.g. SAVE)
- **This paper:**
 - ① Ex-post moral hazard not a reason to avoid income-contingent repayment
 - ② Empirical evidence + model to calibrate effects of different contracts
- **Remaining questions:**
 - ① Should income-contingent repayment be mandated to remove selection?
 - ② Effect of income-contingent repayment on borrowing?
- **Broader question:** Is state-contingent repayment useful for other liabilities?
 - HHs: government-provided shared-appreciation mortgages (UK, Canada)
 - Firms: revenue-based financing

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX

START OF APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF FINANCING OPTIONS TO POTENTIAL BORROWERS

① HECS-HELP

- Loans to students approved for CSP-place at public undergraduate institution
- Covers most undergraduate degrees

② FEE-HELP

- Loans to students at non-CSPs that are FEE-HELP approved
- Covers private undergraduate (uncommon) and post-graduate degrees

③ Private loans from universities or banks

- Common option for international students, not used by domestic students

④ Pay tuition in full up-front

- Around 10% of HELP-eligible students do this
- Mostly borrowers with family support (Norton 2018)

◀ Back

VARIABLE DEFINITIONS

- HELP Income = Taxable Income + Fringe Benefits + Foreign Employment Income + Investment or Property Losses + Employer Super Contributions
- Labor Income = Salary/Wages + Allowances & Tips + Self-Employment Income
- Capital Income = Interest and Dividend Income + Annuity Income + Capital Gains + Rental Income + Managed Trust Income
- Net Deductions = Labor Income + Capital Income - HELP Income

◀ Back

WORLDWIDE INTEREST IN INCOME-CONTINGENT REPAYMENT

United States:



PERSONAL FINANCE

Student Loan Forgiveness: 'We're Going To Win' Says Top Democrat, As Poll Shows Broad Support For Debt Cancellation

HOME > ECONOMY

Student-loan payment plans that are based on income have failed borrowers — a new report revealed they're 'worse than we expected,' a top Democrat says

April 6, 2022, 2:05 PM



SIGN IN

NPR SHOP

DONATE

NEWS

CULTURE

MUSIC

PODCASTS & SHOWS

SEARCH

INVESTIGATIONS

Exclusive: How the most affordable student loan program failed low-income borrowers

Updated April 1, 2022 - 9:28 AM ET
Heard on Morning Edition

TOPICS PROJECTS FEATURES ABOUT GET INVOLVED SEARCH



PEW

Redesigned Income-Driven Repayment Plans Could Help Struggling Student Loan Borrowers

Research indicates that policymakers should address enrollment, affordability, and balance growth



REPORT

February 8, 2022

Read time: 63 min

◀ Back

WORLDWIDE INTEREST IN INCOME-CONTINGENT REPAYMENT

United Kingdom:

News Opinion Sport Culture Lifestyle

Education ► Schools Teachers Universities Students

Students

Student loan changes in England will cost middle earners £30k, analysis says

IFS says from 2023, expected future earnings will be crucial in deciding whether to take gap year

Richard Adams
Education editor

Sat 9 Apr 2022 00.34
AEST

[f](#) [t](#) [e](#)



Australia:

News Opinion Sport Culture Lifestyle

Australia Coronavirus World AU politics Environment Football Indigenous Australia Immigration Media E

Australian education

Hecs debt repayment changes: why more people will be forced to pay off student loans

The income threshold for repaying university fees has dropped to just \$45,881. Here's what you need to know


Naaman Zhou
@naamanzhou
Wed 3 Jul 2019 12.44
AEST

[f](#) [t](#) [e](#) 291





◀ Back

MARGINAL HELP REPAYMENT RATES ON 100 AUD



◀ Back

HELP REPAYMENT RATES AND REPAYMENTS



◀ Back



Be one
of the first
residents.



Advertisement

Politics

Print article

Ease HECS burden on students, say universities

Kate Marshall

Jan 9, 2003 – 11.00am



Save




Share

Australian students owing more than \$9 billion of debts to the federal government should be spared financial heartache under a proposal to lift the income threshold for repayments, the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee said yesterday.

◀ Back

OCCUPATION-SPECIFIC INCOME PROFILES RELATIVE TO THRESHOLDS





◀ Back: Policy

◀ Back: Hours

SUMMARY STATISTICS



	Non-Debtholders (1)	Debtholders (2)
Demographics		
Age	41.1	29.5
Female	0.46	0.60
Wage-Earner	0.85	0.91
Income Totals (in 2005 AUD)		
Taxable Income	37,695	27,796
HELP Income	38,756	28,586
Income Components (in 2005 AUD)		
Salary & Wages	32,415	26,068
Labor Income	35,480	27,136
Interest & Dividend Income	726	242
Capital Income	1,221	324
Net Deductions	-1,548	-1,099
HELP Variables		
HELP Debt (in 2005 AUD)	.	10,830
HELP Payment (in 2005 AUD)	.	991
HELP Debt at Age 26 (in 2005 AUD)	.	13,156
HELP Payment at Age 26 (in 2005 AUD)	.	1,305

DEBT BALANCES BY AGE



◀ Back


DEBT BALANCES BY AGE: INDIVIDUALS WITH POSITIVE DEBT AT AGE 22




◀ Back

83% OF BUNCHING IN HELP INCOME PRESENT IN LABOR INCOME

HELP Income





Labor Income




◀ Back

No BUNCHING AT REPAYMENT THRESHOLD FOR NON-DEBTHOLDERS




◀ Back

ALTERNATIVE MEASURE OF HOURLY FLEXIBILITY




◀ Back

BUNCHING UNCORRELATED WITH MEASURE OF EVASION



◀ Back

BUNCHING UNCORRELATED WITH MEASURE OF EVASION



◀ Back

OCCUPATION-LEVEL REGRESSIONS

	Ratio of Debtholders Below to Above Threshold						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Hourly Flexibility: SD of Changes in Log Hours	1.30 (0.35)	.	.	.	1.30 (0.35)	1.05 (0.28)	0.50 (0.23)
Evasion: Share with Non-Wage Income	.	-0.20 (0.30)	.	.	-0.02 (0.30)	-0.17 (0.30)	0.05 (0.25)
Income Slope: Mean Wage at 45 / Mean Wage at 26	.	.	-0.53 (0.10)	.	.	-0.40 (0.12)	.
Income Peak: Maximum Wage in Occupation Profile	.	.	.	-0.48 (0.06)	.	.	-0.40 (0.07)
<i>R</i> ²	0.34	0.01	0.23	0.58	0.34	0.46	0.62
Number of Occupations	43	43	43	43	43	43	43

◀ Back: Hours

◀ Back: Summary

COMPUTATION OF BUNCHING STATISTIC

- Bunching statistic calculated as in prior literature (Chetty et al. 2011, Kleven-Waseem 2013)


- ① Fit 5-piece spline leaving out $[\$32,500, \$35,000 + X]$ ⇒ **counterfactual density**
- ② Iterate and choose X so that counterfactual density integrates to 1
- ③

$$b = \frac{\text{observed mass in } [\$32,500, \$35,000]}{\text{counterfactual mass in } [\$32,500, \$35,000]} - 1$$

- $b = 0.1 \Rightarrow 10\%$ more people below threshold than would be absent discontinuity
 - Note: normalization makes b comparable across distributions of different shapes
- **Sample:** All debtholders age 20 to 64 pooled across 2005 to 2018
 - Income deflated to 2005 so 0% threshold constant in real terms at **\$35,000**


◀ Back

BUNCHING HETEROGENEITY BY SUPER WEALTH: AGES 20-29




◀ Back

LESS BUNCHING IN REGIONS WITH MORE HOUSING WEALTH




◀ Back

LIMITED EVIDENCE OF DYNAMIC COST TO BUNCHING



◀ Back

BUNCHING AMONG WAGE-EARNERS VS. ENTREPRENEURS






Note: Entrepreneur defined as having positive sole trader, partnership, or personal services income

ELASTICITY OF MOMENTS WITH RESPECT TO PARAMETERS

	ϕ	f	λ
Mass Below 2004 Threshold	0.08	-0.16	0.21
Mass Above 2004 Threshold	-0.03	0.09	-0.13
Mass Below 2005 Threshold	0.12	-0.16	0.28
Mass Above 2005 Threshold	-0.04	0.09	-0.19
Ratio 2005 0%	0.22	-0.34	0.64
Ratio 2005 0.5%	0.13	-0.12	0.16
Ratio 2005 0%, Q1 Debt	0.22	-0.34	0.37
Ratio 2005 0%, Q4 Debt	0.20	-0.33	0.82

◀ Back

SMM OBJECTIVE IS SMOOTH IN LABOR SUPPLY PARAMETERS



◀ Back


SECOND-STAGE SIMULATED MINIMUM DISTANCE: OTHER MOMENTS

$$\text{Parameters} = \left(\underbrace{\phi \ f \ \lambda \ \kappa \ \beta}_{\text{preferences}} \quad \underbrace{\delta_0 \ \delta_1 \ \delta_2 \ \delta_0^E \ \delta_1^E}_{\text{wage profile}} \quad \underbrace{\rho \ \sigma_\nu \ \sigma_\epsilon \ \sigma_i}_{\text{wage risk}} \right)$$

- Age profiles of salary & wages \Rightarrow wage profile parameters
- Moments in Guvenen et al. 2022 \Rightarrow wage risk parameters
- Average capital income at ages 40-44 \Rightarrow β
- Average labor supply \Rightarrow κ

◀ Back

COMPARISON OF ESTIMATED ELASTICITY WITH EXISTING LITERATURE



Source: intensive-margin Hicks and Frisch elasticities in Keane (2011) and Chetty (2012)

◀ Back

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LITERATURE ON LABOR SUPPLY

Reasons why elasticity may be smaller:

- ① Different **sample** of college graduates: less flexibility and further from $y = wL$
- ② Elasticity is **local** to threshold: no high-income individuals Gruber-Saez 2002
- ③ No **extensive** margin responses, which are likely smaller for this group

Contributions:

- ① **Empirical** characterization of responses to income-contingent repayment
 - Labor supply responds to liquidity not wealth, like consumption Ganong-Noel 2020
- ② **Dynamic** model of labor supply with time- and state-dependent adjustment

◀ Back

FULL ESTIMATION RESULTS



Parameter		Estimation						
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Labor supply elasticity	ϕ	0.114 (.004)	0.005 (.000)	0.188 (.003)	0.053 (.002)	0.082 (.002)	0.111 (.004)	0.067 (.002)
Adjustment cost	f	\$377 (\$13)	\$0 . .	\$2278 (\$21)	\$0 . .	\$762 (\$10)	\$513 (\$19)	\$848 (\$11)
Calvo probability	λ	0.183 (.003)	1 . .	1 . .	0.147 (.002)	0.346 (.009)	0.191 (.003)	0.266 (.005)
Scaling parameter	κ	0.560 (.007)	0.030 (.003)	0.059 (.014)	0.510 (.012)	1.242 (.116)	0.593 (.001)	0.448 (.001)
Time discount factor	β	0.973 (.001)	0.996 (.000)	0.972 (.001)	0.944 (.001)	0.951 (.001)	0.951 (.001)	0.946 (.001)
Wage profile parameters	δ_0	8.922 (.009)	9.862 (.002)	8.680 (.006)	9.389 (.007)	9.197 (.007)	9.143 (.008)	9.211 (.008)
	δ_1	0.073 (.000)	0.111 (.000)	0.073 (.000)	0.063 (.000)	0.070 (.000)	0.075 (.000)	0.074 (.000)
	δ_2	-0.001 (.000)	-0.002 (.000)	-0.001 (.000)	-0.001 (.000)	-0.001 (.000)	-0.001 (.000)	-0.001 (.000)
	δ_0^E	-0.487 (.002)	-0.294 (.000)	-0.450 (.001)	-0.530 (.002)	-0.480 (.002)	-0.478 (.002)	-0.505 (.002)
	δ_1^E	0.020 (.000)	0.032 (.000)	0.018 (.000)	0.021 (.000)	0.018 (.000)	0.020 (.000)	0.021 (.000)
Persistence of permanent shock	ρ	0.930 (.000)	0.914 (.000)	0.943 (.000)	0.922 (.000)	0.889 (.000)	0.907 (.001)	0.931 (.001)
Standard deviation of permanent shock	σ_ν	0.236 (.000)	0.076 (.000)	0.196 (.000)	0.268 (.000)	0.288 (.000)	0.275 (.001)	0.246 (.001)
Standard deviation of transitory shock	σ_ϵ	0.130 (.000)	0.504 (.000)	0.168 (.000)	0.077 (.002)	0.064 (.002)	0.080 (.002)	0.116 (.001)
Standard deviation of individual FE	σ_i	0.599 (.003)	0.101 (.001)	0.541 (.003)	0.654 (.003)	0.625 (.003)	0.612 (.003)	0.632 (.003)
Learning-by-doing parameter	α	0 Fixed No	0 Fixed No	0 Fixed No	0 Fixed No	0.24 Fixed No	0 Linear No	0 Fixed Yes
Adjustment cost function								
Misperception of debt payoff								

MODEL FIT: OTHER TARGET MOMENTS

Estimation Target	Data	Model
Average Labor Income	\$42,639	\$45,582
Cross-Sectional Variance of Log Labor Income at Age 22	0.453	0.462
Cross-Sectional Variance of Log Labor Income at Age 32	0.555	0.491
Cross-Sectional Variance of Log Labor Income at Age 42	0.577	0.525
Cross-Sectional Variance of Log Labor Income at Age 52	0.539	0.580
Cross-Sectional Variance of Log Labor Income at Age 62	0.608	0.657
Linear Age Profile Term	0.077	0.080
Quadratic Age Profile Term	-0.001	-0.001
Education Income Premium Constant	-0.574	-0.554
Education Income Premium Slope	0.023	0.023
10th Percentile of 1-Year Labor Income Growth	-0.387	-0.392
10th Percentile of 5-Year Labor Income Growth	-0.667	-0.705
90th Percentile of 1-Year Labor Income Growth	0.415	0.393
90th Percentile of 5-Year Labor Income Growth	0.698	0.710
Average Labor Supply	1.000	0.963
Average Capital Income between Ages 40 and 44	\$1,338	\$1,332

◀ Back



LIQUIDITY: BORROWING CONSTRAINTS AMPLIFY RESPONSES



- **Model:** complete markets $\Rightarrow \downarrow$ value of repayment reduction \Rightarrow bunching $\downarrow 90\%$
- **Data:** bunching \downarrow in wealth and \uparrow in liquidity demands

◀ Back


DYNAMICS: BUNCHING DEPENDS ON PROBABILITY OF REPAYMENT




- **Model:** no repayment limit $\Rightarrow \uparrow$ PDV of repayment reduction \Rightarrow bunching \uparrow 70%
- **Data:** bunching increases with debt and decreases with lifetime income

◀ Back


MODEL: BUNCHING DECREASES IN INITIAL ASSETS



LAFFER CURVE FROM LINEAR TAXATION



DECOMPOSITION OF FISCAL IMPACT: ENDOGENOUS LABOR SUPPLY




▶ Vary ϕ


◀ Back

DECOMPOSITION OF FISCAL IMPACT: ALTERNATIVE ϕ

$$\phi = 0.052$$




$$\phi = 0.21$$




◀ Back

MARGINAL VALUE OF PUBLIC FUNDS




SOLUTION TO CONSTRAINED PLANNER'S PROBLEM: QUADRATIC





◀ Back

OPTIMAL VERSUS EXISTING INCOME-CONTINGENT LOANS





◀ Back

DISTRIBUTION OF INITIAL WELFARE GAINS: ICL



- Only **1.2%** of borrowers have welfare loss above 0.5%

DISTRIBUTION OF INITIAL WELFARE GAINS: ISA




- 18% of borrowers have welfare loss above 0.5% for ISA vs. 1.2% for ICL

▶ Heterogeneity by States


◀ Back

HETEROGENEITY IN WELFARE GAINS ACROSS INITIAL STATES




▶ Losers ICL ▶ Age ▶ Initial CEQ ▶ ICL ▶ ISA

INDIVIDUALS WITH INITIAL WELFARE LOSSES: ICL




WELFARE GAINS BY AGE

ICL vs. 25-Year Fixed




ICL + 20-Year Forgiveness vs. ICL



◀ ICL ▶ ISA


CERTAINTY-EQUIVALENTS ACROSS INITIAL DEBT



WELFARE GAINS FROM INCOME-CONTINGENT LOANS: ALT. MODELS



Difference from Baseline Model	Welfare Gain	= Insurance	+ Moral Hazard	ψ^*	K^*
(1) Occupation Heterogeneity	1.32%	1.45%	-0.13%	41%	\$28,694
(2) Learning-by-Doing	1.68%	.	.	35%	\$36,615
(3) Linear Adjustment Costs	1.74%	1.87%	-0.13%	53%	\$43,560
(4) Wealth Effects on Labor Supply	0.82%	1.05%	-0.23%	37%	\$30,307
(5) Less Persistent Shocks: $\rho = 0.8$	0.90%	1.14%	-0.23%	42%	\$34,244
(6) More Persistent Shocks: $\rho = 0.99$	1.35%	1.63%	-0.28%	35%	\$18,949
(7) Non-Normal Permanent Shocks	1.14%	1.43%	-0.30%	28%	\$26,933
(8) Debt Interest Rate = 2%	1.96%	2.14%	-0.18%	38%	\$47,731
(9) Planner Discount Rate = R	1.06%	1.41%	-0.35%	29%	\$22,696
(10) Planner Discount Rate = $R + 4\%$	1.60%	1.65%	-0.05%	46%	\$34,441
(11) US Tax System	1.18%	1.36%	-0.19%	38%	\$28,838
(12) Larger Initial Debt Balances	3.50%	4.72%	-1.22%	36%	\$18,867
(13) No Ex-Post Uncertainty	0.58%	0.76%	-0.17%	27%	\$18,098
(14) No Uncertainty	-0.17%	0.15%	-0.32%	21%	\$26,906
Average	1.33%	1.60%	-0.29%	36%	\$29,777
Baseline Model	1.32%	1.47%	-0.15%	33%	\$27,147

CONSTRAINING REPAYMENT RATE REDUCES WELFARE GAINS





◀ Back

FORGIVENESS REDUCES WELFARE GAINS



◀ Back


No GAINS TO ADDING FORBEARANCE TO INCOME-CONTINGENT LOANS




◀ Back

FIT OF MODEL IN WHICH FIXED REPAYMENT IS OPTIMAL

Before Policy Change: 2002-2004




After Policy Change: 2005-2007



▶ Occupations


◀ Back

BUNCHING WHEN FIXED REPAYMENT IS OPTIMAL vs. OCCUPATIONS




◀ Back

How INCOME-CONTINGENT LOANS VARY WITH ϕ




◀ Back

ALTERNATIVE CONTRACTS REDUCE WELFARE COST OF MORAL HAZARD




ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF INCOME-CONTINGENT LOANS: $\phi = 0.37$




◀ Back

ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF INCOME-CONTINGENT LOANS: BASELINE ϕ




◀ Back

REDUCING WELFARE COST OF MORAL HAZARD: BASELINE ϕ




◀ Back

SURVEY OF THRESHOLD LOCATION



REPAYMENT STATUS OF US STUDENT LOANS



Physical vs. logical page numbers

- Windows: Ctrl + K, uncheck "Use Logical Page Numbers"
- Mac: Cmd + K, uncheck "Use Logical Page Numbers"
- Might have to toggle on/off if it's off already

Jump to page numbers

- Windows: Ctrl + Shift + N
- Mac: Cmd + Shift + N

- 2 Government-Financed Higher Education
- 3 Government-Financed Higher Education
- 4 Government-Financed Higher Education
- 5 Government-Financed Higher Education
- 6 Government-Financed Higher Education
- 7 Government-Financed Higher Education
- 8 Government-Financed Higher Education
- 9 Government-Financed Higher Education
- 10 This Paper
- 11 This Paper
- 12 Summary of Results
- 13 Summary of Results
- 14 Related Literature & Contributions
- 15 Related Literature & Contributions
- 16 Related Literature & Contributions
- 17 Outline
- 18 Outline
- 19 Why Study Income-Contingent Repayment in Australia?
- 20 Why Study Income-Contingent Repayment in Australia?
- 21 Student Loans in Australia: HELP
- 22 Data
- 23 Data
- 24 Identifying Variation: Discontinuities in Repayment Rates
- 25 Identifying Variation: Discontinuities in Repayment Rates
- 26 Identifying Variation: Discontinuities in Repayment Rates
- 27 Identifying Variation: Discontinuities in Repayment Rates
- 28 Outline
- 29 Borrowers Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments
- 30 Borrowers Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments
- 31 Borrowers Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments
- 32 Borrowers Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments
- 33 Borrowers Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments
- 34 Borrowers Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments

- 35 Borrowers Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments
- 36 Borrowers Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments
- 37 Borrowers Below Repayment Threshold Work Fewer Hours
- 38 More Bunching in Occupations with Greater Hourly Flexibility
- 39 More Bunching in Occupations with Greater Hourly Flexibility
- 40 Bunching Increases with Debt
- 41 Bunching Increases with Debt
- 42 Bunching Increases with Proxies for Liquidity Constraints
- 43 Bunching Increases with Proxies for Liquidity Constraints
- 44 Taking Stock
- 45 Taking Stock
- 46 Outline
- 48 Overview
- 49 Overview
- 50 Overview
- 51 Bunching Consistent with Positive Labor Supply Elasticity
- 52 Bunching Consistent with Positive Labor Supply Elasticity
- 53 Labor Supply Optimization Frictions
- 54 Labor Supply Optimization Frictions
- 55 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 56 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 57 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 58 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 59 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 60 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 61 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 62 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 63 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 64 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 65 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 66 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 67 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

- 68 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 69 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 70 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
- 72 First-Stage Calibration
- 73 First-Stage Calibration
- 74 Second-Stage Simulated Method of Moments
- 75 Second-Stage Simulated Method of Moments
- 76 Second-Stage Simulated Method of Moments
- 77 Second-Stage Simulated Method of Moments
- 78 Parameter Estimates
- 79 Parameter Estimates
- 80 Parameter Estimates
- 81 Model Fit: Bunching Before and After Policy Change
- 82 Model Fit: Bunching Before and After Policy Change
- 83 Model Fit: Bunching Heterogeneity
- 84 Model Fit: Bunching Heterogeneity
- 85 Outline
- 86 Normative Perspective
- 87 Normative Perspective
- 88 Normative Perspective
- 89 Government Budget = Expected Discounted Value of Payments
- 90 Existing Income-Contingent Loans vs. Fixed Repayment
- 91 Existing Income-Contingent Loans vs. Fixed Repayment
- 92 Existing Income-Contingent Loans vs. Fixed Repayment
- 93 Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans
- 94 Solution to Constrained Planner's Problem
- 95 Solution to Constrained Planner's Problem
- 96 Constrained-Optimum = 1.3% Increase in Lifetime Consumption
- 97 Constrained-Optimum = 1.3% Increase in Lifetime Consumption
- 98 Constrained-Optimum = 1.3% Increase in Lifetime Consumption
- 99 Welfare Gain is Positive as Long as $\phi < 0.37$
- 100 Next: Other Budget-Neutral Contracts...

- [101 Next: Other Budget-Neutral Contracts...](#)
- [102 Next: Other Budget-Neutral Contracts...](#)
- [103 Next: Other Budget-Neutral Contracts...](#)
- [104 Next: Other Budget-Neutral Contracts...](#)
- [105 Outline](#)
- [106 Summary of Results](#)
- [107 Summary of Results](#)
- [108 The Big Picture](#)
- [110 .](#)
- [111 START OF APPENDIX](#)
- [112 Summary of Financing Options to Potential Borrowers](#)
- [113 Variable Definitions](#)
- [114 Worldwide Interest in Income-Contingent Repayment](#)
- [115 Worldwide Interest in Income-Contingent Repayment](#)
- [116 Marginal HELP Repayment Rates on 100 AUD](#)
- [117 HELP Repayment Rates and Repayments](#)
- [118 News Article: Policy Change](#)
- [119 Occupation-Specific Income Profiles Relative to Thresholds](#)
- [120 Summary Statistics](#)
- [121 Debt Balances by Age](#)
- [122 Debt Balances by Age: Individuals with Positive Debt at Age 22](#)
- [123 83% of Bunching in HELP Income Present in Labor Income](#)
- [124 No Bunching at Repayment Threshold for Non-Debtholders](#)
- [125 Alternative Measure of Hourly Flexibility](#)
- [126 Bunching Uncorrelated with Measure of Evasion](#)
- [127 Bunching Uncorrelated with Measure of Evasion](#)
- [128 Occupation-Level Regressions](#)
- [129 Computation of Bunching Statistic](#)
- [130 Bunching Heterogeneity by Super Wealth: Ages 20-29](#)
- [131 Less Bunching in Regions with More Housing Wealth](#)
- [132 Limited Evidence of Dynamic Cost to Bunching](#)
- [133 Bunching Among Wage-Earners vs. Entrepreneurs](#)

- 134 Elasticity of Moments with Respect to Parameters
- 135 SMM Objective is Smooth in Labor Supply Parameters
- 136 Second-Stage Simulated Minimum Distance: Other Moments
- 137 Comparison of Estimated Elasticity with Existing Literature
- 138 Comparison with Existing Literature on Labor Supply
- 139 Full Estimation Results
- 140 Model Fit: Other Target Moments
- 141 Liquidity: Borrowing Constraints Amplify Responses
- 142 Dynamics: Bunching Depends on Probability of Repayment
- 143 Model: Bunching Decreases in Initial Assets
- 144 Laffer Curve from Linear Taxation
- 145 Decomposition of Fiscal Impact: Endogenous Labor Supply
- 146 Decomposition of Fiscal Impact: Alternative ϕ
- 147 Marginal Value of Public Funds
- 148 Solution to Constrained Planner's Problem: Quadratic
- 149 Optimal versus Existing Income-Contingent Loans
- 150 Distribution of Initial Welfare Gains: ICL
- 151 Distribution of Initial Welfare Gains: ISA
- 152 Heterogeneity in Welfare Gains across Initial States
- 153 Individuals with Initial Welfare Losses: ICL
- 154 Welfare Gains by Age
- 155 Certainty-Equivalents across Initial Debt
- 156 Welfare Gains from Income-Contingent Loans: Alt. Models
- 157 Constraining Repayment Rate Reduces Welfare Gains
- 158 Forgiveness Reduces Welfare Gains
- 159 No Gains to Adding Forbearance to Income-Contingent Loans
- 160 Fit of Model in which Fixed Repayment is Optimal
- 161 Bunching when Fixed Repayment is Optimal vs. Occupations
- 162 How Income-Contingent Loans Vary with ϕ
- 163 Alternative Contracts Reduce Welfare Cost of Moral Hazard
- 164 Alternative Forms of Income-Contingent Loans: $\phi = 0.37$
- 165 Alternative Forms of Income-Contingent Loans: Baseline ϕ
- 166 Reducing Welfare Cost of Moral Hazard: Baseline ϕ

[167 Survey of Threshold Location](#)

[168 Repayment Status of US Student Loans](#)

[169 Shortcuts in Adobe Acrobat](#)