Insurance versus Moral Hazard in Income-Contingent Student Loan Repayment

Tim de Silva
MIT Sloan

February 2024

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

- Standard contract in US
- Hard to discharge

Income-Contingent Loan

- Used in US, UK, Australia, Canada

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

- Standard contract in US
- Hard to discharge

– Borrowers bear most of risk

➥ US "crisis": 25% default within 5 years

Income-Contingent Loan

- Used in US, UK, Australia, Canada

Equity

- Share of earnings
- Limited successful examples

+ Insurance

– Disincentivize labor supply

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

– Borrowers bear most of risk

Income-Contingent Loan

- Used in US, UK, Australia, Canada

Equity

- Share of earnings
- Limited successful examples

+ Insurance

– Disincentivize labor supply

+ Encourage investment & 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

- 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

+ Insurance

– Disincentivize labor supply

+ Encourage investment & 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

- 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

+ Insurance

— Disincentivize labor supply

+ Encourage investment & risk-taking

— Incentivize over-borrowing

— Adverse selection

This Paper: Insurance vs. Moral Hazard

This Paper

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

1. **Setting**: Australian government's income-contingent student 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

This Paper

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

1. Setting: Australian government's income-contingent student 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 estimates of preference parameters
   - **Normative**: characterize optimal amount and form of income-contingent repayment

This Paper

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

1. Setting: Australian government's income-contingent student 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 estimates of preference parameters
   - **Normative**: characterize optimal amount and form of income-contingent repayment
   - **Caveat**: compute optimal contracts taking ex-ante choices as given

Main Results

1. **Empirics**: borrowers reduce labor supply to $\downarrow$ income-contingent repayments
   - Larger responses in occupations with more hourly flexibility
   - Responses increase with liquidity constraints and decrease with **P**(repayment)
2. **Structural estimation**: labor supply elasticity of **0.11** $+$ adjustment frictions
3. **Contract design**: moral hazard reduces optimal amount of insurance
   - Fixed repayment $\rightarrow$ optimal income-contingent loan $\Rightarrow \uparrow$ **1.3%** lifetime consumption
   - Forbearance $+$ fixed repayment does worse because of slower repayment

Main Results

1. **Empirics**: borrowers reduce labor supply to $\downarrow$ income-contingent repayments
   - Larger responses in occupations with more hourly flexibility
   - Responses increase with liquidity constraints and decrease with **P**(repayment)
2. **Structural estimation**: labor supply elasticity of **0.11** $+$ adjustment frictions
3. **Contract design**: moral hazard reduces optimal amount of insurance
   - Fixed repayment $\rightarrow$ 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 affects contract design, but too small to justify fixed repayment

Related Literature & Contributions

1. Financing of human capital Bovenberg-Jacobs 2005, Lochner-Monge-Naranjo 2016, Stantcheva 2017
2. Empirical effects of student loans
   - $\uparrow$ Debt $\Rightarrow$ $\uparrow$ delinquencies, $\downarrow$ mobility, $\downarrow$ income Di Maggio et al. 2021, $\downarrow$ homeownership Mezza et al. 2020, Δ occupation Luo-Mongey 2019, Δ major Hampole 2022
   - Income-contingent loans $\Rightarrow$ $\downarrow$ delinquencies Herbst 2023, $\downarrow$ defaults Mueller-Yannelis 2019

Related Literature & Contributions

1. Financing of human capital Bovenberg-Jacobs 2005, Lochner-Monge-Naranjo 2016, Stantcheva 2017
2. Empirical effects of student loans
   - $\uparrow$ Debt $\Rightarrow$ $\uparrow$ delinquencies, $\downarrow$ mobility, $\downarrow$ income Di Maggio et al. 2021, $\downarrow$ homeownership Mezza et al. 2020, Δ occupation Luo-Mongey 2019, Δ major Hampole 2022
   - Income-contingent loans $\Rightarrow$ $\downarrow$ delinquencies Herbst 2023, $\downarrow$ defaults Mueller-Yannelis 2019

Contributions:

1. Empirical evidence of moral hazard from income-contingent repayment
   Britton-Gruber 2020, Herbst et al. 2023
2. Structural model of labor supply that replicates these responses
   - ✓ Choice of labor supply is **dynamic**: income-contingent repayment + frictions
3. Quantification of how moral hazard affects optimal contract design

Related Literature & Contributions

3. Insurance vs. moral hazard in social insurance: UI Gruber 1997, Chetty 2008, Ganong-Noel 2019, HH bankruptcy Dobbie-Song 2015, Indarte 2023, health insurance Einav et al. 2015
4. State-contingent securities for households Shiller 2004, Caplin et al. 2007, Mian-Sufi 2014, Hartman-Glaser-Hébert 2020, Greenwald et al. 2021, Campbell et al. 2021, Benetton et al. 2022
5. Bunching at discontinuities in tax rates Saez 2010, Chetty et al. 2011, Kleven-Waseem 2013
6. Determinants of labor supply 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 Impact 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 Impact of Income-Contingent Repayment
5. Conclusion

Student Loans in Australia: HELP

- Australian citizens eligible for government-provided student loans through **HELP**
- **Initial debt** = tuition – government contribution – upfront payment (average $\approx$ \$20K USD)
- Debt grows at CPI net of **income-contingent repayments**:

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

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

- 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

▸ ICL Prevalence ▸ Variable Definitions

Why Study Income-Contingent Repayment in Australia?

- Benefit #1: only one government contract + no private market
  - Only choice is between borrowing and paying upfront; former heavily subsidized
  - ✓ Limited scope for **adverse selection** (or selection on moral hazard)
- Benefit #2: loans can only be used for tuition
  - Tuition is government-controlled at public universities (94% of enrollment)
  - ✓ 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 private market
  - Only choice is between borrowing and paying upfront; former heavily subsidized
  - ✓ Limited scope for **adverse selection** (or selection on moral hazard)
- Benefit #2: loans can only be used for tuition
  - Tuition is government-controlled at public universities (94% of enrollment)
  - ✓ 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

▸ Differences from US

Identifying Variation: Discontinuities in Repayment Rates

Identifying Variation: Policy Change to Repayment Rates

Note: policy change applied to new and existing debtholders

Repayment Threshold Increases **Average** Repayment Rate

Note: policy change applied to new and existing debtholders

Repayment Threshold Increases **Liquidity** more than **Wealth**

Note: policy change applied to new and existing debtholders

Repayment Threshold Increases **Liquidity** more than **Wealth**

Note: policy change applied to new and existing debtholders

Repayment Threshold Increases **Liquidity** more than **Wealth**

Note: policy change applied to new and existing debtholders

Marginal Rates | Payments | News | Occupations

Data

1. Universe of individual tax returns from Australian Tax Office ($\sim$ US Form 1040)
2. Administrative HELP data: debt balances and repayments
3. 2016 Household Census: self-reported hours and mortgage $+$ rent payments
4. Administrative retirement savings data: superannuation balances
5. HILDA: survey data on hours worked and asset holdings

DATA

1. Universe of individual tax returns from Australian Tax Office ($\sim$ US Form 1040)
2. Administrative HELP data: debt balances and repayments
3. 2016 Household Census: self-reported hours and mortgage $+$ rent payments
4. Administrative retirement savings data: superannuation balances
5. HILDA: survey data on hours worked and asset holdings

Sample: $\sim$ 4 million unique debtholders between ages 20-64 from 1991-2018

- Mean HELP Income at age 26 = $34K with 98% from labor income

Limitation: no information about borrowing (e.g., degree, institution) (in progress!)

▸ Summary Stats ▸ Debt by Age ▸ Debt Repay

Outline

1. Institutional Background and Data
2. Labor Supply Responses to Income-Contingent Repayment
3. Life Cycle Model with Endogenous Labor Supply
4. Welfare Impact 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? ▸ Source ▸ Non-Debt ▸ Labor ▸ vs Tax

Borrowers Below Repayment Threshold Work Fewer Hours

- In 2016, reduction is around **1** hour/week = 1.4 fewer weeks per year

More Bunching in Occupations with Greater Hourly Flexibility

Sample: all wage-earners between 2005-2018

Alt. Measure Evasion Table Profiles Additional Results

P(Repayment) Matters: Bunching Decreases with Wage Growth

Multivariate

P(Repayment) Matters: Bunching Increases with Debt

Note: confidence intervals omitted due to small size

▸ b Details

P(Repayment) Matters: Bunching Increases with Debt

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

Taking Stock

Empirical facts:

▸ Additional Results

1. Borrowers reduce 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
   - **P**(repayment): increases with debt, decreases with wage growth and peak
   - Liquidity: increases with liquidity demands, decreases with retirement wealth
3. Limited evidence of future wage reductions from reducing labor supply ▸

Taking Stock

Empirical facts:

Additional Results

1. Borrowers reduce 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
   - **P**(repayment): increases with debt, decreases with wage growth and peak
   - Liquidity: increases with liquidity demands, decreases with retirement wealth
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 Impact of Income-Contingent Repayment
5. Conclusion

Model Description

Overview

$$\text{Life cycle model with debt} + \underbrace{\text{incomplete markets}}_{\Rightarrow \text{ demand for insurance}} + \underbrace{\text{endogenous labor supply}}_{\Rightarrow \text{ moral hazard}}$$

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 aggregate risk, partial equilibrium)
  - Shocks are uninsurable: borrowing allowed up to age-dependent limit with interest
- After age 64, individuals retire and choose consumption c_a

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 aggregate risk, partial equilibrium)
  - 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 ⇒ more leisure **and** $1400 more cash-on-hand

Labor Supply Optimization Frictions

- Choice of ℓ_a subject to two **optimization frictions** to give mass above threshold
  - Similar to models of pricing Nakamura-Steinsson 2010 and refinancing Andersen et al. 2020

1. Canonical model of **time**-dependent adjustment (Calvo):
   - Fraction λ hit by shock and adjust l_a, other $1 - \lambda$ set $l_a = l_{a-1}$
   - E.g., inattention, arrival of opportunities to change hours/jobs

2. Canonical model of **state**-dependent adjustment (sS):
   - Individuals hit by Calvo shock incur utility cost f, **if** they choose $l_a \neq l_{a-1}$
   - 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
  - Similar to models of pricing Nakamura-Steinsson 2010 and refinancing Andersen et al. 2020

1. Canonical model of **time**-dependent adjustment (Calvo):
   - Fraction λ hit by shock and adjust l_a, other $1 - \lambda$ set $l_a = l_{a-1}$
   - E.g., inattention, arrival of opportunities to change hours/jobs

2. Canonical model of **state**-dependent adjustment (sS):
   - Individuals hit by Calvo shock incur utility cost f, **if** they choose $l_a \neq l_{a-1}$
   - E.g., real or psychological costs of changing hours/jobs
   - Robustness: linear adjustment costs

- 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

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

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

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

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

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

$$\mathbf{s}_a = \begin{pmatrix} a & t & A_a & D_a & \theta_a & \epsilon_a & \ell_{a-1} & \omega_a \end{pmatrix}$$

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

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

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

$$\mathbf{s}_a = \begin{pmatrix} a & t & A_a & D_a & \theta_a & \epsilon_a & \ell_{a-1} & \omega_a \end{pmatrix}$$

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

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

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

$$\mathbf{s}_a = \begin{pmatrix} a & t & A_a & D_a & \theta_a & \epsilon_a & \ell_{a-1} & \omega_a \end{pmatrix}$$

- 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

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

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

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

$$\mathbf{s}_a = \begin{pmatrix} a & t & A_a & D_a & \theta_a & \epsilon_a & \ell_{a-1} & \omega_a \end{pmatrix}$$

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

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

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

$$\mathbf{s}_a = \begin{pmatrix} a & t & A_a & D_a & \theta_a & \epsilon_a & \ell_{a-1} & \omega_a \end{pmatrix}$$

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

Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock

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

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

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

$$\mathbf{s}_a = \begin{pmatrix} a & t & A_a & D_a & \theta_a & \epsilon_a & \ell_{a-1} & \omega_a \end{pmatrix}$$

- 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

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

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

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

$$\mathbf{s}_a = \begin{pmatrix} a & t & A_a & D_a & \theta_a & \epsilon_a & \ell_{a-1} & \omega_a \end{pmatrix}$$

- 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

First-Stage Calibration

- **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 tax office
- **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

First-Stage Calibration

- **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 tax office
- **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

$$\text{Parameters} = \left(\qquad \right)$$

- **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**

$$\text{Parameters} = \left(\overbrace{\phi \quad f \quad \lambda}^{\text{labor supply}} \qquad \qquad \right)$$

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

▸ Elasticities ▸ SMM Objective

Second-Stage Simulated Method of Moments: **Identification**

$$\text{Parameters} = \left(\overbrace{\phi \quad f \quad \lambda}^{\text{labor supply}} \right)$$

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

▸ Elasticities ▸ SMM Objective

Second-Stage Simulated Method of Moments: **Identification**

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

- Labor supply elasticity: identified by bunching below repayment threshold
- Frictions: identified by mass above repayment threshold
- Separate identification of frictions
  - **Intuition**: with $f = 0$, decision to bunch depends on Calvo shock not incentives
  - Moments: heterogeneity in bunching with **debt**, bunching at **0.5%** threshold
- No panel data on hours $\Rightarrow$ wage profile & wage risk estimated **jointly**

▸ Other Parameters ▸ Elasticities ▸ SMM Objective

Estimation Results

Parameter		Estimation: Baseline
Labor supply elasticity	ϕ	0.114
Fixed adjustment cost	f	\$377
Calvo parameter	λ	0.183
Time discount factor	β	0.973
Labor supply scaling parameter	κ	0.560
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
All Results with SE

Estimation Results

Parameter		Estimation	
		Baseline	No Frictions
Labor supply elasticity	ϕ	0.114	0.005
Fixed adjustment cost	f	\$377	·
Calvo parameter	λ	0.183	·
Time discount factor	β	0.973	0.996
Labor supply scaling parameter	κ	0.560	0.030
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
All Results with SE

Estimation Results

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
Time discount factor	β	0.973	0.996	0.951
Labor supply scaling parameter	κ	0.560	0.030	1.242
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
All Results with SE

Model Fit: Bunching Before and After Policy Change

Model Fit: Bunching Before and After Policy Change

Model Fit: Bunching Heterogeneity

Model Fit: Bunching Heterogeneity

▸ Model Fit: Other Moments ▸ Additional Results

Outline

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

Normative Perspective

Conditional on government subsidy for higher education, 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

Normative Perspective

Conditional on government subsidy for higher education, 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
- **Three** ways to provide insurance:
  1. Within-individuals over the life cycle
  2. Across ex-post states at each age (e.g., wage shocks)
  3. Across ex-ante states (e.g., initial permanent income)
- **Two** forms of moral hazard: bunching + intensive-margin responses

Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans

Find solution to **constrained**-planner's problem with income-contingent loans:

$$\max \mathbf{E}_0 \left(V_{a_0}^{1-\gamma} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\gamma}}$$

(behind the "veil-of-ignorance")

Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans

Find solution to **constrained**-planner's problem with income-contingent loans:

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

subject to: (à la Ramsey, not Mirrlees)

$$\text{Repayments}_a = \psi * \max\{y_a - K, 0\} \quad \text{(US/UK)} \tag{1}$$

Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans

Find solution to **constrained**-planner's problem with income-contingent loans:

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

subject to:

$$\text{Repayments}_a = \min \left\{ \psi * \max \left\{ y_a - K, 0 \right\}, D_a \right\} \tag{1}$$

Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans

Find solution to **constrained**-planner's problem with income-contingent loans:

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

subject to:

$$\text{Repayments}_a = \min \left\{ \psi * \max \left\{ y_a - K, 0 \right\}, D_a \right\} \tag{1}$$

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

Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans

Find solution to **constrained**-planner's problem with income-contingent loans:

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

subject to:

$$\text{Repayments}_a = \min \left\{ \psi * \max \{ y_a - K, 0 \}, D_a \right\} \tag{1}$$

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

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_a} = \underbrace{\beta^{a-a_0}}_{\text{individual time preference}} * \underbrace{\prod_{s=0}^{a-a_0} m_s}_{\text{mortality}}$$

Robustness with $\mathcal{R}_a =$ risk-free rate and risk-free rate $+$ 4%

Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans

Find solution to **constrained**-planner's problem with income-contingent loans:

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

subject to:

$$\text{Repayments}_a = \min \left\{ \psi * \max \left\{ y_a - K, 0 \right\}, D_a \right\} \tag{1}$$

$$\mathbf{E}_0 \sum_{a=a_0}^{a_T} \frac{\text{Repayments}_a + \text{Taxes}_a - \text{Transfers}_a}{\mathcal{R}_a} \geq \mathcal{G}_{\text{25-Year Fixed}} \tag{2}$$

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_a} = \underbrace{\beta^{a-a_0}}_{\text{individual time preference}} * \underbrace{\prod_{s=0}^{a-a_0} m_s}_{\text{mortality}}$$

Robustness with $\mathcal{R}_a =$ risk-free rate and risk-free rate $+$ 4%

Solution to Constrained-Planner's Problem

Smooth Contract | Compare with Existing | Non-Budget-Neutral

Solution to Constrained-Planner's Problem

Smooth Contract | Compare with Existing | Non-Budget-Neutral

Constrained-Optimum = 1.3% Increase in Lifetime Consumption

▸ Heterogeneity ▸ Restrict $\psi \leq 10\%$ ▸ Robustness: Alt. Models ▸ Robustness: Frictions

Constrained-Optimum = 1.3% Increase in Lifetime Consumption

▸ Heterogeneity ▸ Restrict $\psi \leq 10\%$ ▸ Robustness: Alt. Models ▸ Robustness: Frictions

Welfare Gain is Positive as Long as $\phi < 0.37$

Implied Bunching at $\phi = 0.37$ | Contracts by ϕ | Contracts to Reduce MH

Next: ICLs vs. Other Constrained-Optimal Contracts...

Just Providing Forbearance Gives Smaller Gains

- **Benefit** of income-contingent loan: accelerate payments from high-income

Adding Forgiveness Reduces Welfare Gains

- **Costs** of forgiveness: transfer repayments to young and finite repayment horizon

Equity Contract Gives Larger Gains

- **Benefit** of equity: uncapped payments from high-income ⇒ 70% higher threshold

Equity Contract Gives Larger Gains, But More **Dispersed**

- **Cost** of equity: more likely to cause losses from **ex-ante** responses and **selection**

Equity Contract Gives Larger Gains, But More **Dispersed**

- **Cost** of equity: more likely to cause losses from **ex-ante** responses and **selection**

▸ Heterogeneity ▸ Loss from Endogenous Selection ▸ Restructuring ▸ Additional Results

Outline

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

The Big Picture

- US "student debt crisis": **25%** of borrowers default within 5 years of graduation
  - Possible solution = change contracts to be income-contingent (e.g., SAVE)
- **This paper**: evidence + model to calibrate the effects of different contracts
  1. Ex-post moral hazard is not a reason to avoid income-contingent contracts
  2. Among these contracts, income-contingent loans are relatively effective and robust
- **Open question**: effects of income-contingent contracts on ex-ante choices?
- **Broader question**: is more state-contingent repayment useful for other liabilities?
  - HHs: government-provided shared-appreciation mortgages (UK, Canada)
  - Firms: revenue-based financing

Thank You!

www.timdesilva.me

tdesilva@mit.edu

APPENDIX

START OF APPENDIX

Illustration of Different Repayment Contracts

Back: Introduction
Back: This Paper
Back: Main Results

Survey of Threshold Location

Repayment Status of US Student Loans

Prevalence of Government-Provided Income-Contingent Loans

- Countries with **universal** adoption: Australia (1989), New Zealand (1991), UK (1998), Hungary (2001)
- Countries with **partial** adoption: US (1994), Thailand (2006), South Korea (2009), Brazil (2016), the Netherlands (2016), Japan (2017), Canada (2017), Colombia (2023)
- Countries **considering** adoption (as of 2022): Chile, France, Malaysia, Ireland

Source: Chapman-Dearden 2022

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

AU–US Differences Most Likely to Affect Contract Design

1. More debt in US due to higher tuition, longer degrees, and discretionary items
   - Larger demand for insurance in US, but also more moral hazard
   - Discretionary borrowing in US $\Rightarrow$ possible ex-ante moral hazard
2. Active private market in US cream-skims high-income borrowers Bachas 2019
   - Amount of insurance that can be provided might be lower in US
3. Student loans more subsidized in Australia than US
   - Different moral hazard in US (if there is selection on moral hazard) Karlan-Zinman 2009
4. Tuition and enrollment caps at public universities in Australia
   - Supply-side responses could increase fiscal cost of ICLs in US Kargar-Mann 2023
   - Note: I compare contracts with **identical** subsidy

Statistics Back

Differences between Australia and US: Statistics

Feature of Environment	Australia	US
Cost of Higher Education		
Public Undergraduate Tuition Cost	$2,700–$10,100 USD per year for CSPs	$9,500 USD per year for 4-Year In-State $39,000 USD per year for 4-Year Private Nonprofit
Total Cost of Attendance	$15,850 USD per year	$22,700 USD per year
Prevalence of Scholarships	Rare	Common
Initial Student Debt Borrowed	$8,100–$30,300 USD	$51,800 USD (Average)
Student Population		
% of Population with Undergraduate Degree	38%	32%
% of Undergraduates at Private Universities	6%	26%
% of Undergraduates from Abroad	16%	5%
% of Current Students Employed	50%	40%
Income Distribution and Taxes/Transfers		
Median Personal Income	$33,500 USD	$40,500 USD
Poverty Line for Single Individual	$16,200 USD	$14,580 USD
Gini Coefficient for Income	0.32	0.38
Marginal Tax Rate at Average Income	41%	41%
Heathcote et al. (2017) Tax Progressivity	0.133	0.184
1-Month Individual UI Replacement Rate	23%	35%
Union Membership Rate	13.7%	10.3%

Back: Benefits Back: Differences

Marginal HELP Repayment Rates on 100 AUD

Back

HELP Repayment Rates and Repayments

Back

News Article: Policy Change

FINANCIAL REVIEW

Newsfeed

Advertisement

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

Occcupation-Specific Income Profiles Relative to Thresholds

◂ Back: Policy ◂ Back: Hours ◂ Back: Table

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
HELP Income $<$ 0% Threshold	0.50	0.65
HELP Income $<$ 2004 0% Threshold	0.37	0.51
HELP Income $<$ 2005 0% Threshold	0.52	0.67
Number of Unique Individuals	19,484,517	4,013,382
Number of Individual-Year Observations	247,118,713	27,316,037

Back

Debt Balances by Age

Back

Debt Balances by Age: Individuals with Positive Debt at Age 22

Back

New Bunching Comes from Between Old and New Thresholds

Back

No Bunching at Repayment Threshold for Non-Debtholders

Back

Bunching in Labor Income = 83% of Bunching in HELP Income

Back

Bunching at Threshold is Larger than at Tax Kink: 2016

Back

Alternative Measure of Hourly Flexibility

Back

Bunching Uncorrelated with Measure of Evasion

Easier to misreport non–salary and wage income Paetzold-Winner 2016, Slemrod 2019

Back

Bunching Uncorrelated with Measure of Evasion

Easier to misreport non–salary and wage income Paetzold-Winner 2016, Slemrod 2019

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	·	·	·	1.30	1.05	0.50
	(0.35)	·	·	·	(0.35)	(0.28)	(0.23)
Evasion: Share with Non-Wage Income	·	−0.20	·	·	−0.02	−0.17	0.05
	·	(0.30)	·	·	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.25)
Income Slope: Mean Wage at 45 / Mean Wage at 26	·	·	−0.53	·	·	−0.40	·
	·	·	(0.10)	·	·	(0.12)	·
Income Peak: Maximum Wage in Occupation Profile	·	·	·	−0.48	·	·	−0.40
	·	·	·	(0.06)	·	·	(0.07)
R^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

Profiles Back: Hours Back: Slope 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 $+ X$] $\Rightarrow$ **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

Distribution
Back

Little Difference in Distribution of Future Income

Back

Additional Empirical Results

1. **Persistence** of bunching below threshold lasts around three years
2. No discontinuity in probability of **switching occupations** around threshold
3. Limited heterogeneity in bunching with household **demographics**
   - Caveat: no extensive margin responses, which can vary across groups Saez et al. 2012
4. Limited evidence of bunching coming from **firm responses** (as in Chetty et al. 2011)
5. Additional tests for **evasion**:
   - Bunching present in salary and wages, which is harder to misreport Slemrod 2019
   - Minimal difference in bunching based on filing type
   - Bunching declines by only 4% when dropping self-employed
   - Borrowers are median income $\Rightarrow$ less avoidance opportunities Slemrod-Yitzhaki 2002

Back: Hours Back: Summary

Persistence of Bunching Lasts around Three Years

Back

No Discontinuity in the Probability of Switching Occupations

Back

Demographic Heterogeneity in Bunching

Sample	Estimated Bunching Statistic: b
Non-Electronic Filers	0.086
Electronic Filers	0.082
Wage-Earners	0.081
Entrepreneurs (Not Wage-Earners)	0.117
Females	0.081
Males	0.083
No Dependent Children	0.086
Has Dependent Children	0.077
No Spouse	0.085
Has Spouse	0.081
Full Sample	**0.084**

Back

Chetty et al. (2011) Test of Firm Responses

Chetty et al: Teacher Wages

Borrower Labor Income

Back

Bunching in Distribution of Salary and Wages

HELP Income

Salary and Wages

Back

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

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

- 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 with Existing Literature on Labor Supply (1/2)

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

Comparison with Existing Literature on Labor Supply (2/2)

Reasons why elasticity may be smaller:

1. Different sample: college graduates with less flexibility and further from $y_t = w_t l_t$
2. Elasticity is local to threshold: no high-income individuals Gruber-Saez 2002
3. Bunching does not identify extensive margin responses Saez et al. 2012

Contributions:

1. Empirical characterization of responses to income-contingent repayment
   - ℓ_t of indebted households responds to liquidity not wealth, like c_t Ganong-Noel 2020
2. Dynamic model of labor supply with time- and state-dependent adjustment
   - ✓ First paper (to my knowledge) to explicitly estimate different types of frictions

Back

Full Estimation Results

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

◂ Back: Estimation ◂ Back: Additional

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

Additional Model Results: Positive

1. **Robustness**: $\widehat{\phi} = 0.111$ with linear adjustment costs (vs. 0.114)
2. **Validation** of baseline model on nontargeted moments:
   - Matches heterogeneity in bunching by debt and age, while LBD model cannot
   - Replicates bunching at changes in marginal income tax rates
3. Bunching **decomposition**: $P(\text{Repayment}) \approx 60\%$, liquidity demands $\approx 40\%$
4. **Laffer curve**: revenue-maximizing linear tax rate close to static model

Back

Validation of Baseline Model on Nontargeted Bunching

Heterogeneity by Debt and Age

Bunching at Changes in Tax Rates

Back

Learning-by-Doing Model Fits Worse than Baseline Model

Back

Decomposition: Rate Differential, Repayment, and Liquidity

$$\text{Bunching Liquidity Gain} = \$1400 \geq \$1400 \times \frac{r + 1 - p}{1 + r} = \text{Bunching NPV Gain}$$

- Interest rate differential $\Rightarrow$ 0% of bunching
- Probability of repayment $\Rightarrow$ 61% of bunching
- Demand for liquidity $\Rightarrow$ 39% of bunching (Chetty 2008, Ganong-Noel 2023, Indarte 2023)

Back

Laffer Curve from Linear Taxation

Back

Existing Income-Contingent Loans vs. Fixed Repayment

Decomposition MVPF Back

Decomposition of Fiscal Impact: Endogenous Labor Supply

Back

Marginal Value of Public Funds

Back

Solution to Constrained-Planner's Problem: Quadratic

Back

Optimal versus Existing Income-Contingent Loans

Change in Marginal Rate

Change in Average Rate

Back

Distribution of Initial Welfare Gains: ICL

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

Heterogeneity by Initial States | Losers | Heterogeneity by Age | Back

Distribution of Initial Welfare Gains: ICL vs. Equity

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

Heterogeneity by Initial States
Back

Heterogeneity in Welfare Gains across Initial States

Losers under ICL | Heterogeneity by Age | Heterogeneity by Initial Debt | Back: ICL Gain | Back: Contracts

Individuals with Initial Welfare Losses: ICL

Heterogeneity by Age
Back: ICL Gain
Back: Contracts

Welfare Gains by Age

Back: ICL Gain
Back: Contracts

Certainty-Equivalents across Initial Debt

Back: ICL Gain
Back: Contracts

Constraining Repayment Rate Reduces Welfare Gains

Back

Fit of Model in which Fixed Repayment is Optimal

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

Contract Structures
Baseline ϕ
Back

Alternative Forms of Income-Contingent Loans: $\phi = 0.37$

Back

Reducing Welfare Cost of Moral Hazard: Baseline ϕ

Contract Structures
Back

Alternative Forms of Income-Contingent Loans: Baseline ϕ

Back

Effects of Endogenous Contract Selection

	Constrained-Optimal Contract	
	Income-Contingent Loan	9-Year ISA with Threshold
% Choose 25-Year Fixed Repayment	29%	24%
Borrower Value of Selection	\$180	\$1,544
Fiscal Impact of Selection	-\$757	-\$6,841
Consumption-Equivalent Welfare Gains		
Contract Mandated	1.32%	1.99%
Selection + Taxes to Balance Budget	1.29%	1.64%
Welfare Impact of Selection	−0.03%	−0.35%

- Borrowers choose between two contracts after learning $\mathbf{s}_0$
- After balancing budget, selection **reduces** welfare à la Hirshleifer (1971)

Back

Effects of Restructuring from 25-Year Fixed Repayment

- To do: effects of endogenous **opt-out** and optimal **restructuring** contract

Back

Additional Model Results: Normative

1. Welfare gains are more sensitive to **risk aversion** than EIS
2. Planner's problem is more sensitive to **fixed cost** than Calvo probability
3. No welfare loss from discontinuity in **average** repayment rate
4. **Pure equity** contract does worse than income-contingent loan
5. No welfare gain from **combining** forbearance with income-contingent loans
6. With **optimal tax** progressivity, forbearance is enough and gains are smaller
7. Robustness to **model mispecification** and **alternative frictions**

Back

Effects of Changing Risk Aversion and EIS

Back

Effects of Changing Fixed Cost and Calvo Probability

	Difference from Baseline Model	Welfare Gain	$=$ Insurance	$+$ Moral Hazard	ψ^*	K^*
(1)	$f = 0$	1.31%	1.61%	-0.3%	46%	\$29,618
(2)	$f = \$2278$	1.49%	1.65%	-0.16%	64%	\$33,915
(3)	$\lambda = 1$	1.27%	1.34%	-0.07%	38%	\$28,191
(4)	$\lambda = 0.147$	1.32%	1.47%	-0.15%	40%	\$28,492
	Baseline Model	**1.32%**	**1.47%**	**-0.15%**	**33%**	**\$27,147**

Back

No Loss from Discontinuity in Average Repayment Rate

Back

Pure Equity Does Worse than Income-Contingent Loan

Back

No Gains to Adding Forbearance to Income-Contingent Loans

Back

Welfare Gains with Optimal Tax Progressivity

Back

Robustness to Model Misspecification

	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)	Fixed Adjustment Cost Only	1.00%	1.49%	−0.49%	21%	$22,711
(4)	Calvo Adjustment Only	2.02%	2.10%	−0.08%	64%	$46,452
(5)	Linear Adjustment Cost	1.74%	1.87%	−0.13%	53%	$43,560
(6)	Wealth Effects on Labor Supply	0.82%	1.05%	−0.23%	37%	$30,307
(7)	Less Persistent Shocks: $\rho = 0.8$	0.90%	1.14%	−0.23%	42%	$34,244
(8)	More Persistent Shocks: $\rho = 0.99$	1.35%	1.63%	−0.28%	35%	$18,949
(9)	Non-Normal Permanent Shocks	1.14%	1.43%	−0.30%	28%	$26,933
(10)	Debt Interest Rate = 2%	1.96%	2.14%	−0.18%	38%	$47,731
(11)	Planner Discount Rate = R	1.06%	1.41%	−0.35%	29%	$22,696
(12)	Planner Discount Rate = $R + 4\%$	1.60%	1.65%	−0.05%	46%	$34,441
(13)	US Tax System	1.18%	1.36%	−0.19%	38%	$28,838
(14)	Larger Initial Debt Balances	3.50%	4.72%	−1.22%	36%	$18,867
(15)	Risk-Free Borrowing: $\tau_b = 0\%$	1.68%	1.82%	−0.15%	44%	$39,809
(16)	No Ex-Post Uncertainty	0.58%	0.76%	−0.17%	27%	$18,098
(17)	No Uncertainty	−0.17%	0.15%	−0.32%	21%	$26,906
	Average	1.35%	1.64%	−0.28%	37%	$30,939
	Baseline Model	**1.32%**	**1.47%**	**-0.15%**	**33%**	**$27,147**

◂ Back: ICL Gain ◂ Back: Additional Results

Robustness to Alternative Models of Frictions

	Difference from Baseline Model	Welfare Gain	$=$ Insurance	$+$ Moral Hazard	ψ^*	K^*
(1)	$f = 0$	1.31%	1.61%	-0.3%	46%	\$29,618
(2)	$f = \$2278$	1.49%	1.65%	-0.16%	64%	\$33,915
(3)	$\lambda = 1$	1.27%	1.34%	-0.07%	38%	\$28,191
(4)	$\lambda = 0.147$	1.32%	1.47%	-0.15%	40%	\$28,492
(5)	Fixed Adjustment Cost Only	1.00%	1.49%	-0.49%	21%	\$22,711
(6)	Calvo Adjustment Only	2.02%	2.10%	-0.08%	64%	\$46,452
(7)	Linear Adjustment Cost	1.74%	1.87%	-0.13%	53%	\$43,560
	Baseline Model	**1.32%**	**1.47%**	**-0.15%**	**33%**	**\$27,147**

- Loss from moral hazard is larger when adjustment is more **state**-dependent
- Larger gains with **linear** adjustment costs: more insurance and less moral hazard

◂ Back: ICL Gain ◂ Back: Additional Results

Shortcuts in Adobe Acrobat

Physical vs. logical page numbers

- Windows: Ctrl + K, uncheck ”Use Logical Page Numbers”
- Mac: Cmd + K, uncheck ”Use Logical Page Numbers”
- Always toggle on/off closing window and then reopening

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 This Paper
13 Main Results
14 Main Results
15 Related Literature & Contributions
16 Related Literature & Contributions
17 Related Literature & Contributions
18 Outline
19 Outline
20 Student Loans in Australia: HELP
21 Why Study Income-Contingent Repayment in Australia?
22 Why Study Income-Contingent Repayment in Australia?
23 Identifying Variation: Discontinuities in Repayment Rates
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 Identifying Variation: Discontinuities in Repayment Rates
29 Data
30 Data
31 Outline
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 Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments
38 Borrowers Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments
39 Borrowers Adjust Income to Reduce Repayments
40 Borrowers Below Repayment Threshold Work Fewer Hours
41 More Bunching in Occupations with Greater Hourly Flexibility
42 P(Repayment) Matters: Bunching Decreases with Wage Growth
43 P(Repayment) Matters: Bunching Increases with Debt
44 P(Repayment) Matters: Bunching Increases with Debt
45 Bunching Increases with Proxies for Liquidity Constraints
46 Bunching Increases with Proxies for Liquidity Constraints
47 Taking Stock
48 Taking Stock
49 Outline
51 Overview
52 Overview
53 Overview
54 Bunching Consistent with Positive Labor Supply Elasticity
55 Bunching Consistent with Positive Labor Supply Elasticity
56 Labor Supply Optimization Frictions
57 Labor Supply Optimization Frictions
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
71 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
72 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
73 Optimization Problem of Individuals Hit by Calvo Shock
75 First-Stage Calibration
76 First-Stage Calibration
77 Second-Stage Simulated Method of Moments
78 Second-Stage Simulated Method of Moments
79 Second-Stage Simulated Method of Moments
80 Second-Stage Simulated Method of Moments
81 Estimation Results
82 Estimation Results
83 Estimation Results
84 Model Fit: Bunching Before and After Policy Change
85 Model Fit: Bunching Before and After Policy Change
86 Model Fit: Bunching Heterogeneity
87 Model Fit: Bunching Heterogeneity
88 Outline
89 Normative Perspective
90 Normative Perspective
91 Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans
92 Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans
93 Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans
94 Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans
95 Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans
96 Constrained-Optimal Income-Contingent Loans
97 Solution to Constrained-Planner's Problem
98 Solution to Constrained-Planner's Problem
99 Constrained-Optimum = 1.3% Increase in Lifetime Consumption
100 Constrained-Optimum = 1.3% Increase in Lifetime Consumption
101 Welfare Gain is Positive as Long as $\phi < 0.37$

102 Next: ICLs vs. Other Constrained-Optimal Contracts...
103 Next: ICLs vs. Other Constrained-Optimal Contracts...
104 Next: ICLs vs. Other Constrained-Optimal Contracts...
105 Next: ICLs vs. Other Constrained-Optimal Contracts...
106 Next: ICLs vs. Other Constrained-Optimal Contracts...
107 Next: ICLs vs. Other Constrained-Optimal Contracts...
108 Outline
109 The Big Picture
111 .
112 START OF APPENDIX
113 Illustration of Different Repayment Contracts
114 Survey of Threshold Location
115 Repayment Status of US Student Loans
116 Prevalence of Government-Provided Income-Contingent Loans
117 Variable Definitions
118 AU–US Differences Most Likely to Affect Contract Design
119 Differences between Australia and US: Statistics
120 Marginal HELP Repayment Rates on 100 AUD
121 HELP Repayment Rates and Repayments
122 News Article: Policy Change
123 Occcupation-Specific Income Profiles Relative to Thresholds
124 Summary Statistics
125 Debt Balances by Age
126 Debt Balances by Age: Individuals with Positive Debt at Age 22
127 New Bunching Comes from Between Old and New Thresholds
128 No Bunching at Repayment Threshold for Non-Debtholders
129 Bunching in Labor Income = 83% of Bunching in HELP Income
130 Bunching at Threshold is Larger than at Tax Kink: 2016
131 Alternative Measure of Hourly Flexibility
132 Bunching Uncorrelated with Measure of Evasion
133 Bunching Uncorrelated with Measure of Evasion
134 Occupation-Level Regressions

135 Computation of Bunching Statistic
136 Bunching Heterogeneity by Super Wealth: Ages 20-29
137 Less Bunching in Regions with More Housing Wealth
138 Limited Evidence of Dynamic Cost to Bunching
139 Little Difference in Distribution of Future Income
140 Additional Empirical Results
141 Persistence of Bunching Lasts around Three Years
142 No Discontinuity in the Probability of Switching Occupations
143 Demographic Heterogeneity in Bunching
144 Chetty et al. (2011) Test of Firm Responses
145 Bunching in Distribution of Salary and Wages
146 Elasticity of Moments with Respect to Parameters
147 SMM Objective is Smooth in Labor Supply Parameters
148 Second-Stage Simulated Minimum Distance: Other Moments
149 Comparison with Existing Literature on Labor Supply (1/2)
150 Comparison with Existing Literature on Labor Supply (2/2)
151 Full Estimation Results
152 Model Fit: Other Target Moments
153 Additional Model Results: Positive
154 Validation of Baseline Model on Nontargeted Bunching
155 Learning-by-Doing Model Fits Worse than Baseline Model
156 Decomposition: Rate Differential, Repayment, and Liquidity
157 Laffer Curve from Linear Taxation
158 Existing Income-Contingent Loans vs. Fixed Repayment
159 Decomposition of Fiscal Impact: Endogenous Labor Supply
160 Marginal Value of Public Funds
161 Solution to Constrained-Planner's Problem: Quadratic
162 Optimal versus Existing Income-Contingent Loans
163 Distribution of Initial Welfare Gains: ICL
164 Distribution of Initial Welfare Gains: ICL vs. Equity
165 Heterogeneity in Welfare Gains across Initial States
166 Individuals with Initial Welfare Losses: ICL
167 Welfare Gains by Age

168 Certainty-Equivalents across Initial Debt
169 Constraining Repayment Rate Reduces Welfare Gains
170 Fit of Model in which Fixed Repayment is Optimal
171 Bunching when Fixed Repayment is Optimal vs. Occupations
172 How Income-Contingent Loans Vary with ϕ
173 Alternative Contracts Reduce Welfare Cost of Moral Hazard
174 Alternative Forms of Income-Contingent Loans: $\phi = 0.37$
175 Reducing Welfare Cost of Moral Hazard: Baseline ϕ
176 Alternative Forms of Income-Contingent Loans: Baseline ϕ
177 Effects of Endogenous Contract Selection
178 Effects of Restructuring from 25-Year Fixed Repayment
179 Additional Model Results: Normative
180 Effects of Changing Risk Aversion and EIS
181 Effects of Changing Fixed Cost and Calvo Probability
182 No Loss from Discontinuity in Average Repayment Rate
183 Pure Equity Does Worse than Income-Contingent Loan
184 No Gains to Adding Forbearance to Income-Contingent Loans
185 Welfare Gains with Optimal Tax Progressivity
186 Robustness to Model Misspecification
187 Robustness to Alternative Models of Frictions
188 Shortcuts in Adobe Acrobat