

# Structural models for policy-making\*

## Coping with parametric uncertainty

Philipp Eisenhauer & Janoś Gabler & Lena Janys

University of Bonn

October 3, 2021

The ex-ante evaluation of policies using structural microeconomic models is based on estimated parameters as a stand-in for the truth. This practice ignores uncertainty in the counterfactual policy predictions of the model. We develop an approach that deals with parametric uncertainty and properly frames model-informed policy-making as a decision problem under uncertainty. We use the seminal human capital investment model by [Keane and Wolpin \(1997\)](#) as a well-known, influential, and empirically-grounded test case. We document considerable uncertainty in their policy predictions and highlight the resulting policy recommendations from using different formal rules on decision-making under uncertainty.

---

\*Corresponding author: Philipp Eisenhauer, [peisenha@uni-bonn.de](mailto:peisenha@uni-bonn.de). Philipp Eisenhauer and Lena Janys are both funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy - EXC 2126/1- 390838866 and the TRA Modelling (University of Bonn) as part of the Excellence Strategy of the federal and state governments. Janoś Gabler is grateful for financial support by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through CRC-TR 224 (Project C01) and funding by IZA Institute of Labor Economics. Lena Janys is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy - EXC 2047/1 - 390685813. We thank Tim Mensinger for his help in the early stages of the project. We thank Max Blesch, Joachim Freyberger, Annica Gehlen, Daniel Harenberg, Ken Judd, Gregor Reich, Jörg Stoye, and Rafael Suchy for numerous helpful discussions. We thank Michael Keane and Kenneth Wolpin for providing the dataset used in our analysis. We thank Annica Gehlen for her outstanding research assistance. We are grateful to the Social Sciences Computing Service (SSCS) at the University of Chicago for the permission to use their computational resources.

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Uncertainty propagation</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Statistical decision theory . . . . .	7
2.2. Confidence Set bootstrap . . . . .	10
<b>3. Eckstein-Keane-Wolpin models</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1. Model structure . . . . .	12
3.2. The career decisions of young men . . . . .	13
<b>4. Tuition policy</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1. General subsidy . . . . .	17
4.2. Targeted subsidy . . . . .	18
<b>5. Conclusion</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>A. Appendix</b>	<b>A-1</b>
A.1. Additional results . . . . .	A-1
A.2. Computation . . . . .	3
A.3. Data . . . . .	3

# 1. Introduction

Structural microeconometricians rely on parameterized computational models that assist in the investigation of economic mechanisms, predict the impact of proposed policies, and inform optimal policy-making (Wolpin, 2013). These models represent deep structural relationships of theoretical economic models invariant to policy changes (Hood and Koopmans, 1953). The uncertainties involved in such an analysis are ubiquitous (Saltelli et al., 2020). All models are misspecified, there are numerical approximation errors in the implementation, and its parameters are uncertain. A proper accounting of uncertainty is a prerequisite for using computational models in decision-making in most disciplines (National Research Council, 2012), numerous textbook treatments exist (Smith, 2014), and the required massive parallel computing infrastructure is readily available (Dongarra and Van der Steen, 2012). Economists can contribute decision theory as a toolkit for the systematic treatment of uncertainty in policy-making (Manski, 2013).

When using estimated structural microeconomic models for policy advice, however, we ignore parametric uncertainty. Instead, we conduct an as-if analysis where the point estimates serve as a stand-in for the true parameters. We study the implications of our models at the point estimates (Eisenhauer et al., 2015; Adda et al., 2017; Blundell et al., 2016; Eckstein et al., 2019) and rank competing policy proposals based on the point predictions (Cunha et al., 2010; Todd and Wolpin, 2006; Blundell and Shephard, 2012). In their handbook article, Keane et al. (2011) state that they are unaware of any work that has ever reported the distribution of policy simulations that account for parametric uncertainty. To the best of our knowledge, this statement remains true more than a decade later. Consequently, we accept fragile findings as facts, do not identify gaps in our knowledge, ignore the trade-off between model complexity and prediction uncertainty, and do not properly frame policy-advice as a decision problem under uncertainty.

We develop an approach that copes with parametric uncertainty and embeds model-informed policy-making in a decision-theoretic framework. We follow Manski (2021)'s suggestion and, instead of using the parameter estimates as-if they were true, we incorporate uncertainty in the analysis by treating the estimated confidence set as-if it is correct. This approach allows us to consider all parametrizations within the set for policy evaluation instead of just focusing on the point estimates. We estimate the set using the Confidence Set (CS) bootstrap recently proposed by Woutersen and Ham (2019) who build on the ideas in Rao (1973). We use the seminal human capital investment model by Keane and Wolpin (1997) as a well-known, influential, and empirically-grounded test case. We follow the authors and estimate the model on the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79) (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019) using the

original dataset and reproduce all core results. We revisit their predictions for the impact of a tuition subsidy on completed years of schooling. We document considerable uncertainty in the counterfactual policy predictions and highlight the resulting policy recommendations from different formal rules on decision-making under uncertainty.

Our work contributes to the literature on policy-making under uncertainty ([Manski, 2013](#); [Berger et al., 2020](#)). A structural microeconomic model provides policy-makers with predictions about the consequences of alternative policy proposals. However, the predictions are fraught with uncertainties even after the estimation of the model on data. Statistical decision theory allows for a systematic and transparent treatment of uncertainties in decision-making. We merge the two literatures by embedding a structural model in a decision-theoretic setting.

Our work extends existing research exploring the sensitivity of implications and predictions to parametric uncertainty in climate economics and macroeconomics. For example, [Harenberg et al. \(2019\)](#) study uncertainty propagation and sensitivity analysis for a standard real business cycle model. [Cai and Lontzek \(2019\)](#) examine how uncertainties and risks in economic and climate systems affect the social cost of carbon. However, neither of them estimates their model on data and instead rely on expert judgments to inform the degree of parametric uncertainty. They do not investigate the consequences of uncertainty for policy decisions.

Our work complements a burgeoning literature on the sensitivity analysis of policy predictions in light of model or moment misspecification. For example, [Andrews et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Andrews et al. \(2020\)](#) treat the model specification as given and then analyze the sensitivity of the parameter estimates to misspecification of the moments used in the estimation step. [Christensen and Connault \(2019\)](#) study global sensitivity of the model predictions to misspecification of the distribution of unobservables. However, their research does not take the remaining parametric uncertainty after estimating a structural model into account. [Jørgensen \(2020\)](#) provides a local measure for the sensitivity of quantities of interest to model parameters that are fixed before the estimation of the model. This literature on model or moment misspecification does not analyze the consequences of uncertainty for model-informed policy-making.

We structure the remainder of this paper as follows. We first describe the decision-theoretic framework and its operationalization using the CS bootstrap in Section 2 using an illustrative example. We then summarize the empirical setting of [Keane and Wolpin \(1997\)](#) in Section 3. Section 4 presents our results before we finish with a brief conclusion in Section 5.

## 2. Uncertainty propagation

We now outline the basic idea behind uncertainty propagation, provide more details on the current practice to use the estimated parameters as a plug-in replacement for the truth, and explore its limitations. We then discuss how to embed a model in a decision-problem under uncertainty. Finally, we present the Confidence Set bootstrap ([Woutersen and Ham, 2019](#); [Rao, 1973](#)).

At a high level, a structural microeconomic model  $\mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  provides a mapping between the  $l$  model parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$  and a quantity  $y$  that is of interest to policy-makers.

$$\mathbb{R}^l \supset \Theta \ni \boldsymbol{\theta} \mapsto \mathcal{M}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = y$$

A policy  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  changes the model to a modified version  $\mathcal{M}_g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  and produces a new value of the quantity of interest  $y_g$ . There is uncertainty about the model's true parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ .

Previewing our empirical analysis of [Keane and Wolpin \(1997\)](#), our  $\mathcal{M}$  is a dynamic model of human capital accumulation, which we estimate on observed schooling and labor market decisions using simulated maximum likelihood estimation. The policy  $g$  is the implementation of a college tuition subsidy, and the quantity of interest is the level of completed schooling in the population. Examples for  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  that drive the economics of the model are time preferences of individuals, the return to schooling, and the transferability of work experience across occupations.

Estimation of a baseline model – describing the status-quo – on observed data allows researchers to learn about the true parameters. Frequentist estimation procedures such as maximum likelihood estimation or the method of simulated moments produce a point estimate  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ . However, uncertainty about the true parameters remains.


We use a simplified example throughout this section to highlight our key points. We consider two models ( $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ ) that map  $\theta$  to the quantity of interest  $y_g$  under different policies  $g \in \{1, 2\}$ . In both cases, there is a single parameter whose point estimate  $\hat{\theta}$  is determined by estimating a baseline model on an observed dataset. We assume that the sampling distribution of the point estimate is a normal distribution with a mean of three and a standard deviation of three-fourth, i.e.,  $\hat{\theta} \sim \mathcal{N}(3, (3/4)^2)$ . We denote its probability density function by  $f_{\hat{\theta}}$ .

We parameterize the two models as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_1(\theta) : y_1 = \exp \theta$$

$$\mathcal{M}_2(\theta) : y_2 = 29.08 - 3\theta.$$

Under the first policy, the quantity of interest is an increasing nonlinear function of  $\theta$ . In the case of the second policy, the relationship is decreasing and linear.



**Figure 1.:** Model comparison

Figure 1 traces the quantity of interest from both models over a range of the parameter. At the point estimate, both models yield the same value for the quantity of interest. For higher values, the first policy is preferred, while the opposite is true for lower values. In Figure 2, focusing on the first policy, the dashed line shows the mapping from the point estimate  $\hat{\theta}$  to the point prediction  $\hat{y}_1$  as mediated by the model  $\mathcal{M}_1$ .




Figure 2.: Uncertainty propagation

## 2.1. Statistical decision theory

Manski (2021) suggests acknowledging parametric uncertainty by working with confidence sets instead of point estimates. A confidence set  $\Theta(\alpha) \subset \Theta$  covers the true parameters, from an ex-ante point of view, with a predetermined coverage probability of  $(1 - \alpha)$ . More formally,

$$P(\theta_0 \in \Theta(\alpha)) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$


From now on, instead of using the estimated parameter values as-if they were true, we analyze policy decisions using the estimated confidence set  $\hat{\Theta}(\alpha)$  as-if it is correct. This approach ensures the tractability of our decision-theoretic analysis as the estimated confidence set of the parameters is much smaller than the whole parameter space  $\Theta$  of the model.

We rank the two policies of our example according to alternative statistical decision rules using a confidence set with a 90% coverage probability. All our results potentially depend on the size of the confidence set. In practice, policy-makers choose the confidence set's size in line with their underlying preferences - the more protection against unfavorable outcomes is desired, the larger the confidence set. We provide a more detailed discussion when presenting our results.

A decision problem is set up as follows: A decision-maker has a set of available actions that result in different consequences depending on the environment's uncertain state (Gilboa, 2009; Marinacci, 2015). A decision-maker has preferences over actions. In our case, the structural model maps alternative policies to the quantities of interest under an uncertain parameteriza-

tion of the model. For simplicity, we postulate a linear utility function  $U(y_g)$  describing the policy maker’s preferences for the quantity of interest in what follows.

Returning to our example, Figure 3 shows the implied sampling distribution of the predictions for the two alternative policies and the corresponding 90% confidence sets  $\Theta_{y_g}(0.1)$ . The model  $\mathcal{M}_2$  is linear, while the model  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is highly nonlinear. As a consequence, the spread of the confidence set differs considerably between the two models. When evaluated at the point estimate, the quantity of interest is the same under both policies, so a policy-maker is indifferent. However, the uncertainty differs considerably between the two, and a policy-maker faces a decision problem under uncertainty.



**Figure 3.:** Comparing policy predictions

Decision theory proposes a variety of different rules for reasonable decisions in this setting. We explore the following four: (1) as-if optimization, (2) maximin criterion, (3) minimax regret rule, and (4) subjective Bayes.

As-if optimization describes the current practice. The estimation of the model produces point estimates that serve as a plug-in for the true parameters. The decision maximizes the utility at the point estimate. More formally,

$$g^* = \arg \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} U(M_g(\hat{\theta})).$$

Given our example, a policy-maker is indifferent between the two policies. Both result in the same quantity of interest at the point estimates as indicated by the dashed line in Figure 3.

The maximin criterion and minimax regret rule are two common alternatives favoring actions



that work uniformly well over all possible parameters in the confidence set. This approach departs from as-if optimization, which only considers a policy’s performance at a single point in the confidence set. The maximin decision (Wald, 1950; Gilboa and Schmeidler, 1989) is determined by computing the minimum utility for each policy within the confidence set and choosing the one with the highest worst-case outcome. Stated concisely,


$$g^* = \arg \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \min_{\theta \in \Theta(\alpha)} U(M_g(\theta)).$$

In our simple example, and again returning to Figure 3, a policy-maker prefers  $g_2$  as its worst-case outcome within the confidence set  $\underline{y}_2$  is better than under the alternative policy  $g_1$ .

The minimax regret rule (Niehans, 1948; Manski, 2004) computes the maximum regret for each policy over the whole confidence set and chooses the policy that minimizes the maximum regret. The regret of choosing a policy for a particular parameterization of the model is the difference between the maximum possible utility and the actual utility. The decision maximizes:

$$g^* = \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \max_{\theta \in \Theta(\alpha)} \underbrace{\left[ \max_{\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{G}} U(M_{\tilde{g}}(\theta)) - U(M_g(\theta)) \right]}_{\text{regret}}.$$

Figure 4 compares our two policy examples over the confidence sets. A decision-maker adopting policy  $g_1$  regrets his choice for small values of the model parameter, while the opposite is true for larger values. The regret of each policy is maximized at the boundaries of the confidence set. Maximum regret is minimized when a policy-maker chooses  $g_1$ . It corresponds to the difference in the quantity of interest at the lower boundary of the confidence set instead of the larger difference at its upper bound. This outcome contradicts the maximin decision where policy  $g_2$  is preferred.



**Figure 4.:** Comparing policy regret

All decision rules presented so far focus on a single point in the confidence set as the policy’s relevant performance measure. Bayesian approaches aggregate a policy’s performance over the complete confidence set.

Maximization of the subjective expected utility (Savage, 1954) requires the decision maker to place a subjective probability distribution  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  over the parameters in the confidence set. Then a policy maker selects the alternative with the highest expected subjective utility. More formally,

$$g^* = \arg \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \int_{\hat{\Theta}(\alpha)} U(M_g(\boldsymbol{\theta})) d\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Applying a uniform prior for our example, a decision-maker chooses  $g_1$  as it performs well for high values of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and still reasonably well for low values.

## 2.2. Confidence Set bootstrap

We construct the confidence set for the quantity of interest  $\Theta_{y_g}(\alpha)$  in our empirical application using the Confidence Set bootstrap. This approach was recently proposed by Woutersen and Ham (2019) who build on ideas presented in Rao (1973). Algorithm 1 provides a concise description of the steps involved, where  $\chi_l^2(1 - \alpha)$  is the quantile function for probability  $1 - \alpha$  of the chi-square distribution with  $l$  degrees of freedom.

---

**Algorithm 1.** . Confidence Set bootstrap

---

```
for  $m = 1, \dots, M$  do
  Draw  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})$ 
  if  $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})' \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \leq \chi^2_l(1 - \alpha)$  then
    Compute  $\hat{y}_{g,m} = \mathcal{M}_g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)$ 
    Add  $\hat{y}_{g,m}$  to sample  $Y = \{\hat{y}_{g,1}, \dots, \hat{y}_{g,m-1}\}$ 
  end if
end for
Set  $\Theta_{y_g}(\alpha) = [\min(Y), \max(Y)]$ 
```

---

We draw a large sample of  $M$  parameters from the estimated asymptotic normal distribution of our estimator with mean  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  and covariance matrix  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ , accept only those draws that are elements of the confidence set of the model parameters, compute the quantity of interest for all remaining draws, and then calculate the confidence set for the quantity of interest based on its lowest and highest value.<sup>1</sup>

This approach does not rely on the applicability of the delta method in terms of the smoothness assumptions on the prediction function. We can thus construct confidence sets that are valid when the target function has kinks or is truncated. For example, for our evaluation of a tuition subsidy, the effect is bounded from below by zero.


### 3. Eckstein-Keane-Wolpin models

We now turn to the basic setup of Eckstein-Keane-Wolpin (EKW) models ([Aguirregabiria and Mira, 2010](#)). EKW models are often used by labor economists to learn about human capital investment and consumption-saving decisions and predict the impact of proposed reforms to education policy and welfare programs ([Keane et al., 2011](#); [Low and Meghir, 2017](#); [Blundell, 2017](#)). We start by presenting the general structure of this class of models and their solution approach. We then turn to the customized version used by [Keane and Wolpin \(1997\)](#) to study the career decisions of young men. We outline their model's basic setup, provide some descriptive statistics of the empirical data used in our estimation, and then discuss the core findings.

---

<sup>1</sup>See [Reich and Judd \(2020\)](#) for a critical assessment of confidence sets based on asymptotic arguments.

**Figure 5.:** Timing of events



### 3.1. Model structure

EKW models describe sequential decision-making under uncertainty (Gilboa, 2009; Machina and Viscusi, 2014). At time  $t = 1, \dots, T$  each individual observes the state of their choice environment  $s_t \in S$  and chooses an action  $a_t$  from the set of admissible actions  $\mathcal{A}$ . The decision has two consequences: an individual receives an immediate utility  $u_t(s_t, a_t)$  and their environment evolves to a new state  $s_{t+1}$ . The transition from  $s_t$  to  $s_{t+1}$  is affected by the action but remains uncertain. Individuals are forward-looking. Thus they do not simply choose the alternative with the highest immediate utility. Instead, they take the future consequences of their current action into account.

A policy  $\pi = (a_1^\pi(s_1), \dots, a_T^\pi(s_T))$  provides the individual with instructions for choosing an action in any possible future state. It is a sequence of decision rules  $a_t^\pi(s_t)$  that specify the action at a particular time  $t$  for any possible state  $s_t$  under  $\pi$ . The implementation of a policy generates a sequence of utilities that depends on the objective transition probability distribution  $p_t(s_t, a_t)$  for the evolution of state  $s_t$  to  $s_{t+1}$  induced by the model.

Figure 5 depicts the timing of events for two generic time periods. At the beginning of period  $t$ , an individual fully learns about each alternative's immediate utility, chooses one of them, and receives its immediate utility. Then the state evolves from  $s_t$  to  $s_{t+1}$  and the process is repeated in  $t+1$ .

Individuals make their decisions facing uncertainty about the future and seek to maximize their expected total discounted utilities over all decision periods given all available information. They have rational expectations (Muth, 1961), so their subjective beliefs about the future agree with the objective probabilities for all possible future events provided by the model. Immedi-

ate utilities are separable between periods (Kahneman et al., 1997), and a discount factor  $\delta$  parameterizes a taste for immediate over future utilities (Samuelson, 1937).

Equation (1) provides the formal representation of the individual’s objective. Given an initial state  $s_1$ , they implement a policy  $\pi$  that maximizes the expected total discounted utilities over all decision periods given the information available at the time.

$$\max_{\pi \in \Pi} E_{s_1}^{\pi} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^T \delta^{t-1} u_t(s_t, a_t^{\pi}(s_t)) \right] \quad (1)$$

EKW models are set up as a standard Markov decision process (MDP) (Puterman, 1994; White, 1993; Rust, 1994) that can be solved by a simple backward induction procedure. In the final period  $T$ , there is no future to consider, and the optimal action is choosing the alternative with the highest immediate utility in each state. With the decision rule for the final period, we can determine all other optimal decisions recursively. We use our group’s open-source research code `respy` (Gabler and Raabe, 2020) that allows for the flexible specification, simulation, and estimation of EKW models. Detailed documentation of our software and its numerical components is available at <http://respy.readthedocs.io>.

### 3.2. The career decisions of young men

Keane and Wolpin (1997) specialize the model above to explore the career decisions of young men regarding their schooling, work, and occupational choices using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79) (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019) for the estimation of the model. We restrict ourselves to a basic summary of their setup. More detailed documentation of the model specification and the observed dataset is available in our Appendix.

Keane and Wolpin (1997) follow individuals over their working life from young adulthood at age 16 to retirement at age 65. The decision period  $t = 16, \dots, 65$  is a school year. Figure 6 illustrates the initial decision problem as individuals decide  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  whether to work in a blue-collar or white-collar occupation ( $a = 1, 2$ ), to serve in the military ( $a = 3$ ), to attend school ( $a = 4$ ), or to stay at home ( $a = 5$ ).




Figure 6.: Decision tree

Individuals are already heterogeneous when entering the model. They differ with respect to their level of initial schooling  $h_{16}$  and have one of four different  $\mathcal{J} = \{1, \dots, 4\}$  alternative-specific skill endowments  $\mathbf{e} = (e_{j,a})_{\mathcal{J} \times \mathcal{A}}$ .

The immediate utility  $u(\cdot)$  of each alternative consists of a non-pecuniary utility  $\zeta_a(\cdot)$  and, at least for the working alternatives, an additional wage component  $w_a(\cdot)$ . Both depend on the level of human capital as measured by their alternative-specific skill endowment  $\mathbf{e}$ , years of completed schooling  $h_t$ , and occupation-specific work experience  $\mathbf{k}_t = (k_{a,t})_{a \in \{1,2,3\}}$ . The immediate utilities are influenced by last-period choices  $a_{t-1}$  and alternative-specific productivity shocks  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = (\epsilon_{a,t})_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$  as well. Their general form is given by:

$$u(\cdot) = \begin{cases} \zeta_a(\mathbf{k}_t, h_t, t, a_{t-1}) + w_a(\mathbf{k}_t, h_t, t, a_{t-1}, e_{j,a}, \epsilon_{a,t}) & \text{if } a \in \{1, 2, 3\} \\ \zeta_a(\mathbf{k}_t, h_t, t, a_{t-1}, e_{j,a}, \epsilon_{a,t}) & \text{if } a \in \{4, 5\}. \end{cases}$$

Work experience  $\mathbf{k}_t$  and years of completed schooling  $h_t$  evolve deterministically. There is no uncertainty about grade completion (Altonji, 1993) and no part-time enrollment. Schooling is defined as time spent in school and not by formal credentials acquired. Once individuals reach a certain amount of schooling, they acquire a degree.

$$\begin{aligned} k_{a,t+1} &= k_{a,t} + \mathbf{I}[a_t = a] & \text{if } a \in \{1, 2, 3\} \\ h_{t+1} &= h_t + \mathbf{I}[a_t = 4] \end{aligned}$$

The productivity shocks  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$  are uncorrelated across time and follow a multivariate normal distribution with mean  $\mathbf{0}$  and covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ . Given the structure of the utility functions and the distribution of the shocks, the state at time  $t$  is  $s_t = \{\mathbf{k}_t, h_t, t, a_{t-1}, \mathbf{e}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\}$ .

Skill endowments  $\mathbf{e}$  and initial schooling  $h_{16}$  are the only sources of persistent heterogeneity in the model. All remaining differences in life-cycle decisions result from different transitory shocks  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$  over time.

Theoretical and empirical research from specialized disciplines within economics informs the specification of each  $u_a(\cdot)$ , and we discuss the exact functional form of the non-pecuniary utility from schooling as an example in Equation (2).

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_4(s_t) = & \underbrace{e_{j,4}}_{\text{type}} + \underbrace{\beta_{tc_1} \cdot \mathbf{I}[h_t \geq 12] + \beta_{tc_2} \cdot \mathbf{I}[h_t \geq 16]}_{\text{tuition costs}} + \underbrace{\gamma_{4,4} \cdot t + \gamma_{4,5} \cdot \mathbf{I}[t < 18]}_{\text{time trend}} \\ & + \underbrace{\beta_{rc_1} \cdot \mathbf{I}[a_{t-1} \neq 4, h_t < 12] + \beta_{rc_2} \cdot \mathbf{I}[a_{t-1} \neq 4, h_t \geq 12]}_{\text{re-enrollment cost}} + \dots + \epsilon_{4,t} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$


There is a direct cost of attending school such as tuition for continuing education after high school  $\beta_{tc_1}$  and college  $\beta_{tc_2}$ . The decision to leave school is reversible, but entails re-enrollment costs that differ by schooling category  $(\beta_{rc_1}, \beta_{rc_2})$ .

We analyze the original dataset used by [Keane and Wolpin \(1997\)](#) and provide a brief description. The authors construct their sample based on the NLSY79, a nationally representative sample of young men and women living in the United States in 1979 and born between 1957 and 1964. Individuals were followed from 1979 onwards and repeatedly interviewed about their schooling decisions and labor market experiences. Based on this information, individuals are assigned to either working in one of the three occupations, attending school, or simply staying at home.

[Keane and Wolpin \(1997\)](#) restrict attention to white males that turn 16 between 1977 and 1981 and exploit the information collected between 1979 and 1987. Thus, individuals in the sample are all between 16 and 26 years old. While the sample initially consists of 1,373 individuals at age 16, this number drops to 256 at the age of 26 due to sample attrition and missing data. Overall, the final sample consists of 12,359 person-period observations.

We briefly summarize the evolution of choices and wages over the sample period. Initially, roughly 86% of individuals enroll in school, but this share steadily declines with age. Nevertheless, about 39% obtain more than a high school degree and continue their schooling for more than twelve years. As individuals leave school, most of them initially pursue a blue-collar occupation. But the relative share of the white-collar occupation increases as individuals entering the labor market later have higher levels of schooling. At age 26, about 48% work in

**Figure 7.:** Data overview



**Notes:** The wage is a full-time equivalent deflated by the gross national product deflator, with 1987 as the base year. We do not report the wage if less than ten observations are available.

a blue-collar occupation and 34% in a white-collar occupation. The share of individuals in the military peaks around age 20 when it amounts to 8%. At its maximum around age 18, approximately 20% of individuals stay at home.

Overall, average wages start at about \$10,000 at age 16 but increase considerably up to about \$25,000 at age 26. While wages in the blue-collar occupation are initially highest with about \$10,286, wages in the white-collar occupation and military start around \$9,000. However, wages in the white-collar occupation increase steeper over time and overtake blue-collar wages around age 21. At the end of the observation period, wages in the white-collar occupation are about 50% higher than blue-collar wages with \$32,756 as opposed to only \$20,739. Military wages remain lowest throughout.

We consider observations for  $i = 1, \dots, N$  individuals in each time period  $t = 1, \dots, T_i$ . For every observation  $(i, t)$  in the data, we observe the action  $a_{it}$ , some components  $\bar{u}_{it}$  of the utility, and a subset  $\bar{s}_{it}$  of the state  $s_{it}$ . Therefore, from an economist's point of view, we need to distinguish between two types of state variables  $s_{it} = \{\bar{s}_{it}, \mathbf{e}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\}$ . At time  $t$ , the economist and individual both observe  $\bar{s}_{it}$  while  $\{\mathbf{e}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\}$  is only observed by the individual.

We use simulated maximum likelihood (Fisher, 1922; Manski and Lerman, 1977) estimation and determine the 88 model parameters  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  that maximize the likelihood function  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \mathcal{D})$ , i.e. the probability of observing the given data as a function of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . As we only observe a subset  $\bar{s}_t = \{\mathbf{k}_t, h_t, t, a_{t-1}\}$  of the state, we can determine the probability  $p_{it}(a_{it}, \bar{u}_{it} \mid \bar{s}_{it}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  of individual  $i$  at time  $t$  in  $\bar{s}_{it}$  choosing  $a_{it}$  and receiving  $\bar{u}_{it}$  given parametric assumptions about



the distribution of  $\epsilon_t$ . The objective function takes the following form:

$$\hat{\theta} \equiv \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \underbrace{\prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{t=1}^{T_i} p_{it}(a_{it}, \bar{u}_{it} \mid \bar{s}_{it}, \theta)}_{\mathcal{L}(\theta|\mathcal{D})}.$$

Overall, our parameter estimates are in broad agreement with the results reported in the original paper and the related literature. For example, individuals discount future utilities by 6% per year, and wages increase by about 7% with each additional year of schooling.


We use the estimated model to conduct the ex-ante evaluation of a \$2,000 tuition subsidy on educational attainment. We simulate a sample of 10,000 individuals using the point estimates and compare completed schooling to a sample of the same size but with a reduction of  $\hat{\beta}_{tc_1}$  by \$2,000. The subsidy increases average final schooling by 0.65 years. College graduation increases by 13 percentage points and high school graduation rates improve by 4 percentage points.

## 4. Tuition policy

We now turn to the presentation of our results. Throughout, we focus on the impact of a \$2,000 tuition subsidy on completed schooling and use the estimated 90% confidence set to measure the degree of uncertainty. All results are based on 30,000 draws from the asymptotic normal distribution of our parameter estimates. We follow [Keane and Wolpin \(1997\)](#) and start by analyzing the prediction for a general subsidy. Then we turn to the situation where we use endowment types for policy targeting. We postulate a linear utility function for the policy-maker throughout.


### 4.1. General subsidy

Figure 8 explores the impact prediction for a general tuition subsidy. We show the point prediction, its sampling distribution, and the confidence set. At the point estimate, average schooling increases by 0.65 years. However, there is considerable uncertainty about the prediction as the confidence set ranges from 0.15 to 1.10 years.



**Figure 8.:** General subsidy

In Figure 9, we trace out the effect of the discount rate  $\delta$  on the subsidy's impact over the confidence set while keeping all other parameters at their point estimate. Initially, as  $\delta$  increases, so does the policy's impact as individuals value the long-term benefits from increasing their level of schooling more and more. However, for high levels of the discount factor, the policy's impact starts to decrease as most individuals already complete a high school or college degree even without the subsidy.



**Figure 9.:** Time preference


## 4.2. Targeted subsidy

So far, we restricted the analysis to a general subsidy available to the whole population and the average predicted impact. We now move to the setting where a policy-maker can target individuals by their type of initial endowment. The importance of early endowment hetero-

geneity in shaping economic outcomes over the life-cycle is the most important finding from [Keane and Wolpin \(1997\)](#). It has explicitly motivated subsequent research on the determinants of skill heterogeneity among adolescents ([Todd and Wolpin, 2007](#); [Erosa et al., 2010](#); [Caucutt and Lochner, 2020](#)).

To ease the exposition, we initially focus our discussion of results on Type 1 and Type 3 individuals. We then later rank policies targeting either of the four types based on the different decision-theoretic criteria.


Figure 10 confirms that life-cycle choices differ considerably by initial endowment type. On the left, we show the number of periods the two types spend on average in each of the five alternatives. Type 1 spends more than six years in education even after entering the model. Type 3 only adds another two years. This difference translates into very different labor market experiences. While Type 1 works for about 35 years in a white-collar occupation, Type 2 switches more frequently and spends an equal number of 22 years in a white and a blue-collar occupation. Both types only spend a short time at home.



**Figure 10.:** Type heterogeneity

On the right, we show the distribution of final schooling for the two types. Average schooling is considerably higher for Type 1 with more than 16 years, compared to about 12 years for Type 3. Nearly all Type 1 individuals enroll in college, and most do end up with a degree.

Figure 11 provides a visualization of our core results for a targeted subsidy. At the point estimates, the predicted impact is considerably lower for Type 1 than Type 3. However, the prediction uncertainty is much larger for Type 3 compared to Type 1. The confidence set for Type 3 ranges all the way from 0 to 1.2 years, while the prediction for Type 1 is bounded between 0.18 and 0.75.




**Figure 11.:** Targeted subsidy

This heterogeneity in impact and prediction uncertainty follows directly from the underlying economics of the model. Type 1 is already much more likely to have a college degree before the subsidy, and thus, the predicted impact is smaller. At the same time, Type 1 individuals affected by the subsidy are already pursuing some college and thus directly benefit from the subsidy. Type 3 is at the lower end of the schooling distribution. A tuition subsidy can considerably increase their level of schooling, but whether the subsidy succeeds in doing so is uncertain.

We now consider the policy option to target Type 2 and Type 4 as well. Their point predictions are actually highest with an additional 0.81 years on average for Type 2 and 0.75 years for Type 4. However, both predictions are fraught with uncertainty. For Type 2 the confidence set ranges from 0.17 to 1.3, while for Type 4 it starts at zero and spans all the way to 1.18.

Figure 12 shows the policy alternative’s ranking by the decision-theoretic criteria we discussed in Section 2.1. Ranking alternatives using as-if optimization is straightforward. A policy targeting Type 2 is the most preferred alternative, while a focus on Type 1 is the least attractive. However, once we take the uncertainty in the predictions into account, a more nuanced picture emerges. Moving from as-if optimization to a subjective Bayes criterion using a uniform prior over the confidence set does not change the ordering. However, once a decision-maker is concerned with uniform performance across the whole range of reasonable values – we move to the minimax regret or maximin criterion – a policy targeting Type 1 becomes more and more attractive despite its low point prediction because its worst-case utility is highest.



**Figure 12.:** Policy ranking

Framing policy advice as a decision problem under uncertainty shows that there are many different ways of making reasonable decisions. In general, different criteria result in different policy rankings. Not only that, the ranking of policies for a given criteria potentially depends on the choice of  $\alpha$ . We think of  $\alpha$  as part of a policy-maker's decision problem: The more weight the policy-maker places on worst-case events, the smaller the appropriate value for  $\alpha$ . A policy-maker should decide on their preferred decision rule and perform a sensitivity analysis around the selected value of  $\alpha$ . This approach allows learning about yet another layer of uncertainty concerning the optimal policy choice.

Quantifying and communicating uncertainties in policy predictions using structural economic models is a daunting task. Still, incorporating statistical decision theory in the analysis offers a systematic approach to more responsible and transparent policy-making.

## 5. Conclusion

We cope with parametric uncertainty in a structural econometric model by embedding its predictions in a decision-theoretic framework. We revisit the seminal work by [Keane and Wolpin \(1997\)](#) and document the empirical relevance of our concerns. Focusing on the ex-ante evaluation of a tuition subsidy, we report considerable uncertainty in its impact on completed schooling. We analyze the different policy recommendations from using alternative formal rules for decision-making under uncertainty.

Going forward, we seek to understand what components of structural models are responsible for prediction uncertainties and ease the computational burden of our analysis. Sensitivity analysis ([Razavi et al., 2021](#)) provides several approaches to measuring the importance of individual pa-

rameters for the overall uncertainty in a prediction. This information helps to prioritize model development and data collection efforts. The attribution of importance based on Shapely values (Shapley, 1953; Owen, 2014) appears promising.

The computational burden of our analysis is considerable due to the required large number of evaluations of our quantity of interest. Surrogate modeling has the potential to alleviate that burden (Forrester et al., 2008). A surrogate model is a function that emulates the behavior of the full model at a negligible cost per run. Machine learning techniques offer novel approaches to build the surrogate (Hastie et al., 2008) using only a limited number of evaluations of the full model.

## References

- Adda, J., Dustmann, C., and Stevens, K. (2017). The career costs of children. *Journal of Political Economy*, 125(2):293–337.
- Aguirregabiria, V. and Mira, P. (2010). Dynamic discrete choice structural models: A survey. *Journal of Econometrics*, 156(1):38–67.
- Altonji, J. (1993). The demand for and return to education when education outcomes are uncertain. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 11(1):48–83.
- Andrews, I., Gentzkow, M., and Shapiro, J. M. (2017). Measuring the sensitivity of parameter estimates to estimation moments. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(4):1553–1592.
- Andrews, I., Gentzkow, M., and Shapiro, J. M. (2020). On the informativeness of descriptive statistics for structural estimates. *Econometrica*, 88(6):2231–2258.
- Berger, L., Berger, N., Bosetti, V., Gilboa, I., Hansen, L. P., Jarvis, C., Marinacci, M., and Smith, R. D. (2020). Rational policymaking during a pandemic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(4).
- Blundell, R. (2017). What have we learned from structural models? *American Economic Review*, 107(5):287–92.
- Blundell, R., Costa Dias, M., Meghir, C., and Shaw, J. (2016). Female labor supply, human capital, and welfare reform. *Econometrica*, 84(5):1705–1753.
- Blundell, R. and Shephard, A. (2012). Employment, hours of work and the optimal taxation of low-income families. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 79(2):481–510.

- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2019). *National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 cohort, 1979-2016 (rounds 1-27)*. Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Cai, Y. and Lontzek, T. S. (2019). The social cost of carbon with economic and climate risks. *Journal of Political Economy*, 127(6):2684–2734.
- Caucutt, E. M. and Lochner, L. (2020). Early and late human capital investments, borrowing constraints, and the family. *Journal of Political Economy*, 128(3):1065–1147.
- Christensen, T. and Connault, B. (2019). Counterfactual sensitivity and robustness.
- Cunha, F., Heckman, J. J., and Schennach, S. (2010). Estimating the technology of cognitive and noncognitive skill formation. *Econometrica*, 78(3):883–931.
- Dongarra, J. J. and Van der Steen, A. J. (2012). High-performance computing systems: Status and outlook. *Acta Numerica*, 21:379–474.
- Eckstein, Z., Keane, M., and Lifshitz, O. (2019). Career and family decisions: Cohorts born 1935-1975. *Econometrica*, 87(1):217–253.
- Eisenhauer, P., Heckman, J. J., and Mosso, S. (2015). Estimation of dynamic discrete choice models by maximum likelihood and the simulated method of moments. *International Economic Review*, 56(2):331–357.
- Erosa, A., Koreshkova, T., and Restuccia, D. (2010). How important is human capital? A quantitative theory assessment of world income inequality. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 77(4):1421–1449.
- Fisher, R. A. (1922). On the mathematical foundations of theoretical statistics. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character*, 222(594-604):309–368.
- Forrester, D. A. I. J., Sobester, D. A., and Keane, P. A. J. (2008). *Engineering design via surrogate modelling: A practical guide*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, England.
- Gabler, J. and Raabe, T. (2020). respy - a framework for the simulation and estimation of Eckstein-Keane-Wolpin models.
- Gilboa, I. (2009). *Theory of decision under uncertainty*. Cambridge University Press, New York City, NY.
- Gilboa, I. and Schmeidler, D. (1989). Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 18(2):141–153.

- Harenberg, D., Marelli, S., Sudret, B., and Winschel, V. (2019). Uncertainty quantification and global sensitivity analysis for economic models. *Quantitative Economics*, 10(1):1–41.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Friedman, J. (2008). *The elements of statistical learning: Data mining, inference, and prediction*. Springer, New York City, NY.
- Hood, W. and Koopmans, T. (1953). *Studies in econometric method*. John Wiley & Sons, New York City, NY.
- Jørgensen, T. H. (2020). Sensitivity to calibrated parameters. *IFS Working Paper*.
- Kahneman, D., Wakker, P. P., and Sarin, R. (1997). Back to Bentham? Explorations of experienced utility. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2):375–406.
- Keane, M. P., Todd, P. E., and Wolpin, K. I. (2011). The structural estimation of behavioral models: Discrete choice dynamic programming methods and applications. In Ashenfelter, O. and Card, D., editors, *Handbook of Labor Economics*, pages 331–461. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Keane, M. P. and Wolpin, K. I. (1997). The career decisions of young men. *Journal of Political Economy*, 105(3):473–522.
- Low, H. and Meghir, C. (2017). The use of structural models in econometrics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(2):33–58.
- Machina, M. J. and Viscusi, K. (2014). *Handbook of the economics of risk and uncertainty*. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Manski, C. F. (2004). Statistical treatment rules for heterogeneous populations. *Econometrica*, 72(4):1221–1246.
- Manski, C. F. (2013). *Public policy in an uncertain world: Analysis and decisions*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Manski, C. F. (2021). Econometrics for decision making: Building foundations sketched by Haavelmo and Wald. Unpublished working paper, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Manski, C. F. and Lerman, S. R. (1977). The estimation of choice probabilities from choice based samples. *Econometrica*, 45(8):1977–1988.
- Marinacci, M. (2015). Model uncertainty. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 13(6):1022–1100.
- Muth, J. F. (1961). Rational expectations and the theory of price movements. *Econometrica*, 29(3):315–335.



- National Research Council (2012). *Assessing the reliability of complex models: Mathematical and statistical foundations of verification, validation, and uncertainty quantification*. The National Academies Press, Washington, DC.
- Niehans (1948). Zur Preisbildung bei ungewissen Erwartungen. *Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics*, 84(5):433–456.
- Owen, A. B. (2014). Sobol’ indices and shapley value. *Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 2(1):245–251.
- Puterman, M. L. (1994). *Markov decision processes: Discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons, New York City, NY.
- Rao, C. R. (1973). *Linear statistical inference and its applications*. John Wiley & Sons, New York City, NY.
- Razavi, S., Jakeman, A., Saltelli, A., Prieur, C., Iooss, B., Borgonovo, E., Plischke, E., Piano, S. L., Iwanaga, T., Becker, W., et al. (2021). The future of sensitivity analysis: An essential discipline for systems modeling and policy support. *Environmental Modeling & Software*, 137:104954.
- Reich, G. and Judd, K. L. (2020). Efficient likelihood ratio confidence intervals using constrained optimization. *SSRN Working Paper*.
- Rust, J. (1994). Structural estimation of Markov decision processes. In Engle, R. and McFadden, D., editors, *Handbook of Econometrics*, pages 3081–3143. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Saltelli, A., Bammer, G., Bruno, I., Charters, E., Di Fiore, M., Didier, E., Espeland, W. N., Kay, J., Piano, S. L., Mayo, D., et al. (2020). Five ways to ensure that models serve society: a manifesto. *Nature*, 582:482–484.
- Samuelson, P. A. (1937). A note on measurement of utility. *Review of Economic Studies*, 4(2):155–161.
- Savage, L. J. (1954). *The foundations of statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, New York City, NY.
- Shapley, L. S. (1953). *A value for n-person games*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Smith, R. C. (2014). *Uncertainty quantification: Theory, implementation, and applications*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA.
- Todd, P. E. and Wolpin, K. I. (2006). Assessing the impact of a school subsidy program in Mexico: Using a social experiment to validate a dynamic behavioral model of child schooling and fertility. *American Economic Review*, 96(5):1384–1417.


- Todd, P. E. and Wolpin, K. I. (2007). The production of cognitive achievement in children: Home, school and racial test score gaps. *Journal of Human Capital*, 1(1):91–136.
- Wald, A. (1950). *Statistical decision functions*. John Wiley & Sons, New York City, NY.
- White, D. J. (1993). *Markov decision processes*. John Wiley & Sons, New York City, NY.
- Wolpin, K. I. (2013). *The Limits to Inference without Theory*. MIT University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Woutersen, T. and Ham, J. (2019). Confidence sets for continuous and discontinuous functions of parameters. *Unpublished Working Paper*.

## A. Appendix

Our Appendix contains additional results, details on our computational implementation, and information about the estimation dataset.


### A.1. Additional results

Figure 13 shows the overall agreement between the empirical data and a dataset simulated using the estimated model parameters. The results are based on a simulated sample of 10,000 individuals.




**Figure 13.:** Model fit

Figure 14 provides the point prediction, its sampling distribution, and the estimated confidence set for the impact of the tuition subsidy for all types. All results are based on 30,000 draws from the asymptotic normal distribution of our parameter estimates.



**Figure 14.:** Targeted subsidy for all types

Figure 15 shows the impact of the tuition subsidy at the upper  $\delta_H$  and lower  $\delta_L$  bound of the estimated confidence set for  $\delta$ . The results are based on simulated samples of 10,000 individuals for both scenarios.



**Figure 15.:** Policy impact and time preference

## **A.2. Computation**

Please see <http://bit.ly/ekw-handout> for details about the computational implementation.

## **A.3. Data**

Please see <https://bit.ly/ekw-data> for details about the estimation dataset.