

Comments on: Michael P. Keane 'Structural vs. atheoretic approaches to econometrics'

Blundell, Richard

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Blundell, R. (2009). Comments on: Michael P. Keane 'Structural vs. atheoretic approaches to econometrics'. *Journal of Econometrics*, 156(1), 25-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2009.09.005>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Accepted Manuscript

Comments on: Michael P. Keane ‘ Structural vs. Atheoretic Approaches to Econometrics’

Richard Blundell

PII: S0304-4076(09)00196-1
DOI: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2009.09.005
Reference: ECONOM 3234

To appear in: *Journal of Econometrics*



Please cite this article as: Blundell, R., Comments on: Michael P. Keane ‘ Structural vs. Atheoretic Approaches to Econometrics’. *Journal of Econometrics* (2009), doi:10.1016/j.jeconom.2009.09.005

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Comments on: Michael P. Keane ‘Structural vs. Atheoretic Approaches to Econometrics’

by

Richard Blundell¹

University College London and Institute for Fiscal Studies.

1 Overview

In this paper Michael Keane makes a series of important points and raises a number of key concerns. His is a comprehensive assessment drawing on a line of research in which significant advances have been made in our knowledge, many by Keane and his coauthors. This research deserves to move in to the centre stage and this paper serves to encourage that move.

In my comments I want to pick up on a couple of issues which I feel are worthy of further discussion. The first concerns the variety of ‘questions’ being addressed in empirical microeconomic research. The second concerns the variety of ‘structural’ models that are found in econometrics. I ask the question: Can we really be so categorical about choosing one approach in empirical microeconomics?

2 Experimental and Observational Evidence

Empirical analysis in applied microeconometrics is typically at its best when addressing a sharp question. Often the assessment of a specific policy reform. But the nature of the questions varies widely. They range from the measurement of a simple average impact of some past reform, to the prediction of behaviour or welfare costs under some newly proposed reform. For the first it may be unnecessary to unravel preferences (or technology) from constraints but for the second it will be essential.

Although a structural framework would seem to be a prerequisite for interpretation of any policy reform, the degree to which a stochastic structure needs to be completely specified and empirically implemented will depend on the question to be answered. (Quasi-)Experimental contrasts can answer some ‘structural’ questions, but they cannot answer all. Indeed the range of questions to which they provide answers is often quite limited. But even where they are limited, experimental contrasts can be informative as part of a complete research strategy. For example, the Progresia experiment has been used very imaginatively in informing structural models of education choices, see Attanasio et al (2005) and Todd and Wolpin (2006). Of course, Keane recognizes this but the combination of experimental and observation evidence warrants further

¹Financial support from the ESRC Centre for the Microeconomic Analysis of Public Policy at IFS is gratefully acknowledged. The usual disclaimer applies.

serious consideration as a creative way forward for building credible structural models.

The estimation of structural models forces us to line up the different implications of the economic theory with the evidence, whether it be observational or experimental. They require a logical consistency across a number of contrasts whereas (quasi-)experimental approaches typically recover only a single contrast.

The most convincing of the quasi-experimental approaches have come from four sources: well designed randomised control trials, such as the Progresia experiment referred to above and the Self Sufficiency Program in Canada (see Card and Hyslop (2005)); area based piloting of new policies which can allow us to assess the importance of spill-over and general equilibrium effects (see Blundell et al (2004)), externally driven differential trends across groups as in the analysis of tax reforms (see Blundell, Duncan and Meghir (1998)), and the clever use of discontinuity designs (see Card, Chetty and Weber (2007)).

Poorly designed quasi-experiments have little to offer, but so do poorly focussed structural estimations.

3 Identification and Validation

There are clearly common themes in the identification of any structural model whether we are dealing with a ‘simple’ linear additive structural model or a ‘rich’ discrete nonlinear system. However, the choice of technique and our ability to relax incidental (but often critical) assumptions differs substantially across different types of structural model specification.

There has been considerable recent progress in our understanding of the identification of nonlinear stochastic models. These models come closer to the types of specification applied microeconomic researchers like to adopt. This progress covers structural equations with heterogeneous coefficients (see Heckman and Vytlacil (2005) and Imbens (2007)), as well as nonlinear systems with non-separable heterogeneity (see Matzkin (2007), Imbens and Newey (2003) and Chesher (2003, 2007)). Nonetheless, it is fair to say that progress in developing estimators that are robust to incidental assumptions has been slower than the pace of application.

For many structural discrete stochastic choice models that are used in application we do not yet have conditions for nonparametric identification. Keane notes this and suggests that such considerations of non/semiparametric identification should be replaced by sample hold-out validation studies, to quote ‘Certain primacy for validation exercises over identification analysis for purposes of building confidence in models.’ But validation and identification are addressing different concerns.

Understanding the identification of the structural model is a key part of the econometrics toolkit. In empirical microeconomic models with complicated nonlinearities and observation rules, proving identification is particularly demanding, but necessary. Identification also allows the researcher to pinpoint

where there are overidentifying restrictions that can be used to test the structure. In some case structural restrictions may only provide partial identification, but nonetheless informative in understanding behaviour and policy responses, see Manski (2003, 2007).

Out of sample validation is useful but does not offer a substitute for the development of identification results for more complex models that are used in application. Econometric theorists should not be let off the hook so easily. The fact that research on identification lags behind in addressing models that applied researchers feel are interesting should continue to act as a stimulus for econometric research.

4 Concluding thoughts

So, can we really be so categorical about choosing one approach in empirical microeconomics? I think not. Even in a reasonably simple policy evaluation, the choice of method in empirical microeconomics depends on three broad concerns:² the nature of the question to be answered; the type and quality of data available; and the mechanism by which individuals are allocated or receive the policy. The last of these is typically labeled the ‘assignment rule’ and is a key component in any policy evaluation. Alternative methods exploit different assumptions concerning assignment and differ according to the type of assumption made. In a perfectly designed social experiment, assignment is random. In a structural microeconomic model, assignment is assumed to obey some rules from economic theory. Unless there is a convincing case for the reliability of the assignment mechanism being used, the results of the empirical analysis are unlikely to convince the thoughtful skeptic. Just as an experiment needs to be carefully designed, a structural economic model needs to be carefully argued.

References

- [1] Attanasio, O., C. Meghir and A. Santiago (2005), “Education choices in Mexico: using a structural model and a randomised experiment to evaluate Progresas”, April 2005, 38 pp., *IFS Working Papers*, EWP05/01.
- [2] Blundell, R. and Costa Dias M. (2000), “Evaluation Methods for Non-Experimental Data”, *Fiscal Studies*, 21(4), 427-468
- [3] Blundell, R., Dearden, L. and Sianesi, B. (2005), “Evaluating the Impact of Education on Earnings: Models, Methods and Results from the NCDS”, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series A, 168(3), 473-512
- [4] Blundell, R., Duncan, A. and Meghir, C. (1998), “Estimating Labour Supply Responses using Tax Policy Reforms”, *Econometrica*, 66, 827-861

²See Blundell and Costa-Dias (2000), for example.

- [5] Blundell, R., Costa Dias, M., Meghir, C. and Van Reenen, J. (2004) "Evaluating the Employment Impact of a Mandatory Job Search Assistance Program", *Journal of the European Economic Association*, June.
- [6] Blundell, R. and Powell, J. (2003), "Endogeneity in Nonparametric and Semiparametric Regression Models", Chapter 8 in *Advances in Economics and Econometrics*, M. Dewatripont, L. Hansen, and S. J. Turnovsky (eds.), Cambridge University Press, ESM 36, pp 312-357, 2003.
- [7] Card, David, Raj Chetty and Andrea Weber (2007) "Cash-On-Hand and Competing Models of Intertemporal Behavior: New Evidence from the Labor Market", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 122(4), pages 1511-1560, November.
- [8] Card, David and Dean R. Hyslop (2005) "Estimating the Effects of a Time-Limited Earnings Subsidy for Welfare-Leavers," *Econometrica*, vol. 73(6), pages 1723-1770, November.
- [9] Chesher, A. (2003), "Identification in Nonseparable Models", *Econometrica*, 2003, 71, 1405-1441.
- [10] Chesher, A. (2007), "Identification of Nonadditive Structural Functions" in R. Blundell, W. Newey and T. Persson (eds), *Advances in Economics and Econometrics*, Volume III, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [11] Heckman, J. and Vytlacil, E. (2005), "Structural Equations, Treatment Effects and Econometric Policy Evaluation" *Econometrica*, 73, 669-738.
- [12] Imbens, G. (2007), "Nonadditive Models with Endogenous Regressors" in *Advances in Economics and Econometric*, Volume III, Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Imbens, G. and Angrist, J. (1994), "Identification and Estimation of Local Average Treatment Effects", *Econometrica*, 62(2), 467-75.
- [14] Imbens, G. and Newey, W. (2003), "Identification and Estimation of Triangular Simultaneous Equations Models Without Additivity", mimeo, MIT.
- [15] Manski, C. F. (2003), "Partial Identification of Probability Distributions", *Springer Series in Statistics*, XII, 178 p., Springer-Verlag.
- [16] Manski, C. F. (2007), "Identification for Prediction and Decision", *Harvard University Press*, Harvard.
- [17] Matzkin, R. (2007), "Heterogeneous Choice" in R. Blundell, W. Newey and T. Persson (eds), *Advances in Economics and Econometrics*, Volume III, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- [18] Todd, Petra and Kenneth I. Wolpin (2006) "Using a Social Experiment to Validate a Dynamic Behavioral Model of Child Schooling and Fertility: Assessing the Impact of a School Subsidy Program in Mexico" *American Economic Review*, 96(5),1384-1417