Production Technologies in Stochastic Continuous Time Models

Klaus Wälde

Production Technologies in Stochastic Continuous Time Models

Abstract

Properties of dynamic stochastic general equilibrium models can be revealed by either using numerical solutions or qualitative analysis. Very precise and intuition-building results are obtained by working with models which provide closed-form solutions. Closed-form solutions are known for a large class of models some of which, however, have some undesirable features. This paper offers closed-form solutions for models which are just as tractable but do not suffer from these shortcomings.

JEL Code: E20, O40.

Keywords: dynamic stochastic general equilibrium models, closed-form solution, continuous time, jump diffusion.

Klaus Wälde
Mainz School of Management and Economics
University of Mainz
Jakob-Welder-Weg 4
55131 Mainz
Germany
klaus@waelde.com

1 Introduction

Continuous time models with uncertainty are widely used in economics. The seminal papers are the finance papers by Merton (1969, 1971) and his (1975) Solow growth model with stochastic population growth. These methods were used subsequently - for what could be called an early endogenous growth model - by Eaton (1981). Eaton introduced uncertainty in the production process, highlighting technological uncertainty. Versions of his formulation of the production process, which we will call "differential" in what follows, were used by many authors in several fields. Recent examples include Asea and Turnovsky (1998), Bianconi and Turnovsky (2005), Chatterjee, Giuliano and Turnovsky (2004), Chattopadhyay and Turnovsky (2003), Clemens and Soretz (2004), Corsetti (1997), Epaulart and Pommeret (2003), Evans and Kenc (2003), García-Peñalosa and Turnovsky (2005), Gokan (2002), Gong and Zou (2002, 2003), Grinols and Turnovsky (1993, 1994, 1998a, and 1998b), Kenc (2004), Pommeret and Smith (2005), Smith (1996), Steger (2005), Turnovsky (1993, 1999a, 1999b, and 2000), Turnovsky and Smith (2006) and Koethenbuerger and Lockwood (2009).

While apparently very inspiring and useful for understanding a wide range of issues, the differential production technology has at least two major shortcomings. First, modeling the production process by specifying a differential instead of a standard production function is intuitively hard to understand. Similar difficulties arise when trying to interpret the goods market equilibrium condition embedded in a setup with a differential formulation of the production process. Second, as already Grinols and Turnovsky (1998a) have noticed in footnote 4 of their paper "[...] the flow of output [...] may become negative". They suggest, however, that "[...] the advantages to computation and modeling are sufficiently great to justify this specification, despite this unappealing aspect.". Nevertheless, this implication of this modelling choice as well as its difficult interpretation might be the reasons why continuous time methods under uncertainty are not as widely used in macroeconomics as they could be and as these methods would deserve, given their convenient properties.

It is the purpose of this paper to show that an alternative formulation of production technologies is available which does not have the shortcomings of the differential approach. To this end, section 2.1 presents the basic demand side consisting of an agent that maximizes a standard utility function. Section 2.2 then presents the differential representation of technologies while section 2.3 offers the alternative formulation. Section 3.1 then generalizes existing closed-form solutions for comparison purposes.

Our main theoretical contributions are all in the subsequent section 3.2 which models technologies by standard production functions. We first present a closed form solution of a maximization problem with logarithmic instantaneous utility and both one Wiener process and many Poisson processes as the source of uncertainty for the evolution of total factor productivity (TFP). We also show in app. 6.2.4 where the "educated guess" for the value function comes from.

We then present closed form solutions for maximization problems where the instantaneous utility function is different from the logarithmic specification but still belongs to the constant relative risk aversion (CRRA) class. For these non-logarithmic cases, uncertainty affects the accumulation technology of the economy via a stochastic depreciation process. The fundamental source of uncertainty is the same combination of a Wiener process and many Poisson processes as previously. One can read this section as a reinterpretation of the resource

constraint with differential formulations of the technology such that the formulation of the technology is standard. In this reading, our contribution is this reinterpretation and the generalization of results to a setup with a Wiener process and many Poisson processes.

2 The model

2.1 The planner

We study a classic saving-investment problem. A social planner chooses the amount of consumption $C(\tau)$ so as to maximize a social welfare function representing expected utility of infinitely-lived households,

$$U_t = E_t \left[\int_t^\infty e^{-\rho[\tau-t]} u\left(C\left(\tau\right)\right) d\tau \right], \tag{1}$$

where ρ denotes the time preference rate. The instantaneous utility function is of the CRRA class,

$$u\left(C\left(t\right)\right) = \begin{cases} \frac{C(t)^{1-\gamma}-1}{1-\gamma} & \text{for } \gamma \neq 1 \\ \log C\left(t\right) & \text{for } \gamma = 1 \end{cases}. \tag{2}$$

We see this central planner view as a short-cut to a decentralized economy without any distortions. All of the results which will follow below will therefore also hold in an economy with many households.

2.2 Differential representation of the technology

This section presents the approach which specifies technologies by a differential. In order to be comparable as much as possible to the approach appearing in section 2.3.2 below, we modify the differential setup, as it can be found in the literature, in two ways. First, we make the depreciation rate δ explicit. The depreciation rate is is usually implicitly contained in the constant production technology factor A. We replace A by $A-\delta$ which is of course just a notational matter and does not alter any of the implications of the differential model. Second, instead of adding a stochastic component in the equation for the production technology we subtract this term. Again, this is just a notational matter and only changes the signs of the corresponding parameters of the stochastic processes considered. It will, however, be advantageous later when comparing the approach we suggest with this differential approach.

The production process of an economy can now be specified - following a large part of the literature as cited in the introduction - by

$$dY\left(t\right) = \left(A - \delta\right) K\left(t\right) dt - K\left(t\right) dw\left(t\right), \tag{3}$$

where $Y(t)$ is aggregate output in t, $(A-\delta)$ is a constant measure of the TFP less the deterministic depreciation rate δ, $K(t)$ is the capital stock, and the increment $dw(t)$ will be specified below. The flow of output is used for capital accumulation and for consumption, modeled as

$$dY\left(t\right) = dK\left(t\right) + dC\left(t\right). \tag{4}$$

Combining equations (3) and (4) gives the expression for the capital accumulation which is equal to investment[2]

$$dK\left(t\right) = \left(\left(A - \delta\right)K\left(t\right) - C\left(t\right)\right)dt - K\left(t\right)dw\left(t\right).\qquad(5)$$

This and similar processes are used for example by Evans and Kenc (2003), Gertler and Grinols (1982), Gokan (2002), Gong and Zou (2002, 2003), Grinols and Turnovsky (1998a, 1998b), Steger (2005), or Turnovsky (1993). In most of these papers the stochastic increment in eq. (3) is defined to be $dw\left(t\right) = \sigma dz\left(t\right)$ where $dz\left(t\right)$ is a Brownian motion and the σ is some variance measure of output.

While some authors acknowledge (see e.g. footnote 4 in Grinols and Turnovsky (1998a)) the fact that this implies the possibility of a negative Y, we briefly recapitulate this property here by simply solving the differential equation (3) starting in $t = 0$ with $Y\left(0\right) \equiv Y_0$ and $z\left(0\right) \equiv 0$,

$$Y\left(t\right) = Y_0 + \left(A - \delta\right)\int_0^t K\left(s\right)ds - \sigma\int_0^t K\left(s\right)dz\left(s\right).$$

To see that this is in fact a solution of the above flow-representation just apply Ito's Lemma and recover (3).[3] This says that with a constant factor input K, i.e. $Y\left(t\right) = Y_0 + \left(A - \delta\right)Kt - \sigma K z\left(t\right)$, output in t is determined by a deterministic and a stochastic part. The latter one is often interpreted to reflect various random elements affecting output production (e.g. Gong and Zou, 2003). Ignoring Y_0, the deterministic part $\left(A - \delta\right)t$ implies linear growth (i.e. not exponential growth as is usually the case and empirically more relevant) and the stochastic part $\sigma z\left(t\right)$ implies deviations from the trend. As $z\left(t\right)$ is Brownian motion, the sum of the deterministic and the stochastic part can become negative.

The unusual formulation in (3) and the property that $Y\left(t\right)$ can become negative might be two reasons why this approach is not as popular as it could be. We will now present standard formulations of technologies which make models just as tractable as with this formulation.

2.3 Standard representation of the technology

We now present technologies in the standard way. We use a typical AK structure and introduce uncertainty either through uncertainty in TFP - "standard I" - or through uncertainty in the capital accumulation process - "standard II".

2.3.1 Standard I: stochastic TFP

This section will now preserve the spirit of the technology used above - the AK-structure - but expresses the technology in a way such that it has standard properties. The economy

---

[2]This equation (5) can be obtained under the additional assumption that that $dC\left(t\right) = C\left(t\right)dt$ where "...consumption over the instant dt occurs at the non-stochastic rate $C\left(t\right)dt$." (cf. Turnovsky and Smith (2006) on page 251). The expression $dC\left(t\right) = C\left(t\right)dt$ can be found expicitly e.g. in Grinols and Turnovsky (1998a) on page 503 or in Turnovsky (2000) on page 400 and is at odds with the prediction of this model (see further below) that optimal consumption is a constant fraction ψ of the capital stock, i.e. $C\left(t\right) = \psi K\left(t\right)$, making consumption stochastic and not just a function $C\left(t\right)$ times the deterministic time differential dt.

[3]For an introduction to the methods behind this and for more background, see Wälde (2009, part IV).

produces the final good Y according to

$$Y(t) = A(t) K(t). \tag{6}$$

Capital is the only factor of production and TFP is given by $A(t)$. It follows the stochastic process

$$dA(t) = \mu A(t) dt + A(t) dw(t), \tag{7}$$

where the increment $dw(t)$ in its most general formulation will be specified below as a combination of one Wiener and many Poisson processes.

Capital accumulation is equal to investments $I(t) = Y(t) - C(t)$ net of depreciation,

$$dK(t) = (Y(t) - \delta K(t) - C(t)) dt. \tag{8}$$

2.3.2 Standard II: stochastic depreciation

There is an alternative where output is left in the standard formulation (6), TFP remains constant at A, i.e. $dA(t) = 0$, and hence (7) is not valid. In contrast, following Rebelo and Xie (1999), we assume that capital accumulation is stochastic. Let there be a standard goods market clearing condition $Y(t) = C(t) + I(t)$ but let capital accumulation be risky, e.g. by a stochastic depreciation process:

$$dK(t) = I(t) dt - K(t) (\delta dt + dw(t)).$$

Again, $w(t)$ is a combination of a Wiener and Poisson processes. This capital accumulation equation gives, together with the goods market clearing condition and the production technology, an expression of

$$dK(t) = (AK(t) - \delta K(t) - C(t)) dt - K(t) dw(t). \tag{9}$$

Notice that this equation is identical to the capital accumulation process of the differential setup in (5). Hence, if $w(t)$ is a simple Brownian motion we have a similar formulation of the resource constraint as Eaton (1981) and others, only that we have obtained it with a more standard setup with standard output and a stochastic capital accumulation process.

The interpretation that the stochastic part of the capital accumulation process is the result of stochastic depreciation was already suggested by Eaton (1981, footnote 2). In the differential approach, stochastic capital accumulation is the *result* of combining the assumptions about the stochastic evolution of output in (3) and the goods market clearing condition in (4). By contrast, in the standard II approach proposed here, the fact that capital accumulation is risky is an *assumption* which results in a stochastic evolution of output. This has the advantage of explicitly specifying where uncertainty comes from and avoids specifications of output which can easily be criticized. With more conventional technologies as proposed here, the continuous time approach to uncertainty could become more popular.

3   Closed form solutions

It is well-known that closed form solutions exist for a variety of models. Table 1 summarizes the structure of the models presented above and provides a preview of the optimal consumption levels. This section generalizes existing closed-form solutions and compares them to the

new ones - which are based on models with standard production functions.

Table 1: Model overview and preview of results

	differential (stoch. output)	standard I (stoch. TFP)	standard II (stoch. depreciation)
output	$dY = (A - \delta) K dt - \sigma K dw$	$Y = AK$	$Y = AK$
TFP	constant	$\frac{dA}{A} = \mu dt + dw$	constant
capital	$dK = dY - dC$	$dK = Idt - \delta K dt$	$dK = Idt - \delta K dt - K dw$
investment	$Idt = dK$	$I = Y - C$	$I = Y - C$
stoch. process	$dw = \sigma dz + \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i dq_i$	identical	identical
log-utility	$C = \rho K$	$C = \rho K$	$C = \rho K$
CES-utility	$C = \psi K$	n.a.	$C = \psi K$

The differential approach widely used in the literature and its features are presented in the second column. Approaches with standard production functions appear in columns three and four. The notation used in this table is as in the text. The only new parameter is

$$\psi \equiv \frac{\rho}{\gamma} - \frac{1 - \gamma}{\gamma} (A - \delta) + (1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{\gamma} \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i \left((1 - \beta_i)^{1-\gamma} - 1 \right). \tag{10}$$

Following the idea of Merton (1976), we allow the stochastic component $w(t)$ in the technology (column 2), in TFP (column 3) or in depreciation (column 4) to be a mixture of both a continuous and countably many jump processes, $w(t) = \sigma z(t) + \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i q_i(t)$, implying that

$$dw(t) = \sigma dz(t) + \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i dq_i(t). \tag{11}$$

The differential $dz(t)$ stands for the increment of standard Brownian motion, i.e. $z(t) \sim N(0, t)$, whereas the $dq_i(t)$ for $i = 1, ..., n$ describe increments of independent Poisson processes with arrival rates λ_i. By setting $\beta_i = 0$ the formulation used by Eaton (1981) and in the bulk of the literature thereafter is obtained. With $\sigma = 0$, a pure jump setup results.

3.1 Differential approach

The definition for uncertainty in (11) applied to the capital accumulation process in (5) yields

$$dK(t) = ((A - \delta) K(t) - C(t)) dt - \sigma K(t) dz(t) - \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i K(t) dq_i(t). \tag{12}$$

In order to obtain a closed-form solution, one needs to solve the following nonlinear ordinary differential equation called the maximized Bellman equation (for the derivation, see app. 6.1.1),

$$\rho V(K) = \log \left(\frac{1}{V_K} \right) + V_K \left((A - \delta) K - \frac{1}{V_K} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 K^2 V_{KK} + \tag{13}$$
$$\Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i (V(K - \beta_i K) - V(K)).$$

6

Solving requires an educated guess about the value function V whose structure can be shown to be identical (cf. app. 6.1.2) to that one of the well-known case where $\beta_i = 0 \ \forall i$ (cf. e.g. Merton, 1969), i.e.

$$V(K) \equiv \frac{\log(\psi K)}{\psi} + \Psi \tag{14}$$

with

$$\psi = \rho, \quad \Psi = \frac{A - \delta - \rho - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 + \Sigma_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \log(1 - \beta_i)}{\rho^2}.$$

This explicit form of the value function leads to the conclusion that optimal consumption is just the constant fraction ρ of the capital stock,

$$C^*(t) = \rho K(t). \tag{15}$$

The result that C is a constant fraction of K is robust to allowing a more general instantaneous utility function as in (2). This implies optimal consumption to be given by (cf. app. 6.1.3)

$$C^*(t) = \psi K(t) \tag{16}$$

where the constant ψ is the one from (10).

3.2 Standard approaches

3.2.1 Standard I

In contrast to the differential approach, we now let TFP $A(t)$ to be a function of time and stochastic disturbances. Allowing $\mu \neq 0$ in the formulation for the TFP process (cf. eq. (7) with (11)), we specify the parameters μ, σ, β_i, and the arrival rates λ_i of the Poisson processes q_i such that $A(t)$ is a martingale, i.e. the expectation about the TFP level at some future point in time is given by the current level, $E_t[A(\tau)] = A(t)$ for $\tau \geq t$, implying that $A(t)$ has no trend. Given the AK technology in (6), this assumption is made in order to preserve a stationary expected growth rate of the economy which is governed by the marginal product of capital $A(t)$ (cf. app. 6.2.1). As $E_t[A(\tau)] = A(t)e^{\left(\mu + \Sigma_{i=1}^n \beta_i \lambda_i\right)(\tau - t)}$ (cf. app. 6.2.2) the restriction of no trend in the TFP-process requires that

$$\mu + \Sigma_{i=1}^n \beta_i \lambda_i = 0. \tag{17}$$

Economically speaking, given that the arrival rates λ_i are positive by construction, technological progress is either technological regress ($\mu < 0$) or there are occasional negative shocks, i.e. $\beta_i < 0$. We find the second interpretation more plausible where oil price shocks, natural or other disasters disrupt the smooth evolution of an economy. But it should be kept in mind that without an AK specification, one could allow for both positive μ and β_i.

With this setup and a logarithmic utility, the maximized Bellman equation is a second order nonlinear partial differential equation (cf. app. 6.2.3),

$$\rho V(A, K) = \log\left(\frac{1}{V_K}\right) + V_K\left(AK - \delta K - \frac{1}{V_K}\right) + V_A A\mu + \frac{1}{2}V_{AA}A^2\sigma^2 + \tag{18}$$
$$\Sigma_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \left(V(A + A\beta_i, K) - V(A, K)\right).$$

It is standard in the literature to provide an "educated guess" and prove a verification theorem. Finding such a guess can sometimes be very time-consuming. For our case here in (18), we can be more systematic and derive a solution.

Use the definition of the value function as the expected utility out of current and all future optimal consumption, $V_t(A, K) \equiv \max_{\{C(\tau)\}} U_t$ subject to constraints where U_t is the objective function from (1). Looking at the results from the literature as well as from the previous section, a plausible guess concerning optimal consumption is

$$C^*(t) \equiv \tilde{\psi} K(t), \tag{19}$$

where the $\tilde{\psi}$ is an arbitrary constant. Inserting this conjecture into the objective function we can analyze whether the resulting integral can be solved. In fact, doing so by deriving expressions for $K(t)$ from (8) and for $A(t)$ from (7) with (11), respectively, together with the guess (19) gives (cf. app. 6.2.4)

$$V_t(A, K) = E_t \left[\int_t^\infty e^{-\rho(\tau-t)} \log \left(\tilde{\psi} K(t) e^{\int_t^\tau (A(t)e^\varpi - \delta - \psi) ds} \right) d\tau \right], \tag{20}$$

where

$$\varpi = \mu(s-t) - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(s-t) + \sigma z(s) + \log \left(\Sigma_{i=1}^n \frac{1+\beta_i}{n} \right) \Sigma_{i=1}^n \frac{q_i(s)}{n}.$$

Simplifying and solving this integral and dropping the time subscript (as this expression holds for each point in time) yields the value function,

$$V = \frac{\log\left(\tilde{\psi} K\right)}{\rho} + \frac{A}{\rho^2} - \frac{\delta + \tilde{\psi}}{\rho^2}. \tag{21}$$

It is easy to verify that, for $\tilde{\psi} = \rho$, this is indeed a solution to the maximized Bellman equation. Therefore it is confirmed that optimal consumption is a constant fraction of the capital stock,

$$C^*(t) = \rho K(t). \tag{22}$$

Unfortunately unlike in the case with the differential technology this result holds only for the logarithmic utility (2) and not for the CRRA case of $\sigma \neq 1$.

3.2.2 Standard II with Brownian motion and many Poisson processes

Fortunately, however, closed from solution can be found for CRRA utility functions with $\sigma \neq 1$ and standard technologies. The alternative to stochastic TFP we propose is a stochastic capital accumulation technology via e.g. stochastic depreciation. Let the $dw(t)$ in (9) again stand for a combination of a Wiener process and many Poisson processes as in (11):

$$dK(t) = (AK(t) - C(t)) dt - K(t) \left(\delta dt + \sigma dz(t) + \Sigma_{i=1}^n \beta_i dq_i(t) \right) \tag{23}$$

Of course this equation is identical to the corresponding expression in the differential setup in (12). Therefore, computing the solution for the maximization problem of the social planner both in the case with log-utility (2) and in the case with the more general instantaneous utility function (2) leads to the same rule concerning optimal consumption, i.e. consumption is just the constant fraction ρ (cf. eq. (15)) and ψ (cf. eq. (16)), respectively, of the capital stock.

4 Conclusion

The differential approach to specifying technologies is widely used. Specifications of technologies of this type in continuous time models with uncertainty have undesirable features. These features might be one reason why modeling uncertainty in continuous time is not as popular in macroeconomics as it could be. One major advantage of these specifications is their analytical tractability.

This paper generalizes existing closed-form solutions for differential technologies. More importantly, it proposes two alternative setups where technologies are modeled by standard production functions. In both cases, the undesirable features of the differential approach are not present and the analytical tractability is preserved. Closed form solutions are provided for both alternatives.

One alternative implies solutions which are identical to solutions of models following the differential approach. This shows that all results obtained so far in the literature can be preserved even without the undesirable features. For all future papers, analytical tractability can be obtained just as easily as before.

5 Appendix

The appendix is available upon request

References

Asea, P. K., and S. J. Turnovsky (1998): "Capital income taxation and risk-taking in a small open economy," Journal of Public Economics, 68(1), 55–90.

Bianconi, M., and S. J. Turnovsky (2005): "Welfare gains from stabilization in a stochastically growing economy with idiosyncratic shocks and flexible labor supply," Macroeconomic Dynamics, 9(3), 321–357.

Chattopadhyay, P., and S. J. Turnovsky (2004): "Volatility and growth in developing economies: some numerical results and empirical evidence," Journal of International Economics, 59(2), 267–295.

Clemens, C., and S. Soretz (2004): "Optimal fiscal policy, uncertainty, and growth," Journal of Macroeconomics, 26(4), 679–697.

Corsetti, G. (1997): "A portfolio approach to endogenous growth: equilibrium and optimal policy," Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 21(10), 1627–1644.

Eaton, J. (1981): "Fiscal Policy, Inflation and the Accumulation of Risky Capital," Review of Economic Studies, 48(153), 435–445.

Epaulard, A., and A. Pommeret (2003): "Recursive utility, endogenous growth, and the welfare cost of volatility," Review of Economic Dynamics, 6(3), 672–684.

Evans, L., and T. Kenc (2003): "Welfare cost of monetary and fiscal policy shocks," Macroeconomic Dynamics, 7(2), 212–238.

García-Peñalosa, C., and S. J. Turnovsky (2005): "Production risk and the functional distribution of income in a developing economy: tradeoffs and policy responses," Journal of Development Economics, 76(1), 175–208.

Gertler, M., and E. Grinols (1982): "Monetary randomness and investment," Journal of Monetary Economics, 10(2), 239–258.

Gokan, Y. (2002): "Alternative government financing and stochastic endogenous growth," Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 26(4), 681–706.

Gong, L., and H. fu Zou (2002): "Direct preferences for wealth, the risk premium puzzle, growth, and policy effectiveness," Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 26(2), 247–270.

———— (2003): "Military spending and stochastic growth," Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 28(1), 153–170.

Grinols, E. L., and S. J. Turnovsky (1993): "Risk, the financial market, and macroeconomic equilibrium," Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 17(1/2), 1–36.

———— (1994): "Exchange rate determination and asset prices in a stochastic small open economy," Journal of International Economics, 36(1/2), 75–97.

———— (1998a): "Consequences of debt policy in a stochastically growing monetary economy," International Economic Review, 39(2), 495–521.

———— (1998b): "Risk, Optimal Government Finance and Monetary Policies in a Growing Economy," Economica, 65(259), 401–427.

Kenc, T. (2004): "Taxation, risk-taking and growth: a continuous-time stochastic general equilibrium analysis with labor-leisure choice," Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 28(8), 1511–1539.

Koethenbuerger, M., and B. Lockwood (2009): "Does Tax Competition Really Promote Growth?," Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, forthcoming.

Merton, R. C. (1969): "Lifetime Portfolio Selection under Uncertainty: The Continuous-Time Case," The Review of Economics and Statistics, 51(3), 247–257.

———— (1971a): "Optimum Consumption and Portfolio Rules in a Continuous-Time Model," Journal of Economic Theory, 3(4), 373–414.

———— (1971b): "Option pricing when underlying stock returns are discontinuous," Journal of Financial Economics, 3(1-2), 125–144.

———— (1975): "An Asymptotic Theory of Growth under Uncertainty," The Review of Economic Studies, 42(3), 375–393.

Oksendal, B., and A. Sulem (2005): "Applied Stochastic Control of Jump Diffusions," Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Pommeret, A., and W. T. Smith (2005): "Fertility, volatility, and growth," Economics Letters, 87(3), 347–353.

Rebelo, S., and D. Xie (1999): "On the optimality of interest rate smoothing," Journal of Monetary Economics, 43(2), 263–282.

Santanu Chatterjee, P. G., and S. J. Turnovsky (2004): "Capital Income Taxes and Growth in a Stochastic Economy: A Numerical Analysis of the Role of Risk Aversion and Intertemporal Substitution," Journal of Public Economic Theory, 6(2), 277–310.

Smith, W. T. (1996): "Taxes, uncertainty, and long-term growth," European Economic Review, 40(8), 1647–1664.

Steger, T. M. (2005): "Stochastic growth under Wiener and Poisson uncertainty," Economics Letters, 86(3), 311–316.

Turnovsky, S. J. (1993): "Macroeconomic policies, growth, and welfare in a stochastic economy," International Economic Review, 34(4), 953–981.

——— (1999a): "Productive government expenditure in a stochastically growing economy," Macroeconomic Dynamics, 3, 544–570.

——— (1999b): "On the role of government in a stochastically growing open economy," Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 23(5/6), 873–908.

——— (2000): "Government Policy in a Stochastic Growth Model with Elastic Labor Supply," Journal of Public Economic Theory, 2(4), 389–433.

Turnovsky, S. J., and W. T. Smith (2006): "Equilibrium consumption and precautionary savings in a stochastically growing economy," Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 30(2), 243–278.

Wälde, K. (2009): Applied Intertemporal Optimization. Lecture notes, University of Mainz, Available at www.waelde.com/aio.

CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see www.cesifo-group.org/wp
(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, office@cesifo.de)

_____

2783 Momi Dahan, Tehila Kogut and Moshe Shalem, Do Economic Policymakers Practice what they Preach? The Case of Pension Decisions, September 2009

2784 Eytan Sheshinski, Uncertain Longevity and Investment in Education, September 2009

2785 Nannette Lindenberg and Frank Westermann, How Strong is the Case for Dollarization in Costa Rica? A Note on the Business Cycle Comovements with the United States, September 2009

2786 Leif Danziger, Noncompliance and the Effects of the Minimum Wage on Hours and Welfare in Competitive Labor Markets, September 2009

2787 Gerlinde Fellner, Rupert Sausgruber and Christian Traxler, Testing Enforcement Strategies in the Field: Legal Threat, Moral Appeal and Social Information, September 2009

2788 Gabriel J. Felbermayr, Mario Larch and Wolfgang Lechthaler, Unemployment in an Interdependent World, September 2009

2789 Sebastian G. Kessing, Federalism and Accountability with Distorted Election Choices, September 2009

2790 Daniel Gros, Global Welfare Implications of Carbon Border Taxes, September 2009

2791 Louis N. Christofides, Michael Hoy and Ling Yang, The Gender Imbalance in Participation in Canadian Universities (1977-2005), September 2009

2792 Jan K. Brueckner and Robert W. Helsley, Sprawl and Blight, September 2009

2793 Vidar Christiansen and Stephen Smith, Externality-correcting Taxes and Regulation, September 2009

2794 John Beirne, Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Marianne Schulze-Ghattas and Nicola Spagnolo, Global and Regional Spillovers in Emerging Stock Markets: A Multivariate GARCH-in-mean Analysis, September 2009

2795 Rüdiger Pethig and Frieder Kolleß, Asymmetric Capital-Tax Competition, Unemployment and Losses from Capital Market Integration, September 2009

2796 Ngo Van Long, Horst Raff and Frank Stähler, Innovation and Trade with Heterogeneous Firms, September 2009

2797 Margit Osterloh and Bruno S. Frey, Research Governance in Academia: Are there Alternatives to Academic Rankings?, September 2009

2798 Thiess Buettner and Clemens Fuest, The Role of the Corporate Income Tax as an Automatic Stabilizer, September 2009

2799 Annette Alstadsæter, Measuring the Consumption Value of Higher Education, September 2009