Economics Letters 130 (2015) 93–96

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Economics Letters

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ecolet

Stationarity of econometric learning with bounded memory and a predicted state variable ☆

Tatiana Damjanovic *, Šarūnas Girdėnas, Keqing Liu

University of Exeter, United Kingdom

HIGHLIGHTS

- We consider a model of Econometric Learning with Bounded Memory.
- Price setting depends on expected price and predicted state variable.
- We prove that the RCAR process of price movement is covariance-stationary.
- We formulate a sufficient condition for stationarity of RCAR model.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 19 January 2015
Received in revised form
22 February 2015
Accepted 11 March 2015
Available online 19 March 2015

JEL classification:
C22
C53
C62
D83
E31

Keywords:
Econometric learning
Bounded memory
Random coefficient autoregressive process
Stationarity

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we consider a model where producers set their prices based on their prediction of the aggregated price level and an exogenous variable, which can be a demand or a cost-push shock. To form their expectations, they use OLS-type econometric learning with bounded memory. We show that the aggregated price follows the random coefficient autoregressive process and we prove that this process is covariance stationary.

1. Introduction

Econometric Learning was designed to model the forecast of the future economic variables in forward looking models. In contrast to the Rational Expectations Theory, which imposes a very strong assumption that the agents know the structure of the model, Econometric Learning only assumes that agents behave as professional econometricians. They collect the available data and use OLS regression to produce the forecast. As more data becomes available, this econometric forecast often converges to the rational expectations equilibria (Sargent, 1993). Although econometric learning relaxes many assumptions of the rational expectations mechanism, we think that one of them could still be too strong. In particular, it assumes that agents have access to the entire history of the variables, and they use all of them to form the forecast. Not only does that assumption require infinite memory, it also neglects the cost of data collection and processing.

Several papers facilitate the assumption of infinite memory and consider the case when the memory is bounded (for a survey, see Chevillon and Mavroeidis, 2014). However, the majority of the results are proven for non-stochastic models (Evans and Honkapohja, 2000). The only exception known to us is Honkapohja and Mitra (2003) who investigate learning with bounded memory

☆ We would like to thank Adriana Cornea, Martin Ellison, Michele Berardi, Jack R. Rogers and Dooruj Rambaccussing for comments and discussions. Keqing Liu and Šarūnas Girdėnas are grateful for financial support from ESRC scholarship. Special acknowledge goes to the anonymous referee who corrected some typos in our proof.

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: Tatiana.Damjanovic@Durham.ac.uk (T. Damjanovic), sg325@exeter.ac.uk (Š. Girdėnas), kl307@exeter.ac.uk (K. Liu).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2015.03.011
0165-1765/

in a stochastic environment. However, they consider a very special case of learning the intercept parameter, and their model does not account for the possibility of using some exogenous independent variables when the expectation is formed.

This paper picks up the research from Honkapohja and Mitra (2003) and explores the dynamic properties of econometric learning with bounded memory in a stochastic environment. We expand that paper by adding a stochastic exogenous variable which can be used for econometric forecasts.

The introduction of stochastic independent variable makes the mathematical framework more complex as compared to Honkapohja and Mitra (2003) where the model evolves according to a simple autoregressive process (*AR*). In this paper, the model is more complex since the transition matrix has random coefficients (the random coefficient autoregressive model, *RCAR*, as in Nicholls and Quinn, 1982). It is also more complex than Conlisk (1974), since our transition matrices are autocorrelated. Nevertheless, we proved the stationarity of the model. In addition, we formulate a sufficient condition for stationarity which can be more generally applied in the RCAR literature.

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we present the model and introduce OLS-type learning with finite memory. In Section 3 we prove that the *RCAR* process of price movement is covariance-stationary. Section 4 concludes the paper.

2. The model

We consider a model where producer j sets the current price $p_t(j)$ depending on the expected aggregated level of price p_t^e and the exogenous but not completely observable state variable $\widetilde{w}_t$:

$$p_t(j) = \alpha + \beta p_t^e + \delta \widetilde{w}_t \tag{1}$$

where α, δ are known constant parameters and $\widetilde{w}_t$ is the estimated value of the exogenous cost push shock which can negatively affect the profit. The cost push shock w_t is not observed in period t; however, every producer has access to the historical data of its past realisation of $\{w_s\}$.

This model is very similar to the cobweb model as presented in Kaldor (1934), Ezekiel (1938) and more recently in Evans and Honkapohja (2001). It is known to be stable when $|\beta| < 1$. We will restrict our analysis to this particular case. In equilibrium, each producer sets the same price, that is $p_t = p_t(j)$.

2.1. OLS learning

As w_t is the only state variable, the producer expects the aggregated price to depend on the variable

$$p_t = \alpha_2 + \beta_2 w_t, \tag{2}$$

where α_2 and β_2 are unknown parameters with producer estimates based on available historical data $\{p_s, w_s\}$. The price expectation is then

$$p_t^e = \widehat{\alpha}_{2,t-1} + \widehat{\beta}_{2,t-1}\widetilde{w}_t \tag{3}$$

where $\widehat{\alpha}_{2,t}$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{2,t}$ are estimated coefficients and $\widetilde{w}_t$ is a proxy for w_t. The classical OLS-type learning model assumes that agents forecast future prices by running the OLS regression using Eq. (2) and that at time t, the available information set consists of the entire history of prices and the exogenous state variable $\{p_s, w_s\}_{s=0}^{t-1}$. Coefficients $\widehat{\alpha}_{2,t}$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{2,t}$ are OLS estimators on the information set $\{p_s, w_s\}_{s=0}^{t}$.

2.2. Learning with bounded memory

Learning with bounded memory in our paper simply means that the agent is only using a limited number of observations T to form expectations.[1] The forecast will be made using the same OLS algorithm as in the classical case (3); however, we assume that only a finite set of historical data, $\{p_s, w_s\}_{s=t-T}^{t-1}$, is used to estimate the coefficients. Consequently, the estimators $\widehat{\alpha}_{2,t}$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{2,t}$ are defined as follows:

$$\widehat{\beta}_{2,t-1} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{T}\left[(w_{t-i} - \overline{w}_{t-1})(p_{t-i} - \overline{p}_{t-1})\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^{T}\left[(w_{t-i} - \overline{w}_{t-1})^2\right]}, \tag{4}$$

$$\widehat{\alpha}_{2,t-1} = \overline{p}_{t-1} - \widehat{\beta}_{2,t-1}\overline{w}_{t-1}, \tag{5}$$

$$\overline{w}_{t-1} = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{i=1}^{T} w_{t-i}, \tag{6}$$

$$\overline{p}_{t-1} = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{i=1}^{T} p_{t-i}. \tag{7}$$

Finally, as the agents cannot observe the realisation of w_t at the time when they set their prices, the forecast $\widetilde{w}_t$ is used. The forecast is based on available historical data $\{w_s\}_{s=t-T}^{t-1}$, and consists of the weighted sum as in Mitra and Honkapohja (2003). Formally, $\widetilde{w}_t$ can be written as

$$\widetilde{w}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \gamma_{i,t} w_{t-i}, \tag{8}$$

where $\gamma_{i,t}$ is the expected probability that $w_t = w_{t-i}$ and therefore,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \gamma_{i,t} = 1. \tag{9}$$

Our set up covers an extensive range of models. For example, if w_t follows a Markov process with high persistency, the best prediction for w_t is w_{t-1}. In this case, $\gamma_{1t} = 1$, and $\gamma_{it} = 0$ for $i > 1$. In particular, for $T = 2, \gamma_1 = 1, \gamma_2 = 0$, the price p_t follows a simple autoregressive process with $p_t^e = p_{t-1}$. If w_t is *i.i.d.* distributed, the best proxy for w_t might be $\overline{w}_{t-1}$. In this case, $\gamma_{i,t} = \frac{1}{T}$, and the price p_t follows the $AR(T)$ process with $p_t^e = \overline{p}_{t-1}$. Our model will also work if $\gamma_{i,t}$ corresponds to precautionary predictors with larger weights attached to the worse realisations as in the Robust Control or The Ambiguity Aversion theories.

The complete model consists of (1), (3), (8), (4), (5), (6) and (7). Our aim is to show that p_t is stationary for all $T > 1$.

First, we show that the aggregated price p_t follows a Random Coefficient Autoregressive (*RCAR*) process.

Proposition 1. *The actual price follows an autoregressive process of order T with random coefficients as in (10)*

$$p_t = \alpha + \beta\left(\sum_{i=1}^{T} Z_{i,t}p_{t-i}\right) + \delta\widetilde{w}_t, \tag{10}$$

where

$$Z_{i,t} = \frac{1}{T} + \frac{(w_{t-i} - \overline{w}_{t-1})\left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{T}\gamma_{i,t}\,(w_{t-i} - \overline{w}_{t-1})\right)\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{T}\left[(w_{t-i} - \overline{w}_{t-1})^2\right]}. \tag{11}$$

[1] This is similar to Honkapohja and Mitra (2003) where a simplified version of the model without state variable is considered.