Efficiency and Welfare in a Spatial Economy

Donald, Fukui, & Miyauchi (2023)

Levi Crews (Princeton) October 2023

- Aim: "establish normative implications of a general class of spatial equilibrium models"
 - 1. characterize inefficiency w/ and w/o preference shocks (cf. Mongey and Waugh, 2023)
 - 2. first- vs. second-best (cf. Fajgelbaum and Gaubert, 2020)
 - 3. Hulten-like welfare response to shocks (cf. Dávila and Schaab, 2023)
 - 4. identification of sufficient statistics (cf. Davis and Gregory, 2021)
 - 5. quantitative example (transfers between U.S. states)

- Aim: "establish normative implications of a general class of spatial equilibrium models"
 - 1. characterize inefficiency w/ and w/o preference shocks (cf. Mongey and Waugh, 2023)
 - 2. first- vs. second-best (cf. Fajgelbaum and Gaubert, 2020)
 - 3. Hulten-like welfare response to shocks (cf. Dávila and Schaab, 2023)
 - 4. identification of sufficient statistics (cf. Davis and Gregory, 2021)
 - 5. quantitative example (transfers between U.S. states)
- Key tool: discrete choice w/ $\varepsilon \sim F \cong$ choose lottery s.t. cost(F)
 - Anderson, Palma, and Thisse (1988) for logit, Hofbauer and Sandholm (2002) generalized

- Aim: "establish normative implications of a general class of spatial equilibrium models"
 - 1. characterize inefficiency w/ and w/o preference shocks (cf. Mongey and Waugh, 2023)
 - 2. first- vs. second-best (cf. Fajgelbaum and Gaubert, 2020)
 - 3. Hulten-like welfare response to shocks (cf. Dávila and Schaab, 2023)
 - 4. identification of sufficient statistics (cf. Davis and Gregory, 2021)
 - 5. quantitative example (transfers between U.S. states)
- Key tool: discrete choice w/ $\varepsilon \sim F \cong$ choose lottery s.t. cost(F)
 - Anderson, Palma, and Thisse (1988) for logit, Hofbauer and Sandholm (2002) generalized
- Key idea: dispersion of marginal utility (u') in spatial equilibrium (even w/o externality)
 - first best: equalize u^\prime by reallocating goods and people
 - second best: only $\mathbf{goods} \to \mathsf{equalize} \ u'$ vs. inducing moves to recipient locations

- 1. Free mobility: utility equalized \rightarrow agent-location match is *indeterminate*
 - buy insurance against being *assigned* to Mississippi
 - utility won't be equilized after claims are paid out

- 1. Free mobility: utility equalized \rightarrow agent-location match is *indeterminate*
 - buy insurance against being *assigned* to Mississippi
 - utility won't be equilized after claims are paid out
- 2. Idiosyncratic taste *shocks*: ex ante homogeneous \rightarrow ex post heterogeneous
 - buy insurance against *liking* Mississippi

- 1. Free mobility: utility equalized \rightarrow agent-location match is *indeterminate*
 - buy insurance against being *assigned* to Mississippi
 - utility won't be equilized after claims are paid out
- 2. Idiosyncratic taste *shocks*: ex ante homogeneous \rightarrow ex post heterogeneous
 - buy insurance against liking Mississippi
- 3. Unobserved taste *types*: ex ante *heterogeneous*, but econometrician only knows $\varepsilon \sim F$
 - finite (θ): buy insurance against being *assigned* to Mississippi *if* any of your type lives there
 - still true in generic case $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n$?

- 1. Free mobility: utility equalized \rightarrow agent-location match is *indeterminate*
 - buy insurance against being *assigned* to Mississippi
 - utility won't be equilized after claims are paid out
- 2. Idiosyncratic taste *shocks*: ex ante homogeneous \rightarrow ex post heterogeneous
 - buy insurance against *liking* Mississippi
- 3. Unobserved taste *types*: ex ante *heterogeneous*, but econometrician only knows $\varepsilon \sim F$
 - finite (θ): buy insurance against being *assigned* to Mississippi *if* any of your type lives there
 - still true in generic case $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n$?
 - alternative: "Conditional on a location's characteristics, a location with higher population
 has lower average flow utility, since the marginal agent has a lower preference to live in that
 location. In that sense, preference heterogeneity acts like a congestion force"
 (Desmet, Nagy, and Rossi-Hansberg, 2018, p.912)

- "a general class of spatial equilibrium models": can you characterize conditions? (cf. universal gravity class of Allen, Arkolakis, and Takahashi, 2020)
 - how does housing fit?
 - do results break down if space is continuous?
- 2. quantitative: showed how big the transfers would be, but can you say \ldots
 - what's the resulting dispersion in marginal utilities?
 - how much pop. reallocation is induced?

References

- Allen, Treb, Costas Arkolakis, and Yuta Takahashi. 2020. "Universal gravity." *Journal of Political Economy* 128 (2):393–433.
- Anderson, S. P., A. De Palma, and J.-F. Thisse. 1988. "A representative consumer theory of the logit model." *International Economic Review* 29 (3):461.
- Dávila, Eduardo and Andreas Schaab. 2023. "Welfare accounting." National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 31717.
- Davis, Morris and Jesse M. Gregory. 2021. "Place-based redistribution in location choice models." National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 29045.
- Desmet, Klaus, Dávid Kristián Nagy, and Esteban Rossi-Hansberg. 2018. "The geography of development." *Journal of Political Economy* 126 (3):903–983.
- Fajgelbaum, Pablo D. and Cecile Gaubert. 2020. "Optimal spatial policies, geography, and sorting." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135 (2):959–1036.
- Hofbauer, Josef and William H. Sandholm. 2002. "On the global convergence of stochastic fictitious play." *Econometrica* 70 (6):2265–2294.
- Mongey, Simon and Michael E. Waugh. 2023. "Discrete choice, complete markets, and equilibrium."