

A SHORT WALK ON THE WILD SIDE: AGENT-BASED MODELS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR MACROECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Documents de travail GREDEG
GREDEG Working Papers Series

MAURO NAPOLETANO

GREDEG WP No. 2017-40

<https://ideas.repec.org/s/gre/wpaper.html>

Les opinions exprimées dans la série des **Documents de travail GREDEG** sont celles des auteurs et ne reflètent pas nécessairement celles de l'institution. Les documents n'ont pas été soumis à un rapport formel et sont donc inclus dans cette série pour obtenir des commentaires et encourager la discussion. Les droits sur les documents appartiennent aux auteurs.

The views expressed in the GREDEG Working Paper Series are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the institution. The Working Papers have not undergone formal review and approval. Such papers are included in this series to elicit feedback and to encourage debate. Copyright belongs to the author(s).

A short walk on the wild side: agent-based models and their implications for macroeconomic analysis

Mauro Napoletano¹

Abstract

I discuss recent advances in agent-based modelling applied to macroeconomic analysis. I first present the building blocks of agent-based models. Furthermore, by relying on examples taken from recent works, I argue that agent-based models provide complementary or new lights with respect to more standard models on key macroeconomic issues like endogenous business cycles, the interactions between business cycles and long-run growth, and the role of price vs. quantity adjustments in the return to full employment. Finally, I discuss some limits of agent-based models and how they are currently addressed in the literature.

Keywords: agent-based models, macroeconomic analysis, endogenous business-cycles, short and long-run dynamics, monetary and fiscal policy, price vs. quantity adjustments

JEL Codes: B41, B50, E32, E52

¹ OFCE-Sciences Po, SKEMA business school and Université Côte d'Azur (GREDEG), and Institute of Economics, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna (Pisa – Italy).

Introduction

This paper discusses recent advances in agent-based modelling applied to macroeconomic analysis. The main goal is to briefly illustrate the main building blocks of agent-based models and to argue – with examples from recent works - that this new class of models can provide complementary or new lights with respect to more standard models on several issues.

Agent-based models (ABMs) represent an economy as a dynamical system of heterogeneous interacting agents. Heterogeneity involves agent's characteristics (e.g. the size of firms or the income of households) and/or the behavior of agents (e.g. their expectation rules). Agents in these models can interact globally via prices (as they typically do in traditional macroeconomic models) but also locally via non-price variables (e.g. the imitation of a technology or of an expectation rule adopted by another firm in the economy). In addition, agents' heterogeneity and the structure of their interaction networks are not fixed, but they *evolve* over time together with the dynamics of the whole system. Another important building block of these models is their non-exclusive focus on equilibrium states of the economy. In other words, these models also analyze the dynamics of the system in situations where some markets do not clear and/or where agents are not optimizing their behavior and thus have incentives to change it.² Accordingly, agent-based models also dispense with the assumption of perfect rationality of agents, in the sense of agents taking decisions out of the solution of an intertemporal optimization problem. They rather assume bounded rationality of agents, i.e. in ABMs people have very simple rules of behavior for coping with an environment that is too complex for anyone fully to understand (Howitt, 2011, Tesfatsion, 2006). Boundedly rational behavior may range from static or evolutionary optimization to more routinized rule-of-thumb behavior rooted on experimental or empirical evidence. Finally, one important concept associated to agent-based models is the one of *emergent property*. More precisely, an agent-based model typically lacks any isomorphism between aggregate properties of the system and specific assumptions on the characteristics or behavior of a single agent populating the system itself. Aggregate properties stem from the interaction of the agents populating the economy (Turrell, 2016). This *bottom-up* modelling philosophy echoes the one that has been applied for almost a century by quantum mechanics to study the physics of interacting particles.

One straightforward consequence of assuming evolving agents' heterogeneity and interaction structures is that the dimensionality and the non-linearity of the dynamical system that represents the economy become huge and it precludes any possible closed form solution of the system. Thus agent-based models are typically studied via extensive Monte Carlo simulations, thus in a way similar to bootstrap analyses widely employed in econometrics and statistics.

Agent-based models have a long and established tradition in scientific disciplines different from economics like, for instance, physics³, biology, computer science. They have also become more and more diffused in social sciences like sociology and archeology. They have had much harder life in economics, although the Great recession, and the critiques to standard macroeconomics models that followed, have contributed to pull agent-based models out of the

² Accounting for disequilibrium states also implies that the behavior of the system is not described by the evolution of state variables resulting from the solution of a system of equations. In an agent-based models all variables are instead updated following a precise time-line of events.

³ Interestingly, Turrell (2016) remarks that one of the first scientists to apply agent-based model techniques was Enrico Fermi, to solve problems involving the transport of neutrons through matter.

far periphery of economic theorizing. Since then, ABMs have received increasing attention as useful tools for the analysis of key markets, like the financial and energy markets (see e.g. Le Baron, 2006, Tesfatsion, 2006 and Weidlich and Weit, 2008), and as alternative tools for the analysis of economic and climate change dynamics (see e.g. Balint et al. 2017), and for macroeconomic analysis (see Haldane, 2016).

This paper will not attempt to provide a survey of the state of the art of agent-based models in macroeconomics. Good and updated surveys can for example be found in Fagiolo and Roventini (2017) and in Turrell (2016), and recent collections of research works using agent-based macro models can be found in Delli Gatti et al. (2011), Gaffard and Napoletano (2012), and in Gallegati et al. (2017). This paper will instead try to explain, by means of examples mainly taken from recent works by the author and co-authors, the consequences of some fundamental concepts of the agent-based models. It will then show how the use of these concepts generate results that offer *complementary if not totally new perspectives* on key issues in macro-economics, like the emergence of aggregate fluctuations from microeconomic idiosyncratic shocks, the persistent effects of business cycles (and of monetary and fiscal policies) in the long-run and the role played by prices in favoring the return of the economy to full-employment. Finally, it will discuss some of the critiques raised against macroeconomic agent-based models and how they have recently been addressed in the literature.

Agent-based models, emergent properties and the generative approach in economics

We already mentioned in the introduction that one workhorse of agent-based models is the concept of emergent property, i.e. an aggregate property of the system (e.g. business cycles) that cannot be deduced from assumptions made on single components of the system itself (the household or the firms). Agent-based models thus take a generative approach to science. In this perspective, the goal of the model provides a micro-specification regarding the nature of agents' heterogeneity and the nature of their interaction. The model is then validated – i.e. it provides an explanation of a given macro phenomenon – if it is able to grow up that phenomenon out the specified interaction among heterogeneous agents. As Epstein (2007, Chap. 1) puts it

“Agent-based models provide computational demonstrations that a given microspecification is in fact *sufficient to generate* a macrostructure of interest. Agent-based modelers may use statistics to gauge the generative sufficiency of a given micro-specification—to test the agreement between real-world and generated macro structures [...] A good fit demonstrates that the target macrostructure—the explanandum—be it a wealth distribution, segregation pattern, price equilibrium, norm, or some other macrostructure, is effectively attainable under repeated application of agent-interaction rules: It is effectively computable by agent society. [...] Thus, the motto of generative social science, if you will, is: If you didn't grow it, you didn't explain its emergence.”

The generativist approach followed by agent-based models stands in sharp contrast with the reductionist approach, according to which the explanation of a phenomenon can be reduced to some fundamental laws governing the behavior of single components of the system. The latter approach is still very much popular in economics⁴, and it is the candid opinion of the author of this paper that such a predominance explains a good deal of the diffidence towards agent-based models, and especially their perception as “black-boxes”, i.e. models where the causes and mechanism driving results are blurred. In contrast, reductionism is rather questioned in other scientific disciplines like physics. The dissatisfaction is very well explained by the physics Nobel laureate Phillip Anderson (see Anderson, 1972):

⁴ The popularity of reductionism resists despite key results in general equilibrium theory (the Sonnenschein-Mantel-Debreu theorem) show the impossibility of obtaining well-behaved aggregate excess demand functions directly from assumptions about the micro-behaviour of agents (see Kirman, 1992, for an account).

“The ability to reduce everything to simple fundamental laws does not imply the ability to start from those laws and reconstruct the universe. In fact, the more the elementary particle physicists tell us about the nature of the fundamental laws, the less relevance they seem to have to the very real problems of the rest of science, much less to those of society. [...] The behavior of large and complex aggregates of elementary particles, it turns out, is not to be understood in terms of a simple extrapolation of the properties of a few particles. Instead, at each level of complexity entirely new properties appear, and the understanding of the new behaviors requires research which I think is as fundamental in its nature as any other.”

It follows that in the generative approach (also known as “bottom-up” approach) one should not search for simple “causes” of a given phenomenon but rather check whether starting from assumptions about agents’ behavior and interaction structures the model is able to reproduce that phenomenon at the macro level or not. The approach is also close to the concept of “sequential causality” outlined by Hicks (1979). In that, a given “phenomenon” (e.g. a recession) may or may not be the direct consequence of a specific “cause” (e.g. an exogenous shock) according to the sequence of decisions (and of resulting constraints) that occur in the time lapse between the two. That sequence can change the path leading to the emergence of a given property in a fundamental way, so that it is not always possible to establish a direct link between the specific cause and its effects.⁵

Let us now provide an illustration of emergent property in a macro agent-based models, by means of the K+S agent-based model developed in Dosi et al. (2010,2013,2015,2017).⁶ In its most extended vintage the micro-specification of the model portrays an economy composed of heterogeneous capital- and consumption-good firms, a labour force, banks, a Government, and a Central Bank. Capital-good firms perform R&D and produce heterogeneous machine tools. Consumption-good firms invest in new machines and produce a homogeneous consumption good. The latter type of enterprises finance their production and investments first with their liquid assets and, if these are not enough, they ask their bank for credit (which is more expensive than internal funds). Higher production and investment levels rise firms’ debt, eroding their net worth and consequently increasing their credit risk. Banks, in turn, increase the level of credit rationing in the economy and force firms to curb production and investment, thus possibly triggering a recession. Bank failures can endogenously emerge from the accumulation of loan losses on banks’ balance sheets. Banking crises imply direct bailout costs on the public budget and may therefore affect the dynamics of Government deficit and debt. The latter can also vary with changes in tax revenues and unemployment subsidies over the business cycle.

The K+S model generates as emergent properties the main stylized facts at the macroeconomic level. For instance, it generates time series of GDP, consumption and investment displaying long-run growth (see Figure 1, left). as well as business cycle fluctuations in the short-run (see Figure 1, right). Furthermore, the list of stylized facts is not limited to the highest level of aggregation. The model also generates a wide array of facts characterizing the cross-sectional dynamics of firms, e.g. tent-shaped distributions of firm growth-rates.⁷ It is important to stress that none of these properties is the direct consequence of specific assumptions on the behavior of firms. For instance, recessions and expansions are

⁵ The notion of sequential causality should be contrasted to the one of “contemporaneous causality”, which is typical of standard models, and according to which a specific phenomenon can always be linked to a specific cause and the sequence of decisions and constraints occurring in between is irrelevant in that respect.

⁶ The K+S model has also been extended to analyze the consequences of different policies in the labor market (Napoletano et al. 2012, Dosi et al. 2016, 2017) and as a tool for integrated assessment analysis of the co-evolution of economic and climate change dynamics (see Lamperti et al., 2017).

⁷ In that, the model follows the call of Anderson (1972) for providing explanations at different layers of complexity.

not generated from a specific response of firms to some aggregate shock. All the above properties are instead generated as the result of firm idiosyncratic technology shocks that diffuse from the capital good to the consumption good sector via investment interactions.⁸




Figure 1. Source: Dosi et al. (2015)

The diffusion of technology is heterogeneous across firms as their investment levels differ because of different expectations about final demand and because of different levels of financial constraints. The resulting aggregate level of investment in turn affects the overall level of economic activity, but it also affects future credit availability because firms accumulate debt out of investment and production activities and may therefore become more financially fragile and even go bankrupt, thereby lowering aggregate credit supply and increasing credit rationing. The foregoing tension between *change* (induced by innovation and diffusion of new technologies) and *coordination* (induced by effective demand and by credit constraints) does not only set the long-run growth of the economy, but it also creates business cycles.

In the next section I further develop the above points and discuss how agent-based models may provide new perspectives on several macroeconomic issues.


Some implications of agent-based models for macroeconomic analysis

Agent-based models have applied the generative approach discussed in the previous section to explain a wide array of phenomena in macroeconomics as well to test the impact of several macroeconomic policies (and of their combination). The list includes, but it is not limited to, the generation of business cycles and long-run growth out of the combination between Schumpeterian dynamics of innovation and Keynesian demand dynamics (the K+S model of Dosi et al., 2010, 2013, 2015), the generation of business fluctuations out of evolving distributions of firms' bankruptcy risk (e.g. Delli Gatti et al., 2005, 2010, Cincotti et al., 2010, Mandel et al., 2015), the analysis of the interactions between inequality and growth (Dosi et al., 2013, Ciarli et al., 2010, Cardaci and Saraceno, 2015, Caiani et al., 2016), the analysis of combinations of fiscal and monetary policies (e.g. Dosi et al., 2013, 2015), the analysis of structural policies affecting R&D and innovations (e.g. Dosi et al., 2010, Russo et al., 2007), the impact of labor market policies on aggregate dynamics (Napoletano et al., 2012, Dosi et al., 2016, 2017) and of cohesion policies on regional convergence (Dawid et al., 2014), the impact

⁸Not even a mild cross-sectional agents' heterogeneity is imposed ex-ante. On the contrary, firms are assumed to be completely homogeneous at the beginning of each simulation dynamics.

of the combination of monetary and macro-prudential policies (Ashraf et al., 2017, Popoyan et al., 2017).

The above long list reveals the great flexibility of agent-based models to be used for both positive and normative analyses in macroeconomics. As I already mentioned above, providing an account of all the results obtained by macro agent-based models is beyond the scope of this article. I shall rather focus on some examples that briefly illustrate the ability of agent-based models to address some key issues in macroeconomics from a new perspective with respect to more standard macroeconomic models.



Frequency of full employment in the benchmark scenario (solid line) and in the scenario with zero fiscal policy (dashed line; 95% confidence bands in gray).

Figure 2. Source: Dosi et al. (2013)

Example 1: endogenous business cycles

Agent-based models have a clear advantage with respect to typical DSGE macro models, even those with heterogeneous agents. In those models, expansions and recessions are the result of respectively positive and negative aggregate shock hitting a representative agent or (in more recent works) a set of heterogeneous agents. In contrast, in macro agent-based models, the system can generate both situations where the economy is in full employment as well as mild and deep recessions, *and it endogenously switches across them* (see Figure 1 and discussion in the previous section). Endogenous business cycles arise in agent-based models because agents' heterogeneity and interaction mechanisms introduce several non-linearities in the dynamical system that describes the economy.⁹

The ability agent-based models to endogenously generate business fluctuations is not only important from a purely theoretical viewpoint. It also means that these models can be used as useful tools to explore (and possibly control via specific policies) the economic mechanisms that trigger instabilities during an expansionary phase and put the seeds of a recession. For

⁹ Previous works showed that endogenous business cycles may emerge also in equilibrium models (e.g. Grandmont, 1985) or in models with infinitely-lived agents and rational expectations (see e.g. Baumol and Benhabib 1989 for a discussion, and the papers contained in Benhabib, 1992). All these models were however representative-agent models, or models where heterogeneity was small (e.g. like in overlapping generation models) and typically not evolving over time. These models also did not allow one to analyze how small perturbations of the system at the micro-level (e.g. because of a small exogenous shock) could be magnified via a network of agents' interactions. Agent-based models improve on all these aspects, because they allow one to generate endogenous business cycles in a framework with more realistic assumptions on agents' heterogeneity and mechanisms of interactions across agents.

instance, the frequency of full employment states of the economy can be linked to some key parameters capturing institutional and policy scenarios (e.g. the structure of interaction in markets, the level of income inequality or the intensity of fiscal policy). For instance, in Dosi et al. (2013) the average frequency of full employment states, i.e. the time the economy spends on average in the full-employment equilibrium is inversely related to the inequality in the functional distribution between profits and wages (and captured by the level of the mark-up rate, see Figure 2). In addition, the incidence of full-employment equilibria falls for any level of inequality if fiscal policy is completely absent (no fiscal policy scenario).¹⁰

Another example that illustrates the role played by agents' heterogeneity and interactions generating endogenous business cycles is provided by the work of Guerini et al. (2017). This paper analyzes the behavior of an economy under two different matching protocols: (a) a centralized matching scenario, where a fictitious auctioneer solves any possible coordination problem among the agent, and (b) a decentralized matching scenario, where agents locally interact in the markets. In such a regime, matching frictions and agents' heterogeneity may lead to imperfect allocations of goods and labor. Furthermore, households face liquidity constraints (their consumption is limited by changes in wealth). The authors initialize the variables of the model (consumption, wages, prices, production, firms' net worth, households' wealth, etc.) at values compatible with the full-employment, homogeneous-agents' equilibrium of the economy. They then let idiosyncratic (and auto-regressive) negative technology shocks hit the economy at the firm level and they study the stability of the ensuing equilibrium and the convergence properties of the model. The behavior of the model under the two matching protocol scenarios is very different. In the centralized scenario, the economic system is always able to get back to the full-employment equilibrium after the productivity shocks. In addition, the impulse-response functions generated by the model mimic the ones generated by standard DSGE models (see Figure 3) and, finally, agents' heterogeneity fades away. In contrast, in the decentralized scenario the economy fluctuates around an underemployment equilibrium (Figure 4) and it is characterized by persistent heterogeneity in firms and household behavior. This completely different outcome across the two scenarios is generated by the fact that the decentralized scenario produces frictional unemployment. However, liquidity constraints faced by households amplify the effect of frictional unemployment leads to lower aggregate demand in the goods market, which in turn feeds back in lower aggregated demand and higher unemployment in the labor market.

This last example shows quite well how the structure of interaction has a great effect on the properties of an aggregate dynamics of an economy and how it can greatly amplify even small degrees of heterogeneity across agents, e.g. due to the unemployment status created by the frictions in the allocation of labor across firms.

¹⁰ In a similar fashion, Gualdi et al. (2015) show the existence of multiple equilibria characterized, respectively, by high and low unemployment. The transition between the equilibria is induced by an asymmetry between the rate of hiring and the rate of firing of the firms. The unemployment level remains small until a tipping point, beyond which the economy collapses. Finally, if the parameters of the model are such that the system is close to this transition, any small fluctuation is amplified as the system jumps between the two equilibria.




Figure 3. Impulse response of output and unemployment in the model of Guerini et al. (2017) under the centralized matching scenario. Source: Guerini et al. (2017). In the figure “s.s. deviation” stands for deviations from the full-employment equilibrium.




Figure 4. Impulse response of output and unemployment in the model of Guerini et al. (2017) under the decentralized matching scenario. Source: Guerini et al. (2017). In the figure “s.s. deviation” stands for deviations from the full-employment equilibrium.

Example 2: interactions between the short- and the long-run dynamics of an economy

Macroeconomic theory has been characterized by a sharp distinction between the analysis of long-run growth processes and the one of business cycles. This separation comes from the assumption that any coordination problem is solved in the long-run. It follows, that long-run growth mainly stems from supply factors, in primis technological change. In contrast, some coordination failures may arise in the short-run due to aggregate demand deficiencies. This framework has however several limitations, because it prevents the understanding of how technical change can map into higher growth and how the inherent instability of technical change processes can be mitigated. In one direction, technological innovations may impact upon the long-term rate of growth of the economy, as well as on the short-term evolution of output (and unemployment) over the business cycle. In the other one, macroeconomic

conditions (i.e. aggregate demand, credit availability, etc.) are likely to modulate the creation and diffusion of technological innovations and the long-run performance of the economy (Dosi et al., 2017). As it is argued at more length in the article by Jean-Luc Gaffard in this special issue, answering the above questions requires one to seriously consider the issue of time in economic analysis, and to reject the idea of the presence of an equilibrium growth path towards which the economy converges in the long-run. In contrast, the long-run evolution of the economy is the results of a sequence of short-run states characterized by imperfect coordination¹¹ (see Gaffard, 2017, Dosi and Virgillito, 2017). Agent-based models are very good candidates for this type of analysis. This is because they do not have an exclusive focus on equilibrium states of the economy. They can therefore be used to understand how structural change (e.g. resulting from technology-induced structural changes) and/or coordination failures (e.g. resulting from aggregate demand shortages) may affect the long-run dynamics of an economy, and how different types of macroeconomic policies can intervene in this context. An example of this type of exercise is provided by the series of results obtained with the K+S model by Dosi et al. (2015) about the short- and long-run effects of the fiscal and monetary policy mix. Tables 1 and 2 – taken from Dosi et al. (2015) – show the effects of different combinations of fiscal and monetary policies on, respectively, the average growth rate of real GDP and the unemployment rate. The fiscal policies considered are an unconstrained fiscal policy (*norule*), two constrained fiscal policies (stability and growth pact, *SGP*, and fiscal compact, *FC*) and – finally – the same constrained fiscal policies but with escape clauses for recessionary phases (*SGP_{ec}* and *FC_{ec}*). The monetary policies considered are a conservative Taylor rule, targeting only the inflation rate (*TR_π*), a dual-mandate Taylor rule (*TR_{π,U}*) and the same dual-mandate rule but augmented with a government-debt dependent spread on bonds in order to account for possible feedbacks from high government debt levels on interest rates.

Table 1. Source: Dosi et al. (2015)

Fiscal and monetary policy interactions. Normalised values of average GDP growth rates across experiments. Absolute value of simulation t-statistic of H_0 : “no difference between baseline and the experiment” in parentheses; Fiscal policies: no fiscal rule (*norule*); 3% deficit rule (*SGP*); debt-reduction rule (*FC*); *SGP* with escape clause (*SGP_{ec}*); *FC* with escape clause (*FC_{ec}*). Monetary policies: Taylor rule indexed on inflation only (*TR_π*); dual-mandate Taylor rule (*TR_{π,U}*); bonds spread adjustment policy (*spread*).

Monetary policy	Fiscal policy	TR_{π}	$TR_{\pi,U}$	<i>spread</i>
<i>norule</i>		1	1.019** (3.730)	0.994 (1.017)
<i>SGP</i>		0.527** (6.894)	1.014 (1.157)	0.794** (3.982)
<i>FC</i>		0.572** (6.499)	0.958 (1.296)	0.765** (4.863)
<i>SGP_{ec}</i>		0.995 (0.876)	1.013** (2.572)	0.991* (1.665)
<i>FC_{ec}</i>		0.992 (1.388)	1.021** (4.169)	0.997 (0.524)

* Significant at 10% level.

** Significant at 5% level.

¹¹ This idea of long-run patterns emerging from a sequence of imperfect short-run adjustments is also very much in line with the generative approach discussed in the previous section.

Table 2. Source: Dosi et al. (2015)

Fiscal and monetary policy interactions. Normalised values of average unemployment rate across experiments. Absolute value of simulation t-statistic of H_0 : “no difference between baseline and the experiment” in parentheses.

Monetary policy	Fiscal policy	TR_π	$TR_{\pi,U}$	<i>spread</i>
<i>norule</i>		1	0.322** (5.903)	1.068 (0.468)
<i>SGP</i>		5.692** (8.095)	0.909 (0.555)	4.201** (6.842)
<i>FC</i>		5.706** (7.585)	1.383 (1.350)	4.963** (7.443)
<i>SGP_{ec}</i>		1.419** (2.088)	0.343** (5.527)	1.680** (3.495)
<i>FC_{ec}</i>		1.948** (3.928)	0.317** (5.886)	1.679** (3.139)

** Significant at 5% level.

Values in the table are relative to the benchmark featuring an unconstrained fiscal policy and a pure inflation-targeting monetary rule. The striking results emerging from the analysis of the two tables is that both fiscal and monetary policies have not only significant real short-term effects, as captured by significant unemployment rates differences across policy scenarios. They also matter for the determination of the long-run growth rate of the economy. More precisely, constraining fiscal policy has a deleterious effect on both unemployment and the long-run growth rate of the economy, which is only mitigated by the introduction of escape clauses or by a dual-mandate monetary policy.

Besides the effects arising from specific combinations of monetary and fiscal policies, the above results are important because they indicate the breaking down of the classical dichotomy which occupies a central stage in standard macroeconomic models, and it sheds light on the effects that fiscal and monetary policies can have on long-run real drivers of an economy,

However, how do the above results arise? The mechanism of transmission can be casted in a series of short-run adjustments mapping on the long-run rates of technological innovation and diffusion. The constraints imposed on fiscal policy reduce the ability of this policy to act as a parachute in case of demand shortages. Accordingly, the system become closer to one without fiscal policy, and the incidence of underemployment states rises (see also Figure 2 above). Higher unemployment and lower aggregate demand also imply a lower incentive of firms to invest (investment and production follow the principle of effective demand in the K+S model). Lower investment translates into a slower diffusion of new technologies which are embodied in new machines sold by the capital-goods sector. In addition, by lower demand for capital good firms, lower investment also reduces the incentives of those firms to invest in R&D and this finally maps into lower innovation rates.^{12,13}

The next section briefly discusses a third example of macroeconomic issues where ABMs can bring new lights: the ability of price and wage adjustments to promote the return to full employment.

¹² See also Dosi et al. (2016) for a detailed examination of the effects on technological innovation and diffusion.

¹³ The better performance of the economy under the dual mandate monetary policy is instead explained by the beneficial effects that this policy has on Basel-like capital buffer requirements imposed on banks (see Dosi et al., 2015, for more details).

Example 3: wage and price adjustments and unemployment

Since Keynes' General Theory (1936) one of the most debated questions in macroeconomics is whether changes in real wages are able to mop up disequilibria in the labor markets and to restore full employment. Nowadays, the idea of an inverse relation between real wages and unemployment is strongly embedded in standard macroeconomic models.¹⁴ Recent results in the agent-based models show that the shape of the relation between real wages and unemployment it is very much context dependent: it is determined by the specific rules used by firms in the market of goods and of labor, and by the specific protocols of interactions of agents in the two markets. Accordingly, the inverse relation between real wages and unemployment arises only in very specific cases. For instance, the plots in Figure 5 show that the inverse relation between real wages and unemployment depends on the specific rule used by firms to set the level of investment. The figure is taken from the work of Napoletano et al. (2012) that use the K+S model described in the previous sections to analyze the behavior of the economy under two scenarios of firm investment: a "profit-led" scenario where firm desired investment is a function of firm past profits, and "demand-led" scenario where desired investment depends instead on expected demand in the goods markets. Notice that the first archetype captures the idea of a level of investment fundamentally determined by financial constraints (profits affect cash flows in the model). The second archetype closely mimics Keynes' idea of effective demand.




Figure 5. The relation between the average unemployment rate and the mark-up rate in the K+S model. Source: Napoletano et al. (2012)

The plots in the above figure show the relation between unemployment and the mark-up rate set by firms in the goods market. The latter increases from left to right. Accordingly, the share of output per worker that firms pay to workers as real wages decreases. The figure thus indicates that unemployment decreases with the mark-up rate in the profit-led scenario. It follows that lowering real wages result into lower unemployment rates, as in the standard macroeconomic models. This is explained by the fact that a lower level of real wages increases profits of firms, thus resulting in a stronger incentive of firms to invest (and in higher cash flows

¹⁴ This is for instance illustrated by the positive effects that a reduction in the real wage has on long-term unemployment of a closed economy in the WS-PS model (see e.g. Carlin and Soskice, 2016), which is a good simplification of the main functioning of the labor market of any standard DSGE model featuring unemployment.

to finance it). In its turn, higher investment implies high aggregate demand and this generates low unemployment.

The picture changes sensibly if firms set investment based on expected demand. Indeed, the relation between the mark-up rate and unemployment is instead U-shaped in the demand-led scenario. This indicates that both high and low real wages generate high unemployment. This seemingly surprising result is explained by the dual role that real wages have in this scenario. On the one hand, real wages determine consumption and thus the final demand faced by firms. It follows that consumption demand decreases as we move from left to right in the figure, which explains the low incentives of firms to invest and the high unemployment observed in correspondence of high mark-up rates. On the other hand, real wages affect profits and thus the ability of firms to internally finance investment. It follows that at low mark-up rates firms have strong incentives to invest, but their investment is hampered by the financial constraints they face because of low profits. It turns out that effective investment is low and unemployment high. Napoletano et al. (2012) also analyze the effects of flexibility in money wages on unemployment. They find that more flexible money wages are beneficial for unemployment in the profit-led scenario but not in the demand-led scenario. Dosi et al. (2017) generalize the above results by exploring a richer set of rules for wage and output determination.¹⁵

Agent-based models have also been used to show that the structure of interactions across agents matters much more for aggregate outcomes than wage and price adjustments. For instance, Howitt and Clower (2000) study a primitive economy exchange populated by people with no understanding of their environment other than what has been learned from random meetings with other people, and with a desire to exchange their endowments for something they might want to consume. Starting in an autarkic situation, with no trade organization, they show the emergence of a coherent network of trade facilities (the “shops”) will emerge that allows almost all the potential gains from trade to be fully exploited. Howitt (2006) shows that the same economy generates multiplier process, in which the failure of one trading firm increases the likelihood of other shop failures and can therefore trigger a cascade of firm failures that causes large aggregate output losses in the economy to fall until a suitable set of replacement shops has emerged. Furthermore, the paper shows that price or wage flexibility can do nothing to speed up the recovery process because what is needed is not different prices but the reintroduction organizational structures that allow trade relations to orderly unfold. In a similar fashion, Guerini et al. (2017) study the effects on unemployment and the output gap of a better matching process in the market for goods and labor. They show that making labor and good search less local brings the economy closer to full employment. This is because the economy gets closer to a centralized matching scenario where coordination problems are solved. Moreover, they show that such a result holds independently of the fact that real wages are fully flexible or completely fixed. The reason is that quantity adjustments matter much more than price adjustments. Accordingly, moving towards a centralized scenario reduces the frictions from the job allocation process as well as their amplification via demand feedbacks from the goods market.

¹⁵ The above results about the context-dependent role of real wage adjustments are not completely new to the literature. They had for instance been stressed by works in the so-called French “Régulation” school (see e.g. Boyer, 1988, Aglietta, 2000) and by works like Amendola et al. (2004) and Howitt (1986). The contribution of agent-based models is however to have obtained the above results in the context of fully microfounded models with heterogeneous interacting agents and that explicitly allow for the possibility of market disequilibrium.

By way of conclusion, agent-based macroeconomics: a summary of its results and a discussion of its limitations

In this article, I have discussed the building blocks of agent-based macroeconomic models, and explained that these models employ a generative approach to the analysis of macroeconomic issues, which is different from the reductionist approach traditionally used in other macroeconomic models. I have also discussed examples that show how this new class of models can provide new insights on several central issues in macroeconomics. First, I illustrated how these models can generate endogenous business cycles out of the interaction among heterogeneous agents hit by idiosyncratic shocks. Second, I pointed out that these models can be used to analyze the interactions between the short- and long-run dynamics of an economy, as well as the persistent effects of monetary and fiscal policies. Third, I mentioned how these models can be used to shed lights on the conditions under which wage and price adjustments can or cannot promote the return of an economy to full-employment in the aftermath of shocks.

All the above results are hard to obtain in more standard macro models, like DSGE ones. The latter models have recently been improved to incorporate agents' heterogeneity (e.g. the HANK model, see Kaplan et al., 2017) and to study their effects for the transmission of fiscal and monetary policies (e.g. Algan and Ragot, 2010, Challe and Ragot, 2011). And recent versions of these models can also account for equilibrium multiplicity (e.g. Farmer and Serletis, 2016). Finally, these models have also been modified to introduce elements of bounded rationality (e.g. Gabaix, 2016, Woodford, 2013, and the papers surveyed in Assenza et al., 2014). Still, business cycles in these models arise from exogenous aggregate shocks. In addition, they incorporate a net separation between the analysis of the short- and long-run dynamics of an economy. Accordingly, these models cannot analyze how interactions between heterogeneous agents can generate aggregate dynamics that switch endogenously between phases of full utilization of resources and mild and deep recessions, and study how all this have persistent effects on long-run growth. Furthermore, by being nested in a full general equilibrium framework, DSGE models can hardly investigate the role played by quantity adjustments – versus price adjustments – in the generation of recessions and of subsequent recoveries.

Agent-based models thus represent a valid tool for macroeconomic analysis. At the same time, they also have limitations, some of which are currently tackled by recent works. I shall briefly discuss four critiques raised towards ABMs and of how they are addressed: i) the fact of being “ad hoc” and of letting one being lost in the “wilderness of bounded rationality” (the “ad hocerism” critique); ii) the poor understanding of their causal mechanisms (the “black box” critique); iii) the inability of agents to respond to policies (the “Lucas critique”), (iv) the poor link with data (the “data validation” critique).

Let me start with the critique that ABMs are completely ad hoc. First, one must acknowledge that a similar degree of ad hocerism probably plagues also models with optimizing agents, where various functional forms for production and utility functions are used to obtain – out of constrained maximization – the behavioral rule of interest. Second, ABMs microfound their behavioral rules either by using empirical or experimental evidence about true agents' behavior. Finally, agent-based models typically undergo an indirect validation test, i.e. it must be able to reproduce – with the same values of parameters – a *large* set of stylized facts at the micro- and macroeconomic level.¹⁶

¹⁶ The K+S family of models discussed in this paper (Dosi et al. 2010, 2013, 2015, 2017) is a good example of this type of microfoundation methodology. Notice that, as it is argued in Napolitano et al. (2012), it is not just a matter of reproducing just one stylized fact but many at once! Indeed, the number of stylized facts that an ABM tries to reproduce is typically much larger than in standard models, and this already puts a lot of constraints on the set of parameters' values that can be selected. Moreover, differently from polynomial data-fitting exercises, in ABMs it is required that parameters' values must be economically meaningful.

About the “black box” critique, I have already discussed above that this largely stems from the differences between the generativist approach used by ABMs and the reductionist approach traditionally used in economics. Furthermore, one must also remark that - even in very complicated ABMs - causal mechanisms can be detected through counterfactual analyses. More precisely, the structure of ABMs often allows one to control the presence of some dynamics in the model (through an appropriate setting of the parameters), and to test how results are different when such dynamics are switched off/on. Examples of this approach are the experiments with different types of fiscal and monetary policy discussed above or the example with different types of matching protocols in labor and goods markets or, finally, the phase diagram analysis performed in Gualdi et al. (2015). In addition, the counter-factual analysis can be pushed forward in ABM, up to build treatment and control groups and to apply the same methodologies used in econometrics to detect causal relations. The papers of Neugart (2008) and of Petrovic et al. (2017) are good examples of this approach.

Let me now turn to discuss the Lucas critique towards agent-based models. It is true that ABMs - in line with a vast amount of empirical and experimental evidence (see e.g. Assenza et al., 2014) - do not assume rational expectations. In addition, many ABMs use agents with sticky behavioral routines and/or naïve expectations. This makes them more applicable to situations where agents face constraints in obtaining and processing relevant information about economic variables and/or to situations where financial and income constraints bind, and thus where agents’ expectations are of little importance. At the same time, agent-based macro models have recently tried to address the Lucas critique and to introduce agents with more sophisticated expectation rules taken from the literature on learning in macroeconomics (e.g. Evans and Honkapoja, 2012). The works of Arifovic et al. (2010) and Salle (2015) provide good examples of this new research stream in agent-based macroeconomics.

Finally, agent-based models have been criticized for the lack of validation using macroeconomic data, which is instead extensively applied in the macro DSGE literature to calibrate and estimate models. It is true that ABMs currently lag behind DSGE models in the use of more sophisticated data-validation techniques, and this despite their ability to produce a vast amount of micro and macro simulated data.¹⁷ On these premises, a recent literature on agent-based validation techniques has been flourishing in the last years to fill the above gap. This literature has applied a wide ranging of approaches, ranging from simulated minimum distance methods, to machine learning techniques to, finally, data-driven identification in VAR models, either to estimate parameters in ABM or to check the ability of ABMs to reproduce the features of empirical time-series¹⁸ (Fagiolo et al., 2017, contains a survey of this recent line of research). For instance, Guerini and Moneta (2017), apply independent-component analysis to compare the causal structure of VAR models estimated on empirical time-series and on time-series generated by a macro ABM model. Interestingly, they find that the agent-based model they employ can reproduce between 65% and 80% of the causal relations entailed by a SVAR estimated on real-world data.

To sum up, agent-based models constitute a new tool that allows macroeconomist to explore new research avenues that were not or that cannot be paved by using more traditional macro models, even with recent improvements. Agent-based models have been severely criticized for being too much ad hoc or for not being following some standard practices in macroeconomics. Nevertheless, much of this criticism applies to standard models as well or it

¹⁷ Indeed, this critique applies only in part because, as we discussed above, ABMs already employ empirical (or experimental) evidence to microfound agents’ behavior. In addition, ABMs are already indirectly calibrated, by checking their ability to reproduce moments of distributions both at the micro- and macro-models (see also above).

¹⁸ In addition, these validation techniques can also be applied to DSGE models. This opens the way to the possibility of better comparisons between the performance of ABMs and of DSGE models.

is currently addressed in the literature. In conclusion, macroeconomics can safely take a longer walk on the purported “wild side” of agent-based models.

References

- Aglietta, M. (2000), *A theory of capitalist regulation: The US experience*, Vol. 28, Verso.
- Algan, Y. & Ragot, X. (2010), 'Monetary policy with heterogeneous agents and borrowing constraints', *Review of Economic Dynamics* 13(2), 295--316.
- Amendola, M.; Gaffard, J. L. & Saraceno, F. (2004), 'Wage flexibility and unemployment: the Keynesian perspective revisited', *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 51(5), 654--674.
- Anderson, P. W. (1972), 'More is different', *Science* 177(4047), 393--396.
- Arifovic, J.; Dawid, H.; Deissenberg, C. & Kostyshyna, O. (2010), 'Learning benevolent leadership in a heterogeneous agents economy', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 34(9), 1768--1790.
- Ashraf, Q.; Gershman, B. & Howitt, P. (2017), 'Banks, market organization, and macroeconomic performance: An agent-based computational analysis', *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 135, 143--180.
- Assenza, T.; Bao, T.; Hommes, C. & Massaro, D. (2014), *Experiments on expectations in macroeconomics and finance* 'Experiments in macroeconomics', Emerald Group Publishing Limited, , pp. 11--70.
- Assenza, T.; Gatti, D. D. & Grazzini, J. (2015), 'Emergent dynamics of a macroeconomic agent based model with capital and credit', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 50, 5--28.
- Balint, T.; Lamperti, F.; Mandel, A.; Napoletano, M.; Roventini, A. & Sapio, A. (2017), 'Complexity and the Economics of Climate Change: A Survey and a Look Forward', *Ecological Economics* 138st(C), 252-265.
- Baumol, W. J. & Benhabib, J. (1989), 'Chaos: significance, mechanism, and economic applications', *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 3(1), 77--105.
- Benhabib, J. (1992), *Cycles and chaos in economic equilibrium*, Princeton University Press.
- Boyer, R. (1988), *Formalizing Growth Regimes*, in G. Dosi; C. Freeman; R. Nelson; G. Silverberg & L. L. Soete, ed., 'Technical Change and Economic Theory', Francis Pinter, , pp. 609-629.
- Caiani, A.; Russo, A. & Gallegati, M. (2016), 'Does Inequality Hamper Innovation and Growth?', Technical report, University Library of Munich, Germany.
- Cardaci, A. & Saraceno, F. (2015), 'Inequality, Financialisation and Economic Crises: An Agent-Based Macro Model', Technical report, Department of Economics, Management and Quantitative Methods at Università degli Studi di Milano.
- Carlin, W. & Soskice, D. W. (2014), *Macroeconomics: Institutions, instability, and the financial system*, Oxford University Press, USA.
- Challe, E. & Ragot, X. (2011), 'Fiscal Policy in a Tractable Liquidity-Constrained Economy', *The Economic Journal* 121(551), 273--317.
- Ciarli, T.; Lorentz, A.; Savona, M. & Valente, M. (2010), 'The effect of consumption and production structure on growth and distribution. A micro to macro model', *Metroeconomica* 61(1), 180--218.
- Cincotti, S.; Raberto, M. & Tegli, A. (2010), 'Credit Money and Macroeconomic Instability in the Agent-based Model and Simulator Eurace', *Economics: The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal* 4.
- Comin, D. & Gertler, M. (2006), 'Medium-term business cycles', *The American Economic Review* 96(3), 523--551.
- Dawid, H.; Harting, P. & Neugart, M. (2014), 'Economic convergence: Policy implications from a heterogeneous agent model', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 44, 54--80.
- Delli Gatti, D.; Desiderio, S.; Gaffeo, E.; Cirillo, P. & Gallegati, M. (2011), *Macroeconomics from the Bottom-up*, Vol. 1, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Delli Gatti, D.; Di Guilmi, C.; Gaffeo, E.; Giulioni, G.; Gallegati, M. & Palestrini, A. (2005), 'A new approach to business fluctuations: heterogeneous interacting agents, scaling laws and financial fragility', *Journal of Economic behavior & organization* 56(4), 489--512.
- Delli Gatti, D.; Gallegati, M.; Greenwald, B.; Russo, A. & Stiglitz, J. E. (2010), 'The financial accelerator in an evolving credit network', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 34(9), 1627--1650.
- Dosi, G.; Fagiolo, G.; Napoletano, M. & Roventini, A. (2013), 'Income distribution, credit and fiscal policies in an agent-based Keynesian model', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 37(8), 1598--1625.
- Dosi, G.; Fagiolo, G.; Napoletano, M.; Roventini, A. & Treibich, T. (2015), 'Fiscal and monetary policies in complex evolving economies', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 52, 166--189.

- Dosi, G.; Fagiolo, G. & Roventini, A. (2010), 'Schumpeter meeting Keynes: A policy-friendly model of endogenous growth and business cycles', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 34(9), 1748--1767.
- Dosi, G.; Napoletano, M.; Roventini, A. & Treibich, T. (2017), 'Micro and macro policies in the Keynes+ Schumpeter evolutionary models', *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 27(1), 63--90.
- Dosi, G.; Pereira, M. C.; Roventini, A. & Virgillito, M. E. (2017), 'When more flexibility yields more fragility: The microfoundations of keynesian aggregate unemployment', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*.
- Dosi, G. & Virgillito, M. E. (2017), 'In order to stand up you must keep cycling: Change and coordination in complex evolving economies', *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*.
- Epstein, J. M. (2006), *Generative social science: Studies in agent-based computational modeling*, Princeton University Press.
- Evans, G. W. & Honkapohja, S. (2012), *Learning and expectations in macroeconomics*, Princeton University Press.
- Fagiolo, G.; Guerini, M.; Lamperti, F.; Moneta, A. & Roventini, A. (2017), 'Validation of Agent-Based Models in Economics and Finance'(2017/23), Technical report, LEM Working Paper.
- Fagiolo, G. & Roventini, A. (2017), 'Macroeconomic Policy in DSGE and Agent-Based Models Redux: New Developments and Challenges Ahead.', *Journal of Artificial Societies & Social Simulation* 20(1).
- Farmer, R. E. A. & Serletis, A. (2016), 'The evolution of endogenous business cycles', *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 20(2), 544--557.
- Gabaix, X. (2016), 'A behavioral New Keynesian model', Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Gaffard, J. L. & Napoletano, M. (2012), 'Agent-Based Models and Economic Policy, volume 124 of *Revue de l'OFCE*', Debates and Policies, OFCE.
- Gaffard, J.-L. (2017), 'Vers une macroéconomie non walrasienne', *Revue de l'OFCE*.
- Gallegati, M.; Palestini, A. & Russo, A. (2017), *Introduction to Agent-Based Economics*, Academic Press.
- Grandmont, J.-M. (1985), 'On endogenous competitive business cycles', *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 995--1045.
- Gualdi, S.; Tarzia, M.; Zamponi, F. & Bouchaud, J.-P. (2015), 'Tipping points in macroeconomic agent-based models', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 50, 29--61.
- Guerini, M. & Moneta, A. (2017), 'A method for agent-based models validation', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*.
- Haldane, A. (2016), 'The dappled world', Bank of England-GLS Shackle Biennial Memorial Lecture.
- Hicks, J. R. (1979), *Causality in economics*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Hommes, C. (2013), *Behavioral rationality and heterogeneous expectations in complex economic systems*, Cambridge University Press.
- Howitt, P. (1986), 'Wage flexibility and employment', *Eastern Economic Journal* 12(3), 237--242.
- Howitt, P. (2006), 'The microfoundations of the Keynesian multiplier process', *Journal of Economic Interaction and Coordination* 1(1), 33--44.
- Howitt, P. (2012), 'What have central bankers learned from modern macroeconomic theory?', *Journal of Macroeconomics* 34(1), 11--22.
- Howitt, P. & Clower, R. (2000), 'The emergence of economic organization', *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 41(1), 55--84.
- Kaplan, G.; Moll, B. & Violante, G. (2015), 'The Macroeconomy according to HANK', NBER Working paper 21897.
- Keynes, J. M. (1936), *General theory of employment, interest and money*, Atlantic Publishers & Dist.
- Kirman, A. P. (1992), 'Whom or what does the representative individual represent?', *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 6(2), 117--136.
- LeBaron, B. (2006), 'Agent-based computational finance', *Handbook of computational economics* 2, 1187--1233.
- Mandel, A.; Landini, S.; Gallegati, M. & Gintis, H. (2015), 'Price dynamics, financial fragility and aggregate volatility', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 51, 257--277.
- Napoletano, M.; Dosi, G.; Fagiolo, G. & Roventini, A. (2012), 'Wage formation, investment behavior and growth regimes: An agent-based analysis', *Revue de l'OFCE*(5), 235--261.
- Neugart, M. (2008), 'Labor market policy evaluation with ACE', *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 67(2), 418--430.
- Petrovic, M.; Ozel, B.; Teglio, A.; Raberto, M. & Cincotti, S. (2017), 'Eurace Open: An agent-based multi-country model'(2017/09), Technical report, Economics Department, Universitat Jaume I, Castellón (Spain).

- Popoyan, L.; Napoletano, M. & Roventini, A. (2017), 'Taming macroeconomic instability: Monetary and macro-prudential policy interactions in an agent-based model', *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 134, 117–140.
- Russo, A.; Catalano, M.; Gaffeo, E.; Gallegati, M. & Napoletano, M. (2007), 'Industrial dynamics, fiscal policy and R&D: Evidence from a computational experiment', *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 64(3), 426–447.
- Salle, I. L. (2015), 'Modeling expectations in agent-based models—An application to central bank's communication and monetary policy', *Economic Modelling* 46, 130–141.
- Sun, J. & Tesfatsion, L. (2007), 'Dynamic testing of wholesale power market designs: An open-source agent-based framework', *Computational Economics* 30(3), 291–327.
- Tesfatsion, L. (2006), 'Agent-based computational economics: A constructive approach to economic theory', *Handbook of computational economics* 2, 831–880.
- Turrell, A. (2016), 'Agent-based models: understanding the economy from the bottom up', *Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin* 56(4), 173–188.
- Weidlich, A. & Veit, D. (2008), 'A critical survey of agent-based wholesale electricity market models', *Energy Economics* 30(4), 1728–1759.
- Woodford, M. (2013), 'Macroeconomic analysis without the rational expectations hypothesis', *Annu. Rev. Econ.* 5(1), 303–346.

DOCUMENTS DE TRAVAIL GREDEG PARUS EN 2017

GREDEG Working Papers Released in 2017

- 2017-01** LAUREN LARROUY & GUILHEM LECOUTEUX
Mindreading and Endogenous Beliefs in Games
- 2017-02** CILEM SELIN HAZIR, FLORA BELLONE & CYRIELLE GAGLIO
Local Product Space and Firm Level Churning in Exported Products
- 2017-03** NICOLAS BRISSET
What Do We Learn from Market Design?
- 2017-04** LISE ARENA, NATHALIE ORIOI & IRYNA VERYZHENKO
Exploring Stock Markets Crashes as Socio-Technical Failures
- 2017-05** IRYNA VERYZHENKO, ETIENNE HARB, WAËL LOUHICHI & NATHALIE ORIOI
The Impact of the French Financial Transaction Tax on HFT Activities and Market Quality
- 2017-06** FRÉDÉRIC MARTY
La régulation du secteur des jeux entre Charybde et Scylla
- 2017-07** ALEXANDRU MONAHOV & THOMAS JOBERT
Case Study of the Moldovan Bank Fraud: Is Early Intervention the Best Central Bank Strategy to Avoid Financial Crises?
- 2017-08** NOBUYUKI HANAKI, EIZO AKIYAMA, YUKIHIKO FUNAKI & RYUICHIRO ISHIKAWA
Diversity in Cognitive Ability Enlarges Mispricing in Experimental Asset Markets
- 2017-09** THIERRY BLAYAC & PATRICE BOUGETTE
Should I Go by Bus? The Liberalization of the Long-Distance Bus Industry in France
- 2017-10** AYMERIC LARDON
On the Coalitional Stability of Monopoly Power in Differentiated Bertrand and Cournot Oligopolies
- 2017-11** ISMAËL RAFAÏ & MIRA TOUMI
Pay Attention or Be Paid for Attention? Impact of Incentives on Allocation of Attention
- 2017-12** GÉRARD MONDELLO
Un modèle d'accident unilatéral: incertitude non-radical et estimations différenciées
- 2017-13** GÉRARD MONDELLO
Lenders and Risky Activities: Strict Liability or Negligence Rule?
- 2017-14** FRÉDÉRIC MARTY
Économie des algorithmes et ordre concurrentiel : réflexions sur les abus d'exploitation et les collusions fondés sur des algorithmes de prix
- 2017-15** AGNÈS FESTRÉ, PIERRE GARROUSTE, ANKINÉE KIRAKOZIAN & MIRA TOUMI
The Pen is Might Be Mightier than the Sword: How Third-party Advice or Sanction Impacts on Pro-environmental Behavior
- 2017-16** EDWARD LORENZ & SOPHIE POMMET
Innovation, Credit Constraints and National Banking Systems: A Comparison of Developing Nations
- 2017-17** PATRICE BOUGETTE & CHRISTOPHE CHARLIER
Antidumping and Feed-In Tariffs as Good Buddies? Modeling the EU-China Solar Panel Dispute
- 2017-18** NOBUYUKI HANAKI, EIZO AKIYAMA & RYUICHIRO ISHIKAWA
Behavioral Uncertainty and the Dynamics of Traders' Confidence in their Price Forecasts

- 2017-19** ADNANE KENDEL, NATHALIE LAZARIC & KEVIN MARÉCHAL
What Do People 'Learn By Looking' at Direct Feedback on their Energy Consumption? Results of a Field Study in Southern France
- 2017-20** NICOLAS VALLOIS & DORIAN JULLIEN
Estimating Rationality in Economics: A History of Statistical Methods in Experimental Economics
- 2017-21** NICOLAS VALLOIS & DORIAN JULLIEN
Replication in Experimental Economics: A Historical and Quantitative Approach Focused on Public Good Game Experiments
- 2017-22** BENJAMIN MONTMARTIN, MARCOS HERRERA & NADINE MASSARD
R&D Policy regimes in France: New Evidence from a spatio-temporal Analysis
- 2017-23** THOMAS BOYER-KASSEM & SÉBASTIEN DUCHÊNE
On Discrimination in Health Insurance
- 2017-24** MICHELA CHessa & PATRICK LOISEAU
On Non-monetary Incentives for the Provision of Public Goods
- 2017-25** NICOLAS BRISSET
Models as Speech Acts: The Telling Case of Financial Models
- 2017-26** NOBUYUKI HANAKI, EIZO AKIYAMA & RYUICHIRO ISHIKAWA
Effects of Eliciting Long-run Price Forecasts on Market Dynamics in Asset Market Experiments
- 2017-27** CHARLES AYOUBI, MICHELE PEZZONI & FABIANA VISENTIN
The Important Thing is not to Win, it is to Take Part: What If Scientists Benefit from Participating in Competitive Grant Races?
- 2017-28** FRÉDÉRIC MARTY
Le prix des services juridiques : entre défaillance de la réglementation et défaillance de marché ?
- 2017-29** JOAO V. FERREIRA, NOBUYUKI HANAKI & BENOÎT TARROUX
On the Roots of the Intrinsic Value of Decision Rights: Evidence from France and Japan
- 2017-30** GUILHEM LECOUEUX
Bayesian Game Theorists and Non-Bayesian Players
- 2017-31** BENJAMIN MONTMARTIN & MATHIEU ESCOT
Local Competition and Physicians' Pricing Decisions: New Evidence from France
- 2017-32** TOMOE HOSHIHATA, RYUICHIRO ISHIKAWA, NOBUYUKI HANAKI & EIZO AKIYAMA
Flat Bubbles in Long-Horizon Experiments: Results from two Market Conditions
- 2017-33** KOZO KIYOTA, TOSHIYUKI MATSUURA & LIONEL NESTA
What's Behind the Figures? Quantifying the Cross-Country Exporter Productivity Gap
- 2017-34** THOMAS GREBEL & LIONEL NESTA
Technological Spillovers, Product Market Rivalry and R&D Investment
- 2017-35** SARAH GUILLOU & LIONEL NESTA
Markup Heterogeneity, Export Status and the Establishment of the Euro
- 2017-36** MAI T.P. VU, FLORA BELLONE & MARION DOVIS
Productivity and Wage Premiums: Evidence from Vietnamese Ordinary and Processing Exporters
- 2017-37** PATRICE BOUGETTE, OLIVER BUDZINSKI & FRÉDÉRIC MARTY
Exploitative Abuse and Abuse of Economic Dependence: What can we Learn from the Industrial Organization Approach ?
- 2017-38** JEAN-LUC GAFFARD
Vers une macroéconomie non-walrasienne
- 2017-39** ELISA PALAGI, MAURO NAPOLETANO, ANDREA ROVENTINI & JEAN-LUC GAFFARD
Inequality, Redistributive Policies and Multiplier Dynamics in an Agent-Based Model with Credit Rationing
- 2017-40** MAURO NAPOLETANO
A Short Walk on the Wild Side: Agent-Based Models and their Implications for Macroeconomic Analysis