

An Empirical Dynamic Model of the Used Car Market

Maxim Engers and Steven Stern

August 11, 2000

1 Model

Let u_{ij} be the utility gross of cost that individual i gets from owning automobile j at time t where time is measured relative to the purchase time; $t = 0$ at the purchase time. Assume there is a finite number of brands J . Assume that

$$u_{ij} \sim iidF [\theta(b_j); \sigma_u^2]$$

with support $[0, U]$. Let a_{jt} be the age of j at t and b_j be the brand of j . Assume there are log operating costs of

$$\begin{aligned} \log c_{jt} &= \alpha_j + \lambda(b_j, a_{jt}), \\ \alpha_j &\sim iidN [\mu(b_j), \sigma_\mu^2], \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

and $\lambda(b_j, a_{jt})$ is a known function accounting for the effect of aging on operating costs with

$$\frac{\partial \lambda(b_j, a)}{\partial a} > \lambda^*$$

for some positive constant λ^* . Prior to the purchase of j , i does not know the value of α_j but learns it immediately after purchase. Then the flow i receives from owning j at t is

$$u_{ij} - c_{jt}.$$

Let

$$p_{jt} = p(b_j, a_{jt})$$

be the price of automobile j at time t . Then, the value to i of owning j at t is

$$\begin{aligned} &V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt}) \\ &= u_{ij} - c_{jt} + \beta \max [W, p(b_j, a_{jt+1}) + W, V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt+1})] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$W = \beta \max_k \{0, E_{\alpha_k} V(u_{ik}, \alpha_k, b_k, a_{kt+1}) - p(b_k, a_{kt+1}) \mid V(u_{ik}, \alpha_k, b_k, a_{kt+1}) \leq p(b_k, a_{kt+1}) + W\} \geq 0.$$

Note that i has the option to scrap j costlessly.

2 Equilibrium Properties

Theorem 1 For all b_j and all finite α_j , there exists A large enough such that $V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, A) = \beta W$.

Proof. Conditional on b_j , α_j , and a_{jt} ,

$$V(U, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt}) = U - c_{jt} + \beta \max[W, V(U, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt+1})] \quad (2)$$

because there is no other individual who will value j as much. Equation (2) satisfies

$$V(U, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt}) \leq \max \left[W, U - c_{jt} + \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} (U - \exp\{\alpha_j + \lambda(b_j, a_{jt})\}) \right].$$

Since $U - c_{jt}$ is growing (negatively) without bound, there exists t large enough that satisfies the condition. But if the condition is satisfied for U , then we should be able to show that it is satisfied for any $u_{ij} < U$. ■

Theorem 2 For each pair (b_j, a_{jt}) , $\frac{\partial V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt})}{\partial \alpha_j} \leq 0$ and $\frac{\partial V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt})}{\partial a_{jt}} \leq 0$, there exists an equilibrium price $p(b_j, a_{jt})$ with $\frac{\partial p(b_j, a_{jt})}{\partial a_{jt}} \leq 0$.

Proof. Conditional on b_j and α_j , let A be the first time such that $V_i(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt}) = W$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, A-1)}{\partial \alpha_j} &= -\frac{\partial c_{jt-1}}{\partial \alpha_j} < 0; \\ \frac{\partial V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, A-1)}{\partial a_{jt-1}} &= -\frac{\partial c_{jt-1}}{\partial a_{jt-1}} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $g_\alpha(\alpha | b, a)$ be the density of α and $g_u(u | \alpha, b, a)$ be the conditional density of u given α among owners of brand b cars of age a . Let

$$S(b, a) = \{(\alpha, u) : W \leq V(u, \alpha, b, a) \leq p + W\}$$

be the set of values of (α, u) where a seller wants to sell and

$$\begin{aligned} B(b, a) &= \{(\alpha, u, v, u') : (\alpha, v) \in S(b, a), \\ &E_{\tilde{\alpha}}[V(u, \tilde{\alpha}, b, a) - p(b, a) - W | (\tilde{\alpha}, v) \in S(b, a)] \\ &\geq \max_{j, a'_j > 0} E_{\tilde{\alpha}'}[V(u'_j, \tilde{\alpha}'_j, b'_j, a'_j) - p(b'_j, a'_j) - W | W \leq V(v'_j, \tilde{\alpha}'_j, b'_j, a'_j) \leq p(b'_j, a'_j) + W], \\ &E_{\tilde{\alpha}}[V(u, \tilde{\alpha}, b, a) - p(b, a) - W] \geq \max_j E_{\tilde{\alpha}'}[V(u'_j, \tilde{\alpha}'_j, b'_j, 0) - p(b'_j, 0) - W], \\ &E_{\tilde{\alpha}}[V(u, \tilde{\alpha}, b, a) - p(b, a) - W | (\tilde{\alpha}, v) \in S(b, a)] \geq 0\} \end{aligned}$$

be the set of values of (α, u, v, u') where a buyer wants to buy. Then, at age A , $p(b_j, A)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \gamma \iint_{S(b,a)} g_u(u | \alpha, b, a) g_\alpha(\alpha | b, a) dud\alpha \tag{3} \\
&= \left[\iint_{S(b,a)} g_u(u | \alpha, b, a) g_\alpha(\alpha | b, a) dud\alpha \prod_j \iint_{S(b'_j, a'_j)} g_u(u'_j | \alpha, b, a) du'_j d\alpha'_j \right]^{-1} \\
& \int \cdots \int_{B(b,a)} g_u(v | \alpha, b, a) g_\alpha(\alpha_j | b, a) g_u(u | \alpha, b, a) \cdot \\
& \prod_j \left[g_u(u'_j | \alpha, b, a) g_u(v'_j | \alpha, b, a) g_\alpha(\alpha'_j | b, a) \right] du' dud\alpha
\end{aligned}$$

where γ is the ratio of potential sellers to potential buyers. As $p \rightarrow \infty$, the left hand side (LHS) of equation (3) approaches γ and the right hand side (RHS) approaches 0, and as $p \rightarrow 0$, the LHS approaches $0 \leq \zeta \leq \gamma$ and the RHS approaches $\xi \geq 0$. Also, equation (3) is continuous in p . If $\zeta < \xi$, then there exists $p > 0$ that satisfies equation (3) with positive trade, and if $\zeta \geq \xi$, $p = 0$ maybe with some trade. If $\zeta < \xi$, then, since $\frac{\partial V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, A-1)}{\partial a_{jt-1}} < 0$, $S(b, a)$ is increasing in a and $B(b, a)$ is decreasing in a . So p must be decreasing in a .

Now assume that there exists a a such that, for all $s > a$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, s)}{\partial \alpha_j} &\leq 0; \\
\frac{\partial V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, s)}{\partial s} &\leq 0; \\
\frac{\partial p(b_j, s)}{\partial s} &\leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt})}{\partial \alpha_j} &= -\frac{\partial c_{jt}}{\partial \alpha_j} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_j} \beta \max[W, p(b_j, a_{jt} + 1) + W, V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt} + 1)] \leq 0; \\
\frac{\partial V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt})}{\partial a_{jt}} &= -\frac{\partial c_{jt}}{\partial a_{jt}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial a_{jt}} \beta \max[W, p(b_j, a_{jt} + 1) + W, V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt} + 1)] \leq 0;
\end{aligned}$$

and $\frac{\partial p(b_j, a_{jt})}{\partial a_{jt}} \leq 0$ because $\frac{\partial V(u_{ij}, \alpha_j, b_j, a_{jt})}{\partial a_{jt}} \leq 0$. By induction, the result is proven for all $a \geq 0$. ■

3 Construction of Equilibrium Prices

Step 1: Pick an age A^* such that $p(b, A^*) = 0$ for all b_j .

Step 2: Look for a fixed point in R^{J+A^*} . Standard iteration methods can be used.

4 Empirical Work

Assume we can get data on average price of a brand b car at age a , $p(b, a)$ (from the “Blue Book”). Assume we can get average cost of maintenance of a brand b car at age a ,

$$\exp \left\{ \mu(b) + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_\mu^2 + \lambda(b, a) \right\} \quad (4)$$

(from equation (1)). Assume we can get data on the proportion of brand b cars from vintage t sold in year s ,

$$\widehat{\Psi}(s-t, b) = n_{stb}/n_{ttb}$$

where n_{stb} is the number of brand b automobiles of vintage t sold in year s . The *plim* $\widehat{\Psi}(s-t, b)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(s-t, b) &= \Pr[(u, \alpha) \in S(b, a)] \\ &= \iint_{S(b, a)} g_u(u | \alpha, b, a,) g_\alpha(\alpha | b, a) dud\alpha \end{aligned}$$

(maybe from DMV data). Equation (4) identifies $\mu(b)$ and $\lambda(b, a)$, and $p(b, a)$ is identified from “Blue Book” data. The remaining parameters to estimate are $\pi_2 = [\sigma_u^2, \beta, U, \{\theta(b)\}_{b=1}^J]$. It is pretty likely that the DMV data overidentifies π .

We can estimate all of the parameters by first estimating $\pi_1 = \left\{ \{\mu(b), \lambda(b, a), p(b, a)\}_{a=1}^{A^*} \right\}_{b=1}^J$ using cost and blue book data and then estimating π_2 in a MLE routine using survivor data. The log likelihood function is

$$L = \sum_{b=1}^J L_b$$

with

$$L_b = \sum_{a=1}^{A^*} n_{ba} \log \left[\iint_{S(b, a)} g_u(u | \alpha, b, a,) g_\alpha(\alpha | b, a) dud\alpha \right].$$

5 Policy Issues

- 1) How much do equilibrium prices vary from full information equilibrium prices?
- 2) How much does the equilibrium survivor function vary from the full information survivor function?