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Abstract

This study investigates whether models of forward looking behavior explain the observed patterns of heavy drinking and smoking of men in late middle age in the Health and Retirement Study better than myopic models. We develop and estimate a sequence of nested models which differ by their degree of forward looking behavior. Our empirical findings suggest that forward looking models fit the data better than myopic models. These models also dominate other behavioral models based on out-of-sample predictions using data of men aged 70 and over. Myopic models predict rates of smoking for old individuals which are significantly larger than those found in the data on elderly men.
1 Introduction

Two competing theories have been proposed for explaining the consumption of potentially harmful and addictive goods. Early approaches typically attributed consumption of these goods to irrational or myopic behavior (Winston, 1980; Thaler and Sheffrin, 1981). More recently, Stigler and Becker (1977) and Becker and Murphy (1988) have forcefully argued that addiction can be modeled as an outcome of rational behavior of forward looking individuals with stable preferences. These two theories primarily differ in their assumptions regarding the length of the planning horizon which is attributed to individuals. The myopic model assumes that the planning horizon is short and consists – in the limiting case – of only one time period. Individuals care about today, but ignore tomorrow and hence do not internalize the negative effects of smoking and drinking on health in the future. In contrast, rational addiction theory relies on the notion that individuals are forward looking. Thus, individuals take into consideration the future risks associated with smoking or heavy drinking.

Most prior empirical studies of the rational addiction theory follow Becker and Murphy (1988) and analyze first order conditions that prices and quantities need to satisfy, given individuals’ (quadratic) utility functions. Chaloupka (1991) and Becker, Grossman, and Murphy (1991, 1994) apply this methodology and find that tobacco consumption typically responds to lagged, current and future price changes as predicted by rational addiction theory. However, the empirical literature seems to suggest that price effects are likely to be less important for older individuals, that are the focus of this study, than for teenagers.
and young adults. Our test of the rational addition model is, therefore, not based on the response of individuals to current and future prices.

This study differs from previous empirical studies in a number of important ways. Previous research has largely focused on young adults who are subject to experimentation, habit formation, and reinforcement (Orphanides and Zervos, 1995). However, an important characteristic of tobacco consumption, in particular consumption of cigarettes, is the long latency period between time of initiation and onset of adverse events. Relatively few adverse health events occur in the first half of life. To illustrate, at age 35, the cumulative probability of survival is the same for males who have never smoked and smokers. At age 45 (65, 85), the corresponding ratio is 1.02 (1.18, 2.11) (Hodgson, 1992). Perfectly forward looking individuals may therefore engage in heavy consumption of harmful substances at young ages because events in the distant future are heavily discounted. It is therefore difficult to distinguish between the two theories using data of young adults.

We focus our analysis on a sample of men in late middle age from the Health and Retirement Study (HRS). Persons over the age of 50 start to experience negative health shocks which are, at least partially, due to smoking and heavy drinking in the past. Much of the uncertainty about future health and the link between smoking or drinking and health outcomes is resolved during later years in life. We can thus study whether individuals rationally update their consumption behavior as they experience negative health shocks and provide a new test of the rational addiction hypothesis. The responses of individuals to negative health shocks, therefore, provides the main sources of variation in the data that we exploit in the empirical analysis.

Earlier studies have typically assumed that individuals are either myopic or forward looking. In contrast, we adopt a dynamic discrete choice framework that allows us to control

---

5 See, for example, the discussion in Sloan, Smith, and Taylor (2003).
6 The latency period for alcohol can be substantially less than for smoking, for example, due to accidents while being intoxicated.
7 Previous tests of the rational addiction model have been based on Euler equations, which rest on the implicit assumption that individuals must consume strictly positive amounts of alcohol or cigarettes. This is problematic if a large number of individuals do not consume tobacco or alcohol in each time period.
for varying degrees of forward looking behavior of individuals. The myopic model is a special case of forward looking models. Our framework thus nests the competing behavioral theories. Instead of assuming that individuals are rational, we compare a sequence of nested models which differ by their degree of forward looking behavior.

The HRS is a sample of older individuals. Due to habit formation and the difficulty to quit, it is desirable to estimate econometric models which condition on previous smoking and drinking histories. Based on measured variables in the HRS, we can construct variables that partially capture these differences in initial conditions. However, any observed measures of past smoking or drinking are unlikely to capture all heterogeneity within the panel. We therefore assume individuals differ by (partially) unobserved characteristics at the start of the panel using a semi-nonparametric approach which allows for a finite mixture of types, each comprising a fixed proportion of the population. The type probabilities depend on time invariant state variables such as observed measures of past smoking and drinking histories. We assume that the remaining time varying state variables are exogenous conditional on type when analyzing the decisions observed in the HRS. We estimate models with up to four different (partially) unobserved types and report the results in the paper.

Our empirical findings suggest that forward looking models with moderately high values of the annual discount factor fit the data the best. To gain additional insights in the fit of the different model specifications, we predict the behavior for a sample of elderly individuals from the Asset and Health Dynamics Among the Oldest Old (AHEAD) data. We find that the out-of-sample predictions of our preferred forward looking model clearly dominate those of the myopic model. We thus conclude that forward looking models provide better within

---


9 In that sense our paper is similar in spirit to the analysis by Fang and Silverman (2004) who analyze whether welfare recipients adopt time-inconsistent or type consistent forward looking plans.

10 This approach was introduced into the econometric literature by Heckman and Singer (1984). Keane and Wolpin (1997) adapted these techniques in a dynamic discrete choice framework. Arcidiacono and Jones (2003) discuss how to implement these estimators using an EM algorithm.
Comparing myopic models to forward looking models yields substantial differences in the consumption patterns of alcohol and tobacco over time. Larger discount factors imply larger declines in consumption with age. In forward looking models, individuals take into account that the marginal adverse health effects of heavy drinking and smoking are higher later in life. The main drawback of the myopic model is that it predicts rates of smoking and heavy drinking for old individuals which are significantly larger than those found in the AHEAD. Myopic and forward looking models also have very different behavioral interpretations. Estimates of the myopic model make alcohol and tobacco appear unattractive, particularly for the unhealthy. However, in forward looking models, alcohol and tobacco are more attractive, but are not consumed because of losses in future utility caused by adverse health effects. This is particularly true for the unhealthy as the marginal adverse health effects of heavy drinking and smoking increase as the health of the individual deteriorates.

The rest of the study is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the data used in this study which is based on the Health and Retirement Study. In Section 3, we develop a sequence of forward looking models of decision making under uncertainty and discuss identification and estimation of these models. Section 4 reports the estimation results. In Section 5, we analyze the fit of the models using within sample and out-of-sample predictions. Section 6 discusses how individuals would react to technological changes in health care. Section 7 offers some concluding remarks.

## 2 Data

The data used in this study come from the Health and Retirement Study. The HRS is a national panel study of birth cohorts 1931 through 1941 and their spouses, if married. Participants in the HRS have been interviewed every two years since 1992. We use the first four waves of the survey that have been completed and released. Individuals in the first wave of the HRS range from 51 to 61 years of age with some spouses being younger or
older than this. The average age in wave 1 of individuals in our sample is 58.2. We analyze
smoking and heavy drinking behavior of males.

We exclude women for two reasons. First, women differ significantly from males in
preferences for alcohol and tobacco, in their attitudes towards risk, and their willingness
to engage in harmful consumption. Furthermore, women live longer and have different
tolerance levels for alcohol and tobacco than males. Hence, transitions for health status and
mortality differ significantly between males and females. Controlling for these differences
using additive dummy variables is likely to be insufficient. Second, the computational
complexity of the analysis would be a lot more challenging if we also included women since
the relevant state space for solving the dynamic model would be much larger.\footnote{More research
is clearly needed to address the issue of how spouses influence each others smoking,
drinking, and health maintenance decisions.}

We use the panel structure of the data and include only persons who were not lost due
to attrition and had complete information for the most relevant variables of this study. Our
initial sample consists of 5,735 males. 1,281 men are lost due to attrition.

Drinking behavior questions in the HRS allow us to categorize wave 1 respondents as
current drinkers or non-drinkers, and for drinkers the average number of drinks per day.
Subsequent waves allow for tracking drinking status across time. For purposes of this study,
we categorize individuals as drinkers and non-drinkers, and, among drinkers, by drinks per
day: less than 1, 1-2, 3-4, and more than 4. We define heavy drinking as consuming three
or more drinks on average per day.\footnote{See Graham (1985) for a discussion of alternative measures of alcohol consumption.}

The group of non-heavy drinkers thus largely consists of individuals who are best char-
acterized as moderate drinkers, i.e. individuals who consumer two or less drinks of alcohol
per week. Thus we are primarily analyzing behavior of moderate and heavy drinkers. A
number of individuals in the HRS consume zero drinks in all four waves. These individu-
als abstain from alcohol consumption for a variety of reasons such as religious objections,
medical necessity (i.e. adverse side effects of medications), or lack of taste. Since the HRS
does not contain detailed information about the causes of abstinence, we exclude these in-
individuals from the sample. This, and missing values, gives us 2,784 males on average in each wave, a total number of 8,352 male person-waves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of drinks:</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th>Wave 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= 0</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 4</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smoking:</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th>Wave 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes - no</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health status:</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th>Wave 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very good</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total household income</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th>Wave 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65,593</td>
<td>58,917</td>
<td>56,232</td>
<td>52,997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that there is a steady decline in alcohol consumption, smoking, health status, and total income during the four waves of the panel. For example, the percentage of individuals who do not drink increases from 15.7 percent to 30.6 percent during the observation period. Heavy drinking declines from 10.7 percent in wave 1 to 6.6 percent in wave 4. Smoking, meanwhile, declines from 28.1 percent to 20.3 percent. Some of the trends in Table 1 are explained by the aging of the individuals in our sample. Older individuals are more likely to be in worse health and have lower income levels than younger

---

13The HRS includes detailed information on both labor and non-labor income. In this paper, we define total household income as a sum of the respondent’s wage income, the spouse’s wage income, household capital income and other household income. Income is measured in constant 1999 dollars.

14There is an issue of whether alcoholics give valid self-reports regarding their alcohol consumption. While there is some evidence in the literature that alcohol consumption is measured with error, there do not seem to be any systematic trends of over- or underreporting. See, for example, Watson, Tilleskjor, Hoodecheck-Schow, Purcel, and Jacobs (1984).
individuals. As a consequence, these individuals are more likely to reduce their alcohol and cigarette consumption as they get older. The response of individuals in our sample to negative health shocks provides one of the main sources of variation in the data that we exploit in this analysis.

Table 2: Heavy Drinking and Smoking Transitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lagged Consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d=0,s=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d=0,s=0</td>
<td>5535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d=0,s=1</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Consumption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d=1,s=0</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d=1,s=1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional information about alcohol and tobacco consumption is given in Table 2 which reports the transitions between heavy drinking (no, $d = 0$ and yes, $d = 1$) and smoking (no, $s = 0$ and yes, $s = 1$) combinations. We find that the elements on the diagonal of the transition matrix are larger in magnitude than the elements on the off-diagonals, with the elements on the diagonal ranging from 54 and 91 percent. Thus, in spite of the general trend of reducing alcohol and tobacco consumption evident in the sample means, many men have relatively stable drinking and smoking patterns which is likely due to habit formation. However, there is still a fair amount of transitions between the different heavy drinking and smoking states, as reflected by the off-diagonal elements of the matrix.

The HRS also contains some qualitative information about past problem drinking and smoking behavior. This information is used in the empirical analysis to control for past
habit formation. The first questionnaire of the HRS includes the CAGE instrument for clinical assessment of alcohol disorders. The acronym CAGE represents four questions that comprise the instrument: Have you ever felt you should Cut down on your drinking (32.7 percent)? Have people Annoyed you by criticizing your drinking (16.9 percent)? Have you ever felt bad or Guilty about drinking (21.1 percent)? Have you ever had a drink first thing in the morning (Eye-opener) to calm your nerves or to get over a hang-over (8.7 percent)? Item responses on the CAGE are scored 0 or 1, with a high score indicating the presence of an alcohol problem. We define “problem drinkers” as those persons with a score of 2 or more on the CAGE scale. This is a conservative measure since most of the difference is between 0 and 1. Edwards, Marshall, and Cook (1997) conclude that “these tests (describes another test–MAST as well as CAGE) generally tend to pick up the more extreme rather than the early cases ... they show remarkably good sensitivity and specificity (refers to type 1 and type 2 errors in the language of doctors) for ‘excessive drinking’ as well as ‘alcoholism’ and may be superior to laboratory tests when used as screening instruments” (p. 197). 23.6 percent of the males in our sample are classified as problem drinkers.

With regard to past smoking behavior, the HRS asks when former smokers quit. To capture past smoking behavior, we construct a time invariant dummy variable which equals one if the individual quit less than 10 years ago or smoked at wave 1 and is zero otherwise. 34.5 percent of the individuals in the sample are classified as “problem smokers,” people who entered the survey with smoking in their recent history.

High levels of alcohol use and smoking are highly correlated in our data and in other samples. Thus, many of the same men who were at risk of poor health because of their alcohol consumption patterns were also at high risk because of their smoking. Although use of each substance carries its own risk when used independently of each other, some joint effects are appreciable.

---

15The CAGE testing procedure is also discussed in King (1986) and Bernadt, Taylor, Smith, and Murray (1982).
16See, for example, Rosengren, Wilhelmsen, and Wedel (1988), Schlecht, Franco, J. Pintos, and et. al. (1999) and Palfai, Ostafin, Monti, and Hutchinson (2000).
Self-reported health status is measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from excellent (1) to poor (5). Table 1 shows the sample means for each of the five categories as they evolve over time. Self-reported health status declines throughout most of the observational period. However, the sample means do not decline monotonically as one may have expected, especially for adjacent response categories, which may be due to measurement error in the variable. We therefore aggregate the information in self-reported health status to a simple bivariate health indicator which is equal to one if the individual is in good health (self-reported health status less than 4) and zero otherwise.\footnote{For a discussion of self-reported versus objective measures of health see Bound (1991).}

We also control for a number of demographic characteristics. Educational attainment is measured by an indicator variable equal to one if the individual has a college education and is zero otherwise. 25.9 percent of men in our sample have a college degree. We also create a variable for the person’s expected longevity. We experimented with different family background variables and chose an indicator based on the life span of the mother. 23.8 percent of the sample report that their mothers died by age 70.\footnote{Admittedly it would be helpful to know the causes that led to the mother’s death. In that case one could construct more informative variables which would distinguish between accidental sources of death, choice related sources of early death, and differences in death due to genetic differences. Unfortunately the HRS does include sufficiently specific information.}

We supplement the HRS data with price information for cigarettes, liquor, beer and wine collected by American Chamber of Commerce Researchers’ Association (ACCRA) for a large number different localities. A price index for alcohol is constructed by weighting the prices for liquor, beer and wine using the expenditure shares in the Consumer Price Index. We assign alcohol and cigarette prices to individuals in the HRS sample using prices of the nearest locality for which we have ACCRA data.\footnote{For computational reasons, we need to discretized prices for alcohol and tobacco. We split the sample into 16 subsamples and use the mean prices in the subsamples as points in the grid.}
3 The Framework

Previous analysis of the rational addiction hypothesis has been typically based on versions of the Becker-Murphy (1988) model which rests on the assumption that individuals make continuous choices. We are mostly interested in non-marginal changes in smoking and heavy drinking which are caused by changes in income and health status. We therefore adapt an alternative modelling framework based on the dynamic discrete choice literature.

3.1 A Model of Forward Looking Behavior

Consider the following model of individual decision making. Let $J$ denote the number of alternatives in the choice set ($C_t$) available to an individual in a given period. In our model, individuals choose whether or not to smoke and whether or not to engage in heavy drinking or not, $J = 4$.\(^\text{20}\) Hence there are four mutually exclusive elements in the choice set at each point of time. Let $c_{jt} \in \{0, 1\}$ denote an indicator variable which equals one if the individual chooses alternative $j$ at time $t$ and is zero otherwise. Let the vector $c_t = (c_{1t}, ..., c_{Jt})$ characterize choices of an individual at $t$. Since the alternatives are mutually exclusive,

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{J} c_{jt} = 1
$$

Besides the choice variables, $c_t$, there is a vector of state variables, $X_t$. State variables can be decomposed into an unobserved component, $\epsilon_t$, and an observed component, $x_t$. Individuals have beliefs about uncertain future states of the world. These beliefs are captured by a Markov transition density of the state variables $q_t(X_{t+1}|X_t, c_t)$, which satisfies the following assumption:

$$
q_t(X_{t+1}|X_t, c_t) = g_t(\epsilon_{t+1} | \epsilon_t, c_t) f_t(x_{t+1} | x_t, c_t)
$$

\(^{20}\)As noted in the previous section, heavy drinking and smoking are strongly correlated. Failing to control for either heavy alcohol use or smoking is likely to bias the findings, both regarding the effects of alcohol and tobacco consumption on health, earnings and other outcomes.
In our model, individuals face two types of uncertainty: uncertainty over future health and over future income. First, and most importantly, an individual does not know how his health status will evolve over time. In particular, the relationship between smoking and drinking habits and mortality and morbidity status is stochastic. An individual who engages in heavy drinking and smoking does not necessarily experience bad health outcomes, but rather has a higher probability of experiencing negative health shocks in the future. As individuals experience negative health shocks they will update their beliefs about the remaining life expectancy and may change the behavior. Thus our model differs significantly from the previous literature that has tried to identify forward looking behavior based on the response of individuals to price changes. Here we are mostly interested in the response of individuals to changes in health status.

More formally, individuals face uncertainty about the evolution of their health status, $h_t$. We assume that health status can take on three different values, good, bad and dead. Thus uncertainty about health status also includes uncertainty about death. We assume that the transition probabilities for being in bad health ($bh_{t+1}$) and mortality status follow a multinomial logit model:

$$
Pr(death_{t+1}) = \frac{\exp(x_{ht}\theta_d)}{1 + \exp(x_{ht}\theta_d) + \exp(x_{ht}\theta_b)}
$$

$$
Pr(bh_{t+1}) = \frac{\exp(x_{ht}\theta_b)}{1 + \exp(x_{ht}\theta_d) + \exp(x_{ht}\theta_b)}
$$

where $x_{ht}$ includes health status at time $t$, age, and the smoking and drinking choices at time $t$. Note that consistent estimates of the $\theta_d$'s and the $\theta_b$'s relies upon no unobserved variables that may affect health status and are correlated with the elements of $x_{ht}$. We relax this assumption in the next section when we discuss initial conditions and unobserved heterogeneity.

We assume that individuals also face income uncertainty. They must, therefore, forecast

---

21We experimented with ordered logit models of health status which assume that there is one underlying health variable with cut points at bad health and death. This model was too restrictive and did not allow enough individuals to move from good health to death. We also experimented with nested logit models of health status and could not reject the simpler multinomial logit model.
the evolution of income. The transitions for future income are implicitly given by a log-
normal regression of income at time \( t + 1 \) on income, health status, age, and smoking and
drinking choices at time \( t \).\textsuperscript{22} We index the parameters estimated here as \( \theta^y \).

We assume that individuals have preferences which can be represented by a time sep-
arable (expected) utility function with discount factor \( \beta \). Let \( u_t(c_t, X_t) \) denote the single
period utility function which depends on the state and control variables in \( t \). We assume that

\[
  u_t(c_t, X_t) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_{jt}[u_j(x_t) + \epsilon_{jt}]
\]

(4)

We use the following specification for part of the utility function which depends on observed
state variables:\textsuperscript{23}

\[
  u_j(x_t) = \alpha_{0j} + \alpha_{1j} \ln(y_t - e(a_{jt}, c_{jt})) + \alpha_{2j} b h_t + \alpha_{3} 1\{\text{quit drinking}\} + \alpha_{4} 1\{\text{quit smoking}\}
\]

(5)

where \( y_t \) and \( h_t \) refer to income and health at time \( t \) and \( e(d_{jt}, s_{jt}) \) refer to expenditures
on drinking and smoking given choice \( j \). \( 1\{\cdot\} \) denotes an indicator function which is equal
to one if the event inside the brackets happens and is zero otherwise. This specification
implies that each choice has a fixed benefit (\( \alpha_{0j} \)). The utility derived from income, \( \alpha_{1j} \),
and health, \( \alpha_{2j} \), varies across choices. Utility depends on net income. Unfortunately, the
HRS does not contain data on expenditures on alcohol and tobacco; we therefore impute
expenditures using the following expression

\[
  e(d_{jt}, s_{jt}) = \min\{d_{jt}p_{t}^d + s_{jt}p_{t}^s, \phi y_t\}.
\]

\textsuperscript{24} Using

the minimum of mean expenditures and a fraction of income, \( \phi y_t \), guarantees that imputed
expenditures on alcohol and tobacco are not excessively high for low income people who are

\textsuperscript{22} To simplify the analysis, we assume that prices evolve deterministically and that individuals have correct
point expectations about current and future prices. For a time series analysis of tobacco prices and an
investigation of decision making in the presence of price uncertainty, see Coppejans, Gilleskie, Sieg, and

\textsuperscript{23} For a discussion of utility functions that depend on health status, see Viscusi and Evans (1990).

\textsuperscript{24} \( d_{jt} \) (\( s_{jt} \)) are the mean quantity of alcohol (tobacco) consumption in the sample for individuals who
consume alcohol given choice \( j \). It is zero if choice \( j \) is abstaining.
likely to consume cheaper products than the average individual in our sample.

The last two parameters, $\alpha_3$ and $\alpha_4$, are designed to capture habit persistence of smoking and heavy drinking. We expect that $\alpha_3$ ($\alpha_4$) is negative indicating that quitting heavy drinking (smoking) is costly to individuals because of withdrawal effects. Since it is hard to assign quitting costs to the choices, we prefer to think of these parameters of the utility function as measures of habit persistence and estimate them as part of the parameters of the utility function.\textsuperscript{25}

Individuals are rational and forward looking and behave according to an optimal decision rule $\delta_t(X_t) = c_t$ which solves the following maximization problem:

\[
\max_{\delta = (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_T)} E_\delta \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{T} \beta^t u_t(c_t, X_t) \mid X_0 = X \right\}
\]

where $E_\delta$ denotes the expectation with respect to the controlled stochastic process $\{X_t, c_t\}$ induced by the decision rule, $\delta$. This notation is thus consistent with the key feature of the model that individuals do not have perfect foresight and face uncertainty about the impacts of smoking and heavy drinking on health outcomes and mortality.

3.2 Estimation

The parameters of our model consist of the parameters of the utility function and the transition probabilities. Since a Markov decision process yields deterministic decision rules, we need to rely on unobserved state variables to generate a properly defined econometric model. Rust (1987) shows that if the unobserved state variables satisfy the assumptions of additive separability (AS) and conditional independence (CI), conditional choice probabilities are well defined. If we additionally assume that the unobservables in preferences follow a Type

\textsuperscript{25}Since discrete choices only depend on relative utility levels, we can normalize a set of coefficients. We set $\alpha_{11} = 1$ and $\alpha_{i1} = 0$ for $i \neq 1$. 
I extreme value distribution, we obtain Rust’s multinomial dynamic logit specification:

\[
P_t(c_{jt} = 1 \mid x_t) = \frac{\exp(v_{jt}(x_t, \alpha, \beta, \theta))}{\sum_{j=1}^{J} \exp(v_{jt}(x_t, \alpha, \beta, \theta))}
\] (7)

where the conditional value function \(v_{jt}(x, \theta)\) is recursively defined as:

\[
v_{jT}(x_T, \alpha, \beta, \theta) = u_{jT}(x_T, \alpha)
\]

\[
v_{jt}(x_t, \alpha, \beta, \theta) = u_{jt}(x_t, \alpha) + \beta \int \left( \log \left( \sum_{j=1}^{J} \exp(v_{j+1}(x_{t+1}, \alpha, \beta, \theta)) \right) \right) f(dx_{t+1}|x_t, c_t, \theta)
\]

Substituting these value functions into equation (7) yields the conditional choice probabilities of the dynamic logit model. We observe a panel of \(N\) individuals over \(T\) periods. The log-likelihood for the full model is then given by:

\[
L(\alpha, \beta, \theta) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{T} L_{cnt}(\alpha, \beta, \theta) + L_{hnt}(\theta^d, \theta^b) + L_{ynt}(\theta^y)
\]

where \(L_{cnt}\) is the log-likelihood of the individual \(n\)’s choices on smoking and heavy drinking at time \(t\), with \(L_{hnt}\) and \(L_{ynt}\) the corresponding contributions of the health and income transitions. Note that since the log likelihood is additively separable, it is possible to estimate the model in steps.\(^{26}\) In particular, we could estimate the \(\theta\)'s using only the second two terms of the log likelihood above. Taking these values of the \(\theta\)'s as given, we could then use the first term in the log likelihood only to estimate the \(\alpha\)'s and \(\beta\).

3.3 Initial Conditions and Unobserved Heterogeneity

The above likelihood function assumes there are no persistent unobserved variables in the health and income transitions and no unobserved persistent tastes for drinking and smoking. An individual with bad health endowments and strong tastes for smoking and drinking is much more likely to be classified as problem drinker or problem smoker at the beginning of the sample period. Similarly, a highly educated person may be more strongly aware of

\(^{26}\)See Rust and Phelan (1997) for an example of sequential estimation of dynamic discrete choice problems.
the negative health effects of smoking and drinking or may discount the future less. As a consequence he would be less likely to enter the panel with a strong smoking or drinking history. These examples illustrate that it is problematic to ignore unobserved heterogeneity, especially if it is correlated with initial conditions that characterize previous pattern of habit formation in the sample. Ignoring these problems is likely to cause inconsistent estimators of the parameters of the model.

We therefore assume individuals differ by unobserved characteristics at the start of the panel. Following Heckman and Singer (1984) and Keane and Wolpin (1997), we account for unobserved state variables using a semi-nonparametric approach which allows for a finite mixture of types, each comprising a fixed proportion of the population. These type probabilities depend on all time invariant state variables observed in the beginning of the panel including observed measures of past smoking and drinking histories. More formally, we assume that there are $M$ discrete types of individuals. The probability that an individual in our sample with observed time invariant characteristics $z_n$ is of type $m$ is given by:

\[
\pi_m^n = \frac{\exp(\gamma_m z_n)}{1 + \exp(\gamma_m z_n)} \quad m = 1, \ldots, M
\] (10)

In our application, $z_n$ contains the problem drinker and problem smoker variables, as well as age at wave 1 interacted with lagged smoking and drink choices. It also includes education and a measure of the mother’s longevity, whether one’s mother died by the age of 70.

An individual’s type affects both the health and income transitions as well as his tastes for drinking and smoking. For income, we assume that the intercept term in the log income regression varies across type. For health, we could allow type to have an independent effect on death and bad health. However, since once an individual dies we observe no future health transitions, we instead assume that each additional type adds only one parameter to the health transitions. Namely, we restrict the effect of type on the death and bad health probabilities to be proportional to the corresponding coefficients on lagged bad health. The
probabilities of being in death and bad health are thus given by:

\[ P_r(death_{t+1}) = \frac{\exp(x_{1ht}\theta^d_1 + bh_t\theta^b_2 + I_m\theta_m^d)}{1 + \exp(x_{1ht}\theta^d_1 + bh_t\theta^b_2 + I_m\theta_m^d) + \exp(x_{1ht}\theta^d_1 + bh_t\theta^b_2 + I_m\theta_m^d)} \]

\[ P_r(bh_{t+1}) = \frac{\exp(x_{1ht}\theta^b_1 + bh_t\theta^d_2 + I_m\theta_m^b)}{1 + \exp(x_{1ht}\theta^b_1 + bh_t\theta^d_2 + I_m\theta_m^b) + \exp(x_{1ht}\theta^b_1 + bh_t\theta^d_2 + I_m\theta_m^b)} \]

where \( I_m \) takes on a value of one if the individual is a member of the \( m \)th type and \( x_{1ht} \) refers to \( x_{ht} \) without the lagged bad health status.

We also allow the value of type to affect the utility of heavy drinking and smoking directly in two ways. First, the intercept terms for smoking and heavy drinking are allowed to vary by type. Second, we allow the discount factor, \( \beta \), to vary across type in some versions of the model. Adding unobserved heterogeneity then changes the log likelihood function to:

\[ L(\alpha, \beta, \theta, \gamma) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \ln \left( \sum_{m=1}^{M} \pi_m(\gamma) \prod_{t=1}^{T} l_{cntm}(\alpha, \beta, \theta) l_{hntm}(\theta^d, \theta^b) l_{yntm}(\theta^y) \right) \]  

(11)

where the likelihoods, \( l \)'s, are type-specific. Note that the log likelihood is no longer additively separable and hence a two-step estimator is not feasible. Estimation can still be accomplished by maximizing the objective function with respect to all parameters at once. However, this approach is computationally intensive. We pursue, therefore, in this paper an iterative estimator proposed by Arcidiacono and Jones (2003). This estimator is consistent and significantly decreases the required estimation time.\(^{27}\)

Arcidiacono and Jones (2003) note that one of the techniques for solving mixture models, the Expectation-Maximization (EM) Algorithm, reintroduces the additive separability of the log likelihood function at the maximization step. The EM algorithm works as follows. First, given initial values of the parameters we calculate the conditional probability that an individual is a particular type. Using these conditional probabilities as weights, we treat type as observed and maximize the now additively separable log likelihood function. Given

\(^{27}\)This algorithm has been used in similar situations by Arcidiacono (2004) and Arcidiacono (2005).
the new parameter estimates, we then update the conditional probabilities of being each of
the types and iterate until convergence.

More formally, given values for the $\alpha$’s, $\beta$’s, $\theta$’s, and $\gamma$’s, the conditional probability of
individual $n$ being the $m$th type follows from Bayes’ rule:

$$P_{nm} = \frac{\pi_m(\gamma) \prod_{t=1}^{T} l_{cntm}(\alpha, \beta, \theta) l_{hntm}(\theta^d, \theta^b) l_{ymtm}(\theta^y)}{\sum_{m=1}^{M} \pi_m(\gamma) \prod_{t=1}^{T} l_{cntm}(\alpha, \beta, \theta) l_{hntm}(\theta^d, \theta^b) l_{ymtm}(\theta^y)}$$

(12)

We then maximize the expected log likelihood function:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{t=1}^{T} P_{nm} \left( L_{cntm}(\alpha, \beta, \theta) + L_{hntm}(\theta^d, \theta^b) + L_{ymtm}(\theta^y) \right)$$

(13)

Taking the $P_{nm}$’s as given, we can estimate the $\theta$’s using only the last two terms. Given
values for the $\theta$’s, we can then estimate the $\alpha$’s and the $\beta$’s. With the estimates of the $\alpha$’s,
$\beta$’s, and $\theta$’s, we can estimate the $\gamma$’s by maximizing (11) with respect to the $\gamma$’s, taking
the $l$’s (the likelihoods) as given. Once we have the $\gamma$’s, we update the conditional type
probabilities and again proceed with the sequential maximization, iterating on these steps
until convergence.

### 3.4 Myopic Behavior

As discussed above, heavy drinking and smoking can also stem from myopic behavior which
implies that individuals ignore future risks of harmful consumption goods. The myopic
model is nested in the forward looking model described above. In the limiting case of the
myopic model, individuals ignore the future.28 We can obtain this version of the myopic
model by setting the discount factor $\beta$ equal to zero. The choice probabilities are then given
by the simple (static) logit model:

$$P_t(c_{jt} = 1 \mid x_t) = \frac{\exp(u_{jt}(x_t, \theta))}{\sum_{j=1}^{J} \exp(u_{jt}(x_t, \theta))}$$

(14)

28We condition our analysis on behavior prior to age 50. Hence, our analysis does not allow us to make
statements about behavior of younger adults who may be more likely to engage in myopic behavior.
More generally, we can thus distinguish between myopic and forward looking models based on the value of $\beta$. Low estimated values of $\beta$ suggest myopia; large values of the two-period discount factor $\beta$ in the magnitude of 0.9 are an indication of “fully rational” behavior.29

3.5 Identification of the Discount Factor and Model Selection

Before we proceed and report the main empirical findings of this paper it is useful to discuss the main differences between myopic and forward looking behavior in our context. In a forward looking model individuals will trade-off the short term benefits of the consumption of alcohol and smoking – measured by the per period utility function – with the long term costs – measured by the expected future value function. These long-term costs result because excessive smoking and alcohol consumption make it more likely that an individual will be in bad health. Smoking and heavy drinking also increases the mortality risks and hence lowers life expectancies. The costs largely depend on the evolution of the health status which is stochastic. Thus in a forward looking model smoking and heavy drinking may be quite attractive activities. They may yield a higher instantaneous utility than abstaining. However, individuals will primarily stay away from these activities because they recognize that the greater health risks significantly lower the expected future value associated with these activities.

In contrast, myopic individuals will largely abstain from smoking and heavy drinking because these options are unattractive to them. They result in low values of the instantaneous utility function. As a consequence, if we fit forward looking and myopic models to the same data, we expect to obtain quite different parameter estimates. To explain the same observed pattern in the sample, myopic and forward looking models will have to be based on different parameter estimates. The discount factor is thus primarily identified in our paper from the observed smoking-age and heavy drinking-age profiles in the data. By

29The utility function in the simple logit model can also be interpreted as a linear approximation of the conditional value function. Following that line of reasoning, we are then comparing dynamic models based on full solution algorithms with those based on linear approximations of value functions. It is hard to distinguish between the two alternative interpretations of the simple logit model.
excluding age as an explanatory variable in the instantaneous utility function, we let the
data determine the level of forward looking behavior which largely determines the relative
values of each option in the choice set. There is thus a close link the smoking-age and
drinking age-profiles and the rate of time preference if one does not place age directly into
the utility function.

The discussion also implies that myopic and forward looking models, evaluated at their
parameter estimates, will have different out-of-sample predictions. We can also evaluate
the validity of each behavioral hypothesis by conducting a horse race and analyzing which
model has better out-of-sample predictive properties.

4 Estimation Results

We estimated a variety of models with different number of types. Here we only report the
estimates of models with four types.\textsuperscript{30} Tables 3 through 6 summarize the main findings for
four different model specifications. The first model is a myopic model that is obtained by
setting the discount factor equal to 0.0. The fully rational model uses a two-period discount
rate of 0.9. We also estimate an unconstrained dynamic model by searching over a grid
for $\beta$. The last model that we consider also allows for heterogeneity in discount factors
among the four types of individuals. Tables 3 and 4 report the results for the transition
probabilities. Table 5 summarizes the parameter estimates for the utility function. Finally,
Table 6 reports the estimates for the type probabilities.

The behavior predicted by the forward looking model depends on beliefs that individuals
hold about the evolution of the main state variables. In our model, individuals have beliefs
about transitions of their health status, mortality, and income. Estimating these transitions
is important because smoking and heavy drinking are likely to reduce the life span of an
individual, and thus reduce expected lifetime utility. Out-of-sample predictions of survival
rates are needed to solve the computational dynamic programming model.

\textsuperscript{30}Results for one and two type models are available upon request from the authors.
Table 3: Parameter Estimates of the Health Transitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\beta=0$</th>
<th>$\beta=0.9$</th>
<th>Estimated $\beta$</th>
<th>Heterogeneous $\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff</td>
<td>Std. Err</td>
<td>Coeff</td>
<td>Std. Err</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bad Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.867</td>
<td>0.0997</td>
<td>-2.842</td>
<td>0.0991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged Bad Health</td>
<td>2.7923</td>
<td>0.0709</td>
<td>2.7928</td>
<td>0.0709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0871</td>
<td>0.0129</td>
<td>0.0862</td>
<td>0.0129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged Drinking</td>
<td>-0.0241</td>
<td>0.1333</td>
<td>-0.0171</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged Smoking</td>
<td>0.1432</td>
<td>0.0809</td>
<td>0.1347</td>
<td>0.0815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Death</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-6.3415</td>
<td>0.2426</td>
<td>-6.317</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged Bad Health</td>
<td>2.8554</td>
<td>0.1477</td>
<td>2.8555</td>
<td>0.1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.2562</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>0.2554</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged Drinking</td>
<td>-0.0691</td>
<td>0.2545</td>
<td>-0.0613</td>
<td>0.2538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged Smoking</td>
<td>0.7357</td>
<td>0.1609</td>
<td>0.7258</td>
<td>0.1613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type=2</td>
<td>0.1482</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
<td>0.1402</td>
<td>0.0447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type=3</td>
<td>0.2478</td>
<td>0.0310</td>
<td>0.2419</td>
<td>0.0310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type=4</td>
<td>-0.2193</td>
<td>0.0426</td>
<td>-0.2303</td>
<td>0.0427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accurate estimation of these transitions is therefore an important component of the overall modelling strategy. We assume that individuals subjective beliefs correspond to probability measures that can be estimated based on observed data.\footnote{Sloan, Smith, and Taylor (2001) provide some evidence that individuals correctly update their beliefs in response to health shocks.}

Table 3 reports the results for the health and death transitions. Individuals who are in bad health are much more likely to face bad health outcomes in the future. Similarly, as individuals age they are more likely to experience bad health outcomes or die. The same holds true for smoking as smoking today makes bad health more likely in the future, with even stronger effects on the probability of dying. Since there is a large negative intercept term for death, significant death probabilities only result when an individual is very old or in bad health. Hence, the marginal effect of smoking on the probability of dying is much higher at seventy than at fifty. This will then lead to a downward sloping age-smoking profile, at least at ages below ninety. The type effects indicate that type 1 and 4 have better health transitions than types 2 and 3. As we will see in the discussion of type probabilities, type 4 individuals tend to be those who graduate from college while type 1’s find smoking and heavy drinking unattractive in general. The parameter estimates are robust across the four model specifications.

The one puzzling result is the lack of an effect of heavy drinking on either bad health or death. Previous medical studies have documented the potential negative health effects of heavy drinking among the elderly. Equal doses of alcohol produce higher blood alcohol levels among the elderly compared to the young. Heavy alcohol use increase the risks of injuries and illnesses, including falls, depression, and cognitive impairment, and mortality (Andreason, 1998). The elderly are also more susceptible to the ill effects of alcoholism because of medication and drug-alcohol interactions (Adams, Gary, Rhyne, Hunt, and Goodwin, 1990). We do not see these effects here even though these would be consistent with the downward sloping age-drinking profiles in the data. However, the standard errors are large and economically significant effects can be found within the ninety-five percent confidence intervals of the estimates.
Table 4: Parameter Estimates of the Income Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\beta=0$ Coeff</th>
<th>$\beta=0.9$ Coeff</th>
<th>Estimated $\beta$ Coeff</th>
<th>Heterogeneous $\beta$ Coeff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Err</td>
<td>Std. Err</td>
<td>Std. Err</td>
<td>Std. Err</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.4447</td>
<td>0.1185</td>
<td>5.4487</td>
<td>0.1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged Income</td>
<td>0.5026</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>0.5021</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged Bad Health</td>
<td>-0.2432</td>
<td>0.0247</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>0.0246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.0587</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
<td>-0.0586</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged Drinking</td>
<td>-0.0677</td>
<td>0.0396</td>
<td>-0.0623</td>
<td>0.0393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged Smoking</td>
<td>-0.0476</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.0242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type=2</td>
<td>0.0789</td>
<td>0.0371</td>
<td>0.0717</td>
<td>0.0367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type=3</td>
<td>-0.0213</td>
<td>0.0247</td>
<td>-0.0214</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type=4</td>
<td>0.3332</td>
<td>0.0264</td>
<td>0.3368</td>
<td>0.0264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimating beliefs that individuals hold about income transitions is also complex. Current income of individuals obviously is largely affected by current and past labor market participation, retirement and saving decisions. Modelling these decisions within a well-defined dynamic programming model is exceedingly complicated as documented, for example, by Rust and Phelan (1997). We do not seek to improve upon these efforts. Instead, we analyze interactions between consumption of various harmful goods and their health effects. We therefore adopt a reduced form approach for modelling the income process. The main approach for modelling income transitions is based on log-normal income regressions. Estimates of the transition parameters of the income equation are given in Table 4.

In general, our findings are quite reasonable. The parameters have the expected sign in almost all cases and are often estimated precisely. Not surprisingly, income follows a strong autoregressive process. Health status and age are significant in all three models and have the expected negative sign. Heavy drinking and smoking negatively affect future income. Types 2 and 4 have higher labor market skills than types 1 and 3, with particularly high incomes for Type 4's who are primarily college graduates.

We estimate the preference parameters of the utility function specified in equation (5) using myopic and forward looking model specifications. Most of the coefficients in the utility functions have the expected sign and are statistically significant. Our results suggest that, on average, lower income individuals are more likely to engage in smoking and heavy drinking.

---

32 Income is measured as total household income and therefore one would expect a lower coefficient than estimates typically found for labor income.

33 The maximum fraction of income that an individual can spend on alcohol and tobacco is set at 15%.
Table 5: Parameter Estimates of the Utility Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \beta = 0 )</th>
<th>( \beta = 0.9 )</th>
<th>Estimated ( \beta )</th>
<th>Heterogeneous ( \beta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff</td>
<td>Std. Err</td>
<td>Coeff</td>
<td>Std. Err</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year ( \beta )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 Two-year ( \beta )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3 Two-year ( \beta )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4 Two-year ( \beta )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d=1,s=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-13.6817</td>
<td>5.8207</td>
<td>-4.7333</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln Income</td>
<td>0.7563</td>
<td>0.0824</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.0684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Health</td>
<td>-0.2907</td>
<td>0.1954</td>
<td>0.2121</td>
<td>0.1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d=1,s=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.6736</td>
<td>0.6527</td>
<td>-1.2057</td>
<td>0.5793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln Income</td>
<td>0.8062</td>
<td>0.0606</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.0535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Health</td>
<td>-0.3677</td>
<td>0.1608</td>
<td>-0.4184</td>
<td>0.1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d=0,s=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-9.5438</td>
<td>5.7733</td>
<td>-1.899</td>
<td>0.8009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln Income</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.0505</td>
<td>0.8414</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Health</td>
<td>-0.3011</td>
<td>0.1179</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitting Cost-Drinking</td>
<td>1.6755</td>
<td>0.1212</td>
<td>1.7369</td>
<td>0.1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quitting Cost-Smoking</td>
<td>-4.5368</td>
<td>0.1033</td>
<td>-4.4754</td>
<td>0.1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2-Abstain Alc</td>
<td>-8.8634</td>
<td>5.7477</td>
<td>-3.6128</td>
<td>0.5626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2-Abstain Smoke</td>
<td>-3.5922</td>
<td>0.2253</td>
<td>-2.8462</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3-Abstain Alc</td>
<td>-8.6261</td>
<td>5.7473</td>
<td>-3.651</td>
<td>0.5606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3-Abstain Smoke</td>
<td>-1.6559</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>-1.4104</td>
<td>0.1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4-Abstain Alc</td>
<td>-7.9795</td>
<td>5.7472</td>
<td>-3.3455</td>
<td>0.5817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4-Abstain Smoke</td>
<td>0.3256</td>
<td>0.3902</td>
<td>0.4311</td>
<td>0.3702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-likelihood</td>
<td>17199</td>
<td></td>
<td>17195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Including variables for habit formation improves the fit of the model considerably. There are substantial costs for quitting smoking or heavy drinking. Quitting smoking, however, is much harder than quitting heavy drinking. The parameter estimates of the utility function differ significantly across model specifications. The parameter estimates of the instantaneous utility function indicate that smoking or heavy drinking are more attractive alternatives in forward looking models. This finding is due to the fact that myopic models do not account for the fact that the future expected utility of abstaining is higher due to improved health and longer life expectancies.

The finding that there are only small differences in the estimated quitting costs between myopic and the forward looking models may at first seem puzzling. One potential explanation for this result is as follows. If the true data generating process involves forward looking behavior, estimating a myopic model will still be approximating the results from a forward looking model. We find much lower intercept terms for drinking and smoking in the utility function for the myopic model. When a myopic model is used, the differences in expected future utility across the choices are largely captured by the intercepts. Hence, the myopic model shows that individuals generally do not have a preference for drinking and smoking. In contrast, the forward looking models indicate that individuals enjoy drinking and smoking. But they do not engage in these activities because of the future health risks. The lagged variables themselves pick up the same level of persistence in the drinking and smoking decisions that are revealed in the data regardless of whether we estimate a myopic model or a forward looking model.

The values of the likelihood functions indicate that the forward looking model ($\beta = 0.9$) fits the data slightly better than the myopic model ($\beta = 0.0$). The unconstrained estimate of the model yields a point estimate for the two-period discount factor $\beta$ of approximately 0.82, which translates into an annual discount factor of approximately 0.91.\textsuperscript{34} Based on the likelihood values, we conclude that forward looking models provide a slightly better fit than

\textsuperscript{34}Discount rates both higher and lower have been reported in the literature. These studies use different approaches for estimating discount rates than we do. See Hausman (1979), Dreyfus and Viscusi (1995), Moore and Viscusi (1988, 1990), and Warner and Pleeter (2001).
myopic models.

We have argued before that controlling for unobserved heterogeneity and differences in initial conditions is important for obtaining reliable parameter estimates. The results in Tables 3 - 5 clearly indicate that there are substantial differences among the four types. Moreover, we also find that the parameter estimates for the discount factor may be seriously biased downward if one does not account for unobserved heterogeneity. For example, the point estimate in the one-type model for the two-year discount factor is equal to 0.59 which is almost 25% lower than the point estimate obtained in the four type model. Finally, we also estimated a model which allowed for heterogeneity in the discount factors among the four types. The last two columns in Table 5 indicate that the two-year discount factors vary from 0.685 to 0.993 which suggests individuals may have different time preferences.

Finally, we consider the estimation results which measure the impact of observed time invariant characteristics on the type probabilities. These results are summarized in Table 6 for all four model specifications. We find that there are many commonalities among the specifications. Types 2, 3, and 4 are all more likely to enter the panel with significant histories of smoking and heavy drinking.

Educated individuals have typically high levels of income and thus have access to better health care. As a consequence they have longer life expectancies, and thus smoking or heavy drinking may be less attractive for them. More educated individuals may also be more aware of the negative health effects of smoking. We explore this hypothesis and include education in the type probabilities. We find that education has a strong impact on the type probabilities. Hence there is some evidence that smoking patterns among older individuals differ by educational backgrounds. The type probabilities depend to a lesser degree on the longevity of the mother thus picking up differences in health endowments. These differences are also reflected in the point estimates reported in Table 3.

In summary, we find that forward looking models fit the data slightly better than myopic models. The models also yield different estimates for key parameters of the model. In particular, estimates of myopic models imply that the instantaneous utility of smoking and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type=2</th>
<th>Type=3</th>
<th>Type=4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-Year $\beta=0$</strong></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.618</td>
<td>-1.9969</td>
<td>-19.9151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Drink</td>
<td>1.0132</td>
<td>2.4038</td>
<td>1.2658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Smoke</td>
<td>11.0168</td>
<td>19.1057</td>
<td>10.2435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother Dead by 70</td>
<td>-1.2098</td>
<td>1.0836</td>
<td>-0.7443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>0.9138</td>
<td>-25.00</td>
<td>21.3611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink Wave 1</td>
<td>6.0235</td>
<td>1.3318</td>
<td>1.0363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoke Wave 1</td>
<td>20.1204</td>
<td>8.5631</td>
<td>19.2468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink Wave 1×Age Wave 1</td>
<td>-0.3455</td>
<td>-2.8825</td>
<td>-0.2868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoke Wave 1×Age Wave 1</td>
<td>-1.2077</td>
<td>1.9818</td>
<td>-1.3763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Prob.</td>
<td>0.1339</td>
<td>0.3633</td>
<td>0.1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-year $\beta=.9$</strong></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.6269</td>
<td>-2.1111</td>
<td>-19.8829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Drink</td>
<td>0.9877</td>
<td>2.3918</td>
<td>1.3047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Smoke</td>
<td>10.7948</td>
<td>19.5158</td>
<td>10.0378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother Dead by 70</td>
<td>-1.2497</td>
<td>1.0989</td>
<td>-0.7655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>1.0251</td>
<td>-25.00</td>
<td>21.3974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink Wave 1</td>
<td>6.1690</td>
<td>0.9259</td>
<td>1.2546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoke Wave 1</td>
<td>20.2845</td>
<td>7.9617</td>
<td>19.6808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink Wave 1×Age Wave 1</td>
<td>-0.3713</td>
<td>-2.8990</td>
<td>-0.3134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoke Wave 1×Age Wave 1</td>
<td>-1.1878</td>
<td>2.1078</td>
<td>-1.4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Prob.</td>
<td>0.1362</td>
<td>0.3566</td>
<td>0.1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated</strong></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.6669</td>
<td>-2.0512</td>
<td>-19.8732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Drink</td>
<td>1.0565</td>
<td>2.4166</td>
<td>1.3124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Smoke</td>
<td>10.8846</td>
<td>19.3771</td>
<td>10.0877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother Dead by 70</td>
<td>-1.2672</td>
<td>1.0837</td>
<td>-0.7546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>1.0773</td>
<td>-25.00</td>
<td>21.4057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink Wave 1</td>
<td>6.2174</td>
<td>1.1150</td>
<td>1.2783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoke Wave 1</td>
<td>20.2076</td>
<td>8.0965</td>
<td>19.6299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink Wave 1×Age Wave 1</td>
<td>-0.3736</td>
<td>-2.8989</td>
<td>-0.3102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoke Wave 1×Age Wave 1</td>
<td>-1.1963</td>
<td>2.0689</td>
<td>-1.4589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Prob.</td>
<td>0.1345</td>
<td>0.3603</td>
<td>0.1770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterogeneous</strong></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.6385</td>
<td>-2.0386</td>
<td>-19.8848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Drink</td>
<td>1.0473</td>
<td>2.4057</td>
<td>1.3267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Smoke</td>
<td>10.8674</td>
<td>19.3722</td>
<td>10.1171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother Dead by 70</td>
<td>-1.2614</td>
<td>1.0199</td>
<td>-0.7633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>1.0514</td>
<td>-25.00</td>
<td>21.3973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink Wave 1</td>
<td>6.2029</td>
<td>1.1141</td>
<td>1.2989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoke Wave 1</td>
<td>20.2090</td>
<td>8.1058</td>
<td>19.6232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drink Wave 1×Age Wave 1</td>
<td>-0.3707</td>
<td>-2.8963</td>
<td>-0.3118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoke Wave 1×Age Wave 1</td>
<td>-1.1823</td>
<td>2.0729</td>
<td>-1.4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Prob.</td>
<td>0.1355</td>
<td>0.3612</td>
<td>0.1763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
heavy drinking is lower than the one in forward looking models. As a consequence, we expect these models to have different predictive properties. We investigate these issues in detail in the next section.

5 Goodness of Fit and Out-of-Sample Predictions

We consider both within sample fit and out-of-sample predictions of the models estimated above. Table 7 reports the predicted probabilities of smoking and heavy drinking for the observations from waves 2-4 of the HRS and compares these predictions to the actual data. Table 7 suggests that there are only small differences in the models’ within-sample predictions. All of the models match the overall trend in the data reasonably well.

Table 7: Within Sample Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th>Wave 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion Drinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myopic</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Rational</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Beta</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero. Beta</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion Smoking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myopic</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Rational</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Beta</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hetero. Beta</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more interesting comparison of the different models examines out-of-sample predictions. In this study, we focus on predicted smoking profiles as a function of age. This allows us to evaluate the models since we do not include age as an explanatory variable in the preferences. We run the following experiment. We take the set of individuals in our data
and forecast out the probabilities of smoking at each age. We condition on being alive by dividing the unconditional probabilities of smoking by the mean probability of being alive at a particular age. Individuals with a high probability of dying are weighted less in later years than those who have a low probability of dying.

We plot in Figure 1 the age-smoking profiles for HRS data as well as data from the Asset and Health Dynamics Among the Oldest Old (AHEAD). AHEAD is a companion data set to HRS which contains individuals that were aged 70 or over in 1993, and their spouses who could be any age. In particular, the HRS data are used for ages 52 to 72, and then the first 3 waves of the AHEAD data are attached for ages 72 to 90. One caution is necessary when examining the AHEAD data: the model was estimated with permanent abstainers removed from the HRS; this was not possible for the AHEAD data.

Large differences across the models are apparent when examining the age-smoking profiles. The myopic model predicts fairly flat profiles. As individuals age, they become more unhealthy which makes smoking less attractive. However, they also become poorer which makes smoking more attractive. In contrast, the fully rational model predicts sharp declines in smoking rates. Here, individuals smoke more than in the myopic model up until the age of 62. The decline in smoking rates occurs because the marginal adverse health effects of smoking increase as individuals age. After the age of 80 the myopic model shows decreases in smoking rates, the fully rational model shows increases in smoking rates. This occurs because of an end-of-life effect. Individuals expect to die soon. Hence they are more likely to ignore the negative health effects of smoking and heavy drinking. The model in which the discount factor is estimated yields profiles in between the fully rational and myopic model for ages 60 through 85. After age 85, the model predicts lower smoking rates than either of the myopic or the fully rational model. Finally, the model with heterogeneous discount factors predicts an even steeper profile. This model clearly matches the trends in the data best, both in and out of sample.

Finally, we consider heavy drinking pattern as a function of age. The results are plotted in Figure 2. Our findings suggest that all of our models do not match the trend in the
Figure 1: Age-smoking profiles under different discount factors
Figure 2: Age-drinking profiles under different discount factors
AHEAD well. We find that both the myopic and the estimated discount factor model predict very flat age-drinking profiles. This corresponds to the drinking pattern found in the HRS. The fully rational model predicts declining alcohol consumption until the age 78 and increasing consumption after that. The data show sharp declines in alcohol consumption later in the life-cycle.

There are two plausible explanations for the lack of predictive power of the alcohol-age profiles of all our models. First, our estimates imply that heavy drinking has only a small impact on health outcomes. As a consequence all of our models have a hard time explaining why individuals quit as they get older. If we used higher parameter estimates in the health transitions for the impact of heavy drinking, the forward-looking models would fit the trend in the data much better. Second, the lack of fit may also be due to a deficiency in the construction of the data. AHEAD did not have the information needed to remove permanent abstainers. This would obviously affect the profiles for heavy drinking more than for smoking. It is thus likely that the observed patterns in AHEAD sample are not good predictors for future drinking for the HRS sample used in the estimation of our model.

6 Implications of the Model

The different models also lead to differential responses to either public policy or advances in medical technology. Here we focus on how the age-smoking profile change given advances in medical technology. We consider a case in which smoking is less taxing on one’s health. In our experiment we focus on 52 year old individuals and assume that at age 65 a medical advance occurs such that the coefficients on smoking in the health transitions fall by fifty percent.

We plot the predicted age-smoking profiles of five models in Figure 3. The baseline forward looking model with heterogeneous discount factors is given by the bold line. If

---

35We also investigated the effects of price changes on smoking and heavy drinking behavior. Increasing the price of either alcohol or cigarettes leads to increases in the demand for the other suggesting that heavy drinking and smoking serve as substitutes.
individuals anticipate the advance in technology, the results are given by the dotted line. If
the advance is a surprise, the results are given by the bold dashed line. The myopic baseline
model is given by the solid line. The myopic model after the change in technology is given
by the dashed line. Note that the myopic model has the same predictions regardless of
whether the medical advance is anticipated or not.

Figure 3: Age-smoking profiles with a medical advance

First consider the case in which the medical advance comes as a surprise and is thus
not anticipated. Not surprisingly, Figure 3 shows that the behavior until age 65 is not
affected by an unanticipated medical advance in both myopic and forward-looking models.
However, there are pronounced behavior responses starting at age 65. The forward looking model predicts smoking rates start to increase at age 65. This occurs because individuals in the forward looking model like to smoke but avoid it because of the negative health consequences. Relaxing the negative consequences then increases smoking rates. In contrast, the medical advance has no direct effect on the evaluation of the different alternatives in the myopic model. Smoking rates increase in the myopic model after the medical advance because individuals are less likely to be in bad health. This (indirect) effect is, however, small in comparison to the changes in behavior in the forward looking model.

Figure 3 also shows that smoking rates increase in a forward-looking model before age 65 when the medical advance is anticipated. Individuals know that the expected health costs of smoking will be smaller in the future. They anticipate the future benefits of the medical advance. As a consequence smoking is a more attractive option even before the medical innovation occurs.

Given the large differences in behavioral responses, we also expect differences in the predicted death rates. Figure 4 plots the percent change in the probability of dying from moving from the base case to the case with the medical advance.\textsuperscript{36} We find that death rates actually increase before age 65 when the medical advance is anticipated. Individuals forecasting the medical advance increase their smoking rates before age 65. This leads to a higher probability of death. Death rates drop the most in the myopic model since the myopic model induces the smallest change in smoking behavior. More individuals smoke in forward looking models in the post-advance regime than in the myopic model.

The death rates actually increase in the forward looking models after age 75. This occurs in part because people who would have died earlier are now living longer. However, the increased death rates are also due to the higher smoking rates. In fact, a crossing point occurs: the overall probability of living until age 86 is higher with the medical advance but is lower post age 86 because of the higher smoking rates. This does not occur in the myopic

\textsuperscript{36}The comparison group for the forward looking models is the model with heterogeneous discount factors without the advance while the comparison group for the myopic model is the myopic model without the advance.
Figure 4: Changes in the probability of dying with a medical advance
model because of the lack of a behavioral response to the medical advance.

7 Conclusions

This study has analyzed smoking and heavy drinking in a sample of elderly individuals drawn from the HRS. The main objective of the analysis has been to explore differences between myopic and forward looking models. We have investigated whether models of forward looking behavior explain the main regularities found in the data better than myopic models. Earlier studies have typically assumed that individuals are either myopic or forward looking. In contrast, we provide an empirical framework which allows us to control for varying degrees of forward looking behavior of individuals and, therefore, nest the competing theories. Estimating the discount factor is desirable and helps us to distinguish between the competing hypotheses which have been put forward to explain the consumption of harmful and addictive goods. Our analysis suggests that forward looking models which control for observed habit formation, unobserved heterogeneity and differences in initial conditions fit the data the best. They also have the best predictive power for a sample of mean above age 70. Our analysis thus provides strong evidence for the hypothesis that older individuals are forward looking and take future risks associated with smoking and heavy drinking into consideration when determining their choices.

Our analysis relies on a number of simplifying assumptions. Models based on hyperbolic discounting present an alternative to the two types of models considered here. Our framework could be extended to estimate a behavioral model with hyperbolic discount factors. Future research, with longer panels, should investigate whether these hybrid models provide better fits of the data than models we analyzed. Although estimating hyperbolic-discounting models are feasible, in principle, additional problems arise because of the need to estimate two separate discount factors. Given the availability of only short panels, it may prove to be quite challenging to precisely estimate these types of models.\textsuperscript{37} Nevertheless, our results

\textsuperscript{37}Fang and Silverman (2004) provide some evidence which suggests the presence of hyperbolic discounting among welfare recipients.
are quite promising for further work which combines formal decision-theoretic analysis and estimation to address questions regarding the degree of forward looking behavior imposed in modelling the consumption of potentially harmful and addictive goods.
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