

The Distribution of Wealth in a Life-Cycle Model with Durables

Master Thesis Presented to the
Department of Economics at the
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science (M.Sc.)

Supervisor: Professor Thomas Hintermaier

Submitted in October 2017 by:
Eric Lustenberger
Matriculation Number 2849851

1 Introduction

The importance of distributional questions

Such models provide the basis for the analysis of redistributive policies. They shed light on the underlying mechanisms leading to unequal distributions of wealth and consumption. In order to improve policy making it is crucial in understanding these mechanisms.

The main goal of this paper is to contribute to the net-worth literature by investigating the empirical prediction of the net-worth cross-section in the US. Doing so, using detailed micro-data for income as well as the net-worth distributions for three different age groups thus allows me to accurately illustrate, what part of the distribution can be explained by the model and where the model presents shortcomings. Moreover, I look at two important determinants, the income risk and the LTV-ratio by simulating unexpected changes to illustrate how these affect the distribution across different age groups and the consumption-savings decision across the life-cycle. Finally, I show that the initial portfolio allocation is particularly important to predict the net-worth distribution of the youngest age group when calibrating the model.

I use detailed consumer data from Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) to evaluate the out of sample prediction of the evolution of the net-worth distribution in the US in a model abstracting from durables. Modeling durables is particularly interesting, since they exhibit a dual-role. On the one hand consumers derive consumption services by holding durables, on the other hand, they may use these as collateral to borrow and thus transfer wealth across time. Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) show that this dual role is important to reproduce the non-durable consumption life-cycle profile. An abstraction from durables may therefore bias life-cycle profiles of non-durable consumption and thus the accumulation of net-worth in a model with one asset. Moreover, they point out that durables help to explain why households with higher life-cycle income save proportionally more than poor households. As the durable stock rises, liquid assets become relatively more attractive and thus rich consumers with a high durable stock will increase their liquid assets. Díaz and Luengo-Prado (2010) investigate the role of housing in the wealth-distribution in the US using an infinite-horizon model. I show that my model is able to accurately reproduce life-cycle profiles of the portfolio composition as well as non-durable consumption over the life-cycle observed in the data. In order to do so, I compare the simulated life-cycle profiles to the empirical data presented in other literature.

The first section discusses the theoretical literature, whose motive is to find deter-

minants of net-worth and empirically validate these. The second section presents important empirical facts of the wealth distribution. In the third section I present the model. The fourth discusses the calibration and in the fifth I present the results. The sixth section concludes.

2 Modeling the wealth distribution

2.1 The Standard Incomplete Markets Model

The modeling of distributions requires some form of heterogeneity. The most common model used to achieve differences across agents is the standard incomplete markets model (SIM) (Heathcote, Storesletten, and Violante, 2009). In this model, ex-ante identical consumers are subject to uninsurable idiosyncratic income risks. In order to insure themselves against these income shocks agents accumulate precautionary savings. Since income histories vary according to the agent, these accumulate different amounts of savings resulting in an endogenous wealth distribution. An important feature is thereby the exogenously determined imperfect market structure, which leads to the accumulation of precautionary savings, since the trade of contingent claims is assumed away.¹ Consumers are thus limited to a certain choice of assets. The canonical version allows for a one-time period bond only – Commonly interpreted as net-worth holdings. The hypothesis of the complete market framework has been rejected by the vast majority of empirical research (Tideman and Weber, 2010). Deaton and Paxson (1994) show that the life-cycle profile of consumption inequality is increasing with age, a fact that would be inconsistent with complete markets. Moreover, the assuming away markets, where individuals can trade contingent claims to insure themselves against the idiosyncratic wage shocks is justified by moral hazard problems (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011). While in some rare cases - such as when only studying aggregates, it may still be sufficient to consider a complete market framework, when considering wealth-distributive questions, the imperfect market assumption is both necessary from a theoretical perspective and well-founded from an empirical perspective. It remains to discuss the whether it makes sens to treat distributive issues from a life-cycle point of view. This model is based on the works of Bewley (1977), Aiyagari (1994), Huggett (1993).²

(MAKE SHORTER AND SIMPLER!!!!)

¹Note, in a complete market framework consumers could perfectly diversify away idiosyncratic risks (Tideman and Weber, 2010).

²These types of models are thus sometimes also referred to as Bewley-Models.

2.2 The Life-Cycle Feature

One important extension to the standard version, which was based on infinite-horizon models, for understanding the wealth distribution was the life-cycle model. This extension to the first versions of the SIM was made by Imrohoroglu, Imrohoroglu, and Joines (1995), Ríos-Rull (1995) and Huggett (1996).

The choice to study the empirical validity of a life-cycle model, which produces a net-wealth distribution arising from rational choices of consumers subject to income uncertainty, allows for a detailed analysis of consumption and savings behavior over a person's life-span. Explicitly modeling an agent's life-cycle, thus allows for some forms of heterogeneity across ages – As I will discuss further below, this feature is particularly interesting since there are strong heterogeneities across ages in the distribution of wealth in the data. One important component is the modeling of a retirement period, introducing life-cycle risk to precautionary savings i.e. consumers need to accumulate enough savings during their active working life in order to smooth consumption across their whole life-span. Another important feature of realism is the modeling of an experience premium and stochastic death probabilities.

The more recent literature on determinants of the net-worth distribution, almost unanimously employs versions of this type of models and enriches the standard version with various heterogeneities across the life-cycle in order to improve its prediction of the net-worth distribution. (CITE BETTER IN THIS SUBSECTION I.E. EXAMPLES OR PEOPLE WHO SHOW THAT THESE FEATURES ARE IMPORTANT!!!!)

2.3 Wealth Distribution Literature

Although, the SIM model is used to study a variety of different economical questions (TO CITE A FEW), the endogenously generated distribution of wealth within the model, makes it a natural candidate to study the wealth-distribution.

Gourinchas and Parker (2002) and Cagetti (2003) look at savings behavior over the life-cycle; Castaneda, Diaz-Gimenez, and Rios-Rull (2003) evaluate the prediction of the cross-section and Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) study of distributional dynamics, to name a few. More recent literature has primarily focused on modeling the the right tail of the wealth distribution, which is particularly challenging, as the canonical SIM fails to produce the extreme density of wealth found among the richest in empirical data (see for example: Fella and De Nardi (2017)). A commonly used approach entails modeling extreme income shocks in order to provoke precautionary savings to match the vast accumulation of assets by the very top of the wealth distribution and is based Castaneda et al. (2003) ((Díaz and Luengo-Prado, 2010) or (Kaymak and Poschke, 2016) for a more recent implementations). Krusell and Smith (1998) were the first to

point out that a stochastic discount factor across dynasties can account for the variance of the cross-sectional distribution of wealth and does increase the wealth concentration among the richest. Other approaches are: A heterogeneous rates of return Benhabib, Bisin, and Zhu (2011), a richer earnings process (De Nardi, Fella, and Pardo, 2016) or the role of entrepreneurship (Cagetti and De Nardi, 2009). De Nardi and Yang (2014) show that adding voluntary bequests and intergenerational transmission of earnings drastically improves the model’s prediction for the empirical cross-sectional differences in wealth at retirement as well as their correlation with lifetime incomes. Although these additional modeling features are able to better approximate the right tail of the wealth distribution, they still fail to produce a satisfying representation.³

Whereas the literature demonstrating that a plausibly parameterized version of the SIM can quantitatively explain features of the net-worth distribution is quite large, few of these models incorporate durables.

2.4 Durables and the Net-Worth Literature

Besides the authors mentioned in the introduction, a few others investigate the importance of modeling durables. Yang (2009) shows that borrowing constraints are important in explaining the accumulation of housing assets early in life. Gruber and Martin (2003) show that durables are important for the accumulation of precautionary savings. Cho (2012) show that changes in the LTV ratio can account for 40% of the difference in homeownership between Korea and the US.

(((((((((demonstrate that a plausibly parameterized version of their models can quantitatively explain empirical findings as arising from rational choices of consumers facing an increasing wage profile and income uncertainty))))))))

3 Facts about the Net-Worth distribution

Net-Worth and Changes across age groups There are substantial differences in the net-worth distribution across different age groups. Table 1 displays the gini-coefficients and the means for three different age groups, both for the whole sample, as well as up to the 90th percentile.⁴

The average wealth holding is more than 2 times larger with each age group, for both the full distribution and the distribution up to the 90th percentile. Mean wealth thus

³For a more indebted review and the shortcomings of the different modeling approaches of this literature, see (Fella and De Nardi, 2017).

⁴The table corresponds to the column for the SCF 2004 US data in Table 2 of Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011).

Table 1: My caption

	Age 26-35	Age 36-45	Age 46-55
Full sample			
Mean	2.28	5.90	12.49
Gini coefficient	0.824	0.765	0.765
Sample \leq 90th pctl			
Mean	0.80	2.36	4.81
Gini coefficient	0.713	0.596	0.564

increases substantially across age groups. While average wealth is increasing, the gini-index indicates that the within age group inequality tends to be increasing. The only exception is the stagnation between the older age groups for the full distribution. Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) show that this pattern holds true for eight surveys from 1983 to 2007, with the exception that inequality tends to increase between the last two age-groups for the whole sample.⁵ (ADD OTHER NEWER SOURCE!!!)

Furthermore, the differences between the full sample and the 90th percentile sample indicate that the wealth held by the top 10% is quite significant and its magnitude is relatively increasing in the age groups.


Figure 1 plots the detailed net-worth distribution for different age groups of the US in 2004 for the distribution up to the 90th percentile, as well as the full distribution. The data is SCF data from Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011).

Portfolio composition and the importance of Durables Two things are particularly noteworthy about durables. First, households in the bottom 90% hold almost their entire wealth in durables (citepkuhn et al). Using data from the SCF 1998 review, Díaz and Luengo-Prado (2010) point out that housing represents 96.3% of their total wealth. Whereas, to top 20% hold 26.8% of their total wealth in housing. Secondly, as can be expected from the evidence discussed above, Yang (2009) and Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) show that a similar picture can be painted, when one compares the average wealth portfolio across age groups. Young household tend to hold most of their net-worth in durables, and only start to accumulate liquid assets later in live. (FIND BETTER EVIDENCE!!!!)

This evidence suggests that it might be particularly important to model durables, when considering consumers aged 26 to 55 and focusing on the bottom 90% of the wealth distribution and if indeed, as Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) suggest, durables

⁵See Table 2 in their paper.

Figure 1: Average Durable Holdings over the Life-Cycle



CHANGE THE BLOODY COLOURS!!!! IT IS THE SAME AS IN HINTER-
MAIERS! NEED TO INDICATE THE MEASURES. JUST VERY STANDARD!
NEEDS TO BE UPDATED

are important for the accumulation of wealth. (RETHINK THAT LAST PHRASE!)

4 Research Strategy

As discussed above, the modeling of the top of the wealth distribution is still unsatisfactory, unless one models extreme income shocks. The method introduced by Castaneda et al. (2003) is based on calibrating the income process in order to match the Lorenz curves of both earnings and wealth inequality and is thus not estimated based on micro-level data on earnings. This application, although able to match the right tail of the wealth distribution, therefore uses cross-sectional moments rather than household level data on earnings dynamics over time. The advantage is to get around the issue of oversampling and top-coding for the richest (Heathcote et al., 2009). It, however, is unclear, whether the actual earnings process can produce the strong concentration of wealth at the top of the distribution (Fella and De Nardi (2017)). Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) propose an alternative strategy, namely to focus on the the wealth distribution up to the 90th percentile. Moreover, they focus on consumers between the ages 26 and 55 for whom changes in labor earnings are most relevant and that are not affected by measurement problems due to changes in the pension plans, which are poorly measured by the SCF Data. As these authors point out, this strategy is robust if general equilibrium feedback effects on the consumers excluded do not adversely affect

the result.

4.0.1 Partial Equilibrium

Last but not least, partial equilibrium as modeling choice has to be discussed briefly.
(????????????????)

(copy paste from hintermaier 2011 Note that we assume that changes in the domestic supply of assets do not affect the interest rate. As in a small-open economy, this price is determined exogenously (on the world markets.) ⁶)

The first quantitative was based on the following the work of Kydland and Prescott (1982) was based on the representative agent paradigm. One of the main reasons of abstracting from heterogeneity and incomplete markets was the lack of dynamic tools to solve such models. Heathcote et al. (2009) Over the past twenty years computational power has increased substantially and numerous dynamic methods have been developed, thus allowing to solve more complex models. This development is crucial for the modeling of distributions.

Modeling heterogeneity is important for several reasons: precautionary savings as a consequence of idiosyncratic uncertainty increases aggregate savings and, thus, decreases the interest rate Huggett (1993)

5 The Model

In the following section I will present the life-cycle model with durables I use in my analysis. After describing the consumer's problem and the income process, I will give a brief description of the savings determinants accommodated by the model, which will facilitate the subsequent discussion of the results.

As established above, the baseline model in question is a life-cycle model with an imperfect market structure, which incorporates durables. ⁷

5.1 Demographics

There is a continuum of ex ante identical risk averse consumers with a finite time horizon. At age 90 consumers die with certainty, younger consumers between the age of 26 and 90 may die with probability $\pi_j < 1$ at age j .

⁶This assumption is not restrictive for our purposes since we observe the price in our ex post analysis for the period 1983-2007. Hence, the supply of assets and the observed price suffice to determine the equilibrium asset quantities. This allows us to be agnostic about the price elasticity of asset demand.

⁷The present model is a life-cycle version of Hintermaier and Koeniger (2010).

5.2 Consumer's Problem

Consumption savings decision Consumers derive utility from a durable good d and a non-durable good c . The utility function $U(c, d)$ is strictly increasing in both arguments and strictly concave, with diminishing returns for both arguments and allowed to be non-separable in c and d . The choice-set of assets is restricted to durables d and a one-period bond a . Preferences are assumed to be time separable and future utility is discounted with a constant discount factor β . In each period, after receiving the income y_{ij} , consumers decide on the amount they want to consume in this period c_j and next periods portfolio composition d_{j+1} and the financial risk-free asset a_{j+1} are chosen after receiving the income. Agents then derive utility from consumption and durable services, before the assets pay returns. While the liquid assets return an interest rate r durables depreciate at rate δ . This implies the following budget constraint:

$$a_{j+1} + d_{j+1} + c_j = (1 + r)a_j + (1 - \delta)d_j + y_j \quad (1)$$

Income Process I directly follow the specification of the income process in Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011). Until retirement every consumer i receives an individual, stochastic labor income y_{ij} in each period. After the age 65 is completed, they retire with certainty and receive deterministic individual-specific retirement benefits b_i . The authors assume that log of earnings y_{ij} of individual i at age j before retirement is additively separable in a deterministic age polynomial ϕ_j and an idiosyncratic income shock z_{ij} .⁸

$$y_{ij} = \phi_j + z_{ij}$$

,

where the shock z_{ij} follows an AR(1) process

$$z_{ij} = \rho z_{i,j-1} + \epsilon_{ij}$$

Collateral Constraint Durable serve both as consumption good and value storing asset, since their durability implies that they may be used as collateral for short-sales of the liquid asset. It is assumed that all credit needs to be collateralized, either by income or by durable holdings.⁹ The collateral constraint takes the form:

⁸This approach is quite standard in the literature (see others! NEWERS THAN YANG AND KAPLAN VIOLANTE)

⁹As (Hintermaier and Koeniger, 2010) point out, this assumption is reasonable since about 85% of household debt in the SCF 2004 is secured by collateral.

$$\underbrace{\mu(1 - \delta)d_{i,j+1} + \gamma y_j}_{collateral} \geq -(1 + r)a_{i,j+1} \quad (2)$$

where y_j is the minimum labor income realization across all states in each period and $\mu \in [0, 1)$ and $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ are the respective fractions of the durable stock and of minimum labor income, which can be collateralized. The timing assumptions made above imply that this constraint guarantees full repayment by consumers and thus acts as non-bankruptcy constraint.¹⁰ γy_j can be interpreted as debts where the wage plays a major part in the risk assessment from the lender's side i.e. credit card debts or short-term unsecured loans. (ASSUMPTIONS DO NOT MAKE SENSE!!!)

Net-Worth in the model Net-worth is defined as:

$$x_{i,j} \equiv (1 + r)a_{i,j} + (1 - \delta)d_{i,j}, \quad (3)$$

And thus reflects the total amount of assets a consumer has access to in a given period.¹¹

5.3 The recursive formulation of the household problem

We let T^r denote the first period of retirement. The Bellman equation prior to retirement, if $j < T^r$ thus is:

$$v_{i,j}(x_j, d_{i,j}, y_{i,j}) = \max_{a_{i,j+1}, d_{i,j+1}} \left[U(\underbrace{x_{i,j} + y_{i,j} - a_{i,j+1} - d_{i,j+1}}_{c_{i,j}}, d_{i,j}) + \hat{v}_{i,j}(x_{i,j+1}, d_{i,j+1}, y_{i,j}) \right] \quad (4)$$

where the expected next period value function is discounted by the product of the probability of survival $(1 - \pi_j)$ and the discount factor β

$$\hat{v}_{i,j}(x_{i,j+1}, d_{i,j+1}, y_{i,j}) \equiv \beta(1 - \pi_j)E_j v_{i,j+1}(x_{i,j+1}, d_{i,j+1}, y_{i,j+1}),^{12} \quad (5)$$

with the constraints:

$$a_{i,j+1} + d_{i,j+1} + c_{i,j} = x_{i,j} + y_{i,j}, \quad (6)$$

$$x_{i,j+1} = (1 + r)a_{i,j+1} + (1 - \delta)d_{i,j+1}, \quad (7)$$

¹⁰This is assured by the fact, that the lender does know the financial portfolio choice (a_{j+1}, d_{j+1}) and the minimum of the support of the income distribution for all ages, but does not know the realization of future income shocks y_j .

¹¹The borrowing constraint in terms of net-worth and future durable holdings then is: $x_{j+1} \geq -\gamma y_j + (1 - \mu)(1 - \delta)d_{j+1}$ This implies that in each period net-worth needs to be larger than the negative value of the minimum fraction of income that can be collateralized and the fraction of wealth which cannot be used as collateral.

$$x_{i,j+1} \geq -\gamma \underline{y}_j + (1 - \mu)(1 - \delta)d_{j+1}, \quad (8)$$

(WHAT HAPPENS WITH MIN Y IN RETIREMENT???)

$$d_{i,j+1} \geq d_{min}, \quad (9)$$

CHECK THE PART OF INCOME THAT CAN BE USED TO ACQUIRE DEBT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

After retirement, for periods $j \geq T^r$, the income y_{ij} is given by $b(z_{i,T^r})$, the retirement benefits b depending on the last realization of labor income before retirement z_{i,T^r} .

5.4 Equilibrium Concept

The interest rate is fixed, assuming that changes in the domestic supply of assets do not affect the economy. This assumption corresponds to a small open economy. Moreover, as the price is observed in the ex-post analysis it suffices to determine the equilibrium asset quantities (Hintermaier and Koeniger, 2011). Furthermore, it is assumed that the assets of agents, who dye are taxed away and that equilibrium feedbacks from the government budget constraint are negligible. (ARE THESE ASSUMPTIONS REASONABLE???)

5.5 Motivation

There are a variety of characteristics of this model that demonstrate the its suitability for the analysis at hand. The limited variety of assets implies an incomplete market structure, which hinders consumers to perfectly diversify away the idiosyncratic risk from income uncertainty. The ex-ante identical consumers thus will thus, depending on their income trajectory, end up with different portfolios of the endogenous state variables. Moreover, the optimal decision will depend on the consumers age. The model is therefore well suited to match net-worth distributional facts introduced above, as well as differences across ages.

5.6 The determinants of savings

The model presented above accommodates several determinants of savings, the accumulation of net-worth, which I will briefly outline here. These will be further discussed in the subsequent analysis.

The Experience Premium The experience premium corresponds to the deterministic part of the labor income before retirement and thus is known with certainty prior to realization to all consumers. An expected higher income causes perfectly rational

consumers to reduce their present savings and increase consumption as they seek to smooth consumption across their life-cycle.

Life-Cycle Risk The life-cycle risk has the exact opposite effect. As consumers anticipate a large drop in their income due to retirement at the age of 65, they seek to accumulate more assets in order to save for retirement. As... and ... have shown, consumers mainly save in liquid assets for retirement. Moreover, Gourinchas and Parker (2002) show that this effect starts to become more important as consumers age. It's importance is therefore of small magnitude for the present analysis. As discussed above, I focus on consumers aged 26 to 55, where the income process is the main driver of the income risk.

Income Risk As that same author shows, income risk mainly dominates life-cycle risk in the early part of life. This effects illustrates the risk a lower future income. Agents accumulate precautionary savings to save up for rainy days, as they seek to smooth consumption. Aiyagari (1994) shows the importance of precautionary savings for the aggregate capital stock.

Borrowing Constraint Another important determinant of savings in these models is the borrowing constraint. A tighter constraint limits the insurance potential of liquid assets. The particularity of the present model is an endogenous borrowing constraint. Consumers with higher durable holdings can borrow more. Moreover, there is a small but quantitatively negligible effect of the experience premium allowing for more borrowing due to a higher minimal state for older wage earners. (BE MORE PRECISE, PRESENT EVIDENCE WHY IT IS NEGLIGABLE). Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) show that this leads to a higher dispersion of net-worth with respect to earnings. (BE MORE PRECISE. WHY EXACTLY???)

The relative price of durables ARE YOU SURE??? As the durable stock increases, liquid assets become relatively more attractive. WHAT DOES IT MEAN FOR NET-WORTH????

Early life-cycle models predict consumption (SLOWLY DECREASING???) to be flat over the life-cycle. This is the case, when perfect consumption smoothing can be achieved. With an income profile observed above, agents would thus accumulate debt, when expected future earnings are high to substitute this higher income for lower income today. And high current income is converted into savings when future higher earnings are low. (CITE A MODEL OF THIS TYPE)

Income uncertainty The each period the consumer receives an idiosyncratic income shock, which unanticipated Idiosyncratic income risk as for example in (Aiyagari, 1994) is an additional savings motive. Savings are used as a buffer for future income shocks. If, uncertainty is high, agents save more and thus cut down on consumption to do so in order to save for rainy days.

Borrowing Constraints A third determinant are the borrowing constraints. These prevent agents from borrowing and thus do not allow for perfect consumption smoothing across time or income states.

Durables (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011) show that including durables into a life-cycle model is an important determinant of the consumption behavior along an agents life cycle. The relative price of durables does affect savings-consumption (IS IT LIKE THAT???) decisions.

Borrowing Constraints Besides the income risk discussed above, there is a second element that is crucial in determining the level of consumption smoothing across periods, namely the borrowing constraint. As the borrowing constraint tightens, consumption smoothing becomes more difficult – Borrowing constraint agents need to lower their consumption in case of a low income shock. Ljungqvist and Sargent (2012) show that giving agents an additional dollar of wealth has the same effect as loosening the borrowing constraint. There are various specifications of the borrowing constraint. Aiyagari (1994) introduced the natural borrowing limit, meaning that agents do only have to be able to repay debt with probability one, thus allowing for a lot of borrowing. Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) do not allow for borrowing, thus setting the limit to 0 (NOTE THAT THIS IS FOR NET WORTH!!!). (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011) assessed the performance of different borrowing constraints, mainly comparing an endogenous specification with the two previously mentioned exogenous specifications, finding that in the context of life-cycle profiles, the former outperforms the latter. Modeling durables, thus provides the opportunity to model an endogenous specification, where the durables can be used as collateral. Higher durable holdings do therefore loosen the borrowing constraint and enable the consumers to borrow a larger amount of liquid assets.

To some degree, this allows to incorporate changes in the financial liberalization into the model. Díaz and Luengo-Prado (2010) simulate changes in the downpayment rate and investigate how these affect the distribution. Yang (2009) show how these affect the life-cycle. Finally, Cho (2012) assess the importance of the loan-to-value ratio for differences in the wealth distributions between the US and Korea.

Endogenous borrowing constraint: The specification of the borrowing constraint in Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) is adapted from the recent endogenous incomplete-markets literature: Kehoe and Levine (1993), Kocherlakota (1996), Krueger and Perri (1999, 2006), and Alvarez and Jermann (2000). Lustig (2004) also has a model with durable assets and an endogenous borrowing constraint to explain the equity premium puzzle, however agents have full access to Arrow securities and are infinitely lived. Literature on optimal portfolio choice in the presence of consumer durables: Grossman and Laroque (1990), Eberly (1994), Chah et al. (1995), and Flavin and Yamashita (2002).)

Note: missing citations, not all of the above are cited properly!!!!

6 Calibration

The calibration strategy demands to be in line with the aim of the paper - discussing the importance of modeling durables in context of the distribution of net worth. It is thus crucial to satisfy a high degree of comparability with other work dealing with net-worth distributions. Moreover, the calibration ought to replicate some features of the data, without containing too much information on the features the model is asked to show. (CITE SOME BOOK/ PAPER). In order to give insight on the underlying parameters of the cross-section of inequality I will thus proceed in the following way. As discussed above, I base the parametrisation of model on Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) and apply the algorithm introduced by Hintermaier and Koeniger (2010) to solve the model with durables.

6.1 The income process

¹³ As discussed above the income process is an important driver of the accumulation of savings in the form of precautionary savings. Its calibration does thus decisively influence the outcome. Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) use the SCF cross sections to construct a measure for labor earnings risk before retirement purging labor earnings from age effects for consumers between age 26 and age 65.

After retirement the income process is deterministic. Thus, each individual receives retirement benefits from social security, the level of which is determined by the last period's income resulting in a replacement ratio of benefits over gross income of 52% for the median income in the last period before retirement. The approximation takes into account the US social security legislation(<http://www.ssa.gov>). ¹⁴ The age polynomial

¹³The construction of these benefits is discussed in the Appendix.

¹⁴The reader may consult Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) for a more detailed description of the calibration of the retirement benefits.

ϕ_j is obtained by regression the log of earnings on a quartic age polynomial in each survey year of the SCF data between ages 26 and 65.¹⁵ The then obtained standard deviation of the residuals are used to calibrate the distribution of earnings shocks z_{ij} , with the assumption that the shocks are drawn from a normal distribution. This means that in the calibration to the SCF 1983, $z_{1983} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.498)$, and in the calibration to the SCF 2004, $z_{2004} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.607)$. (POSSIBLY COMPARE THIS RISK TO OTHER STUDIES ALSO SEE KRUEGER AND PERRI 2006) The calculations for the experience premium displays a concave relationship between the base age and the rising age it is compared to. Moreover, the experience premium has risen since the 1980s. The autocorrelation of the log-earnings shocks are calibrates as $\rho = 0.95$, which implies a variance for the innovations of $\epsilon_{ij} = 0.048$. (HERE ALSO COMPARE TO OTHER, MORE RECENT LITERATURE) The AR(1) process for z_{ij} is then approximated by a Markov chain with 21 income states via the Rouwenhorst method.

Finally, the authors adjust for growth in life-cycle income to convert the cross-sectional age-earnings pattern into life-cycle profiles considering a growth factor of $1.015^{age-baseage}$, where the base age is a reference age to make income units comparable across cohorts of different years.

The choice for the comparison of the SCF 2004 with the SCF 1983 is motivated by the fact that both surveys have been undertaken at similar points in the business cycle.

Controlling for the age distribution is another important determinant for the dynamics!

It is worth noting that the smallest income is larger than 0!!!!

Income Process LOOK AT GOURINCHAS and PARKER (2002) AND AT THE ADDA and COOPER BOOK!

1. (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011) stochastic labor income process up to age 65, where they impose mandatory retirement. Differs from other specifications such as Abowd and Card (1989), Carroll (1992), or Gourinchas and Parker (2002) in two aspects:
 - (a) do not allow labor income to go to zero- very low probability Carroll (1992) estimates it at 0.003 for a year. However, its effects on the intertemporal allocations are quite big, since hh will not borrow any positive amount since

¹⁵The table in appendix A displays the experience obtained by Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011).

they might face a lifelong sequence of zero labor income and might be unable to consume a positive amount and repay their debt in some period. (Moreover, argument of public income-support programs in the US -> labor in the model is after-tax, after-government transfer labor income.

- (b) unit root in AR process is not imposed (is something that is debated - > they show that their results are not very sensitive toward this issue -> increase ρ toward unity (LOOK AT STORESLETTEN ET AL: (2001) -> do not reject unit root.

2. Check Hintermaier and Koeniger (2010) and Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011)

6.2 Utility parameters

I consider a utility function that is non-separable in durable- and non-durable consumption, strictly increasing in both consumption types, strictly concave and obeying the INADA-Conditions with respect to nondurable consumption. It is the same class of preferences as Hintermaier and Koeniger (2010), which is commonly used in the literature considering durable and non-durable consumption (CITE MORE).¹⁶

$$U(c, d) = \frac{\psi(c, d)^{1-\sigma} - 1}{1-\sigma} \quad \text{where} \quad \psi(c, d) = c^\theta (d + \epsilon_d)^{1-\theta}, \quad (10)$$

where I assume $\epsilon_d > 0$, which thus indicates a number small enough to be irrelevant for the quantitative exercise at hand but nonetheless larger than zero. The CRRA utility function with the Cobb-Douglas specification of the consumption index, thus allows for zero consumption of durables, while the INADA-Condition ensures that people always consume some non-durables, i.e. intuitively this means consumers cannot survive without food, but are allowed to survive without houses and cars.¹⁷ (WHAT IS THE CONSEQUENCE OF OMITTING THE EPSILON????

(Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011) utility form death is normalized to 0 ???????????

The risk-aversion σ typically takes values from 1-5 in the literature (Yang, 2009). Following the aforementioned author I use $\sigma = 1.5$ as estimated by Attanasio, Banks, Meghir, and Weber (1999) and Gourinchas and Parker (2002) from consumption data. The discount factor β and the weight on non-durable consumption θ are calibrated to match the average net-worth holding and average durable holding of the prime age population up to the 90th percentile, respectively. The data moments are 2.95

¹⁶Note that this choice is in line with a more generic formulation of the utility function (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011).

¹⁷For the recursive problem it means that when allowing the potentially optimal choice $d' = d_{min}$, the constraint for minimal durable holdings needs to be accounted for explicitly, as the INADA-Conditions do not implicitly exclude zero durable consumption.

for the durable holdings and 2.39 for the net-worth in terms of median labor-income. TO MATCH HOW EXACT: SHOW WITH SMALL TABLE (BE CAREFUL TO BE SPECIFIC ENOUGH!) To calibrate the two parameters I solved the for a grid of (?????) for θ and a grid of (?????) for β . The choice to match the 90th percentile and the population from 26 to 55 years old is motivated by the fact that calibrating the model for the whole data-set would lead to overestimating the net-worth holdings of the prime sample –as is both the population above 55 years of age and above the 90th percentile hold more wealth on average than in the prime age sample. The estimation procedure is explained in more detail in appendix B.

Table 2: This table depicts the parameter estimates matching the average durable holdings and average total worth of the prime age population in the data.

Parameters	Baseline	Alternative
β	0.991	??
θ	0.761	???

(BE MINDFUL OF THE FACT THAT HINTERMAIER 2016 HAS 0.76 FOR HOUSING - SAME SAMPLE!!!!!!) The estimation results are somewhat different from what other authors with similar models have obtained. (NOTE DIFFERENCE INF HORIZON AND LIFE CYCLE) Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) estimate a weight on non-durable consumption of 0.81, Yang (2009) 0.8615 and Hintermaier and Koeniger (2010) 0.8092. (CITE NEWER STUDIES) Whereas studies solely considering housing, obtain estimates more closely to mine (CITE THESE STUDIES). This should, however, not be surprising, as I used data moments which correspond to the means of the above defined prime-age sample, contrary to these other studies, who calibrated their to the whole sample. Díaz and Luengo-Prado (2010) among others, show that the empirical portfolio composition changes over life-time, as will be discussed more in detail below. Young households take on credit to invest in durables and older households accumulate assets to finance retirement. The fraction of durables of total wealth, as the two data moments show 2.95/2.39 is larger than one for the prime-age sample, since the average liquid assets are negative. Where as for the whole sample the fraction of average durable holdings in terms of average total wealth 4.45/6.33 is smaller than one (Hintermaier and Koeniger, 2010). The estimated discount factor β is quite similar to the one in Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011).

6.3 Further inputs

As is common in the literature dealing with the period of the great moderation and supported by empirical evidence, the interest rate r is set to 4%. (CITING LITERA-

TURE). As discussed above, this partial equilibrium approach entails the assumption of a small open economy. Furthermore, I set the loan-to-value ratio $\mu = 0.8$. Although commonly used in the literature, this is a rather conservative assumption for the loan-to-value ratio: CAPLIN ET AL (1997) claim that it is almost impossible for a hh to obtain a house without paying at least 10%, moreover (OTHER AUTHOR IN HINTERMAIER2010 max LTV). However, this will allow me to investigate the effects of recent years, which lead to a relaxation of the LTV (IacovielloandPavan 2013) or (THAT OTHER PAPER ABOUT THE DENSITIES OF LTV). Finally, as in Hintermaier and Koeniger (2010) $\gamma = 0.97$ is chosen to be smaller than 1 in order to assure positive consumption at the smallest gridpoint of next periods net-worth x' . The probabilities of death as in Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) are taken from Table 1 of the decennial life tables 1979-1982 and 1999-2001 for the calibration of 1983 and 2004, respectively.¹⁸ (COMMENT ON WHY THESE ARE IMPORTANT!)

7 Numerical algorithm

The problem above does not provide a closed-form solution (CITE!!!!) and thus the solution has to be approximated numerically. Hintermaier and Koeniger (2010) offer a solution for problems of this type. They expand the endogenous gridpoints method (EGM) proposed by Carroll (2006) for a problem with two states and thus providing a very efficient algorithm to solve models with durables and collateralized debt. As their algorithm is formulated recursively, it is well suited to solve life-cycle models.¹⁹ I iterate over the policy function starting in period $j = T$ where the consumer sells all liquid assets and durables (TIME ASSUMPTION OF DURABLES IS IMPORTANT HERE - agents retrieve utility from the durable stock before it is sold, and can consume afterwards????) to consume them before death. It thus holds that $x' = d' = a' = 0$ and thus the initial consumption policy is $c(x, d_j, y_{kj}) = x + y_{j,k}$ (NOTE CASE WITHOUT ADC). Each iteration n on the policy function then gives the the solution for the period $T - n$, where in my case $n = 65$ which corresponds to ages 90 to 26.

The exogenous grids for d and x are chosen as follows:

(NOTE THAT ALGORITHM MUST BE CHANGED FOR CASE WITH ADJUSTMENT COSTS)

For each period $t < T-1$, the algorithm proceeds as follows. In a first step it maps x'

¹⁸They are published by the National Center for Health Statistics at [http : //www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/life_tables.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/life_tables.htm).

¹⁹Solving such models has been considered particularly expensive and challenging, as durables enter as additional state (if non-separability utility from durables and non-durable or adjustment costs are allowed for) and durables increase the dimensionality of the portfolio choice.(Hintermaier and Koeniger, 2010)

into d' and in a second step it solves for the current choice c and state x from optimal future combinations (x', d') . Moreover, the values for the exogenous grid are chosen such that the results are not affected. (BE MORE PRECISE INDICATE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN POST/PRE RETIREMENT (expectation)!

7.0.1 Comparing the simulation output with SCF data

Data (Initializing DATA + probability of death (PLOT!))

8 Life-Cycle Profiles

As discussed above, the choice of a life-cycle model is mainly motivated by the fact, that age plays an important role in questions related to wealth distribution and in particular to the net-wealth distribution. This section will give insight into the accumulation of wealth by agents over their lifetime. As we will see, this also affects consumption. Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) have pointed out that it is paramount to consider durables in order to properly model the life-cycle profile of consumption, which is hump shaped. The authors underline the importance of modeling durables in order to accurately reproduce the the shape of consumption over the life cycle observed in the data. He shows that including durables in a non-separable way in the utility function into the canonical incomplete markets model with one asset may achieve a better representation of the hump shape. Namely, durables account for 50% of the hump size, while the other half is attributed to changes in the household size, a fact pointed out by Attanasio et al. (1999). The first section discusses empirical results as well as life-cycle profiles produced by models from theoretical research. In the second section I will produce and comment on the life-cycle profile of my baseline model and then go over to a more detailed investigation of certain factors in the third section. LOOK AT GOURINCHAS and PARKER (2002) for more insight

8.1 Life-Cycle profiles in the data and theoretical literature

This section discusses a number of important issues discussed by the theoretical literature related to empirical patterns. I thereby focus on issues discussed in relation to durables.

8.1.1 Consumption smoothing

The standard life-cycle model with complete financial markets predicts, that individuals smooth consumption over their lifetimes and across states of the world.²⁰ This is true if the one period utility function and the time discount factor are constant. As households will then choose consumption plans in order to equate marginal utility across time and states of the world. Potentially they might do this with some growth rate, depending on the relative size of the real interest rate and the discount factor. (COPY PASTE (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011): "Under CRRA (Constant Relative Risk Aversion), period utility consumption growth itself should be constant across time. With complete markets, consumption smoothing can be achieved through the transfer of contingent claims across periods and states. (this statement relies on the further assumption that leisure and consumption are separable in the period utility function.") However, the data shows that consumption of both, non-durables and durables, is hump shaped over the life-cycle.²¹ (amongst others CITE MORE). As these authors point out it is important, especially for policy considerations, such as social security reforms, public provision of saving incentives, or welfare consequences of progressive taxation, as these will vary by age group. Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) show that 50% of the consumption hump can be accounted for by adjustment through family size. However, the other 50% can only be explained by including durables. Namely, if the period utility function is separable in nondurable consumption and durable consumption, the real interest rate will be equal to the time discount factor and remain constant over time. It thus follows that optimizing households will buy the desired stock of durables early in life and then only replace depreciation from there on. However, as the data shows, durable consumption is hump shaped, which is consistent with work, which has documented liquidity constraints in the purchases of consumption durables ²² or argued that is vital to consider nonseparabilities in the utility function ²³.

In this first section, Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) thus contradict Blundell et al. (1994), Attanasio and Browning (1995) and Attanasio et al. (1999), who argue that if one adjusted the consumption data for changes in household size (which is also

²⁰NEED TO FIND GOOD REFERENCES!!! SEE also: Further empirical literature about the life-cycle profile of consumption observed in cross-sectional micro data: Blundell et al. (1994), Attanasio and Browning (1995), Attanasio and Weber (1995), Gourinchas and Parker (2002).

²¹In the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CEX), when the head of household is 50, the average household spends 63% more when he or she is 25 and 70% more when he or she is 65 (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011).

²²NOTE COPY PASTE FROM FV& K2011 Eberly (1994); Alessie et al. 1997; Barrow and McGranahan (2000); Attanasio et al. (2005)

²³NOTE COPY PASTE FROM FV& K2011 Attanasio and Weber (1995)

hump-shaped over the life-cycle) the hump in life cycle consumption disappears.

Income tracking consumption (COPY PASTE :Deaton (1992) provides an overview for the literature answering this question. The main stylized fact emerging in this literature was that consumption seems to track income over the life cycle, changing only when income changes and not when it becomes known that income will change, as economic theory predicts. was interpreted as indication for liquidity constraints or other financial market imperfections. The empirical observation that consumption initially underresponds to income shocks and then adjusts with a delay. Flavin (1985), Campbell and Deaton (1989), Jappelli and Pistaferri (2010))

8.1.2 Portfolio Composition

As Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) point out households' portfolio composition do vary over the lifetime. Young households only little liquid assets and hold most of their wealth in consumer durables, whereas later in life, they accumulate big amounts of financial assets to save up for retirement. Durables make up 35% of the aggregate composition of wealth, while equity only accounts for 28% (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011). The same authors thus show that these facts can better be accounted for, when one considers liquid assets and durables separately, instead of combining them in one asset such as net worth. The interaction of the two assets thus is able to reproduce the observed pattern in the data. Where the consumer durables provide both consumption and collateral services as well as an endogenous borrowing constraint.

8.2 Profiles predicted by the model

NOTE THE NUMBERS AND FIGURES NEED TO BE ADJUSTED SINCE THERE WERE SOME OBSERVATIONS DROPPED TO CALCULATE THESE PROFILES!!!!


In the following section I will discuss the baseline life-cycle profiles produced by the model more in detail and compare it to other work and empirical results presented therein. I will mainly focus on two aspects discussed in the literature. The consumption and income profiles and comparing the asset profiles, which entails a discussion about portfolio allocations over the life-cycle.

The life-cycle presented in figure 2 and figure 3 show averages of the variables of interest over the simulated population of 100000 consumers aged between 26 and 90. With the exception of net-labor earnings all variables are in units of average net-labor earnings per adult-equivalent. (BE MORE PRECISE HERE)

8.3 Income and Consumption

Income Figure 2 shows the hump of the income profile arising by construction as the process is determined exogenously. Note that this hump shaped profile arises from the experience premium captured by the estimated age polynomial as well as economic growth, up to age 65. Consumers earnings rise until the age of 49, when they reach the maximum log net-income equivalent of 2.3131. Afterwards the experience premium decreases, as the experience factor is dominated by a decrease in productivity to the age of 65, where consumers earn 2.0834, thus around 10% less than when they are at their top. At this point the average income decreases sharply, as every consumer retires after the age of 65 and receives deterministic retirement benefits from then on, with an average of 1.0966.²⁴

Figure 2: Average Income and Consumption over the Life-Cycle



Consumption is in terms of average net labor-earning equivalents and and the labor earnings are as calibrated, the log of net labor earnings-equivalents?????
JUST VERY STANDARD! NEEDS TO BE UPDATED

Consumption As income consumption is hump shaped and seems to follow the behavior of income with a slight time lag and its decrease is smooth. Non-durable consumption peaks on average at the age of 74. At that point agents consume 1.9911 in terms of the average net labor-earnings equivalent, which is almost four times as much as at the age of 27, when their non-durable consumption is lowest.²⁵

Clearly, agents do not achieve perfect consumption smoothing over their life-cycle. In-

²⁴Following Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) the growth adjustment is neglected for the retirement period, therefore the curve does not increase for ages 66 to 90. (CHECK IF WOULD HAVE AN EFFECT! OR IS THERE A REASON FOR THIS???)

²⁵Note this first fall of consumption is due to adaptation from initiating durables and net worth.

stead, their consumption depends on other factors. The first observation, consumption tracking income, is due to borrowing constraints. In principle, agent's expected future income rises with certainty, due to the higher experience premium. Thus, they would like to accumulate debt early in life to substitute future higher income for today's lower income. In the beginning of their life, as their durable stock is low, and thus the borrowing constraint is tight. Consumption does therefore quite closely track the deterministic, averaged part of the income early in life.²⁶ As they grow older accumulating a stock of durables, the constraint loosens and agents may borrow more, which facilitates consumption smoothing thus permitting consumption to behave contrarily to income.

As discussed above, (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011) show, durables contribute to a large extent to this hump shape of consumption. The double role of durables, which provides consumption services and may be utilized to substitute wealth across periods, as well as the non-separability of durable and non-durable consumption are responsible for this behavior. In the early part of life consumers prefer to stack durables over consuming more non-durables as marginal utilities are similar, however durables may be used as collateral and itself provides the benefits of investment. The non-separability is responsible for a rise in non-durable consumption as the early increase in durables decreases the latter's marginal utility and thus the relative utility benefits of consumption rises as agents grow older.

Later in life, when death becomes more likely and utility is discounted to a larger extent consumption decreases again.²⁷

Comparing to results reported in the literature Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) and Yang (2009) have looked at life-cycle profiles using very similar models. They both find similar shapes. However, differing in the size and period of the peak.

Using data from the Consumer expenditure survey (CEX) and correcting it for the family size, Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) show that the average household spends 65% more than when the head of the household is 50 compared to when he or she is 25 and around 70% more, when he or she is 65.²⁸ Their model predicts

²⁶this model does display excess sensitivity of consumption to income (income tracking consumption to closely SEE LITERATURE!!!!), which contradicts the predictions of the basic life-cycle model. See DEATON (1992) for a review

²⁷The late rise in consumption is due to life-time uncertainty. As consumers are never entirely sure at what point they will die, they hold a small buffer even when retired and subject to deterministic income. In the last period, they die with certainty and thus sell all of their assets increasing consumption.

²⁸Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) use data from 1998. Yang (2009) reports similar findings for estimating consumption profiles from CEX 2001 data. Adjusting for household size, he finds

a peak around the age of 45, with a size that is about 40% bigger than at the age of 20. Yang (2009) reports similar results: non-housing consumption at age 50, where it peaks, is 80% more than that of age 20, after the peak, the decrease is steady and at age 75, people consume 25% less on average.

Notably, the increase of consumption is much higher than reported by other, similar models and the data. Moreover, consumption peaks much later in life. One important difference between the two papers discussed above and my own analysis is the model calibration involving the estimation of preference parameters. As explained above, the estimation of the discount factor (SURE ABOUT THIS?????) and the weight on non-durable consumption are calibrated to match the prime-age sample, which leads to a lower θ and a higher β . (SHOW THIS!!!!!!!!!!!!) (MAYBE ANALYSIS WITH POLICY FUNCTIONS!!!) Trading off durable and non-durable consumption has a lot to do with the discount factor!!!!

8.4 Portfolio Composition over the Life-Cycle

As discussed in the previous section, average non-durable consumption over the life-cycle is influenced by the capacity to accumulate assets as well as the choice of asset accumulation. The present section discusses the average portfolio composition over the life-cycle.

Wealth Portfolio All three curves display humps. Liquid assets and net-worth peak at age 66, the period when consumers retire and durables peak at 73, exhibiting a later and somewhat slower decline.


Early on in live households borrow as much as possible to accumulate durables, which leads to a sharp rise in the average durable stock early on in live. Savings in liquid assets thus start out to be negative and then rise as consumers start to save up for retirement. As durables can also be used to insure against idiosyncratic shocks, assets are primarily used for life-cycle purposes. Moreover, assets only become relatively more interesting as the average stock of durables rises and its marginal utility, the return on durables, shrinks, while the interest rate is fixed.

What does the literature say? Yang (2009) documents life-cycles for net worth, housing stock and non-housing assets controlling for cohort and time effects by constructing synthetic cohorts by using six waves of the SCF (1983-1998).²⁹ He shows that housing value increases until age sixty-five and then flattens out until the end of

an peak at age 55, with an increase of roughly 60% compared to age 20.

²⁹Details of the estimation are available in Yang (2009)

Figure 3: Average Asset Holdings over the Life-Cycle



NEED TO INDICATE THE MEASURES. JUST VERY STANDARD! NEEDS TO BE UPDATED

the life cycle.³⁰ Moreover, he shows that young agents tend to hold little wealth, borrowing early in life to buy houses and once they have accumulated stocks of houses start to save in financial assets. Financial assets surpass housing assets in the early 40ies. Moreover, net-worth and liquid assets peak at the age of 70 and then stay constant until the end of life.

While the model captures the between durables and financial assets quite well and predicts the timing of the peaks in a reasonable manner, two factors are at odds. Durables, seem to be favored to an extend not found in the data (LOOK FOR A BETTER WAY TO DESCRIBE THIS!) and in the model, all assets decline again. While, the decline in durables may be explained by the data to some extent and only of small magnitude (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011), liquid assets and net worth decline by a very big margin. Liquid assets become negative again at the age of 80, and net-worth reaches zero at 90, when all agents die with certainty. For the very obvious reason, that agent do not derive utility from leaving any assets behind.

(Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011) look at data and show that durables rise quite early until around the age of 30 and then peak in the mid-40ies, while declining

³⁰He shows that in order to achieve this one must model adjustment costs. Otherwise, the key prediction of the standard life-cycle model is that ratio housing stock to non-housing consumption stays constant over time, does arise, which is inaccurate.

afterwards.

The model reproduces a few important factors of the life-cycle composition of wealth:

1. (COPY PASTE (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011): Young households save and thus net worth becomes positive at the age of 35 (MINE IS NEVER NEGATIVE!!!) but they do not save in financial assets, but rather accumulate consumer durables.
2. As the households get older, they do start accumulating more assets, which are important in retirement. They do hold a lot of net worth until high ages in order to insure against living too long. Elderly households seem to overaccumulate assets. (Seems not to be the case in my model!!!)

Figure ?? shows how net net worth evolves over the life-cycle.

Durables Note that the durables are rather different from (Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger, 2011) (COPY PASTE: Consumer durables: the stock follows a hump shape, differing from a complete-markets model where the desired stock is built up in the first period and only an amount equal to depreciation is spent each period thereafter. Comparing durable consumption (model) and durable expenditure (the data): the model generates a pattern of consumer durables that somehow diverges from the observed pattern: there is a big peak in the first years and then it falls, even though it is possible to see something of a hump after the first spike. One possible explanation is that in the data young families obtain bequests, which in large part come as consumer durables. A second possible explanation is the endogenous formation of households in the data. In our model, all households enter their active economic life at age 20, a time period where they want to build up the desired stock of capital. In the data, however, economically active (in the sense of our model) households are created endogenously due to differences in marriage timing and education. This endogeneity smooths out the first big spike of durable expenditures in the data and leads to the pattern of life-cycle durables expenditure reported in section 2. (this divergence between data and model may also indicate that our borrowing constraint is specified too loosely, allowing households to invest in consumer durables at too rapid a pace when young.)

Yang (2009) shows that modelling adjustment costs is important to account for the slow downsizing of durables (housing in his case) as agents get older. Since the high transaction costs for trading houses prevents the households from decreasing their stock quickly later in life. He also shows that when agents are young they build a housing stock and compromise on non-housing consumption. Moreover, as they age they start to decrease non-housing consumption because the time preference is higher than the interest rate and mortality rates are increasing along the life cycle.

8.5 What drives the life-cycle profiles within the model?

Yang (2009) investigates the quantitative relevance of transaction costs, borrowing constraints and bequest motives. He shows (COPY PASTE: that borrowing constraints are essential in explaining the accumulation of housing assets early in life, the existence of transaction costs is crucial in explaining the slow downsizing of housing profile later in life.) Moreover, he shows that the bequest motives play a role in determining total lifetime wealth, but not the housing profile!!!! Certain features Yang (2009) has abstracted from and his justification:

1. no inter-vivos transfers (parents lend children money if they need some), data from Health and Retirement Study suggest that these transfers are fairly small, this would lead to higher durable and non-durable consumption
2. yang uses exogenous borrowing constraints and not endogenous ones. Fernández-Villaverde and Krueger (2011) compare the two and show that life-cycle profiles are identical. only exception, with endogenous borrowing constraints net worth of average young agents is slightly negative
3. no housing rental market
4. no health shocks for elderly, which might be important for accumulation of wealth stock

What I want to look at:

1. Check if income uncertainty zero
2. Check what happens when death proba is always zero
3. Use Ad-Hoc constraint
4. With adjustment costs!

9 What features of the Wealth Distribution are explained by the model?

In the previous section we have seen what durables may contribute. Since they do have an impact on life-cycle consumption it seems likely that they will affect the wealth distribution created by the model in one way or the other. In the first part of this chapter I will discuss certain features of the wealth distribution that the baseline model is able to capture. In a second part I will conduct experiments on some parameter


changes and analyze how this affects the wealth distribution. Namely, I will drop the adjustment costs, then simulate a model where durables do not provide any utility to provide an insight for the importance of durables. Moreover, I will try different versions of the borrowing constraint, remove the probability of death and finally look at some features of the income process.

9.1 Creating a cross-section from simulated life-cycle profiles

In order to proceed with the distributional analysis and to compare the model distribution to the empirical distribution, the above life-cycle profiles have to be converted into a cross-section. In order to do so I follow Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011), who reproduce the age-composition of the relevant data sample and then account for cohort effects resulting from income growth.³¹

9.2 Model Predictions

Figure 4: Average Durable Holdings over the Life-Cycle



CHANGE THE BLOODY COLOURS!!!! IT IS THE SAME AS IN HINTER-
MAIERS! NEED TO INDICATE THE MEASURES. JUST VERY STANDARD!
NEEDS TO BE UPDATED

Figure 4 shows the net-wealth distribution for three different age groups from the 10th to the 90th percentile. The blue represents the SCF-Data from the year 2004

³¹I hereby use the matlab function, `compose_survey.m`, provided by Hintermaier and Koeniger (2016).

and the dotted orange line shows the distribution reproduced by the model. Table 3 shows the corresponding gini-indices. The ones for the SCF-Data are directly taken from Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) whereas the model indices and averages are calculated from the net-wealth distribution resulting from the model simulation.³² The evidence suggests that the model does manage to reproduce a decent representation of the wealth distribution. For the youngest age group it does underpredict inequality, while for the other two the model does quite accurately reproduce the ginis. While one may argue about the precision it is evident, that it reproduces a known feature (AS DISCUSSED IN THE FACTS PART) of the empirical distribution, namely that while average wealth holdings increase with age, the concentration of wealth holdings decreases. The means are such that the model predicts average net-worth of the younger two age groups quite accurately, however, underpredicts average worth for the oldest age group.

COMPARE RESULTS TO OTHER STUDIES!

Table 3: As Table 6 in Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) this Table shows the Gini and Means for the distribution of different age groups up to and with the 90th percentile of the net-worth distribution.

	Data	Model
<hr/>		
Age 26-35		
Mean	0.80	0.8137
Gini coefficient	0.713	0.6273
<hr/>		
Age 36-45		
Mean	2.36	2.3609
Gini coefficient	0.596	0.5850
<hr/>		
Age 46-55		
Mean	4.81	4.2821
Gini coefficient	0.564	0.5464
<hr/>		

10 The decomposition of determinants

In this section I perform a series of experiments to simulate, how one-time unexpected changes in the determinants introduced above affect both the wealth distributions of

³²As I allow for negative net-worth holdings in the model, the gini-indices have to be normalized, as otherwise indices of a magnitude larger than 1 were possible. I hereby follow Chen, Tsaur, and Rhai (1982). Note that this may slightly bias the gini-indices compared to the ones calculated without normalization. BE MORE PRECISE!!!

the age groups, as well as the life-cycle profiles.

10.1 Loan-to-value ratio

An important determinant, when considering durables is the loan-to value ratio (LTV), which is equal to the part of a durable that is collateralizable. A lower loan to value ratio, would mean that when purchasing a house the amount of credit needed by a consumer would be higher. As is evident, the loan to value ratio has increased by quite a margin during financial liberalization. I here simulate the effect of a one time change and unexpected change of the loan to value ratio. A decrease in the LTV to 0.8 (Show increase instead and cite papers. Possible to go over 1?) .

10.1.1 The distribution

Figure 5 shows the impact of such a change on the distributions. The red line represents the results obtained from the baseline calibration and the dotted blue line the steady state distribution for the prime age sample after a change of the LTV ratio. All three age groups seem to be affected. However, only the poorer consumers are affected. With a tighter borrowing constraint, poor agents cannot borrow as much and thus keep more net-assets. This tightening does not affect the rich, who have already accumulated enough assets to borrow at their desired rate.

Look at different ginis: change of gini of net-worth, gini of durables and gini of liquid assets


10.1.2 Over the life-cycle

Figure 6 shows how the change affects consumers over the life-cycle. A lower loan to value ratio forces agents to postpone the accumulation of durables for a few years. As they now can finance a smaller part with debt, they cannot immediately increase the durable stock but need to accumulate it step by step to be able to increase borrowing. Note that only in the very first period, consumption is affected. It does therefore not affect consumption smoothing??? This trade-off is mainly one, between durables and liquid assets. At around age 30 the durable level is the same as in the baseline case, however, the liquid assets stock stays higher for quite some time and thus net worth is affected over this period.

look at policies!


NOTE SIMULATE OVERBORROWING i.e. a negative downpayment

Figure 5: Average Durable Holdings over the Life-Cycle



CHANGE THE BLOODY COLOURS!!!! IT IS THE SAME AS IN HINTER-
 MAIERS! NEED TO INDICATE THE MEASURES. JUST VERY STANDARD!
 NEEDS TO BE UPDATED

Figure 6: Average Durable Holdings over the Life-Cycle



CHANGE THE BLOODY COLOURS!!!! IT IS THE SAME AS IN HINTER-MAIERS! NEED TO INDICATE THE MEASURES. JUST VERY STANDARD! NEEDS TO BE UPDATED

10.2 Income risk

10.3 The experience premium

10.3.1 Adjustment Costs

Yang (2009) shows and explains the impact of the adjustment costs on the life-cycle profiles:

1. Transaction Costs and Borrowing constraints
 - (a) Helps to slow down decrease of non-housing consumption later in life
 - (b) Comparing ratio of housing to non-housing consumption
 - i. Without transaction costs, ratio becomes flatter over the life cycle
 - ii. ratio is increasing early in life since borrowing constraints bind more likely than later in life
 - iii. borrowing constraints are essential in explaining accumulation of housing assets early in life
 - (c) average life cycle profiles of financial assets and total net worth
 - i. the evolution of wealth portfolio over the life cycle is similar
 - ii. shift from financial assets to housing assets when transaction costs are reduced

(d) small effect on net worth profile!!!

2. explains that it is not that important in explaining the net worth distribution!

Díaz and Luengo-Prado (2010) Interaction Between Adjustment Costs and the Collateral Constraint Effect of zero adjustment costs: Home ownership rate rises to 89%, the Gini indices of houses and financial assets increase significantly for the group of homeowners Gini index of houses for total pop falls from 0.58 to 0.52 in the benchmark economy Since houses are liquid, fraction of wealth held increases as houses increases for all wealth quintiles (although relatively more for the poor) thus effect on overall wealth distribution is minimal With lower adjustment costs, houses are liquid and there is less need to accumulate financial assets for precautionary reasons Zero down payment it follows that households accumulate less financial assets because they are not required to keep a down payment

10.3.2 Durables

10.3.3 Collateral Constraint

10.3.4 Income Process

In connection with the relative degrees of inequality:

Moreover, Hintermaier and Koeniger (2010) and Díaz and Luengo-Prado (2010) both show that a modeling of persistent earnings is necessary to reproduce higher inequality in the durables and thus to more closely match the data.

10.3.5 Determinants

What I can look at

1. Diaz and Luengo-Prado(2010)

- (a) the role of superstars and how it affects other results
- (b) interaction between adjustment costs and the collateral constraint
- (c) the role of persistent earnings

What are the savings motives? Hence why do households accumulate wealth?

1. Kaymak and Poschke (2015): the relative strength of each motive depends on a household's productivity

- (a) precautionary savings motive to insure against life-cycle income risk
- (b) consumption smoothing motive to save for retirement
- (c) bequest motive to endow estates for their offsprings

10.3.6 The literature

10.3.7 Implementing Castañeda

11 Conclusion

References

- S Rao Aiyagari. Uninsured idiosyncratic risk and aggregate saving. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(3):659–684, 1994.
- Orazio P Attanasio, James Banks, Costas Meghir, and Guglielmo Weber. Humps and bumps in lifetime consumption. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 17(1): 22–35, 1999.
- Jess Benhabib, Alberto Bisin, and Shenghao Zhu. The distribution of wealth and fiscal policy in economies with finitely lived agents. *Econometrica*, 79(1):123–157, 2011.
- Truman Bewley. The permanent income hypothesis: A theoretical formulation. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 16(2):252–292, 1977.
- Marco Cagetti. Wealth accumulation over the life cycle and precautionary savings. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 21(3):339–353, 2003.
- Marco Cagetti and Mariacristina De Nardi. Estate taxation, entrepreneurship, and wealth. *The American Economic Review*, 99(1):85–111, 2009.
- Christopher D Carroll. The method of endogenous gridpoints for solving dynamic stochastic optimization problems. *Economics letters*, 91(3):312–320, 2006.
- Ana Castaneda, Javier Diaz-Gimenez, and Jose-Victor Rios-Rull. Accounting for the us earnings and wealth inequality. *Journal of political economy*, 111(4):818–857, 2003.
- Chau-Nan Chen, Tien-Wang Tsaur, and Tong-Shieng Rhai. The gini coefficient and negative income. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 34(3):473–478, 1982.
- Sang-Wook Stanley Cho. Accounting for life-cycle wealth accumulation: the role of housing institution. *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, 16(4):493–517, 2012.
- Mariacristina De Nardi and Fang Yang. Bequests and heterogeneity in retirement wealth. *European Economic Review*, 72:182–196, 2014.
- Mariacristina De Nardi, Giulio Fella, and Gonzalo Paz Pardo. The implications of richer earnings dynamics for consumption and wealth. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2016.
- Angus Deaton and Christina Paxson. Intertemporal choice and inequality. *Journal of political economy*, 102(3):437–467, 1994.
- Antonia Díaz and María José Luengo-Prado. The wealth distribution with durable goods. *International Economic Review*, 51(1):143–170, 2010.

- Darrell Duffie and Kenneth J Singleton. Simulated moments estimation of markov models of asset prices. *Econometrica*, 61(4):929–952, 1993.
- G Fella and M De Nardi. Saving and wealth inequality. *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 2017.
- Jes s Fern ndez-Villaverde and Dirk Krueger. Consumption And Saving Over The Life Cycle: How Important Are Consumer Durables? *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, 15(05):725–770, November 2011.
- Pierre-Olivier Gourinchas and Jonathan A. Parker. Consumption over the life cycle. *Econometrica*, 70(1):47–89, 2002. ISSN 00129682, 14680262. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2692163>.
- Joseph W Gruber and Robert F Martin. Precautionary savings and the wealth distribution with illiquid durables. 2003.
- Jonathan Heathcote, Kjetil Storesletten, and Giovanni L Violante. Quantitative macroeconomics with heterogeneous households. *Annu. Rev. Econ.*, 1(1):319–354, 2009.
- Thomas Hintermaier and Winfried Koeniger. The method of endogenous grid-points with occasionally binding constraints among endogenous variables. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 34(10):2074–2088, October 2010. URL <https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/dyncon/v34y2010i10p2074-2088.html>.
- Thomas Hintermaier and Winfried Koeniger. On the evolution of the us consumer wealth distribution. *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 14(2):317–338, 2011.
- Thomas Hintermaier and Winfried Koeniger. Debt portfolios and homestead exemptions. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 8(4):103–141, 2016.
- Mark Huggett. The risk-free rate in heterogeneous-agent incomplete-insurance economies. *Journal of economic Dynamics and Control*, 17(5):953–969, 1993.
- Mark Huggett. Wealth distribution in life-cycle economies. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 38(3):469–494, 1996.
- Ayse İmrohoroglu, Selahattin Imrohoroglu, and Douglas H Joines. A life cycle analysis of social security. *Economic theory*, 6(1):83–114, 1995.
- Barış Kaymak and Markus Poschke. The evolution of wealth inequality over half a century: the role of taxes, transfers and technology. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 77:1–25, 2016.

- Per Krusell and Anthony A Smith, Jr. Income and wealth heterogeneity in the macroeconomy. *Journal of political Economy*, 106(5):867–896, 1998.
- Lars Ljungqvist and Thomas J Sargent. *Recursive macroeconomic theory*. MIT press, 2012.
- José-Víctor Ríos-Rull. Models with heterogeneous agents. *Frontiers of business cycle research*, pages 98–125, 1995.
- Sander Tideman and Guglielmo Weber. Consumption and saving: models of intertemporal allocation and their implications for public policy. *Journal of Economic literature*, 48(3):693–751, 2010.
- Fang Yang. Consumption over the life cycle: How different is housing? *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 12(3):423–443, 2009.

A Experience Premium

Table 4: The annualized experience premium of labor income at ages 36, 46 and 56 relative to age 26.

Source: Corresponds to Table 4 in Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) and displays the results of the authors' calculation based on SCF Data.

Annualized experience premium		1983	2004
Age -26:	10 years	1.81%	2.60%
	20 years	1.33%	2.18%
	30 years	0.99%	1.83%

B Estimation

Due to my estimation strategy, to estimate the model for the prime age sample and thus excluding consumers, which are situated in the top 10% of the wealth distribution, the means estimation does not suffer from the bias Cagetti (2003) puts forward.

ADDA and COOPER: Model is just identified. Choice of weighting matrix imp when model is overidentified.

The moment condition holds for both moments:

$$E(d_i - D(\beta_0, \theta_0)) = 0$$

$$E(d_i - X(\beta_0, \theta_0)) = 0$$

where D and X are the average of durable stock and net worth holdings of the prime age population respectively. As a consequence, the simulated method of moments can be applied (Duffie and Singleton, 1993).

Therefore I look for

$$\hat{\Theta} = \arg \min [(m(\Theta) - \nu)' I (m(\Theta) - \nu)]$$

where Θ is a vector containing β and θ , m contains the simulated moments for a specific Θ and $\nu = [2.95, 2.39]$ the empirical counterpart.

$\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\theta}$ that

Heathcote et al. (2010): (COPY PASTE: As Christiano and Eichenbaum argue, the exact identification strategy allows for a clear separation between what the model is

restricted to match and what it is designed to explain. The exactly identified strategy amounts to a weighting matrix that sets positive and equal weight only on certain moments, based on the investigator's prior about the (first-order) dimensions of the data that the model should fit.)

C Data


D The full distribution and the issue with the tails of the distribution

Figure 7 shows the full distribution of the three age groups. Note that the scale of the y-axis varies between the age groups and compared to 4 in order to illustrate the whole outline of the empirical distribution. In comparison to the previous graph, two differences immediately meet the eye. For one, the model is not able to correctly predict the lowest part of the distribution. While in the model the poorest agents' net-worth holdings are around 0 for all ages, the SCF-Data displays negative values, which are more pronounced for the two younger generations. The second notable difference is the top of the distribution. Clearly, the model is unable to generate high enough savings for the richest 10%. This is a known problem in the literature.³³

The richest One of the reasons is that people in the later stages of their lives do not have enough incentives to accumulate assets. The main driving forces during their life-cycle is the accumulation of assets for retirement as well as precautionary savings, i.e. to be able to deal with wage shocks. However, as the agent approaches death, the incentive to substitute assets for consumption becomes stronger and stronger. As seen in the life-cycle profiles REFERENCE GRAPH, the point where agents start decumulating liquid assets and durables with 65, when entering the retirement period. There are different ways in dealing with this issue. One approach is to model a bequest motive. Agents will thus draw utility from the capital stock remaining at the time of death and therefore tend to accumulate more and longer over the life-cycle (CITE DE NARDI!). Another way is to model extreme income risk. (Castaneda et al., 2003) calibrates the income process to match the ginis of both the income as well as the net-worth distribution. The resulting income states contain an extreme income state of a magnitude about 100 times larger than the second state and 1000 times larger

³³See Fella and De Nardi (2017) for a review and modeling choices that are able to deal with this issue.

Figure 7: Average Durable Holdings over the Life-Cycle



CHANGE THE BLOODY COLOURS!!!! IT IS THE SAME AS IN HINTER-MAIERS! NEED TO INDICATE THE MEASURES. JUST VERY STANDARD! NEEDS TO BE UPDATED. NOTE THAT THE LOWEST PART OF THE DISTRIBUTION IS NOT VISIBLE!

than the worst state. The issue with this approach is that the income process then is not founded on micro-data of the income, which may be counterproductive for policy recommendation.

MAYBE INCLUDE GRAPH WITH SAVING RATE FROM DE NARDI

The poorest The main reason for the poor reproduction of the lowest 10% is the calibration. When Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011) estimated their preference parameters they did not consider all observation with negative net-worth as their estimation approach did not permit for negative values.

E Relative degrees of inequality

So far I have only discussed net-worth in the distribution section. However, the model does also reproduce a distribution of consumption as well as the two assets, which make up net-worth, independently. Moreover, there is the distribution of earnings, which is endogenously determined. It is well known that heterogeneous agent models of this type are able to reproduce the ordinal ranking of inequalities for consumption,

Table 5: Gini indices for the different distributions

	Consumption	Income	Durables	Liquid Assets	Net Worth
Model	0.3250	0.4062	0.3678	0.9523	0.6674
Data	????	0.427	0.67	0.97	0.81

income and net-worth in line with empirical evidence. Aiyagari (1994) shows that the model reproduces the (COPY PASTE: empirical plausible relative degrees of inequality), where consumption exhibits the least inequality, followed by income and capital is most unequal. (NOTE AIYAGARI IS A INFINITE HORIZON MODEL)

Table 5 displays the gini indices produced by the model and the one found in the data.³⁴ The model manages to match the ordering for the different inequalities only considering the types of the assets as well as net-worth. Moreover, it also shows that the consumption inequality is lowest. However, it does not manage to show that durables are more concentrated than income. Díaz and Luengo-Prado (2010) show, in a model with housing, that this may be overcome by explicitly modeling a rental market. Housing makes up the biggest part of durables (CITE AND SHOW NUMBERS). As a consequence of rental markets, wealth poor households will decide to rent instead of owning, thus satisfying their durable consumption needs without being able to benefit from the collateral value of the durable object. As the rented object does not account for the housing part of the durable holdings, wealth poor will hold less durables and thus the gini index of durables increases, while, as Díaz and Luengo-Prado (2010) show, the other indices change only slightly and are only marginally affected. As I will show below. The concentration on durables largely depends on the persistence of the earning process. A change in the income process thus helps to improve on the prediction of the gini index of durables by the model.

³⁴The empirical indices for durables, liquid assets and net worth are taken from Hintermaier and Koeniger (2010) and the index for income from Hintermaier and Koeniger (2011)