#### LIQUIDITY CONSTRAINTS OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

#### Jeffrey R. Campbell\* and Zvi Hercowitz<sup>+</sup>

\* Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago and CentER, Tilburg University

<sup>+</sup> Tel Aviv University

#### NYU Cooley Conference, October 2013

The views expressed are those of the authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, the Federal Reserve System, or its Board of Governors.

CAMPBELL & HERCOWITZ (FRBC & TAU)

LIQUIDITY CONSTRAINTS

#### Shapiro & Slemrod 2003 AER, Sahm, Shapiro, & Slemrod 2008 TPE

	Percentage	Percentage Spending
Stock Ownership Class	of Sample	Most of Rebate
	200	1 Tax Rebates
None	42.8	19.5
\$1 - \$15,000	9.1	13.1
\$15,001 - \$50,000	9.9	18.1
\$50,000 - \$100,000	6.8	26.7
100,000 - 250,000	6.2	33.6
More than \$250,000	5.1	22.9
Refused/Dont Know	20.1	25.3
	2008 Econo	mic Stimulus Payments
None	33	20
1 - 15,000	13	19
\$15,001 - \$50,000	14	19
\$50,000 - \$100,000	10	14
\$100,000 - \$250,000	11	25
More than \$250,000	9	39
Refused/Dont Know	11	25

CAMPBELL & HERCOWITZ (FRBC & TAU)

The finding that the Euler equation fails for a fraction of the population does imply that consumption is excessively sensitive to temporary income changes, But that does not allow us to calculate quantitatively (even abstracting from the general equilibrium interaction running from consumption to income) the response of a hypothetical temporary increase in labor income. This is partly because the horizon of those who satisfy the Euler equation is unknown and partly because the concomitant changes in the loan rate schedule depend on the specification of the loan market.

### SURVEY OF CONSUMER FINANCES, 1995-2007

		SCF	<sup>-</sup> Survey	Year	
	1995	1998	2001	2004	2007
All Households	99.0	102.5	106.5	112.1	116.1
Without imputation	97.0	100.3	103.5	109.9	114.5
& with 25 $\leq$ head's age $\leq$ 64,	71.3	74.4	76.3	80.4	84.9
& without food assistance,	63.9	68.8	71.7	74.3	76.5
& above the poverty line,	54.2	59.2	61.5	62.5	64.3
& not wealthy,	49.9	54.3	57.0	57.9	60.2
& not self-employed.	43.1	46.9	48.8	49.1	53.1

#### MIDDLE CLASS FINANCIAL WEALTH RELATIVE TO INCOME

	Full		Deciles of Wealth to Annual Labor Income								
Year	Sample	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
				In	oludina		anaial A	ccotc			
					ciuuinį	<b>J</b> All I III	anciai A	55615			
1995	30.8	0.1	1.5	3.6	6.2	9.2	13.4	22.4	37.1	71.1	171.6
1998	47.6	0.3	2.1	4.6	8.0	13.1	20.4	32.3	54.7	100.5	247.7
2001	50.4	0.4	2.3	4.9	8.1	13.0	21.0	32.2	54.3	100.6	263.8
2004	43.7	0.1	1.5	3.6	6.2	10.3	16.0	25.4	42.4	85.5	214.9
2007	46.1	0.3	1.7	3.7	6.5	10.3	16.4	26.0	44.2	84.2	220.8
					Fx	cludina l	Fauities				
					_/	sidding i	_qaoo				
1995	22.9	0.1	1.3	3.1	5.2	7.8	10.9	16.2	27.1	49.2	134.3
1998	29.8	0.3	2.0	4.0	6.6	10.1	15.0	22.7	35.5	62.9	162.9
2001	31.7	0.4	2.2	4.2	6.5	9.7	14.2	22.7	35.1	62.7	174.6
2004	29.4	0.1	1.3	3.0	5.3	8.3	12.4	18.6	29.8	51.4	150.9
2007	32.1	0.2	1.5	3.2	5.6	8.4	12.8	19.6	31.5	56.6	158.0

## WHY SAVE?

Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about your family's savings. People have different reasons for saving, even though they may not be saving all the time. What are your family's most important reasons for saving?

- Retirement and Estate
- Precaution
  - Reserves in case of unemployment,
  - In case of illness; medical/dental expenses,
  - Emergencies; "rainy days"; other unexpected needs; For "security" and independence, or
  - Liquidity; to have cash available/on hand.
- Anticipated Expenditures
  - Children's education; education of grandchildren,
  - Own education; spouse's education; education NA for whom,
  - Buying own house,
  - Purchase of cottage or second home for own use, or
  - Buy a car, boat or other vehicle.

	1995	1998	2001	2004	2007
Retirement & Estate	44.6	60.1	55.4	57.9	64.2
Precaution	45.1	30.9	31.9	31.3	33.8
Anticipated Expenditure	43.6	43.7	41.9	42.6	39.2

In the next 5 to 10 years, are there any forseeable major expenses that you and your family expect to have to pay for yourselves, such as educational expenses, purchases of a new home, health care costs, support for other family members, or anything else?"

	1995	1998	2001	2004	2007
Foresees Expense	63.1	58.8	60.5	59.0	57.5
Saving Now	38.1	37.1	36.8	35.8	33.9
Saving Complete					1.6

### FREQUENCY OF SAVING FOR HOME PURCHASE

Age of Head	1995	1998	2001	2004	2007
All	15.5	17.7	17.1	15.5	13.3
25-29	28.3	33.5	24.0	29.5	35.1
30-34	25.2	28.1	29.0	21.2	14.4
35-39	16.9	19.0	22.6	16.1	16.4
40-44	8.3	15.3	14.8	11.8	11.5
45-49	9.4	15.4	11.2	12.7	8.5
50-54	8.9	5.3	12.6	10.4	11.0
55-59	11.9	6.1	6.4	11.3	5.0
60-64	5.9	3.4	6.1	7.3	3.0

#### FREQUENCY OF SAVING FOR EDUCATION

Age of Head	1995	1998	2001	2004	2007
All	18.6	19.9	17.8	19.2	17.1
25-29	11.8	18.5	11.1	16.3	13.7
30-34	14.7	16.9	16.9	14.9	13.3
35-39	27.0	26.8	20.5	22.1	23.4
40-44	24.5	29.4	26.6	27.3	21.6
45-49	26.9	19.1	23.1	26.4	25.3
50-54	13.4	19.2	15.7	15.5	15.5
55-59	7.1	6.4	7.7	11.8	9.3
60-64	4.9	2.2	2.6	6.2	6.7

## FREQUENCY OF SAVING FOR MEDICAL EXPENSES

Age of Head	1995	1998	2001	2004	2007
All	7.6	5.8	5.4	5.9	6.8
25-29	5.7	5.3	2.5	5.1	4.3
30-34	9.5	7.1	6.5	2.6	5.2
35-39	6.3	7.9	4.7	5.6	4.8
40-44	7.7	6.1	6.0	3.3	4.0
45-49	7.5	5.8	3.4	5.7	7.5
50-54	8.4	3.8	7.0	6.0	8.1
55-59	7.9	2.0	6.4	11.3	11.8
60-64	9.5	6.0	10.1	14.3	10.2

#### WEALTH AND TERM SAVING DYNAMICS



CAMPBELL & HERCOWITZ (FRBC & TAU)

LIQUIDITY CONSTRAINTS

NYU COOLEY CONFERENCE 12 / 18

## OUR APPROACH

**Basic Model Ingredients** 

- Impatience ( $\beta R < 1$ )
- Borrowing constraint (e.g.  $A \ge 0$ )
- Large expenditures at exogenous intervals

Term Saving

- Assets grow as the expenditure approaches.
- Wealth indicates a forthcoming need for liquidity.

Globally Binding Constraints (Zeldes (1984, 1989))

- Anticipation of hitting the borrowing constraint limits the horizon over which consumption is smoothed.
- MPC rises as the expenditure approaches *if* the household is saving.

#### THE BASIC MODEL

• Preferences:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} eta^t \left( \ln C_t + \mu_t \ln M_t 
ight) 
onumber \ 0 < eta < 1, \ eta R < 1$$

 $\mu_t = \mu > 0$  every  $\tau$  "years" and  $\mu_t = 0$  otherwise.

• Budget Constraint:

$$C_t = W + RA_t - A_{t+1} - M_t$$

Stochastic wage is introduced later

• Borrowing constraint:

 $A_{t+1} \ge 0$ 

CAMPBELL & HERCOWITZ (FRBC & TAU)

## ERGODIC DETERMINISTIC CYCLE



# QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

• The wage process (Meghir and Pistaferri (2004)):

$$\ln W_t = \ln W_t^P + \ln W_t^T,$$
  

$$\Delta \ln W_t^P \sim N(0, 0.177^2),$$
  

$$\ln W_t^T = \varepsilon_t + 0.2566\varepsilon_{t-1},$$
  

$$\varepsilon_t \sim N(0, 0.173^2)$$

- $R = 1.04, \beta = 1/1.06$
- Set  $\tau = 10$ . Then we set  $\mu$  using SCF data on the average 2001 nonretirement assets/disposable labor income ratio. Sample: age 25-64, positive labor income, excluding top 5% and recipients of UI, Food Stamps and TANF. Average ratio: 0.55. This implies  $\mu = 1.0135$

## QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

MARGINAL PROPENSITIES TO CONSUME

		Marginal Propensities to Consume out of a					
10 1 / 141	Fraguanay	One Year	One Year	Three Year	Five Year		
12A/VV	Frequency	Transfer	Tax Cut	Tax Cut	Tax Cut		
0	7	35	33	54	68		
1	8	28	25	47	63		
2	8	19	17	41	60		
3	7	18	15	40	59		
4	7	18	15	41	58		
5	8	19	16	41	58		
6	7	22	19	43	59		
7	7	25	22	46	60		
8	7	27	25	47	61		
9	6	29	26	48	62		
10	5	28	22	48	62		
11	4	21	21	47	62		
12	4	23	17	46	62		
13+	15	20	16	43	61		

- Term saving is widespread among middle-class U.S. households.
- Term saving predicts wealth dynamics.
- Adding term saving to the standard precautionary model allows it to reproduce the U-shaped/flat relationship between wealth and the MPC
- In our interpretation of the evidence, most middle class households are liquidity constrained to a substantial degree.