

van Santen, Peter

Working Paper

Uncertain pension income and household saving

Sveriges Riksbank Working Paper Series, No. 330

Provided in Cooperation with:

Central Bank of Sweden, Stockholm

Suggested Citation: van Santen, Peter (2016) : Uncertain pension income and household saving, Sveriges Riksbank Working Paper Series, No. 330, Sveriges Riksbank, Stockholm

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/189930>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

SVERIGES RIKSBANK
WORKING PAPER SERIES

330



Uncertain pension income and household saving

Peter van Santen

October 2016

WORKING PAPERS ARE OBTAINABLE FROM

www.riksbank.se/en/research

Sveriges Riksbank • SE-103 37 Stockholm

Fax international: +46 8 21 05 31

Telephone international: +46 8 787 00 00

The Working Paper series presents reports on matters in the sphere of activities of the Riksbank that are considered to be of interest to a wider public.

The papers are to be regarded as reports on ongoing studies and the authors will be pleased to receive comments.

The opinions expressed in this article are the sole responsibility of the author(s) and should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of Sveriges Riksbank.

Uncertain pension income and household saving

Peter van Santen*

Sveriges Riksbank Working Paper Series

No. 330

October 2016

Abstract

This paper investigates the relationship between household saving and pensions, and estimates both the displacement effect of pensions on private saving and the precautionary saving effect due to uncertainty in pension income. I estimate the savings equation derived from a lifecycle model featuring income uncertainty using survey data for Dutch households, with subjective expectations on pension benefits and uncertainty. Exploiting exogenous variation due to pension fund performance, I find that households save significantly more due to uncertainty in pension income. Not controlling for uncertainty biases the estimated displacement effect of pensions on private savings towards zero.

Keywords: Precautionary saving, Displacement effect, Subjective expectations

JEL classification: D91,H55,J26

*Correspondence: Research Division, Monetary Policy Department, Sveriges Riksbank, SE-103 37, Stockholm, Sweden. Telephone: 00-46-878-70569. Fax: 00-46-878-70526. Email: peter.van.santen@riksbank.se.

I wish to thank many colleagues and especially Rob Alessie and Adriaan Kalwij, as well as participants in seminars at the Cardiff Business School, Koç University, Netspar Pension Workshop, Sabancı University, Spring Meetings of Young Economists and Sveriges Riksbank. Data provision by Hanny van Antwerpen (Pensioenfederatie), Arthur van Soest (Tilburg University) and Corrie Vis (CentERData) is gratefully acknowledged. The opinions expressed in this article are the sole responsibility of the author and should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of Sveriges Riksbank.

1 Introduction

The relationship between pensions and household savings is important to understand the consequences of reforms to the pension system. Due to the aging of the population, many countries have reformed or will need to reform their pension system to be able to provide adequate pension benefits in a sustainable way. More recently, low returns on investment, low interest rates and lack of economic growth have further deteriorated the financial position of retirement income systems worldwide. According to the lifecycle hypothesis, forward looking agents will respond to changes in their expected pension wealth by adjusting their consumption levels.

The empirical literature, going back to Feldstein (1974),¹ suggests that increases in pension wealth reduce private saving, although typically less than one-for-one, as a simple lifecycle model would predict. Departures from this 100% displacement effect are typically ex-post rationalized by the existence of liquidity constraints, bequest motives and various sources of uncertainty, all of which are left out of the simple model based on certainty or certainty-equivalence. In this paper, I extend the empirical specification used in virtually all studies of the displacement effect, by including a measure of uncertainty over future pension benefits. This specification follows naturally from a lifecycle model where future retirement income is a random variable, giving rise to a precautionary motive to save. Hence, the contribution of this paper is to estimate both the displacement effect of pension income on current saving, as well as the precautionary motive to save using micro data.

Viewing retirement income as a random variable is intuitively appealing, as it is notoriously difficult to forecast future benefit levels. In many countries, social security systems are subject to policy risk (Dominitz and Manski, 2006), as pay-as-you-go systems are vulnerable to demographic trends and budget deficits down the road. Earnings-related, or occupational pensions, instead typically depend on the entire earnings profile until retirement, requiring a forecast of earnings until retirement. In addition, the exact benefit level for those purchasing an annuity at retirement will depend on such things as the interest rate and life expectancy prevailing at that point in the future.

The setting of this paper is The Netherlands, where social security is

¹The main contributions to this field are reviewed in section 1.1 below.

based on a pay-as-you-go system administered by the state, and defined-benefit occupational pensions typically make up for around half of total pension income. By international standards, the pension system is generous, with a net replacement rate of 95.7% of earnings for an average earner (OECD, 2015). At the same time, population aging and low returns of the pension funds have raised concerns about future generosity. Despite the calls for and discussions on reforms in the political arena, lack of consensus resulted in the (likely unsustainable) status quo, at least until the end of my sample period. Given the uncertainty on future reforms, estimating future entitlements is even more challenging for working-age individuals.

The survey data used in this paper elicit expectations of pension benefits. To be precise, the expectations of pension benefits are elicited from probabilistic survey questions of the type suggested by Dominitz and Manski (1997) and Manski (2004), asking respondents to supply points on their subjective probability distribution function of future benefits. These questions allow for the calculation of both the expected level of retirement income, as well as its variance, separately for all households and time periods. The regression of interest relates household saving to the expectation and variance of pension income.

Estimating a saving equation using observational data is unlikely to give us the causal effects of interest. As Engelhardt and Kumar (2011) argue, omitted variable bias (due to, for instance, heterogeneity in unobserved tastes for saving) is the most prominent candidate to invalidate OLS regressions. To make progress on obtaining causal effects, I exploit exogenous variation in pension fund performance across respondents. In The Netherlands, almost all employees are covered by a mandatory employer pension plan, administered by pension funds. Due to the financial crisis, pension fund performance has been rather weak, causing pension funds to have low funding ratios (equal to the ratio of assets over liabilities). By law, pension funds are required to take corrective actions to increase the funding ratio to at least 105%. These actions include increasing pension premia, foregoing inflation adjustment as well as, in the extreme, cutting nominal pension rights. Matching respondents to their pension fund, I show that, cross-sectionally, there is meaningful variation in this funding ratio to explain household retirement income expectations. As expected, the expected pension benefit increases with the funding ratio, and the variance of pension income decreases with the funding ratio. As employees cannot influence the funding ratio of their pension fund with-

out changing job, I argue that this variation is exogenous, and can be used to identify the causal effect of pension income expectations on private saving. Importantly, the sample is restricted to those individuals not changing pension fund over time to rule out sorting by fund performance, as well as to those pension funds not changing the pension premium between two years, to rule out direct impacts of fund performance on disposable income and, potentially, household savings.

I use the level and 4-quarter change in the funding ratio as instruments to estimate the savings equation, and find significant effects of expected pension income on savings: a dollar in additional pension wealth decreases private saving by 32 cents. A one standard deviation decrease in the expected replacement rate increases annual saving by €1,200 or the saving rate by 2.7 percentage points. Equally significant is the effect of uncertainty: a one standard deviation increase in the variance of the replacement rate increases saving by €1,500 or the saving rate by 3.6 percentage points. To shed light on the magnitudes, I note that if uncertainty had been the same in 2011 as it was in 2007, the saving rate would have dropped from 13.1% to 11.5%, which has potentially aggregate implications. As an extra result, I show that controlling for uncertainty increases the estimate of crowding out of private savings by pensions. In other words, virtually all estimates of the displacement effect in the literature are likely biased towards zero due to lack of measures of uncertainty, such as those I have available.

The paper is organized as follows. I review the relevant literature in section 1.1. Section 2 briefly discusses the Dutch pension system. Section 3 discusses the data on subjective pension income expectations. Section 4 presents a stylized lifecycle model, and discusses the empirical strategy. Section 5 presents the results and Section 6 concludes.

1.1 Related literature

Since the seminal article of Feldstein (1974), many studies have made attempts to estimate the displacement effect, which can be interpreted as the amount by which private wealth is reduced when pension wealth increases by one dollar. Gale (1998) estimates the displacement effect of pensions on non-pension wealth to be 82.3 (39.3) cents using least absolute deviations (robust) regressions. Engelhardt and Kumar (2011) and Alessie

et al. (2013) use data on the entire earnings history of older respondents from, respectively, the Health and Retirement Study in the US and the SHARE household survey in Europe. Both studies estimate a model for discretionary household wealth as a function of pension wealth, and find evidence of limited displacement, between 47 and 67 cents. Kapteyn et al. (2005) exploit productivity differences across cohorts and the introduction of social security in the Netherlands to find a small but statistically significant displacement effect of 11.5 cents.

Attanasio and Rohwedder (2003) and Attanasio and Brugiavini (2003) estimate a model for annual household saving, using pension reforms in the United Kingdom and Italy respectively to alleviate endogeneity and attenuation biases affecting the displacement effect. Attanasio and Brugiavini (2003) find that the displacement effect differs per age group, ranging from close to zero for young adults and nearly retired individuals to 2 dollars for middle-aged individuals, although the coefficients differ per specification. Attanasio and Rohwedder (2003) find that the displacement effect is close to zero for the basic state pension, and ranges from 55 cents for middle aged to 75 cents for nearly retired individuals regarding occupational pensions.

Chetty et al. (2014) analyse total savings when persons switch to a firm with higher pension contribution rate using administrative data from Denmark. The estimated displacement effect is around 20 cents, implying that job switches to firms with high contribution rates stimulate retirement savings. In contrast, Chetty et al. (2014) find that retirement saving subsidies are unable to increase total savings, as most individuals are passive savers that do not respond to incentives. Increasing automatic contributions therefore has much more impact (less displacement) on total savings.

Finally, Blau (2016) shows how uncertainty matters in a calibrated life cycle model, mimicking the US pension system. In a world where uncertainty is eliminated, the displacement effect increases from 9 to 39 cents for DB pensions, and from 56 to 73 cents for social security; for DC plans, the displacement effect instead drops slightly from 37 to 32 cents. Overall, these magnitudes imply a sizeable role for precautionary savings.

A few other studies have also used subjective expectations data to study pension crowd out and/or precautionary savings. Guiso et al. (1992) analyze precautionary savings against uncertain labor earnings, while Guiso et al. (1996) and Delavande and Rohwedder (2011) analyze portfolio choice in the presence of labor and retirement income risk, respectively. Bottazzi

et al. (2006) have panel data for Italian households at their disposal, and use a subjective measure of expected pension benefits to study displacement of private wealth by social security wealth; their IV estimate of the displacement effect equals 64.5 cents using Italian pension reforms to identify this effect. The survey questions these authors employed do not allow the calculation of a measure of uncertainty however, and thus excludes the precautionary savings motive.

Guiso et al. (2013) use similar probabilistic survey questions as used in this paper to calculate individual-level expected replacement rates of pension income, as well as the standard deviation as measure of uncertainty. Using probit regressions on a cross-section of Italian investors, the authors find that the probability of investing in a pension fund decreases with the expected replacement rate, and increases with its standard deviation, in line with the lifecycle model. The same sign and significance are obtained for the probability of having health insurance. For life insurance and casualty insurance, only the expected replacement rate is significant, with the correct (negative) sign.

This paper extends the analysis of Guiso et al. (2013) by estimating a saving equation derived from a lifecycle model, and by exploiting exogenous variation to estimate the displacement effect and precautionary motive. Moreover, in this paper I extend the certainty equivalence model used in nearly all studies estimating the displacement effect, by modeling pension income as a random variable, thus allowing for precautionary saving motives.

2 Uncertainties in the Dutch pension system

The Dutch pension system consists of three pillars.² The first pillar is the flat-rate state pension benefit, provided to all inhabitants aged 65 and above. In 2010, the gross monthly benefit amounted to €1057 for singles and €1470 for couples. The accrual rate equals 2% per year for every year lived in The Netherlands, implying maximum benefits after living in The Netherlands for 50 years. The second pillar, the occupational pensions,

²See Bovenberg and Gradus (2008) for an overview of the Dutch pension system and its reforms.

is mandatory for all employees if the employer offers a pension plan³, and both employers and employees contribute to a defined benefit pension fund. Traditionally, the Dutch occupational pension system is one of the most developed in the world, with pension funds holding around 150% of GDP in investments in 2013 (OECD, 2015). Finally, the third pillar concerns private pension savings, such as annuities bought from banks or insurance companies or private retirement saving accounts. The third pillar is less popular in the Netherlands, as documented by Mastrogiacomo and Alessie (2011).

The replacement rate, i.e. the ratio of pension benefits (summing up the first and second pillar benefits) to wage income, is often used to express the generosity of the pension system. Whereas social security benefits are a fixed amount, occupational pension benefits are determined based on the average earnings during the career. The survey question used in this paper concerns future pension benefits in relation to the current wage of employees.

Bodie (1990) argues that employer pensions can serve as insurance against replacement rate inadequacy, deterioration of social security benefits, longevity risk, investment risk and inflation risk. However, this "insurance contract" is far from complete. The recent turmoil on financial markets during the Great Recession, in addition to population aging in many developed economies has led to revisions in pension systems worldwide. In The Netherlands, these include an increase in the statutory retirement age, from currently 65 to 67 between 2016 and 2023, as well as a shift from a defined benefit (DB) to a defined contribution (DC) system for occupational pensions, making explicit the dependence of pension benefits on asset returns.⁴ In recent years, Dutch pension funds have taken different measures during the crisis due to funding shortages resulting from sharp negative investment returns and low interest rates, including a reduction of nominal accrued pension rights, increasing the pension premium and/or not adjusting pension wealth to inflation. Hence, already

³Around 90% of the labor force is covered by occupational pension schemes; see Bovenberg and Gradus (2008).

⁴The sample period in this study ends in 2011, before changes in the retirement age or a transition from DB to DC occupational pensions are implemented. In June 2011, unions and employer's federations published further details regarding the future reforms; see Sichting van de Arbeid (2010, 2011) for details.

Table 1: Household saving

Answer	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Saving interval (€'000)	$(-\infty, 0)$	$(0, 1.5)$	$(1.5, 5)$	$(5, 12.5)$	$(12.5, 20)$	$(20, 37.5)$	$(37.5, 75)$	$(75, +\infty)$
Midpoint (€)	0	750	3,250	8,750	16,250	28,750	56,250	75,000
Frequency (%)	26.0	17.6	31.2	18.0	4.3	1.8	0.6	0.6

under the implicitly risky DB contracts, income after retirement is not as certain as usually perceived. The next section discusses the survey used to elicit pension benefit expectations from a sample of non-retired households.

3 Data

For the empirical analysis, I use two sources of survey data: the DNB Household Survey (DHS) and the Pension Barometer (PB). Both surveys are administered by CentERData, Tilburg, The Netherlands, and have unique identifiers allowing us to merge the two data sets at the individual level. The respondents represent the Dutch population aged 16 and above. Both surveys are administered via the internet, and internet access is provided to those that do not have access themselves. The DHS collects information on many socio-economic characteristics of the household, including a detailed breakdown of household income and wealth holdings, which can be used to construct measures of total assets, financial assets and housing assets; see Alessie et al. (2002) and Teppa and Vis (2012) for an extended description. The Appendix contains more details on the survey and variables used in this paper; here I discuss the most important measures.

Household saving is based on a bracketed response question, with answer categories, intervals and midpoints shown in table 1. The empirical model for saving uses either the scale (0-7), the midpoint (i.e. the amount of saving) or the ratio between midpoint and income (i.e. the saving rate) as dependent variables.

3.1 Pension benefit expectations

The Pension Barometer survey is administered to a subset of respondents from the DHS, in particular to employees aged below the statutory retirement age of 65. The survey started in 2006, and 2011 is the most recent survey year at my disposal. Among other questions, the PB elicits expectations of pension benefits. More specifically, the PB contains probabilistic survey questions of the type suggested by Dominitz and Manski (1997) and Manski (2004) that elicit the subjective distribution of the pension income replacement rate. Using the responses to these questions allows the construction of individual-specific measures of expected pension benefits and subjective uncertainty of pension income, by calculating the first and second moment of the distribution.

The exact wording of these questions is as follows.

Question 1 *At which age do you think you can retire at the earliest, following your employer's pension scheme?*

The answer to this question, say age K , is used in the subsequent question:

Question 2 *If you would retire at age K , please think about your total net pension income including social security, compared to your current total net wage or salary. What do you think is the probability that the purchasing power of your total net pension income in the year following your retirement will be:*

- a) *more than 100% of your current net wage? ... %*
- b) *less than 100% of your current net wage? ... %*
- c) *less than 90% of your current net wage? ... %*
- d) *less than 80% of your current net wage? ... %*
- e) *less than 70% of your current net wage? ... %*
- f) *less than 60% of your current net wage? ... %*
- g) *less than 50% of your current net wage? ... %*

The probabilities answered by the respondent define 7 points on the subjective cumulative distribution function of pension income. I assume a

maximum replacement rate of 120%, and use linear interpolation between the thresholds to derive the complete distribution for each respondent in each survey year.⁵ The observation-specific CDF equals

$$F(RR) = \begin{cases} P(RR < 50) \left(\frac{RR}{50}\right) & \text{if } 0 \leq RR < 50 \\ P(RR < 50) + P(50 \leq RR < 60) \left(\frac{RR-50}{10}\right) & \text{if } 50 \leq RR < 60 \\ P(RR < 60) + P(60 \leq RR < 70) \left(\frac{RR-60}{10}\right) & \text{if } 60 \leq RR < 70 \\ P(RR < 70) + P(70 \leq RR < 80) \left(\frac{RR-70}{10}\right) & \text{if } 70 \leq RR < 80 \\ P(RR < 80) + P(80 \leq RR < 90) \left(\frac{RR-80}{10}\right) & \text{if } 80 \leq RR < 90 \\ P(RR < 90) + P(90 \leq RR < 100) \left(\frac{RR-90}{10}\right) & \text{if } 90 \leq RR < 100 \\ P(RR < 100) + P(RR = 100) & \text{if } RR = 100 \\ P(RR \leq 100) + P(100 < RR < 120) \left(\frac{RR-100}{20}\right) & \text{if } 100 < RR < 120 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$


All the probabilities in 1 are known from the answers given by respondents. Writing the CDF as in 1 allows us to work with a continuous distribution function, with point mass at $RR = 100$, as the answers's to 2a and 2b might not add up to 100%, indicating that there is a positive probability associated to the event that the replacement rate is exactly equal to 100%. From the CDF, we can readily compute the expected replacement rate, denoted by μ as well as its variance (σ^2), to be used as measures of expected pension income and the uncertainty associated with future income.

Evaluated at the sample averages of the probabilities responded to question 2, the CDF is shown in figure 1. The average probabilities imply an expected replacement rate of 71.3%, with a standard deviation of 30.1%, revealing substantial uncertainty over future income. I emphasize

⁵Dominitz and Manski (1997), Manski (2004) and De Bresser and van Soest (2013) instead fit a log-normal distribution to the probabilities to compute moments for each respondent. I prefer the nonparametric approach used here, as the distributional assumption is not testable. Moreover, the least-squares fit can be severely biased for certain answer sequences, such as a high response to question 2a, or fails to converge, such as a 50% probability response to each question 2a-2g. Nonetheless, the correlation between the expected replacement rate (standard deviation) from the parametric vs. nonparametric approach is 91% (74%), and hence the results are robust.

that the CDF, and hence the variables μ and σ^2 can be computed for *each* observation in the data, which are used to estimate the savings equation.

Figure 1: Average cumulative distribution function



The determinants of the expected value and standard deviation of the replacement rate have been investigated in Van Santen et al. (2012), who show that the expected benefit is U-shaped in age with a minimum at 48, while uncertainty is inverted U-shaped with age with maximum at age 36. Educational attainment depresses the expectation, and increases uncertainty. The uncertainty is highest in the years 2008-2011, compared to 2006 and 2007, possibly due to the financial crisis. Similarly, the expected replacement rate was lower in these years.⁶

⁶De Bresser and van Soest (2013) also report the determinants of the expectations, with an emphasis on identifying response patterns to these type of questions (such as rounding, focal points and non-response).

4 Model

To guide the empirical analysis, I construct a simple model of a lifecycle consumer which allows for a precautionary savings motive, in the spirit of Leland (1968). I consider a two-period model with uncertainty over income in the second period, interpreted as retirement. The per-period utility function is of the Constant Absolute Risk Aversion (CARA) type, and future income is a normally distributed variable with expected value μ and variance σ^2 , following Cantor (1985) and Caballero (1990, 1991). To keep the model as simple as possible, labour income, y as well as the retirement date and terminal date are assumed to be exogenous. Moreover, the interest rate and the rate of time preference are set to zero.

The problem the currently young individual faces is to maximize lifecycle utility subject to the consolidated lifetime budget constraint; formally,

$$\max_{c_t, c_{t+1}} -\frac{1}{\alpha} \exp[-\alpha c_t] - \frac{1}{\alpha} E_t \exp[-\alpha c_{t+1}] \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } c_t + c_{t+1} = A_{t-1} + y_t + y_{t+1} \quad (2b)$$

where c_τ is consumption in period τ , A_{t-1} is predetermined wealth and E_t is the expectation operator conditional on information available in period t . In this setup, the consumption function is easily shown to be given by

$$c_t = \frac{1}{2} (A_{t-1} + y_t + \mu) - \frac{1}{4} \alpha \sigma^2 \quad (3)$$

The first term denotes the familiar expected present value of future income streams (or permanent income). Without uncertainty, consumption would be equal to permanent income. With uncertainty over retirement income, consumption is adjusted downwards due to risk-aversion.

As the data does not contain expenditures, but does report annual savings, the equation taken to the data reads

$$s_t = \frac{1}{2} (y_t - A_{t-1} - \mu) + \frac{1}{4} \alpha \sigma^2 \quad (4)$$

Equation 4 yields two hypothesis to be tested: savings should increase with uncertainty over pension income, and decrease with the expectation of retirement income.

4.1 Identification strategy

The empirical counterpart to equation 4 can be written as

$$s_i = \mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta} + \gamma_1 \mu_i + \gamma_2 \sigma_i^2 + u_i \quad (5)$$

where we expect $\gamma_1 = -1/2 < 0$ and $\gamma_2 = \alpha/4 > 0$. The vector \mathbf{x}_i contains last-period wealth A_{it-1} , household income y_{it} , age and control variables. The control variables will capture other factors explaining household savings⁷, most notably, health status and subjective survival probabilities (to capture saving for future medical expenditures or longevity risk); bequest motives, planning horizon and risk aversion (to capture preference heterogeneity); household composition; education; and home ownership. Moreover, I control for income risk, by computing the variances of permanent and transitory shocks, respectively (Carroll and Samwick, 1997). The appendix contains definitions and an elaboration on the income risk measures. Finally, we add year fixed effects to control for common factors, and hence exploit cross-sectional variation.

Given a random sample, we can estimate the population parameters of interest γ_1, γ_2 consistently by OLS as long as the error term, u , is orthogonal to the explanatory variables. There are at least three reasons why OLS may lead to inconsistent estimates: unobserved heterogeneity, reverse causality and sample selection.

First, the presence of unobserved heterogeneity (such as a "taste for saving") could bias the estimates. A natural story here could be that savers accumulate wealth in all forms, including pensions; alternatively, savers sort into jobs with generous pension entitlements. Taste for saving makes it difficult to identify the effect of pensions on savings separately from preferences. Second, pension benefit expectations may be optimistic because of large private savings (reverse causality).⁸

Third, the sample from which consistent answers to probabilistic questions are obtained, i.e. probabilities satisfying the law of total probability and monotonicity of the cumulative distribution function, is a selected sample. For the question at hand, the law of total probability is violated

⁷Unless indicated otherwise, all variables refer to the household head.

⁸Note that, for reverse causality to be a concern, it must be that the individual does not interpret the questions literally, as expectations refer to public and occupational pensions only, whereas saving refers to discretionary private savings.

if the sum of answers to questions 2a and 2b exceeds 100%. Monotonicity is violated if, for instance, the answer to 2b is strictly less than the answer to 2c.⁹ As shown in Van Santen et al. (2012) using the same data as used here, the endogenous sample selection from removing inconsistent answers to the probabilistic survey questions, biases the results toward more pessimistic expectations and excess uncertainty in the replacement rate.

To identify the effects of interest, I use an instrumental variables estimator, corrected for non-random sample selection. In the IV approach, I will use instruments for both μ_i and σ_i^2 to estimate the parameters of interest γ_1 and γ_2 in equation 5. The instruments are derived from the performance of the respondent's pension fund. As explained in section 2, pension fund participation is mandatory for employees, and the choice of pension fund is fully determined by the employer. Moreover, most pension funds cover many or all firms in a particular sector.¹⁰ In particular, employees can not change pension fund within a given employment spell, if, say, the pension fund's performance deteriorates.

One way to assess the performance of the pension fund is given by the funding ratio, equal to the ratio between the market value of assets and the pensions to be paid in the future (i.e. the discounted market value of liabilities). The regulatory framework specifies a minimum funding ratio of 105%. Whenever assets fall short of 105% of liabilities, funds must submit a recovery plan to the regulator (the Dutch Central Bank) detailing how the fund plans to return to the minimum funding ratio of 105%. To restore solvency, the pension fund can increase their premium (paid by employer's and/or employees), forego inflation adjustments and/or cut (nominal) pension rights. For example, in 2013, 68 pension funds out of 415 had to cut (nominal) pension rights of 2 million employees, by on average 1.9%; 19 of them cut entitlements by 7%. As another example of recently taken actions, the largest Dutch pension fund, ABP, covering around 2.8 million employees, has increased existing pension claims by 0.28% over the period 2009-2011, while inflation was 4.8% over the same

⁹Unlike the Survey of Economic Expectations data used in, for instance, Dominitz and Manski (1997), the survey design for eliciting the probabilities did not ask respondents to correct their answers when monotonicity of the CDF or adding up was violated. Respondents are free to choose any number between 0 and 100 (inclusive) for a given probability.

¹⁰88% of employees in 2010 were covered by a sectoral or professional pension fund.

period. These actions are responses to low returns on assets and the low interest rate used for discounting future pension payments, following the financial crisis.

The survey data allows us to match the respondent to a pension fund. In total, we are able to match 106 pension funds to the respondents.¹¹ For each matched pension fund, we obtained quarterly data on the funding ratio from the Federation of the Dutch Pension Funds (the interest association of many pension funds). For the instruments, we construct 1) the level of the funding ratio, and 2) the change in the funding ratio over the last 4 quarters. Variation in these instruments stems from (cross-sectional) variation in pension fund performance, depending on which pension fund covers the respondent's current job.

Although the performance of the pension fund is exogenous to the employee within an employment spell, one could still argue that sorting across sectors based on pension fund performance may invalidate this instrument. We believe this to be of minor importance, however. Most labor flows occur within narrowly defined industries (Davis et al., 1998), while most pension funds cover many or all firms within such an industry. Moreover, with low vacancy levels after the recession, switching jobs only based on the performance of the pension fund, is unlikely.¹² Finally, Engelhardt and Kumar (2011) find no evidence of the sorting hypothesis to invalidate the results in studying the effect of pensions on private wealth accumulation in the US.

More important is the notion that the pension fund performance measures are invalid as instruments whenever it has a direct influence on household savings, violating the exclusion restriction for IV's. This is particularly problematic whenever worse performance leads the pension fund to increase the pension premium, resulting in a net decrease of disposable income from labor. Controlling for labour income and a measure of labour income risk, as I do throughout, is unlikely to solve this issue

¹¹The survey question asks respondents to choose one of 32 listed pension funds they invest in, or else to write down the name of their pension fund as an open question. We obtained the answers to the open question to identify an additional 74 pension funds.

¹²Even if persons switched based on (past or current) pension fund performance, there are no guarantees that performance of the pension fund of the new job is still better in the next quarter. In other words, individuals will have imprecise control over fund performance.

in full. Fortunately, the DHS includes a direct question on changes in the pension premium during the last year. In the analysis, I exclude all households that report a change in the pension premium during the last year.¹³

Figure 2: Replacement rate moments and the instruments




Figure 2 shows binned scatter plots depicting the relationships between the moments of the replacement rate distribution and pension fund performance. The expected replacement rate is positively correlated with both the level and trend of the pension fund funding ratio. The variance of the replacement rate correlates negatively with either instrument. These

¹³13 pension funds (8.7% of the sample) are removed due to changing premia.

results confirm the intuition that pension fund performance matters in forming expectations on future retirement benefits. The formal F -test for significance of the instruments shows that the instruments have sufficient explanatory power (see table 2).

4.2 Econometric model

The econometric model is a standard two-stage least-squares estimator with a Heckman (1979)-correction for the first-stage regressions. Formally, let d_i denote an indicator variable equal to 1 if the answer sequence to questions 2a-g satisfies the adding up and monotonicity requirements of a CDF (i.e. $d_i = 1$ if μ_i and σ_i^2 are computable from the CDF), let w_i denote a (vector of) observables explaining the selection process (exclusion restrictions), and let m_i denote a vector of instruments. The model used to estimate equation 5 can then be written as

$$P(d_i = 1 | x_i, m_i, w_i) = \Phi(x_i' \beta_d + m_i' \theta_d + w_i' \kappa) \quad (6a)$$

$$\mu_i = x_i' \beta_\mu + m_i' \theta_\mu + \alpha_\mu \hat{\lambda}_i + \eta_i \quad (6b)$$

$$\sigma_i^2 = x_i' \beta_\sigma + m_i' \theta_\sigma + \alpha_\sigma \hat{\lambda}_i + \epsilon_i \quad (6c)$$

$$s_i = x_i' \beta + \gamma_1 \hat{\mu}_i + \gamma_2 \hat{\sigma}_i^2 + u_i \quad (6d)$$

The equation of interest is the savings equation, 6d, where the variables μ and σ^2 have been replaced by fitted values from the respective first-stage equations, 6b and 6c. Absent $\hat{\lambda}$, equations 6b-6d define a standard 2SLS estimator. In addition, the first-stage relationships are corrected for non-random sample selection using the Heckman (1979) two-step approach. The selection-correction term, $\hat{\lambda}$, equals the Mill's ratio using the fitted values from the Probit regression in 6a. Standard errors in the savings equation are based on a bootstrap procedure, estimating each equation per replication, and drawing bootstrap samples of pension funds, to allow for correlation within pension funds.

As discussed, the instruments contained in m consist of the level of the pension fund's funding ratio, as well as the 4-quarter change in the funding ratio. To identify the selection model, we need excluding variables, w , that appear only in the selection equation but not in the outcome equation. Our exclusion restrictions are the same as used in Van Santen et al. (2012),

and are based on answering patterns to other probabilistic survey questions on income growth. The dummy variables Income adding-up error, Income probability error and Inflation probability error are all equal to 1 if the respondent's answer to probabilistic question on next-year income growth and expected inflation do not satisfy the law of total probability or monotonicity of the CDF. The appendix contains the exact wording of these questions.

5 Results

Table 2 shows the results of estimating the saving equation, using the 0–7 scale (columns 1,2), the midpoints (column 3) as well as the saving rate (column 4), dividing the midpoint by income (see Table 1).

Table 2: Baseline results

	Dependent variable: Annual Saving				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Scale 0-7	Scale 0-7	Midpoint (€)	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
	OLS	IV	IV	IV	IV, "Q"-adjusted
Expected replacement rate	-0.0015*	-0.014**	-125.15***	-0.275**	-0.317**
	(0.0008)	(0.007)	(41.53)	(0.106)	(0.126)
Variance replacement rate	-0.000034	0.0018***	13.98***	0.032***	0.040***
	(0.000069)	(0.00068)	(4.06)	(0.011)	(0.014)
Observations	2128	3196	3196	3196	3196
Pension funds	95	106	106	106	106
F-statistic exclusion restrictions		30.3	30.3	30.3	26.4
F-statistic instruments (μ)		23.4	23.4	23.4	27.2
F-statistic instruments (σ^2)		23.3	23.3	23.3	21.8

Control variables included: sector- and year fixed effects, age and its square, education, income, lagged wealth, gender, household composition, health, measures of risk aversion and planning horizon, bequest probabilities as well as the variances of permanent and transitory income shocks, computed as in Carroll and Samwick (1997).

Block-bootstrap (by pension fund) standard errors in parentheses

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

OLS estimates in column 1, which do not correct for selection into correct answering or endogeneity of the variables of interest, show a small, significant negative impact of the expected replacement rate on private saving. Uncertainty on the other hand enters insignificantly.

The IV estimates in column 2 yield the expected signs of the coefficients: saving increases when uncertainty increases, and when expected pension income decreases. The magnitudes imply that a one standard deviation (approximately 10 percentage points) increase in the expected replacement rate causes a 7.9% decrease in annual saving. Similarly, a one standard deviation (or 110 unit) increase in the variance of the replacement rate increases saving by 12.3%. The F -statistics of 23 show that the pension fund performance measures have a significant impact on the moments of the replacement rate distribution.

In column 3, the dependent variable is the amount of annual saving, given by the midpoint of the range in Table 1. Here, a 1 S.D. increase in expected benefits reduces saving by around €1200; a 1 S.D. increase in the variance increases saving by around €1500.

Column 4 divides the midpoint of saving by income. This saving rate declines (increases) by 2.66 (3.62) percentage points for a 1 S.D. increase in the expected (variance) replacement rate.

Column 5 uses the saving rate as well, and in addition multiplies the replacement rate variables by Gale (1998)'s "Q"-variable, i.e. the age-related adjustment factor to correct for differences in years until retirement.¹⁴ The advantage of doing so is that the coefficient on the expected replacement rate is a direct estimate of the displacement effect. An additional cent in expected pension wealth crowds out private wealth by 31.7 cents.

Table 3 shows the IV estimates, with different measures of expected benefits and uncertainty. Specifically, I use the median and support of the replacement rate distribution, respectively. The support is computed as the largest replacement rate with positive probability mass, minus the smallest rate with positive mass.

Across each saving measure, the median replacement rate decreases

¹⁴In the simple 2-period model presented in section 4, this factor equals 1/2. In an N -period model with CARA utility and non-zero real interest rate, this factor becomes $\sum_{\tau=K}^N R^{t-\tau} / \sum_{\tau=t}^N R^{t-\tau}$, where $R = 1 + r$ is the interest factor, t is the respondent's age, K is the retirement age and N the terminal period. I compute this adjustment using K from question 1, $N = 100$ and $r = 3\%$.

savings, while a larger support of the distribution increases saving. Hence, the results are robust with respect to the precise measure of expected pension benefits and uncertainty used.

Table 3: Robustness checks

Dependent variable: Annual Saving			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Scale 0-7	Midpoint (€)	Rate (%)
	IV	IV	IV
Median replacement rate	-0.031** (0.014)	-265.59*** (81.23)	-0.621*** (0.229)
Support replacement rate	0.026*** (0.010)	203.69*** (59.61)	0.493*** (0.171)
Observations	3196	3196	3196
Pension funds	106	106	106
F-statistic exclusion restrictions	30.3	30.3	30.3
F-statistic instruments (μ)	22.9	22.9	22.9
F-statistic instruments (σ^2)	23.7	23.7	23.7

Control variables included: sector- and year fixed effects, age and its square, education, income, lagged wealth, gender, household composition, health, measures of risk aversion and planning horizon, bequest probabilities as well as the variances of permanent and transitory income shocks, computed as in Carroll and Samwick (1997).

Block-bootstrap (by pension fund) standard errors in parentheses

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

5.1 Heterogeneity

The model in section 4 yields a specification linear in the expected replacement rate and its variance. With CRRA utility, instead of CARA, this linearity would no longer hold. In particular, one would expect wealth to impact on the decision how much to save, as a function of expectations: high-wealth respondents should attribute less weight to uncertainty in

future income (Carroll and Kimball, 2001), and less weight to expected future income. Furthermore, even under CARA preferences, one would expect respondent age and risk aversion to matter for the relationships of interest.

Figure 3: Heterogeneous impacts




Figure 3 shows the coefficients and 95% confidence intervals, interacting the moments of the replacement rate distribution with 1) a dummy for being aged below 50, 2) a dummy having below-median income, 3) dummies for having low (below-median) or high (top quartile) wealth, and 4) a dummy for being risk averse.¹⁵¹⁶

I find no significant difference between younger and older respondents in the marginal effect of expected benefits or its uncertainty on saving. As

¹⁵To estimate these models, I expand the instrument set by interacting the original instruments (level and trend of the funding ratio) with the dummies depicting the heterogeneity. Hence, for age, there are four first-stage regressions (two for the expected replacement rate (1 baseline and 1 interacted with the young age dummy) and 2 for the variance), and four instruments. For wealth, there are six first-stage regressions and six instruments. In all cases, the F -statistic exceeds 10, with a minimum of 12.59.

¹⁶For easier reading, I present the coefficient for the younger half of the sample by adding the baseline and interaction effects, and similarly for the other variables.

expected, uncertainty significantly increases saving for those closer to retirement. Low-income respondents react stronger to changes in the expected replacement rate, while high-income respondents save more if uncertainty increases.

Wealth differences have a non-linear impact: both low-wealth and high-wealth individuals react strongly to changes in the expected replacement rate, but not at all to uncertainty; the opposite is true for the middle class. For high wealth respondents, these results are in line with what a CRRA utility function would predict, where cash on hand essentially offsets uncertainty, leaving only the permanent income effect at work. In addition, low-wealth individuals should, under CRRA utility, be most affected by expected pension income, as Figure 3a suggests. However, the non-monotonicity in the responses to expected income and uncertainty are at odds with CRRA (or more general) utility functions. Finally, risk aversion has a major impact on the estimated coefficients: those stating to be risk averse strongly react to pension income expectations in line with what theory predicts. Surprisingly, the less risk averse group seems to behave opposite to predictions.

5.2 Bias in estimates ignoring uncertainty

How does the displacement effect change when ignoring uncertainty? The empirical literature thus far has almost exclusively omitted uncertainty from the empirical specifications for wealth or saving. Table 4 shows that the estimated displacement effect is biased towards zero when omitting this significant variable. In fact, none of the estimated coefficients are significantly different from zero once uncertainty is left out of the model. This feature is in line with the (ad-hoc) explanation in many studies that uncertainty can cause deviations from full (100%) crowd-out as a theoretical benchmark.

Ignoring uncertainty in addition allows me to test the overidentifying restrictions when using two instruments and one endogenous covariate. The bottom row of table 4 shows that the null of exogenous instruments cannot be rejected across each dependent variable.

Table 4: Estimates ignoring uncertainty

	Dependent variable: Annual Saving			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Scale 0-7	Midpoint (€)	Rate (%)	Rate (%)
	IV	IV	IV	IV, "Q"-adjusted
Expected replacement rate	0.0007 (0.003)	-11.11 (17.78)	-0.010 (0.035)	-0.011 (0.041)
Observations	3196	3196	3196	3196
Pension funds	106	106	106	106
F-statistic exclusion restrictions	30.3	30.3	30.3	26.4
F-statistic instruments (μ)	23.4	23.4	23.4	27.2
<i>p</i> -value over-identifying restrictions	0.86	0.30	0.75	0.75

Control variables included: sector- and year fixed effects, age and its square, education, income, lagged wealth, gender, household composition, health, measures of risk aversion and planning horizon, bequest probabilities as well as the variances of permanent and transitory income shocks, computed as in Carroll and Samwick (1997).

Block-bootstrap (by pension fund) standard errors in parentheses

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

6 Conclusion

This paper quantifies the effect of uncertainty over future pension benefits on household saving. The retirement income replacement rate has been elicited probabilistically from a representative sample of Dutch employees. These subjective expectations allow the computation of both the expected replacement rate as well as its variance, both of which vary across individuals and time periods. Instrumental variable estimates, exploiting variation in pension fund performance, show that uncertainty significantly increases household saving. The displacement effect, i.e. the decrease in private saving following a dollar increase in pension benefits, is estimated to be 32 cents. This estimate drops to an insignificant 1 cent when not controlling for uncertainty.

The results in this paper highlight the role of uncertainty when making consumption and saving decisions. Some of this uncertainty is hard to resolve, for instance over future career paths, which impact on earnings and hence retirement wealth accumulation. However, policy risk, i.e. the uncertainty over future reforms of pension systems, is manageable, and should be minimized if saving rates are deemed to high, for instance in recessions.

This paper shows that the certainty equivalence equation typically estimated likely suffers from omitted variable biases in estimating the displacement effect. Future work can extend the typical saving (or wealth) equations estimated in this literature even more, for instance by using subjective expectations over health and medical expenditures or future labour income.

A Data appendix: DNB Household survey

The DNB household survey (DHS), formerly known as the VSB-CentER Savings Study, is a yearly survey that started in 1993 and covers about 2000 Dutch households representative of the population. Respondents answer questions on a broad range of topics, including household income, assets and liabilities, health, and economic and psychological concepts. We use the waves of 2006-2011, for which pension benefit expectations are available through the supplementary Pension Barometer modules.

A.1 Dependent variable: annual savings

From the DHS, we construct our dependent variable, private savings, as well as control variables. Private savings are obtained from two survey questions on money put aside over the last year:

Question 3 *Did your household put any money aside IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?*

Question 4 *About how much money has your household put aside IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?*

- 1 *less than € 1,500*
- 2 *between € 1,500 and € 5,000*
- 3 *between € 5,000 and € 12,500*
- 4 *between € 12,500 and € 20,000*
- 5 *between € 20,000 and € 37,500*
- 6 *between € 37,500 and € 75,000*
- 7 *€ 75,000 or more*
- 8 *Don't know*

The dependent variable Saving is categorical, and takes on the same values as stated in question 4 (on a scale of 0-7), where 0 is imputed for respondents answering "No" to question 3. Where possible, for those answering "Don't know" to question 4 as well as missing observations, the dependent variable is imputed using the change in financial wealth between $t - 1$ and t , using the same cutoff values as in question 4; otherwise

these observations are excluded from the analysis.¹⁷ Financial wealth is defined as the sum of bank and saving accounts, stocks and bonds. In addition to the categorical variable, we use the midpoint of the interval, as well as the midpoint divided by income.

Most control variables used are standard: household income, age, gender, education, family composition (presence of partner and/or children), home ownership, beginning-of-period financial wealth, self-reported health status and the (self-assessed) probability of survival up to age 75 (of the head of the household). I also construct variables capturing preference heterogeneity: bequest motives, planning horizon and risk aversion. The bequest motive is captured by the (self-reported) probability of leaving a bequest. Planning horizon is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent identifies a period of 5 years or longer as the most important horizon for making consumption or savings decisions. Risk aversion is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent agrees with the statement that "it is more important to invest safely and get a guaranteed return than to take risks hoping for a higher return".

A.2 Exclusion restrictions

To identify the selection model, exclusion restrictions are placed on three variables that capture answering probabilistic survey questions inconsistently. The same variables as used here are also used by Van Santen et al. (2012).

Question 5 *What is the probability that the purchasing power of your total household income, in one year from now, will be higher / lower than it is now?*

Respondents provide two probabilities, one for the higher expected income and one for the lower. We construct the variable *Expected income*

¹⁷An alternative would be to use the change in financial wealth as a direct measure of private savings; the disadvantage of using this measure is that wealth is typically measured with error, which gets exacerbated when taking first differences. Moreover, due to panel attrition, the sample size is bigger using the direct survey questions on money put aside. For the subset of observations where we have both the direct savings measure as well as the change in financial wealth, the correlation between the direct survey questions and the similarly discretized change in financial wealth equals 0.35.

adding-up error, which is equal to one if these probabilities sum up to more than 100%, and zero otherwise.

The next question first elicits the minimum and maximum expected household incomes, after which a series of four follow-up questions are posed based on those answers:

Question 6 *What do you think is the probability that the total net yearly income of your household will be less than €[LOWEST + (HIGHEST – LOWEST) * {0.2/0.4/0.6/0.8}] in the next 12 months?*

In words, respondents are asked the probability that their net household yearly income will be less than 20% above their lowest expected income, and similarly for 40%, 60%, and 80% above. Note that the survey software computes the nominal amounts, which is what respondents see on the screen when answering the four questions. The four probabilities answered should be increasing with the threshold level (less than 20% above the lowest expected income implies less than 40% above the lowest expected income), and we construct the variable *Expected income probability error*, which is equal to one if this monotonicity is violated, and zero otherwise. The final question has a setup similar to that of question 6 but concerns expected inflation, for which we construct the variable *Inflation probability error*, which is equal to one if monotonicity is violated, and zero otherwise.

A.3 Labour income risk

To construct a measure of labour income risk, I use the full panel of the DHS data (i.e. 1993-2013) to estimate a model for household income, and compute the household-level variance of the income growth innovation, following Carroll and Samwick (1997). Specifically, the income process is taken from Cocco et al. (2005):

$$\ln y_{it} = \alpha_i + z_{it}'\beta + \zeta_{it} \quad (7)$$

where y denotes household income, z are predictors and α is a household fixed effect. The error term ζ can be decomposed in a permanent and transitory component: $\zeta_{it} = v_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$. The permanent component follows




Figure A1: Age-Income profiles

a random walk: $v_{it} = v_{it-1} + \zeta_{it}$ where $\zeta_{it} \sim N(0, \sigma_{\zeta}^2)$ is a shock to permanent income. The idiosyncratic temporary shock ε_{it} is distributed as $N(0, \sigma_{\varepsilon}^2)$, and independent of ζ_{it} at all ages.

As predictor variables z , I use education-specific age dummies and household size. Income is deflated using the CPI. The estimated age-income profiles are shown in figure A1.

To estimate the variances of permanent and transitory income shocks, I follow Carroll and Samwick (1997) by first computing the income growth innovation, i.e. $r_{id} = \ln(y_{it}/y_{it-d}) - (z_{it} - z_{it-d})' \hat{\beta}$. The sample variance of this innovation of length d is then given by

$$\text{Var}(r_{id}) = d\sigma_{i,\zeta}^2 + 2\sigma_{i,\varepsilon}^2 \quad (8)$$

Estimates of $\sigma_{i,\zeta}^2$ and $\sigma_{i,\varepsilon}^2$ are easily obtained by regressing, household-by-household, r_{id}^2 on d and a vector of 2's. As my panel is unbalanced, I use the longest possible time series for each household, with a minimum of two income growth differences.

A.4 Summary statistics

Table AI: Summary statistics

Variable	Mean	Median	SD
<i>Control variables</i>			
Income (€)	35,739	31,377	20,053
Financial wealth (€)	36,123	12,500	71,811
Age	46	47	10
Male (%)	60	100	49
Partner (%)	76	100	43
Children (%)	47	0	50
High school or less (%)	56	100	50
Homeowner (%)	77	100	42
Good health (%)	84	100	36
>5 years planning horizon (%)	16	0	37
Risk averse (%)	60	100	49
Prob survival to age 75 (%)	70	70	17
Prob leave bequest (%)	71	90	34
Variance permanent income shocks	0.74	0.73	0.08
Variance transitory income shocks	0.30	0.28	0.10
Gale's adjustment factor	0.84	0.83	0.09
<i>Exclusion restrictions</i>			
Expected income error (%)	12	0	33
Expected inflation error (%)	8	0	27
Expected income adding up error (%)	7	0	26
<i>Instrumental variables</i>			
Level funding ratio	119	110	18
Change funding ratio	-6	-2	19
<i>Dependent variables</i>			
Saving (0-7)	2	2	1
Amount saving (€)	4895	3250	9037
Saving rate (%)	14	8	26
<i>Replacement rate variables</i>			
Expected replacement rate	69	66	10
Median replacement rate	69	66	10
Variance replacement rate	395	332	113
Standard deviation replacement rate	18	18	7
Support replacement rate	80	70	30

References

- Alessie, R. J. M., Angelini, V., Van Santen, P. C., 2013. Pension wealth and household savings in europe: Evidence from SHARELIFE. *European Economic Review* 63, 308 – 328.
- Alessie, R. J. M., Hochguertel, S., van Soest, A., 2002. Household portfolios in the Netherlands. In: Guiso, L., Haliassos, M., Jappelli, T. (Eds.), *Household portfolios*. MIT press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 341–388.
- Attanasio, O. P., Brugiavini, A., 2003. Social security and households' saving. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118 (3), 1075–1119.
- Attanasio, O. P., Rohwedder, S., 2003. Pension wealth and household saving: Evidence from pension reforms in the United Kingdom. *The American Economic Review* 93 (5), 1499–1521.
- Blau, D. M., 2016. Pensions, household saving and welfare: A dynamic analysis of crowd out. *Quantitative Economics* 7, 193–224.
- Bodie, Z., 1990. Pensions as retirement income insurance. *Journal of Economic Literature* 28 (1), 28–49.
- Bottazzi, R., Jappelli, T., Padula, M., December 2006. Retirement expectations, pension reforms, and their impact on private wealth accumulation. *Journal of Public Economics* 90 (12), 2187–2212.
- Bovenberg, A., Gradus, R., 2008. Dutch policies towards ageing. *European View* 7, 265–275.
- Caballero, R. J., 1990. Consumption puzzles and precautionary savings. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 25 (1), 113 – 136.
- Caballero, R. J., 1991. Earnings uncertainty and aggregate wealth accumulation. *The American Economic Review* 81 (4), 859–871.
- Cantor, R., 1985. The consumption function and the precautionary demand for savings. *Economics Letters* 17 (3), 207 – 210.
- Carroll, C. D., Kimball, M. S., October 2001. Liquidity constraints and precautionary saving. Working Paper 8496, NBER.

- Carroll, C. D., Samwick, A. A., September 1997. The nature of precautionary wealth. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 40 (1), 41–71.
- Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., Leth-Petersen, S., Nielsen, T. H., Olsen, T., 2014. Active vs. passive decisions and crowd-out in retirement savings accounts: Evidence from Denmark. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129 (3), 1141–1219.
- Cocco, J. F., Gomes, F. J., Maenhout, P. J., 2005. Consumption and portfolio choice over the life cycle. *Review of Financial Studies* 18 (2), 491–533.
- Davis, S. J., Haltiwanger, J. C., Schuh, S., 1998. *Job Creation and Destruction*. MIT Press.
- De Bresser, J., van Soest, A., 2013. Survey response in probabilistic questions and its impact on inference. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 96, 65 – 84.
- Delavande, A., Rohwedder, S., 04 2011. Individuals' uncertainty about future social security benefits and portfolio choice. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 26 (3), 498–519.
- Dominitz, J., Manski, C. F., 1997. Using expectations data to study subjective income expectations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92 (439), 855–867.
- Dominitz, J., Manski, C. F., 2006. Measuring pension-benefit expectations probabilistically. *Labour* 20 (2), 201–236.
- Engelhardt, G. V., Kumar, A., 2011. Pensions and household wealth accumulation. *Journal of Human Resources* 46 (1), 203–236.
- Feldstein, M. S., 1974. Social security, induced retirement, and aggregate capital accumulation. *The Journal of Political Economy* 82 (5), 905–926.
- Gale, W. G., 1998. The effects of pensions on household wealth: A reevaluation of theory and evidence. *The Journal of Political Economy* 106 (4), 706–723.
- Guiso, L., Jappelli, T., Padula, M., 2013. Pension wealth uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 80 (4), 1057–1085.

- Guiso, L., Jappelli, T., Terlizzese, D., 1992. Earnings uncertainty and precautionary saving. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 30 (2), 307 – 337.
- Guiso, L., Jappelli, T., Terlizzese, D., March 1996. Income risk, borrowing constraints, and portfolio choice. *American Economic Review* 86 (1), 158–72.
- Heckman, J., 1979. Sample selection bias as a specification error. *Econometrica* 47 (1), 153–161.
- Kapteyn, A., Alessie, R. J. M., Lusardi, A., 2005. Explaining the wealth holdings of different cohorts: Productivity growth and social security. *European Economic Review* 49 (5), 1361 – 1391.
- Leland, H. E., 1968. Saving and uncertainty: The precautionary demand for saving. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 82 (3), 465–473.
- Manski, C. F., 2004. Measuring expectations. *Econometrica* 72 (5), 1329–1376.
- Mastrogiacomo, M., Alessie, R. J. M., 2011. Did you really save so little for retirement? An analysis of retirement savings and unconventional retirement accounts. Discussion Paper 200, CPB.
- OECD, 2015. Pensions at a Glance 2015: OECD and G20 indicators. OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Sichting van de Arbeid, June 2010. Pension accord spring 2010.
- Sichting van de Arbeid, June 2011. Memorandum detailing the pension accord of 4 June 2010.
- Teppa, F., Vis, C., Sep. 2012. The CentERpanel and the DNB Household Survey: Methodological Aspects. DNB Occasional Studies 1004, Netherlands Central Bank, Research Department.
- Van Santen, P. C., Alessie, R. J. M., Kalwij, A. S., 2012. Probabilistic survey questions and incorrect answers: Retirement income replacement rates. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 82 (1), 267 – 280.

Earlier Working Papers:

For a complete list of Working Papers published by Sveriges Riksbank, see www.riksbank.se

Estimation of an Adaptive Stock Market Model with Heterogeneous Agents <i>by Henrik Amilon</i>	2005:177
Some Further Evidence on Interest-Rate Smoothing: The Role of Measurement Errors in the Output Gap <i>by Mikael Apel and Per Jansson</i>	2005:178
Bayesian Estimation of an Open Economy DSGE Model with Incomplete Pass-Through <i>by Malin Adolphson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Mattias Villani</i>	2005:179
Are Constant Interest Rate Forecasts Modest Interventions? Evidence from an Estimated Open Economy DSGE Model of the Euro Area <i>by Malin Adolphson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Mattias Villani</i>	2005:180
Inference in Vector Autoregressive Models with an Informative Prior on the Steady State <i>by Mattias Villani</i>	2005:181
Bank Mergers, Competition and Liquidity <i>by Elena Carletti, Philipp Hartmann and Giancarlo Spagnolo</i>	2005:182
Testing Near-Rationality using Detailed Survey Data <i>by Michael F. Bryan and Stefan Palmqvist</i>	2005:183
Exploring Interactions between Real Activity and the Financial Stance <i>by Tor Jacobson, Jesper Lindé and Kasper Roszbach</i>	2005:184
Two-Sided Network Effects, Bank Interchange Fees, and the Allocation of Fixed Costs <i>by Mats A. Bergman</i>	2005:185
Trade Deficits in the Baltic States: How Long Will the Party Last? <i>by Rudolfs Bems and Kristian Jönsson</i>	2005:186
Real Exchange Rate and Consumption Fluctuations following Trade Liberalization <i>by Kristian Jönsson</i>	2005:187
Modern Forecasting Models in Action: Improving Macroeconomic Analyses at Central Banks <i>by Malin Adolphson, Michael K. Andersson, Jesper Lindé, Mattias Villani and Anders Vredin</i>	2005:188
Bayesian Inference of General Linear Restrictions on the Cointegration Space <i>by Mattias Villani</i>	2005:189
Forecasting Performance of an Open Economy Dynamic Stochastic General Equilibrium Model <i>by Malin Adolphson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Mattias Villani</i>	2005:190
Forecast Combination and Model Averaging using Predictive Measures <i>by Jana Eklund and Sune Karlsson</i>	2005:191
Swedish Intervention and the Krona Float, 1993-2002 <i>by Owen F. Humpage and Javiera Ragnartz</i>	2006:192
A Simultaneous Model of the Swedish Krona, the US Dollar and the Euro <i>by Hans Lindblad and Peter Sellin</i>	2006:193
Testing Theories of Job Creation: Does Supply Create Its Own Demand? <i>by Mikael Carlsson, Stefan Eriksson and Nils Gottfries</i>	2006:194
Down or Out: Assessing The Welfare Costs of Household Investment Mistakes <i>by Laurent E. Calvet, John Y. Campbell and Paolo Sodini</i>	2006:195
Efficient Bayesian Inference for Multiple Change-Point and Mixture Innovation Models <i>by Paolo Giordani and Robert Kohn</i>	2006:196
Derivation and Estimation of a New Keynesian Phillips Curve in a Small Open Economy <i>by Karolina Holmberg</i>	2006:197
Technology Shocks and the Labour-Input Response: Evidence from Firm-Level Data <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Jon Smedsaas</i>	2006:198
Monetary Policy and Staggered Wage Bargaining when Prices are Sticky <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Andreas Westermark</i>	2006:199
The Swedish External Position and the Krona <i>by Philip R. Lane</i>	2006:200

Price Setting Transactions and the Role of Denominating Currency in FX Markets <i>by Richard Friberg and Fredrik Wilander</i>	2007:201
The geography of asset holdings: Evidence from Sweden <i>by Nicolas Coeurdacier and Philippe Martin</i>	2007:202
Evaluating An Estimated New Keynesian Small Open Economy Model <i>by Malin Adolfson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Mattias Villani</i>	2007:203
The Use of Cash and the Size of the Shadow Economy in Sweden <i>by Gabriela Guibourg and Björn Segendorf</i>	2007:204
Bank supervision Russian style: Evidence of conflicts between micro- and macro-prudential concerns <i>by Sophie Claeys and Koen Schoors</i>	2007:205
Optimal Monetary Policy under Downward Nominal Wage Rigidity <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Andreas Westermark</i>	2007:206
Financial Structure, Managerial Compensation and Monitoring <i>by Vittoria Cerasi and Sonja Daltung</i>	2007:207
Financial Frictions, Investment and Tobin's q <i>by Guido Lorenzoni and Karl Walentin</i>	2007:208
Sticky Information vs Sticky Prices: A Horse Race in a DSGE Framework <i>by Mathias Trabandt</i>	2007:209
Acquisition versus greenfield: The impact of the mode of foreign bank entry on information and bank lending rates <i>by Sophie Claeys and Christa Hainz</i>	2007:210
Nonparametric Regression Density Estimation Using Smoothly Varying Normal Mixtures <i>by Mattias Villani, Robert Kohn and Paolo Giordani</i>	2007:211
The Costs of Paying – Private and Social Costs of Cash and Card <i>by Mats Bergman, Gabriella Guibourg and Björn Segendorf</i>	2007:212
Using a New Open Economy Macroeconomics model to make real nominal exchange rate forecasts <i>by Peter Sellin</i>	2007:213
Introducing Financial Frictions and Unemployment into a Small Open Economy Model <i>by Lawrence J. Christiano, Mathias Trabandt and Karl Walentin</i>	2007:214
Earnings Inequality and the Equity Premium <i>by Karl Walentin</i>	2007:215
Bayesian forecast combination for VAR models <i>by Michael K. Andersson and Sune Karlsson</i>	2007:216
Do Central Banks React to House Prices? <i>by Daria Finocchiaro and Virginia Queijo von Heideken</i>	2007:217
The Riksbank's Forecasting Performance <i>by Michael K. Andersson, Gustav Karlsson and Josef Svensson</i>	2007:218
Macroeconomic Impact on Expected Default Frequency <i>by Per Åsberg and Hovick Shahnazarian</i>	2008:219
Monetary Policy Regimes and the Volatility of Long-Term Interest Rates <i>by Virginia Queijo von Heideken</i>	2008:220
Governing the Governors: A Clinical Study of Central Banks <i>by Lars Frisell, Kasper Roszbach and Giancarlo Spagnolo</i>	2008:221
The Monetary Policy Decision-Making Process and the Term Structure of Interest Rates <i>by Hans Dillén</i>	2008:222
How Important are Financial Frictions in the U S and the Euro Area <i>by Virginia Queijo von Heideken</i>	2008:223
Block Kalman filtering for large-scale DSGE models <i>by Ingvar Strid and Karl Walentin</i>	2008:224
Optimal Monetary Policy in an Operational Medium-Sized DSGE Model <i>by Malin Adolfson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Lars E. O. Svensson</i>	2008:225
Firm Default and Aggregate Fluctuations <i>by Tor Jacobson, Rikard Kindell, Jesper Lindé and Kasper Roszbach</i>	2008:226

Re-Evaluating Swedish Membership in EMU: Evidence from an Estimated Model <i>by Ulf Söderström</i>	2008:227
The Effect of Cash Flow on Investment: An Empirical Test of the Balance Sheet Channel <i>by Ola Melander</i>	2009:228
Expectation Driven Business Cycles with Limited Enforcement <i>by Karl Walentin</i>	2009:229
Effects of Organizational Change on Firm Productivity <i>by Christina Håkanson</i>	2009:230
Evaluating Microfoundations for Aggregate Price Rigidities: Evidence from Matched Firm-Level Data on Product Prices and Unit Labor Cost <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Oskar Nordström Skans</i>	2009:231
Monetary Policy Trade-Offs in an Estimated Open-Economy DSGE Model <i>by Malin Adolfson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Lars E. O. Svensson</i>	2009:232
Flexible Modeling of Conditional Distributions Using Smooth Mixtures of Asymmetric Student T Densities <i>by Feng Li, Mattias Villani and Robert Kohn</i>	2009:233
Forecasting Macroeconomic Time Series with Locally Adaptive Signal Extraction <i>by Paolo Giordani and Mattias Villani</i>	2009:234
Evaluating Monetary Policy <i>by Lars E. O. Svensson</i>	2009:235
Risk Premiums and Macroeconomic Dynamics in a Heterogeneous Agent Model <i>by Ferre De Graeve, Maarten Dossche, Marina Emiris, Henri Sneessens and Raf Wouters</i>	2010:236
Picking the Brains of MPC Members <i>by Mikael Apel, Carl Andreas Claussen and Petra Lennartsdotter</i>	2010:237
Involuntary Unemployment and the Business Cycle <i>by Lawrence J. Christiano, Mathias Trabandt and Karl Walentin</i>	2010:238
Housing collateral and the monetary transmission mechanism <i>by Karl Walentin and Peter Sellin</i>	2010:239
The Discursive Dilemma in Monetary Policy <i>by Carl Andreas Claussen and Øistein Røisland</i>	2010:240
Monetary Regime Change and Business Cycles <i>by Vasco Cúrdia and Daria Finocchiaro</i>	2010:241
Bayesian Inference in Structural Second-Price common Value Auctions <i>by Bertil Wegmann and Mattias Villani</i>	2010:242
Equilibrium asset prices and the wealth distribution with inattentive consumers <i>by Daria Finocchiaro</i>	2010:243
Identifying VARs through Heterogeneity: An Application to Bank Runs <i>by Ferre De Graeve and Alexei Karas</i>	2010:244
Modeling Conditional Densities Using Finite Smooth Mixtures <i>by Feng Li, Mattias Villani and Robert Kohn</i>	2010:245
The Output Gap, the Labor Wedge, and the Dynamic Behavior of Hours <i>by Luca Sala, Ulf Söderström and Antonella Trigari</i>	2010:246
Density-Conditional Forecasts in Dynamic Multivariate Models <i>by Michael K. Andersson, Stefan Palmqvist and Daniel F. Waggoner</i>	2010:247
Anticipated Alternative Policy-Rate Paths in Policy Simulations <i>by Stefan Laséen and Lars E. O. Svensson</i>	2010:248
MOSES: Model of Swedish Economic Studies <i>by Gunnar Bårdsen, Ard den Reijer, Patrik Jonasson and Ragnar Nymoén</i>	2011:249
The Effects of Endogenous Firm Exit on Business Cycle Dynamics and Optimal Fiscal Policy <i>by Lauri Vilmi</i>	2011:250
Parameter Identification in a Estimated New Keynesian Open Economy Model <i>by Malin Adolfson and Jesper Lindé</i>	2011:251
Up for count? Central bank words and financial stress <i>by Marianna Blix Grimaldi</i>	2011:252

Wage Adjustment and Productivity Shocks <i>by Mikael Carlsson, Julián Messina and Oskar Nordström Skans</i>	2011:253
Stylized (Arte) Facts on Sectoral Inflation <i>by Ferre De Graeve and Karl Walentin</i>	2011:254
Hedging Labor Income Risk <i>by Sebastien Betermier, Thomas Jansson, Christine A. Parlour and Johan Walden</i>	2011:255
Taking the Twists into Account: Predicting Firm Bankruptcy Risk with Splines of Financial Ratios <i>by Paolo Giordani, Tor Jacobson, Erik von Schedvin and Mattias Villani</i>	2011:256
Collateralization, Bank Loan Rates and Monitoring: Evidence from a Natural Experiment <i>by Geraldo Cerqueiro, Steven Ongena and Kasper Roszbach</i>	2012:257
On the Non-Exclusivity of Loan Contracts: An Empirical Investigation <i>by Hans Degryse, Vasso Ioannidou and Erik von Schedvin</i>	2012:258
Labor-Market Frictions and Optimal Inflation <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Andreas Westermarck</i>	2012:259
Output Gaps and Robust Monetary Policy Rules <i>by Roberto M. Billi</i>	2012:260
The Information Content of Central Bank Minutes <i>by Mikael Apel and Marianna Blix Grimaldi</i>	2012:261
The Cost of Consumer Payments in Sweden <i>by Björn Segendorf and Thomas Jansson</i>	2012:262
Trade Credit and the Propagation of Corporate Failure: An Empirical Analysis <i>by Tor Jacobson and Erik von Schedvin</i>	2012:263
Structural and Cyclical Forces in the Labor Market During the Great Recession: Cross-Country Evidence <i>by Luca Sala, Ulf Söderström and Antonella Trigari</i>	2012:264
Pension Wealth and Household Savings in Europe: Evidence from SHARELIFE <i>by Rob Alessie, Viola Angelini and Peter van Santen</i>	2013:265
Long-Term Relationship Bargaining <i>by Andreas Westermarck</i>	2013:266
Using Financial Markets To Estimate the Macro Effects of Monetary Policy: An Impact-Identified FAVAR* <i>by Stefan Pitschner</i>	2013:267
DYNAMIC MIXTURE-OF-EXPERTS MODELS FOR LONGITUDINAL AND DISCRETE-TIME SURVIVAL DATA <i>by Matias Quiroz and Mattias Villani</i>	2013:268
Conditional euro area sovereign default risk <i>by André Lucas, Bernd Schwaab and Xin Zhang</i>	2013:269
Nominal GDP Targeting and the Zero Lower Bound: Should We Abandon Inflation Targeting?*	2013:270
<i>by Roberto M. Billi</i>	
Un-truncating VARs* <i>by Ferre De Graeve and Andreas Westermarck</i>	2013:271
Housing Choices and Labor Income Risk <i>by Thomas Jansson</i>	2013:272
Identifying Fiscal Inflation* <i>by Ferre De Graeve and Virginia Queijo von Heideken</i>	2013:273
On the Redistributive Effects of Inflation: an International Perspective* <i>by Paola Boel</i>	2013:274
Business Cycle Implications of Mortgage Spreads* <i>by Karl Walentin</i>	2013:275
Approximate dynamic programming with post-decision states as a solution method for dynamic economic models <i>by Isaiah Hull</i>	2013:276
A detrimental feedback loop: deleveraging and adverse selection <i>by Christoph Bertsch</i>	2013:277
Distortionary Fiscal Policy and Monetary Policy Goals <i>by Klaus Adam and Roberto M. Billi</i>	2013:278
Predicting the Spread of Financial Innovations: An Epidemiological Approach <i>by Isaiah Hull</i>	2013:279

Firm-Level Evidence of Shifts in the Supply of Credit <i>by Karolina Holmberg</i>	2013:280
Lines of Credit and Investment: Firm-Level Evidence of Real Effects of the Financial Crisis <i>by Karolina Holmberg</i>	2013:281
A wake-up call: information contagion and strategic uncertainty <i>by Toni Ahnert and Christoph Bertsch</i>	2013:282
Debt Dynamics and Monetary Policy: A Note <i>by Stefan Laséen and Ingvar Strid</i>	2013:283
Optimal taxation with home production <i>by Conny Olovsson</i>	2014:284
Incompatible European Partners? Cultural Predispositions and Household Financial Behavior <i>by Michael Haliassos, Thomas Jansson and Yigitcan Karabulut</i>	2014:285
How Subprime Borrowers and Mortgage Brokers Shared the Piecial Behavior <i>by Antje Berndt, Burton Hollifield and Patrik Sandås</i>	2014:286
The Macro-Financial Implications of House Price-Indexed Mortgage Contracts <i>by Isaiah Hull</i>	2014:287
Does Trading Anonymously Enhance Liquidity? <i>by Patrick J. Dennis and Patrik Sandås</i>	2014:288
Systematic bailout guarantees and tacit coordination <i>by Christoph Bertsch, Claudio Calcagno and Mark Le Quement</i>	2014:289
Selection Effects in Producer-Price Setting <i>by Mikael Carlsson</i>	2014:290
Dynamic Demand Adjustment and Exchange Rate Volatility <i>by Vesna Corbo</i>	2014:291
Forward Guidance and Long Term Interest Rates: Inspecting the Mechanism <i>by Ferre De Graeve, Pelin Ilbas & Raf Wouters</i>	2014:292
Firm-Level Shocks and Labor Adjustments <i>by Mikael Carlsson, Julián Messina and Oskar Nordström Skans</i>	2014:293
A wake-up call theory of contagion <i>by Toni Ahnert and Christoph Bertsch</i>	2015:294
Risks in macroeconomic fundamentals and excess bond returns predictability <i>by Rafael B. De Rezende</i>	2015:295
The Importance of Reallocation for Productivity Growth: Evidence from European and US Banking <i>by Jaap W.B. Bos and Peter C. van Santen</i>	2015:296
SPEEDING UP MCMC BY EFFICIENT DATA SUBSAMPLING <i>by Matias Quiroz, Mattias Villani and Robert Kohn</i>	2015:297
Amortization Requirements and Household Indebtedness: An Application to Swedish-Style Mortgages <i>by Isaiah Hull</i>	2015:298
Fuel for Economic Growth? <i>by Johan Gars and Conny Olovsson</i>	2015:299
Searching for Information <i>by Jungsuk Han and Francesco Sangiorgi</i>	2015:300
What Broke First? Characterizing Sources of Structural Change Prior to the Great Recession <i>by Isaiah Hull</i>	2015:301
Price Level Targeting and Risk Management <i>by Roberto Billi</i>	2015:302
Central bank policy paths and market forward rates: A simple model <i>by Ferre De Graeve and Jens Iversen</i>	2015:303
Jump-Starting the Euro Area Recovery: Would a Rise in Core Fiscal Spending Help the Periphery? <i>by Olivier Blanchard, Christopher J. Erceg and Jesper Lindé</i>	2015:304
Bringing Financial Stability into Monetary Policy* <i>by Eric M. Leeper and James M. Nason</i>	2015:305

SCALABLE MCMC FOR LARGE DATA PROBLEMS USING DATA SUBSAMPLING AND THE DIFFERENCE ESTIMATOR <i>by MATIAS QUIROZ, MATTIAS VILLANI AND ROBERT KOHN</i>	2015:306
SPEEDING UP MCMC BY DELAYED ACCEPTANCE AND DATA SUBSAMPLING <i>by MATIAS QUIROZ</i>	2015:307
Modeling financial sector joint tail risk in the euro area <i>by André Lucas, Bernd Schwaab and Xin Zhang</i>	2015:308
Score Driven Exponentially Weighted Moving Averages and Value-at-Risk Forecasting <i>by André Lucas and Xin Zhang</i>	2015:309
On the Theoretical Efficacy of Quantitative Easing at the Zero Lower Bound <i>by Paola Boel and Christopher J. Waller</i>	2015:310
Optimal Inflation with Corporate Taxation and Financial Constraints <i>by Daria Finocchiaro, Giovanni Lombardo, Caterina Mendicino and Philippe Weil</i>	2015:311
Fire Sale Bank Recapitalizations <i>by Christoph Bertsch and Mike Mariathasan</i>	2015:312
Since you're so rich, you must be really smart: Talent and the Finance Wage Premium <i>by Michael Böhm, Daniel Metzger and Per Strömberg</i>	2015:313
Debt, equity and the equity price puzzle <i>by Daria Finocchiaro and Caterina Mendicino</i>	2015:314
Trade Credit: Contract-Level Evidence Contradicts Current Theories <i>by Tore Ellingsen, Tor Jacobson and Erik von Schedvin</i>	2016:315
Double Liability in a Branch Banking System: Historical Evidence from Canada <i>by Anna Grodecka and Antonis Kotidis</i>	2016:316
Subprime Borrowers, Securitization and the Transmission of Business Cycles <i>by Anna Grodecka</i>	2016:317
Real-Time Forecasting for Monetary Policy Analysis: The Case of Sveriges Riksbank <i>by Jens Iversen, Stefan Laséen, Henrik Lundvall and Ulf Söderström</i>	2016:318
Fed Liftoff and Subprime Loan Interest Rates: Evidence from the Peer-to-Peer Lending <i>by Christoph Bertsch, Isaiah Hull and Xin Zhang</i>	2016:319
Curbing Shocks to Corporate Liquidity: The Role of Trade Credit <i>by Niklas Amberg, Tor Jacobson, Erik von Schedvin and Robert Townsend</i>	2016:320
Firms' Strategic Choice of Loan Delinquencies <i>by Paola Morales-Acevedo</i>	2016:321
Fiscal Consolidation Under Imperfect Credibility <i>by Matthieu Lemoine and Jesper Lindé</i>	2016:322
Challenges for Central Banks' Macro Models <i>by Jesper Lindé, Frank Smets and Rafael Wouters</i>	2016:323
The interest rate effects of government bond purchases away from the lower bound <i>by Rafael B. De Rezende</i>	2016:324
COVENANT-LIGHT CONTRACTS AND CREDITOR COORDINATION <i>by Bo Becker and Victoria Ivashina</i>	2016:325
Endogenous Separations, Wage Rigidities and Employment Volatility <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Andreas Westermark</i>	2016:326
Renovatio Monetæ: Gesell Taxes in Practice <i>by Roger Svensson and Andreas Westermark</i>	2016:327
Adjusting for Information Content when Comparing Forecast Performance <i>by Michael K. Andersson, Ted Aranki and André Reslow</i>	2016:328
Economic Scarcity and Consumers' Credit Choice <i>by Marieke Bos, Chloé Le Coq and Peter van Santen</i>	2016:329



Sveriges Riksbank
Visiting address: Brunkebergs torg 11
Mail address: se-103 37 Stockholm

Website: www.riksbank.se
Telephone: +46 8 787 00 00, Fax: +46 8 21 05 31
E-mail: registratorn@riksbank.se