Discussion of "Wealth and Volatility" J. Heathcote and F. Perri

Franck Portier

Toulouse School of Economics – CEPR

ESSIM 2012 – Tarragona

Three main ideas

1. Consumption depends on expected income - and actual income depends on consumption (Idea # 1)
2. The level of an household wealth affects its ability to smooth consumption (Idea # 2)
3. Fluctuations are partly driven by sunspots (Idea # 3)

Three main ideas

1. Consumption depends on expected income - and actual income depends on consumption (Idea # 1)
2. The level of an household wealth affects its ability to smooth consumption (Idea # 2)
3. Fluctuations are partly driven by sunspots (Idea # 3)

Three main ideas

1. Consumption depends on expected income - and actual income depends on consumption (Idea # 1)
2. The level of an household wealth affects its ability to smooth consumption (Idea # 2)
3. Fluctuations are partly driven by sunspots (Idea # 3)

Three main ideas

1. I will first write a reduced form model that illustrates how those three ideas interplay
2. Then I will briefly explain J & F modelling choices
3. Then I will make some comments

Three main ideas

1. I will first write a reduced form model that illustrates how those three ideas interplay
2. Then I will briefly explain J & F modelling choices
3. Then I will make some comments

Three main ideas

1. I will first write a reduced form model that illustrates how those three ideas interplay
2. Then I will briefly explain J & F modelling choices
3. Then I will make some comments

A Keynesian Cross

- It is possible to tell the paper story in a simple non micro-founded model
- The model is essentially a Keynesian cross (Idea # 1) with some twists to incorporate ideas # 2 and 3

A Keynesian Cross

- It is possible to tell the paper story in a simple non micro-founded model
- The model is essentially a Keynesian cross (Idea # 1) with some twists to incorporate ideas # 2 and 3

A Keynesian Cross

- The idea that consumption depends on expected income, and income on consumption is the core of the Keynesian Cross
- Prices are fixed, no investment, labor supply is inelastically 1
- Production function : $Y = L$
- Consumption function : $C = C_0 + \alpha wL$
- unemployment is $u = 1 - L$
- wage is $w = 1$

A Keynesian Cross

- The idea that consumption depends on expected income, and income on consumption is the core of the Keynesian Cross
- Prices are fixed, no investment, labor supply is inelastically 1
- Production function : $Y = L$
- Consumption function : $C = C_0 + \alpha wL$
- unemployment is $u = 1 - L$
- wage is $w = 1$

A Keynesian Cross

- The idea that consumption depends on expected income, and income on consumption is the core of the Keynesian Cross
- Prices are fixed, no investment, labor supply is inelastically 1
- Production function : $Y = L$
- Consumption function : $C = C_0 + \alpha w L$
- unemployment is $u = 1 - L$
- wage is $w = 1$

A Keynesian Cross

- The idea that consumption depends on expected income, and income on consumption is the core of the Keynesian Cross
- Prices are fixed, no investment, labor supply is inelastically 1
- Production function : $Y = L$
- Consumption function : $C = C_0 + \alpha wL$
- unemployment is $u = 1 - L$
- wage is $w = 1$

A Keynesian Cross

- The idea that consumption depends on expected income, and income on consumption is the core of the Keynesian Cross
- Prices are fixed, no investment, labor supply is inelastically 1
- Production function : $Y = L$
- Consumption function : $C = C_0 + \alpha w L$
- unemployment is $u = 1 - L$
- wage is $w = 1$

A Keynesian Cross

- The idea that consumption depends on expected income, and income on consumption is the core of the Keynesian Cross
- Prices are fixed, no investment, labor supply is inelastically 1
- Production function : $Y = L$
- Consumption function : $C = C_0 + \alpha wL$
- unemployment is $u = 1 - L$
- wage is $w = 1$

A Keynesian Cross

- Consumption : $C = C_0 + \alpha(1 - u)$
- Good market (production is demand determined) : $C = 1 - u$

A Keynesian Cross

- Consumption : $C = C_0 + \alpha(1 - u)$
- Good market (production is demand determined) : $C = 1 - u$

A Keynesian Cross

Baseline Case



A Keynesian Cross

Baseline Case



A Keynesian Cross

Baseline Case



A Keynesian Cross

Adding Wealth Effects

- Assume now that households hold houses, with price P
- Assume that wealth affects the average propensity to consume, not the marginal propensity to consume
- $C_0 = C_0 \underbrace{(P)}_{+}$

A Keynesian Cross

Adding Wealth Effects

- Assume now that households hold houses, with price P
- Assume that wealth affects the average propensity to consume, not the marginal propensity to consume
- $C_0 = C_0 \underbrace{(P)}_{+}$

A Keynesian Cross

Adding Wealth Effects

- Assume now that households hold houses, with price P
- Assume that wealth affects the average propensity to consume, not the marginal propensity to consume
- $C_0 = C_0 \underbrace{(P)}_{+}$

A Keynesian Cross

Adding Wealth Effects



A Keynesian Cross

Adding Wealth Effects



A Keynesian Cross

Adding Wealth Effects



A Keynesian Cross

Adding Rich Wealth Effects

- Assume a more general consumption function $C(P, u)$
- Assume that little wealth (P low) implies a higher sensitivity of C to income $1 - u$ ...
- ... particularly so when income is low (u is high)
- (Idea # 2)

A Keynesian Cross

Adding Rich Wealth Effects

- Assume a more general consumption function $C(P, u)$
- Assume that little wealth (P low) implies a higher sensitivity of C to income $1 - u$ ...
- ... particularly so when income is low (u is high)
- (Idea # 2)

A Keynesian Cross

Adding Rich Wealth Effects

- Assume a more general consumption function $C(P, u)$
- Assume that little wealth (P low) implies a higher sensitivity of C to income $1 - u$ ...
- ... particularly so when income is low (u is high)
- (Idea # 2)

A Keynesian Cross

Adding Rich Wealth Effects

- Assume a more general consumption function $C(P, u)$
- Assume that little wealth (P low) implies a higher sensitivity of C to income $1 - u$ ...
- ... particularly so when income is low (u is high)
- (Idea # 2)

A Keynesian Cross

Adding Rich Wealth Effects



A Keynesian Cross

Adding Rich Wealth Effects



A Keynesian Cross

Adding Rich Wealth Effects



A Keynesian Cross

Adding Rich Wealth Effects



A Keynesian Cross

Adding Rich Wealth Effects



A Keynesian Cross

An Extreme Case

- Assume that houses price is so low that households cannot disconnect at all consumption from current income
- The consumption function is then $C = 1 - u$

A Keynesian Cross

An Extreme Case

- Assume that houses price is so low that households cannot disconnect at all consumption from current income
- The consumption function is then $C = 1 - u$

A Keynesian Cross

An Extreme Case



A Keynesian Cross

An Extreme Case



A Keynesian Cross

An Extreme Case

- The model posses a continuum of equilibria
- If we assume that the economy jumps between equilibria according to a sunspot, we have a link between wealth and volatility.

A Keynesian Cross

An Extreme Case

- The model posses a continuum of equilibria
- If we assume that the economy jumps between equilibria according to a sunspot, we have a link between wealth and volatility.

A Keynesian Cross

An Extreme Case



A Keynesian Cross

Stabilizing Policy in an Extreme Case

- In this case it is possible to design a simple and extremely efficient stabilizing policy:
  - Tax income at rate $1 - \tau$
  - Redistribute in a lumpsum way a fraction γ of the tax revenues $\tau(1 - u)$
  - $1 - \gamma$ percent of the tax revenues are lost

A Keynesian Cross

Stabilizing Policy in an Extreme Case

- In this case it is possible to design a simple and extremely efficient stabilizing policy:
  - Tax income at rate $1 - \tau$
  - Redistribute in a lumpsum way a fraction γ of the tax revenues $\tau(1 - u)$
  - $1 - \gamma$ percent of the tax revenues are lost

A Keynesian Cross

Stabilizing Policy in an Extreme Case

- In this case it is possible to design a simple and extremely efficient stabilizing policy:
  - Tax income at rate $1 - \tau$
  - Redistribute in a lumpsum way a fraction γ of the tax revenues $\tau(1 - u)$
  - $1 - \gamma$ percent of the tax revenues are lost

A Keynesian Cross

Stabilizing Policy in an Extreme Case

- In this case it is possible to design a simple and extremely efficient stabilizing policy:
  - Tax income at rate $1 - \tau$
  - Redistribute in a lumpsum way a fraction γ of the tax revenues $\tau(1 - u)$
  - $1 - \gamma$ percent of the tax revenues are lost

A Keynesian Cross

Stabilizing Policy in an Extreme Case



A Keynesian Cross

Stabilizing Policy in an Extreme Case



A Keynesian Cross

Stabilizing Policy in an Extreme Case



Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Three main ideas

1. Consumption depends on expected income - which depends itself on consumption (Idea # 1)
2. The level of an household wealth affects its ability to smooth consumption (Idea # 2)
3. Fluctuations are partly driven by sunspots (Idea # 3)

Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Three main ideas

1. Consumption depends on expected income - which depends itself on consumption (Idea # 1)
2. The level of an household wealth affects its ability to smooth consumption (Idea # 2)
3. Fluctuations are partly driven by sunspots (Idea # 3)

Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Three main ideas

1. Consumption depends on expected income - which depends itself on consumption (Idea # 1)
2. The level of an household wealth affects its ability to smooth consumption (Idea # 2)
3. Fluctuations are partly driven by sunspots (Idea # 3)

Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Idea # 1: Consumption depends on expected income - which depends itself on consumption

- modeled by assuming that labor supply is inelastic and that households commit to consumption

Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Idea # 2: The level of an household wealth affects its ability to smooth consumption

- Here there is more than the Permanent Income model:
  - Because consumption is chosen before income is known, houses can serve for precautionary savings.
  - But if their value is too low, unemployed households will have to go to costly credit.

Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Idea # 2: The level of an household wealth affects its ability to smooth consumption

- Here there is more than the Permanent Income model:
  - Because consumption is chosen before income is known, houses can serve for precautionary savings.
  - But if their value is too low, unemployed households will have to go to costly credit.

Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Idea # 2: The level of an household wealth affects its ability to smooth consumption

- Here there is more than the Permanent Income model:
  - Because consumption is chosen before income is known, houses can serve for precautionary savings.
  - But if their value is too low, unemployed households will have to go to costly credit.

Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Idea # 3: Fluctuations are partly driven by sunspots

- When wealth is low,
  - if unemployment is low: low savings $\rightsquigarrow$ high demand $\rightsquigarrow$ low unemployment
  - if unemployment is high: high savings $\rightsquigarrow$ low demand $\rightsquigarrow$ high unemployment
- Once multiple equilibria, easy to construct SSE

Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Idea # 3: Fluctuations are partly driven by sunspots

- When wealth is low,
  - if unemployment is low: low savings $\rightsquigarrow$ high demand $\rightsquigarrow$ low unemployment
  - if unemployment is high: high savings $\rightsquigarrow$ low demand $\rightsquigarrow$ high unemployment
- Once multiple equilibria, easy to construct SSE

Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Idea # 3: Fluctuations are partly driven by sunspots

- When wealth is low,
  - if unemployment is low: low savings $\rightsquigarrow$ high demand $\rightsquigarrow$ low unemployment
  - if unemployment is high: high savings $\rightsquigarrow$ low demand $\rightsquigarrow$ high unemployment
- Once multiple equilibria, easy to construct SSE

Jonathan and Fabrizio Contribution

Idea # 3: Fluctuations are partly driven by sunspots

- When wealth is low,
  - if unemployment is low: low savings $\rightsquigarrow$ high demand $\rightsquigarrow$ low unemployment
  - if unemployment is high: high savings $\rightsquigarrow$ low demand $\rightsquigarrow$ high unemployment
- Once multiple equilibria, easy to construct SSE

Some Comments

- Sunspot for modelling infrequent and abrupt changes of equilibria (recessions) and not quarter to quarter fluctuations
- Microevidence: The question is
  - "Did wealth-poor households reduce consumption more than rich households as unemployment rose during the Great Recession?"
  - This must be *ceteris paribus*
  - Aren't wealth rich agents less affected by unemployment risk? income risk?
- The Great Recession in the model:
  - 2006-2007: negative shock to the utility of houses (...)
  - a negative confidence shock in 2008
  - A bit hard to believe the story

Some Comments

- Sunspot for modelling infrequent and abrupt changes of equilibria (recessions) and not quarter to quarter fluctuations
- Microevidence: The question is
  - "Did wealth-poor households reduce consumption more than rich households as unemployment rose during the Great Recession?"
  - This must be *ceteris paribus*
  - Aren't wealth rich agents less affected by unemployment risk? income risk?
- The Great Recession in the model:
  - 2006-2007: negative shock to the utility of houses (...)
  - a negative confidence shock in 2008
  - A bit hard to believe the story

Some Comments

- Sunspot for modelling infrequent and abrupt changes of equilibria (recessions) and not quarter to quarter fluctuations
- Microevidence: The question is
  - "Did wealth-poor households reduce consumption more than rich households as unemployment rose during the Great Recession?"
  - This must be *ceteris paribus*
  - Aren't wealth rich agents less affected by unemployment risk? income risk?
- The Great Recession in the model:
  - 2006-2007: negative shock to the utility of houses (...)
  - a negative confidence shock in 2008
  - A bit hard to believe the story

Some Comments

- Sunspot for modelling infrequent and abrupt changes of equilibria (recessions) and not quarter to quarter fluctuations
- Microevidence: The question is
  - "Did wealth-poor households reduce consumption more than rich households as unemployment rose during the Great Recession?"
  - This must be *ceteris paribus*
  - Aren't wealth rich agents less affected by unemployment risk? income risk?
- The Great Recession in the model:
  - 2006-2007: negative shock to the utility of houses (...)
  - a negative confidence shock in 2008
  - A bit hard to believe the story

Some Comments

- Sunspot for modelling infrequent and abrupt changes of equilibria (recessions) and not quarter to quarter fluctuations
- Microevidence: The question is
  - "Did wealth-poor households reduce consumption more than rich households as unemployment rose during the Great Recession?"
  - This must be *ceteris paribus*
  - Aren't wealth rich agents less affected by unemployment risk? income risk?
- The Great Recession in the model:
  - 2006-2007: negative shock to the utility of houses (...)
  - a negative confidence shock in 2008
  - A bit hard to believe the story

Some Comments

- Sunspot for modelling infrequent and abrupt changes of equilibria (recessions) and not quarter to quarter fluctuations
- Microevidence: The question is
  - "Did wealth-poor households reduce consumption more than rich households as unemployment rose during the Great Recession?"
  - This must be *ceteris paribus*
  - Aren't wealth rich agents less affected by unemployment risk? income risk?
- The Great Recession in the model:
  - 2006-2007: negative shock to the utility of houses (...)
  - a negative confidence shock in 2008
  - A bit hard to believe the story

Some Comments

- Sunspot for modelling infrequent and abrupt changes of equilibria (recessions) and not quarter to quarter fluctuations
- Microevidence: The question is
  - "Did wealth-poor households reduce consumption more than rich households as unemployment rose during the Great Recession?"
  - This must be *ceteris paribus*
  - Aren't wealth rich agents less affected by unemployment risk? income risk?
- The Great Recession in the model:
  - 2006-2007: negative shock to the utility of houses (...)
  - a negative confidence shock in 2008
  - A bit hard to believe the story

Some Comments

- Sunspot for modelling infrequent and abrupt changes of equilibria (recessions) and not quarter to quarter fluctuations
- Microevidence: The question is
  - "Did wealth-poor households reduce consumption more than rich households as unemployment rose during the Great Recession?"
  - This must be *ceteris paribus*
  - Aren't wealth rich agents less affected by unemployment risk? income risk?
- The Great Recession in the model:
  - 2006-2007: negative shock to the utility of houses (...)
  - a negative confidence shock in 2008
  - A bit hard to believe the story

Some Comments

- Sunspot for modelling infrequent and abrupt changes of equilibria (recessions) and not quarter to quarter fluctuations
- Microevidence: The question is
  - "Did wealth-poor households reduce consumption more than rich households as unemployment rose during the Great Recession?"
  - This must be *ceteris paribus*
  - Aren't wealth rich agents less affected by unemployment risk? income risk?
- The Great Recession in the model:
  - 2006-2007: negative shock to the utility of houses (...)
  - a negative confidence shock in 2008
  - A bit hard to believe the story