EC9AA Term 3: Lectures on Economic Inequality Debraj Ray, University of Warwick, Summer 2023 Supplement 2 to Slides 1: Differential Savings Rates

Supplement 2: Differential Savings Rates

- Do the rich save more than the poor? (lifetime vs current income)
- Estimates from Survey of Consumer Finances (SCF):

	6-Yr Income Average	Instrumented By Vehicle Consumption
Quintile 1	1.4	2.8
Quintile 2	9.0	14.0
Quintile 3	11.1	13.4
Quintile 4	17.3	17.3
Quintile 5	23.6	28.6
Top 5%	37.2	50.5
Top 1%	51.2	35.6

Source: Dynan-Skinner-Zeldes (2004), they provide other estimates

$$r = \frac{[x(t)/x(0)]^{1/t}(1+g) - 1}{s}$$

- Some quick calculations for top 10% in the US:
- $\quad x_0=1/3$ in 1970, rises to $x_t=47/100$ in 2000.



$$r = \frac{[x(t)/x(0)]^{1/t}(1+g) - 1}{s}$$

- Some quick calculations for top 10% in the US:
- $_{\rm I\hspace{-.1em}I}$ $x_0=1/3$ in 1970, rises to $x_t=47/100$ in 2000.
- \blacksquare Estimate for $g\hbox{:}\ 2\%$ per year.
- Estimate from Dynan et al for s: 35% (optimistic).
- Can back out for r: r=9.7%.
- Inflation-adjusted rate of return on US stocks over 20th century: 6.5%
- $_{\mbox{\tiny II}}$ Much lower in the 1970s and 2000s, higher in the 1980s and 1990s.

$r = \frac{[x(t)/x(0)]^{1/t}(1+g) - 1}{s}$
$r = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \right) \right) \right)}{1} \right) \right) \right)} \right) \right)} \right)} \right)} \right)}}} \right) \right)}}}}}} \right) }$
·
Circillar relavilations for the 100
Similar calculations for top 1% in the US:
0.1400
$x_0 = 8/100$ in 1980, rises to $x_t = 18/100$ in 2005.
Estimate for g : 2% per year.
f s Estimate from Dynan et al for s : 51%.
f a Can back out for r : $r=10.5%$.
$[x(t)/x(0)]^{1/t}(1+o)-1$
$r=rac{[x(t)/x(0)]^{1/t}(1+g)-1}{\epsilon}$
$r = rac{[x(t)/x(0)]^{1/t}(1+g)-1}{s}$
$r = \frac{[x(t)/x(0)]^{1/t}(1+g)-1}{s}$ Try the top 0.1% for the United States:
■ Try the top 0.1% for the United States:
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \ \mbox{in 1980, rises to} \ x_t=8/100 \ \mbox{in 2007.}$
■ Try the top 0.1% for the United States:
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year.
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \ \mbox{in 1980, rises to} \ x_t=8/100 \ \mbox{in 2007.}$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year.
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$
Try the top 0.1% for the United States: $x_0=2.2/100 \text{ in 1980, rises to } x_t=8/100 \text{ in 2007.}$ Estimate for g : 2% per year. If these guys also save at 0.5, then $r=14.4\%!$

 $r = \frac{[x(t)/x(0)]^{1/t}(1+g) - 1}{}$ ■ Slightly better job for Europe, but not much. Top 10%: $x_0 = 29/100$ in 1980, rises to $x_t = 35/100$ in 2010. ${\color{red} \bullet}$ Estimate for $g{\scriptsize{:}}$ 2% per year. $_{\bullet}\;$ Estimate from Dynan et al for s: 35%. $_{\rm \bullet}$ Can back out for $r{:}\;r=7.5\%.$ lacksquare High relative to r in Europe. UK the highest at 5.3% over 20th century, others appreciably lower. $r = \frac{[x(t)/x(0)]^{1/t}(1+g) - 1}{r}$ ■ Finally, top 1% for the UK: $x_0=6/100$ in 1980, rises to $x_t=15/100$ in 2005. ${\color{red} \bullet}$ Estimate for $g{\scriptsize{:}}$ 2% per year. lacksquare Estimate from Dynan et al for s: 51%. ${\color{red} \bullet}$ Can back out for $r{:}\;r=11.4\%.$ Summary Differential savings rates explain some of the inequality, but far from all of it.