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## Using Surveys in Macro (I)

Application: How do households reason and make decisions when faced with unexpected and transitory income shocks of different sign and size?

## Survey use 1: Model selection

Which model, among several consistent ones, explains data patterns? We can ask people more directly about their "mode of functioning" and mental models.

Adjustment margins: what decisions - e.g. spending, (de)leveraging, saving, labor supply - are affected by the shock?

Motivations/Reasons: why do households choose to use or not certain adjustment margins?

Heterogeneity. Ask detailed questions about economic and financial circumstances, past salient events, perceptions, expectations, hurdles and constraints, goals...

## Using Surveys in Macro (II)

## Survey use 2: Estimate key parameters

Hypotheticals. Recover estimates that are hard to obtain using revealed behavior (e.g., iMPCs out of hypothetical income changes).

Experiments. Provide randomized info or framing (e.g., shift macro perceptions).
Higher-order beliefs. How do you think others react in some scenarios? Relevant for policy and expectations.

## Example: Estimating iMPCs from Survey Data

- Auclert et al. $(2018,2020)$ : a limited set of moments - iMPCs - are key sufficient statistics to study the GE propagation of shocks and policies.
- Matrix M of iMPCs:

$$
\mathbf{M}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}_{0}}{\partial Z_{0}} & \frac{\partial C_{0}}{\partial Z_{1}} & \frac{\partial C_{0}}{\partial Z_{2}} & . . \\
\frac{\partial C_{1}}{\partial Z_{0}} & \frac{\partial C_{1}}{\partial Z_{1}} & \frac{\partial C_{1}}{\partial Z_{2}} & . . \\
\frac{\partial C_{2}}{\partial Z_{0}} & . . & . & . . \\
. & . . & . . & . .
\end{array}\right]
$$

- Available data allow to estimate the first rows of the first column.
- Solution: match available estimates, then use models to extrapolate to other columns.
- Survey estimates allow to study the planned spending response to future anticipated income shocks $d Z_{1}, d Z_{2}, \ldots$
- Use these estimates to parametrize the infinite-dimensional matrix $\mathbf{M}$.


## The Sample

## Sample and Representativeness

- We designed and conducted a survey of around 3,000 U.S. households between November 2022 and January 2023.
- Survey distributed through Lucid Marketplace.
* Leading platform granting researchers access to multiple suppliers of survey takers.
- Focus on respondents who are in the labor force at the time of the interview and aged between 25 and 65.
- $\approx 25$ minutes to complete the survey.
- We set quotas on age, total annual household gross income, gender and race to target U.S. population shares from the CPS-ASEC (2022).
- Data quality: robust sample (exclude respondents based on abnormal time to complete, patterns in closed-ended questions, inconsistencies in open-ended questions).
- Older waves of data collection: survey on iMPCs estimation (May - October 2021; $\approx$ 1450 respondents); survey on model selection (February - March 2022; $\approx 900$ respondents).


## Sample and Representativeness: Targeted Characteristics

|  | U.S. Population | Survey |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Male | .53 | .53 |
|  |  |  |
| $25-29$ years old | .13 | .13 |
| 30-39 years old | .28 | .28 |
| 40-49 years old | .25 | .25 |
| $50-59$ years old | .24 | .24 |
| 60-65 years old | .1 | .1 |
| $\$ 0-\$ 19,999$ | .04 | .04 |
| $\$ 20,000-\$ 39,999$ | .11 | .11 |
| $\$ 40,000-\$ 69,999$ | .2 | .2 |
| $\$ 70,000-\$ 124,999$ | .29 | .29 |
| $\$ 125,000+$ | .36 | .36 |
|  |  |  |
| White | .61 | .73 |
| Black/African-American | .12 | .12 |
| Hispanic/Latino | .18 | .13 |
| Asian/Asian-American | .07 | .03 |
|  |  |  |
| Full time employed | .78 | .79 |
| Part time employed | .09 | .08 |
| Self-employed | .1 | .08 |
| Unemployed | .03 | .05 |
| U.S. total popluation | 260,329 | - |
| U.S. labor force, age 25-65 | 129,923 | - |
| Sample size | - | 2923 |

## Sample and Representativeness: Non-targeted Characteristics

|  |  | U.S. Population | Survey |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Primary residence: | ownership rate value (mean) value (median) | $\begin{gathered} .64 \\ 368000 \\ 243000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline .75 \\ 339000 \\ 325000 \end{gathered}$ |
| Business: | ownership rate <br> value (mean) <br> value (median) | $\begin{gathered} .13 \\ 1235000 \\ 105000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} .24 \\ 623000 \\ 300000 \end{gathered}$ |
| Checking accounts: | ownership rate <br> value (mean) <br> value (median) | $\begin{gathered} .94 \\ 10347 \\ 2500 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} .93 \\ 11728 \\ 4000 \end{gathered}$ |
| Total assets: | value (mean) <br> value (median) | $\begin{aligned} & 823000 \\ & 236000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1113000 \\ 507000 \end{gathered}$ |
| Mortgages on primary residence: | share with mortgages value (mean) value (median) | $\begin{gathered} .49 \\ 201000 \\ 150000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} .45 \\ 150000 \\ 138000 \end{gathered}$ |
| Credit card balances: | value (mean) value (median) | $\begin{aligned} & 6386 \\ & 3000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5872 \\ & 3250 \end{aligned}$ |
| Total debts: | share with debts value (mean) value (median) | $\begin{gathered} .86 \\ 166000 \\ 97000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} .73 \\ 152000 \\ 93000 \end{gathered}$ |

Tot. assets: real estate, HH shares in business, motor vehicles, checking \& short-term accounts, CDs, hedge funds, treasuries, bonds, stocks, pension accounts. Tot. debts: credit card balances, mortgages, motor vehicle loans, education loans, residual debts.

## Cross-Validation of Survey Responses

## Data Quality and Cross-Validations $\rightarrow$ Details here.

| Paper | Estimate | Sample | Value | Our estimate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Karger and Rajan (2021) | MPC out of the first EIP, 2 weeks | Facteus bank-account data | . 46 | . 51 (.022) |
| Baker et al. (2020) | MPC out of the first EIP, 10 days | SaverLife bank-account data | .25-. 35 |  |
| Misra et al. (2021) | MPC out of the first EIP, 1 week | Facteus data, ZIP code level | . 51 |  |
| Karger and Rajan (2021) | MPD out of the first EIP, 2 weeks | Facteus bank-account data | . 10 | . 3 (.021) |
| Karger and Rajan (2021) | MPC out of the second EIP, 2 weeks | Facteus bank-account data | . 39 | . 49 (.024) |
| Karger and Rajan (2021) | MPD out of the second EIP, 2 weeks | Facteus bank-account data | . 14 | . 29 (.022) |
| Patterson (2021) | MPC out of income loss due to unemp. | CEX, PSID | . 53 | $.58(.023)$ $.58(.042)$ <br> all concern unemp. |
| Ganong and Noel (2019) | $\Delta$ spending in first month of unemp. | JPMCI bank-account data | -. 06 | $\begin{array}{c\|c} \hline-.24(.02) & -.18(.051) \\ \text { all } & \text { concern unemp. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Kaplan et al. (2014) | Share of HtM households | SCF | . 31 | . 29 (.012) |
|  | Share of wealthy HtM out of total HtM | SCF | . 62 | . 63 (.035) |
| Chetty and Szeidl (2007) | Share of committed expenditures | CEX, PSID | 0.5 (update: 0.6 ) | . 62 (.005) |

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses.

## The Survey

## Survey flow



## iMPC and iMPD elicitation

| Please provide an estimate of your total household income, |
| :--- |
| after taxes and transfers, in 2021. |
| \$0- $\$ 14,999$ |
| $\$ 15,000-\$ 19,999$ |
| $\$ 20,000-\$ 24,999$ |
| $\$ 25,000-\$ 29,999$ |
| $\$ 30,000-\$ 39,999$ |
| $\$ 40,000-\$ 49,999$ |
| $\$ 50,000-\$ 59,999$ |
| $\$ 60,000-\$ 69,999$ |
| $\$ 70,000-\$ 79,999$ |
| \$ $\$ 80,000-\$ 99,999$ |
| $\$ 100,000-\$ 149,999$ |
| $\$ 150,000-\$ 249,999$ |
| $\$ 250,000$ or $90 r e$ |

# Quantitative iMPC and iMPD elicitation 

Suppose that today you learn that you and your household will receive an unexpected, one-time payment of approximately 10 percent of your total household annual income (after taxes and transfers). You can think of this payment as a government stimulus check, tax refund, bonus, inheritance, gift, or lottery win. This one-time payment, which will not be taxed, will be available on your bank account or as a check in your mailbox within a few days.

Now, consider ways in which you and your household could use this additional income:

1. Additional spending: purchases of durable goods (e.g., cars, furniture, jewelry, etc.) or non-durable goods and services that do not last for a long time (e.g., food, clothes, vacation, etc.) in addition to those you have already planned.
2. Additional debt repayments: principal and interest payments to reimburse outstanding debt (e.g., credit card debts, mortgages, student and consumer loans, etc.) in addition to those you have already planned.
3. Savings: amount of additional income that is neither spent nor used to repay debt. It is left for future use, for instance by depositing it in checking, savings, or pension accounts, or by purchasing financial assets.

We would like to understand how you and your household would allocate this one-time payment to additional spending and debt repayments in the next few quarters.

# Quantitative iMPC and iMPD elicitation 

Suppose that today you and your household receive a one-time payment of the following amount:
\$4500

Please enter how you would allocate this one-time payment to additional spending and debt repayments in different 3month periods. Money that you do not use for additional spending and debt repayments during these periods will saved for future use.
Additional spending

| Between today and 3 |
| :--- |
| months from now |
| Between 4 and 6 |
| months from now |


| Between 7 and 9 |
| :--- |
| months from now |


| Between 10 and 12 |
| :--- |
| months from now |

SavingS: $\$ 4500$

# Quantitative iMPC and iMPD elicitation 

Suppose that today you and your household receive a one-time payment of the following amount:
\$4500

Please enter how you would allocate this one-time payment to additional spending and debt repayments in different 3month periods. Money that you do not use for additional spending and debt repayments during these periods will saved for future use.

|  | Additional spending |
| :--- | :--- |
| Between today and 3 <br> months from now | 500 |
| Between 4 and 6 <br> months from now | 200 |
| Between 7 and 9 <br> months from now |  |
| Between 10 and 12 <br> months from now | 100 |

## Quantitative iMPC and iMPD elicitation

Consider a hypothetical scenario identical to the question above, except that today you learn that you and your household will receive a future one-time payment of approximately 10 percent of your total household annual income (after taxes and transfers). You can think of this payment as a government stimulus check, tax refund, bonus, inheritance, gift, or lottery win.

This one-time payment will be available on your bank account or as a check in your mailbox $\mathbf{3}$ months from now.

Will you and your household be able to increase spending and debt repayments over the next 3 months ahead of the one-time payment?


## Example: Responding to a positive income shock

Suppose that today you learn that you and your household will receive an unexpected one-time payment of $\mathbf{\$ 4 5 0 0}$ (e.g., a government stimulus check, tax refund, bonus, inheritance, gift, or lottery win). This one-time payment (which will not be taxed) will be available in your bank account or as a check in your mailbox in just a few days.

We will now ask you a few questions about how you and your household would react to this unexpected payment.

## Qualitative response to a positive income shock

Suppose that today you learn that you and your household will receive an unexpected one-time payment of $\mathbf{\$ 4 5 0 0}$ (e.g., a government stimulus check, tax refund, bonus, inheritance, gift, or lottery win). This one-time payment (which will not be taxed) will be available in your bank account or as a check in your mailbox injust a few days.

We will now ask you a few questions about how you and your household would react to this unexpected payment.

Would you do any of the following after receiving the unexpected one-time $\$ 4500$ payment?

You can spend all the money in one category or split it among categories.

| Repay Iate bills that we woulant normaly pay withous this extra money. | res | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nveet more than we usually would (eg., buying more stocks). | Yes | No |
| Put money into our amorgancy fund. | Yes | No |
| Lend money to someone else. | Yes | No |
| Give some money to someone else as a git or to charity. | Yes | No |
| Cut back on our workng hours for o while. | Yes | No |
| Make more repayments on our other bans (eg. mortgoges, auto bans, etc.). | Yes | No |
| Purchase basic necessaities onditems that we need and cannol currently afford. | Yes | No |
| Purchase some bigger-ticket items (e.g, oppiances, fumiture, car, etc) that we wouldnt otherwise purchase | Yos | No |
| spend on the things and actuvities that we like. | Yes | No |
| Put money aside to be able to spend more over the next few weeks or months. | Yes | No |
| Make more repayments on our creait card(s). | Yes | No |
| Put more money towards our long-term goals (eg. house purchase education or retirement) | Yes | No |

## Example: Responding to a positive income shock

Suppose that today you learn that you and your household will receive an unexpected one-time payment of $\mathbf{\$ 4 5 0 0}$ (e.g., a government stimulus check, tax refund, bonus, inheritance, gift, or lottery win). This one-time payment (which will not be taxed) will be available in your bank account or as a check in your mailbox in just a few days.

We will now ask you a few questions about how you and your household would react to this unexpected payment.

## Open-ended question

Is there any other action you would take in response to the unexpected one-time $\$ 4500$ payment?
$\square$

| You can spend all the money in one category or split categories. | it am |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Repay Iate bill that we wouldrit normally pay wenout this extra money- | res | No |
| Invest moro than we uevally would (eg. buying mare stocke). | yos | No |
| Put money into our emergency fund. | yes | No |
| Lend money to someore ese. | yes | No |
| Give some money to someone else as a gitt or to charity. | yes | No |
| Cut back on our waking hours for a while. | Yes | No |
| Make more repcyments on our other loans (e.g. mortgages, outo loons, etc). | Yes | No |
| Purchase batic nocesestios and iteme that wo neod and cannst currently afford | yot | No |
| Purchase some bigger-ticket liems (e.g, appliances, furniture, cat, etc.) that we wouldn't otherwise purchase. | Yes | No |
| Spend on the things and activities that we like. | Yes | No |
| Put money aside to be able to spend more over the next few weets cr months. | yes | No |
| Make more repoyments on out creat card(s). | Yes | No |
| Put more money towards cur long-term goals (e.g. house purchase, education or reifement). | Yes | No |

## Example: Responding to a positive income shock

Purchase basic necessities and items that we need and cannot currently afford;
Purchase some bigger-ticket items (e.g., appliances, furniture, car, etc.) that we wouldn't otherwise purchase;
Spend on things and activities that we like;
Make more repayments on our credit card(s);
Make more repayments on our other loans (e.g., mortgages, auto loans, etc.);
Repay late bills that we wouldn't normally pay without this extra money;
Put money into our emergency fund;
Put money aside to be able to spend more over the next few weeks or months;
Put more money towards our long-term goals (e.g., house purchase, education, or retirement);
Invest more than we usually would (e.g., buy more stocks);
Give some money to someone else as a gift or to charity;
Lend money to someone else;
Cut back on our working hours for a while

## Reasons for adjusting spending to a positive income shock

Why increase spending?
You answered that you would increase your spending in response to an unexpected $\$ 4500$ payment. How relevant are the following reasons for not increasing your spending by even more?
We dont like to splurge
too much when we get
exra money.

Why not increase spending by more?
You answered that you would increase your spending in response to an unexpected $\$ 4500$ payment. How relevant are the following reasons for not increasing your spending by even more?
Not at alt
relivant

## Reasons for adjusting spending to a positive income shock

## Why increase spending?

We would like to splurge on something nice;
We really need some items that we cannot otherwise afford;
We have been saving toward a larger purchase (e.g., a car, appliances etc.) and this unexpected payment allows us to purchase it;
We try to save towards our goals, so it's nice to have extra cash for spending;
Most of our wealth is invested and we don't like selling assets for spending. It's nice to have extra cash to spend more freely;
When we get extra money we like to spend it on higher-quality items or activities that we would not otherwise; We don't have time to think about how to invest or save that money or how else to use it, so we prefer to simply spend it.;
This amount of money is not enough to spend time thinking about;
When we receive some extra money, we cannot resist the temptation to buy something nice;
We like to enjoy what we currently have and not worry too much about future issues.;
We worry that prices will keep rising, so we prefer to use this money to buy things now

# Example: Responding to a positive income shock - Adjusting spending 

## Why not increase spending by more?

There is nothing else we currently need or want;
We don't like to splurge too much when we get extra money;
We try to maintain a relatively stable level of spending;
We don't want to think more about how to spend this money;
This amount of money is too little to spend more time thinking about how to spend it;
We are very self-disciplined in how we spend our money and we mostly stick to our plans; We don't like spending too much of any extra money because we worry about the future

## Adjustment Margins and MPCs

## Adjustment margins



- 4 margins of adjustment for each of the 2 shocks. $\rightarrow$ Distribution of number of margins here.
- Asymmetry in extensive margins: more spending \& hours adjustment for negative shock.
- Difficult to adjust hours of work down; possible to work overtime.


## iMPCs estimates



Size effects: MPCs decrease in size of the transfer (higher for \$1,000 fixed shock)

Sign effects: no difference on impact, but cumulating over one year

Relation to previous estimates: Auclert (2019) Italy annual MPC $\approx 0.45$; Fagereng et al. (2021) Norway annual MPC $\approx 0.5$; Fuster et al. (2021) quarterly MPC $\approx 0.1$;
Kaplan and Violante (2014) quarterly MPC $\approx$ 0.14 .

Avg reported MPCs out of an income shock.

## iMPDs estimates



Size effects: MPDs decrease in size of the transfer (higher for \$1,000 fixed shock)

Sign effects: on impact and cumulatively after one year

Relation to previous estimates: Kosar et al. (2022) NY Fed SCE find cumulative MPD slightly greater than cumulative MPC.

Avg reported MPDs out of an income shock.

## MPCs across survey waves

- Relatively stable estimates across waves.
- Smaller cumulative MPCs after Covid checks sent to households.



# Predicting MPCs from HH characteristics 

|  | iMPC (Q1) | iMPC (Y1) | iMPD (Y1) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fixed shock | $0.038^{* * *}$ | $0.047^{* *}$ | $0.049^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.012)$ | $(0.019)$ | $(0.022)$ |
| Age: 35-49 | 0.021 | $0.045^{*}$ | -0.001 |
|  | $(0.016)$ | $(0.025)$ | $(0.029)$ |
| Age: 50-65 | -0.005 | $-0.053^{*}$ | $0.138^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.017)$ | $(0.027)$ | $(0.032)$ |
| High education | 0.003 | 0.015 | 0.034 |
|  | $(0.016)$ | $(0.025)$ | $(0.030)$ |
| HH with children | 0.002 | $0.046^{* *}$ | -0.039 |
|  | $(0.015)$ | $(0.023)$ | $(0.027)$ |
| High income | -0.010 | 0.005 | $-0.051^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.016)$ | $(0.026)$ | $(0.031)$ |
| High liquid assets | -0.003 | 0.020 | -0.036 |
|  | $(0.015)$ | $(0.024)$ | $(0.028)$ |
| High cred card debt | -0.016 | $-0.050^{* *}$ | $0.051^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.013)$ | $(0.020)$ | $(0.023)$ |
| High Illiquid Assets | -0.000 | $0.060^{* *}$ | -0.035 |
|  | $(0.015)$ | $(0.024)$ | $(0.028)$ |
| High illiquid debt | $-0.029^{* *}$ | $-0.073^{* * *}$ | 0.012 |
|  | $(0.012)$ | $(0.020)$ | $(0.025)$ |
| Observations | 1179 | 1170 | 860 |
| Adjusted $R^{2}$ | 0.012 | 0.085 | 0.089 |

More difficult to predict impact MPCs than cumulative (one-year) MPCs.

- Timing variation across households.


## Demographics, income \& assets

- Age (life-cycle component): older HHs have lower MPCs, higher MPDs. High MPCs in middle-age.
- Income: high income HHs have lower MPDs. No role for MPCs
- Liquidity: high credit card debt HHs have lower MPCs and higher MPDs (in line with Kosar et al., 2022).
- High illiquid assets \& low illiquid debts HHs have higher MPCs; HHs with children have higher cumulative MPCs.


## Predicting MPCs from HH characteristics

|  | iMPC (Q1) | iMPC (Y1) | iMPD (Y1) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low self-control | 0.008 | $0.068^{* *}$ | -0.038 |
|  | $(0.017)$ | $(0.027)$ | $(0.030)$ |
| Risk lover | 0.014 | 0.032 | -0.009 |
|  | $(0.014)$ | $(0.023)$ | $(0.027)$ |
| Patient | 0.008 | -0.004 | 0.006 |
|  | $(0.013)$ | $(0.021)$ | $(0.024)$ |
| Concern retirement | 0.006 | -0.022 | $0.055^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.016)$ | $(0.025)$ | $(0.029)$ |
| High commitments | 0.013 | 0.007 | $0.048^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.013)$ | $(0.020)$ | $(0.024)$ |
| High income risk | 0.007 | 0.004 | 0.009 |
|  | $(0.017)$ | $(0.026)$ | $(0.031)$ |
| High planned investments | -0.008 | 0.020 | $0.054^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.013)$ | $(0.020)$ | $(0.024)$ |
| Not enough for basic needs | -0.013 | $-0.062^{* *}$ | $0.104{ }^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.019)$ | $(0.029)$ | $(0.034)$ |
| Observations | 1174 | 1165 | 856 |
| Adjusted $R^{2}$ | 0.008 | 0.092 | 0.114 |

## Preferences, beliefs, and goals:

- Preferences: low self control have higher MPCs.
- Concern retirement: predicts higher MPDs.
- High commitments \& high planned investments: higher cumulative MPD.
- Not enough for basic needs: lower cumulative MPC; higher cumulative iMPD.

Note: we control for demographics, income \& assets. $\rightarrow$ Definitions here.

Heterogeneity in models across households

## Reasons: why adjust/not adjust spending out of a positive shock?



## Reasons: why adjust/not adjust spending out of a negative shock?



Note: scale from "not at all relevant" (light color) to "extremely relevant" (dark color).

## Classifying Households into Types $\rightarrow$ Details on defrititions here.

- Smoothers (24\%):
smooth spending in response to the positive and negative shock
are unconstrained (sufficient savings, low debts, have enough for essential purchases).
- Behavioral (21\%):
spend the money when positive shock or cut spending when negative shock because do not want to spend time/effort thinking about how to adjust to income shock.
follow rules of thumb.
- Constrained (6\%):
are constrained (need to adjust spending on essential items when negative shock, cannot easily borrow, have insufficient savings).


## MPCs of different household types



## MPDs of different household types



Predicting models from HH characteristics - I

|  | Smooth (P \& N ) | Behavioral (P \& N) | Constrained ( P \& N ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fixed shock | $\begin{aligned} & 0.028^{*} \\ & (0.016) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.006 \\ & (0.015) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.001 \\ & (0.009) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Age: 35-49 | $\begin{aligned} & -0.006 \\ & (0.022) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.025 \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.012 \\ (0.012) \end{gathered}$ | Smoothers: |
| Age: 50-65 | $\begin{gathered} 0.079 * * * \\ (0.022) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.087^{* * *} \\ (0.021) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.011 \\ (0.012) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| High education | $\begin{gathered} 0.018 \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.002 \\ (0.019) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.003 \\ (0.011) \end{gathered}$ | are older; have higher liquid and illiquid assets; lower debt. |
| HH with children | $\begin{gathered} -0.067^{* * *} \\ (0.019) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.064^{* * *} \\ (0.018) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.009 \\ (0.010) \end{gathered}$ | Behavioral individuals: |
| High income | $\begin{aligned} & -0.015 \\ & (0.021) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.062^{* * *} \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.052^{* * *} \\ (0.011) \end{gathered}$ | - are younger; have higher income; higher debt |
| High liquid assets | $\begin{gathered} 0.116^{* * *} \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \\ (0.019) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.061^{* * *} \\ (0.011) \end{gathered}$ | Constrained individuals: |
| High cred card debt | $\begin{gathered} -0.078^{* * *} \\ (0.017) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.069 * * * \\ (0.016) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.030^{* * *} \\ (0.009) \end{gathered}$ | - are poorer; have lower liquid and illiquid assets; |
| High Illiquid Assets | $\begin{gathered} 0.054^{* * *} \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ (0.019) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ (0.011) \end{gathered}$ | have higher credit card (but not other) debt. |
| High illiquid debt | $\begin{gathered} -0.054^{* * *} \\ (0.017) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.033^{* *} \\ & (0.016) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ (0.009) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Observations Adjusted $R^{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2668 \\ & 0.052 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2668 \\ & 0.077 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2668 \\ & 0.067 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |

## Predicting models from HH characteristics - II

|  | Smooth ( P \& N ) | Behavioral ( $\mathrm{P} \& \mathrm{~N}$ ) | Constrained ( P | Smoothers: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low self-control | $\begin{aligned} & -0.037^{*} \\ & (0.022) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.113^{* * *} \\ & (0.021) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.024^{* *} * \\ & (0.012) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Risk lover | $\begin{gathered} -0.002 \\ (0.018) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.047^{* * *} \\ (0.017) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.015 \\ (0.010) \end{gathered}$ | investments; higher self-control |
| Patient | $\begin{gathered} -0.024 \\ (0.017) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.012 \\ (0.016) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.019^{* *} \\ (0.009) \end{gathered}$ | Behavioral individuals: |
| Concern retirement | $\begin{aligned} & -0.027 \\ & (0.021) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.052^{* * *} \\ & (0.019) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ (0.011) \end{gathered}$ | - report lower self-control, lower risk aversion, |
| High commitments | $\begin{gathered} -0.014 \\ (0.017) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.021 \\ (0.016) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.021^{* *} \\ & (0.009) \end{aligned}$ | lower planned investments. |
| High income risk | $\begin{gathered} -0.059 * * * \\ (0.022) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.020 \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.037 * * * \\ & (0.012) \end{aligned}$ | Constrained individuals: |
| High planned investments | $\begin{gathered} 0.057^{* * *} \\ (0.017) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.051^{* * *} \\ (0.016) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.019^{* *} \\ & (0.009) \end{aligned}$ | - report lower patience; higher commitments; |
| Not enough for basic needs | $\begin{gathered} -0.065^{* * *} \\ (0.023) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.014 \\ (0.022) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.085^{* * *} \\ & (0.012) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | higher income risk, lower planned investments; and scarcity of resources for basic needs. |
| Observations <br> Adjusted $R^{2}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2659 \\ 0.082 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2659 \\ & 0.140 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2659 \\ & 0.106 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $R^{2}$ consistently low. |

Resolving Puzzles

## Spending behavior of the constrained

- How do strongly constrained households respond to transfers?
- Recent evidence shows smaller spending responses to transfers than previously estimated
- Parker et al. (2022) use the Consumer Expenditure Interview Survey. Find quarterly MPCs $\approx 15 \%$ out of the EIPs (similar to us during that period), smaller than previous estimates
- Kosar et al. (2023) use NY Fed special survey modules during Covid and show that more constrained households focus on debt repayments rather than spending upon receipt of transfers
- Both papers suggest the stimulus checks might be largely used for insurance purposes rather than spending
- In our data we jointly observe
- proxies for constraints (e.g., respondents' self-reported need for basic goods)
- their reported MPCs and MPDs
- the reasoning (models) they use when adjusting to income shocks


## Spending behavior of the constrained: iMPCs



Avg reported MPCs out of an income shock by group.

## Spending behavior of the constrained: iMPDs



Constrained respondents also have significantly larger MPDs, both on impact and cumulatively

Jointly, results confirm that constrained households favor using transfers to deleverage rather than to increase spending
Our data on reasoning suggest why:

- $\approx 35 \%$ increase spending because "they really need some items"
- $\approx 70 \%$ increase savings or deleverage out of "precautionary" motives
main priority when receiving transfers is to create buffer and/or relieve some constraints by deleveraging (self-insurance).


## The liquidity puzzle

- Why do we observe high MPCs for liquid HHs?
- Tabulate reasons of low vs high liquid assets HHs who have high cumulative MPCs (i.e., above median conditional on $M P C>0$ ).
- Different ranking of reasons and different shares:
- Low liquidity HHs: more likely to spend out of need.
- High liquidity HHs: more likely to splurge, spend because have term liquidity constraint, and want to make a lumpy purchase.

|  | Low liquid assets |  | High liquid assets |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reasons rank | Reasons | Shares (s.e.) | Reasons | Shares (s.e.) |
| $(1)$ | Splurge | $.46(.04)$ | Long-Term Goals | $.65(.03)$ |
| $(2)$ | Long-Term Goals | $.46(.04)$ | Splurge | $.53(.03)$ |
| $(3)$ | Behavioral | $.42(.04)$ | Behavioral | $.42(.03)$ |
| $(4)$ | Need | $.36(.04)$ | Lumpy | $.35(.03)$ |
| $(5)$ | Inflation | $.33(.04)$ | Need | $.29(.03)$ |
| $(6)$ | Lumpy | $.24(.03)$ | Inflation | $.26(.03)$ |

## The coholding puzzle

- Gomes et al. (2022) with SCF: $\approx 30 \%$ of U.S. credit card holders who revolve debt have liquid assets exceeding their outstanding balance.
- Our sample: $\approx 60 \%$ of card holders who revolve debt have liquid assets (checking + short-term accounts) exceeding their outstanding balance (but subject to measurement error).
- $21 \%$ of all sample; $26 \%$ of all with credit card.
- Consider only respondents who do not repay credit card debt when receiving the positive income shock (i.e., who behave as coholders): $\approx 17 \%$.
- Various explanations in the literature for this puzzling behavior: cash needed to purchase some items (Telyukova and Wright, 2008); concerns about future access to credit (Fulford, 2015; Druedahl and Jorgensen, 2018; Gorbachev and Luengo-Prado, 2019); disjoint decision making within HH (Bertaut et al., 2009).
- In our survey: ask co-holders why they behave in such a way; directly elicit which explanation applies.


## Why do people engage in coholding?



## Coholding puzzle for low and high income HHs

- $50 \%$ of coholders are high-income.
- Tabulate reasons of low vs high income.
- Different ranking of reasons:
- Preference for holding cash common to both.
- High income: "realize mistake" and have "already planned covering credit card balances."
- Low income: "need to prioritize other debts first."

|  | Low income |  | High income |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reasons rank | Reasons | Shares (s.e.) | Reasons | Shares (s.e.) |
| $(1)$ | Like to keep cash | $.3(.04)$ | Like to keep cash | $.36(.05)$ |
| $(2)$ | Use cash to repay other debts first | $.21(.04)$ | Realize that this is a mistake | $.2(.04)$ |
| $(3)$ | Safe to keep cash for unexpected expenses | $.21(.04)$ | Safe to keep cash for unexpected expenses | $.18(.04)$ |
| $(4)$ | Realize that this is a mistake | $.11(.03)$ | Already planned covering outstanding balance | $.13(.03)$ |
| $(5)$ | Costly to take cash from check account | $.11(.03)$ | Hold extra cash for some planned expense | $.13(.03)$ |
| $(6)$ | Hold extra cash for some planned expense | $.11(.03)$ | Manage accounts separately in HH | $.13(.03)$ |

## Conclusion

Surveys can help us understand why households act the way they do.
Can disentangle observationally equivalent models

Households follow heterogeneous models.
We can understand some puzzles better by asking households directly.
Survey responses can be cross-validated: key feature is that hypotheticals respondents are asked about are not too far from their daily choices.

## Thank you!

- Comprehensive guide: "How to Run Surveys: A guide to creating your own identifying variation and revealing the invisible." (socialeconomicslab.org/how-to-run-surveys/)

- More projects: socialeconomicslab.org


## Appendix

## Example: Responding to a positive income shock - Adjusting debts $\rightarrow$ Go back here.

## Why repay debts?

We have too many outstanding loans and debts;
We have maxed out or are close to maxing out our credit card(s);
We want to maintain or improve our credit score;
We are late on our credit card payments/bills or loan payments;
We want to make sure that if we need to borrow or take out credit again in the future, we will be able to do so;
We don't like having debt so we try to reduce them whenever we can;
We need to repay friends or family members who lent us money;
We worry about what could happen and that we may not be able to repay our bills or debts in the future. So, we prefer paying whatever we can now

## Example: Responding to a positive income shock - Adjusting debts $\rightarrow$ Go back here.

## Why not repay more debts?

We do not have any additional outstanding bills, credit card payments, or other overdue loan payments; We do not have any outstanding loans or debts;
The interest rates on all our loans are low;
Even if we have some outstanding bills, credit card payments, or other loan payments, we already have a plan for how to repay them over time;
We mostly stick to our regular monthly payments for all our loans or credit cards. It is too complicated to make any change to our plans;
This amount of money wouldn't make much of a difference so we'd rather not think about which additional loans to repay;
Even if we have some additional outstanding bills, credit card payments, or other loan payments on which we are late, we don't want to think about it more now

## Example: Responding to a positive income shock - Adjusting savings $\rightarrow$ Go back here.

## Why save?

In order to meet our long-term goals, we need to save as much as we can;
We don't have as much in savings as we'd like right now;
We like saving extra money whenever we can;
We are usually not able to save as much as we would like;
We worry about unexpected things that can happen in the future, so we'd rather save the money;
We worry that in the future we may struggle to access credit (e.g., obtain a loan or credit card) in case we need some money. So, we prefer to save this money;
We want to invest and take advantage of the current market returns and rates;
We don't need to buy anything right now or over the next several months that we haven't already budgeted for; We plan to use the money for some purchases or activities in a few months, but not now;
We are worried about rising prices, so we prefer to save for future needs

## Example: Responding to a positive income shock - Adjusting savings $\rightarrow$ Go back here.

## Why not save more?

We don't need to save more;
We are well on track to meet our financial goals;
We don't worry too much about future problems because we have enough savings if something comes up;
We would like to save more, but we don't want to think about it right now;
We wouldn't be able to invest more of this money well right now;

## Example: Responding to a positive income shock - Adjusting work $\rightarrow$ Go back here

## Why reduce work hours?

Our main jobs have flexible hours and we can easily adjust our working hours from month to month; We have second jobs with flexible hours and can easily adjust our working hours from month to month; We already work overtime, so we'd like to reduce our work hours; We usually work extra hours in some paid activity (such as freelance, driving for a ride-sharing company, babysitting, etc.) that we would be willing to cut down if we could.

## Example: Responding to a positive income shock - Adjusting work

## Why not reduce work hours by more?

Our current jobs do not allow us to adjust hours more;
We do not work extra hours in any paid activity (such as in a freelance, driving or ride-sharing company babysitting, etc.);
We do not want to reduce our income from working by more;
It's too complicated to change our work hours further.

## Karger and Rajan (2021) $\rightarrow$ Go back here

Object of estimation: MPC and MPD out of First\&Second EIPs.

## Elicitation in the paper:

- Horizon: 2 weeks after EIP receipt.
- Facteus (standardized) transaction-level data from multiple banks.

Paper estimate:
MPC $($ First $/$ Second EIP $)=0.46 / 0.39$.

## Our elicitation:

- Report amount received of (first, second, or third) EIP.
- Report (out of every \$ 100 received as EIP) amount allocated to durable, non-durable spending, debt-repayments, savings.
- Horizon: 3 months after EIP receipt $\Longrightarrow$ estimate an upper bound.


## Our estimate:

MPC $($ First $/$ Second EIP $)=0.51 / 0.30$.

## Patterson (2021) $\rightarrow$ Go back here.

Object of estimation: MPC out of income losses following unemployment.

## Elicitation in the paper:

- Horizon $\approx 1$ year.
- MPC at the individual level.
- PSID data (total spending imputed from CEX following Blundell et al., 2008).
- Unemployment used as instrument of income drop.


## Our elicitation:

- Report individual labor earnings in 2020.
- Hypothetical scenario: unemployment with loss $\approx 30 \%$ of labor earnings.
- Report spending reduction in food, non-durables, durables, over next 12 months.

Paper estimate:
MPC for total spending $=0.53$.

Our estimate:
MPC for total spending $=0.58$.

## Ganong and Noel (2019) $\rightarrow$ Go back here

Object of estimation: Monthly drop in non-durable spending at unemployment onset, before UI receipt.

## Elicitation in the paper:

- Horizon: 1 month before UI receipt.
- JPMCI bank-account data.
- Monthly frequency at HH level.

Paper estimate:
Drop in spending $=6 \%$.

## Our elicitation:

- Report HH non-durable spending over last month.
- Hypothetical scenario: unemployment with labor earnings loss, no UI before 1 month.
- Modify spending? No/increase/decrease.
- If increase/decrease: report planned non-durable spending over next month.


## Our estimate:

Drop in spending $=24 \%$.

## Number of adjustment margins selected

Tabulation of Positive Adjustment Margins


Tabulation of Negative Adjustment Margins


## Reasons: why adjust/not adjust debts?



Note: scale from "not at all relevant" (light color) to "extremely relevant" (dark color)

## Reasons: why adjust/not adjust savings?



## Reasons: why adjust/not adjust hours?



Note: scale from "not at all relevant" (light color) to "extremely relevant" (dark color)

## Some variable definitions I $\rightarrow$ Go back here.

## Tables - Part 1

- Income: indicator for HH total net income in 2021 above median.
- Liquid assets: sum of checking and short-term accounts. Indicators for being above median.
- Illiquid assets: total assets minus liquid assets. Indicators for being above median.
- Illiquid debts: total debts minus credit card debts. Indicators for being above median.


## Some variable definitions II $\rightarrow$ Go back here.

## Tables - Part 2

- Low self control: respondent regrets purchase "often" or "very often" (self-reported measure of self-control, followingParker (2017)).
- Patient: indicator for patience above median value (self-reported measure of impatience, following Falk et al., 2018).
- Risk lover: indicator for risk-loving above median value (according to self-reported measure of risk-loving, following Falk et al., 2018).
- Concern retirement: respondent "extremely concerned" about retirement.
- High commitments: indicator for committed expenditures above median value.
- High income risk: respondent "extremely uncertain" to "neither certain nor uncertain" about future HH income.
- High planned investment: indicator for planned investments (retirement, housing, durables, education, health, other) above median value.
- Not enough for basic needs: self-report not having enough money for basic needs.


## Details on model definition I $\rightarrow$ Go back here.

- Smooth (P \& N):
- Positive shock. Unconstrained \& Smoother: not increase spending by more since "don't need anything now," "keep spending stable," "stick to plans and self-disciplined," "don't like to splurge;" or don't repay debts by more since "Don't have bills, credit card/loan payments," "Don't have loans/debts," "Low interest on loans," "Already have plan to repay;" or don't save by more since 'No need to save more," "On track with financial goals," "Have enough savings for future concerns."
- Negative shock. Unconstrained: not cutting spending by more since "Keep spending stable," "Don't cut spending on non-essential items," "Keep spending habits," or borrow since "Able to repay debt quickly," "Able to repay debt over time;" or dip into savings since "Already on track with financial goals," "Have enough savings for future concerns."


## Details on model definition II $\rightarrow$ Go back here.

- Behavioral (P \& N):
- Positive shock. Behavioral: increase spending, or not repaying debts, or not saving since "don't have time to think how to repay debts or save," "too little money to think how to repay debts or save."
- Negative shock. Behavioral: cut spending since "Don't have time to think how to adjust in other ways," "Easier to cut spending than to adjust in other ways."
- Constrained (P \& N):
- Positive shock. Constrained: increase spending since "really need some items;" or repay debts since "Have too many debts," "Maxed out credit cards," "Late on payments/bills," "Repay family/friends;" or save since "Would like more savings," "Cannot usually save as would like."
- Negative shock. Constrained: cut spending since "Need to cut spending on essential items;" or not cutting spending by more since "Cannot cut spending on essential items;" or not borrowing since "Cannot take bank loan," "Cannot put on credit card," "Cannot borrow from family/friends;" or not dipping into savings since "Don't have enough savings."

Number of reasons selected: positive shock, spending margin

Tabulation of reasons for increasing spending


Tabulation of reasons for not increasing spending by more


