



HAL
open science

Further evidence of excess sensitivity of consumption?. Non-separability among goods and heterogeneity across households

Joaquín Alegre, Llorenç Pou

► **To cite this version:**

Joaquín Alegre, Llorenç Pou. Further evidence of excess sensitivity of consumption?. Non-separability among goods and heterogeneity across households. *Applied Economics*, 2008, 40 (07), pp.931-948. 10.1080/00036840600749896 . hal-00582073

HAL Id: hal-00582073

<https://hal.science/hal-00582073>

Submitted on 1 Apr 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Further evidence of excess sensitivity of consumption?. Non-separability among goods and heterogeneity across households

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-06-0082.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
JEL Code:	D12 - Consumer Economics: Empirical Analysis < D1 - Household Behavior and Family Economics < D - Microeconomics, E21 - Consumption Saving < E2 - Consumption, Saving, Production, Employment, and Investment < E - Macroeconomics and Monetary Economics, D91 - Intertemporal Consumer Choice Life Cycle Models and Saving < D9 - Intertemporal Choice and Growth < D - Microeconomics
Keywords:	permanent income model, excess sensitivity, separability, heterogeneity

powered by ScholarOne
Manuscript Central™

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **Full title: Further evidence of excess sensitivity of consumption?.**
9 **Non-separability among goods and heterogeneity**
10 **across households**
11

12
13
14 **Running title: The excess sensitivity of consumption to predictable income**
15 **with Spanish data**
16

17
18 **Authors:**
19

20
21 **JOAQUÍN ALEGRE**
22

23 *Department of Applied Economics, University of the Balearic Islands, Spain*
24

25 *Mailing address: Edifici Jovellanos-Campus UIB, Crta. Valldemossa Km. 7.5, 07122*
26

27 *Palma de Mallorca, Illes Balears, Spain.*
28

29
30 **LLORENÇ POU (corresponding author)**
31

32 *Department of Applied Economics, University of the Balearic Islands, Spain*
33

34 *Mailing address: Edifici Jovellanos-Campus UIB, Crta. Valldemossa Km. 7.5, 07122*
35

36 *Palma de Mallorca, Illes Balears, Spain.*
37

38
39 *E-mail: llorens.pou@uib.es*
40

41
42 **ABSTRACT**
43

44
45 The standard theoretical framework for analysing households' intertemporal decisions is
46 the life-cycle/permanent income model. Among its implications, testing the model allows
47 to analyse the response of consumption to fiscal policy. However, the empirical literature
48 with microdata has yielded mixed results. This paper examines the sensitivity of the
49 results to the assumption of separability among goods and of homogeneity across
50 households. For that purpose, we test a rational expectations permanent income model
51 with household data drawn from the Spanish Family Expenditure Survey. This survey
52 contains detailed information on total expenditure, and the income presents large,
53 exogenous quarterly changes due to an institutional feature. The paper shows that
54 assuming separability among commodities biases the test against the model. When
55 separability is not imposed, we show that the rejection of the model depends on
56 heterogeneity across households in terms of their members being unemployed or not. For
57 those households permanently employed, the model cannot be rejected whatever their
58 income status.
59
60

1. Introduction

Since Robert Hall's paper (1978), most studies of consumption have focused on Euler equations. The rational expectations permanent income hypothesis (henceforth the REPIH) states that households incorporate any available information into consumer-related decision making. Therefore, changes in household consumption should not respond to predicted income growth. In this sense, a tax policy's ability to affect the aggregate demand depends on the acceptance of the REPIH: if households are foresighted, only unexpected changes affecting their permanent income will modify current consumption.

Most of the early studies that tested Hall's model used aggregate data (e.g. Flavin, 1981; Hayashi, 1982; Campbell and Mankiw, 1989). However, the possibility of controlling for heterogeneity across households and of avoiding distortions caused by the aggregation of micro-level non-linear relations has gradually directed analyses of the intertemporal allocation of consumption towards the field of microeconomics, which also happens to be the level at which theories were formulated (Heckman, 2001). A review of empirical literature based on household data indicates that the rejection of the model is sensitive to the measure of consumption analysed (Lage, 1991; Ziliak, 1998; Parker, 1999; Soulesles, 1999, 2002), to the set of imposed separability hypotheses, mainly centred on leisure/consumption-type decision making (Attanasio and Browning, 1995; Attanasio and Weber, 1995) and on decisions associated with the family's demographic composition (Attanasio and Browning, 1995; Attanasio and Weber, 1995), or to the power of the instruments used to predict income growth (Altonji and Siow, 1987; Shea, 1995; Lusardi, 1996; Soulesles, 1999).

1
2
3 Although the overall rejection of the model has been reduced by taking into account the
4
5 above aspects, there is no sufficient consensus as yet (Deaton, 1992; Browning and
6
7 Lusardi, 1996; Attanasio, 1999). For this reason, in recent years a number of different
8
9 studies have emerged that take advantage of existing “institutional features” associated
10
11 with household income. These studies analyse situations in which individuals have prior
12
13 knowledge of changes in their income. This can be construed as a “natural experiment” of
14
15 the REPIH: if individuals are forewarned of variations in their income, their consumption
16
17 patterns should not vary when their income changes.
18
19

20
21
22 These articles have mainly followed two alternative approaches. One consists of testing
23
24 households’ response to announced tax changes¹ (Shapiro and Slemrod, 1995; Soulesles,
25
26 2002).² The problem with this approach resides in the difficulty in discerning whether tax
27
28 changes are permanent or transitory (Watanabe *et al.*, 2001). A second approach has
29
30 focused on households’ reactions to intrayear fluctuations in income. Thus Paxson (1993)
31
32 and Browning and Collado (2001) compare expenditure patterns across the year in
33
34 Thailand and Spain, respectively, between households with an uneven intrayear income
35
36 distribution and those with a more homogenous one. Other authors have analysed the
37
38 excess sensitivity of consumption to intrayear income variations caused by tax refunds
39
40 (Soulesles, 1999; Hsieh, 2003) or by the cessation of Social Security taxes (Parker, 1999).
41
42 Finally, Stephens (2003, 2006) examines whether spending is sensitive to the time of
43
44 month when people receive their pay in Great Britain and their Social Security cheques in
45
46 the United States, respectively. Overall, the results of this second approach are not
47
48 conclusive, with fewer studies that fail to reject the REPIH (Paxson, 1993; Browning and
49
50 Collado, 2001; Hsieh, 2003). Nevertheless, in some of these articles income changes are
51
52 small. In this context, if individuals must incur big costs in order to smooth consumption,
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 ¹ A similar proposal is that made by Levenson (1996), who analyses whether households in Taiwan increased
60 their consumption after an announced reform to the Social Security that represented windfall retirements/severance benefits.

1
2
3 then the rejection of the REPIH might be due to a near-rational type of behaviour (Thaler,
4
5 1990).
6
7

8
9
10 This paper aims to contribute towards testing the REPIH by taking advantage of
11
12 information available in the Spanish Family Expenditure Survey (Encuesta Continua de
13
14 Presupuestos Familiares, hereafter the ECPF), both in terms of income and expenditure
15
16 data, so that our test of the REPIH overcomes some of the shortcomings highlighted
17
18 above.
19

20
21
22 Most Spanish wage earners (and all pensioners) face periodic intrayear fluctuations in
23
24 income with which they are perfectly familiar, both in terms of when they will occur and
25
26 in the amount concerned. This is due to the existence of two extra payments (one in July
27
28 and another in late December).³ Since these extra payments are systematic, exogenous to
29
30 individuals and non-performance related, there is no point in distinguishing between
31
32 permanent and transitory quarterly variations in income for those individuals that are
33
34 retired or permanently employed. From this point of view, this article complements other
35
36 studies which analyse institutional features affecting income based on U.S. micro data (
37
38 Soulesles, 1999; Parker, 1999; Hsieh, 2003) and Spanish micro data (Browning and
39
40 Collado, 2001).⁴
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 With regard to the arguments of the utility function, in this paper we do not assume
48
49 separability among commodities. This paper takes into account the relationship among
50
51 the three categories that together make up total spending (food, other nondurable goods
52
53 and services, and durables). The purpose is to test whether the rejection of the REPIH
54
55

56
57 ² Poterba (1988) and Wilcox (1989) are examples of pioneering studies in this type of REPIH test, using
58 aggregate data.

59 ³ See Browning and Collado (2001) for a description of the annotation of the extra payments in the ECPF.

60 ⁴ As commented below, the main differences between this study and that of Browning and Collado (2001) are
that this paper does not assume separability among goods, whilst heterogeneity across households is
contemplated via the sample's segmentation. Finally, this study includes households with unemployed members
and households where the spouse works.

1
2
3 detected in other studies can be accounted for by the omission of spending variables as
4 regressors, since this hypothesis is systematically overlooked in the literature (Browning
5 and Lusardi, 1996; Attanasio, 1999), partially because this information is lacking in many
6
7
8
9
10 databases.

11
12
13
14 Finally, we also explore the influence of heterogeneity across households on the excess
15 sensitivity of consumption to income. Along some of the most commonly used criteria
16 (based on income level or age) to segment the sample, this paper also tests whether the
17
18
19 results are driven by transitory income caused by transitions into unemployment.⁵
20
21

22
23
24
25 The results of this paper show that the imposition of separability among goods biases the
26 test against the REPIH. When the extended model that includes groups of commodities as
27 regressors is tested, the rejection of the model is not extensive to the whole sample.
28
29
30 Unlike, its rejection is dependent on the chosen source of heterogeneity across
31 households. In this respect, our results allow to reconcile papers that reject the REPIH
32
33
34 with those that fail to reject it, even when using the same database; the REPIH is rejected
35
36
37 when we split the sample using income as our criterion and to a lesser extent when based
38
39
40 on the age of the household head. However, we fail to reject the REPIH when households
41
42
43 where either of the spouses is unemployed are dropped, regardless of whether
44
45
46 segmentation is based on income or age. Our results suggest then that the mixed findings
47
48
49 observed in empirical literature when income (wealth) or age is used as a segmentation
50
51
52 criterion, might be due to these variables' correlation with transitory income caused by
53
54
55 transitions into unemployment.
56
57

58
59
60

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 motivates our analysis;
Section 3 presents the theoretical model; Section 4 describes the database; Section 5 is

1
2
3 dedicated to econometric issues; Section 6 comments the estimation results. Finally, the
4
5 concluding remarks are presented in Section 7.
6
7

8 9 10 **2. Motivation**

11
12
13
14 Analyses of the REPIH have mainly been based on the correlation between consumption
15
16 growth and predicted income (Deaton, 1992; Browning and Lusardi, 1996; Attanasio,
17
18 1999). In this respect, if we dispense with discussions on control variables, in order to test
19
20 the REPIH it is essential to have a database that shows a sufficient variability in income,
21
22 as well as powerful instruments for predicting income growth. Not only is income
23
24 variability important in achieving precise estimates, but also due to the consequences of
25
26 measurement errors. The lower the true variation in income, the easier it is for
27
28 measurement error to drive the sign of income changes. In fact, measurement error in
29
30 consumption and income is one of the most serious limitations when using household
31
32 data to test the REPIH (Altonji and Siow, 1987; Runkle, 1991; Deaton, 1992; Lusardi,
33
34 1996).
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 As mentioned above, most permanently employed Spanish workers' (and all pensioners')
42
43 yearly income is not evenly distributed across the twelve months, due to two extra
44
45 payments (one in July and the other in late December). Each extra payment ranges
46
47 between 60 to 100% of a normal monthly one. Thus most households interviewed in the
48
49 ECPF present high quarterly income changes of between 15 and 30% in real terms that
50
51 are not common with other microdata sets.
52
53
54

55
56 This considerable variability in quarterly income has important implications on the testing
57
58 of the REPIH. First, as is also the case in Soulesles (1999), Parker (1999) and Hsieh
59
60

⁵ See Browning and Crossley (1999) for theoretical and empirical results on consumption during an

1
2
3 (2003), because these extra payments are systematic and exogenous in nature, most of the
4
5 quarterly income changes observed by the investigator are known to households in
6
7 advance⁶ and they do not transmit new information: a factor which is crucial in a
8
9 rational-expectations context. Second, it compels forward-looking households to take an
10
11 active role in planning the intrayear allocation of their income, which reduces the effect
12
13 of bounded rationality.⁷ Third, it greatly reduces the influence of measurement error in
14
15 income on the sign of quarterly income changes. Finally, the extra payments' exogenous,
16
17 systematic characteristic is reflected in the unusually high predictive power of our
18
19 instruments of income growth (an adjusted R^2 of around 0.45). Thanks to this high value,
20
21 we avoid the acceptance of the REPIH attributable to the usual weak correlation of the
22
23 instrument set with income growth.
24
25
26
27
28

29 The second element we would like to focus on is the interrelation between the groups of
30
31 commodities. If the possibility that households might readjust their total expenditure
32
33 across different groups of commodities is not contemplated, this effect might be captured
34
35 by income, rejecting the REPIH (Attanasio and Weber, 1995; Browning and Lusardi,
36
37 1996; Attanasio, 1999). One of the peculiarities of the ECPF is the fact that it contains
38
39 detailed information on all household spending. Figure 1 shows the quarterly expenditure
40
41 changes over the sample period for each of the three groups of commodities into which
42
43 total expenditure has been divided: food, other nondurables and durables (see Appendix 1
44
45 for details of how the goods were grouped). Figure 1 highlights how Spanish households
46
47 seem to adjust their expenditure on an intratemporal basis. In fact, after removing
48
49
50
51
52

53 unemployment spell.

54 ⁶ For those households without transitions into and out of employment, in 85% of all observations the sign of the
55 quarterly income changes can be correctly predicted. In fact, despite a lack of official information on how
56 widespread extra payments are, the analysis of the ECPF points to the fact that around 75% of all employees
57 with no labour transitions receive extra payments.

58 ⁷ Browning and Crossley (2001) calculate the welfare costs for Spanish households of automatically consuming
59 all current income (measured as a percentage of annual spending) rather than following an optimally smoothed
60 path, under the hypothesis that, during months with extra payments, double the normal income is paid. The
authors conclude that the welfare costs stand at around 7%, very much higher than the figure for institutional
features examined by Hsieh (2003) and Parker (1999), thus demonstrating the relevance of intrayear planning
in the Spanish case.

1
2
3 seasonal patterns, simple Pearson correlations between other nondurables and food,
4
5 between other nondurables and durables, and between food and durables showed values
6
7 (and p-values) of 0.068 (0.0001), -0.050 (0.0001) and -0.047 (0.0001), respectively.
8
9 Therefore, apart from seasonal preferences, it cannot be ruled out *a priori* that part of the
10
11 quarterly changes in food or in other nondurables spending is due to nonseparability
12
13 among commodity groups. For this reason, when specifying Euler equations for a group
14
15 of commodities, the strategy used was to condition them on the expenditure of the
16
17 remaining commodity groups. This issue will be taken up again in the following section,
18
19 when specifying the utility function.
20
21

22
23
24
25 [INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]
26
27

28 29 3. The Model

30
31
32
33 The rational expectations permanent income hypothesis proposed by Hall (1978)
34
35 establishes that households try to maximize their expected lifetime utility using all the
36
37 available information on their expected lifetime income endowments. Thus households
38
39 allocate their consumption on an intertemporal basis until their discounted marginal
40
41 utility across periods is smoothed,
42
43

$$44
45
46 U'_{it} = E_t \left[U'_{it+1} \left(\frac{1+r_{it}}{1+\delta_i} \right) \right] + \mu_{it} \quad (1)
47
48
49$$

50
51 where U'_{it} is the marginal utility of household i during period t , E_t the mean operator
52
53 conditioned on the set of information known at moment t , δ_i the household i rate of time
54
55 preference, r_{it} the after-tax real interest rate and μ_{it} a Lagrange multiplier associated with
56
57 the non-negativity constraint on wealth (Zeldes, 1989b).
58
59
60

From (1) the rejection of the REPIH can be attributable to two main sources. On the one hand, the existence of liquidity constraints, a precautionary-saving motive or simply a “rule-of-thumb” behaviour, for example, which would hinder the intertemporal allocation process stated by the standard REPIH based on expected future information. In this case μ_{it} , which is unobservable, will be different from zero. So, to detect the violation of the martingale condition, variables must be introduced that are correlated with μ_{it} , such as income. The second source of rejection is when the researcher fails to include all the variables that the household incorporates into its utility function. In this second case, at least part of the model’s rejection can be attributed to the omission of relevant variables whose effect might be captured by income, even if the model is true. In this paper we use a wider set of preference variables in the utility function (which usually includes demographic and labour-supply variables as taste shifters), based on the non-imposition of separability among food consumption, FC, other non-durable goods and services, ONDC, and the stock of durables, S.

Thus the utility function used, which is of the constant relative risk aversion type, takes a multiplicative form which includes the three aforementioned expenditure categories and a vector of household preferences, θ_{it} .

$$U(FC_{it}, ONDC_{it}, S_{it}; \theta_{it}) = \frac{1}{1-\tau} FC_{it}^{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} ONDC_{it}^{1-\tau} \frac{1}{1-\Psi} S_{it}^{1-\Psi} \exp(\theta_{it}) \quad (2)$$

θ_{it} is composed of an observable stochastic part, expressed as a vector of demographic variables (the age of the household head, age_{it} ; the age squared, age_{it}^2 ; and the family size, $FAMS_{it}$) and of labour supply (the number of earners, NE_{it} ; and the household head’s unemployment status, UH_{it}), and an unobservable part. The latter is made up of an individual effect which does not vary over time, β_i , and an error term for household preferences that varies in time and across households, ϖ_{it} , which we assume is orthogonal to β_i .

$$\theta_{it} = b_0 age_{it} + b_1 age_{it}^2 + b_2 FAMS_{it} + b_3 NE_{it} + b_4 UH_{it} + \beta_i + \varpi_{it} \quad (3)$$

For the sake of brevity we restrict the exposition to the case of other nondurables consumption. If we suppose that the rate of time preference is equal to the real interest rate, $\delta_i = r_{it}$, as in Lusardi (1996) and Jappelli and Pistaferri (2000), taking logarithms of both sides of the expression derived from the substitution of the utility function (2) and household preferences (3) in the first-order condition (1), and using a second-order Taylor expansion, we can express the Euler equation as follows, once rational expectations have been applied:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln ONDC_{it+1} = & k_{0i} + k_1 age_{it} + k_2 \Delta FAMS_{it+1} + k_3 \Delta NE_{it+1} + k_4 \Delta UH_{it+1} + \\ & + k_5 \Delta \ln FC_{it+1} + k_6 \Delta \ln S_{it+1} + k_7 \Delta \ln Y_{it+1} + \phi_{it+1} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where

$$k_{0i} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(b_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\Delta \ln c_{it+1}}^2 \right); \quad \phi_{it+1} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left[\Delta \varpi_{it+1} - Lr(1 + \varepsilon_{it+1}) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\Delta \ln c_{it+1}}^2 + Lr(1 + \mu'_{it}) \right]$$

where Δ is the first difference operator, α is the coefficient of relative risk aversion and $\sigma_{\Delta \ln c_{it+1}}^2$ is the variance in consumption growth. The term ε_{it+1} incorporates expectational errors; it has mean zero and is uncorrelated with any information available at time t , $E[\varepsilon_{it+1}/\Omega_{it}] = 0$. Following Runkle (1991), except where otherwise noted, k_{0i} is assumed to be the same for all households (see Section 5).

Equation (4) incorporates the variables that determine the intertemporal allocation of consumption. The central hypothesis to test is whether the lagged information over which the household has intertemporal control has predictive power over consumption growth. For this reason, predicted income has been included in equation (4): if income is

1
2
3 statistically significant, $k_7 \neq 0$, then the REPIH is rejected. Note, therefore, that possible
4
5 specific sources of excess sensitivity are not tested in this paper. The other hypothesis of
6
7 interest concern separability among commodity groups, tested via parameters k_5 and k_6 .
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 **4. The Data** 15 16 17

18
19 The household-information data set used in this paper was drawn from the Spanish
20 Family Expenditure Survey for the period 1986-1996. The ECPF, which is conducted by
21 the National Institute of Statistics (INE), is a rotating quarterly panel survey
22 representative of the Spanish population. The survey combines direct annotations of
23 expenditure made during the week when contact with the household is maintained and a
24 personal interview regarding expenditure prior to that week.⁸ In addition, income made
25 during the previous three months is recorded, together with sociodemographic and
26 labour-related information concerning the households during the week of the interview.
27 For the purposes of comparisons with other surveys, the information not available
28 includes household members' number of working hours and households' net wealth and
29 stock of durables.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 Each quarter 3,200 households are interviewed. From these, 12.5% are randomly replaced
60 each quarter, so that each household is monitored for up to eight consecutive quarters. In
order to minimize possible inconsistency in parameter estimates associated with panel
data sets where the number of observations per household is small (Chamberlain, 1984),
we restricted our sample to households that answered the survey for the maximum eight
possible quarters, leading to a sample of 8,774 households. From these, households were

⁸ The reference period for each type of goods depends on the frequency of its purchase. Food expenditure corresponds to purchases made during the week of the interview, other nondurables to the previous month including the week of the interview, and durables to the previous three months including the week of the

1
2
3 selected whose heads were aged between 25 and 80, and who were not self-employed.
4
5 We followed previous empirical work in applying several filters to exclude households
6
7 with extreme measurement errors in consumption or income (Altonji and Siow, 1987;
8
9 DeJuan and Seater, 1999). The final sample consisted of 5,143 households, representing a
10
11 total of 41,144 observations.
12
13

14
15
16 As for the construction of the variables used in the model, total expenditure was divided
17
18 into three groups of commodities: food (in and away from home), other nondurable goods
19
20 and services (including clothes and footwear as semi-durables), and durables. Each group
21
22 of commodities was deflated by a household-specific Stone Price Index, derived from the
23
24 disaggregated national consumer retail price index published by the INE, where the
25
26 household budget shares were taken as weights. The income variable comprises total
27
28 after-tax household income and it was deflated to 1985 prices with the general CPI.
29
30 Variations in the stock of durables were proxied by a dummy variable that took a value of
31
32 one when the household's expenditure on durables was equal to or higher than 60€ and
33
34 zero otherwise.⁹ The household head's transitions into and out of unemployment were
35
36 also controlled by a dummy variable, with a value of one if the household head was
37
38 unemployed during the week of the interview and zero if not. The remaining explanatory
39
40 variables were specified as continuous variables. The family size was measured in adult-
41
42 equivalent terms, according to the OECD equivalence scale.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix 1 details the components of each commodity group of commodities and the filters used. It also contains a table with descriptive statistics of all the variables used in the Euler equation estimates.

interview. The INE raises food spending and expenditure on other nondurables to a standard three-month period to homogenize the global expenditure period.

5. Econometric Issues

Equation (4) was estimated using the Generalised Method of Moments (GMM), exploiting the orthogonality conditions imposed by the rational expectations hypothesis, i.e., $E[\phi_{it}/\Omega_{is}] = 0 \forall t \geq s$ where Ω_{is} is the set of information available at time s , that contains the instrument set. The standard errors are robust to general forms of heterocedasticity and serial correlation.¹⁰ In this context of rational expectations, testing the model's overidentifying restrictions constitutes a complementary test of the REPIH (Runkle, 1991).

For the estimation of equation (4), controls were made for the information contained in the error term. Following Runkle (1991), different factors were taken into account: the presence of aggregate shocks, the presence of persistent household-specific effects,¹¹ and measurement error in consumption. The aggregate shocks were accounted for using year dummies, under the null hypothesis of aggregate shocks to consumption growth that are common across households (Mariger and Shaw, 1993). Measurement error in consumption was controlled using a twofold approach: household filters (see Appendix 1) and the number of instrument lags. Given the MA(1) structure of the error term, instruments were used with two lags and earlier.

All the explanatory variables, except for time dummies, were assumed to be endogenous and so they were instrumented. The availability of suitable instruments is crucial in

⁹ The results were not affected when other minimum values for expenditure on durables were used.

¹⁰ We estimated the Euler equations by GMM using the DPD programme written in GAUSS by Arellano and Bond (1998).

¹¹ This type of heterogeneity could arise if each household had its own discount rate, which remained constant across time. In this case, the presence of persistent household-specific effects causes lagged consumption growth to have predictive power over current consumption growth. For this reason, to test their existence, $\Delta \ln C_{t-1}$, which would be correlated with the household-specific effect, was incorporated into the instrument set.

1
2
3 testing orthogonality between consumption growth and predicted income.¹² In this paper
4
5 advantage was taken of the unique extra-payment factor and the fact that the ECPF
6
7 monitors the same households for over four quarters. As can be seen in Appendix 2, the
8
9 exogenous, systematic, non-performance-related nature of these extra payments provides
10
11 powerful instruments of $\Delta \text{Ln}Y_{it+1}$ with an adjusted R^2 of up to 0.46 for those households
12
13 without unemployed members: a figure much higher than the normal 0.02 offered by
14
15 other databases (Altonji and Siow, 1987; Shea, 1995; Lusardi, 1996; Browning and
16
17 Lusardi, 1996). Appendix 2 details the set of instruments used in the estimations,
18
19 comprising sociodemographic, labour-supply, expenditure and income variables.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **6. Results**

28
29
30
31
32 In this section, we discuss the results of the Euler equations for the two groups of
33
34 nondurable commodities: food and other nondurables. In order to check how
35
36 heterogeneity across households could influence the test of the REPIH, we segmented the
37
38 sample using different criteria. On the one hand, the sample was separated into three
39
40 groups based on the age of the household head: 25 to 44 years old, 45 to 60 years old and
41
42 65 to 80 years old.¹³ Most articles do not consider households with heads over the age of
43
44 64 suitable for testing the REPIH, because certain factors such as health, the likelihood of
45
46 death, changes in family size etc. can alter how they plan consumption. In this paper,
47
48 households with heads aged over 64 were included as an additional group in order to
49
50 complement previous papers. If the model's violation is due to liquidity constraints or to
51
52 precautionary saving, excess sensitivity is more likely to arise in the younger and older
53
54 age groups (Jappelli, 1990; Gourinchas and Parker, 2002). On the other hand, the sample
55
56
57
58

59
60 ¹² See Hansen and Singleton (1982), Arellano and Bond (1991) and Bound *et al.* (1995) for the properties of the IV estimators when the instruments are weakly correlated with the endogenous variable.

¹³ The group aged between 61 and 64 was excluded to prevent transitions into retirement from distorting the results.

1
2
3 was also split according to household income¹⁴ into a low-income and high-income
4
5 group. The statistical power of the test is dependent on the capacity of the segmentation
6
7 criterion to ensure the correct separation of those households able to smooth their
8
9 marginal utility intertemporally from those not able to do so. We therefore considered
10
11 high-income households to be those that remained above the 6th decile for each of the
12
13 eight waves. Those households that consistently remained below the 6th decile were
14
15 classified low-income households. If the REPIH's violation is due to liquidity constraints
16
17 or to a precautionary motive, excess sensitivity should only arise in the low-income
18
19 group. As with the age-based segmentation criterion, if excess sensitivity is due to some
20
21 other source, e.g. a rule-of-thumb behaviour, there is no reason to believe that the results
22
23 for the two income groups should differ. Appendix 3 shows the sociodemographic and
24
25 economic characteristics of each household sample.
26
27
28
29
30

31 For the sake of brevity, we only report the parameter estimates of interest: those referred
32
33 to the excess sensitivity of consumption to predicted income ($\Delta \ln Y_{t+1}$ or $\ln Y_t$) and those
34
35 concerning the influence that non-separability among commodity groups can have on it.
36
37 All the other results are available from the authors on request.
38
39
40
41

42 *6a. Results for the consumption of other nondurables*

43
44
45
46
47 Tables 1 and 2 present the results of the Euler equations for other nondurables using the
48
49 extended model and when we assume separability among commodity groups,
50
51 respectively. From Table 1 it can be seen that for household groups whose head is below
52
53 the age of 61 (columns 1 to 4), neither of the two income specifications is statistically
54
55 significant at the 5% level. Neither can overidentifying restrictions be rejected.¹⁵ Notice,
56
57
58

59
60 ¹⁴ Zeldes (1989b) and most subsequent authors separate the sample on the basis of (liquid) wealth to income ratios. Unfortunately, wealth-related information is not available in the ECPF.

¹⁵ The null hypothesis of absence of second-order autocorrelation for the disturbance term (M2) could not be rejected. Neither could the null hypothesis of absence of persistent household-specific effects. These results

1
2
3 however, that failure to reject the REPIH for the younger group is dependent upon the
4 hypothesis of nonseparability of other nondurables from durables (see Table 2). Unlike
5 the previous age groups, there is evidence against the REPIH for the over-64 age group
6 (columns 5 and 6 of Table 1): $\ln Y_t$ is significant at the 5% level and overidentifying
7 restrictions are also rejected.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 An analysis of the Euler equations when the sample is split according to income (columns
17 7 to 10 of Table 1), shows that there is evidence of excess sensitivity of consumption to
18 predicted income growth for the low-income group: the coefficient on $\Delta \ln Y_{t+1}$ is
19 significant at the 5% level.¹⁶ In contrast, as expected when there is a precautionary motive
20 or liquidity constraints, the REPIH cannot be rejected for the high-income group, as in
21 Soulesles (1999).¹⁷ It is important to note that, as detected for the younger group,
22 assuming separability among commodity groups biases the results against the REPIH for
23 the high-income group: Table 2, in particular, shows that the overidentifying restrictions
24 are rejected.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36
37
38 On the other hand, the hypotheses of separability between other nondurables and food,
39 and between other nondurables and durables are rejected for several household groups, as
40 shown in Table 1. The signs of the coefficients obtained are the expected ones: positive
41 for food and negative for durables.¹⁸
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
[INSERT TABLES 1 AND 2 ABOUT HERE]

were repeated in the remaining estimations. For the sake of brevity, tests of persistent household-specific effects are not reported, but are available upon request.

¹⁶ Note from table 2 that the excess sensitivity is maintained when neither of the two groups of commodities is included as an explanatory variable.

¹⁷ The results were not affected when retired households were excluded.

¹⁸ Brugiavini and Weber (1994) also obtain a negative correlation between nondurables and durables with cross-section data.

1
2
3 6b. Results for food consumption
4
5
6

7 When the REPIH is tested for food consumption, it shows the same results as the test for
8 other nondurables when the youngest household group is analysed: the orthogonality
9 condition between consumption growth and predicted income cannot be rejected
10 (columns 1 and 2 of Table 3). The results obtained for the other two household age
11 groups are the opposite of those observed for other nondurables: the REPIH is rejected
12 for the middle-age household group, but not for the older group. Again, the failure to
13 reject the REPIH for some household groups is dependent upon the assumption of
14 separability among groups of commodities, as shown in Table 4.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 When the sample is segmented according to income, the same different intertemporal
27 allocation capacity observed for nondurables is maintained. The REPIH is rejected for the
28 low-income group, but not for the high-income group, as also detected in Zeldes (1989b),
29 Jappelli *et al.* (1998) and Soulesles (1999).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 [INSERT TABLES 3 AND 4 ABOUT HERE]
38
39
40

41 As for explanatory consumption variables, in those cases in which they are statistically
42 significant, the expected parameter signs are also obtained: positive for other
43 nondurables, as in Attanasio and Weber (1995), and negative for durables.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 6c. The segmentation criteria and the effect of being unemployed
51
52
53

54 The results reported so far indicate that segmenting the sample according to income
55 provides more stable results than dividing it into age groups. In other words, they do not
56 seem to have the same power to classify those households with and those without
57 difficulties in allocating their consumption intertemporally. The question we raise in this
58
59
60

1
2
3 sub-section is whether the disparity of our results is due to the fact that income and age
4 are not equally correlated with the latent variable that conditions the intertemporal
5 allocation.
6
7
8
9

10
11 In order to check this possibility and to make our results comparable with previous work,
12 we concentrated on those households whose heads were 60 years old or younger. From
13 these, households were excluded if either the head or the spouse (if applicable) was
14 unemployed during any of the eight quarters. This led to a new sample of 2,576
15 households and 20,608 observations. This new sample allows us to compare our results
16 directly with those of Browning and Collado (2001), who also use a sample of Spanish
17 households drawn from the ECPF characterized by their household head's "permanent
18 employment status". Unlike us, however, these authors do not segment the sample.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 After dropping those households with unemployed members, our new sample is less
32 likely to be affected by income risk or liquidity constraints. Thus, if the results differ from
33 those obtained using our whole sample, it could be attributable to a correlation between
34 the segmentation criterion and unemployment (e.g. with transitory income). Moreover, by
35 dropping those households with unemployed members, we can take full advantage of the
36 extra payments' systematicity. In fact, Appendix 2 shows how the predictive power of the
37 instruments of income growth rises dramatically for these households, thus enhancing the
38 statistical power of the REPIH test.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 [INSERT TABLES 5 AND 6 ABOUT HERE]
52
53
54

55 Tables 5 and 6 report the estimated Euler equations for other nondurables and food,
56 respectively, based on the new sample. From both tables it can be observed that neither
57 type of segmentation, by age or income, shows evidence of an excess sensitivity of
58 consumption growth to predicted income, regardless of the group of commodities
59
60

1
2
3 analysed. That is, once we remove those households with unemployed members, we
4 cannot reject the REPIH on the basis of expected future information, thus corroborating
5 Browning and Collado's findings (2001). In this respect, these results suggest that age or
6 income criteria *per se* do not capture the true source of heterogeneity in Spanish
7 household consumption patterns. The key element that conditions the results of the Euler
8 equations for the whole ECPF sample is the transitory income that accompany a transition
9 into unemployment. The more highly correlated the segmentation variable is with
10 transitions into and out of work, the greater capacity it will have to classify households
11 correctly.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **7. Conclusions**

27
28
29
30 Empirical literature on the REPIH yields mixed results. This paper has attempted to
31 contribute towards the testing of the REPIH by using a high-quality database, the Spanish
32 ECPF, and by analysing the influence of heterogeneity both across households and goods.
33 In two respects the information on total expenditure and income offered by the ECPF has
34 allowed us to overcome some of the drawbacks detected in empirical literature. On the
35 one hand, this paper has extended the standard Euler equation by assuming non-
36 separability between food and other nondurables, as in Attanasio and Weber (1995), and
37 also of the latter two categories from durables. On the other hand, we have also taken
38 advantage of a Spanish institutional feature that leads to an uneven intrayear wage and
39 pension distribution. Unlike other data sets, the large, highly predictable quarterly income
40 changes that these extra payments produce enhance the power of the REPIH test.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 This paper has shown that conditioning the Euler equations on consumption variables,
57 including durables, can alter the rejection of the REPIH. In consequence, assuming
58 separability among commodity groups biases the results against the REPIH, so that the
59
60

1
2
3 rejection of the REPIH observed with other databases might partially be attributable to
4
5 this omission.
6
7

8
9
10 The overall result of this paper, when separability among commodity groups is not
11 imposed, is the rejection of the REPIH, in the sense that not all households behave
12 according to the orthogonality condition between consumption growth and predicted
13 income. However, this paper has shown that not all segmentation criteria are equally
14 correlated with the latent variable (i.e. the true source of heterogeneity across households)
15 that conditions the intertemporal allocation of consumption. Whilst the results are not
16 stable for households with heads over the age of 44, segmentation by income always
17 leads to the rejection of the REPIH for the low-income group, but not for the high-income
18 one (as in Zeldes, 1989b; Jappelli *et al.*, 1998; Soulesles, 1999) regardless of the measure
19 of consumption analysed.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 The importance of controlling for the correct source of heterogeneity is shown when we
34 drop those households with unemployed members: there is no evidence against the
35 REPIH for any group of households, neither when segmented by age nor by income,
36 irrespective of the group of consumption commodities analysed. In consonance with the
37 standard REPIH, for those households permanently employed segmentation according to
38 current income does not show different results for high-income and low-income groups,
39 because their reference variable is permanent income.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The different conclusions that we reach when households with unemployed members are
52 either taken or not taken into account are not contradictory under a less restrictive
53 Rational Expectations Permanent Income Model. As suggested by Zeldes (1989a), the
54 rejection of the standard REPIH is the expected result in an uncertain framework like that
55 experienced by prudent families with unemployed members. Indeed, our results suggest
56 that the mixed findings obtained in empirical literature might be attributable to the failure
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to control properly for heterogeneity across households. For instance, if being
4 unemployed is the key variable, the sample period (in terms of the stages of the business
5 cycle covered) is an important issue, as some authors (e.g. Deaton, 1992) have
6 emphasized to explain in part the different conclusions reached by Zeldes (1989b) and
7 Runkle (1991). In this respect, our results suggest that the segmentation criterion should
8 be flexible enough to separate households according to their economic performance (with
9 greater flexibility in the case of income than age or other variables also used, such as
10 home ownership versus tenancy).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 In terms of fiscal policy, the rejection of the REPIH for the household sample containing
23 unemployed members but not for those with permanently employed members points to
24 the existence of two groups at the aggregate, as suggested by Hall and Mishkin (1982)
25 and Campbell and Mankiw (1989). What is more, the importance of transitory income
26 that accompany transitions into unemployment might suggest that the fraction of
27 consumers who track their consumption to current income is not constant over time, but
28 might have a cyclical profile as shown by Jappelli and Fissel (1990).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 In summary, this paper has shown that heterogeneity across households and separability
41 among goods strongly influences the results of consumption Euler equations. Future
42 research should focus on analysing how the sources of heterogeneity that influence the
43 consumption Euler equations are correlated with structural factors, like unemployment, as
44 demonstrated in this paper for Spanish households. This could be an avenue for
45 reconciling the mixed results shown in empirical literature.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendices

A1. The ECPF: commodity groups, filters and descriptive statistics of estimation variables.

Composition of commodity groups: the food category includes spending on food in and away from home, and spending on alcoholic drinks and tobacco. The category for other non-durable goods and services includes spending on clothes and footwear, housing, heating and lighting (not including any imputed rent from owner occupation), household goods, goods and services for the home maintenance, medicine, fuels, public transport, postage and communications, leisure and cultural services, books, newspapers and magazines. Durables include spending on furniture, carpets and rugs, heating and kitchen appliances, household fittings, glassware, the purchase of vehicles and other appliances and accessories.

Filters: households fulfilling any of the following conditions were dropped: (a) those at the 0.5% bottom or top percentiles of the income distribution, (b) those experiencing a quarterly income change per earner higher than +200% or lower than -75% during one of the quarters, (c) those experiencing a quarterly expenditure change per adult equivalent on food or on other nondurables higher than +300% or lower than -85% during one of the quarters, and (d) those whose expenditure on food or other nondurables fell below 6 euros during one quarter.

Descriptive Statistics. Whole sample. 1986.IV-1996.IV

	Mean	Standard deviation	Maximum	Minimum	Median
Income (€)	1,912.72	1,130.72	8,862.12	90.51	1,671.01
Food (€)	803.97	473.61	6,313.81	33.35	717.40
Other nondurables (€)	835.76	685.23	10,936.99	12.46	665.80
Durables +	0.482	0.499	1	0	-
Family size	2.58	0.978	9.80	1	2.40
Number of earners	1.78	0.896	7	1	2
Inactive household head +	0.429	0.494	1	0	-
Employed household head +	0.570	0.499	1	0	-
Unemployed household head+	0.047	0.21	1	0	-
Sex (female) * +	0.169	0.375	1	0	-
Age *	54.27	14.81	80	25	55
Educational level *+					
Elementary school or less	0.723	0.447	1	0	-
Compulsory secondary school studies (up to 16 years old)	0.103	0.304	1	0	-
Full secondary school studies (up to 18 years old)	0.099	0.299	1	0	-
University	0.073	0.260	1	0	-
Professional group (those economically active) **+					
Labourers	0.216	0.411	1	0	-
Management	0.094	0.291	1	0	-
Others	0.689	0.462	1	0	-

Note: (*) refers to the household head. (+) indicates a dummy variable.

A2. The predictive power of the quarterly income growth instruments

The table below shows the adjusted R^2 from the regressions of $\Delta \ln Y_{t+1}$ on the instrument set used. With the database used, different sub-samples were created to highlight the influence of two factors. Firstly, transitions into unemployment, so that distinguishing between households with and those without unemployed members. Secondly, the length of the quarterly database. Consequently, in one case we used only four quarters for each household (as in the widely used American CEX), whereas in the other all eight available observations were used.

Adjusted R^2 of $\Delta \ln Y_{t+1}$ on different instrument sets (OLS)

4 observations		8 observations	
All households	Households without unemployed members	All households	Households without unemployed members
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
0.2581	0.3960	0.3067	0.4615

The instrument set used in the estimations of equation (4) includes the following variables and lags:

- With no lags: a constant, seasonal dummies and yearly dummies.
- With two lags (t-1): age, the age squared, the interaction of both with the household head's educational level and employment status, dummies for the permanently employed status of the two spouses and a dummy reflecting whether or not the household head was retired.
- With three lags (t-2): a dummy for purchases of durables.
- With two and three lags (t-1 and t-2): the total spending on food and other nondurables, the number of household members under 14 years of age, the total number of household members, and a dummy reflecting whether the spouse (if applicable) was unemployed. In the Euler equations for other nondurables (for food) spending on food (on other nondurables) was also included.
- All lags from t-1: income, a dummy reflecting whether the household head was unemployed, and the number of wage and pension earners.

A3. Household groups' sociodemographic and economic features

	Low-income group	High-income group	25-44 years	45-60 years	65-80 years
# households	2,092	2,224	# households 1,639	1,714	1,678
Age *			Income groups		
25 – 44	29.7	35.8	Deciles 1 to 3	14.5	13.7
45 – 64	33.5	50.8	Deciles 4 to 6	38.5	31.4
65 – 80	36.7	13.2	Deciles 7 to 10	46.8	54.8
Labour status *			Labour status *		
Economically inactive	52.8	24.2	Economically inactive	2.4	20.7
Working	40.0	72.8	Working	91.9	70.6
Unemployed	7.0	2.8	Unemployed	5.6	8.6
House			House		
Rented home	16.2	7.5	Rented home	15.5	9.7
Mortgage	9.7	19.6	Mortgage	23.3	13.0
Dummy for spending on durables	37.5	61.4	Dummy for spending on durables	56.3	53.2
# members	2.26	3.04	# members	2.73	3.07
# earners	1.52	2.16	# earners	1.54	2.04
Educational studies *			Educational studies *		
Illiterate or without studies	34.0	12.1	Illiterate or without studies	5.5	24.1
Elementary	58.8	55.5	Elementary	60.5	59.9
Secondary or higher	7.2	32.4	Secondary or higher	34.0	16.0

Notes: in percentages for each variable. (*) refers to the household head.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Altonji, J. G. and Siow, A. (1987) Testing the Response of Consumption to Income Changes with (Noisy) Panel Data, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **102**, 293-328.
- Arellano, M. and Bond, S. (1998) Dynamic Panel Data Estimation using DPD98 for Gauss, mimeo.
- Arellano, M. and Bond, S. (1991) Some Tests of Specification for Panel Data: Monte Carlo Evidence and an Application to Employment Equations, *Review of Economic Studies*, **58**, 277-297.
- Attanasio, O. P. (1999) Consumption, in *Handbook in Macroeconomics*, (Eds) J.B. Taylor and M. Woodford, North-Holland, Ch. 11.
- Attanasio, O. P. and Browning, M. (1995) Consumption over the Life Cycle and over the Business Cycle, *American Economic Review*, **85**, 1187-1237.
- Attanasio, O. P. and Weber, G. (1995) Is Consumption Growth Consistent with Intertemporal Optimization? Evidence from the Consumer Expenditure Survey, *Journal of Political Economy*, **103**, 1121-1157.
- Bound, J., Jaeger, D. A. and Baker, R. (1995) Problems with Instrumental Variables Estimation When the Correlation Between the Instruments and the Endogenous Explanatory Variable is Weak, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **90**, 443-450.
- Browning, M. and Collado, M. D. (2001) The Response of Expenditures to Anticipated Income Changes: Panel Data Estimates, *American Economic Review*, **91**, 681-692.
- Browning, M. and Crossley, T. F. (2001) The Life-Cycle Model of Consumption and Saving, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, **15**, 3-22.
- Browning, M. and Crossley, T. F. (1999) Shocks, stocks and socks: consumption smoothing and the replacement of durables during an unemployment spell, Technical Report Working Papers in Economics and Econometrics, **376**, School of Economics, ANU.
- Browning, M. and Lusardi, A. (1996) Household Saving: Micro Theories and Micro Facts, *Journal of Economic Literature*, **34**, 1797-1855.
- Brugiavini, A. and Weber, G. (1994) Durables and Non-durables Consumption: Evidence from Italian Household Data, in *Saving and the Accumulation of Wealth. Essays on Italian*

- 1
2
3 *Household and Government Saving Behavior*, (Eds) A. Ando, L. Guiso and I. Visco,
4 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 305-329.
5
6
7 Campbell, J. Y. and Mankiw, G. (1989) Consumption, income and interest rates: reinterpreting the
8 time series evidence, in *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, (Eds) O. J. Blanchard and S. Fisher,
9 Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 185-216.
10
11
12 Chamberlain, G. (1984) Panel Data, in *Handbook of Econometrics* (Eds) Griliches and Intriligator,
13 North-Holland, Amsterdam, Vol. 2, 1247-318.
14
15
16
17 Deaton, A. (1992) *Understanding Consumption*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
18
19 DeJuan, J. S. and Seater, J. (1999) The permanent income hypothesis: Evidence from the
20 consumer expenditure survey, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, **43**, 351-376.
21
22
23 Flavin, M. A. (1981) The adjustment of consumption to changing expectations about future
24 income, *Journal of Political Economy*, **89**, 974-1009.
25
26
27 Gourinchas, P.-O. and Parker, J. A. (2002) Consumption over the Life Cycle, *Econometrica*, **70**,
28 47-89.
29
30
31 Hall, R. E. (1978) Stochastic Implications of the Life Cycle-Permanent Income Hypothesis:
32 Theory and Evidence, *Journal of Political Economy*, **86**, 971-987.
33
34
35 Hall, R. E. and Mishkin, F. S. (1982) The Sensitivity of Consumption to Transitory Income:
36 Estimates from Panel Data on Households, *Econometrica*, **50**, 461-482.
37
38
39 Hansen, L. P. and Singleton, K. J. (1982) Generalized Instrumental Variables Estimators of
40 Nonlinear Rational Expectations Models, *Econometrica*, **50**, 1269-1286.
41
42
43 Hayashi, F. (1982) The Permanent Income Hypothesis: Estimation and Testing by Instrumental
44 Variables, *Journal of Political Economy*, **90**, 895-916.
45
46
47 Heckman, J. J. (2001) Micro data, Heterogeneity, and the Evaluation of Public Policy: Nobel
48 Lecture, *Journal of Political Economy*, **109**, 673-711.
49
50
51 Hsieh, C-T. (2003) Do Consumers React to Anticipated Income Shocks? Evidence from the
52 Alaska Permanent Fund, *American Economic Review*, **93**, 397-405.
53
54
55 Jappelli, T. (1990) Who Is Liquidity Constrained in the U.S. Economy?, *Quarterly Journal of*
56 *Economics*, **105**, 219-34.
57
58
59 Jappelli, T. and Fissel, G. (1990) Do Liquidity Constraints Vary Over Time? Evidence from
60 Survey and Panel Data, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, **22**, 253-62.

- 1
2
3 Jappelli, T. and Pistaferri, L. (2000) Using subjective income expectations to test for excess
4 sensitivity of consumption to predicted income growth, *European Economic Review*, **44**, 337-
5
6 358.
7
8
9 Jappelli, T., Pischke, J.S. and Soulesles, N. S. (1998) Testing for Liquidity Constraints in Euler
10 Equations with Complementary Data Sources, *Review of Economics and statistics*, **80**, 251-
11
12 262.
13
14
15 Lage, M. J. (1991) Sensitivity of Tests of the PIH to Alternative Consumption Proxies, *Economics*
16
17 *Letters*, **36**, 429-433.
18
19 Levenson, A. R. (1996) Do Consumers Respond to Future Income Shocks? Evidence from Social
20 Security Reform in Taiwan, *Journal of Public Economics*, **62**, 275-295.
21
22
23 Lusardi, A. (1996) Permanent Income, Current Income, and Consumption: Evidence From Two
24 Data Panel Sets, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **14**, 81-90.
25
26
27 Mariger, R. P. and Shaw, K. (1993) Unanticipated Aggregate Disturbances and Tests of the Life-
28 Cycle Model Using Panel Data, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, **75**, 48-56.
29
30
31 Parker, J. (1999) The Reaction of Household Consumption to Predictable Changes in Social
32 Security Taxes, *American Economic Review*, **89**, 959-973.
33
34
35 Paxson, C. H. (1993) Consumption and Income Seasonality in Thailand, *Journal of Political*
36
37 *Economy*, **101**, 39-72.
38
39 Poterba, J. M. (1988) Are Consumers Forward Looking? Evidence from Fiscal Experiments, *AEA*
40
41 *Papers and Proceedings*, **78**, 413-418.
42
43
44 Runkle, D. E. (1991) Liquidity Constraints and the Permanent Income Hypothesis, *Journal of*
45
46 *Monetary Economics*, **27**, 73-98.
47
48
49 Shapiro, M. D. and Slemrod, J. (1995) Consumer Response to the Timing of Income: evidence
50 from in tax withholding, *American Economic Review*, **85**, 274-283.
51
52
53 Shea, J. (1995) Union Contracts and the Life-Cycle/Permanent-Income Hypothesis, *American*
54
55 *Economic Review*, **85**, 186-200.
56
57
58 Soulesles, N. S. (1999) The Response of Household Consumption to Income Tax Refunds,
59
60 *American Economic Review*, **89**, 947-958.

Soulesles, N. S. (2002) Consumer response to the Reagan Tax Cuts, *Journal of Public Economics*,
85, 99-120.

- 1
2
3 Stephens Jr., M. (2006) Paycheck Receipt and the Timing of Consumption, *The Economic Journal*,
4
5 forthcoming.
6
7 Stephens Jr., M. (2003) “3rd of the month”: do Social Security Recipients smooth consumption
8
9 between checks?, *American Economic Review*, **93**, 406-422.
10
11 Thaler, R. H. (1990) Anomalies: Saving, Fungibility, and Mental Accounts, *Journal of Economic*
12
13 *Perspectives*, **4**, 193-205.
14
15 Watanabe, K., Watanabe, T. and Watanabe, T. (2001) Tax Policy and Consumer Spending:
16
17 evidence from Japanese fiscal experiments, *Journal of International Economics*, **53**, 261-281.
18
19 Wilcox, D. W. (1989) Social Security Benefits, Consumption Expenditure, and the Life Cycle
20
21 Hypothesis, *Journal of Political Economy*, **97**, 305-346.
22
23 Zeldes, S. P. (1989a) Optimal Consumption with Stochastic Income: Deviations from Certainty
24
25 Equivalence, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **104**, 275-298.
26
27 Zeldes, S. P. (1989b) Consumption and Liquidity Constraints: an Empirical Investigation, *Journal*
28
29 *of Political Economy*, **97**, 305-46.
30
31 Ziliak, J. P. (1998) Does the Choice of Consumption Matter? An Application to the Permanent-
32
33 Income Hypothesis, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, **41**, 201-216.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Euler equation estimates for other nondurables ($\Delta \text{LnONDC}_{t+1}$)

	25-44 years		45-60 years		65-80 years		Low-income group		High-income group	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
$\Delta \text{Ln Food}_{t+1}$	-0.045 (0.150)	-0.043 (0.150)	0.474 (0.191)**	0.469 (0.197)**	-0.181 (0.204)	-0.231 (0.213)	-0.030 (0.165)	-0.131 (0.167)	-0.027 (0.144)	-0.066 (0.146)
Durables_{t+1}	-0.028 (0.034)	-0.025 (0.044)	-0.046 (0.029)	-0.057 (0.049)	-0.096 (0.035)*	-0.208 (0.063)*	-0.078 (0.037)**	-0.119 (0.044)*	-0.104 (0.032)*	-0.133 (0.040)*
ΔLnY_{t+1}	-0.042 (0.155)	-	-0.093 (0.146)	-	0.362 (0.216)	-	0.338 (0.135)**	-	-0.150 (0.132)	-
LnY_t	-	-0.002 (0.018)	-	0.007 (0.022)	-	0.047 (0.023)**	-	0.024 (0.022)	-	0.023 (0.022)
OI	58.62	58.89	62.78	64.153	61.422	59.140	62.681	65.306	73.62	73.041
[p-value]	[0.698]	[0.689]	[0.554]	[0.506]	[0.042]	[0.063]	[0.558]	[0.460]	[0.216]	[0.220]
M1	-22.219	-22.235	-17.607	-16.402	-16.766	-14.480	-24.551	-23.437	-24.771	-25.192
M2	0.603	0.597	-0.046	-0.008	-1.287	-1.148	0.532	0.481	0.655	0.529

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively. All the estimations include seasonal dummies and time dummies as explanatory variables. M1 and M2 are test statistics for first and second order serial correlation, respectively. M1 and M2 tests follow a standardized normal distribution. The Sargan test analyses the lack of correlation of instruments with the error term. It is distributed as an χ^2 , with degrees of freedom equal to the number of overidentifying restrictions. These notes are extensible to the remaining tables.

Table 2. Sensitivity of the test of excess sensitivity of other nondurables spending to separability among commodity groups.

	$\Delta \text{Ln Food}_{t+1}$	Durables_{t+1}	$\Delta \text{Ln Y}_{t+1}$	Ln Y_t	OI	M1	M2
					[p-value]		
25-44 years old	-0.006	-	-0.631	-	59.139	-22.181	0.632
	(0.143)		(0.156)*		[0.681]		
	-	-0.022	-0.047	-	57.527	-22.000	0.609
		(0.033)	(0.156)		[0.733]		
	-	-	-0.066	-	57.750	-22.028	0.633
			(0.157)		[0.726]		
45-60 years old	-0.016	-	-	-0.009	59.478	-22.304	0.614
	(0.143)			(0.014)	[0.669]		
	-	-0.014	-	-0.006	57.814	-22.052	0.603
		(0.043)		(0.019)	[0.693]		
	-	-	-	-0.009	58.100	-22.098	0.613
				(0.014)	[0.684]		
65-80 years old	0.517	-	-0.055	-	65.661	-17.509	-0.082
	(0.189)*		(0.144)		[0.453]		
	-	-0.049	-0.125	-	69.451	-21.779	0.046
		(0.029)	(0.145)		[0.298]		
	-	-	-0.089	-	73.719	-21.926	0.004
			(0.142)		[0.190]		
Low-income group	0.534	-	-	-0.014	64.325	-16.681	0.017
	(0.192)**			(0.013)	[0.500]		
	-	-0.087	-	0.023	71.540	-21.747	0.026
		(0.047)		(0.022)	[0.241]		
	-	-	-	-0.007	75.150	-22.130	0.073
				(0.013)	[0.160]		
High-income group	0.011	-	0.433	-	70.848	-19.131	-1.241
	(0.1929)		(0.207)**		[0.006]		
	-	-0.068	0.376	-	52.382	-18.831	-1.291
		(0.033)**	(0.211)		[0.154]		
	-	-	0.419	-	57.150	-19.113	-1.243
			(0.208)**		[0.072]		
Low-income group	-0.001	-	-	-0.011	73.68	-19.488	-1.472
	(0.188)			(0.012)	[0.003]		
	-	-0.124	-	0.023	55.838	-19.808	-1.354
		(0.057)**		(0.021)	[0.090]		
	-	-	-	-0.0130	60.334	-19.810	-1.477
				(0.012)	[0.041]		
Low-income group	0.060	-	0.387	-	68.271	-24.901	0.396
	(0.160)		(0.133)*		[0.366]		
	-	-0.052	0.308	-	51.540	-24.767	0.430
		(0.036)	(0.132)**		[0.869]		
	-	-	0.331	-	53.636	-24.838	0.347
			(0.131)**		[0.818]		
High-income group	-0.001	-	-	-0.007	76.683	-24.913	0.330
	(0.157)			(0.018)	[0.152]		
	-	-0.065	-	0.002	56.638	-24.775	0.376
		(0.043)		(0.022)	[0.731]		
	-	-	-	-0.0152	59.621	-24.907	0.306
				(0.018)	[0.631]		
High-income group	0.066	-	-0.197	-	82.564	-23.512	0.744
	(0.140)		(0.131)		[0.069]		
	-	-0.109	-0.141	-	72.668	-25.248	0.682
		(0.032)*	(0.132)		[0.214]		
	-	-	-0.169	-	85.440	-25.541	0.672
			(0.131)		[0.045]		
High-income group	0.030	-	-	-0.017	85.079	-24.032	0.646
	(0.140)			(0.018)	[0.048]		
	-	-0.135	-	0.022	71.789	-25.019	0.601
		(0.040)*		(0.022)	[0.235]		
	-	-	-	-0.020	86.88	-25.576	0.623
				(0.018)	[0.031]		

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively.

Table 3. Euler equation estimates for food ($\Delta \text{LnFOOD}_{t+1}$)

	25-44 years		45-60 years		65-80 years		Low-income group		High-income group	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
$\Delta \text{LnOND}_{t+1}$	0.018 (0.082)	0.017 (0.084)	0.114 (0.067)	0.120 (0.070)	0.005 (0.073)	-0.032 (0.075)	0.089 (0.078)	0.052 (0.075)	0.050 (0.070)	0.039 (0.071)
Durables _{t+1}	-0.053 (0.026)**	-0.049 (0.031)	0.004 (0.020)	-0.045 (0.030)	-0.075 (0.027)*	-0.121 (0.038)*	-0.025 (0.025)	-0.052 (0.028)	-0.028 (0.025)	-0.048 (0.029)
ΔLnY_{t+1}	0.055 (0.107)	-	-0.007 (0.097)	-	-0.030 (0.141)	-	-0.122 (0.085)	-	0.145 (0.096)	-
LnY_t	-	-0.002 (0.014)	-	0.030 (0.013)**	-	0.022 (0.012)	-	0.028 (0.014)**	-	0.022 (0.015)
OI	61.754	58.89	56.617	48.531	40.084	36.961	65.475	65.843	73.54	72.853
[p-value]	[0.591]	[0.689]	[0.761]	[0.936]	[0.640]	[0.764]	[0.460]	[0.447]	[0.218]	[0.235]
M1	-18.630	-22.235	-17.601	-17.483	-16.730	-16.527	-20.074	-20.514	-21.559	-21.744
M2	-1.298	0.597	-1.393	-1.279	-0.124	-0.179	-0.851	-0.998	-1.125	-1.187

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively.

Table 4. Sensitivity of the test of excess of sensitivity of food spending to separability among commodity groups.

	$\Delta \ln \text{Other nondurables}_{t+1}$	Durables_{t+1}	$\Delta \ln Y_{t+1}$	$\ln Y_t$	OI [p-value]	M1	M2
25-44 years old	0.052 (0.081)	-	0.031 (0.107)	-	64.957 [0.443]	-18.317	-1.312
	-	-0.056 (0.027)**	0.064 (0.109)	-	60.977 [0.583]	-18.630	-1.287
	-	-	0.039 (0.108)	-	65.318 [0.430]	-18.688	-1.311
	0.026 (0.084)	-	-	-0.013 (0.011)	76.210 [0.161]	-18.491	-1.298
	-	-0.050 (0.033)	-	-0.002 (0.014)	61.061 [0.581]	-18.555	-1.265
	-	-	-	-0.014 (0.011)	63.961 [0.477]	-18.688	-1.291
45-60 years old	0.108 (0.065)	-	-0.014 (0.095)	-	56.361 [0.768]	-17.715	-1.380
	-	-0.0000 (0.020)	0.001 (0.094)	-	57.540 [0.702]	-18.560	-1.451
	-	-	-0.003 (0.092)	-	57.249 [0.712]	-18.550	-1.444
	0.138 (0.068)**	-	-	0.0161 (0.0088)	51.584 [0.886]	-17.144	-1.351
	-	-0.051 (0.031)	-	0.029 (0.0134)**	49.935 [0.901]	-18.362	-1.342
	-	-	-	0.013 (0.008)	54.380 [0.798]	-18.606	-1.453
65-80 years old	0.071 (0.069)	-	-0.100 (0.137)	-	49.50 [0.263]	-17.797	-0.228
	-	-0.079 (0.026)*	-0.031 (0.137)	-	40.168 [0.636]	-17.443	-0.114
	-	-	-0.060 (0.135)	-	49.995 [0.215]	-17.748	-0.227
	0.063 (0.068)	-	-	-0.006 (0.008)	73.68 [0.003]	-17.666	-0.165
	-	-0.127 (0.036)*	-	0.024 (0.012)	55.838 [0.108]	-17.298	-0.158
	-	-	-	-0.006 (0.008)	49.107 [0.246]	-17.684	-0.173
Low-income group	0.110 (0.076)	-	-0.115 (0.085)	-	67.139 [0.403]	-19.465	-0.877
	-	-0.039 (0.026)	-0.096 (0.082)	-	67.870 [0.346]	-20.679	-0.834
	-	-	-0.077 (0.081)	-	68.722 [0.320]	-20.825	-0.905
	0.097 (0.073)	-	-	0.019 (0.012)	69.130 [0.339]	-19.784	-1.012
	-	-0.070 (0.029)**	-	0.031 (0.014)**	62.074 [0.544]	-20.624	-0.958
	-	-	-	-0.015 (0.012)	69.336 [0.302]	-20.833	-1.018
High-income group	0.077 (0.067)	-	0.136 (0.096)	-	75.442 [0.176]	-21.147	-1.049
	-	-0.029 (0.024)	0.157 (0.096)	-	70.721 [0.263]	-22.249	-1.218
	-	-	0.146 (0.096)	-	73.162 [0.202]	-22.302	-1.198
	0.078 (0.067)	-	-	0.013 (0.013)	76.210 [0.161]	-21.346	-1.096
	-	-0.047 (0.028)	-	0.020 (0.015)	70.451 [0.270]	-21.996	-1.252
	-	-	-	0.008 (0.012)	74.400 [0.175]	-22.189	-1.231

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively.

**Table 5. Euler equation estimates for other nondurables ($\Delta \text{LnONDC}_{t+1}$).
Households aged between 25 and 60 without unemployed members.**

	25-44 years		45-60 years		Low-income group		High-income group	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
$\Delta \text{Ln Food}_{t+1}$	0.044 (0.149)	0.034 (0.149)	0.339 (0.192)	0.325 (0.192)	0.136 (0.149)	0.147 (0.147)	0.243 (0.200)	0.263 (0.193)
Durables_{t+1}	-0.036 (0.036)	-0.021 (0.043)	-0.053 (0.032)	-0.080 (0.051)	-0.076 (0.050)	-0.110 (0.061)	-0.065 (0.037)	-0.079 (0.042)
ΔLnY_{t+1}	-0.043 (0.180)	-	0.092 (0.183)	-	0.042 (0.201)	-	0.053 (0.202)	-
LnY_t	-	-0.011 (0.018)	-	0.014 (0.022)	-	0.035 (0.038)	-	0.016 (0.023)
OI	39.994	39.756	53.718	53.555	23.625	22.798	41.320	40.918
[p-value]	[0.867]	[0.872]	[0.370]	[0.376]	[0.908]	[0.928]	[0.181]	[0.192]
M1	-18.472	-18.552	-17.576	-17.232	-14.066	-14.131	-19.644	-19.272
M2	0.784	0.755	0.086	0.078	1.179	1.171	0.461	0.525

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively.


**Table 6. Euler equation estimates for food ($\Delta \text{LnFOOD}_{t+1}$).
Households aged between 25 and 60 without unemployed members.**

	25-44 years		45-60 years		Low-income group		High-income group	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
$\Delta \text{LnOND}_{t+1}$	0.094 (0.107)	0.082 (0.110)	0.072 (0.077)	0.072 (0.078)	0.160 (0.142)	0.202 (0.142)	0.050 (0.105)	0.087 (0.103)
Durables_{t+1}	-0.009 (0.030)	0.002 (0.033)	-0.002 (0.023)	-0.041 (0.033)	-0.045 (0.038)	-0.030 (0.044)	-0.022 (0.029)	-0.025 (0.032)
ΔLnY_{t+1}	0.019 (0.136)	-	0.146 (0.118)	-	0.252 (0.136)	-	0.272 (0.150)	-
LnY_t	-	-0.009 (0.015)	-	0.018 (0.013)	-	-0.002 (0.027)	-	0.004 (0.017)
OI	53.736 [0.369]	57.420 [0.249]	50.391 [0.497]	49.717 [0.524]	47.208 [0.065]	48.472 [0.051]	40.403 [0.208]	40.409 [0.208]
M1	-13.990	-14.070	-15.801	-15.746	-9.717	-9.078	-16.791	-16.828
M2	-0.812	-0.832	-1.654	-1.501	-1.026	-0.900	-0.939	-0.892

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively.

FIGURE 1

Quarterly household expenditure on food, other nondurables and durables.
1987-1996.



Notes: Expenditure on food and other nondurables are measured as quarterly changes and expenditure on durables in levels. All values are deflated to 1985 prices.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge the financial support of the Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology through the SEC2002-01512 project.

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **Full title: Further evidence of excess sensitivity of consumption?.**
9 **Non-separability among goods and heterogeneity**
10 **across households**
11

12
13
14 **Running title: The excess sensitivity of consumption to predictable income**
15 **with Spanish data**
16

17
18 **Authors:**
19

20
21 **JOAQUÍN ALEGRE**
22

23 *Department of Applied Economics, University of the Balearic Islands, Spain*
24

25 *Mailing address: Edifici Jovellanos-Campus UIB, Crta. Valldemossa Km. 7.5, 07122*
26

27 *Palma de Mallorca, Illes Balears, Spain.*
28

29
30 **LLORENÇ POU (corresponding author)**
31

32 *Department of Applied Economics, University of the Balearic Islands, Spain*
33

34 *Mailing address: Edifici Jovellanos-Campus UIB, Crta. Valldemossa Km. 7.5, 07122*
35

36 *Palma de Mallorca, Illes Balears, Spain.*
37

38
39 *E-mail: llorens.pou@uib.es*
40
41

42 **ABSTRACT**
43
44

45 The standard theoretical framework for analysing households' intertemporal decisions is
46 the life-cycle/permanent income model. Among its implications, testing the model allows
47 to analyse the response of consumption to fiscal policy. However, the empirical literature
48 with microdata has yielded mixed results. This paper examines the sensitivity of the
49 results to the assumption of separability among goods and of homogeneity across
50 households. For that purpose, we test a rational expectations permanent income model
51 with household data drawn from the Spanish Family Expenditure Survey. This survey
52 contains detailed information on total expenditure, and the income presents large,
53 exogenous quarterly changes due to an institutional feature. The paper shows that
54 assuming separability among commodities biases the test against the model. When
55 separability is not imposed, we show that the rejection of the model depends on
56 heterogeneity across households in terms of their members being unemployed or not. For
57 those households permanently employed, the model cannot be rejected whatever their
58 income status.
59
60

1. Introduction

Since Robert Hall's paper (1978), most studies of consumption have focused on Euler equations. The rational expectations permanent income hypothesis (henceforth the REPIH) states that households incorporate any available information into consumer-related decision making. Therefore, changes in household consumption should not respond to predicted income growth. In this sense, a tax policy's ability to affect the aggregate demand depends on the acceptance of the REPIH: if households are foresighted, only unexpected changes affecting their permanent income will modify current consumption.

Most of the early studies that tested Hall's model used aggregate data (e.g. Flavin, 1981; Hayashi, 1982; Campbell and Mankiw, 1989; Wirjanto, 1996; Villagomez, 1997). However, the possibility of controlling for heterogeneity across households and of avoiding distortions caused by the aggregation of micro-level non-linear relations has gradually directed analyses of the intertemporal allocation of consumption towards the field of microeconomics, which also happens to be the level at which theories were formulated (Heckman, 2001). A review of empirical literature based on household data indicates that the rejection of the model is sensitive to the measure of consumption analysed (Lage, 1991; Ziliak, 1998; Parker, 1999; Soulesles, 1999, 2002),¹ to the set of imposed separability hypotheses, mainly centred on leisure/consumption-type decision making (Attanasio and Browning, 1995; Attanasio and Weber, 1995) and on decisions associated with the family's demographic composition (Attanasio and Browning, 1995; Attanasio and Weber, 1995), or to the power of the instruments used to predict income growth (Altonji and Siow, 1987; Shea, 1995; Lusardi, 1996; Soulesles, 1999).

1
2
3 Although the overall rejection of the model has been reduced by taking into account the
4
5 above aspects, there is no sufficient consensus as yet (Deaton, 1992; Browning and
6
7 Lusardi, 1996; Attanasio, 1999). For this reason, in recent years a number of different
8
9 studies have emerged that take advantage of existing “institutional features” associated
10
11 with household income. These studies analyse situations in which individuals have prior
12
13 knowledge of changes in their income. This can be construed as a “natural experiment” of
14
15 the REPIH: if individuals are forewarned of variations in their income, their consumption
16
17 patterns should not vary when their income changes.
18
19

20
21
22 These articles have mainly followed two alternative approaches. One consists of testing
23
24 households’ response to announced tax changes² (Shapiro and Slemrod, 1995; Soulesles,
25
26 2002).³ The problem with this approach resides in the difficulty in discerning whether tax
27
28 changes are permanent or transitory (Watanabe *et al.*, 2001). A second approach has
29
30 focused on households’ reactions to intrayear fluctuations in income. Thus Paxson (1993)
31
32 and Browning and Collado (2001) compare expenditure patterns across the year in
33
34 Thailand and Spain, respectively, between households with an uneven intrayear income
35
36 distribution and those with a more homogenous one. Other authors have analysed the
37
38 excess sensitivity of consumption to intrayear income variations caused by tax refunds
39
40 (Soulesles, 1999; Hsieh, 2003) or by the cessation of Social Security taxes (Parker, 1999).
41
42 Finally, Stephens (2003, 2006) examines whether spending is sensitive to the time of
43
44 month when people receive their pay in Great Britain and their Social Security cheques in
45
46 the United States, respectively. Overall, the results of this second approach are not
47
48 conclusive, with fewer studies that fail to reject the REPIH (Paxson, 1993; Browning and
49
50 Collado, 2001; Hsieh, 2003). Nevertheless, in some of these articles income changes are
51
52 small. In this context, if individuals must incur big costs in order to smooth consumption,
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 ¹ See also the papers by Dow (1993), Shea (1994), and Lee and Kong (2000), with aggregate data.

60 ² A similar proposal is that made by Levenson (1996), who analyses whether households in Taiwan increased their consumption after an announced reform to the Social Security that represented windfall retirements/severance benefits.

1
2
3 then the rejection of the REPIH might be due to a near-rational type of behaviour (Thaler,
4
5 1990).
6
7

8
9
10 This paper aims to contribute towards testing the REPIH by taking advantage of
11 information available in the Spanish Family Expenditure Survey (Encuesta Continua de
12 Presupuestos Familiares, hereafter the ECPF), both in terms of income and expenditure
13 data, so that our test of the REPIH overcomes some of the shortcomings highlighted
14 above.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 Most Spanish wage earners (and all pensioners) face periodic intrayear fluctuations in
23 income with which they are perfectly familiar, both in terms of when they will occur and
24 in the amount concerned. This is due to the existence of two extra payments (one in July
25 and another in late December).⁴ Since these extra payments are systematic, exogenous to
26 individuals and non-performance related, there is no point in distinguishing between
27 permanent and transitory quarterly variations in income for those individuals that are
28 retired or permanently employed. From this point of view, this article complements other
29 studies which analyse institutional features affecting income based on U.S. micro data
30 (Soulesles, 1999; Parker, 1999; Hsieh, 2003) and Spanish micro data (Browning and
31 Collado, 2001).⁵
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 With regard to the arguments of the utility function, in this paper we do not assume
58 separability among commodities. This paper takes into account the relationship among
59 the three categories that together make up total spending (food, other nondurable goods
60 and services, and durables). The purpose is to test whether the rejection of the REPIH

³ Poterba (1988) and Wilcox (1989) are examples of pioneering studies in this type of REPIH test, using aggregate data.

⁴ See Browning and Collado (2001) for a description of the annotation of the extra payments in the ECPF.

⁵ As commented below, the main differences between this study and that of Browning and Collado (2001) are that this paper does not assume separability among goods, whilst heterogeneity across households is contemplated via the sample's segmentation. Finally, this study includes households with unemployed members and households where the spouse works.

1
2
3 detected in other studies can be accounted for by the omission of spending variables as
4 regressors, since this hypothesis is systematically overlooked in the literature (Browning
5 and Lusardi, 1996; Attanasio, 1999), partially because this information is lacking in many
6
7
8
9
10 databases.

11
12
13
14 Finally, we also explore the influence of heterogeneity across households on the excess
15 sensitivity of consumption to income. Along some of the most commonly used criteria
16 (based on income level or age) to segment the sample, this paper also tests whether the
17
18
19
20 results are driven by transitory income caused by transitions into unemployment.⁶
21
22

23
24
25 The results of this paper show that the imposition of separability among goods biases the
26 test against the REPIH. When the extended model that includes groups of commodities as
27 regressors is tested, the rejection of the model is not extensive to the whole sample.
28
29
30 Unlike, its rejection is dependent on the chosen source of heterogeneity across
31 households. In this respect, our results allow to reconcile papers that reject the REPIH
32
33
34 with those that fail to reject it, even when using the same database; the REPIH is rejected
35
36
37 when we split the sample using income as our criterion and to a lesser extent when based
38
39
40 on the age of the household head. However, we fail to reject the REPIH when households
41
42
43 where either of the spouses is unemployed are dropped, regardless of whether
44
45
46 segmentation is based on income or age. Our results suggest then that the mixed findings
47
48
49 observed in empirical literature when income (wealth) or age is used as a segmentation
50
51
52 criterion, might be due to these variables' correlation with transitory income caused by
53
54
55 transitions into unemployment.
56
57

58
59 The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 motivates our analysis;
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 dedicated to econometric issues; Section 6 comments the estimation results. Finally, the
4
5
6 concluding remarks are presented in Section 7.

9 10 **2. Motivation**

11
12
13
14 Analyses of the REPIH have mainly been based on the correlation between consumption
15
16 growth and predicted income (Deaton, 1992; Browning and Lusardi, 1996; Attanasio,
17
18 1999). In this respect, if we dispense with discussions on control variables, in order to test
19
20 the REPIH it is essential to have a database that shows a sufficient variability in income,
21
22 as well as powerful instruments for predicting income growth. Not only is income
23
24 variability important in achieving precise estimates, but also due to the consequences of
25
26 measurement errors. The lower the true variation in income, the easier it is for
27
28 measurement error to drive the sign of income changes. In fact, measurement error in
29
30 consumption and income is one of the most serious limitations when using household
31
32 data to test the REPIH (Altonji and Siow, 1987; Runkle, 1991; Deaton, 1992; Lusardi,
33
34 1996).

35
36
37
38
39
40 As mentioned above, most permanently employed Spanish workers' (and all pensioners')
41
42 yearly income is not evenly distributed across the twelve months, due to two extra
43
44 payments (one in July and the other in late December). Each extra payment ranges
45
46 between 60 to 100% of a normal monthly one. Thus most households interviewed in the
47
48 ECPF present high quarterly income changes of between 15 and 30% in real terms that
49
50 are not common with other microdata sets.
51
52

53
54
55 This considerable variability in quarterly income has important implications on the testing
56
57 of the REPIH. First, as is also the case in Parker (1999), Soulesles (1999) and Hsieh
58
59

60
⁶ See Browning and Crossley (1999) for theoretical and empirical results on consumption during an

1
2
3 (2003), because these extra payments are systematic and exogenous in nature, most of the
4
5 quarterly income changes observed by the investigator are known to households in
6
7 advance⁷ and they do not transmit new information: a factor which is crucial in a
8
9 rational-expectations context. Second, it compels forward-looking households to take an
10
11 active role in planning the intrayear allocation of their income, which reduces the effect
12
13 of bounded rationality.⁸ Third, it greatly reduces the influence of measurement error in
14
15 income on the sign of quarterly income changes. Finally, the extra payments' exogenous,
16
17 systematic characteristic is reflected in the unusually high predictive power of our
18
19 instruments of income growth (an adjusted R² of around 0.45). Thanks to this high value,
20
21 we avoid the acceptance of the REPIH attributable to the usual weak correlation of the
22
23 instrument set with income growth.
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 The second element we would like to focus on is the interrelation between the groups of
31
32 commodities. If the possibility that households might readjust their total expenditure
33
34 across different groups of commodities is not contemplated, this effect might be captured
35
36 by income, rejecting the REPIH (Attanasio and Weber, 1995; Browning and Lusardi,
37
38 1996; Attanasio, 1999). One of the peculiarities of the ECPF is the fact that it contains
39
40 detailed information on all household spending. Figure 1 shows the quarterly expenditure
41
42 changes over the sample period for each of the three groups of commodities into which
43
44 total expenditure has been divided: food, other nondurables and durables (see Appendix 1
45
46 for details of how the goods were grouped). Figure 1 highlights how Spanish households
47
48 seem to adjust their expenditure on an intratemporal basis. In fact, after removing
49
50
51
52

53
54 unemployment spell.

55 ⁷ For those households without transitions into and out of employment, in 85% of all observations the sign of the
56
57 quarterly income changes can be correctly predicted. In fact, despite a lack of official information on how
58
59 widespread extra payments are, the analysis of the ECPF points to the fact that around 75% of all employees
60
with no labour transitions receive extra payments.

⁸ Browning and Crossley (2001) calculate the welfare costs for Spanish households of automatically consuming
all current income (measured as a percentage of annual spending) rather than following an optimally smoothed
path, under the hypothesis that, during months with extra payments, double the normal income is paid. The
authors conclude that the welfare costs stand at around 7%, very much higher than the figure for institutional
features examined by Hsieh (2003) and Parker (1999), thus demonstrating the relevance of intrayear planning
in the Spanish case.

1
2
3 seasonal patterns, simple Pearson correlations between other nondurables and food,
4
5 between other nondurables and durables, and between food and durables showed values
6
7 (and p-values) of 0.068 (0.0001), -0.050 (0.0001) and -0.047 (0.0001), respectively.
8
9 Therefore, apart from seasonal preferences, it cannot be ruled out *a priori* that part of the
10
11 quarterly changes in food or in other nondurables spending is due to nonseparability
12
13 among commodity groups. For this reason, when specifying Euler equations for a group
14
15 of commodities, the strategy used was to condition them on the expenditure of the
16
17 remaining commodity groups. This issue will be taken up again in the following section,
18
19 when specifying the utility function.
20
21

22
23
24
25 [INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]
26
27

28 29 3. The Model

30
31
32
33 The rational expectations permanent income hypothesis proposed by Hall (1978)
34
35 establishes that households try to maximize their expected lifetime utility using all the
36
37 available information on their expected lifetime income endowments. Thus households
38
39 allocate their consumption on an intertemporal basis until their discounted marginal
40
41 utility across periods is smoothed,
42
43

$$44
45
46 U'_{it} = E_t \left[U'_{it+1} \left(\frac{1+r_{it}}{1+\delta_i} \right) \right] + \mu_{it} \quad (1)
47
48
49$$

50
51 where U'_{it} is the marginal utility of household i during period t , E_t the mean operator
52
53 conditioned on the set of information known at moment t , δ_i the household i rate of time
54
55 preference, r_{it} the after-tax real interest rate and μ_{it} a Lagrange multiplier associated with
56
57 the non-negativity constraint on wealth (Zeldes, 1989b).
58
59
60

From (1) the rejection of the REPIH can be attributable to two main sources. On the one hand, the existence of liquidity constraints, a precautionary-saving motive or simply a “rule-of-thumb” behaviour, for example, which would hinder the intertemporal allocation process stated by the standard REPIH based on expected future information. In this case μ_{it} , which is unobservable, will be different from zero. So, to detect the violation of the martingale condition, variables must be introduced that are correlated with μ_{it} , such as income. The second source of rejection is when the researcher fails to include all the variables that the household incorporates into its utility function. In this second case, at least part of the model’s rejection can be attributed to the omission of relevant variables whose effect might be captured by income, even if the model is true. In this paper we use a wider set of preference variables in the utility function (which usually includes demographic and labour-supply variables as taste shifters), based on the non-imposition of separability among food consumption, FC, other non-durable goods and services, ONDC, and the stock of durables, S.

Thus the utility function used, which is of the constant relative risk aversion type, takes a multiplicative form which includes the three aforementioned expenditure categories and a vector of household preferences, θ_{it} .

$$U(FC_{it}, ONDC_{it}, S_{it}; \theta_{it}) = \frac{1}{1-\tau} FC_{it}^{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} ONDC_{it}^{1-\tau} \frac{1}{1-\Psi} S_{it}^{1-\Psi} \exp(\theta_{it}) \quad (2)$$

θ_{it} is composed of an observable stochastic part, expressed as a vector of demographic variables (the age of the household head, age_{it} ; the age squared, age_{it}^2 ; and the family size, $FAMS_{it}$) and of labour supply (the number of earners, NE_{it} ; and the household head’s unemployment status, UH_{it}), and an unobservable part. The latter is made up of an individual effect which does not vary over time, β_i , and an error term for household preferences that varies in time and across households, ϖ_{it} , which we assume is orthogonal to β_i .

$$\theta_{it} = b_0 age_{it} + b_1 age_{it}^2 + b_2 FAMS_{it} + b_3 NE_{it} + b_4 UH_{it} + \beta_i + \varpi_{it} \quad (3)$$

For the sake of brevity we restrict the exposition to the case of other nondurables consumption. If we suppose that the rate of time preference is equal to the real interest rate, $\delta_i = r_{it}$, as in Lusardi (1996) and Jappelli and Pistaferri (2000), taking logarithms of both sides of the expression derived from the substitution of the utility function (2) and household preferences (3) in the first-order condition (1), and using a second-order Taylor expansion, we can express the Euler equation as follows, once rational expectations have been applied:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln ONDC_{it+1} = & k_{0i} + k_1 age_{it} + k_2 \Delta FAMS_{it+1} + k_3 \Delta NE_{it+1} + k_4 \Delta UH_{it+1} + \\ & + k_5 \Delta \ln FC_{it+1} + k_6 \Delta \ln S_{it+1} + k_7 \Delta \ln Y_{it+1} + \phi_{it+1} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where

$$k_{0i} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left(b_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\Delta t+1}^2 \right); \quad \phi_{it+1} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \left[\Delta \varpi_{it+1} - \ln(1 + \varepsilon_{it+1}) - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\Delta t+1}^2 + \ln(1 + \mu'_{it}) \right]$$

where Δ is the first difference operator, α is the coefficient of relative risk aversion and $\sigma_{\Delta t+1}^2$ is the variance in consumption growth. The term ε_{it+1} incorporates expectational errors; it has mean zero and is uncorrelated with any information available at time t , $E[\varepsilon_{it+1}/\Omega_{it}] = 0$. Following Runkle (1991), except where otherwise noted, k_{0i} is assumed to be the same for all households (see Section 5).

Equation (4) incorporates the variables that determine the intertemporal allocation of consumption. The central hypothesis to test is whether the lagged information over which the household has intertemporal control has predictive power over consumption growth. For this reason, predicted income has been included in equation (4): if income is

1
2
3 statistically significant, $k_7 \neq 0$, then the REPIH is rejected. Note, therefore, that possible
4 specific sources of excess sensitivity are not tested in this paper.⁹ The other hypothesis of
5 interest concern separability among commodity groups, tested via parameters k_5 and k_6 .
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 **4. The Data** 15 16 17

18 The household-information data set used in this paper was drawn from the Spanish
19 Family Expenditure Survey for the period 1986-1996. The ECPF, which is conducted by
20 the National Institute of Statistics (INE), is a rotating quarterly panel survey
21 representative of the Spanish population. The survey combines direct annotations of
22 expenditure made during the week when contact with the household is maintained and a
23 personal interview regarding expenditure prior to that week.¹⁰ In addition, income made
24 during the previous three months is recorded, together with sociodemographic and
25 labour-related information concerning the households during the week of the interview.
26 For the purposes of comparisons with other surveys, the information not available
27 includes household members' number of working hours and households' net wealth and
28 stock of durables.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Each quarter 3,200 households are interviewed. From these, 12.5% are randomly replaced
58 each quarter, so that each household is monitored for up to eight consecutive quarters. In
59 order to minimize possible inconsistency in parameter estimates associated with panel
60 data sets where the number of observations per household is small (Chamberlain, 1984),
we restricted our sample to households that answered the survey for the maximum eight

⁹ In order to have a direct measure of liquidity constraints, García (1999) substitutes the income variable for the change in households' indebtedness, the latter obtained from National Accounts.

¹⁰ The reference period for each type of goods depends on the frequency of its purchase. Food expenditure corresponds to purchases made during the week of the interview, other nondurables to the previous month including the week of the interview, and durables to the previous three months including the week of the interview. The INE raises food spending and expenditure on other nondurables to a standard three-month period to homogenize the global expenditure period.

1
2
3 possible quarters, leading to a sample of 8,774 households. From these, households were
4
5 selected whose heads were aged between 25 and 80, and who were not self-employed.
6
7 We followed previous empirical work in applying several filters to exclude households
8
9 with extreme measurement errors in consumption or income (Altonji and Siow, 1987;
10
11 DeJuan and Seater, 1999). The final sample consisted of 5,143 households, representing a
12
13 total of 41,144 observations.
14
15

16
17
18 As for the construction of the variables used in the model, total expenditure was divided
19
20 into three groups of commodities: food (in and away from home), other nondurable goods
21
22 and services (including clothes and footwear as semi-durables), and durables. Each group
23
24 of commodities was deflated by a household-specific Stone Price Index, derived from the
25
26 disaggregated national consumer retail price index published by the INE, where the
27
28 household budget shares were taken as weights. The income variable comprises total
29
30 after-tax household income and it was deflated to 1985 prices with the general CPI.
31
32 Variations in the stock of durables were proxied by a dummy variable that took a value of
33
34 one when the household's expenditure on durables was equal to or higher than 60€ and
35
36 zero otherwise.¹¹ The household head's transitions into and out of unemployment were
37
38 also controlled by a dummy variable, with a value of one if the household head was
39
40 unemployed during the week of the interview and zero if not. The remaining explanatory
41
42 variables were specified as continuous variables. The family size was measured in adult-
43
44 equivalent terms, according to the OECD equivalence scale.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Appendix 1 details the components of each commodity group of goods and the filters
52
53 used. It also contains a table with descriptive statistics of all the variables used in the
54
55 Euler equation estimates.
56
57
58
59
60

¹¹ The results were not affected when other minimum values for expenditure on durables were used.

5. Econometric Issues

Equation (4) was estimated using the Generalised Method of Moments (GMM), exploiting the orthogonality conditions imposed by the rational expectations hypothesis, i.e., $E[\phi_{it}/\Omega_{is}] = 0 \forall t \geq s$ where Ω_{is} is the set of information available at time s , that contains the instrument set. The standard errors are robust to general forms of heteroscedasticity and serial correlation.¹² In this context of rational expectations, testing the model's overidentifying restrictions constitutes a complementary test of the REPIH (Runkle, 1991).

For the estimation of equation (4), controls were made for the information contained in the error term. Following Runkle (1991), different factors were taken into account: the presence of aggregate shocks, the presence of persistent household-specific effects,¹³ and measurement error in consumption. The aggregate shocks were accounted for using year dummies, under the null hypothesis of aggregate shocks to consumption growth that are common across households (Mariger and Shaw, 1993). Measurement error in consumption was controlled using a twofold approach: household filters (see Appendix 1) and the number of instrument lags. Given the MA(1) structure of the error term, instruments were used with two lags and earlier.

¹² We estimated the Euler equations by GMM using the DPD programme written in GAUSS by Arellano and Bond (1998).

¹³ This type of heterogeneity could arise if each household had its own discount rate, which remained constant across time. In this case, the presence of persistent household-specific effects causes lagged consumption growth to have predictive power over current consumption growth. For this reason, to test their existence, $\Delta \ln C_{t-1}$, which would be correlated with the household-specific effect, was incorporated into the instrument set.

1
2
3 All the explanatory variables, except for time dummies, were assumed to be endogenous
4 and so they were instrumented.¹⁴ The availability of suitable instruments is crucial in
5 testing orthogonality between consumption growth and predicted income.¹⁵ In this paper
6 advantage was taken of the unique extra-payment factor and the fact that the ECPF
7 monitors the same households for over four quarters. As can be seen in Appendix 2, the
8 exogenous, systematic, non-performance-related nature of these extra payments provides
9 powerful instruments of $\Delta \ln Y_{it+1}$ with an adjusted R^2 of up to 0.46 for those households
10 without unemployed members: a figure much higher than the normal 0.02 offered by
11 other databases (Altonji and Siow, 1987; Shea, 1995; Lusardi, 1996; Browning and
12 Lusardi, 1996). Appendix 2 details the set of instruments used in the estimations,
13 comprising sociodemographic, labour-supply, expenditure and income variables.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **6. Results**

33
34
35
36 In this section, we discuss the results of the Euler equations for the two groups of
37 nondurable commodities: food and other nondurables. In order to check how
38 heterogeneity across households could influence the test of the REPIH, we segmented the
39 sample using different criteria. On the one hand, the sample was separated into three
40 groups based on the age of the household head: 25 to 44 years old, 45 to 60 years old and
41 65 to 80 years old.¹⁶ Most articles do not consider households with heads over the age of
42 64 suitable for testing the REPIH, because certain factors such as health, the likelihood of
43 death, changes in family size etc. can alter how they plan consumption. In this paper,
44 households with heads aged over 64 were included as an additional group in order to
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 ¹⁴ Attention was also paid to the possible correlation between age and unemployment. The analysis of the
59 sample did not show a high degree of correlation between age and unemployment transitions.

60 ¹⁵ See Hansen and Singleton (1982), Arellano and Bond (1991) and Bound *et al.* (1995) for the properties of the
IV estimators when the instruments are weakly correlated with the endogenous variable.

¹⁶ The group aged between 61 and 64 was excluded to prevent transitions into retirement from distorting the
results.

1
2
3 complement previous papers. If the model's violation is due to liquidity constraints or to
4 precautionary saving, excess sensitivity is more likely to arise in the younger and older
5 age groups (Jappelli, 1990; Gourinchas and Parker, 2002). On the other hand, the sample
6 was also split according to household income¹⁷ into a low-income and high-income
7 group. The statistical power of the test is dependent on the capacity of the segmentation
8 criterion to ensure the correct separation of those households able to smooth their
9 marginal utility intertemporally from those not able to do so. We therefore considered
10 high-income households to be those that remained above the 6th decile for each of the
11 eight waves. Those households that consistently remained below the 6th decile were
12 classified low-income households. If the REPIH's violation is due to liquidity constraints
13 or to a precautionary motive, excess sensitivity should only arise in the low-income
14 group. As with the age-based segmentation criterion, if excess sensitivity is due to some
15 other source, e.g. a rule-of-thumb behaviour, there is no reason to believe that the results
16 for the two income groups should differ. Appendix 3 shows the sociodemographic and
17 economic characteristics of each household sample.

18
19 For the sake of brevity, we only report the parameter estimates of interest: those referred
20 to the excess sensitivity of consumption to predicted income ($\Delta \ln Y_{t+1}$ or $\ln Y_t$) and those
21 concerning the influence that non-separability among commodity groups can have on it.
22 All the other results are available from the authors on request.

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

6a. *Results for the consumption of other nondurables*

Tables 1 and 2 present the results of the Euler equations for other nondurables using the extended model and when we assume separability among commodity groups, respectively. From Table 1 it can be seen that for household groups whose head is below

¹⁷ Zeldes (1989b) and most subsequent authors separate the sample on the basis of (liquid) wealth to income ratios. Unfortunately, wealth-related information is not available in the ECPF.

1
2
3 the age of 61 (columns 1 to 4), neither of the two income specifications is statistically
4 significant at the 5% level. Neither can overidentifying restrictions be rejected.¹⁸ Notice,
5
6 however, that failure to reject the REPIH for the younger group is dependent upon the
7 hypothesis of nonseparability of other nondurables from durables (see Table 2). Unlike
8
9 the previous age groups, there is evidence against the REPIH for the over-64 age group
10 (columns 5 and 6 of Table 1): $\ln Y_t$ is significant at the 5% level and overidentifying
11
12 restrictions are also rejected.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 An analysis of the Euler equations when the sample is split according to income (columns
22 7 to 10 of Table 1), shows that there is evidence of excess sensitivity of consumption to
23 predicted income growth for the low-income group: the coefficient on $\Delta \ln Y_{t+1}$ is
24 significant at the 5% level.¹⁹ In contrast, as expected when there is a precautionary motive
25 or liquidity constraints, the REPIH cannot be rejected for the high-income group, as in
26
27 Soulesles (1999).²⁰ It is important to note that, as detected for the younger group,
28 assuming separability among commodity groups biases the results against the REPIH for
29 the high-income group: Table 2, in particular, shows that the overidentifying restrictions
30 are rejected.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 On the other hand, the hypotheses of separability between other nondurables and food,
43 and between other nondurables and durables are rejected for several household groups, as
44 shown in Table 1. The signs of the coefficients obtained are the expected ones: positive
45 for food and negative for durables.²¹
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ¹⁸ The null hypothesis of absence of second-order autocorrelation for the disturbance term (M2) could not be
56 rejected. Neither could the null hypothesis of absence of persistent household-specific effects. These results
57 were repeated in the remaining estimations. For the sake of brevity, tests of persistent household-specific
58 effects are not reported, but are available upon request.

59 ¹⁹ Note from table 2 that the excess sensitivity is maintained when neither of the two groups of commodities is
60 included as an explanatory variable.

²⁰ The results were not affected when retired households were excluded.

²¹ Brugiavini and Weber (1994) also obtain a negative correlation between nondurables and durables with cross-section data.

[INSERT TABLES 1 AND 2 ABOUT HERE]

6b. Results for food consumption

When the REPIH is tested for food consumption, it shows the same results as the test for other nondurables when the youngest household group is analysed: the orthogonality condition between consumption growth and predicted income cannot be rejected (columns 1 and 2 of Table 3). The results obtained for the other two household age groups are the opposite of those observed for other nondurables: the REPIH is rejected for the middle-age household group, but not for the older group. Again, the failure to reject the REPIH for some household groups is dependent upon the assumption of separability among groups of commodities, as shown in Table 4.

When the sample is segmented according to income, the same different intertemporal allocation capacity observed for nondurables is maintained. The REPIH is rejected for the low-income group, but not for the high-income group, as also detected in Zeldes (1989b), Jappelli *et al.* (1998) and Soulesles (1999).

[INSERT TABLES 3 AND 4 ABOUT HERE]

As for explanatory consumption variables, in those cases in which they are statistically significant, the expected parameter signs are also obtained: positive for other nondurables, as in Attanasio and Weber (1995), and negative for durables.

6c. The segmentation criteria and the effect of being unemployed

The results reported so far indicate that segmenting the sample according to income provides more stable results than dividing it into age groups. In other words, they do not

1
2
3 seem to have the same power to classify those households with and those without
4
5 difficulties in allocating their consumption intertemporally. The question we raise in this
6
7 sub-section is whether the disparity of our results is due to the fact that income and age
8
9 are not equally correlated with the latent variable that conditions the intertemporal
10
11 allocation, that we proxy for the fact of being unemployed.
12
13

14
15
16 In order to check this possibility and to make our results comparable with previous work,
17
18 we concentrated on those households whose heads were 60 years old or younger. From
19
20 these, households were excluded if either the head or the spouse (if applicable) was
21
22 unemployed during any of the eight quarters. This led to a new sample of 2,576
23
24 households and 20,608 observations. This new sample allows us to compare our results
25
26 directly with those of Browning and Collado (2001), who also use a sample of Spanish
27
28 households drawn from the ECPF characterized by their household head's "permanent
29
30 employment status". Unlike us, however, these authors do not segment the sample.
31
32
33

34
35
36 After dropping those households with unemployed members, our new sample is less
37
38 likely to be affected by income risk or liquidity constraints. Thus, if the results differ from
39
40 those obtained using our whole sample, it could be attributable to a correlation between
41
42 the segmentation criterion and unemployment (e.g. with transitory income). Moreover, by
43
44 dropping those households with unemployed members, we can take full advantage of the
45
46 extra payments' systematicity. In fact, Appendix 2 shows how the predictive power of the
47
48 instruments of income growth rises dramatically for these households, thus enhancing the
49
50 statistical power of the REPIH test.
51
52
53

54
55 [INSERT TABLES 5 AND 6 ABOUT HERE]
56
57

58
59 Tables 5 and 6 report the estimated Euler equations for other nondurables and food,
60
respectively, based on the new sample. From both tables it can be observed that neither

1
2
3 type of segmentation, by age or income, shows evidence of an excess sensitivity of
4 consumption growth to predicted income, regardless of the group of commodities
5 analysed. That is, once we remove those households with unemployed members, we
6 cannot reject the REPIH on the basis of expected future information, thus corroborating
7 Browning and Collado's findings (2001). In this respect, these results suggest that age or
8 income criteria *per se* do not capture the true source of heterogeneity in Spanish
9 household consumption patterns. The key element that conditions the results of the Euler
10 equations for the whole ECPF sample is the transitory income that accompany a transition
11 into unemployment. The more highly correlated the segmentation variable is with
12 transitions into and out of work, the greater capacity it will have to classify households
13 correctly.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **7. Conclusions**

32
33
34 Empirical literature on the REPIH yields mixed results. This paper has attempted to
35 contribute towards the testing of the REPIH by using a high-quality database, the Spanish
36 ECPF, and by analysing the influence of heterogeneity both across households and goods.
37 In two respects the information on total expenditure and income offered by the ECPF has
38 allowed us to overcome some of the drawbacks detected in empirical literature. On the
39 one hand, this paper has extended the standard Euler equation by assuming non-
40 separability between food and other nondurables, as in Attanasio and Weber (1995), and
41 also of the latter two categories from durables. On the other hand, we have also taken
42 advantage of a Spanish institutional feature that leads to an uneven intrayear wage and
43 pension distribution. Unlike other data sets, the large, highly predictable quarterly income
44 changes that these extra payments produce enhance the power of the REPIH test.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This paper has shown that conditioning the Euler equations on consumption variables,
4 including durables, can alter the rejection of the REPIH. In consequence, assuming
5 separability among commodity groups biases the results against the REPIH, so that the
6 rejection of the REPIH observed with other databases might partially be attributable to
7 this omission.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 The overall result of this paper, when separability among commodity groups is not
17 imposed, is the rejection of the REPIH, in the sense that not all households behave
18 according to the orthogonality condition between consumption growth and predicted
19 income. However, this paper has shown that not all segmentation criteria are equally
20 correlated with the latent variable (i.e. the true source of heterogeneity across households)
21 that conditions the intertemporal allocation of consumption. Whilst the results are not
22 stable for households with heads over the age of 44, segmentation by income always
23 leads to the rejection of the REPIH for the low-income group, but not for the high-income
24 one (as in Zeldes, 1989b; Jappelli *et al.*, 1998; Soulesles, 1999) regardless of the measure
25 of consumption analysed.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The importance of controlling for the correct source of heterogeneity is shown when we
41 drop those households with unemployed members: there is no evidence against the
42 REPIH for any group of households, neither when segmented by age nor by income,
43 irrespective of the group of consumption commodities analysed. In consonance with the
44 standard REPIH, for those households permanently employed segmentation according to
45 current income does not show different results for high-income and low-income groups,
46 because their reference variable is permanent income.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 The different conclusions that we reach when households with unemployed members are
58 either taken or not taken into account are not contradictory under a less restrictive
59 Rational Expectations Permanent Income Model. As suggested by Zeldes (1989a), the
60

1
2
3 rejection of the standard REPIH is the expected result in an uncertain framework like that
4
5 experienced by prudent families with unemployed members. Indeed, our results suggest
6
7 that the mixed findings obtained in empirical literature might be attributable to the failure
8
9 to control properly for heterogeneity across households. For instance, if being
10
11 unemployed is the key variable, the sample period (in terms of the stages of the business
12
13 cycle covered) is an important issue, as some authors (e.g. Deaton, 1992) have
14
15 emphasized to explain in part the different conclusions reached by Zeldes (1989b) and
16
17 Runkle (1991). In this respect, our results suggest that the segmentation criterion should
18
19 be flexible enough to separate households according to their economic performance (with
20
21 greater flexibility in the case of income than age or other variables also used, such as
22
23 home ownership versus tenancy).
24
25
26
27
28

29 In terms of fiscal policy, the rejection of the REPIH for the household sample containing
30
31 unemployed members but not for those with permanently employed members points to
32
33 the existence of two groups at the aggregate, as suggested by Hall and Mishkin (1982)
34
35 and Campbell and Mankiw (1989). What is more, the importance of transitory income
36
37 that accompany transitions into unemployment might suggest that the fraction of
38
39 consumers who track their consumption to current income is not constant over time, but
40
41 might have a cyclical profile as shown by Jappelli and Fissel (1990).
42
43
44
45
46

47 In summary, this paper has shown that heterogeneity across households and separability
48
49 among goods strongly influences the results of consumption Euler equations. Future
50
51 research should focus on analysing how the sources of heterogeneity that influence the
52
53 consumption Euler equations are correlated with structural factors, like unemployment, as
54
55 demonstrated in this paper for Spanish households. This could be an avenue for
56
57 reconciling the mixed results shown in empirical literature.
58
59
60

Appendices

A1. The ECPF: commodity groups, filters and descriptive statistics of estimation variables.

Composition of commodity groups: the food category includes spending on food in and away from home, and spending on alcoholic drinks and tobacco. The category for other non-durable goods and services includes spending on clothes and footwear, housing, heating and lighting (not including any imputed rent from owner occupation), household goods, goods and services for the home maintenance, medicine, fuels, public transport, postage and communications, leisure and cultural services, books, newspapers and magazines. Durables include spending on furniture, carpets and rugs, heating and kitchen appliances, household fittings, glassware, the purchase of vehicles and other appliances and accessories.

Filters: households fulfilling any of the following conditions were dropped: (a) those at the 0.5% bottom or top percentiles of the income distribution, (b) those experiencing a quarterly income change per earner higher than +200% or lower than -75% during one of the quarters, (c) those experiencing a quarterly expenditure change per adult equivalent on food or on other nondurables higher than +300% or lower than -85% during one of the quarters, and (d) those whose expenditure on food or other nondurables fell below 6 euros during one quarter.

Descriptive Statistics. Whole sample. 1986.IV-1996.IV

	Mean	Standard deviation	Maximum	Minimum	Median
Income (€)	1,912.72	1,130.72	8,862.12	90.51	1,671.01
Food (€)	803.97	473.61	6,313.81	33.35	717.40
Other nondurables (€)	835.76	685.23	10,936.99	12.46	665.80
Durables +	0.482	0.499	1	0	-
Family size	2.58	0.978	9.80	1	2.40
Number of earners	1.78	0.896	7	1	2
Inactive household head +	0.429	0.494	1	0	-
Employed household head +	0.570	0.499	1	0	-
Unemployed household head+	0.047	0.21	1	0	-
Sex (female) * +	0.169	0.375	1	0	-
Age *	54.27	14.81	80	25	55
Educational level *+					
Elementary school or less	0.723	0.447	1	0	-
Compulsory secondary school studies (up to 16 years old)	0.103	0.304	1	0	-
Full secondary school studies (up to 18 years old)	0.099	0.299	1	0	-
University	0.073	0.260	1	0	-
Professional group (those economically active) **					
Labourers	0.216	0.411	1	0	-
Management	0.094	0.291	1	0	-
Others	0.689	0.462	1	0	-

Note: (*) refers to the household head. (+) indicates a dummy variable.

A2. The predictive power of the quarterly income growth instruments

The table below shows the adjusted R^2 from the regressions of $\Delta \ln Y_{t+1}$ on the instrument set used. With the database used, different sub-samples were created to highlight the influence of two factors. Firstly, transitions into unemployment, so that distinguishing between households with and those without unemployed members. Secondly, the length of the quarterly database. Consequently, in one case we used only four quarters for each household (as in the widely used American CEX), whereas in the other all eight available observations were used.

Adjusted R^2 of $\Delta \ln Y_{t+1}$ on different instrument sets (OLS)

4 observations		8 observations	
All households	Households without unemployed members	All households	Households without unemployed members
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
0.2581	0.3960	0.3067	0.4615

The instrument set used in the estimations of equation (4) includes the following variables and lags:

- With no lags: a constant, seasonal dummies and yearly dummies.
- With two lags (t-1): age, the age squared, the interaction of both with the household head's educational level and employment status, dummies for the permanently employed status of the two spouses and a dummy reflecting whether or not the household head was retired.
- With three lags (t-2): a dummy for purchases of durables.
- With two and three lags (t-1 and t-2): the total spending on food and other nondurables, the number of household members under 14 years of age, the total number of household members, and a dummy reflecting whether the spouse (if applicable) was unemployed. In the Euler equations for other nondurables (for food) spending on food (on other nondurables) was also included.
- All lags from t-1: income, a dummy reflecting whether the household head was unemployed, and the number of wage and pension earners.

A3. Household groups' sociodemographic and economic features

	Low-income group	High-income group	25-44 years	45-60 years	65-80 years
# households	2,092	2,224	# households 1,639	1,714	1,678
Age *			Income groups		
25 – 44	29.7	35.8	Deciles 1 to 3	14.5	13.7
45 – 64	33.5	50.8	Deciles 4 to 6	38.5	31.4
65 – 80	36.7	13.2	Deciles 7 to 10	46.8	54.8
Labour status *			Labour status *		
Economically inactive	52.8	24.2	Economically inactive	2.4	20.7
Working	40.0	72.8	Working	91.9	70.6
Unemployed	7.0	2.8	Unemployed	5.6	8.6
House			House		
Rented home	16.2	7.5	Rented home	15.5	9.7
Mortgage	9.7	19.6	Mortgage	23.3	13.0
Dummy for spending on durables	37.5	61.4	Dummy for spending on durables	56.3	53.2
# members	2.26	3.04	# members	2.73	3.07
# earners	1.52	2.16	# earners	1.54	2.04
Educational studies *			Educational studies *		
Illiterate or without studies	34.0	12.1	Illiterate or without studies	5.5	24.1
Elementary	58.8	55.5	Elementary	60.5	59.9
Secondary or higher	7.2	32.4	Secondary or higher	34.0	16.0

Notes: in percentages for each variable. (*) refers to the household head.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Altonji, J. G. and Siow, A. (1987) Testing the Response of Consumption to Income Changes with (Noisy) Panel Data, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **102**, 293-328.
- Arellano, M. and Bond, S. (1998) Dynamic Panel Data Estimation using DPD98 for Gauss, mimeo.
- Arellano, M. and Bond, S. (1991) Some Tests of Specification for Panel Data: Monte Carlo Evidence and an Application to Employment Equations, *Review of Economic Studies*, **58**, 277-297.
- Attanasio, O. P. (1999) Consumption, in *Handbook in Macroeconomics*, (Eds) J.B. Taylor and M. Woodford, North-Holland, Ch. 11.
- Attanasio, O. P. and Browning, M. (1995) Consumption over the Life Cycle and over the Business Cycle, *American Economic Review*, **85**, 1187-1237.
- Attanasio, O. P. and Weber, G. (1995) Is Consumption Growth Consistent with Intertemporal Optimization? Evidence from the Consumer Expenditure Survey, *Journal of Political Economy*, **103**, 1121-1157.
- Bound, J., Jaeger, D. A. and Baker, R. (1995) Problems with Instrumental Variables Estimation When the Correlation Between the Instruments and the Endogenous Explanatory Variable is Weak, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **90**, 443-450.
- Browning, M. and Collado, M. D. (2001) The Response of Expenditures to Anticipated Income Changes: Panel Data Estimates, *American Economic Review*, **91**, 681-692.
- Browning, M. and Crossley, T. F. (2001) The Life-Cycle Model of Consumption and Saving, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, **15**, 3-22.
- Browning, M. and Crossley, T. F. (1999) Shocks, stocks and socks: consumption smoothing and the replacement of durables during an unemployment spell, Technical Report Working Papers in Economics and Econometrics, **376**, School of Economics, ANU.
- Browning, M. and Lusardi, A. (1996) Household Saving: Micro Theories and Micro Facts, *Journal of Economic Literature*, **34**, 1797-1855.
- Brugiavini, A. and Weber, G. (1994) Durables and Non-durables Consumption: Evidence from Italian Household Data, in *Saving and the Accumulation of Wealth. Essays on Italian*

- 1
2
3 *Household and Government Saving Behavior*, (Eds) A. Ando, L. Guiso and I. Visco,
4 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 305-329.
5
6
7 Campbell, J. Y. and Mankiw, G. (1989) Consumption, income and interest rates: reinterpreting the
8 time series evidence, in *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, (Eds) O. J. Blanchard and S. Fisher,
9 Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 185-216.
10
11
12 Chamberlain, G. (1984) Panel Data, in *Handbook of Econometrics* (Eds) Griliches and Intriligator,
13 North-Holland, Amsterdam, Vol. 2, 1247-318.
14
15
16
17 Deaton, A. (1992) *Understanding Consumption*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
18
19 DeJuan, J. S. and Seater, J. (1999) The permanent income hypothesis: Evidence from the
20 consumer expenditure survey, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, **43**, 351-376.
21
22
23 Dow, J.P. (1993) Durability and tests of the permanent income hypothesis using partially
24 disaggregated consumption data, *Applied Economics*, **25**, 627-633.
25
26
27 Flavin, M. A. (1981) The adjustment of consumption to changing expectations about future
28 income, *Journal of Political Economy*, **89**, 974-1009.
29
30
31 García, A. (1999) Consumption of Spanish Households: evidence from Cohort Data, *Applied*
32 *Economics*, **31**, 841-855.
33
34
35 Gourinchas, P.-O. and Parker, J. A. (2002) Consumption over the Life Cycle, *Econometrica*, **70**,
36 47-89.
37
38
39 Hall, R. E. (1978) Stochastic Implications of the Life Cycle-Permanent Income Hypothesis:
40 Theory and Evidence, *Journal of Political Economy*, **86**, 971-987.
41
42
43 Hall, R. E. and Mishkin, F. S. (1982) The Sensitivity of Consumption to Transitory Income:
44 Estimates from Panel Data on Households, *Econometrica*, **50**, 461-482.
45
46
47 Hansen, L. P. and Singleton, K. J. (1982) Generalized Instrumental Variables Estimators of
48 Nonlinear Rational Expectations Models, *Econometrica*, **50**, 1269-1286.
49
50
51 Hayashi, F. (1982) The Permanent Income Hypothesis: Estimation and Testing by Instrumental
52 Variables, *Journal of Political Economy*, **90**, 895-916.
53
54
55 Heckman, J. J. (2001) Micro data, Heterogeneity, and the Evaluation of Public Policy: Nobel
56 Lecture, *Journal of Political Economy*, **109**, 673-711.
57
58
59 Hsieh, C-T. (2003) Do Consumers React to Anticipated Income Shocks? Evidence from the
60 Alaska Permanent Fund, *American Economic Review*, **93**, 397-405.

- 1
2
3 Jappelli, T. (1990) Who Is Liquidity Constrained in the U.S. Economy?, *Quarterly Journal of*
4 *Economics*, **105**, 219-34.
5
6
7 Jappelli, T. and Fissel, G. (1990) Do Liquidity Constraints Vary Over Time? Evidence from
8
9 Survey and Panel Data, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, **22**, 253-62.
10
11 Jappelli, T. and Pistaferri, L. (2000) Using subjective income expectations to test for excess
12
13 sensitivity of consumption to predicted income growth, *European Economic Review*, **44**, 337-
14
15 358.
16
17 Jappelli, T., Pischke, J.S. and Soulesles, N. S. (1998) Testing for Liquidity Constraints in Euler
18
19 Equations with Complementary Data Sources, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, **80**, 251-
20
21 262.
22
23 Lage, M. J. (1991) Sensitivity of Tests of the PIH to Alternative Consumption Proxies, *Economics*
24
25 *Letters*, **36**, 429-433.
26
27 Lee, H-K. and Kong, M-K. (2000) Consumption of durable goods and tests of the permanent
28
29 income hypothesis: evidence from Korean macro data, *Applied Economics*, **32**, 39-44.
30
31 Levenson, A. R. (1996) Do Consumers Respond to Future Income Shocks? Evidence from Social
32
33 Security Reform in Taiwan, *Journal of Public Economics*, **62**, 275-295.
34
35 Lusardi, A. (1996) Permanent Income, Current Income, and Consumption: Evidence From Two
36
37 Data Panel Sets, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **14**, 81-90.
38
39 Mariger, R. P. and Shaw, K. (1993) Unanticipated Aggregate Disturbances and Tests of the Life-
40
41 Cycle Model Using Panel Data, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, **75**, 48-56.
42
43 Parker, J. (1999) The Reaction of Household Consumption to Predictable Changes in Social
44
45 Security Taxes, *American Economic Review*, **89**, 959-973.
46
47 Paxson, C. H. (1993) Consumption and Income Seasonality in Thailand, *Journal of Political*
48
49 *Economy*, **101**, 39-72.
50
51 Poterba, J. M. (1988) Are Consumers Forward Looking? Evidence from Fiscal Experiments, *AEA*
52
53 *Papers and Proceedings*, **78**, 413-418.
54
55 Runkle, D. E. (1991) Liquidity Constraints and the Permanent Income Hypothesis, *Journal of*
56
57 *Monetary Economics*, **27**, 73-98.
58
59 Shapiro, M. D. and Slemrod, J. (1995) Consumer Response to the Timing of Income: evidence
60
from in tax withholding, *American Economic Review*, **85**, 274-283.

- 1
2
3 Shea, J. (1994) Should We Test the Life Cycle-Permanent Income Hypothesis with Food
4 Consumption Data?, *Economics Letters*, **45**, 63-68.
5
6
7 Shea, J. (1995) Union Contracts and the Life-Cycle/Permanent-Income Hypothesis, *American*
8 *Economic Review*, **85**, 186-200.
9
10
11 Soulesles, N. S. (1999) The Response of Household Consumption to Income Tax Refunds,
12 *American Economic Review*, **89**, 947-958.
13
14
15 Soulesles, N. S. (2002) Consumer response to the Reagan Tax Cuts, *Journal of Public Economics*,
16 **85**, 99-120.
17
18
19 Stephens Jr., M. (2006) Paycheck Receipt and the Timing of Consumption, *The Economic*
20 *Journal*, forthcoming.
21
22
23 Stephens Jr., M. (2003) “3rd of the month”: do Social Security Recipients smooth consumption
24 between checks?, *American Economic Review*, **93**, 406-422.
25
26
27 Thaler, R. H. (1990) Anomalies: Saving, Fungibility, and Mental Accounts, *Journal of Economic*
28 *Perspectives*, **4**, 193-205.
29
30
31 Villagomez, F.A. (1997) Private saving, interest rates and liquidity constraints in LDCs: recent
32 evidence, *Applied Economics*, **29**, 607-615.
33
34
35 Watanabe, K., Watanabe, T. and Watanabe, T. (2001) Tax Policy and Consumer Spending:
36 evidence from Japanese fiscal experiments, *Journal of International Economics*, **53**, 261-281.
37
38
39 Wilcox, D. W. (1989) Social Security Benefits, Consumption Expenditure, and the Life Cycle
40 Hypothesis, *Journal of Political Economy*, **97**, 305-346.
41
42
43 Wirjanto, T.S. (1996) An empirical investigation into the permanent income hypothesis: further
44 evidence from the Canadian data, *Applied Economics*, **28**, 1451-1461.
45
46
47 Zeldes, S. P. (1989a) Optimal Consumption with Stochastic Income: Deviations from Certainty
48 Equivalence, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **104**, 275-298.
49
50
51 Zeldes, S. P. (1989b) Consumption and Liquidity Constraints: an Empirical Investigation, *Journal*
52 *of Political Economy*, **97**, 305-46.
53
54
55 Ziliak, J. P. (1998) Does the Choice of Consumption Matter? An Application to the Permanent-
56 Income Hypothesis, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, **41**, 201-216.
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Euler equation estimates for other nondurables ($\Delta \text{LnONDC}_{t+1}$)

	25-44 years		45-60 years		65-80 years		Low-income group		High-income group	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
$\Delta \text{Ln Food}_{t+1}$	-0.045 (0.150)	-0.043 (0.150)	0.474 (0.191)**	0.469 (0.197)**	-0.181 (0.204)	-0.231 (0.213)	-0.030 (0.165)	-0.131 (0.167)	-0.027 (0.144)	-0.066 (0.146)
Durables _{t+1}	-0.028 (0.034)	-0.025 (0.044)	-0.046 (0.029)	-0.057 (0.049)	-0.096 (0.035)*	-0.208 (0.063)*	-0.078 (0.037)**	-0.119 (0.044)*	-0.104 (0.032)*	-0.133 (0.040)*
ΔLnY_{t+1}	-0.042 (0.155)	-	-0.093 (0.146)	-	0.362 (0.216)	-	0.338 (0.135)**	-	-0.150 (0.132)	-
LnY_t	-	-0.002 (0.018)	-	0.007 (0.022)	-	0.047 (0.023)**	-	0.024 (0.022)	-	0.023 (0.022)
OI	58.62	58.89	62.78	64.153	61.422	59.140	62.681	65.306	73.62	73.041
[p-value]	[0.698]	[0.689]	[0.554]	[0.506]	[0.042]	[0.063]	[0.558]	[0.460]	[0.216]	[0.220]
M1	-22.219	-22.235	-17.607	-16.402	-16.766	-14.480	-24.551	-23.437	-24.771	-25.192
M2	0.603	0.597	-0.046	-0.008	-1.287	-1.148	0.532	0.481	0.655	0.529

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively. All the estimations include seasonal dummies and time dummies as explanatory variables. M1 and M2 are test statistics for first and second order serial correlation, respectively. M1 and M2 tests follow a standardized normal distribution. The Sargan test analyses the lack of correlation of instruments with the error term. It is distributed as an χ^2 , with degrees of freedom equal to the number of overidentifying restrictions. These notes are extensible to the remaining tables.

Table 2. Sensitivity of the test of excess sensitivity of other nondurables spending to separability among commodity groups.

	$\Delta \text{Ln Food}_{t+1}$	Durables_{t+1}	$\Delta \text{Ln Y}_{t+1}$	Ln Y_t	OI	M1	M2
					[p-value]		
25-44 years old	-0.006	-	-0.631	-	59.139	-22.181	0.632
	(0.143)		(0.156)*		[0.681]		
	-	-0.022	-0.047	-	57.527	-22.000	0.609
		(0.033)	(0.156)		[0.733]		
	-	-	-0.066	-	57.750	-22.028	0.633
			(0.157)		[0.726]		
45-60 years old	-0.016	-	-	-0.009	59.478	-22.304	0.614
	(0.143)			(0.014)	[0.669]		
	-	-0.014	-	-0.006	57.814	-22.052	0.603
		(0.043)		(0.019)	[0.693]		
	-	-	-	-0.009	58.100	-22.098	0.613
				(0.014)	[0.684]		
65-80 years old	0.517	-	-0.055	-	65.661	-17.509	-0.082
	(0.189)*		(0.144)		[0.453]		
	-	-0.049	-0.125	-	69.451	-21.779	0.046
		(0.029)	(0.145)		[0.298]		
	-	-	-0.089	-	73.719	-21.926	0.004
			(0.142)		[0.190]		
Low-income group	0.534	-	-	-0.014	64.325	-16.681	0.017
	(0.192)**			(0.013)	[0.500]		
	-	-0.087	-	0.023	71.540	-21.747	0.026
		(0.047)		(0.022)	[0.241]		
	-	-	-	-0.007	75.150	-22.130	0.073
				(0.013)	[0.160]		
High-income group	0.011	-	0.433	-	70.848	-19.131	-1.241
	(0.1929)		(0.207)**		[0.006]		
	-	-0.068	0.376	-	52.382	-18.831	-1.291
		(0.033)**	(0.211)		[0.154]		
	-	-	0.419	-	57.150	-19.113	-1.243
			(0.208)**		[0.072]		
Low-income group	-0.001	-	-	-0.011	73.68	-19.488	-1.472
	(0.188)			(0.012)	[0.003]		
	-	-0.124	-	0.023	55.838	-19.808	-1.354
		(0.057)**		(0.021)	[0.090]		
	-	-	-	-0.0130	60.334	-19.810	-1.477
				(0.012)	[0.041]		
Low-income group	0.060	-	0.387	-	68.271	-24.901	0.396
	(0.160)		(0.133)*		[0.366]		
	-	-0.052	0.308	-	51.540	-24.767	0.430
		(0.036)	(0.132)**		[0.869]		
	-	-	0.331	-	53.636	-24.838	0.347
			(0.131)**		[0.818]		
High-income group	-0.001	-	-	-0.007	76.683	-24.913	0.330
	(0.157)			(0.018)	[0.152]		
	-	-0.065	-	0.002	56.638	-24.775	0.376
		(0.043)		(0.022)	[0.731]		
	-	-	-	-0.0152	59.621	-24.907	0.306
				(0.018)	[0.631]		
High-income group	0.066	-	-0.197	-	82.564	-23.512	0.744
	(0.140)		(0.131)		[0.069]		
	-	-0.109	-0.141	-	72.668	-25.248	0.682
		(0.032)*	(0.132)		[0.214]		
	-	-	-0.169	-	85.440	-25.541	0.672
			(0.131)		[0.045]		
High-income group	0.030	-	-	-0.017	85.079	-24.032	0.646
	(0.140)			(0.018)	[0.048]		
	-	-0.135	-	0.022	71.789	-25.019	0.601
		(0.040)*		(0.022)	[0.235]		
	-	-	-	-0.020	86.88	-25.576	0.623
				(0.018)	[0.031]		

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively.

Table 3. Euler equation estimates for food ($\Delta \text{LnFOOD}_{t+1}$)

	25-44 years		45-60 years		65-80 years		Low-income group		High-income group	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
$\Delta \text{LnOND}_{t+1}$	0.018 (0.082)	0.017 (0.084)	0.114 (0.067)	0.120 (0.070)	0.005 (0.073)	-0.032 (0.075)	0.089 (0.078)	0.052 (0.075)	0.050 (0.070)	0.039 (0.071)
Durables _{t+1}	-0.053 (0.026)**	-0.049 (0.031)	0.004 (0.020)	-0.045 (0.030)	-0.075 (0.027)*	-0.121 (0.038)*	-0.025 (0.025)	-0.052 (0.028)	-0.028 (0.025)	-0.048 (0.029)
ΔLnY_{t+1}	0.055 (0.107)	-	-0.007 (0.097)	-	-0.030 (0.141)	-	-0.122 (0.085)	-	0.145 (0.096)	-
LnY_t	-	-0.002 (0.014)	-	0.030 (0.013)**	-	0.022 (0.012)	-	0.028 (0.014)**	-	0.022 (0.015)
OI	61.754	58.89	56.617	48.531	40.084	36.961	65.475	65.843	73.54	72.853
[p-value]	[0.591]	[0.689]	[0.761]	[0.936]	[0.640]	[0.764]	[0.460]	[0.447]	[0.218]	[0.235]
M1	-18.630	-22.235	-17.601	-17.483	-16.730	-16.527	-20.074	-20.514	-21.559	-21.744
M2	-1.298	0.597	-1.393	-1.279	-0.124	-0.179	-0.851	-0.998	-1.125	-1.187

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively.

Table 4. Sensitivity of the test of excess of sensitivity of food spending to separability among commodity groups.

	$\Delta \ln \text{Other nondurables}_{t+1}$	Durables_{t+1}	$\Delta \ln Y_{t+1}$	$\ln Y_t$	OI [p-value]	M1	M2
25-44 years old	0.052 (0.081)	-	0.031 (0.107)	-	64.957 [0.443]	-18.317	-1.312
	-	-0.056 (0.027)**	0.064 (0.109)	-	60.977 [0.583]	-18.630	-1.287
	-	-	0.039 (0.108)	-	65.318 [0.430]	-18.688	-1.311
	0.026 (0.084)	-	-	-0.013 (0.011)	76.210 [0.161]	-18.491	-1.298
	-	-0.050 (0.033)	-	-0.002 (0.014)	61.061 [0.581]	-18.555	-1.265
	-	-	-	-0.014 (0.011)	63.961 [0.477]	-18.688	-1.291
	0.108 (0.065)	-	-0.014 (0.095)	-	56.361 [0.768]	-17.715	-1.380
	-	-0.0000 (0.020)	0.001 (0.094)	-	57.540 [0.702]	-18.560	-1.451
	-	-	-0.003 (0.092)	-	57.249 [0.712]	-18.550	-1.444
	0.138 (0.068)**	-	-	0.0161 (0.0088)	51.584 [0.886]	-17.144	-1.351
-	-0.051 (0.031)	-	0.029 (0.0134)**	49.935 [0.901]	-18.362	-1.342	
-	-	-	0.013 (0.008)	54.380 [0.798]	-18.606	-1.453	
65-80 years old	0.071 (0.069)	-	-0.100 (0.137)	-	49.50 [0.263]	-17.797	-0.228
	-	-0.079 (0.026)*	-0.031 (0.137)	-	40.168 [0.636]	-17.443	-0.114
	-	-	-0.060 (0.135)	-	49.995 [0.215]	-17.748	-0.227
	0.063 (0.068)	-	-	-0.006 (0.008)	73.68 [0.003]	-17.666	-0.165
	-	-0.127 (0.036)*	-	0.024 (0.012)	55.838 [0.108]	-17.298	-0.158
	-	-	-	-0.006 (0.008)	49.107 [0.246]	-17.684	-0.173
	0.110 (0.076)	-	-0.115 (0.085)	-	67.139 [0.403]	-19.465	-0.877
	-	-0.039 (0.026)	-0.096 (0.082)	-	67.870 [0.346]	-20.679	-0.834
	-	-	-0.077 (0.081)	-	68.722 [0.320]	-20.825	-0.905
	0.097 (0.073)	-	-	0.019 (0.012)	69.130 [0.339]	-19.784	-1.012
-	-0.070 (0.029)**	-	0.031 (0.014)**	62.074 [0.544]	-20.624	-0.958	
-	-	-	-0.015 (0.012)	69.336 [0.302]	-20.833	-1.018	
High-income group	0.077 (0.067)	-	0.136 (0.096)	-	75.442 [0.176]	-21.147	-1.049
	-	-0.029 (0.024)	0.157 (0.096)	-	70.721 [0.263]	-22.249	-1.218
	-	-	0.146 (0.096)	-	73.162 [0.202]	-22.302	-1.198
	0.078 (0.067)	-	-	0.013 (0.013)	76.210 [0.161]	-21.346	-1.096
	-	-0.047 (0.028)	-	0.020 (0.015)	70.451 [0.270]	-21.996	-1.252
	-	-	-	0.008 (0.012)	74.400 [0.175]	-22.189	-1.231

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively.

**Table 5. Euler equation estimates for other nondurables ($\Delta \text{LnONDC}_{t+1}$).
Households aged between 25 and 60 without unemployed members.**

	25-44 years		45-60 years		Low-income group		High-income group	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
$\Delta \text{Ln Food}_{t+1}$	0.044 (0.149)	0.034 (0.149)	0.339 (0.192)	0.325 (0.192)	0.136 (0.149)	0.147 (0.147)	0.243 (0.200)	0.263 (0.193)
Durables_{t+1}	-0.036 (0.036)	-0.021 (0.043)	-0.053 (0.032)	-0.080 (0.051)	-0.076 (0.050)	-0.110 (0.061)	-0.065 (0.037)	-0.079 (0.042)
ΔLnY_{t+1}	-0.043 (0.180)	-	0.092 (0.183)	-	0.042 (0.201)	-	0.053 (0.202)	-
LnY_t	-	-0.011 (0.018)	-	0.014 (0.022)	-	0.035 (0.038)	-	0.016 (0.023)
OI	39.994 [0.867]	39.756 [0.872]	53.718 [0.370]	53.555 [0.376]	23.625 [0.908]	22.798 [0.928]	41.320 [0.181]	40.918 [0.192]
M1	-18.472	-18.552	-17.576	-17.232	-14.066	-14.131	-19.644	-19.272
M2	0.784	0.755	0.086	0.078	1.179	1.171	0.461	0.525

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively.


**Table 6. Euler equation estimates for food ($\Delta \text{LnFOOD}_{t+1}$).
Households aged between 25 and 60 without unemployed members.**

	25-44 years		45-60 years		Low-income group		High-income group	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
$\Delta \text{LnOND}_{t+1}$	0.094 (0.107)	0.082 (0.110)	0.072 (0.077)	0.072 (0.078)	0.160 (0.142)	0.202 (0.142)	0.050 (0.105)	0.087 (0.103)
Durables_{t+1}	-0.009 (0.030)	0.002 (0.033)	-0.002 (0.023)	-0.041 (0.033)	-0.045 (0.038)	-0.030 (0.044)	-0.022 (0.029)	-0.025 (0.032)
ΔLnY_{t+1}	0.019 (0.136)	-	0.146 (0.118)	-	0.252 (0.136)	-	0.272 (0.150)	-
LnY_t	-	-0.009 (0.015)	-	0.018 (0.013)	-	-0.002 (0.027)	-	0.004 (0.017)
OI	53.736	57.420	50.391	49.717	47.208	48.472	40.403	40.409
[p-value]	[0.369]	[0.249]	[0.497]	[0.524]	[0.065]	[0.051]	[0.208]	[0.208]
M1	-13.990	-14.070	-15.801	-15.746	-9.717	-9.078	-16.791	-16.828
M2	-0.812	-0.832	-1.654	-1.501	-1.026	-0.900	-0.939	-0.892

Notes: The standard errors are in parentheses below the coefficients. One and two stars denote significance at the 1% and 5% level, respectively.

FIGURE 1

Quarterly household expenditure on food, other nondurables and durables.
1987-1996.



Notes: Expenditure on food and other nondurables are measured as quarterly changes and expenditure on durables in levels. All values are deflated to 1985 prices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank José M. Labeaga for helpful comments. Financial support of the Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology through the SEC2002-01512 project is also acknowledged.

For Peer Review