CeRP
CENTER FOR RESEARCH
ON PENSIONS AND
WELFARE POLICIES

Working Paper 96/10

Portfolio Choice and Precautionary Savings

Riccardo Calcagno
Mariacristina Rossi

Portfolio Choice and Precautionary Savings

Riccardo Calcagno*and Mariacristina Rossi†

February 18, 2010

Abstract

We study the effect on savings of an increase in the capital risk of the investment opportunities when the representative consumer is allowed to optimally choose her portfolio. Sandmo (1970) and Levhari and Srinivasan (1969) prove that individuals with high risk-aversion and time-separable, power utility increase their optimal savings when capital risk increases holding constant the expected return of the risky asset. We obtain the opposite effect when the consumer chooses her portfolio allocation optimally.

JEL Classification: E21, G11

Keywords: Precautionary Saving, Capital Risk, Portfolio Allocation.

2 Introduction

A key insight of the modern consumption theory is that agents try to keep the marginal utility of their expenditure constant over time, also known as the"consumption smoothing" behavior. The former behaviour is central in the life-cycle and permanent income theory (LCPI), which dates at least back, in its simplest form, to Brumberg and Modigliani (1954) and Friedman (1957).

Several modifications have been added to the basic LCPI model to allow for a more realistic environment in which the individuals make their choices on savings. Among these extensions, uncertainty plays a big role. More specifically, Kimball (1990) shows that agents exhibiting prudence in their utility function (that is, when the marginal utility is convex) behave very differently from what is predicted by the basic LCPI in a certain environment. When their preferences exhibit prudence, Kimball (1990) proves that the agent's total savings increase with future earnings uncertainty, generating the so-called precautionary saving. Some theoretical studies could attribute half of individual savings to precautionary motives (e.g. Caballero (1991)), while empirical studies, such as Dynan (1993) and Lusardi (1996) do not find strong evidence of a precautionary wealth accumulation process on U.S data.

---

*VU University Amsterdam, Tinbergen Institute and CeRP, Collegio Carlo Alberto (Moncalieri, Italy).

†University of Turin and CeRP, Collegio Carlo Alberto (Moncalieri, Italy).

The aim of this paper is to shed light on whether the precautionary motive for saving is still at work when uncertainty on the risky asset return (i.e. capital risk), instead of income risk, is considered and when the consumer optimally chooses her portfolio composition. Sandmo (1970) argues that when capital investment becomes riskier, the agent will respond to the higher potential future losses by generating additional savings, similarly to the case of income uncertainty. While the net effect of higher capital risk on saving cannot be determined in general, Levhari and Srinivasan (1969) prove that individuals with high risk-aversion and time-separable, isoelastic utility increase their optimal savings when capital risk increases.

We extend the two-period analysis of Sandmo (1970) by endogenizing the choice of the optimal investment portfolio between a risky and a risk-free asset. The representative agent thus maximizes her lifetime utility over consumption in both periods and over the portfolio composition. We assume that her utility function exhibits constant relative risk aversion and that she faces uncertainty in the rate of return of the risky asset, which is not known when the resource allocation decisions are made. Following Sandmo (1970), we increase the volatility of the risky asset return with a mean-preserving shock and we obtain the opposite result as Levhari and Srinivasan (1969), where the consumer invests all her savings in the risky asset. In our model, opposite to theirs, consumers exhibiting higher risk aversion *reduce* their savings in the first period when capital risk increases. The intuition for the result is the following. Risk-averse consumers reduce their exposure towards the risky asset when its return becomes more volatile. Two opposite forces are at work in presence of a more volatile asset return. First, a more uncertain and riskier environment would generate additional savings, the "income effect" in Sandmo (1970)). At the same time, given that the frontier of investment opportunities becomes less attractive, the consumer will modify her portfolio choice by investing less in the risky asset (the "substitution effect"). We show that, at optimum, this second effect always prevails if the individual is sufficiently risk-averse, thus she decreases her optimal amount of savings. Notice that our increase in capital risk is obtained holding constant the expected return of the risky asset: in this respect, our result differs from Gollier and Kimball (1996), who study the effect on total saving of introducing a risky asset with expected return higher than the risk-free one in the investment possibilities of the consumer. This would generate a positive wealth effect that we do not consider in our model.

Finally, it is important to remind that fluctuations on asset returns have a strong impact on household welfare, particularly at older age, when the stock of assets reaches its peak value, while income represents a small fraction of the individual wealth.

3 The model

A representative consumer lives two periods $t = 1, 2$ and is endowed with a power utility function with constant degree of relative risk aversion $\gamma > 0$. At the beginning of the first period she chooses the level of savings s and the portfolio allocation α in order to maximize her lifetime welfare:

$$\max_{s,\,\alpha} \frac{(y-s)^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{1-\gamma} E\left[s\left(1+\alpha(1+\widetilde{R}-1)\right)\right]^{1-\gamma} \tag{1}$$

under the budget constraints

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= y-s \\ \tilde{c}_2 &= \alpha s + s\,(1-\alpha)\left(1+\widetilde{R}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where c_t denotes the consumption in period t, α the fraction of total saving invested in the risky asset and $\widetilde{R}$ the excess rate of return of the risky asset over the riskless rate. The consumer can invest a quota $(1-\alpha)$ of her saving in a riskless asset whose return is normalized to zero. Initial endowments and bequests are also set to zero. The realization of $\widetilde{R}$ is unknown to the consumer when she decides the optimal portfolio allocation. Following a standard practice in the literature[1] we assume that the excess return of the risky asset is log-normal, i.e. $1+\widetilde{R}=e^{\widetilde{X}}$ with $\widetilde{X} \sim N(m,\sigma^2)$. Denoting by μ the mean of the log-normal distribution, we posit $m=\mu-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}$.[2]

3.1 Optimal Portfolio Choice

As the choice of the optimal portfolio allocation does not involve the first period utility, problem (1) can be seen as a dynamic problem in which s is selected in period one and α in the final period[3]. We introduce then a value function $v(s)$ that can be written as

$$v(s) = \max_{\alpha} E\left[\frac{\left(s(1+\alpha\widetilde{R})\right)^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma}\right] \tag{2}$$

so that (1) becomes

$$\max_{s} \frac{(y-s)^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} + v(s) \tag{3}$$

Proceeding backward, we first solve for the optimal α^* given the level of total savings.

Proposition 1: *The optimal portfolio allocation is given by*

$$\alpha^* = \frac{m+\Sigma/2}{\gamma\Sigma} \tag{4}$$

---

[1] See for example Campbell and Viceira (2002).

[2] Since the mean of the log-normal distribution is equal to $m+\frac{\sigma^2}{2}$ in this way we obtain that the mean of the log-normal μ is independent of σ^2.

[3] For a similar procedure, see Gollier (2003).

where $\Sigma = m^2 + \sigma^2$.

Proof: The solution of (2) is characterized by its first-order condition

$$s^{1-\gamma} E\left[(1+\alpha\widetilde{R})^{-\gamma}\widetilde{R}\right] = 0 \tag{5}$$

that can be expressed as:

$$E\left[(1+\alpha(e^{\widetilde{X}}-1))^{-\gamma}(e^{\widetilde{X}}-1)\right] = 0 \tag{6}$$

using the fact that $1+\widetilde{R} = e^{\widetilde{X}}$. We then approximate $f(\widetilde{X}) = (1+\alpha(e^{\widetilde{X}} - 1))^{-\gamma}(e^{\widetilde{X}} - 1)$ with its Taylor expansion around $\widetilde{X} = 0$ writing $f(\widetilde{X}) = f(0) + f'(0)\widetilde{X} + \frac{1}{2}f''(0)\widetilde{X}^2$ where

$$\begin{aligned} f(0) &= 0 \\ f'(0) &= 1 \\ f''(0) &= 1 - 2\gamma\alpha \end{aligned}$$

Taking the expected value of $f(\widetilde{X})$ we obtain $E[f(\widetilde{X})] = f(0) + f'(0)E[\widetilde{X}] + \frac{1}{2}f''(0)E[\widetilde{X}^2]$ so that we can approximate $E[f(\widetilde{X})]$ locally as

$$E[f(\widetilde{X})] \simeq f(0) + f'(0)m + \frac{1}{2}f''(0)\Sigma$$

where $\Sigma = m^2 + \sigma^2 = \left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)^2 + \sigma^2$.[4] Finally, substituting for $f(0)$, $f'(0)$, $f''(0)$ into (6):

$$\begin{aligned} m + \frac{1}{2}(1-2\gamma\alpha)\Sigma &= 0 \\ \alpha^* &= \frac{m}{\gamma\Sigma} + \frac{1}{2\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

that can be rewritten as (4). ■

Proposition 1 yields the usual optimal portfolio rule in a log-normal model with power utility (see for example Campbell and Viceira (2002)): the optimal share invested in the risky asset α^* is increasing in its expected excess log-return[5] and decreasing in its variance. Finally notice that the optimal portfolio allocation (4) is independent of the level of savings.

3.2 Optimal savings decision

We now proceed solving (3) where the optimal portfolio allocation α^* characterized in Proposition 1 is taken as given.

---

[4] Notice that Σ is increasing in σ^2 if and only if $\mu < \frac{\sigma^2}{2} + 1$. In this case the comparative statics w.r.to σ have the same sign as the ones w.r.to Σ.

[5] Remember that the mean of the excess log-return $\mu = m + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}$, which explains the addition of the term with one-half of the variance.

Proposition 2: *Given the optimal portfolio allocation* α^* *in (4), the optimal level of savings is given by*

$$s(\alpha^*) = \frac{y}{1 + \exp\left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}\left(\alpha^* m + \frac{1}{2}\alpha^*\left(1-\gamma\alpha^*\right)\Sigma\right)\right)} \tag{7}$$

Proof: For simplicity, in this proof we write α instead of α^*. The first order condition of (3) is

$$\begin{aligned} (y-s)^{-\gamma} &= E\left[s^{-\gamma}\left(1+\alpha(1+\widetilde{R}-1)\right)^{1-\gamma}\right] \\ \left(\frac{y-s}{s}\right)^{-\gamma} &= E\left[\left(1+\alpha(1+\widetilde{R}-1)\right)^{1-\gamma}\right] \qquad (8) \end{aligned}$$

Use a Taylor expansion around $\widetilde{X}=0$ of $f(\widetilde{X}) = \left(1+\alpha(e^{\widetilde{X}}-1)\right)^{1-\gamma}$. Given that

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x) &= (1-\gamma)\left(1+\alpha\left(e^x-1\right)\right)^{-\gamma}\alpha e^x, \\ f''(x) &= -\gamma\left(1-\gamma\right)\left(1+\alpha\left(e^x-1\right)\right)^{-\gamma-1}\left(\alpha e^x\right)^2 + \left(1-\gamma\right)\left(1+\alpha\left(e^x-1\right)\right)^{-\gamma}\alpha\left(e^x\right)^2 \\ &\Rightarrow f(0)=1, \\ &\Rightarrow f'(0)=(1-\gamma)\alpha, \\ &\Rightarrow f''(0)=\left(1-\gamma\right)\alpha\left(1-\gamma\alpha\right). \end{aligned}$$

we can approximate $\left(1+\alpha(e^{\widetilde{X}}-1)\right)^{1-\gamma}$ as:

$$\left(1+\alpha(1+\widetilde{R}-1)\right)^{1-\gamma} \simeq 1 + (1-\gamma)\alpha m + \frac{1}{2}\left(1-\gamma\right)\alpha\left(1-\gamma\alpha\right)\Sigma \tag{9}$$

Substituting (9) into (8) and taking the log of both sides we obtain the following equality:

$$-\gamma\log\left(\frac{y}{s}-1\right) = \log\left(1+(1-\gamma)\alpha m + \frac{1}{2}\left(1-\gamma\right)\alpha\left(1-\gamma\alpha\right)\Sigma\right)$$

Finally, using the approximation $\log(1+z)=z$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\gamma\log\left(\frac{y}{s}-1\right) &= (1-\gamma)\alpha m + \frac{1}{2}\left(1-\gamma\right)\alpha\left(1-\gamma\alpha\right)\Sigma \qquad (10) \\ \log\left(\frac{y}{s}-1\right) &= \frac{(1-\gamma)\alpha m + \frac{1}{2}(1-\gamma)\alpha(1-\gamma\alpha)\Sigma}{-\gamma} \qquad (11) \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{y}{s} = 1 + \exp\left(\frac{1-\gamma}{-\gamma}\left(\alpha m + \frac{1}{2}\alpha\left(1-\gamma\alpha\right)\Sigma\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

which rearranged provides (7). ■

The interpretation of Proposition 2 becomes clear analyzing (11): with $\alpha \in]0,1]$, the RHS of (11) is negative for $\gamma \leq 1$. Hence $\frac{y}{s} - 1 < 1$, that is $\frac{y}{2} < s$ where $s = y/2$ is the optimal level of saving when there is no uncertainty (or, equivalently, the consumer can invest only in the riskless asset). Thus Proposition 2 obtains a result similar to Gollier and Kimball (1996): the possibility to invest in a risky asset increases (resp. reduces) saving compared to the case with only a risk-free asset if and only if absolute prudence is larger (resp. smaller) than twice the absolute risk aversion.[6] However, notice that this conclusion is not obvious *a priori*. In fact, Gollier and Kimball (1996) consider the effect of introducing a risky asset with an expected return higher than the risk-free rate in the market. Thus they analyze a situation in which not only the riskiness, but also the returns possibilities change. This in turn generate a positive wealth effect since it increases the expected future income of the consumer. We abstract from this latter wealth effect, but still reach similar conclusions on the precautionary saving for a pure change in the riskiness of the investment possibilities.

4 The effect on savings of capital risk

In this section we show the main result of our paper: increasing the uncertainty on the return of capital provides effects on the level of savings opposite to the ones already known in the literature when we allow the representative consumer to choose for the optimal portfolio allocation.

Reconsider the f.o.c. (10) and substitute for the optimal value for α^*:

$$\begin{aligned}\log\left(\frac{y}{s}-1\right) &= \frac{(1-\gamma)\alpha^* m + \frac{1}{2}(1-\gamma)\,\alpha^*\,(1-\gamma\alpha^*)\,\Sigma}{-\gamma} \qquad (12)\\ &= \frac{(\gamma-1)}{\gamma}\alpha^*\left(m + \frac{1}{2}(1-\gamma\alpha^*)\,\Sigma\right)\\ &= \frac{(\gamma-1)}{\gamma}\left(\frac{m}{\gamma\Sigma}+\frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)\left(m+\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\gamma\left(\frac{m}{\gamma\Sigma}+\frac{1}{2\gamma}\right)\right)\Sigma\right)\\ &= \frac{(\gamma-1)}{\gamma^2}\left(\frac{m}{\Sigma}+\frac{1}{2}\right)\left(\frac{m}{2}+\frac{\Sigma}{4}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Our goal is to obtain the comparative statics of saving when we increase the variance of the risky asset returns, σ^2, keeping its mean μ constant[7].

Proposition 3: *When the return of the risky asset is distributed log-normal with an expected excess return sufficiently close to zero, a mean-preserving increase in its variance leads to lower savings (resp. higher savings) when $\gamma > 1$ (resp. when $\gamma < 1$).*

---

[6] With a CRRA utility function this last condition is satisfied for $\gamma \leq 1$.

[7] With a log-normal distribution, an increase in the average excess return would also generate an increase in the portfolio variance. However, we want to isolate the effect of an increase in the variance that does not affect the average expected return. For this reason, we concentrate on the increase in σ^2.

Proof: By substituting the expressions corresponding to m and Σ into (*12*) we obtain:

$$\log\left(\frac{y}{s}-1\right)=\frac{(\gamma-1)}{\gamma^2}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)+\frac{1}{8}\left(2\sigma^2+\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)^2\right)+\frac{1}{2}\frac{\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)^2}{\left(2\sigma^2+\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)^2\right)}\right)$$

For $\gamma>1$ saving decreases with σ^2 if the RHS of the above equality increases with σ^2. We compute the sign of the partial derivative:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)+\frac{1}{8}\left(2\sigma^2+\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)^2\right)+\frac{1}{2}\frac{\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)^2}{\left(2\sigma^2+\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)^2\right)}\right)}{\partial\sigma^2}\\
= \quad & -\frac{1}{4}\frac{\left(2\sigma^2+\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)^2\right)^2+\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)\left(2\sigma^2+\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)^2\right)^2+4\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)\left(\mu+\sigma^2\right)}{\left(\sigma^4-2\sigma^2+2\sigma^2\mu+\mu^2\right)^2}
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit of the above expression for $\mu\to 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\mu\to 0}-\frac{1}{4}\frac{\left(2\sigma^2+\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)^2\right)^2+\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)\left(2\sigma^2+\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)^2\right)^2+4\left(\mu-\sigma^2\right)(\mu+\sigma^2)}{\left(\sigma^4-2\sigma^2\mu+2\sigma^2+\mu^2\right)^2}\\
= \quad & \frac{\sigma^6}{4}\frac{1}{\left(\sigma^4+2\sigma^2\right)^2}\left(\sigma^2+3\right)>0
\end{aligned}$$

In this case, with $\gamma>1$ the RHS is increasing in σ^2. Hence an increase in the variance of portfolio, holding constant the average return μ, causes a reduction in the optimal level of saving. ■

Notice that in Proposition 3 we obtain the opposite result as with $\alpha=1$ fixed exogenously (Sandmo (1970) and Levhari and Srinivasan (1969)): in these papers, more risk-averse consumers (those with $\gamma>1$) *increase* savings when the riskiness of their portfolio increases if they are forced to invest in the risky asset all theirs savings. Indeed, putting $\alpha^*=1$ in (8) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{y-s}{s}\right)^{-\gamma} &= E\left[\left(1+\widetilde{R}\right)^{1-\gamma}\right]=Ee^{(1-\gamma)\widetilde{X}}\\
&= e^{(1-\gamma)\left(\mu-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)+(1-\gamma)^2\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2}\\
&= e^{(1-\gamma)\left(\mu-\gamma\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)}
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\frac{y}{s}=1+e^{(1-\gamma)\left(\mu-\gamma\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)}$$

from which it is easy to derive the result of Sandmo (1970) and Levhari and Srinivasan (1969).

The intuition for our result is the following. In our model, the representative consumer is allowed to choose optimally his portfolio allocation between a riskless and a risky asset. When the volatility of the risky asset return increases, the consumers reduce their exposure to this asset. The market overall provides a less attractive investment opportunity set to the consumer/investor who in turn then saves less (a "substitution effect"). For high levels of risk-aversion this substitution effect is stronger. In the absence of a riskless investment, higher riskiness on the market forces the consumer to save more in order to protect herself against future low realizations of returns (an "income effect"): however, with the possibility of investing in a riskless asset, this income effect is much lower than when the riskless asset is not available. This explains the difference between our result and the one in Sandmo (1970) and Levhari and Srinivasan (1969).

5 Conclusions

In this paper we study the effect on savings of an increase in the capital risk when the representative consumer optimally chooses her portfolio allocation between risky and riskless assets. We show that if the agent is allowed to invest only in aggregate risk and if the volatility of this unique asset increases holding constant its expected return, then savings increases (resp. decreases) for more (resp. less) risk-averse consumers. Our results are opposite to the ones obtained when the portfolio composition of the agent is fixed exogenously.

6 References

Browning, M. and A. Lusardi, (1996), "Household saving: Micro Theories and Micro Facts". *Journal of Economic Literature* 24, 1797-1855.

Caballero, R., (1991), "Earnings Uncertainty and Aggregate Wealth Accumulation". *American Economic Review* 81, 859-871.

Campbell J. and L. Viceira, (2002), *Strategic Asset Allocation*, Oxford University Press.

Dynan, K. E., (1993), "How Prudent are Consumers?". *Journal of Political Economy* 101, 1104-1113.

Gollier, C., (2003), *The Economics of Risk and Time*, MIT University Press.

Gollier, C. and M. S. Kimball, (1997), "Toward a systematic approach to the economic effects of uncertainty: Characterizing utility functions". Discussion paper, University of Michigan.

Kimball, M. S., (1990), "Precautionary Saving in the Small and in the Large". *Econometrica* 58, 53-73.

Levhari, D. and T. N. Srinivasan, (1969), "Optimal Savings under Uncertainty". *Review of Economic Studies* 36, 153-163.

Lusardi, A., (1996), "Permanent income, current income, and consumption: Evidence form two panel data sets". *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 14, 81-90.

Sandmo, A., (1970), "The Effect of Uncertainty on Saving Decisions". *Review of Economic Studies* 37, 353-360.

Our papers can be downloaded at:

http://cerp.unito.it/index.php/en/publications

CeRP Working Paper Series

N° 1/00	Guido Menzio	Opting Out of Social Security over the Life Cycle
N° 2/00	Pier Marco Ferraresi Elsa Fornero	Social Security Transition in Italy: Costs, Distorsions and (some) Possible Correction
N° 3/00	Emanuele Baldacci Luca Inglese	Le caratteristiche socio economiche dei pensionati in Italia. Analisi della distribuzione dei redditi da pensione (only available in the Italian version)
N° 4/01	Peter Diamond	Towards an Optimal Social Security Design
N° 5/01	Vincenzo Andrietti	Occupational Pensions and Interfirm Job Mobility in the European Union. Evidence from the ECHP Survey
N° 6/01	Flavia Coda Moscarola	The Effects of Immigration Inflows on the Sustainability of the Italian Welfare State
N° 7/01	Margherita Borella	The Error Structure of Earnings: an Analysis on Italian Longitudinal Data
N° 8/01	Margherita Borella	Social Security Systems and the Distribution of Income: an Application to the Italian Case
N° 9/01	Hans Blommestein	Ageing, Pension Reform, and Financial Market Implications in the OECD Area
N° 10/01	Vincenzo Andrietti and Vincent Hildebrand	Pension Portability and Labour Mobility in the United States. New Evidence from the SIPP Data
N° 11/01	Mara Faccio and Ameziane Lasfer	Institutional Shareholders and Corporate Governance: The Case of UK Pension Funds
N° 12/01	Roberta Romano	Less is More: Making Shareholder Activism a Valuable Mechanism of Corporate Governance
N° 13/01	Michela Scatigna	Institutional Investors, Corporate Governance and Pension Funds
N° 14/01	Thomas H. Noe	Investor Activism and Financial Market Structure
N° 15/01	Estelle James	How Can China Solve ist Old Age Security Problem? The Interaction Between Pension, SOE and Financial Market Reform
N° 16/01	Estelle James and Xue Song	Annuities Markets Around the World: Money's Worth and Risk Intermediation
N° 17/02	Richard Disney and Sarah Smith	The Labour Supply Effect of the Abolition of the Earnings Rule for Older Workers in the United Kingdom
N° 18/02	Francesco Daveri	Labor Taxes and Unemployment: a Survey of the Aggregate Evidence
N° 19/02	Paolo Battocchio Francesco Menoncin	Optimal Portfolio Strategies with Stochastic Wage Income and Inflation: The Case of a Defined Contribution Pension Plan
N° 20/02	Mauro Mastrogiacomo	Dual Retirement in Italy and Expectations
N° 21/02	Olivia S. Mitchell David McCarthy	Annuities for an Ageing World

N° 22/02	Chris Soares Mark Warshawsky	Annuity Risk: Volatility and Inflation Exposure in Payments from Immediate Life Annuities
N° 23/02	Ermanno Pitacco	Longevity Risk in Living Benefits
N° 24/02	Laura Ballotta Steven Haberman	Valuation of Guaranteed Annuity Conversion Options
N° 25/02	Edmund Cannon Ian Tonks	The Behaviour of UK Annuity Prices from 1972 to the Present
N° 26/02	E. Philip Davis	Issues in the Regulation of Annuities Markets
N° 27/02	Reinhold Schnabel	Annuities in Germany before and after the Pension Reform of 2001
N° 28/02	Luca Spataro	New Tools in Micromodeling Retirement Decisions: Overview and Applications to the Italian Case
N° 29/02	Marco Taboga	The Realized Equity Premium has been Higher than Expected: Further Evidence
N° 30/03	Bas Arts Elena Vigna	A Switch Criterion for Defined Contribution Pension Schemes
N° 31/03	Giacomo Ponzetto	Risk Aversion and the Utility of Annuities
N° 32/04	Angelo Marano Paolo Sestito	Older Workers and Pensioners: the Challenge of Ageing on the Italian Public Pension System and Labour Market
N° 33/04	Elsa Fornero Carolina Fugazza Giacomo Ponzetto	A Comparative Analysis of the Costs of Italian Individual Pension Plans
N° 34/04	Chourouk Houssi	Le Vieillissement Démographique : Problématique des Régimes de Pension en Tunisie
N° 35/04	Monika Bütler Olivia Huguenin Federica Teppa	What Triggers Early Retirement. Results from Swiss Pension Funds
N° 36/04	Laurence J. Kotlikoff	Pensions Systems and the Intergenerational Distribution of Resources
N° 37/04	Jay Ginn	Actuarial Fairness or Social Justice? A Gender Perspective on Redistribution in Pension Systems
N° 38/05	Carolina Fugazza Federica Teppa	An Empirical Assessment of the Italian Severance Payment (TFR)
N° 39/05	Anna Rita Bacinello	Modelling the Surrender Conditions in Equity-Linked Life Insurance
N° 40/05	Carolina Fugazza Massimo Guidolin Giovanna Nicodano	Investing for the Long-Run in European Real Estate. Does Predictability Matter?
N° 41/05	Massimo Guidolin Giovanna Nicodano	Small Caps in International Equity Portfolios: The Effects of Variance Risk.
N° 42/05	Margherita Borella Flavia Coda Moscarola	Distributive Properties of Pensions Systems: a Simulation of the Italian Transition from Defined Benefit to Defined Contribution
N° 43/05	John Beshears James J. Choi David Laibson Brigitte C. Madrian	The Importance of Default Options for Retirement Saving Outcomes: Evidence from the United States

N° 44/05	Henrik Cronqvist	Advertising and Portfolio Choice
N° 45/05	Claudio Campanale	Increasing Returns to Savings and Wealth Inequality
N° 46/05	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell	Financial Literacy and Planning: Implications for Retirement Wellbeing
N° 47/06	Michele Belloni Carlo Maccheroni	Actuarial Neutrality when Longevity Increases: An Application to the Italian Pension System
N° 48/06	Onorato Castellino Elsa Fornero	Public Policy and the Transition to Private Pension Provision in the United States and Europe
N° 49/06	Mariacristina Rossi	Examining the Interaction between Saving and Contributions to Personal Pension Plans. Evidence from the BHPS
N° 50/06	Andrea Buffa Chiara Monticone	Do European Pension Reforms Improve the Adequacy of Saving?
N° 51/06	Giovanni Mastrobuoni	The Social Security Earnings Test Removal. Money Saved or Money Spent by the Trust Fund?
N° 52/06	Luigi Guiso Tullio Jappelli	Information Acquisition and Portfolio Performance
N° 53/06	Giovanni Mastrobuoni	Labor Supply Effects of the Recent Social Security Benefit Cuts: Empirical Estimates Using Cohort Discontinuities
N° 54/06	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell	Baby Boomer Retirement Security: The Roles of Planning, Financial Literacy, and Housing Wealth
N° 55/06	Antonio Abatemarco	On the Measurement of Intra-Generational Lifetime Redistribution in Pension Systems
N° 56/07	John A. Turner Satyendra Verma	Why Some Workers Don't Take 401(k) Plan Offers: Inertia versus Economics
N° 57/07	Giovanni Mastrobuoni Matthew Weinberg	Heterogeneity in Intra-Monthly Consumption. Patterns, Self-Control, and Savings at Retirement
N° 58/07	Elisa Luciano Jaap Spreeuw Elena Vigna	Modelling Stochastic Mortality for Dependent Lives
N° 59/07	Riccardo Calcagno Roman Kraeussl Chiara Monticone	An Analysis of the Effects of the Severance Pay Reform on Credit to Italian SMEs
N° 60/07	Riccardo Cesari Giuseppe Grande Fabio Panetta	La Previdenza Complementare in Italia: Caratteristiche, Sviluppo e Opportunità per i Lavoratori
N° 61/07	Irina Kovrova	Effects of the Introduction of a Funded Pillar on the Russian Household Savings: Evidence from the 2002 Pension Reform
N° 62/07	Margherita Borella Elsa Fornero Mariacristina Rossi	Does Consumption Respond to Predicted Increases in Cash-on-hand Availability? Evidence from the Italian "Severance Pay"
N° 63/07	Claudio Campanale	Life-Cycle Portfolio Choice: The Role of Heterogeneous Under-Diversification
N° 64/07	Carlo Casarosa Luca Spataro	Rate of Growth of Population, Saving and Wealth in the Basic Life-cycle Model when the Household is the Decision Unit
N° 65/07	Annamaria Lusardi	Household Saving Behavior: The Role of Literacy, Information and Financial Education Programs (Updated version June 08: "Financial Literacy: An Essential Tool for Informed Consumer Choice?")

N° 66/07	Maarten van Rooij Annamaria Lusardi Rob Alessie	Financial Literacy and Stock Market Participation
N° 67/07	Carolina Fugazza Maela Giofré Giovanna Nicodano	International Diversification and Labor Income Risk
N° 68/07	Massimo Guidolin Giovanna Nicodano	Small Caps in International Diversified Portfolios
N° 69/07	Carolina Fugazza Massimo Guidolin Giovanna Nicodano	Investing in Mixed Asset Portfolios: the Ex-Post Performance
N° 70/07	Radha Iyengar Giovanni Mastrobuoni	The Political Economy of the Disability Insurance. Theory and Evidence of Gubernatorial Learning from Social Security Administration Monitoring
N° 71/07	Flavia Coda Moscarola	Women participation and caring decisions: do different institutional frameworks matter? A comparison between Italy and The Netherlands
N° 72/08	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia Mitchell	Planning and Financial Literacy: How Do Women Fare?
N° 73/08	Michele Belloni Rob Alessie	The Importance of Financial Incentives on Retirement Choices: New Evidence for Italy
N° 74/08	Maela Giofré	Information Asymmetries and Foreign Equity Portfolios: Households versus Financial Investors
N° 75/08	Harold Alderman Johannes Hoogeveen Mariacristina Rossi	Preschool Nutrition and Subsequent Schooling Attainment: Longitudinal Evidence from Tanzania
N° 76/08	Riccardo Calcagno Elsa Fornero Mariacristina Rossi	The Effect of House Prices on Household Saving: The Case of Italy
N° 77/08	Giovanni Guazzarotti Pietro Tommasino	The Annuity Market in an Evolving Pension System: Lessons from Italy
N° 78/08	Margherita Borella Giovanna Segre	Le pensioni dei lavoratori parasubordinati: prospettive dopo un decennio di gestione separata
N° 79/08	Annamaria Lusardi	Increasing the Effectiveness of Financial Education in the Workplace
N° 80/08	Claudio Campanale	Learning, Ambiguity and Life-Cycle Portfolio Allocation
N° 81/09	Fabio Bagliano Claudio Morana	Permanent and Transitory Dynamics in House Prices and Consumption: Cross-Country Evidence
N° 82/09	Carolina Fugazza Massimo Guidolin Giovanna Nicodano	Time and Risk Diversification in Real Estate Investments: Assessing the Ex Post Economic Value
N° 83/09	Annamaria Lusardi Peter Tufano	Debt Literacy, Financial Experiences, and Overindebtedness
N° 84/09	Luca Spataro	Il sistema previdenziale italiano dallo shock petrolifero del 1973 al Trattato di Maastricht del 1993
N° 85/09	Cathal O'Donoghue John Lennon Stephen Hynes	The Life-Cycle Income Analysis Model (LIAM): A Study of a Flexible Dynamic Microsimulation Modelling Computing Framework

N° 86/09	Margherita Borella Flavia Coda Moscarola	Microsimulation of Pension Reforms: Behavioural versus Nonbehavioural Approach
N° 87/09	Elsa Fornero Annamaria Lusardi Chiara Monticone	Adequacy of Saving for Old Age in Europe
N° 88/09	Maela Giofré	Convergence of EMU Equity Portfolios
N° 89/09	Elena Vigna	Mean-variance inefficiency of CRRA and CARA utility functions for portfolio selection in defined contribution pension schemes
N° 90/09	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell	How Ordinary Consumers Make Complex Economic Decisions: Financial Literacy and Retirement Readiness
N° 91/09	Annamaria Lusardi Olivia S. Mitchell Vilsa Curto	Financial Literacy among the Young: Evidence and Implications for Consumer Policy
N° 92/10	Rob Alessie Michele Belloni	Retirement choices in Italy: what an option value model tells us
N° 93/10	Mathis Wagner	The Heterogeneous Labor Market Effects of Immigration
N° 94/10	John A. List Sally Sadoff Mathis Wagner	So you want to run an experiment, now what? Some Simple Rules of Thumb for Optimal Experimental Design
N° 95/10	Flavia Coda Moscarola Elsa Fornero Mariacristina Rossi	Parents/children “deals”: Inter-Vivos Transfers and Living Proximity
N° 96/10	Riccardo Calcagno Mariacristina Rossi	Portfolio Choice and Precautionary Savings