

# Earnings Inequality and Other Determinants of Wealth Inequality<sup>†</sup>

By JESS BENHABIB, ALBERTO BISIN, AND MI LUO\*

## I. Introduction

Increasing income and wealth inequality has led to renewed interest in understanding and explaining wealth and income distributions, and in particular, the recent growth in their top shares (Piketty 2014). The literature has largely emphasized the role of earnings inequality in explaining wealth inequality. Indeed, Aiyagari-Bewley economies, which focus on precautionary savings as an optimal response to stochastic earnings, represent the most popular approach of introducing heterogeneity into a representative consumer framework to study the distribution of wealth (see Benhabib and Bisin forthcoming for a survey).

However, models of earnings inequality and precautionary savings find it generally difficult to reproduce the thick right tail of the wealth distribution observed in the data. In particular, these models cannot reproduce wealth distributions with substantially thicker right tails (larger top shares) than earnings distributions. But, while comparable estimates of the statistical properties of wealth and earnings distributions are available only for a few countries, they invariably show that thicker wealth tails are a critical and robust feature of data. Consider to-date estimates of the tail index, a measure of the rate of decay of the right tail of a distribution, and hence a measure which is inversely

related to its thickness:<sup>1</sup> Wealth and earnings indices are, respectively, 1.48–1.55 and 2 in the United States; 1.63–1.85 and 3 in Sweden; and 1.33–1.54 and 2 in Canada.<sup>2</sup>

More specifically, in the context of Aiyagari-Bewley models, simulations tend to produce tail indices of wealth close to those of the distribution of labor earnings which has been fed into the model. This is explicitly noted, for instance, by Carroll, Slacalek, and Tokunaga (2014). Similar results are obtained by De Nardi, Fella, and Pardo (2016), which argues that adopting the exceptional recently available earnings data from Guvenen et al. (2015) allows for a much better fit of the wealth distribution relative to the bottom 60 percent of agents, but generates too little wealth concentration at the top of the wealth distribution; and most recently by Hubmer, Krusell, and Smith (2016, p. 11), which aptly concludes:

*the wealth distribution inherits not only the Pareto tail of the earnings distribution but also its Pareto coefficient. Because earnings are considerably less concentrated than wealth, the resulting tail in wealth is too thin to match the data [...].*

Most importantly, in economic environments in which wealth accumulation is mainly driven by stochastic earnings, it is natural to expect a positive relationship between earnings and wealth inequality: higher earning risk tends to increase wealth accumulation via precautionary

\*Benhabib: New York University, 19 W 4th Street, New York, NY 10012 (e-mail: [jess.benhabib@nyu.edu](mailto:jess.benhabib@nyu.edu)); Bisin: New York University, 19 W 4th Street, New York, NY 10012 (e-mail: [alberto.bisin@nyu.edu](mailto:alberto.bisin@nyu.edu)); Luo: New York University, 19 W 4th Street, New York, NY 10012 (e-mail: [mi.luo@nyu.edu](mailto:mi.luo@nyu.edu)). Thanks to Xavier Gabaix, Luigi Guiso, and Alexis Toda for insightful comments and suggestions. We also thank the Washington Center for Equitable Growth for their generous financial support.

<sup>†</sup>Go to <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20171005> to visit the article page for additional materials and author disclosure statement(s).

<sup>1</sup>In the standard and simplest case of a Pareto distribution, whose cumulative is  $F(x) = 1 - \left(\frac{x_m}{x}\right)^\alpha$  for  $x \in [x_m, \infty)$  and  $x_m, \alpha > 0$ , the tail index coincides with the exponent  $\alpha$ . For a survey of power laws in economics, see Gabaix (2016).

<sup>2</sup>Wealth estimates: Vermeulen (forthcoming, Table 8) for United States; Cowell (2011) for Canada and Sweden. Earnings estimates: Badel et al. (2016).




FIGURE 1. EARNINGS AND WEALTH GINI

Sources: Wealth: Davies et al. (2011). Earnings: (Krueger et al. 2010).

savings, thereby spreading the distribution, which in turn, under borrowing constraints, tends to increase wealth inequality (Aiyagari 1994). Interestingly, on the other hand, the cross-country data does not display a statistically significant correlation between inequality in earnings and wealth, indicating a significant role for other factors to drive the distribution of wealth. Consider Gini coefficients, the standard inequality measure (which can also be considered a proxy for the inverse of tail indices), reported in Figure 1.

Indeed, the slope coefficient from a linear regression of wealth Gini on earnings Gini is 0.258, not statistically significant with a standard error of 0.296. Though only suggestive due to the paucity of data, we consider this as additional evidence that earnings inequality does not adequately explain wealth inequality.

## II. A Theoretical Explanation

A simple but deep theoretical result is useful to understand why it is difficult to reproduce important statistical properties of the wealth distribution which are observed in the data with earnings inequality and precautionary savings alone.

Consider a linear individual wealth accumulation equation,

$$(1) \quad w_{t+1} = r_t w_t + y_t - c_t,$$

where  $w_t$ ,  $y_t$ ,  $c_t$ , and  $r_t$  are wealth, earnings, consumption, and rate of return at time  $t$ . We

may assume  $\{y_t, r_t\}$  are stationary stochastic processes.

Consider also a linear consumption function,

$$c_t = \psi w_t + \chi_t.$$

We can then write the wealth accumulation equation as

$$(2) \quad w_{t+1} = (r_t - \psi) w_t + (y_t - \chi_t).$$

Suppose that  $r_t$  and  $y_t > 0$  are both random variables, independent and i.i.d. over time and independent of  $w_t$ . Suppose also that  $\chi_t \geq 0$ ,<sup>3</sup>  $0 < E(r_t) - \psi < 1$ , and  $\Pr(r_t - \psi > 1) > 0$  for any  $t \geq 0$ .<sup>4</sup>

The stationary distribution for  $w_t$  can be characterized by applying a theorem due to Grey (1994), extending results of Kesten (1973), to (2).

**THEOREM 1:** *Suppose  $y_t - \chi_t$  has a thick right tail, with tail index  $\beta > 0$ . If  $E((r_t - \psi)^\beta) < 1$ , and  $E((r_t - \psi)^\gamma) < \infty$  for some  $\gamma > \beta > 0$ , then the right-tail index of the stationary distribution of wealth will be  $\beta$ . If instead  $E((r_t - \psi)^\gamma) = 1$  for  $\gamma < \beta$ , then the right-tail index of the stationary distribution of wealth will be  $\gamma$ .*

The Theorem makes clear that the right-tail index of the wealth distribution induced by the accumulation equation, (2), is either  $\gamma$ , which depends on the stochastic properties of returns, or  $\beta$ , the right tail of  $y_t - \chi_t$ . With  $\chi_t \geq 0$  the right tail of  $y_t - \chi_t$  will be no thicker than that of  $y_t$ .<sup>5</sup> In other words, it is either stochastic returns via the accumulation process or skewed earnings which determine the thickness of the right tail of the wealth distribution, not both.

Theorem 1 is of course obtained under very specific assumptions and, furthermore, pertains literally only to economies with linear consumption rules, that is, to very special microfoundations. Indeed infinitely-lived agent models with

<sup>3</sup>Note that  $\chi_t$  will depend on the stochastic properties (i.e., the persistence and variance of its innovations) of the earnings process.

<sup>4</sup>Some additional regularity conditions are required; see Benhabib, Bisin, and Zhu (2011) for details.

<sup>5</sup>This is because  $y_t - \chi_t$  is a left shift of the earnings density  $y_t$ , and if indeed it has a thick power tail, it must by its definition be decreasing in the right tail.

stochastic earnings and precautionary savings as in Aiyagari-Bewley economies generally display concave consumption functions. But assumptions can be substantially relaxed to allow for persistent (Markov-dependent) earning processes  $y_t - \chi_t$ , as well as for earnings and returns  $r_t$  which are correlated (see Ghosh et al. 2010 and Roitershtein 2007). Also, with Constant Relative Risk Aversion preferences, the consumption function in this class of models becomes linear at high wealth levels and the theorem applies asymptotically (see Benhabib, Bisin, and Zhu 2015 for a rigorous exposition and proofs). Moreover, linearity obtains in a larger class of Overlapping Generations Economies (Benhabib, Bisin, and Zhu 2011).

Even when holding as an approximation, the result does clearly point to the potential difficulty of matching the right tail of wealth distribution by relying solely on earnings. First of all, since the distribution of wealth has a thicker tail than the distribution of earnings, Theorem 1 directly suggests that the distribution of earnings cannot by itself explain the thick tail of the wealth distribution. In fact, the implications of the theorem are even more striking: the distribution of earnings cannot even partially contribute to explain the thickness of the tail of the wealth distribution; the burden for explaining the thick tails of wealth distribution will have to rely on other factors, like stochastic idiosyncratic returns on wealth  $r_t$ . Second, if indeed it is other factors which are driving wealth inequality, then the lack of a positive relationship between earnings and wealth inequality which we observe in the available cross-country data, Figure 1, is in fact not surprising at all.

### III. Further Empirical Considerations

Theorem 1 also suggests an explanation why several studies which postulate extraordinarily high earnings states, originally to account for top-coding in earnings data, do in fact match the wealth distribution even if relying solely on earnings and precautionary savings as a determinant wealth accumulation. In fact, Theorem 1 suggests that, working with models in which earnings and precautionary savings are the main determinant of wealth accumulation, a much thicker distribution of earnings than the observed distribution is required to fit wealth data. This

is exactly what the *awesome state* estimates, introduced with great success by Castañeda, Díaz-Giménez, and Ríos-Rull (2003), effectively achieve.

More precisely, an *awesome state* is a state added to the observed stochastic process for earnings whose properties are estimated in order to better match the wealth distribution. Castañeda, Díaz-Giménez, and Ríos-Rull (2003), in a rich overlapping-generation model with various demographic and life-cycle features, obtain estimates of the *awesome state* which requires the top 0.039 percent earners to have about 1,000 times the average labor endowment of the bottom 61 percent. With the recent availability of earnings data which have not been top coded, we can assess the reliability of this estimate. In fact, the ratio between even the top 0.01 percent and the median is at most of the order of 200 in the World Wealth and Income Database (WWID, 2011–2017).<sup>6</sup> Similarly, Díaz, Pijoan-Mas, and Ríos-Rull (2003) estimate a top 6 percent of the population to earn 46 times the labor earnings of the median, while the top 5 percent in WWID earns about 5 times the median.

To better account for wealth inequality, and especially top wealth shares, we conclude it is necessary to rely on other factors. Remaining close to the Aiyagari-Bewley environment, for instance, several papers exploit heterogeneous life spans, adding death rates independent of age (“perpetual youth”) to amplify wealth inequality (see Benhabib and Bisin forthcoming for a survey). In such a framework, however, standard calibrations of demographics imply that a significant fraction of agents enjoy counterfactually long life spans. With stochastic but realistic finite life spans, these models fail to match the top shares of the wealth distribution (De Nardi, Fella, and Pardo 2016, p. 44).

Theorem 1 suggests instead a role for stochastic idiosyncratic returns to wealth. Available evidence suggests that the idiosyncratic rate of return on wealth (capital income) is composed, in large part, of returns to entrepreneurship (returns to private business equity).<sup>7</sup> Since

<sup>6</sup>We use WWID earnings data for 2014. The argument is not much changed even when considering average income, excluding capital gains.

<sup>7</sup>See Quadrini (2000) and Cagetti and De Nardi (2006), and equivalently for stochastic discount factors, see Krusell and Smith (1998).

a good measure of these returns is generally hard to find, Benhabib, Bisin, and Luo (2015) explicitly estimates the stochastic properties of the Markov process for returns to match the distribution of wealth.<sup>8</sup> Its conclusions are that stochastic idiosyncratic returns are essential for explaining the thickness of the wealth distribution.

Finally, other promising factors which possibly help explain the thick tail of the wealth distribution include nonhomogeneous bequests (see De Nardi 2004) and savings rates (increasing in wealth) as well as returns to wealth which are increasing in wealth (see Fagereng et al. 2016). Benhabib, Bisin, and Luo (2015) find that all these are statistically significant in a model which includes also stochastic earnings as well as stochastic returns to wealth.

#### REFERENCES

- Aiyagari, S. Rao.** 1994. "Uninsured Idiosyncratic Risk and Aggregate Saving." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 109 (3): 659–84.
- Badel, Alejandro, Moira Daly, Martin Nybom, and Mark Huggett.** 2016. "Top Earners: Comparing the US, Canada, Denmark and Sweden." Society for Economic Dynamics Meeting Paper 1057.
- Benhabib, Jess, and Alberto Bisin.** Forthcoming. "Skewed Wealth Distributions: Theory and Empirics." *Journal of Economic Literature*.
- Benhabib, Jess, Alberto Bisin, and Mi Luo.** 2015. "Wealth Distribution and Social Mobility in the US: A Quantitative Approach." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 21721.
- Benhabib, Jess, Alberto Bisin, and Shenghao Zhu.** 2011. "The Distribution of Wealth and Fiscal Policy in Economies with Finitely Lived Agents." *Econometrica* 79 (1): 123–57.
- Benhabib, Jess, Alberto Bisin, and Shenghao Zhu.** 2015. "The Wealth Distribution in Bewley Economies with Capital Income Risk." *Journal of Economic Theory* 159: 489–515.
- Cagetti, Marco, and Mariacristina De Nardi.** 2006. "Entrepreneurship, Frictions, and Wealth." *Journal of Political Economy* 114 (5): 835–70.
- Carroll, Christopher D., Jiri Slacalek, and Kiichi Tokunaka.** 2014. "The Distribution of Wealth and the Marginal Propensity to Consume." European Central Bank Working Paper 1655.
- Castañeda, Ana, Javier Díaz-Giménez, and José-Víctor Ríos-Rull.** 2003. "Accounting for the U.S. Earnings and Wealth Inequality." *Journal of Political Economy* 111 (4): 818–57.
- Cowell, Frank A.** 2011. "Inequality among the Wealthy." London School of Economics and Political Science, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion Paper 150. <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/cp/CASEpaper150.pdf>.
- Davies, James B., Susanna Sandstrom, Anthony Shorrocks, and Edward N. Wolff.** 2011. "The Level and Distribution of Global Household Wealth." *Economic Journal* 121 (551): 223–54.
- De Nardi, Mariacristina.** 2004. "Wealth Inequality and Intergenerational Links." *Review of Economic Studies* 71 (3): 743–68.
- De Nardi, Mariacristina, Giulio Fella, and Gonzalo Paz Pardo.** 2016. "The Implications of Richer Earnings Dynamics for Consumption and Wealth." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 21917.
- Díaz, Antonia, Josep Pijoan-Mas, and José-Víctor Ríos-Rull.** 2003. "Precautionary Savings and Wealth Distribution under Habit Formation Preferences." *Journal of Monetary Economics* 50 (6): 1257–91.
- Fagereng, Andreas, Luigi Guiso, Davide Malacrin, and Luigi Pistaferri.** 2016. "Heterogeneity in Returns to Wealth and the Measurement of Wealth Inequality." *American Economic Review* 106 (5): 651–55.
- Gabaix, Xavier.** 2016. "Power Laws in Economics: An Introduction." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30 (1): 185–206.
- Ghosh, Arka P., Diana Hay, Vivek Hirpara, Reza Rastegar, Alexander Roitershtein, Ashley Schulteis, and Jiyeon Suh.** 2010. "Random Linear Recursions with Dependent Coefficients." *Statistics and Probability Letters* 80 (21–22): 1597–1605.
- Grey, D. R.** 1994. "Regular Variation in the Tail Behavior of Solutions of Random Difference Equations." *Annals of Applied Probability* 4 (1): 169–83.
- Güvener, Fatih, Fatih Karahan, Serdar Ozkan, and Jae Song.** 2015. "What Do Data on Millions

<sup>8</sup>Interestingly, the mean and standard deviation of estimated returns, 2.76 percent and 2.54 percent, respectively, closely match those estimated by Fagereng et al. (2016) for the idiosyncratic component of the lifetime rate of return on wealth.

- of U.S. Workers Reveal about Life-Cycle Earnings Risk?" National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 20913.
- Hubmer, Joachim, Per Krusell, and Tony Smith.** 2016. "The Historical Evolution of the Wealth Distribution: A Quantitative-Theoretic Investigation." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 23011.
- Kesten, Harry.** 1973. "Random Difference Equations and Renewal Theory for Products of Random Matrices." *Acta Mathematica* 131 (1): 207–48.
- Krueger, Dirk, Fabrizio Perri, Luigi Pistaferri, and Giovanni L. Violante, eds.** 2010. *Review of Economic Dynamics: Special Issue: Cross-Sectional Facts for Macroeconomists* 13 (1).
- Krusell, Per, and Anthony A. Smith, Jr.** 1998. "Income and Wealth Heterogeneity in the Macroeconomy." *Journal of Political Economy* 106 (5): 867–96.
- Piketty, Thomas.** 2014. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Quadrini, Vincenzo.** 2000. "Entrepreneurship, Saving, and Social Mobility." *Review of Economic Dynamics* 3 (1): 1–40.
- Roitershtein, Alexander.** 2007. "One-Dimensional Linear Recursions with Markov-Dependent Coefficients." *Annals of Applied Probability* 17 (2): 572–608.
- Vermeulen, Philip.** Forthcoming. "How Fat is the Top Tail of the Wealth Distribution?" *Review of Income and Wealth*.
- World Wealth and Income Database.** 2011–17. "World Wealth and Income Database." <http://wid.world/>.

**This article has been cited by:**

1. Qingyin Ma, John Stachurski, Alexis Akira Toda. 2020. The income fluctuation problem and the evolution of wealth. *Journal of Economic Theory* **187**, 105003. [[Crossref](#)]
2. Thomas Epper, Ernst Fehr, Helga Fehr-Duda, Claus Thustrup Kreiner, David Dreyer Lassen, Søren Leth-Petersen, Gregers Nytoft Rasmussen. 2020. Time Discounting and Wealth Inequality. *American Economic Review* **110**:4, 1177-1205. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
3. Shubin Wang, Junsheng Ha, Hakan Kalkavan, Serhat Yüksel, Hasan Dinçer. 2020. IT2-Based Hybrid Approach for Sustainable Economic Equality: A Case of E7 Economies. *SAGE Open* **10**:2, 215824402092443. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Moritz Kuhn, Moritz Schularick, Ulrike Isabel Steins. 2020. Income and Wealth Inequality in America, 1949-2016. *Journal of Political Economy* . [[Crossref](#)]
5. Salvatore Morelli. 2020. The Dynamics of Wealth Concentration: Thoughts on Tony Atkinson's Contributions. *Italian Economic Journal* **6**:1, 197-205. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Xiaowen Lei. 2019. Information and Inequality. *Journal of Economic Theory* **184**, 104937. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Abebe Hailemariam, Ratbek Dzhumashev. 2019. Income Inequality and Economic Growth: Heterogeneity and Nonlinearity. *Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics & Econometrics*, ahead of print. [[Crossref](#)]
8. John Stachurski, Alexis Akira Toda. 2019. An impossibility theorem for wealth in heterogeneous-agent models with limited heterogeneity. *Journal of Economic Theory* **182**, 1-24. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Alexis Akira Toda. 2019. Wealth distribution with random discount factors. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **104**, 101-113. [[Crossref](#)]
10. Jess Benhabib, Alberto Bisin, Mi Luo. 2019. Wealth Distribution and Social Mobility in the US: A Quantitative Approach. *American Economic Review* **109**:5, 1623-1647. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
11. Jess Benhabib, Alberto Bisin. 2018. Skewed Wealth Distributions: Theory and Empirics. *Journal of Economic Literature* **56**:4, 1261-1291. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
12. Kenneth Kasa, Xiaowen Lei. 2018. Risk, uncertainty, and the dynamics of inequality. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **94**, 60-78. [[Crossref](#)]
13. Dimitra Kavarnou, Nikodem Szumilo. Rich Become Richer and Poor Become Poorer: A Wealth Inequality Approach from Great Britain 275-321. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Nicola Borri, Pietro Reichlin. 2018. Wealth Taxes and Inequality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
15. Alexis Akira Toda. 2017. Wealth Distribution with Random Discount Factors. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
16. Jongmoo Jay Choi, Jose M. Plehn-Dujowich, Xiaotian Tina Zhang. 2010. Power Game between the CEO and Labor: Evidence from Outsourcing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]