Jul, 2025
GRINS DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES DP N° 25/2025 ISSN 3035-5567

GRINS

# Anatomy of Consumption Risk

## DP N° 25/2025

**Authors:**
**Tullio Jappelli, Luigi Guiso**

**Jul, 2025**
**GRINS DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES DP N° 25/2025** **ISSN 3035-5567**

# Anatomy of Consumption Risk

Tullio Jappelli, Luigi Guiso

KEYWORDS

Consumption Risk | Income Risk | Health Risk | Aggregate Risk | Precautionary Savings

JEL CODE

D12, D14, D15, C99

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was funded by the European Union - NextGenerationEU, in the framework of the GRINS - Growing Resilient, INclusive and Sustainable project (GRINS PE00000018). The views and opinions expressed are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union, nor can the European Union be held responsible for them.

CITE THIS WORK

Author(s): Tullio Jappelli, Luigi Guiso. Title: Anatomy of Consumption Risk. Publication Date: 2025.

We use quarterly panel data from the Italian Survey of Consumer Expectations to analyze the relative contribution of idiosyncratic and aggregate risks on household consumption uncertainty. Consumption uncertainty is primarily driven by individual shocks rather than macroeconomic fluctuations. Estimating pass-through coefficients, we find that idiosyncratic risks (particularly those related to health and income) account for 75% of consumption risk, while aggregate risks (particularly GDP and house price fluctuations) contribute less than 20%. Young workers with limited cash reserves face greater exposure due to limited insurance options. Using subjective expectations data and an instrumental variables approach to the Euler equation, we estimate a relative prudence coefficient of 2–3. On average, precautionary savings amount to 2.7% of current consumption, three quarters of this driven by idiosyncratic risks. Only one third of these savings buffer labor income shocks, while the remainders is a response to expenditure shocks. These findings suggest that focusing solely on income risk significantly understates precautionary savings. Consistent with theoretical predictions, precautionary savings are highest among younger individuals and decline with age.
Keywords: Consumption Risk; Income Risk; Health Risk; Aggregate Risk; Precautionary Savings.
JEL: D12, D14, D15, C8, C99

Finanziato dall'Unione europea NextGenerationEU
Ministero dell'Università e della Ricerca
Italiadomani PIANO NAZIONALE DI RIPRESA E RESILIENZA
GRINS FOUNDATION

GRINS FOUNDATION

## Discussion Paper Series

# Anatomy of Consumption Risk

Discussion paper n. 25/2025

Luigi Guiso (a), Tullio Jappelli (b): (a) EIEF and CEPR; (b) University of Naples Federico II, CSEF and CEPR

ISSN 3035-5567

# Anatomy of Consumption Risk

Luigi Guiso (a), Tullio Jappelli (b): (a) EIEF and CEPR; (b) University of Naples Federico II, CSEF and CEPR

Discussion Paper DP nº 25/2025

We use quarterly panel data from the Italian Survey of Consumer Expectations to analyze the relative contribution of idiosyncratic and aggregate risks on household consumption uncertainty. Consumption uncertainty is primarily driven by individual shocks rather than macroeconomic fluctuations. Estimating pass-through coefficients, we find that idiosyncratic risks (particularly those related to health and income) account for 75% of consumption risk, while aggregate risks (particularly GDP and house price fluctuations) contribute less than 20%. Young workers with limited cash reserves face greater exposure due to limited insurance options. Using subjective expectations data and an instrumental variables approach to the Euler equation, we estimate a relative prudence coefficient of 2–3. On average, precautionary savings amount to 2.7% of current consumption, three quarters of this driven by idiosyncratic risks. Only one third of these savings buffer labor income shocks, while the remainders is a response to expenditure shocks. These findings suggest that focusing solely on income risk significantly understates precautionary savings. Consistent with theoretical predictions, precautionary savings are highest among younger individuals and decline with age.

Keywords: Consumption Risk; Income Risk; Health Risk; Aggregate Risk; Precautionary Savings.

JEL: D12, D14, D15, C8, C99

The research is funded by the European Union - Next Generation EU, in the framework of the GRINS - Growing Resilient, Inclusive and Sustainable Project (GRINS PE00000018 – CUP E63C22002140007). The views and opinions expressed are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union and the European Union cannot be held responsible for them. We thank seminar participants at the Collegio Carlo Alberto (Torino), Bank of Italy, Einaudi Institute for Economics and Finance, University of Cyprus. We are grateful to Rob Alessie and Orazio Attanasio for comments and discussions, and Alessandro Sciacchetano for excellent research assistance.

# Anatomy of Consumption Risk

Luigi Guiso

EIEF and CEPR

Tullio Jappelli

University of Naples Federico II, CSEF and CEPR

June 22, 2025

Abstract

We use quarterly panel data from the Italian Survey of Consumer Expectations to analyze the relative contribution of idiosyncratic and aggregate risks on household consumption uncertainty. Consumption uncertainty is primarily driven by individual shocks rather than macroeconomic fluctuations. Estimating pass-through coefficients, we find that idiosyncratic risks (particularly those related to health and income) account for 75% of consumption risk, while aggregate risks (particularly GDP and house price fluctuations) contribute less than 20%. Young workers with limited cash reserves face greater exposure due to limited insurance options. Using subjective expectations data and an instrumental variables approach to the Euler equation, we estimate a relative prudence coefficient of 2–3. On average, precautionary savings amount to 2.7% of current consumption, three quarters of this driven by idiosyncratic risks. Only one third of these savings buffer labor income shocks, while the remainders is a response to expenditure shocks. These findings suggest that focusing solely on income risk significantly understates precautionary savings. Consistent with theoretical predictions, precautionary savings are highest among younger individuals and decline with age.

**Keywords**: Consumption Risk; Income Risk; Health Risk; Aggregate Risk; Precautionary Savings.

**JEL**: D12, D14, D15, C8, C99

The research is funded by the European Union - Next Generation EU, in the framework of the GRINS - Growing Resilient, Inclusive and Sustainable Project (GRINS PE00000018 – CUP E63C22002140007). The views and opinions expressed are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union and the European Union cannot be held responsible for them. We thank seminar participants at the Collegio Carlo Alberto (Torino), Bank of Italy, Einaudi Institute for Economics and Finance, University of Cyprus. We are grateful to Rob Alessie and Orazio Attanasio for comments and discussions, and Alessandro Sciacchetano for excellent research assistance.

# 1. Introduction

In intertemporal consumption models, expected consumption volatility plays a central role in shaping consumers' decisions and welfare. This volatility is a sufficient statistic for all consumption-relevant sources of uncertainty. However, with some exceptions, standard intertemporal consumption models typically assume that income is the sole source of risk and that markets do not provide insurance against it.[1] While income risk is undoubtedly a major driver of fluctuations in household budget constraints, individuals face many other risks that can significantly impact consumption volatility and financial well-being. These include shocks to healthcare costs, energy prices, asset prices, and business cycle fluctuations. The *relative* and *overall* importance of these risks for consumption volatility and thus for the accumulation of precautionary savings, remains an open empirical question. This paper seeks to address this gap. Understanding which risks disrupt consumption and how households respond to them is essential for reducing vulnerability to shocks and developing mitigation strategies. It is also crucial for improving macroeconomic models that emphasize consumers' uncertainty.

To analyze the anatomy of consumption risk, we use a consumer expectations survey to elicit the probability distribution of future consumption growth, constructing an individual-level measure of expected consumption risk. Because individuals base their responses on available information, this measure cannot be inferred from volatility of realized consumption. Additionally, we gather subjective probability distributions for a broad set of risks that represent key sources of uncertainty—ranging from income and health expenditures to energy price shocks, GDP fluctuations, and other aggregate variables.

This approach allows us to trace expected consumption risk back to both individual-specific risks (such as income, health expenditures, and energy bills) and aggregate risks. By doing so, we estimate how each source of uncertainty affects consumption volatility, quantify their relative importance, and assess their heterogeneous impact across consumers. To our knowledge, this is the first empirical study to systematically examine the anatomy of consumption risk and evaluate the contribution of each risk factor to overall consumption uncertainty.

To elicit subjective expectations, we designed the Italian Survey of Consumer Expectations (ISCE), a panel of 5,000 individuals that has collected quarterly data since

[1] For recent surveys, see Attanasio and Weber (2010), Jappelli and Pistaferri (2017), and Violante (2024).

October 2023. The survey gathers participants' expected probability distributions for consumption growth, income growth, energy prices, health expenditures, and key aggregate variables (GDP growth, inflation, unemployment, house prices and interest rates). Respondents allocate 100 probability points across a set of interval growth rates for each variable over the 12 months following the interview. In many cases, growth rate intervals range symmetrically from negative (below -8%) to positive (above 8%).

For each respondent, we compute moments of these distributions, using variance as our measure of risk. Consumption risk exhibits substantial heterogeneity across individuals and varies over time within the survey period. Subjective consumption risk tends to be lower than labor income risk, consistent with consumption smoothing. Both idiosyncratic and aggregate risk measures correlate with observable characteristics in intuitive ways. For instance, self-employed individuals have a higher income variance and a stronger correlation between expected income and GDP growth, reflecting their greater exposure to business cycle fluctuations. Similarly, young consumers anticipate lower health expenditure growth than older individuals. These, and other validation tests confirm that the elicited probability distribution are meaningful and informative.

To estimate pass-through coefficients, we regress consumption risk on the variances of its underlying risk sources, initially assuming these risks are independent. Extending Banks et al. (2001) to a multi-risk framework, we show that pass-through coefficients reflect both exposure to specific risks and ability to insure against them, either formally or informally. In our preferred specification, we control for individual fixed effects, using only time variation in measured risks for identification.

Our results indicate that these risk sources have strong explanatory power, collectively accounting 57% of the variation in consumption risk. Among individual level risks, personal income, health and energy expenditure risks have the largest impact. Health expenditure risk exhibits the highest pass-though (0.37), surpassing that of income risk (0.21) and energy expenditure risk (0.19). We argue this is because health shocks influence consumption volatility both directly through health expenditures, and indirectly, as health status affects the marginal utility of consumption, as demonstrated by Blundell et al. (2024). Aggregate risks also play a role, particularly the expected variability in GDP and house price growth.

We also find systematic differences across individuals in how source risks translate into consumption uncertainty, reflecting both heterogeneity in exposure and differences in the

ability to absorb shocks. Younger individuals (under 35) experience a 50% higher pass-through of income risk than older individuals (60+), likely due to greater labor market volatility and lower financial buffers. The self-employed face a 70% higher pass-through of energy expenditure risk and twice as high of GDP risk compared to employees, as they are more exposed to these factors. Older individuals, with higher homeownership rates (82% vs. 68% for younger groups), are twice as sensitive to housing price fluctuations. Finally, individuals with high liquid cash reserves exhibit lower risk pass-throughs of income, health, and energy risks on consumption volatility, underscoring their role as financial buffers.

In the total sample, most of the expected consumption risk is explained by idiosyncratic sources, which together account for 73% of expected consumption risk, reflecting both the size of the pass-through and the average variance of the source risk. Aggregate risks account for about 17% of consumption risk, suggesting that the uncertainty affecting consumer welfare is largely driven by individual-level shocks rather than shocks associated with business cycle fluctuations. Among macroeconomic risks, GDP and house price risks are the most important contributors to consumption risk, while interest rate, inflation, and unemployment risks together account for only 4% of predicted consumption risk.

Importantly, our conclusions hold even when we relax the assumption of independence between the underlying sources of risk. If the risks are correlated, interactions between the standard deviations of risk pairs might influence expected consumption risk. However, our tests show that only the interaction between the standard deviation of expected health expenditures and income and that between the standard deviations of expected inflation and house prices significantly affects expected consumption uncertainty. Despite this, when evaluated at the sample means, the contributions of the individual sources of risk remain unchanged.

In a second step of our study by using the information on subjective distributions to estimate the structural prudence parameter of the Euler equation for consumption and to bring additional evidence on the relevance of precautionary motives for savings. We find that expected consumption growth is related positively to expected consumption risk in line with the predictions of precautionary saving models. Our estimates imply a coefficient of relative prudence in the plausible 2-3 range. We then combine the Euler equation estimates with the risk measures, to quantify the size of precautionary savings in our sample. We estimate that the average flow of precautionary savings due to the underling risks amounts to 2.7% of

consumption. Of this, about 70% is due to idiosyncratic uncertainty, with roughly similar contributions from labor market risk, health and energy expenditures. Thus, focusing only on labor market risk as done by a large part of the literature is bound to grossly understate the size of precautionary savings. Aggregate risks explain the remaining 30% of precautionary saving, with roughly equal contributions of inflation, GDP and house price risk. We also find a marked decline in the importance of precautionary savings over consumers age, as implied by finite horizon models of precautionary wealth accumulation (Caballero, 1990).

This paper contributes to the classic literature on precautionary saving in the presence of non-insurable risks (e.g., Caballero, 1990, 1991; Carroll and Kimball, 1996; Banks et al., 2001) and to research estimating prudence using the Euler equation approach (e.g., Dynan, 1993; Carroll, 2001; Ludvigson and Paxon, 2001; Attanasio and Low, 2004; Bertola et al., 2003; Fagereng et al., 2017; Attanasio et al., 2019). While much of this literature focuses on labor income risk, various studies have expanded the scope of precautionary savings to other sources of uncertainty. Some papers emphasize health shocks alongside income risk. Palumbo (1999) estimates a structural model in which uncertain future medical expenses play a key role in saving decisions. De Nardi and Fella (2017) argue that earnings risk, life expectancy uncertainty, and medical expenditure risk are all crucial in shaping consumption decisions and wealth inequality. More recently, Blundell et al. (2024) analyze how consumption and medical expenses jointly respond to income and health shocks. Other studies highlight the role of aggregate risks. Ryngaert (2022) finds that perceived inflation risk correlates with higher real consumption growth and a greater propensity to purchase durables. Coibion et al. (2024) use European household survey data to examine how exogenous variation in perceived macroeconomic uncertainty influences spending decisions. However, no prior work has jointly examined the full set of idiosyncratic and aggregate risks to assess their impact on consumption volatility and precautionary savings—precisely the focus of this paper.

Our work is also closely related to Fulford and Low (2024), who use survey data from the U.S. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to document key patterns in expense and income shocks. They find that expense shocks are more frequent and larger than income drops and, except for health expenses, are generally uncorrelated with income declines. While their study focuses on realized shocks, we examine ex ante expected uncertainty and its role in perceived consumption volatility—ultimately what drives precautionary saving behavior. Additionally, we extend the analysis beyond personal income and expenditure shocks to

include aggregate uncertainty. Despite these differences, our papers are highly complementary.

Finally, we contribute to the growing literature using elicited subjective expectations to measure risks, including income and unemployment risk (Dominitz and Manski, 1997; Guiso et al., 2002; Jappelli and Pistaferri, 2000), pension risk (Guiso et al., 2013), inflation uncertainty (Crump et al., 2015), consumption uncertainty (Christelis et al., 2020), and business cycle volatility (Georgarakos et al., 2025).

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 outlines our conceptual framework for measuring consumption risk. Section 3 describes the Italian Survey of Consumer Expectations and the design of the subjective probability elicitations. Section 4 presents the data and validation exercises. Section 5 analyzes consumption risk by estimating risk pass-throughs and quantifying the contribution of different risk sources. Section 6 uses our risk indicators to estimate the Euler equation for consumption and measure precautionary savings. Section 7 concludes.

## 2. Measuring consumption risk

The literature employs various approaches to measure consumption risk, including ex-post consumption volatility, income volatility, asset pricing models, and subjective expectations, each with its own strengths and limitations. Some studies use realized consumption volatility to proxy for consumption risk in Euler equation estimates (e.g. Dynan, 1993). A limitation of this approach is that expected consumption volatility does not coincide necessarily align with realized volatility. The latter, beyond capturing genuine innovations, also reflects individual choice, making it endogenous.[2] Another approach to measure consumption risk is to use labor income volatility as a proxy, often defined as the standard deviation or variance of realized labor income growth (Bertola et al., 2005). However, while income risk is an important factor, it represents only one of many risks people face, leading to an understatement of overall consumption risk. Additionally, similar to consumption volatility, realized income volatility reflects both genuine risk as well as choices (e.g., decisions to work more or fewer extra hours), making it partially endogenous. Some studies instead employ consumption-based asset pricing models, such as the CAPM, to estimate

[2] To address endogeneity issues in the Euler equation estimate, Dynan uses education and occupation as instruments, but these instruments have low power.

consumption risk directly (Ludvigson, 2013). These models link consumption growth to asset returns, using financial market data to infer the riskiness of future consumption streams.

Our approach, by contrast, relies on self-reported household spending behavior and subjective probability distributions of various risks. The use of subjective expectations to measure economic uncertainty was pioneered by Manski (2004) and Guiso, Jappelli and Terlizzese (1992), and has recently been applied by Caplin et al. (2023), and Arellano et al. (2024), among others. More broadly, Bachmann et al. (2022) and Stancheva (2022) provide numerous applications of survey-based subjective expectations across fields such as education, labor, health, and macro-finance.

**2.2. Conceptual framework**

Our starting point is that consumption uncertainty is induced by many economic factors. To varying degrees income risk, price variability, health shocks, asset prices volatility all contribute to consumption risk. Some of these risks are common to all consumers, while some are individual specific. By limiting people's ability to cope with income and prices volatility and health shocks, financial and insurance markets imperfections can amplify the impact of these sources of risk on expected consumption uncertainty.

In this paper we document how various sources of risk affect consumption uncertainty using insights from the literature on intertemporal consumption decisions. The first insight is that expected consumption volatility is the relevant measure of the uncertainty affecting consumers' saving response to risk and thus the amount of precautionary savings. The second insight is that expected consumption volatility is a sufficient statistics for all consumption-relevant sources of risk and can be traced back to these sources. The third insight is that the need to engage in precautionary saving in response to a specific risk depends on the level of exposure to this risk. For instance, exposure to energy price shocks depends on the weight of energy costs in the individual budget constraint. The fourth insight is that some risks can be insured, totally or partially, either through formal insurance markets or through informal mechanisms. This attenuates their impact on overall consumption risk depending on available insurance opportunities.

To capture these insights, we build on Banks et al. (2001) and assume that preferences are constant relative risk averse (CRRA) and time separable. We also assume that optimal consumption $c_t$ (net of energy and health expenses) is approximately proportional to individual wealth $w_t$, $c_t \approx \mu w_t$. When labor income is the only source of risk, Banks et al.

(2001) show that, to a second-order approximation in the Euler equation, the expected variance of consumption growth is proportional to the expected variance of income growth, scaled by the ratio of labor income to total wealth. This scaling factor implies that consumption risk (i.e., the expected variance of consumption growth) is more sensitive to income risk for individuals with lower wealth.[3]

We extend this framework to incorporate multiple sources of risk, making simplifying assumptions to derive an explicit solution for the relation between the expected variance of consumption growth and the underlying risks, one that can be implemented empirically. To illustrate the methodology, we focus here on four key sources of risk, for which we elicited subjective probability distributions. Let $\tilde{y}_{t+1}$ denote random labor income in period $t$+1. Random health expenditures are given by $p_h\tilde{h}_{t+1}$, where $p_h$ is the certain and constant price of health goods and services, and $\tilde{h}_{t+1}$ represents uncertain health status. Energy costs are denoted by $e\tilde{p}_{t+1}$, the product of a known quantity of energy needs $e$ and the uncertain energy price $\tilde{p}_{t+1}$. Finally, $\tilde{r}_{t+1}$ is the uncertain return to wealth, encompassing both financial and real assets. For a consumer $i$ (omitted in notation for simplicity) the budget constraint in period $t$+1 is:

$$\tilde{w}_{t+1} = (1 + \tilde{r}_{t+1} + v\tilde{p}_{t+1})w_t + \tilde{y}_{t+1} - c_t - p_h\tilde{h}_{t+1} \quad (1)$$

where we assume $e = vw_t$, that is, the quantity of energy purchased is a constant share of individual wealth - a simple way to capture the idea that energy consumption is highly price inelastic. In Appendix A we show that a second order Taylor approximation of the expected marginal utility of consumption delivers the following expression:

$$\sigma^2_{\xi,t+1} = \pi^2_y\sigma^2_{y,t+1} + \pi^2_h\sigma^2_{h,t+1} + \pi^2_p\sigma^2_{p,t+1} + \pi^2_r\sigma^2_{r,t+1} \quad (2)$$

where $\sigma^2_{\xi,t+1}$ is the variance of the innovation of consumption growth, and the four variances

[3] Banks et al. (2001) also show that transitory income processes have a small impact on consumption risk, and that this impact increases with the persistence of this process.

on the right-hand-side of equation (2) are, respectively, innovations of income growth, health expenditure, energy prices, and interest rate variances. All these variances are conditional on the information available to consumers in period *t* and can evolve over time as new information is acquired. In deriving the equation, we assume that all covariances between these risks are zero, though we will later relax this assumption.

The scaling factors $\pi_z^2$ are proportional to the weight of each risk ($z = y, h, p, r$) on predictable consumption $\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)$, and thus measures the consumer's exposure to each of the four risks. We treat $\pi_z^2$ as parameters, potentially varying across consumers. For example, the conditional variance of income growth is more important for individuals whose lifetime wealth is largely composed of human capital (a high $\pi_y^2$ term) than for those less dependent on human capital (a relatively low $\pi_y^2$). Similarly, individuals close to retirement are less exposed to labor income risk than those just entering the labor market. In a world where these risks cannot be insured or hedged, $\pi_z^2$ measures the pass-through of risk *z* to overall consumption risk.

In practice, consumers can mitigate some of these risks through formal markets, informal networks, public intervention, or accumulated precautionary savings.[4] To allow for partial insurance we let the pass-through coefficient of risk *z* be equal to $\beta_z = \alpha_z \pi_z^2$, where $0 \leq \alpha_z \leq 1$ is a risk attenuation factor reflecting insurance opportunities vis a vis risk source *z*. Absence of insurance implies $\alpha_z = 1$, and full insurance $\alpha_z = 0$. We can than re-write equation (2) as:

$$\sigma_{\xi,t+1}^2 = \beta_y \sigma_{y,t+1}^2 + \beta_h \sigma_{h,t+1}^2 + \beta_p \sigma_{p,t+1}^2 + \beta_r \sigma_{r,t+1}^2 + \varepsilon_{t+1} \quad (3)$$

The $\beta_z$ coefficients in equation (3) measure the pass-through of risk *z* on consumption

[4] For example, in Italy some health shocks are fully covered by the National Health System (NHS), while out-of-pocket health expenditures are primarily related to services not covered by the NHS, such as dental care and preventive healthcare. Another example are welfare programs, including unemployment insurance, fiscal transfers, and social safety nets, that help reduce expected consumption volatility for individuals facing income and unemployment risk. Additionally, some income shocks are partially offset by financial support from parents, relatives, or friends (e.g., Fagereng et al., 2024).

risk and reflect both exposure and insurability. In the (unrealistic) case of complete markets, the $\beta_z$ coefficients are all equal to zero, and the rate of growth of individual consumption has no idiosyncratic volatility. Otherwise, the coefficients reflect the sensitivity of consumption volatility to the underlying risks, due to both exposure and insurance.

Since our aim is to trace consumption risk back to its sources using a regression framework, in equation (3) we also include the term ε. This captures additional determinants of expected consumption volatility not included in our list of source risks, higher order terms omitted from the Taylor expansion, individual specific unobserved factors that contribute to consumption risk such as ability to process information, and measurement error.[5] We model the error term as $\varepsilon_{i,t+1} = \kappa_i + \vartheta_{i,t+1}$ , the sum of an individual fixed effect and an error term. Thus, using cross-sectional data to estimate equation (3) could result in inconsistent estimates of the pass-through parameters due to the presence of unobserved heterogeneity and any other time-invariant characteristic. To address this issue, we estimate model (3) using a fixed effect estimator in panel data. Thus, our identification strategy of the pass-throughs relies on variation over time in expected consumption risk $\sigma^2_{\xi}$ and its underlying risk sources $\sigma^2_z$.

Equation (3) provides the framework for our decomposition exercise and has interesting implications. It shows that consumption risk reflects all sources of risk that affect the consumer's budget constraint. Additionally, what matters for expected consumption risk is the individual's subjective perception of the risk sources, not the ex-post volatilities calculated using observational data. Finally, since the $\beta_z$ coefficients reflect risk insurability and exposure (i.e. the $\alpha_z$ and $\pi_z$ parameters), and since both might vary across individuals, the estimated pass-throughs may also differ across individuals. To account for these differences, and indirectly to validate the decomposition of consumption risk, we also estimate equation (3) for different groups of consumers with supposedly different exposure to specific risk sources or with different capability to buffer consumption-relevant risks.

In some specifications we allow also for covariances among risk sources, and write model (3) as:

[5] Notice that this error is not an expectational error (i.e. the difference between planned and realized consumption) as in the Euler consumption equations which often are estimated with panel data. All terms in the equation are variances computed conditional on the information available to the consumer at the time they predict consumption, income, and the other variables of equation (3).

$$\sigma^2_{\xi,t+1} = \beta_y \sigma^2_{y,t+1} + \beta_h \sigma^2_{h,t+1} + \beta_p \sigma^2_{p,t+1} + \beta_r \sigma^2_{r,t+1} + \sum_z \sum_{x<z} \beta_{zx} \pi_{zx} \sigma_{z,t+1} \sigma_{x,t+1} + \varepsilon_{t+1} \quad (4)$$

where $\beta_{zx} = 2\rho_{zx}\pi_{zx}$, and $\rho_{zx}$ is the correlation coefficient between risk sources $z$ and $x$ and $\pi_{zx} = \pi_z \pi_x$ the product of the two exposures. Non-zero correlations imply that the interaction terms between the standard deviations of pairs of risk sources might also affect consumption uncertainty. The interaction terms are irrelevant if two risks are uncorrelated or if the consumer is exposed to only one of them, or if one of the two risks is fully insured.

In the empirical implementation of equations (3) and (4) we account also for indicators of subjective aggregate risk, demographic variables, time and individual fixed effects. We also test for the significance and influence of the covariance terms, and whether their presence affects our decomposition of consumption risk.

## 3. The Italian Survey of Consumer Expectations

The Italian Survey of Consumer Expectations (ISCE) is a quarterly rotating panel. We use the first five waves collected in October 2023, January 2024, April 2024, July 2024 and October 2024.[6] The survey collects data on demographic variables, household resources (income and wealth components), consumption, individual expectations of future distribution of individual-level variables (consumption, income, energy expenditures and health expenditures), and macroeconomic variables (GDP growth, unemployment, inflation, nominal interest rate, and house prices growth).

The survey builds upon two international online, high-frequency surveys: the New York Federal Reserve Survey of Consumer Expectations, which collects information on consumers' views and expectations regarding inflation, employment, income, and household finances, and the European Central Bank Consumer Expectation Survey which collects monthly data on households' expectations in the euro area economies.

ISCE targets Italian resident population aged between 18 and 75. The survey includes approximately 5,000 interviews in each of the five waves, and a total of 25,026 interviews

[6] We have chosen this quarterly sequence to avoid interviewing consumers during the seasonal months of August and December.

conducted during the first 7-15 days of the reference month.[7] The average response rate across waves (ratio of completed interviews to invitations) is around 40%. The average retention rate (percentage of individuals interviewed in two consecutive waves) is around 80%.[8] To maintain population representativeness the sample is refreshed at quarterly intervals. The ISCE Statistical Bulletin provides detailed information on the survey, see Guiso and Jappelli (2025).

The ISCE sampling scheme is modeled after that used in the Bank of Italy's Survey of Household Income and Wealth (SHIW). The sample is based on a stratification of the Italian resident population according to several criteria: area of residence (North-East, North-West, Central and South Italy), age group (18-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, and over 65), gender, education (college degree, high school degree, and less than high school), and employment status (working, not working). We apply sample weights to ensure that the descriptive statistics are representative of the population.

Appendix B provides further details on the survey and compares the sample means of selected ISCE variables with those from the 2022 SHIW, the most recent available wave. The gender, age, family composition and education levels in both samples are similar (see Table B1), which is noteworthy, given that the ISCE sample likely includes individuals to have internet access and to respond to online questionnaires. Consumption medians are generally comparable between the two surveys, but income appears to be underestimated in ISCE relative to SHIW (see Table B2). A possible explanation is that SHIW collects much more detailed information on disposable income than ISCE. Homeownership is reported at 72% in both surveys, while ISCE respondents report higher financial wealth and greater participation in financial markets (bonds, stocks, private pensions and life insurance).

ISCE elicits subjective probability distributions of consumption, income and the other risk sources over the 12 months following the interview. In the case of income, respondents are asked to assign probabilities to 11 possible income growth intervals, ranging from less than -8% to more than 8%.[9] To construct the moments of the subjective income growth distribution, we take the midpoint of each growth interval. For the lowest (less than -8%) and

[7] All interviews are conducted using the Computer Assisted Web Interviewing (CAWI) method, with an average duration of 18 minutes.

[8] For example, of the 5,011 individuals interviewed in the fifth wave, 2,978 had participated since wave 1, 422 since wave 2, 416 since wave 3, 635 since wave 4 and 560 were interviewed for the first time in wave 5.

.

[9] Except for unemployment (intervals ranging from zero to 14%) and the nominal interest rate (from 0 to 8%).

highest (more than 8%) open intervals, we assume values of -10% and 10%, respectively. The variance of the individual distributions serves as our measure of income risk, which we use to analyze the determinants of consumption risk. ISCE elicits respondents' subjective distributions of individual-level and aggregate variables in a similar way. The intervals are the same across variables and respondent are asked to make sure that probabilities sum up to 100.

## 4. Descriptive analysis and validation

Table 1 presents summary statistics for the pooled sample across five survey waves conducted from October 2023 to October 2024. The top panel reports the means and standard deviations of key demographic variables. The sample is evenly split between males and females, with an average age of 48 years. Additionally, 33% of respondents hold a college degree. Homeownership is prevalent, with 75% of participants owning their homes. Approximately 9% are self-employed, while 45% are employees. On average, cash-on-hand amounts to 29,844 euros, with a standard deviation of a similar magnitude.

The second panel displays the sample means and standard deviations for the first moments of subjective distributions of consumption growth and eight sources of uncertainty. Average growth rates vary across variables, reflecting considerable diversity in expectations, as indicated by standard deviations that generally exceed the means. On average, respondents anticipate a 0.7% increase in consumption, with a standard deviation of 3.9%. They are less optimistic about disposable income growth, projecting an average decline of approximately 1% across the five waves. Over the sample period, health costs are expected to rise by 0.8%, while energy costs are projected to increase by 1.3%, both with a standard deviation of around 3.5%.

The lower part of Table 1 presents the sample means of the variances (scaled by a factor of 100) and the second moments of the expected distributions of consumption growth and its underlying sources of risk. The variances of income, health, and energy expenditure growth rates are similar in magnitude and display substantial dispersion. The variances of consumption and income growth are also comparable, though the income variance is larger, suggesting some degree of smoothing. Appendix C (Figure C1) provides additional insights into the average values of our risk measures over time.

Crucially, expectations vary both over time for the same individual and across respondents. A simple variance decomposition reveals that 57% of the total variance of $\sigma^2_{\xi}$ is

due to cross-sectional differences, while the remaining 43% results from time variation within individuals. Similarly, the variance decomposition of our risk indicators shows that within-individual variance accounts for approximately 40% of total variance.

### 4.1. Validation of uncertainty measures

We validate our measures of subjective uncertainty using two strategies. First, we examine whether the moments of our risk indicators correlate with observable characteristics — such as age, occupation, and cash-on-hand — in ways consistent with theoretical expectations. We find that all perceived risks, particularly consumption and income risk, are higher for younger individuals, who experience greater career uncertainty and more precarious employment (see Appendix C, Figures C2 and C3). Additionally, we observe a strong negative relationship between cash-on-hand and consumption risk, which aligns with precautionary savings models predicting that the variance of innovations to consumption growth should decrease monotonically as cash-on-hand increases (Carroll, 2001).

Further, when comparing self-employed individuals to employees, we find that the self-employed exhibit greater income variance and a 40% higher correlation between expected income and GDP growth, consistent with their heightened exposure to business cycle fluctuations. Similarly, comparing younger respondents (under 35) with older respondents (60+), we find that the younger group anticipates a significantly lower rate of health expense growth (0.4% vs. 1.6%) and half the expected variance of income growth.

These findings reinforce the validity of our elicited probability distributions, suggesting that respondents meaningfully assess and incorporate the uncertainties they face, an essential condition for accurately accounting for the relevant risk sources when expressing their consumption risk.

Our second strategy for validating our measures of uncertainty is to assess the consistency between the elicited risk sources and consumption risk as implied by equation (4), Section 2.[10] To do this, we define a dummy variable, $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right)$, which equals one if the variance of expected consumption growth is positive and zero otherwise. Similarly, we define another dummy variable, $I(\sigma_{s}^{2})$, which equals one when at least one source of risk has a positive variance and zero if all sources of risk have zero variance. By interacting these two dummies,

[10] Recall that equation (4) shows that the variance of consumption innovation is a weighted sum of source risks.

we obtain a 2×2 matrix with four possible outcomes.

If our risk sources are exhaustive, equation (3) implies that individuals who report no source risks should also report no consumption risk, that is, $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 0$ when $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right) = 0$. This condition holds for 6,982 cases (27.9% of the sample, Table 2, Panel A). A second interesting case arises when consumption variance is positive, $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 1$ despite no reported source risks, $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right) = 0$. This occurs in only 1% of the sample (247 observations), and may suggest either that there are other risk sources not captured by our questions or an inconsistent response (people expect consumption volatility despite facing no risk). But such cases are rare. We interpret this as evidence that our list of source risks is fairly comprehensive for the vast majority of the sample.

The third case involves respondents who perceive some risk, $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right) = 1$, and expect their consumption to be volatile, $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 1$. This should be the typical scenario unless individuals can fully insure against all reported risks. Indeed, this group represents the majority of observations (50.86%).

The fourth case, comprising 20.1% of the sample (5,058 observations), requires more explanation. In this scenario, respondents expect no consumption risk, $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 0$ despite reporting that at least one positive variance of the risk source, $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right) = 1$. This could indicate that some consumers effectively insure against these risks.. Alternatively, it may suggest that they fail to pass reported risks to consumption risk, due to inattentiveness during the interview, measurement issues, or the insignificance of these risks (i.e., small variances are simply ignored).

Panel B of Table 2 compares the means variances of different risk sources among respondents who report positive risk factors, distinguishing between those who expect no consumption risk, $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 0$, and those who do, $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 1$ . The results show that the variance of each individual risk factor is much lower among those reporting no consumption risk. The last row reveals that the average variance of these risks is 0.014 in the group expecting no consumption risk, and 5.6 time larger among those reporting positive consumption risk (0.079). Moreover, the former group reports an average of 2.6 risk sources

with positive variance (out of 8), compared to 6.0 in the latter group.

Because consumption risk is additive in source risks (see equation 3), this evidence suggests that when risks are either small or few in number, individuals are more likely to insure against them or simply do not perceive them as a threat to consumption stability. To explore this further, we examine the relation between relate the probability of reporting zero consumption risk and two factors: the sum of the variances of the risk sources ($sum_\sigma_s^2$)[11] and the number of risk sources with positive variance, $num_I(\sigma_s^2)$. Using a linear probability model, we estimate this regression among respondent with at least one positive-variance source risk ($I\left(\sigma_s^2\right) = 1$) using the panel and controlling for individual fixed effects. The results confirm a significant inverse relationship between the probability of reporting zero consumption risks and both $sum_\sigma_s^2$ and $num_I(\sigma_s^2)$ (Table 4, panel C ).[12]

### 4.2. Potential correlations among responses to different risks

In Appendix D, we examine how correlations between different risks impact our analysis. We find that the variances of various risks are positively correlated in both the cross-section and over time (Table D1). For example, the cross-sectional correlation between income risk and health expenditure risk is 0.71, while the correlation between changes in these risks over time is 0.44. More broadly, correlations in risk levels are around 0.7, and correlations in first differences are approximately 0.4. This suggests that individuals who anticipate high risk in one domain tend to expect higher risks in others. Similarly, those who report an increase in risk in one area are likely to report rising risks in other domains as well.[13]

There are at least two possible explanations for these correlations. One possibility is behavioral: individuals who have experienced economic instability may develop a heightened perception of uncertainty across multiple domains (Ben-David et al., 2018). Alternatively, individuals' general perception of uncertainty—and their ability to interpret

[11] The risk sources are weighted by the pass-through coefficients estimated in Table 3.

[12] Effects are large. A one standard deviation increase in sum_s2 lowers the probability of fully insuring consumption by 23 percentage points. Holding the number of risks constant, an increase in num_I(s2) by one standard deviation lowers the probability of fully insuring consumption by 3.5 percentage points.

[13] Notice that here we refer to the cross-sectional correlation of say, the variance of income risk and the variance of health costs risk and not to the correlation between the subjective *distribution* of income growth and health costs growth. Since our survey elicits the subjective marginal probability distributions of the two variables not their joint distribution, we cannot make any claims about their correlation.

probabilities—may influence how they assess risks in different areas. Since our goal is to understand how underlying risks translate into consumption uncertainty, we must account for the possibility that respondents answer similar questions in a repetitive or mechanical manner.

To investigate this, we analyze how respondents assign probabilities to different growth intervals across seven risk indicators, all measured on the same scale (from "less than -8%" to "more than 8%"). If respondents were simply applying the same probability distribution to each risk mechanically—e.g., assigning 20% to a given interval across all risks—it would artificially induce correlations across risk measures. If this kind of automatic response were applied to all intervals, it would result in identical variances (and other statistical moments) across all risks for the same respondent. In that case, consumption risk would appear to be correlated with all risk sources, even those that do not actually contribute to consumption uncertainty.

We address this issue in Appendix D. First, we present the distribution (Figure D1), sample means (Table D2), and regressions (Table D3) of the probability weights assigned to each growth interval. We then run a formal test of the hypothesis that the values assigned to each interval across risks are similar, controlling for individual, time and question fixed effects. This hypothesis is overwhelmingly rejected for all growth intervals. Moreover, individual fixed effects account for only 10% to 30% of the total variance in assigned probabilities across intervals. Overall, our test shows that there is genuine individual variability in responses across questions, implying that our estimated relation between consumption risk and source risks is unlikely to reflect equal answers to different questions.

## 5. Anatomy of consumption risk

### 5.1 Pass-through estimates

Table 3 presents our main findings. Column (1) reports the panel estimates for a variant of equation (3).[14] Since some individuals exit the panel, the sample size decreases from 25,026 to 23,117 individual-wave observations. Because the regression includes fixed effects, the results can be interpreted as indicating that changes in quarterly consumption risk between October 2023 and October 2024 are partly explained by fluctuations in perceived income, energy, and health risks, as well as by changes in aggregate uncertainty. The regression also

[14] In the Appendix we regress the variance of consumption on the variances of the other risk indicators, separately for each of the five ISCE waves (Table C2). In these OLS regressions we exploit the cross-sectional variability of the risk indicators.

controls for demographic factors, including age, gender, family size, education, region of residence, occupation, cash-on-hand, and homeownership. However, given the high-frequency nature of our panel, these effects are largely absorbed by the fixed effects, so their coefficients are not reported in Table 3.

As already explained, the pass-through coefficients of the risk indictors reflect the weight of human capital in total wealth ($\pi$), and expected formal and informal insurance opportunities ($\alpha$). All pass-through coefficients are positive, implying that – on average - consumers do not expect to be able to insure completely, either formally or informally against the risks they face.

In particular, the coefficient of income risk is positive and precisely estimated. The size of the coefficients indicates that 20% of the expected income variance is transmitted to the consumption variance. Also, the other coefficients of microeconomic risk (health and energy expenditures) are positive, precisely estimated, and significantly below one.

The pass through of health expenditure risk (0.37) is higher than that of income and energy expenditure risks. This is consistent with the evidence in Blundell et al. (2024) who find that the pass-through of transitory health shocks to consumption is exceeds that of transitory income shocks. The reason is that health shocks affect consumption in two ways: (i) directly, because shocks to health affect health related expenses with a very large pass-through, as they cannot typically be deferred; (ii) indirectly, because health status affects the marginal utility of consumption, discouraging expenditures when bad health hits, and vice versa. Energy expenditure shocks, like health shocks, are difficult to defer but have no direct effect on the marginal utility of consumption. Their pass-through is of the same magnitude as that of income risk.

Among the macro risks, only the coefficients of GDP and house price risks are positive and statistically different from zero, while interest rate risk, inflation risk, and unemployment risk have a minor influence. Table D4 in Appendix D shows that results are stable across the five waves for the income risk and health risk coefficients, and that in each of the subsamples the regression explains more than 70% of consumption volatility.

One potential concern is that the positive correlation between consumption risk and underlying risk factors may be affected by the individuals who report positive consumption variance but no variance in the source risks.[15] These responses are either inconsistent or arise

[15] In Section 4.2. we identify 1% of the cases for which $I2>0$ when $Is2=0$.

from uncertainty sources not captured in our data. Excluding this group leaves the results unchanged (column 2, Table 3). As explained in Section 4.2, a second, larger group of respondents (27.9%) reports zero variance for each of the risk factors, that is, $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 0$ and $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right) = 0$. In column 3 we drop these observations. Also in this restricted sample estimated pass-through coefficients very close to those in column (1).

In column (4) we further drop all observations reporting zero consumption risk even though they report positive values for one or more risk factors, that is, $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 0$ and $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right) = 1$. In this restricted sample with 11,575 observations, the pass-through coefficient of income risk increases to 0.24 (from 0.21 in column 1), while the pass-through of health and energy risks are slightly lower than in column 1 (0.31 and 0.16, respectively). But qualitatively results are similar across sample selections.

Table 4 presents the panel fixed-effects estimates of equation (4), incorporating potential interactions between different risks—specifically, the product of the standard deviations of the subjective distributions, as specified in equation (4). We first estimate a model that includes the full set of covariances among the eight risk factors. We then refine the model by retaining only the two covariances with statistically significant coefficients.

Column 1 shows that the covariance between expected health expenditure growth and expected income growth has a positive coefficient, aligning with findings from Blundell et al. (2024) and Fulford and Low (2024) that suggest a positive correlation between health and income shocks. In contrast, the covariance between inflation and house price growth has a negative coefficient, consistent with the idea that housing serves as a hedge against inflation. We then report in column 2 of Table 4 the marginal effects and associated standard errors of the risk indicators, evaluated at the sample means of the expected variances of the risks considered.[16] Comparing the results in Tables 2 and 3, we conclude that the pass-through of the risk factors are quite stable even allowing for potential covariance effects.

### 5.2 Pass-through heterogeneity

[16] For instance, the marginal effect of income risk is evaluated as y+2yhh2y22, where h2 and h2 are, respectively, the average variances of the health and income distributions.

Recall that the pass-through coefficients in equation (3) should vary across population groups with different risk exposure and access to insurance. While our data do not allow us to disentangle these two factors – meaning we cannot separately estimate the $\alpha_z$ and $\pi_z$ coefficients, we can still assess their relevance by focusing on those groups where we would expect, a priori, we expect in both risk exposure ($\pi$ coefficients) and insurance ($\alpha$ coefficients).

To identify these groups, the descriptive analysis in Section 4 is useful. For instance, individuals with high levels of human capital relative to wealth (the young with more career uncertainty) should be more exposed to income risk (have higher $\pi_y^2$ in equation 3) whereas those individuals with high levels of wealth relative to income (older and retired individuals) have a larger buffer and are less exposed to income risk. Similarly, compared to the self-employed, employees should be less exposed to business cycle fluctuations, as their wages tend to be more stable—a pattern reflected in the elicited expectations discussed in Section 4..

Table 5 presents separate pass-through regressions for different consumer groups based on age (≤35 and >60), occupation (employee vs. self-employed), and sector of activity. For the latter, we classify workers into "high-risk sectors," which include agriculture, manufacturing, and construction, and "low-risk sectors," which encompass services and public administration.

The pass-through coefficients align with a priori expectations regarding differences in risk exposure across groups. For instance, compared to older individuals (age ≥60), the pass-through of income risk is higher for younger individuals (age ≤35). Similarly, while the pass-through of unemployment risk is small and not statistically significant in the overall sample (Table 4), it becomes larger and significant among younger individuals but remains small and insignificant among older individuals. Additionally, the pass-through of house price risk is higher for the older group, which is consistent with their greater exposure to house price fluctuations due to higher homeownership rates. Employees exhibit a significantly lower pass-through of energy expenditure risk than the self-employed (0.165 vs. 0.271), reflecting the fact that self-employed individuals are more vulnerable to energy cost fluctuations, as energy serves as both a production input and a consumption good. Furthermore, the self-employed show a pass-through of GDP growth risk that is twice as large as that of employees. Consistent with these findings, individuals employed in high-risk sectors exhibit a

higher pass-through of income risk compared to those in low-risk sectors (0.33 vs. 0.22).

Table 6 presents estimates based on cash-on-hand as a measure of heterogeneity in access to self-insurance. Individuals with low cash-on-hand (less than €10,000) exhibit a 35% higher pass-through of income risk to consumption volatility compared to those with high cash-on-hand (above €30,000). Additionally, their pass-through of health and energy expense risks is 9% and 12% higher, respectively. These findings support the hypothesis that cash-on-hand provides a form of self-insurance against income and expenditure shocks, particularly income shocks. Overall, the evidence in Tables 5 and 6 reinforces our decomposition exercise and suggests that both risk exposure and access to insurance play key roles in explaining the determinants of consumption risk.

The last two columns of Table 6 highlight that the pass-through of income risk is significantly higher for younger individuals with low cash-on-hand (0.295). This indicates that income risk has a greater impact when financial buffers are limited and individuals are in the early stages of their careers, where income volatility is typically higher. Conversely, the pass-through of income risk declines considerably for older individuals with greater cash reserves (0.127). Furthermore, macroeconomic risks have a much lower impact on consumption volatility among younger individuals with low cash-on-hand compared to older individuals with substantial financial buffers.

### 5.3 Contribution of risk sources to consumption uncertainty

To evaluate the economic significance of different sources of risk, Table 7 presents the contribution of each risk factor to predicted consumption risk. For the full sample, we use the pass-through coefficients estimated in Table 3 (column 1) and calculate contributions based on the mean values of the source risk variables. Specifically, for each risk source, its contribution to predicted consumption risk is obtained by multiplying the estimated pass-through coefficient by the sample mean of that risk's variance and dividing by the sample average of consumption risk. We differentiate between idiosyncratic and aggregate risks and provide estimates for the full sample as well as various consumer sub-groups classified by risk exposure (young vs. old; employed vs. self-employed; high-risk vs. low-risk sectors) and self-insurance capacity (low vs. high cash-on-hand).

Panel A of Table 7 shows that, for the full sample, idiosyncratic risks account for the majority of consumption risk (72.8%), while aggregate risks contribute only 17.4%, and

demographic factors and time effects together explain the remaining 9.8%. Notably, health expenditure risk emerges as the largest contributor to expected consumption risk (33.6%). Since the average variance of health risk is lower than that of income risk (see Table 1), its large contribution is driven by the higher pass-through coefficients documented in Tables 4 to 6, consistent with findings in Blundell et al. (2024). Similarly, while energy risk has a lower average variance than income risk, its substantial pass-through coefficients highlight the significance of expenditure shocks, supporting the results of Fulford and Low (2024).

In the remaining columns of Panel A in Table 7, we further decompose consumption risk across different groups, highlighting heterogeneity in risk exposure. The share of consumption risk attributable to individual-level risks varies significantly, ranging from a low of 61% among individuals aged 60 and above to a high of 77% for those working in high-risk sectors. We also observe relatively high contributions of micro risks for younger individuals (77%) and the self-employed (75%). In contrast, aggregate risks play a larger role for older individuals (25%) but are less significant for younger individuals and those in high-risk sectors (16%). For other groups, aggregate risks contribute between 15% and 18% of total consumption risk. Demographic factors and time effects account for approximately 10% of consumption risk.

Panel B shifts the focus to differences in self-insurance capacity. Here, income risk is shown to be more important for individuals with low cash-on-hand, while macroeconomic risks are substantially more significant for wealthier individuals with greater financial buffers.

The findings in Table 7 indicate that consumption uncertainty affects all population segments, though the relative importance of different risk sources varies significantly across groups. This variation underscores the role of precautionary savings, though the motivations for accumulating such savings differ based on life stage, occupation, employment sector, and individual capacity to manage financial risks.

### 5.4. Willingness to pay to fully insure residual consumption risk

As a final exercise, we leverage data on consumption uncertainty and its sources to estimate individuals' willingness to pay for insurance against consumption risk. Following Lucas (2003), this can be computed as $\left(\frac{1}{2}RRA\times\sigma_c^2\right)$, representing the risk premium a consumer with risk aversion *RRA* would be willing to pay to insure against consumption

growth volatility of size $\sigma_c^2$.

Since we observe $\sigma_c^2$ , we can back up the contribution from business cycle fluctuations (Lucas focus) and from idiosyncratic uncertainty. However, it is important to note that our measure of $\sigma_c^2$ reflects *residual* consumption risk, i.e., the portion that remains after consumers have utilized available insurance mechanisms to mitigate the pass-through of source risks onto consumption uncertainty. This distinction underscores that the estimated willingness to pay represents compensation for risks that individuals are unable to fully insure against through existing financial or informal risk-sharing arrangements.

From Table 7, we observe that $\sigma_c^2$ =0.057%. In Section 6, our Euler equation estimates suggest a relative risk aversion (*RRA*) of 1.4. Therefore, the willingness to pay to avoid residual consumption uncertainty for the average consumer in our sample is $0.5 \times 1.4 \times 0.057 = 0.04\%$ of consumption. The contribution to consumption uncertainty from micro and macro risks are 0.728 and 0.174, respectively. Thus, the willingness to pay to insure micro risks amounts to 0.029% of consumption, while the willingness to pay to insure aggregate fluctuation to 0.011%. This constitutes a small welfare cost, confirming Lucas' (2003) conclusion that the willingness to pay for insurance against consumption uncertainty is relatively low.

## 6. Euler equation estimates

The first step of our analysis has shown that the expected volatility of consumption can be attributed to a variety of risks, with pass-through coefficients consistently below 1, reflecting a combination of risk exposure and insurance opportunities. However, the impact of consumption risk on expected consumption growth remains to be explored. In this section, we use our data on consumption risk and its determinants to estimate an Euler equation for consumption. The goal is to assess whether expected consumption volatility influences the expected rate of consumption growth and to measure the strength of the precautionary savings motive.

Following Blanchard and Mankiw (1988), we approximate the Euler equation using a second-order Taylor expansion of the marginal utility of consumption $u'(c_{t+1})$ around $c_t$.

Solving for the expected growth rate of consumption we obtain:

$$E_t\left(\frac{c_{t+1}-c_t}{c_t}\right) \cong EIS\left(\frac{r-\delta}{1+r}\right) + \frac{1}{2}p(c)E_t\left(\frac{c_{t+1}-c_t}{c_t}\right)^2 + \psi_{it+1} \quad (5)$$

where $p(c) = -\frac{u'''(c_t)c_t}{u''(c_t)}$ is Kimball's coefficient of relative prudence, $EIS = -\frac{u'(c_t)}{u''(c_t)c_t}$ is the elasticity of intertemporal substitution which in this framework is also equal to the inverse of the coefficient of relative risk aversion, and $\psi$ is a remainder term in the Taylor approximation. The second moment of the conditional distribution of consumption growth $E_t\left(\frac{c_{t+1}-c_t}{c_t}\right)^2$ is a measure of the expected variability of consumption.

Equation (5) shows that the anticipated volatility of consumption growth is linked to a higher growth rate of consumption. Consumption uncertainty prompts consumers to reduce current consumption and increase savings, with the extent of this adjustment depending on their degree of prudence.[17] There two ways to estimate equation (5). One approach is to use realized consumption data, as pioneered by Dynan (1993). However, this method faces significant identification challenges due to the endogeneity of realized consumption and the difficulty in finding valid instruments (see, for example, Carroll, 2001). Our proposed alternative, following Christelis et al. (2020), is to rely on data regarding consumers' subjective expectations of the distribution of consumption growth. This allows us to obtain measures of the key variables in equation (5) – the expected rate of consumption growth and its expected second moment, both conditional on the information available to consumers. We assume that prudence is a parameter invariant to wealth (as implied by CRRA preferences), and express the equation in a regression framework:

$$E_{it}\left(g_{i,t+1}\right) = \gamma_0 + \omega E_{it}\left(g^2_{i,t+1}\right) + f_i + d_{t+1} + v_{i,t+1} \quad (6)$$

[17] In the certainty equivalence model consumers do not respond to uncertainty and pc=0. Caballero (1991) demonstrates that if utility is exponential and income follows a random walk, then expected consumption growth equals the product of the coefficient of relative prudence and the variance of income, normalized by current income. A closed-form solution can also be derived if utility is isoelastic and consumption growth is normally distributed.

where $E_{it}\left(g_{i,t+1}\right)$ and $E_{it}\left(g_{i,t+1}^{2}\right)$ represent, respectively, the first and second moment of the distribution of expected consumption growth in period $t$+1, ($g_{i,t+1}$); $f_i$ and $d_{t+1}$ are individual and time fixed effects, and $v_{i,t+1}$ is an error term. The individual fixed effects capture systematic differences in returns to wealth, as documented in Fagereng et al. (2020). The parameter ω equals ½ of the degree of relative prudence and thus identifies the strength of the precautionary saving motive. In some specification we allow $\omega = \omega(z_i)$ to vary depending on observables $z_i$ that the literature has shown to correlate with individual risk aversion. We do this to increase confidence that we are identifying a structural preference parameter.

Notice that the error term $v_{i,t+1}$ of equation (6) is not a forecast error, which allows equation (6) to avoid endogeneity problems that typically affect estimates based on ex-post consumption realizations. Additionally, systematic deviations of expectations from realizations do not undermine the consistency of our estimates, even with short panels.[18] However, there remains the possibility that unobservable variables included in the error term are correlated with consumption risk (this could arise, for example, from omitted higher-order terms in the Taylor expansion). Furthermore, subjective expectations might be influenced by measurement error, which could also affect our estimates in Table 8 presents the estimates of two versions of equation (6): (i) OLS without and with fixed-effects panel estimation; (ii) IV fixed-effects panel estimation, using the second moments of risk factors as instruments. The IV specification is our preferred one, as it allows us to trace the effect of consumption volatility back to the underlying risk sources. Column (1) shows a basic OLS regression The coefficient of consumption risk is precisely estimated at 1.137, implying a coefficient of relative prudence of 2.27. This value is in line with previous evidence based on different methodologies and datasets.[19]

[18] If one uses realized consumption data, one can write equation (6) in a regression framework as: gi,t+1=0++ωgi,t+12+fi +dt+vi,t+1+ei,t. But in this case the term vi,t+1 is the difference between realized and expected consumption (the forecast error), which is likely to be correlated with gi,t+12. For instance, if households receive positive news, they may revise consumption upward, affecting both the mean and the variance of the (ex post) consumption distribution. Consequently, any regression of realized consumption growth on realized consumption volatility produces inconsistent estimates of the strength of the precautionary motive (Carroll, 2001). Another consequence of the presence of the expectational error is that estimates derived from short panel data may be inconsistent (Chamberlain, 1984).

[19] Dynan (1993) estimates the Euler equation using realized consumption data and an instrumental variable approach. Bertola et al. (2005) use the subjective variance of income growth from the SHIW as an instrument for realized consumption variability, finding a coefficient of relative prudence of approximately 2. Similarly,

The Euler equation (6) is derived under the assumption of perfect capital markets, but this equation may not hold in the presence of liquidity constraints or myopic consumers. To capture these individuals, we assume that some consumers set consumption equal to income in each period. Column 2 nests the two models and adds expected income growth to the regressors. The coefficient of consumption risk is 2.06 (implying relative prudence of 4.12), and the coefficient of income growth is 0.29, consistent with a large body of empirical evidence showing that consumption growth is sensitive to expected income growth.[20]

In column 3 of Table 8 we add individual fixed effects, which capture heterogeneity in returns on wealth across individuals. The estimate on consumption risk, (-1.76), is of the same order of magnitude as in the OLS estimates, yielding a measure of prudence of 3.52.

Column 4 presents IV fixed-effects estimates, using the second moments of the expected distributions of our microeconomic risk factors (expected income growth, expected healthcare expenditure growth, and expected growth of energy costs) as instruments. Column 5 also includes in the instrument list macroeconomic sources of risk, such as GDP, inflation, interest rate, unemployment, and house price risks. [21] In both cases, the effect of consumption risk is precisely estimated, with implied prudence ranging between 2.8 and 2.5. We take the latter as our reference estimate. Excess sensitivity remains nearly unchanged across both specifications and is also precisely estimated.[22]

Panel B of Table 8 exploits heterogeneity in risk aversion based on observable characteristics to strengthen the structural interpretation of the estimated prudence parameter. Under CRRA preferences, relative prudence is directly related to relative risk aversion, following the relation: prudence = 1+ RRA. To explore this relationship, we split the sample in two ways. First, columns (1) and (2) distinguish between younger individuals (age<=35) and older ones (age>60). Second, columns (3) and (4>) split the sample by occupational risk, given that risk aversion is positively related to and age, and influences job selection – more risk averse individuals are more likely to choose safer jobs, such as positions in the public sector (e.g. Albert Duffy, 2012). The Euler equation estimates reveal a clear pattern: prudence

Fagereng et al (2017) estimate a prudence coefficient of 2 by instrumenting income variance with the variance of shocks to the firm the consumer is employed. Christelis et al. (2020) regress expected consumption growth on expected consumption risk in Dutch data and also obtain a relative prudence estimate of 2.

[20] For further references, see Jappelli and Pistaferri (2017), Havranek and Sokolova (2020), Crawley and Theloudis (2024).

[21] Table C3 in Appendix C reports the first stage regressions corresponding to columns 1 and 2 in Table 8.

[22] As robustness check, we exclude observations where consumption risk, risk factors, or both equal to zero, following the approach in Table 3. This exclusion does not affect the results, particularly the coefficient of prudence.

is significantly lower among the young (approximately 2.2) compared to the old (5.8), consistent with the idea that older individuals tend to be more risk averse. Similarly, prudence is lower for individuals employed in low-risk sectors (around 0.6, though with a high standard error) than for those employed in high-risk sectors (approximately 5.2).

## 7. Size and drivers of precautionary saving

Using our estimate of the Euler equation, along with information on subjective distributions of consumption and the underlying risks, we assess how precautionary savings influence consumption and its sensitivity to various risks that drive expected consumption volatility. The detailed methodology and step-by-step approach are provided in Appendix A2. Here, we outline the key intuition and discuss the results.

For an individual of age $a$, the Euler equation estimates the expected consumption growth rate, which consists of two main components: (i) a precautionary saving component, $\omega\sigma_a^2$, which corresponds to the second term on the right-hand side of equation (6). The parameter $\omega$ is estimated in Table 8, while the second moment of expected consumption growth $\sigma_a^2$ is derived from the elicited distributions of future consumption growth. The second component $(\alpha = \gamma_0 + f_i)$ captures other motives for savings, including intertemporal substitution and heterogeneity in returns to capital, which is accounted for by the individual fixed effects. Our assumption is that this component remains unchanged when the precautionary motive is removed.

Following Caballero (1990, 1991) we assume that uncertainty influences the volatility of future resources but does not alter their expected value over the remaining lifetime. Under this assumption, uncertainty affects only the slope of the age profile of expected consumption from age $a$ onwards, while leaving its total lifetime value unchanged. Since $\omega > 0$ current consumption under uncertainty, $C_a^u$, will be lower than current consumption under certainty, $C_a$ . In the appendix we derive the ratio of these two consumption levels:

$$\frac{C_a^u}{C_a} = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{T_a-a} \left[\frac{1+\alpha_a}{1+r}\right]^k}{\sum_{k=0}^{T_a-a} \left[(1+\alpha_a+\beta\sigma_a^2)/(1+r)\right]^k} = \mu_a < 1$$

Here $r$ represents the real rate of interest used to discount expected consumption over the life cycle. Thus $(1-\mu_a)$ is the level of precautionary savings relative to consumption under certainty. Following the prediction in Caballero (1991), we can test twhether precautionary savings decreases as an individual's horizon shortens.[23]

In Table 9 we report the average values of $(1-\mu_a)$ for the entire sample and for three age groups: young (ages 18-24), middle-aged (40-45), and pre-retirement (60-65). To estimate the consumer's horizon, we use life expectancy tables (separately for males and females) and set the discount rate at 3%. We obtain the relevant parameters from the first stage estimates of regression (5) in Table 8 (column 5) and evaluate $(1-\mu_a)$ at the sample means of the risk factors used as instruments. On average, precautionary savings accounts for 2.74% of consumption, with individual-level risks contributing nearly 2 percentage points and aggregate risk accounting for 0.8 percentage points. These results remain consistent when performing the calculations separately for males and females, or when assuming that the discount rate is 2 or 4%.

For the 18-24 age group, $\left(1-\mu_a\right) = 4.2\%$, higher than the sample average. In terms of the sources of precautionary saving, 69% stems from microeconomic risks, while the remaining 31% from aggregate risks. For the middle-aged and the pre-retirement groups precautionary savings decline notably with age (3.3% and 1.7%, respectively), in line with predictions from precautionary savings models. There is also a mild age-related shift in the composition of these savings. While idiosyncratic risk accounts for 69% of precautionary savings among the young, this share rises to 74% among older individuals, largely due to the increasing importance of energy and health expenditure risks in later life.

Finally, we can contrast the welfare cost of these fluctuations estimated in Section 5 with the amount of precautionary savings that consumers are willing to pile up to cushion business cycle fluctuations. From Table 9 this amounts to 0.78% of consumption, much higher than the willingness to pay to insure against aggregate fluctuations (0.007%). This is

[23] In Caballero (1990) the statistic (1-a) has a closed-form solution given by p22T-a where p represents the degree of relative prudence, 2 is the squared coefficient of variation of the innovation to the income process, assumed to be normally distributed, and T-a denotes the remaining horizon for an individual aged a.

what it should be, since paying to avoid the business cycle entails a sure loss of consumption while precautionary savings entail only procrastination of consumption.

## 7. Conclusions

Intertemporal consumption models suggest that consumers' decisions depend on the expected variability of consumption, which, in turn, reflects all relevant sources of uncertainty they face. However, most of the literature has primarily focused on income risk and the strategies consumers use to mitigate it. While income uncertainty is a major concern, it is not the only source of risk affecting consumption. Focusing solely on income risk overlooks other important uncertainties. This paper fills that gap by eliciting the probability distribution of expected consumption risk, along with a comprehensive set of underlying risk sources. This approach allows us to uncover several novel findings that enhance our understanding of the anatomy of consumption risk:

First, we find significant heterogeneity in both consumption risk and its underlying sources. About 28% of consumers report no uncertainty from risk sources and thus experience no consumption risk. Another 20% also report no consumption risk, possibly due to their ability to insure against the risks they face—which typically happens when risks are limited in numbers and small. However, the majority of consumers experience multiple sources of risk that, in turn, influence their expected consumption volatility.

Second, the extent to which risk sources affect consumption varies between zero and one for all risks, but is significantly higher for individual-specific risks than for aggregate risks. Third, the pass-through of expenditure risks arising from health and energy price shocks is at least as large as that of income risk. Fourth, when considering both the size of risks and their pass-through rates, we find that individual-specific risks account for most of consumption uncertainty, whereas aggregate risks (including business cycle fluctuations) contribute less than a quarter of the overall consumption uncertainty. Finally, we document substantial heterogeneity in both pass-through rates and the relative importance of different risk sources, reflecting differences in risk exposure (e.g., age and employment sector) and access to insurance (e.g. liquid resources available for self-insurance).

Using our data, we estimate the structural parameter of the Euler equation for consumption and leverage it to quantify precautionary savings flows, examining how different

risks contribute to these savings and how they vary across consumers. Our findings suggest that precautionary savings account for slightly less than 3% of consumption, with about 2 percentage points allocated to buffer individual-level risks and 1 percentage point in response to aggregate risk. Precautionary savings are higher among younger consumers (~4%), a group more exposed to microeconomic risks.

We see this study as a first step in a broader research agenda aimed at evaluating the welfare costs of limited insurability when consumers face multiple sources of risk. This requires a full-fledged structural life-cycle model that accounts for heterogeneous exposure and insurability across multiple risks. Such a model, which will be calibrated using our empirical findings, will be developed in a separate study.

## References


Albert, Steven M, John Duffy (2012), "Differences in Risk Aversion Between Young and Older Adults", *Neuroscience and Neuroeconomics* 2012, 3–93.

Armantier, Olivier, Giorgio Topa, Wilbert van der Klaauw, Basit Zafar (2016), "An Overview of the Survey of Consumer Expectations," Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff Reports No. 800.

Attanasio, Orazio P., Guglielmo Weber (2010), "Consumption and Saving: Models of Intertemporal Allocation and Their Implications for Public Policy", *Journal of Economic Literature* 48, 693-751.

Attanasio, Orazio P., Hamish Low (2004), "Estimating Euler Equations", *Review of Economic Dynamics* 7, 406-435.

Attanasio, Orazio, Agnes Kovacs, Krisztina Molnar (2019), "Euler Equations, Subjective Expectations and Income Shocks", *Economica* 87, 406-441.

Arellano, Manuel, Orazio Attanasio, Margherita Borella, Gonzalo Paz-Pardo (2024), "Subjective Earnings and Employment Dynamics", mimeo.

Bachmann, Ruediger, Giorgio Topa, Wilbert van der Klaauw (2022), *Handbook of Economic Expectations*, Elsevier.

Banks, James, Richard Blundell, Agar Brugiavini (2001), "Risk Pooling, Precautionary Saving and Consumption Growth," *The Review of Economic Studies* 68, 757–779.

Ben-David, Itzhak, Elyas Fermand, Camelia M. Kuhnen, Geng Li (2018), "Expectations Uncertainty and Household Economic Behavior," NBER Working Papers 25336.

Bertola, Giuseppe, Luigi Guiso, Luigi Pistaferri (2005), "Uncertainty and Consumer Durables Adjustment," *Review of Economic Studies* 72, 973–1007.

Blanchard, Olivier and Gregory Mankiw (1988), "Consumption: Beyond Certainty Equivalence," *The American Economic Review P&P* 78, 173-177.

Blundell, Richard, Margherita Borella, Jeanne Commault, Mariacristina De Nardi (2024), "Old Age Risks, Consumption, and Insurance," *American Economic Review* 114, 575-613.

Boguth Oliver and Lors-Alexander Kuehn (2013), "Consumption Volatility Risk", *The Journal of Finance*, 2589-2615.

Caballero, Ricardo (1990), "Consumption Puzzles and Precautionary Savings," *Journal of Monetary Economics* 25, 113-136.

Caballero, Ricardo (1991), "Earnings Uncertainty and Aggregate Wealth Accumulation," *American Economic Review* 81, 859-71.

Caplin, Andrew, Victoria Gregory, Eungik Lee, Søren Leth-Petersen and Johan Sæverud (2023) "Subjective Earnings Risk", NBER Working Paper 31019.

Carroll, Christopher D. (2001), "Death to the Log-Linearized Consumption Euler Equation! (And Very Poor Health to the Second-Order Approximation)," *Topics in Macroeconomics* 1, Article 6.

Carroll, Christopher D., and Miles S. Kimball, (1996), "On the Concavity of the Consumption Function," *Econometrica* 64, 981–92.

Carroll, Christopher, Jiri Slacalek, Kiichi Tokuoka, Matthew White (2017), "The Distribution of Wealth and the Marginal Propensity to Consume," *Quantitative Economics* 8, 977-1020.

Chamberlain, Gary (1984), "Panel Data," in Zvi Griliches and Michael. D. Intriligator, eds. *Handbook of Econometrics*, vol. 2. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

Christelis, Dimitris, Dimitris Georgarakos, Tullio Jappelli, Maarten van Rooij (2020), "Consumption Uncertainty and Precautionary Saving," *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 102, 148–161.

Coibion, Olivier, Yuriy Gorodnichenko, Geoff Kenny, Michael Weber (2024), "The Effect of Macroeconomic Uncertainty on Household Spending," *American Economic Review* 114, 645-77.

Crawley, Edmund, Theloudis Alexandros (2024), "Income Shocks and their Transmission into Consumption," CentER Discussion Paper 2024-012, forthcoming in the Encyclopedia of Consumption.

De Nardi, Maria Cristina, Giulio Fella (2017), "Saving and Wealth Inequality," *Review of Economic Dynamics* 26, 280-300.

Dominitz, Jeff, Charles F. Manski (1997), "Using Expectations Data to Study Subjective Income Expectations," *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92, 855–867.

Dynan, Karen, (1993) "How Prudent Are Consumers?" *Journal of Political Economy* 101, 1104–1113.

ECB (2021), "ECB Consumer Expectations Survey: An Overview and First Evaluation," Occasional Paper Series, No. 287, December.

Fagereng, Andreas, Luigi Guiso and Luigi Pistaferri (2017), "Firm-Related Risks and Precautionary Savings Response", *American Economic Review P&P* 107, 393-97.

Fagereng, Andreas, Luigi Guiso and Luigi Pistaferri (2017), "Heterogeneity and Persistence in Returns to Wealth", *Econometrica* 88, 115-170.

Fagereng, Andreas, Luigi Guiso, Luigi Pistaferri, Marius Ring (2024), "Insuring Labor Income Shocks: The Role of the Dynasty", EIEF Working Paper.

Fulford, Scott L., David Low (2024), "Expense Shocks Matter", Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Office of Research Working Paper No. 2024-08

Georgarakos, Dimitris, Kwang Hwan Kim, Olivier Coibion, Myungkyu Shim, Myunghwan Andrew Lee, Yuriy Gorodnichenko, Geoff Kenny, Seowoo Han, Michael Weber (2025), How Costly Are Business Cycle Volatility and Inflation? A Vox Populi Approach, NBER Working Paper 33476.

Gourinchas, Pierre-Olivier, Jonathan A. Parker (2002), "Consumption over the Life Cycle," *Econometrica* 70, 47–89.

Guiso, Luigi, Tullio Jappelli (2025), "The Italian Survey of Consumer Expectations: Statistical Bulletin," https://isrlab.it/italian-survey-consumer-expectations.

Guiso, Luigi, Tullio Jappelli, Daniele Terlizzese (1992), "Earnings Uncertainty and Precautionary saving," *Journal of Monetary Economics* 30, 307-337.

Guiso, Luigi, Tullio Jappelli, Mario Padula (2013), "Pension Wealth Uncertainty," *Journal of Risk and Insurance* 80, 1057–1085.

Guiso, Luigi, Tullio Jappelli, Luigi Pistaferri (2022), "An Empirical Analysis of Earnings and Employment Risk," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 20, 241–253.

Havranek, Tomas, Anna Sokolova (2020), "Do Consumers Really Follow a Rule of Thumb? Three Thousand Estimates from 144 Studies Say Probably Not," *Review of Economic Dynamics* 35, 97-122.

Jappelli, Tullio, Luigi Pistaferri (2000), "Using Subjective Income Expectations to Test for Excess Sensitivity of Consumption to Predicted Income Growth," *European Economic Review* 44, 337–358.

Jappelli, Tullio, Luigi Pistaferri (2017), *The Economics of Consumption*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, Greg, Giovanni L. Violante, Justin Weidner (2014), "The Wealthy Hand-to-Mouth," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 48 (2014),77–153.

Lucas, Robert, E Jr. (2003), "Macroeconomic Priorities," *American Economic Review* 93, 1–14**.**

Ludvigson Sydney C. (2013), "Advances in Consumption-Based Asset Pricing: Empirical Tests," in *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, edited by George M. Constantinides, Milton Harris and Rene M. Stulz, vol. 2, pp. 799-906. Elsevier Science B.V., North Holland, Amsterdam.

Ludvigson, Sydney, Christina Paxon (2001), "Approximation Bias in Linearized Euler Equations", *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 83, 242-256.

Manski, Charles F. (2004), "Measuring Expectations," *Econometrica* 72, 1329–1376.

Palumbo, Michael G. (1999), "Uncertain Medical Expenses and Precautionary Saving near the End of the Life Cycle," *Review of Economic Studies* 66, 395–421.

Ryngaert, Jane M. (2022), "Inflation Disasters and Consumption," *Journal of Monetary Economics* 129, S67-S81.

Stantcheva, Stefanie (2023), "How to Run Surveys: A Guide to Creating your Own Identifying Variation and Revealing the Invisible," *Annual Review of Economics* 15, 205-234.

Violante, Gianluca (2024), "Consumption," in *Macroeconomics: A Comprehensive Textbook for First-year Ph.D. Courses in Macroeconomics*, edited by Marina Azzimonti, Per Krusell, Alisdair McKay, and Toshihiko Mukoyama. Unpublished (https://phdmacrobook.org).

## Table 1. Descriptive statistics

| | Mean | Standard deviation |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| Male | .493 | .5 |
| Age | 48.379 | 14.299 |
| Family size | 2.784 | 1.133 |
| College degree | .222 | .415 |
| North | .464 | .499 |
| Centre | .195 | .396 |
| South | .341 | .474 |
| Employed | .449 | .497 |
| Self-employed | .088 | .283 |
| Cash-on-hand | 29.844 | 23.185 |
| Homeowner | .758 | .428 |
| | | |
| Consumption growth | .007 | .039 |
| Income growth | -.01 | .035 |
| Health expenditures growth | .008 | .035 |
| Energy expenditures growth | .013 | .036 |
| Nominal interest rate | .031 | .023 |
| GDP growth | -.013 | .036 |
| Inflation | .013 | .038 |
| Unemployment rate | .09 | .039 |
| House price growth | .001 | .032 |
| | | |
| | **Variance of** | **Second moment of** |
| Consumption growth | .057 | .211 |
| Income growth | .064 | .195 |
| Health expenditures growth | .051 | .182 |
| Energy expenditures growth | .047 | .195 |
| Nominal interest rate | .012 | .157 |
| GDP growth | .048 | .194 |
| Inflation | .045 | .206 |
| Unemployment rate | .033 | .999 |
| House price growth | .043 | .143 |
| | | |
| Observations | 25,026 | 25,026 |

*Note*. The table reports the sample means and standard deviations of selected variables from the ISCE. The average growth rates and their standard deviations are presented as the original numbers, while the variances are multiplied by 100. All statistics are computed using sample weights from the pooled 2023-24 ISCE.

## Table 2. Distribution of consumption risk, by risk factors

**Panel A. Cross-tabulation of $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right)$ and $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right)$**

| $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right)$ | $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right)$ | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | |
| 0 | 6,982<br>(27.90) | 5058<br>(20.21) | 12,040<br>(48.1)1 |
| 1 | 257<br>(1.03) | 12,729<br>(50.86) | 12,986<br>(51.89) |
| Total | 7,239<br>(28.93) | 17,787<br>(71.07) | 25,026<br>(100) |

**Panel B. Average risk factors, by consumption risk groups**

| | $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right)=1$ and $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right)=0$ | $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right)=1$ and $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right)=1$ |
|---|---|---|
| Income risk | .039 | .111 |
| Health risk | .008 | .098 |
| Energy risk | .007 | .089 |
| Interest rate risk | .006 | .022 |
| GDP risk | .017 | .087 |
| Inflation risk | .013 | .082 |
| Unemployment risk | .015 | .058 |
| House price risk | .005 | .083 |
| Average risk | .014 | .079 |
| Average number of positive risks | 2.59 | 6.04 |
| N | 5,058 | 12,729 |

**Panel C. Probability of reporting zero consumption risk in the sample with some positive source risk**

| | Coefficient | Standard error |
|---|---|---|
| $sum_\sigma_{s}^{2}$ | -0.504 | (0.059)*** |
| $num_I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right)=1$ | -0.087 | (0.002)*** |
| $R^2$ | 0.533 | |
| $N$ | 16,251 | |

Note. Panel A presents a cross-tabulation of two dummy variables: $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right)$ equals one if the variance of at least one risk source is positive, and zero otherwise; $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right)$ equals one if the variance of expected consumption growth is positive, and zero otherwise. Percentage are reported in parenthesis. Panel B shows the averages of risk sources and the average number of positive risk factors when the variance of consumption growth is zero or positive. Statistics are computed sample weights. Panel C reports results from a linear regression of the probability of zero consumption risk on the weighted sum of the variances of source risk and on the number of non-zero-variance source risks.

**Table 3. Determinants of consumption risk**

| | Whole sample | Excluding $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 0$ when $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right) = 1$ | Excluding also $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 0$ when $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right) = 0$ | Excluding also $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right) = 0$ when $I\left(\sigma_{s}^{2}\right) = 1$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Income risk | 0.206 | 0.207 | 0.191 | 0.240 |
| | (0.013)*** | (0.013)*** | (0.014)*** | (0.019)*** |
| Health risk | 0.373 | 0.373 | 0.360 | 0.314 |
| | (0.022)*** | (0.022)*** | (0.022)*** | (0.025)*** |
| Energy risk | 0.195 | 0.196 | 0.202 | 0.157 |
| | (0.023)*** | (0.023)*** | (0.024)*** | (0.024)*** |
| Interest rate risk | 0.063 | 0.065 | 0.052 | 0.053 |
| | (0.056) | (0.056) | (0.060) | (0.074) |
| GDP risk | 0.074 | 0.075 | 0.070 | 0.065 |
| | (0.018)*** | (0.018)*** | (0.019)*** | (0.022)*** |
| Inflation risk | 0.008 | 0.008 | 0.016 | 0.010 |
| | (0.020) | (0.020) | (0.021) | (0.024) |
| Unemployment risk | 0.024 | 0.024 | 0.020 | 0.014 |
| | (0.021) | (0.021) | (0.023) | (0.029) |
| House price risk | 0.104 | 0.103 | 0.105 | 0.084 |
| | (0.022)*** | (0.022)*** | (0.023)*** | (0.025)*** |
| $R^2$ | 0.57 | 0.58 | 0.53 | 0.45 |
| $N$ | 23,117 | 22,885 | 16,251 | 11,575 |

*Note*. The variable $I\left(\sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right)$ equals one for observations where the variance of expected consumption growth is positive, and zero otherwise. The variable $I(\sigma_{s}^{2})$ equals one when at least one source of risk has a positive variance, and zero if all sources of risk have zero variance. All regressions are panel fixed effects estimates and include time fixed effects and demographic variables. Standard errors in parentheses. * significance at 10%, ** significance at 5%, *** significance at 1%.

**Table 4. Determinants of consumption risk, with interaction terms**

| | Coefficients | Marginal effects |
|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) |
| Income risk | 0.143 | 0.247 |
| | (0.017)*** | (0.017) *** |
| Health risk | 0.249 | 0.378 |
| | (0.036)*** | (0.222)*** |
| Energy risk | 0.184 | 0.184 |
| | (0.023)*** | (0.023)*** |
| Interest rate risk | 0.065 | 0.065 |
| | (0.055) | (0.055) |
| GDP risk | 0.070 | 0.070 |
| | (0.017)*** | (0.017)*** |
| Inflation risk | 0.063 | -0.004 |
| | (0.028)** | (0.020) |
| Unemployment risk | 0.026 | 0.026 |
| | (0.021) | (0.021) |
| House price risk | 0.155 | 0.085 |
| | (0.033)*** | (0.021)*** |
| s.d.(income growth)×s.d(health exp. growth) | 0.231 | |
| | (0.048)*** | |
| s.d.(inflation)×s.d.(house price growth) | -0.137 | |
| | (0.050)*** | |
| $R^2$ | 0.58 | |
| $N$ | 23,117 | |

*Note*. Coefficients in column (1) represents panel fixed effects estimates. Column (2) reports marginal effects and their associated standard errors, evaluated at the sample means of the expected variances of the risks considered. All regressions include demographic variables. Standard errors in parentheses. * significance at 10%, ** significance at 5%, *** significance at 1%.

**Table 5. Pass-through to consumption volatility. Sample splits by employment and age**

| | Age<=35 | Age>60 | Employees | Self-employed | Low risk sector | High risk sector |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Income risk | 0.186 | 0.143 | 0.216 | 0.194 | 0.220 | 0.326 |
| | (0.022)*** | (0.026)*** | (0.020)*** | (0.047)*** | (0.029)*** | (0.055)*** |
| Health risk | 0.388 | 0.372 | 0.374 | 0.351 | 0.352 | 0.272 |
| | (0.036)*** | (0.054)*** | (0.032)*** | (0.058)*** | (0.040)*** | (0.061)*** |
| Energy risk | 0.231 | 0.168 | 0.165 | 0.271 | 0.142 | 0.129 |
| | (0.043)*** | (0.050)*** | (0.034)*** | (0.057)*** | (0.034)*** | (0.060)** |
| Interest rate risk | -0.010 | -0.016 | 0.072 | 0.190 | 0.015 | -0.123 |
| | (0.106) | (0.103) | (0.088) | (0.205) | (0.124) | (0.170) |
| GDP risk | 0.030 | 0.099 | 0.061 | 0.126 | 0.057 | 0.123 |
| | (0.036) | (0.032)*** | (0.024)** | (0.063)** | (0.029)** | (0.065)* |
| Inflation risk | -0.016 | 0.031 | 0.014 | -0.026 | 0.034 | 0.002 |
| | (0.039) | (0.032) | (0.028) | (0.066) | (0.035) | (0.076) |
| Unemployment risk | 0.106 | 0.028 | 0.032 | -0.044 | 0.007 | 0.013 |
| | (0.047)** | (0.032) | (0.036) | (0.080) | (0.049) | (0.084) |
| House price risk | 0.096 | 0.198 | 0.117 | 0.084 | 0.078 | 0.074 |
| | (0.042)** | (0.056)*** | (0.031)*** | (0.064) | (0.043)* | (0.052) |
| $R^2$ | 0.56 | 0.60 | 0.55 | 0.58 | 0.45 | 0.44 |
| $N$ | 5,592 | 5,779 | 10,493 | 2,041 | 4,601 | 1,804 |

*Note*. All regressions use the panel fixed effects estimator and include demographic variables and time effects. High-risk sectors includes respondents working in agriculture, manufacturing and construction, while low-risk sectors include services and public administration. Standard errors in parentheses. *significance at 10%, **significance at 5%, ***significance at 1%

.

**Table 6. Pass-through to consumption volatility. Sample splits by cash-on-hand**

| | Cash-on-hand<=10 | 10<Cash-on-hand<=30 | Cash-on-hand>30 | Cash-on-hand<=10 and Age<=35 | Cash-on-hand>30 and Age>60 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Income risk | 0.265 | 0.202 | 0.197 | 0.295 | 0.127 |
| | (0.034)*** | (0.020)*** | (0.028)*** | (0.062)*** | (0.038)*** |
| Health risk | 0.327 | 0.446 | 0.300 | 0.288 | 0.221 |
| | (0.050)*** | (0.034)*** | (0.032)*** | (0.103)*** | (0.052)*** |
| Energy risk | 0.245 | 0.175 | 0.218 | 0.386 | 0.194 |
| | (0.067)*** | (0.036)*** | (0.040)*** | (0.137)*** | (0.070)*** |
| Interest rate risk | 0.049 | 0.095 | -0.022 | -0.040 | 0.201 |
| | (0.142) | (0.090) | (0.098) | (0.216) | (0.152) |
| GDP risk | 0.024 | 0.125 | -0.000 | 0.025 | 0.103 |
| | (0.036) | (0.028)*** | (0.031) | (0.076) | (0.051)** |
| Inflation risk | -0.023 | -0.011 | 0.052 | 0.072 | -0.009 |
| | (0.050) | (0.030) | (0.040) | (0.087) | (0.062) |
| Unemployment risk | 0.048 | 0.005 | 0.033 | 0.051 | -0.026 |
| | (0.052) | (0.031) | (0.043) | (0.098) | (0.056) |
| House price risk | 0.105 | 0.055 | 0.140 | -0.004 | 0.242 |
| | (0.045)** | (0.033)* | (0.051)*** | (0.086) | (0.108)** |
| $R^2$ | 0.56 | 0.61 | 0.52 | 0.61 | 0.48 |
| $N$ | 4,874 | 10,294 | 7,949 | 1,110 | 2,728 |

*Note*. All regressions use the panel fixed effects estimator and include demographic variables and time effects. Cash-on-hand is defined as financial assets plus monthly income in euros. Standard errors in parentheses. * significance at 10%, ** significance at 5%, *** significance at 1%

**Table 7. Anatomy of consumption risk**

| **Panel A. Whole sample and risk exposure groups** | Total | Age <=35 | Age >60 | Employed | Self-Employed | Low risk sectors | High risk sectors |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (7) | (8) |
| Income risk | .232 | .223 | .144 | .246 | .226 | .231 | .279 |
| Health risk | .336 | .346 | .335 | .335 | .314 | .344 | .316 |
| Energy risk | .161 | .194 | .136 | .137 | .21 | .136 | .178 |
| **Micro risks** | **.728** | **.764** | **.616** | **.718** | **.75** | **.711** | **.773** |
| GDP risk | .062 | .029 | .071 | .049 | .099 | .047 | .09 |
| House price | .079 | .074 | .139 | .09 | .07 | .088 | .074 |
| Interest rate risk | .013 | 0 | -.003 | .016 | .037 | .013 | -.017 |
| Inflation risk | .006 | -.017 | .026 | .012 | -.018 | .02 | -.015 |
| Unemployment risk | .014 | .06 | .019 | .019 | -.026 | .012 | .024 |
| **Macro risks** | **.174** | **.146** | **.252** | **.188** | **.163** | **.18** | **.156** |
| **Demographics and time** | **.098** | **.09** | **.133** | **.094** | **.087** | **.109** | **.071** |
| Total | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Consumption risk | .057 | .069 | .035 | .059 | .065 | .060 | .063 |

| **Panel B. Self-insurance groups** | Cash<10 | 10<Cash<30 | Cash>30 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| Income risk | .304 | .227 | .219 |
| Health risk | .289 | .399 | .278 |
| Energy risk | .202 | .145 | .175 |
| **Micro risks** | **.795** | **.772** | **.671** |
| GDP risk | .021 | .105 | -.003 |
| House price | .08 | .043 | .1 |
| Interest rate risk | .01 | .02 | -.004 |
| Inflation risk | -.019 | -.008 | .04 |
| Unemployment risk | .027 | .003 | .019 |
| **Macro risks** | **.12** | **.163** | **.152** |
| **Demographics and time** | **.084** | **.065** | **.177** |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Consumption risk | .065 | .066 | .040 |

*Note*. The table reports the contribution of microeconomic and aggregate risks (evaluated at the sample means) to consumption risk for the entire sample and for different groups. Column (1) in Panel A uses the regression coefficients of Table 2 column (1), while the other columns use the corresponding regression coefficients from Table 5. Panel B uses the regressions coefficients from Table 6.

## Table 8. Euler equation estimates

| Panel A | OLS | OLS | FE | IV FE | IV FE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| Consumption risk | 1.137 | 2.061 | 1.764 | 1.408 | 1.250 |
| | (0.088)*** | (0.088)*** | (0.106)*** | (0.243)*** | (0.232)*** |
| Wave 2 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.002 |
| | (0.001)*** | (0.001)*** | (0.001)*** | (0.001)*** | (0.001)*** |
| Wave 3 | 0.003 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| | (0.001)*** | (0.001)*** | (0.001)** | (0.001)** | (0.001)* |
| Wave 4 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| | (0.001)* | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) | (0.001) |
| Wave 5 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| | (0.001)*** | (0.001)*** | (0.001)** | (0.001) | (0.001) |
| Expected income growth | | 0.288 | 0.252 | 0.248 | 0.246 |
| | | (0.007)*** | (0.009)*** | (0.009)*** | (0.009)*** |
| *N* | 23,117 | 23,117 | 23,117 | 23,117 | 23,117 |

| Panel B | IV FE Age<=35 | IV FE Age>60 | IV FE Low risk | IV FE High risk |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Consumption risk | 1.097 | 2.887 | 0.281 | 2.516 |
| | (0.422)*** | (0.572)*** | (0.380) | (0.659)*** |
| Wave 2 | 0.001 | 0.004 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| | (0.001) | (0.001)*** | (0.001) | (0.002) |
| Wave 3 | -0.001 | 0.004 | -0.000 | 0.001 |
| | (0.001) | (0.001)*** | (0.001) | (0.002) |
| Wave 4 | -0.001 | 0.003 | -0.002 | -0.002 |
| | (0.001) | (0.002)** | (0.001) | (0.002) |
| Wave 5 | 0.001 | 0.005 | -0.002 | 0.001 |
| | (0.002) | (0.002)*** | (0.001) | (0.002) |
| Expected income growth | 0.285 | 0.245 | 0.246 | 0.300 |
| | (0.018)*** | (0.020)*** | (0.015)*** | (0.026)*** |
| *N* | 5,592 | 5,779 | 8,529 | 3,208 |

*Note*. The dependent variable is expected consumption growth. Consumption risk is the second conditional moment of the distribution of expected consumption growth. The upper panel presents full sample estimates: OLS estimates in columns (1) and (2), fixed effects in column (3), and IV with fixed effects in columns (4) and (5). In column (4), the instruments are the microeconomic risks, while in column (5) the instruments include both micro and macro risks. The lower panel reports fixed effects IV estimates using micro and macro risks. High-risk sectors includes the sample of respondents working in agriculture, manufacturing and construction, while low-risk sectors include services and public administration Standard errors are in parentheses. * significance at 10%, ** significance at 5%, *** significance at 1%.

## Table 9. Contribution to precautionary saving

| | Total sample | 18-24 sample | 40-45 sample | 60-65 sample |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Income risk | 0.64 | 0.99 | 0.81 | 0.37 |
| Health risk | 0.76 | 1.13 | 0.85 | 0.53 |
| Energy risk | 0.56 | 0.81 | 0.68 | 0.37 |
| **Micro risks** | **1.96** | **2.93** | **2.34** | **1.27** |
| House price risk | 0.24 | 0.39 | 0.31 | 0.13 |
| GDP risk | 0.19 | 0.34 | 0.26 | 0.10 |
| Interest rate risk | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| Inflation risk | 0.27 | 0.45 | 0.35 | 0.16 |
| Unemployment risk | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| **Macro risks** | **0.78** | **1.29** | **1.00** | **0.44** |
| **Excess saving** | **2.74** | **4.22** | **3.34** | **1.71** |

*Note*. The contribution to precautionary saving is computed using the Euler equation estimates from column (5) of Table 8. All values are expressed as a percentages. Expected life is based on the 2023 ISTAT life tables, separately for males and females, and averaged over the 18-24 age interval. Column 1 predicts contribution using the sample of individuals 18-24 years old. Column 2 excludes individuals reporting no risk. All statistics are presented as percentages.

# Appendix A

## A1. Derivation of equation (1)

Following Banks, Blundell and Brugiavini (2001), we assume that preferences are CRRA and time separable. We assume also that optimal consumption $c_t$ (net of energy and health expenses) is approximately a fraction of individual wealth $w_t$, $c_t \approx \mu w_t$. The Euler equation is:

$$c_t^{-\theta} = \beta(1 + r)E_t c_{t+1}^{-\theta} = \beta(1 + r)E_t\left[\mu\left(\tilde{w}_{t+1} + \xi_{t+1}\right)\right]^{-\theta} \quad \text{(A1)}$$

where expectations are taken at time *t*, $\theta$ is relative risk aversion, and $\tilde{w}_{t+1} = \overline{w}_{t+1} + \xi_{t+1}$ is the sum of the predictable component $\overline{w}_{t+1}$ and an innovation $\xi_{t+1}$, as described below. The innovation is in real dollar terms. Banks et al. (2001) focus on a single source of risk – from labor income shocks; we assume several sources of uncertainty. The consumer faces labor income risk, health expenditure risk (arising from variation in health conditions), energy cost risk (due to variations in the price of energy), and capital income risk.

In equation (A2) $\tilde{y}_{t+1}$ is random labor income at $t + 1$, $p_h\tilde{h}_{t+1}$ *is* health expenditure where $p_h$ is the certain price of health services and $\tilde{h}_{t+1}$ represents uncertain health status, $\tilde{ep}_{t+1}$ is the value of uncertain energy costs, where *e* is the known quantity of energy needs and $\tilde{p}_{t+1}$ *the uncertain energy price, and* $\tilde{r}_{t+1}$ is the uncertain rate of return on wealth. Then the consumer budget constraint at $t + 1$, is

$$\tilde{w}_{t+1} = (1 + \tilde{r}_{t+1} + v\tilde{p}_{t+1})w_t + \tilde{y}_{t+1} - c_t - p_h\tilde{h}_{t+1} \quad \text{(A2)}$$

Labor income risk originates from individual specific shocks as well as from uncertain business cycle fluctuations and inflation. We make no distinction here but account for both empirically. Rate of return uncertainty captures risk from returns on all components of wealth, including housing. Given the weight of the latter in households wealth we will collect specific data on house prices risk. We assume that $e = vw_t$, meaning the quantity of energy purchased is a constant share of individual wealth. This provides a simple way to capture the idea that energy consumption is highly price inelastic.

The innovation in wealth (in euro) is $\xi_{t+1} = \left(\xi_{t+1}^r + \nu\xi_{t+1}^p\right)w_t + \xi_{t+1}^y + p\xi_{t+1}^h$ where $\xi_{t+1}^z$ is the innovation in the source of risk $z$ in the budget constraint (in euro for energy, health expenditure, and income, and as a fraction for the return on wealth). Taking a second order approximation to $E_t\left[\mu\left(\tilde{w}_{t+1} + \xi_{t+1}\right)\right]^{-\theta}$ around $\xi_{t+1} = 0$, we obtain:

$$E_t\left[\mu\left(\tilde{w}_{t+1} + \xi_{t+1}\right)\right]^{-\theta} \approx \left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^{-\theta}[1 + \theta(1 + \theta)]\frac{E\xi_{t+1}^2}{\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^2}$$

The Euler equation can be written as:

$$c_t^{-\theta} = \beta(1 + r)\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^{-\theta}[1 + \theta(1 + \theta)]\frac{E\xi_{t+1}^2}{\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^2}$$

$$c_t = \left\{\beta(1 + r)\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^{-\theta}[1 + \theta(1 + \theta)]\frac{E\xi_{t+1}^2}{\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^2}\right\}^{-\frac{1}{\theta}}$$

$$c_t = \left\{\beta(1 + r)\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^{-\theta}[1 + \theta(1 + \theta)]\frac{E\xi_{t+1}^2}{\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^2}\right\}^{-\frac{1}{\theta}}$$

Considering the ratio $\frac{c_{t+1}}{c_t}$ and then taking logs we obtain:

$$\Delta lnc_{t+1} = \frac{1}{\theta}(r - \delta) + (1 + \theta)\frac{E\xi_{t+1}^2}{\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^2} + \zeta_{t+1} \qquad \text{(A3)}$$

where $\zeta_{t+1} = ln\frac{w_{t+1}}{\overline{w}_{t+1}} \approx \frac{\xi_{t+1}}{\overline{w}_{t+1}}$, $(1 + \theta)$ is the degree of relative prudence and $\frac{E\xi_{t+1}^2}{\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^2} = \frac{var(\xi_{t+1}^2)}{\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)^2}$ is the variance of the proportional innovation to $w_{t+1}$. It captures all underlying sources of risk that impact the consumer budget constraint and affect individual consumption uncertainty. Using the expression for $\xi_{t+1}$ and letting $\rho_{z,x}$ denote the correlation between $x$ and $z$ we can write (dropping the time subscripts for simplicity):

$$\sigma_\xi^2 = \pi_y^2\sigma_y^2 + \pi_h^2\sigma_h^2 + \pi_p^2\sigma_p^2 + \pi_r^2\sigma_r^2 + \sum_z\sum_{x<z} 2\rho_{zx}\pi_{zx}\sigma_z\sigma_x \qquad \text{(A4)}$$

where $\sigma_{\xi z}^2$ is the variance of the proportional innovation to factor z defined as $\frac{var(\xi_z)}{z_t^2}$. $\pi_z^2$ is the square of the ratio of factor $z$ at time $t$ to predictable consumption $\left(\mu\overline{w}_{t+1}\right)$, and thus measures the consumer's exposure to the variance of risk $z$. Similarly, $\pi_{zx} = \pi_z\pi_x$ measures exposure to the covariance between proportional risks $z$ and $x$, measured by $\rho_{zx}\sigma_{\xi z}\sigma_{\xi z}$. The single terms are defined as:

$$\pi_r^2 = \frac{w_t^2}{\left(\bar{\mu w}_{t+1}\right)^2};\ \sigma_r^2 = var(\xi^r)$$
$$\pi_p^2 = \frac{(vp_t)^2}{\left(\bar{\mu w}_{t+1}\right)^2};\ \sigma_p^2 = \frac{var(\xi^p)}{p_t^2}$$
$$\pi_y^2 = \frac{y_t^2}{\left(\bar{\mu w}_{t+1}\right)^2};\ \sigma_y^2 = \frac{var(\xi^y)}{y_t^2}$$
$$\pi_h^2 = \frac{(ph_t)^2}{\left(\bar{\mu w}_{t+1}\right)^2};\ \sigma_h^2 = \frac{var(\xi^h)}{h_t^2}$$

Our decomposition exercise is based on the above expression, and has two key implications: (1) consumption uncertainty reflects all sources of risk that affect the consumer's budget constraint, and (2) these sources matter only if they influence the consumer budget constraint.

The importance of each risk depends on the annual share of expenditure on risk source z in lifetime resources. This share can vary systematically across individuals and may change across different states of nature or stages of the lifecycle. For example, interest rate risk is likely to have a greater effect on consumption risk for individuals with larger stocks of current wealth, while labor income risk should matter more for those with a higher income-wealth ratio. Similarly, health risk should be more important for the elderly. These predictions inform our empirical analysis.

Covariances might also play a role. Non-zero correlations in equation (A4) suggest that the interaction terms between the standard deviations of pairs of risk sources could affect consumption uncertainty.

In practice, consumers can mitigate some of these risks through formal markets, informal networks, public intervention, or accumulated precautionary savings. To allow for partial insurance we let the pass-through coefficient of risk *z* be equal to $\beta_z = \alpha_z \pi_z^2$, where $0 \leq \alpha_z \leq 1$ is a risk attenuation factor reflecting insurance opportunities vis a vis risk source *z*. Absence of insurance implies $\alpha_z = 1$, and full insurance $\alpha_z = 0$. We can than re-write equation (A4) as:

$$\sigma_\xi^2 = \beta_y \sigma_y^2 + \beta_h \sigma_h^2 + \beta_p \sigma_p^2 + \beta_r \sigma_{r,}^2 + \sum_z \sum_{x<z} \beta_{zx} \pi_{zx} \sigma_z \sigma_x + \varepsilon_{t+1} \qquad \text{(A5)}$$

The $\beta_z$ coefficients in equation (A5) measure the pass-through of risk *z* on consumption risk and reflect both exposure and insurability. In the case of complete markets, the $\beta_z$ coefficients are all equal to zero, and the rate of growth of individual consumption has no idiosyncratic volatility. Otherwise, the coefficients reflect the sensitivity of consumption volatility to the underlying risks, due to both exposure and insurance.

## A.2. Estimating precautionary savings from the Euler equation

In this appendix we outline how we estimate the size of the precautionary saving and the contribution of risk sources to consumption risk. From the Euler equation, omitting the contribution of the individual and time effects, we have

$$g_a = \alpha + \omega\sigma_a^2$$

where the left-hand-side represents the expected growth rate of consumption for an individual aged $a$ between $a$ and $a + 1$ and $\sigma_a^2$ is the second moment of expected consumption growth for the same individual; αand ω are parameters estimated in Table 4.[24]

Let $C_{a+1}$ denote the level of expected consumption for an individual aged $a$. It follows that

$$C_{a+1} = C_a(1 + g_a) \tag{A5}$$

Assume that individuals expect $\sigma_a^2$ to be the same over the future course of life. Consumption at age $\alpha + k$ is expected to be

$$C_{a+k}^u = C_a^u(1 + \alpha + \omega\sigma_a^2)^k$$

which defines the trajectory of future optimal consumption under consumption uncertainty $\sigma_a^2$. In the absence of consumption uncertainty, the profile would be:

$$C_{a+k} = C_a(1 + \alpha)^k$$

Following Caballero (1990, 1991), we assume that expected *future* resources over the residual lifetime are *unaffected by underlying uncertainty* (e.g., there are no effects on labor supply, asset allocation and rate of return on wealth).[25] If the individual expected lifetime is $T_a$ (which depends on current age), the expected value of lifetime consumption must equal the expected present value of income in both scenarios. By discounting future consumption flows at the rate $r$, this requires:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{T_a-a} C_a\left(\frac{1+\alpha_a}{1+r}\right)^k = \sum_{k=0}^{T_a-a} C_a^u\left(\frac{1+\alpha_a+\omega\sigma_a^2}{1+r}\right)^k$$

[24] We ignore the approximation error that results by from the Taylor expansion that leads to the Euler equation above.

[25] Past resources, accumulated up to age a-1 may depend on past perceived uncertainty as well as on the realized shocks to the other components of the consumer budget constraints. However, these resources are known at age a and are the same whether a2=0 or a2>0 .

or

$$\frac{C_a^u}{C_a} = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{T_a-a}\left(\frac{1+\alpha_a}{1+r}\right)^k}{\sum_{k=0}^{T_a-a}\left(\frac{1+\alpha_a+\omega\sigma_a^2}{1+r}\right)^k} = \mu_a < 1 \qquad \text{(A6)}$$

Equation (A6) shows that initial consumption under uncertainty is lower than consumption at the same age under certainty. The precautionary saving as a share of consumption under certainty is $(1-\mu_a)$, while the ratio $(1-\mu_a)/\mu_a$ represents precautionary saving as a share of actual consumption $C_a^u$. We target this statistic. As in Caballero (1991), the size of precautionary savings decreases with the length of the individual horizon, an implication we can test using our data. [26]

To estimate $(1-\mu_a)$ we use expectancy tables to estimate $T_a$ and set the discount rate at 3%. We retrieve parameters from the first stage estimates of regression (5) in Table 8 and evaluate $(1-\mu_a)$ at the sample means of the risk sources used as instruments. The results are reported in Table 9. On average, we estimate that precautionary saving is approximately 2.74% of consumption. Results are relatively insensitive calculating precautionary savings for males and females, as well as changing the discount rate (2 or 4%).

[26] Assuming the innovation to the income process is normally distributed, the statistics (1-a) has a closed form solution equal p22T-a, where p is the degree of relative prudence, 2 the square of the coefficient of variation of the innovation to the income process and T-a the residual horizon of an individual aged a (Caballero 1990, 1991).

# Appendix B.

## B1. The Italian Survey of Consumer Expectations

The Italian Survey of Consumer Expectations (ISCE) collects detailed information on demographics, income, wealth, consumption, and individuals' expectations and beliefs from a representative sample of Italians aged 18 to 75. The survey is conducted quarterly, beginning in October 2023. This report outlines the survey design, questionnaire structure, and the key variables.

The ISCE aims to provide an infrastructure to:

- Elicit high-frequency data on individual expectations and behaviors
- Support policy analysis
- Conduct survey-based experiments
- Develop and test methods for capturing expectations and beliefs

The design of ISCE draws from international best practices in online, high-frequency survey research. Notable examples include:

- The New York Fed's Survey of Consumer Expectations (SCE), which captures U.S. consumers' views on inflation, employment, income, and household finances
- The European Central Bank's Consumer Expectations Survey (CES), which collects monthly data from approximately 20,000 households across euro area countries
- Research initiatives such as Harvard's Social Economics Lab, which investigates social preferences, attitudes, and perceptions through survey data

Sample and Methodology. The ISCE sample is drawn from a broader, nationally representative panel of 120,000 individuals maintained by Doxa, a leading market and social research firm. The target population includes individuals aged 18 to 75 residing in Italy. Data collection is conducted using the Computer-Assisted Web Interviewing (CAWI) method.

The survey is administered quarterly—in October, January, April, and July—deliberately excluding the highly seasonal months of December and August. A pilot wave was conducted in September 2023. Subsequent waves include approximately 5,000 respondents in each quarter. Each wave incorporates replenishment through random sampling to replace respondents who exit the panel.

Additional Resources. Summary statistics, questionnaires, and further documentation are available on the project website: https://isrlab.it

## B2. Survey design

The population statistics required to construct the sample are drawn from ISTAT (https://demo.istat.it/), the Italian national statistical institute. The following variables are used for sample stratification:

- Gender: male, female
- Age: 18-34 years, 35-54 years, 55-75 years
- Geographical area: Northwest, Northeast, Center, South, Islands
- City size: less than 30,000 inhabitants, 30,000-100,000 inhabitants, more than 100,000 inhabitants

- Education: university undergraduate degree and postgraduate degrees, high school diploma, lower qualifications (junior high school diploma and elementary school)
- Employment status: employed, unemployed

Survey weights are designed to reflect the actual distribution of the reference population for the full sample. Weighting is based on the same stratification variables used in sampling and was conducted using *pTabs2*, a software tool for statistical data analysis.

The fieldwork phase follows strict protocols to minimize bias, particularly from fast respondents ("speeders"). Questionnaires are randomly assigned to participants, and survey invitations are staggered over several days to reduce the likelihood of rapid, inattentive responses. Invitations remain active for at least one week, including a weekend, to encourage participation from individuals who check their email less frequently or who are less likely to respond immediately.

The average interview duration is 19 minutes, ranging from 21 minutes in Wave 1 to 16.5 minutes in Wave 4. These averages exclude respondents whose interviews exceeded 60 minutes—approximately 8% of the sample across all waves. Response rates are 31.4% in wave 1, 34.4% in wave 2, 53.1% in wave 3, 42.8% in wave 4, and 40.6% in wave 5.

| **Outcome of interviews** | **Wave 1** | **Wave 2** | **Wave 3** | **Wave 4** | **Wave 5** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (a) Completed interviews | 5,006 | 5,001 | 5,005 | 5,004 | 5,011 |
| (b) Interruptions (abandoned the interview) | 447 | 361 | 214 | 272 | 229 |
| (c) Unable to participate because the sample quota had already been reached | 694 | 830 | 706 | 648 | 591 |
| (d) Screenouts (ineligible individuals) | 71 | 25 | 21 | 25 | 386 |
| (e) Did not respond to the invitation | 10,483 | 9,162 | 4,216 | 6,405 | 7,089 |
| (f) Total invitations sent | 16,632 | 15,380 | 10,163 | 12,534 | 13,307 |
| (g) % response rate: a / (a + b + e) | 31.4 | 34.4 | 53.1 | 42.8 | 40.6 |

The table below presents the sample sizes for each wave of the survey, from October 2023 (Wave 1) to October 2024 (Wave 5), and highlights the number of respondents who participated in multiple waves. For example, among the 5,011 individuals surveyed in Wave 5, 2,978 had participated since Wave 1, 422 since Wave 2, 416 since Wave 3, while 560 were new respondents joining in Wave 5. The retention rate (percentage of individuals interviewed in two consecutive waves) is 84% from wave 1 to wave 2, 87% from wave 2 to wave 3, 86% from wave 3 to wave 4 and 88% from wave 4 to 5.

| **Quarter of entry** | **Wave 1** | **Wave 2** | **Wave 3** | **Wave 4** | **Wave 5** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wave 1 – October 2023 | 5006 | 4197 | 3744 | 3234 | 2,978 |
| Wave 2 – January 2024 | | 804 | 589 | 498 | 422 |
| Wave 3 – April 2024 | | | 673 | 486 | 416 |
| Wave4 – July 2024 | | | | 785 | 635 |
| Wave 5 – October 2024 | | | | | 560 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Observations in each wave | 5006 | 5001 | 5005 | 5003 | 5011 |

## B3. Questionnaire design

The questionnaire has two parts: a common and stable part (about 12-14 minutes) that is repeated in each wave, and special sections of about 5-6 minutes that change in each survey. There is also the possibility of introducing one or more sections of “experiments" in which the overall sample is divided into random sub-samples to allow for treatment and control designs.

A pilot survey was conducted during the first two weeks of September 2023 to identify potential problems. The pilot targeted a small sample of 100 respondents. There was a high level of engagement and understanding among respondents. However, a few routing errors were identified and resolved.

In each wave, as described below, the questionnaire has five sections, plus one special section.

**B3.1. Common sections**

**A. Demographics and Employment.** Section A collects information on respondents' demographic characteristics: gender, city of residence, education, marital status, family size, income recipients. For education, the ISCE collects data on the type and specialization of college degree. In the case of employment status it distinguishes between employees and self-employed, retired, or seeking employment. For employed individuals, the survey asks about the sector of employment to obtain a comprehensive snapshot of the labor force. To allow comparison, the coding of the variables is as close as possible to that adopted in the Bank of Italy Survey of Household Income and Wealth (SHIW).

**B. Income.** Income variables refer to monthly income in Wave 1 (October 2023), Wave 2 (January 2024), Wave 3 (April 2024), Wave 4 (July 2024) and Wave 5 (October 2024). Income is elicited based on through 11 income brackets and a qualitative question for whether the income is well below, below, about the same, above, or well above the Italian household mean. To create the descriptive statistics, we take the mid-point of the intervals chosen by the respondent. In the case of unbounded intervals, a reasonable upper and lower bound is used to estimate the moments in the distributions.

The survey focuses on the following income variables: household disposable income, household labor and retirement income, individual total income, and individual labor and retirement income.

Each of these variables is collected "net of tax and transfers" as in the SHIW. In the final part of the section, respondents report whether they have received bonuses or transfers in the reference month, how long they worked at home in the previous month, the probability of losing the job (if employed), and finding a job (if unemployed).

**C. Wealth.** Section C attempts to construct an indicator of net wealth and financial market participation. Respondents report on financial wealth, real wealth, and total debt based on 6 brackets. They also report whether they are homeowners. For financial wealth, they report having a current (transaction) account and investments such as bonds, stocks, private pensions, and life insurance. The section asks questions also about health and accident insurance.

**D. Consumption.** Section D elicits monthly consumption and consumption categories in the reference month. Respondents report total consumption (11 brackets), gas and electricity bills (6 brackets), and health expenditures (6 brackets).

**E. Expectations.** Section E focuses on expectations and intentions. The aim is to elicit not only the means of future variables (generally 12 months ahead) but also the entire distribution based on asking respondents to allocate 100 points to given expectations intervals. For instance, respondents are asked to report the likelihood (as a percentage) that their income will decrease or increase within specified ranges (e.g., decrease by more than 8%, increase between 2% and 4%, etc.). With this information, one can directly estimate the subjective probability density function of each respondent.

Section E asks the distributions in the next 12 months of expected growth of the following variables: disposable income, labor and pension income, total consumption, health expenditures, gas and electricity bills, house prices, and nominal interest rates on respondents' financial investments. The section asks about intentions (yes/no) to purchase specific durable goods (cars, home appliances, furniture, electronics), to apply for a loan in the next 12 months, and likelihood (on a 1 to 100 scale) that the loan will be granted. The section elicits also the distribution of expected retirement age and

replacement rate and the likelihood that specific events will have financial consequences for the household in the next 12 months (unemployment, health expenditure of more than €10,000, disability).

Using the same approach, in the final part of Section E respondents give their forecasts over the next 12 months of four key macroeconomic variables: GDP growth, inflation, unemployment, and nominal interest rate on mortgages. These expectations can be compared to current forecasts of aggregate variables provided by government, central banks, national and international agencies, and other surveys.

### B3.2. Special sections

The survey's special sections focus on topics that change overtime. In Wave 1, the focus is on eliciting expectations of catastrophic risks. Wave 2 features an experiment on willingness to pay to avoid natural disasters, and a hypothetical lottery to capture the propensity to spend in the long run. Wave 3 has a survey experiment to elicit the willingness to pay to cover health costs, an experiment linking pension information to pension expectations, and basic information on use of artificial intelligence. Wave 4 focuses on another experiment on willingness to cover environmental costs and on decisions within the family. Wave 5 has data on incentives to invest in the energy-saving home investments, and a survey experiment on willingness to pay for sustainable and social responsible fashion.

**Section F.** In Wave 1, the special section focuses on 10 catastrophic risks to gauge overall perception of risk, potential impact on the Italian economy, likelihood of impact on respondents' disposable income, and impact on respondents' real estate. The format of the question is similar for all elicited risks: participants are asked to evaluate the likelihood of various serious events occurring in the next 5 years by assigning a probability to each event on a scale ranging from 1 to 100. The 10 risks are:

1. Nuclear war
2. Technological disruptions leading to job loss
3. Cyber-attack
4. Financial crisis
5. End of democracy
6. Collapse of the EU and the euro
7. Social tensions
8. New pandemic
9. Natural disasters
10. Earthquake

**Section G.** In Wave 2, the special section asks about financial literacy, long-term financial planning, and includes a survey experiment on the effect of information on the willingness to pay to avoid natural disasters. The special section includes the following sub-sections:

*Propensity to consume.* Participants report how and when they would spend hypothetical lottery prizes of €1,000, €10,000, or €50,000 over the next 20 years.
*Disaster insurance*. In this survey experiment, participants are randomly allocated in different information groups. The aim is to study how awareness about the consequences of natural disasters affects the willingness to contribute to a public fund dedicated to protecting against environmental risk.
*Financial literacy*. Participants respond to standard questions on financial literacy: knowledge of interest rates, inflation, and investment diversification.
*Credit constraints*. Respondents are asked whether they had applied for credit, had been refused credit, or had been discouraged from borrowing.

**Section H.** In Wave 3, the special section includes a survey experiment on health insurance, an

experiment on pension information, information about artificial intelligence, and a question about disaster insurance.

*Pension and survey experiment*: Respondents are split into two randomized groups; a control group, and a treatment group that receives information about population ageing and the sustainability of the pension system. The objective is to evaluate how the information treatment affected respondents' subjective expectations about replacement rates, retirement age, and propensity to invest in a pension fund.
*Willingness to pay for health insurance*: Respondents are split into two randomized groups: a control group, and a treatment group that receives information on the quality of the public health system and the cost of treatment in a private hospital. They are then asked about their willingness to pay a range of amounts for a policy that covered the costs of major surgery, minor outpatient surgeries, and complex diagnostic exams.
*Use and knowledge of Artificial Intelligence (AI)*: Respondents self-report knowledge of AI tools such as ChatGPT and Gemini and how often they had used AI tools in the previous 12 months. Respondents are also asked about the likelihood of use of AI tools in various contexts (work, financial advice, medical advice, education, and leisure activities).
*Disaster insurance*: As in Wave 2, the section elicits willingness to contribute to a public fund dedicated to protecting against environmental risk.

**Section I.** In Wave 4, some of the questions from wave 2 are repeated. In a survey experiment, participants are randomly allocated to different information groups. The aim is to study how awareness about the consequences of natural disasters affects the willingness to contribute to a public fund dedicated to protecting against environmental risk.

The Section has information also on decisions within the family, with questions on how expenses are managed, how much respondents contribute to family income, and detailed questions on respondents' involvement in some decisions: buying a house, a car, appliances, electronics, everyday purchases, holidays, savings/investment products, and about the choice of school and school path of children, and hiring a babysitter

The special section has also background information on parents' education, engagement in social activities, and trust (in government, police, judiciary, health system, civil protection).

**Section L.** In Wave 5 the special section is divided in two parts. The first part focuses on the role of information on sustainability and social responsibility in fashion. The sample includes a control and various treatment group. The treatment groups read information about the type of t-shirt production and certifications. All groups report their willingness to pay for a simple short-sleeved cotton t-shirt

The second part of the section focuses on energy efficiency improvements in the home (external thermal insulation, windows, boiler, heat pump for cooling, solar panels. Various questions refer to expenses for improvements, with special attention to the role of government incentives.

## B4. Descriptive statistics

Table B1 compares sample means and medians from the ISCE with corresponding figures from the 2022 *Survey of Household Income and Wealth* (SHIW), the most recent available edition. The ISCE sample is broadly aligned with the SHIW in terms of key demographic and labor market characteristics, including gender, age distribution, employment status, and regional representation. One notable difference is in educational attainment: ISCE has a lower share of respondents with only primary education and a correspondingly higher share of high school graduates.

Table B2 presents a comparison of income, consumption, and wealth statistics between the two surveys. The ISCE reports a lower median disposable income compared to the SHIW, while median consumption levels are similar across both datasets. Financial wealth appears lower in SHIW, whereas total wealth is comparable between the two sources. Financial market participation (ownership of bonds, stocks, private pensions, and life insurance) is higher among ISCE respondents.

## Table B1. ISCE-SHIW comparison: demographic variables

| | ISCE | SHIW |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| Male | 0.48 | 0.49 |
| Female | 0.52 | 0.51 |
| | | |
| Age 18-34 | 0.26 | 0.19 |
| Age 35-54 | 0.39 | 0.40 |
| Age 55-75 | 0.35 | 0.41 |
| | | |
| Family size = 1 | 0.12 | 0.14 |
| Family size = 2 | 0.30 | 0.26 |
| Family size = 3 | 0.28 | 0.27 |
| Family size = 4 | 0.23 | 0.24 |
| Family size >= 5 | 0.07 | 0.09 |
| | | |
| Primary education | 0.31 | 0.35 |
| Secondary education | 0.50 | 0.46 |
| Tertiary education | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| | | |
| North | 0.44 | 0.45 |
| Centre | 0.21 | 0.20 |
| South and Islands | 0.35 | 0.35 |
| | | |
| **Total** | **7,828** | **16,455** |

Note: This table compares the sample means of selected demographic variables in the ISCE and the 2022 SHIW. For consistency, the SHIW sample is restricted to individuals aged 18 to 75. The ISCE sample includes all respondents interviewed for the first time since October 2023. In both surveys, the reported means are weighted using the respective sample weights.


## Table B2. ISCE-SHIW comparison: consumption, income and wealth

| | ISCE | SHIW |
|---|---|---|
| Disposable income | 21,000 | 26,003 |
| Total consumption | 15,000 | 15,920 |
| | | |
| Financial wealth | 25,000 | 10,000 |
| Real assets | 148,080,1 | 151,200 |
| Debt | 13,471.88 | 0 |
| Total wealth | 123,583.4 | 153,500 |
| | | |
| Homeownership | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| | | |
| Investing in | | |
| Bonds | 0.19 | 0.10 |
| Stocks | 0.18 | 0.05 |
| Private pensions | 0.20 | 0.12 |
| Life insurance | 0.23 | 0.17 |
| | | |
| Number of observations | 7,828 | 7,605 |

Note: This table compares sample medians for consumption, income, and wealth, as well as the proportion of respondents who invest in real and financial assets, using data from the ISCE and the 2022 SHIW. The SHIW sample includes all households with a head aged 18 to 75, while the ISCE sample includes all respondents interviewed for the first time since October 2023. All statistics are computed using the respective sample weights in each survey.


# Appendix C. Additional tables and figures

## Figure C1. Uncertainty indicators, 2023-24





Note. Each risk indicators is the variance of the corresponding expected probability distributions.

## Figure C2. Uncertainty declines with age



Note. Each risk indicators is the variance of the corresponding expected probability distributions.

## Figure C3. Uncertainty declines with cash-on-hand




Note. Cash-on-hand (in €'000) is defined as the sum of financial wealth and monthly income. Risk indicators correspond to the variance of the expected probability distributions.

## Table C1. Descriptive statistics, by wave

| | Wave 1 | Wave 2 | Wave 3 | Wave 4 | Wave 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Average of** | | | | | |
| Consumption growth | .005 | .008 | .007 | .006 | .007 |
| Income growth | -.012 | -.011 | -.009 | -.009 | -.009 |
| Health cost growth | .01 | .009 | .008 | .007 | .008 |
| Energy cost growth | .022 | .012 | .007 | .01 | .013 |
| Nominal interest rate | .034 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .03 |
| GDP growth | -.018 | -.012 | -.012 | -.011 | -.011 |
| Inflation | .016 | .013 | .012 | .012 | .013 |
| Unemployment rate | .096 | .089 | .089 | .088 | .088 |
| House price growth | 0 | 0 | .001 | .001 | .001 |
| **Variance of** | | | | | |
| Consumption growth | .096 | .054 | .048 | .045 | .042 |
| Income growth | .095 | .064 | .058 | .052 | .051 |
| Health cost growth | .089 | .048 | .042 | .041 | .037 |
| Energy cost growth | .084 | .043 | .039 | .036 | .034 |
| Nominal interest rate | .019 | .011 | .01 | .01 | .01 |
| GDP growth | .08 | .043 | .04 | .04 | .035 |
| Inflation | .079 | .038 | .036 | .037 | .033 |
| Unemployment rate | .054 | .029 | .027 | .028 | .025 |
| House price growth | .078 | .038 | .035 | .034 | .031 |
| Observations | 5,006 | 5,001 | 5,005 | 5,003 | 5,011 |

Note. The table reports sample means of selected variables for each wave of the ISCE. Means are computed using sample weights.

## Table C2. Determinants of consumption risk, by wave

| | Wave 1 | Wave 2 | Wave 3 | Wave 4 | Wave 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Income risk | 0.196 | 0.221 | 0.208 | 0.167 | 0.244 |
| | (0.022)*** | (0.025)*** | (0.026)*** | (0.024)*** | (0.027)*** |
| Health risk | 0.377 | 0.407 | 0.364 | 0.446 | 0.390 |
| | (0.039)*** | (0.033)*** | (0.042)*** | (0.045)*** | (0.040)*** |
| Energy risk | 0.131 | 0.190 | 0.225 | 0.172 | 0.255 |
| | (0.035)*** | (0.042)*** | (0.051)*** | (0.045)*** | (0.047)*** |
| Interest rate risk | 0.136 | -0.090 | 0.005 | 0.008 | 0.171 |
| | (0.078)* | (0.102) | (0.086) | (0.086) | (0.085)** |
| GDP risk | 0.109 | 0.106 | -0.008 | 0.135 | 0.012 |
| | (0.025)*** | (0.034)*** | (0.025) | (0.045)*** | (0.035) |
| Inflation risk | 0.015 | -0.034 | 0.022 | -0.002 | -0.002 |
| | (0.025) | (0.040) | (0.037) | (0.045) | (0.036) |
| Unemployment risk | 0.024 | 0.074 | 0.020 | 0.007 | 0.062 |
| | (0.028) | (0.043)* | (0.041) | (0.038) | (0.047) |
| House price risk | 0.122 | 0.072 | 0.199 | 0.080 | 0.027 |
| | (0.031)*** | (0.043)* | (0.045)*** | (0.041)* | (0.043) |
| $R^2$ | 0.71 | 0.74 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 |
| $N$ | 5,006 | 5,001 | 5,005 | 5,003 | 5,011 |

Note. All regressions are estimated using OLS and include demographic variables (age, family size, education, regional and employment dummies), cash-on-hand, and homeownership. Standard errors are reported in parentheses. *significance at 10%, **significance at 5%, ***significance at 1%

## Table C3. First stage regressions

| | First stage, col. 4 of Table 5 | First stage, col. 5 of Table 5 |
|---|---|---|
| Income risk | 0.204 | 0.182 |
| | (0.008)*** | (0.008)*** |
| Health risk | 0.258 | 0.232 |
| | (0.007)*** | (0.007)*** |
| Energy risk | 0.199 | 0.160 |
| | (0.007)*** | (0.008)*** |
| House price risk | | 0.093 |
| | | (0.008)*** |
| Unemployment risk | | 0.004 |
| | | (0.003) |
| Interest rate risk | | 0.007 |
| | | (0.010) |
| Inflation risk | | 0.073 |
| | | (0.008)*** |
| GDP risk | | 0.054 |
| | | (0.008)*** |
| Expected income growth | -0.002 | -0.002 |
| | (0.001)** | (0.001)** |
| Constant | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| | (0.000)*** | (0.000)*** |
| $R^2$ | 0.23 | 0.24 |
| *N* | 23,117 | 23,117 |
| *F-test* | 1339 | 517 |

Note. The table presents the first-stage estimates of the IV regressions in columns (4) and (5) of Table 5, using micro and macro risks as instruments. The *F*-test is a test of the power of the instruments in the first stage regression. Standard errors are reported in parentheses. * significance at 10%, ** significance at 5%, *** significance at 1%

.

## Appendix D. Correlation of responses across questions

Our estimates of the relation between consumption risk and underlying risks (income, health, etc.) might face criticism that the similar structure of some questions could lead respondents to mechanically provide similar answers.

The table below presents the answer choices to the expectations questions for the 7 subjective expectations elicited in the survey and used in the paper.[27] All the questions follow a similar format: "*in the next 12 months, you expect that (your household's income / total consumption / gas and energy bills / health expenditures / house price / GDP / inflation)*:

| Interval | | Probability (%) |
|---|---|---|
| $g_1$ | *will decrease by more than 8%* | $p_1$ |
| $g_2$ | *will decrease between 6 and 8%* | $p_2$ |
| $g_3$ | *will decrease between 4 and 6%* | $p_3$ |
| $g_4$ | *will decrease between 2 and 4%* | $p_4$ |
| $g_5$ | *will decrease between 0 and 2%* | $p_5$ |
| $g_6$ | *will remain constant* | $p_6$ |
| $g_7$ | *will increase between 0 and 2%* | $p_7$ |
| $g_8$ | *will increase between 2 and 4%* | $p_8$ |
| $g_9$ | *will increase between 4 and 6%* | $p_9$ |
| $g_{10}$ | *will increase between 6 and 8%* | $p_{10}$ |
| $g_{11}$ | *will increase more than 8%* | $p_{11}$ |
| Total | | 100 |

Thus, the potential problem can be exemplified by the following scenario:

(i) people indicate a certain probability $p_m$ that the distribution of *income* over the next year lies within the growth interval $g_m$ ($m$ = 1,…$M$), for example, they may report a 20% chance that income growth will increase by 4 to 6% over the next year;

(ii) respondents then automatically provide the same probability for the future distribution of *consumption* within the same $g_m$ interval;

(iii) they repeat this process for each of the other intervals in the given distributions of the other risk sources.

In this example, the expected income and consumption growth distributions will be identical, as would the estimated variances. Consequently, the correlation between the two cross-sectional distributions of the second moments of the subjective distribution of expected

[27] The format of the questions referring to unemployment and interest is different since respondents are presented with only positive intervals ranging from 0 to "over 14%" for unemployment and from 0 to "over 8%" for interest rate.

income and consumption growth will be equal to 1.

Suppose further that respondent behavior is consistent in each of the five waves, so that the variances of the distributions change over time but move in the same way for each respondent. In this case the correlation between the changes in the variances of consumption and income woud also equal 1. In this appendix we provide evidence that our estimates are unlikely to be affected by mechanically induced correlation.

Figure D1 plots the average reported probabilities for each question across the five waves. Table D1 presents the correlation matrices of the variances of the seven subjective distributions, as well as the change in these variances between waves. The correlations in levels are approximately 0.7, and correlations in first differences are of the order of 0.4.

We leverage the similar format of the questions to examine whether "mechanical correlation" is influencing our results. To do so, we analyzed the data used to calculate the moments of each distribution, estimating to what extent respondents tended to assign similar (or identical) probability weights to a particular interval $g_m$. The descriptive statistics in Table D2 reveal that the intervals receiving the largest weights are the central interval $g_6$ and the two extreme intervals $g_1$ and $g_{11}$.

Next, we organize the interval data in a panel, appending the data related to the seven questions into a single datafile, resulting in 175,182 (individual-time-question) observations. These observations originate from 7 questions and 25,026 total interviews conducted during the five waves from October 2023 to October 2024. We use *q* to index the seven questions and δ for the five waves. For each of the *g* intervals we estimate the following panel regression with fixed effects:

$$p_{j,i,t,m} = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{Q} \beta_{j,m,} q_{j,m} + \delta_{t,m} + \mu_{i,m} + \varepsilon_{j,i,t,m} \qquad \text{(D.1)}$$

where:

| | |
|---|---|
| $m = 1, ...M$ | indicates the 11 intervals; |
| $q_{j,m}$: $j = 1, ...Q$ | are indicators for the 7 questions and each of the intervals; |
| $\mu_{i,m}$: $i = 1, ...N$ | are indicators for each respondent and interval; |
| $\delta_{t,m} = 1, 2$ | are time (wave) dummies, specific to each interval; |
| $p_{j,i,t,m}$ | is the probability assigned by individual *i* to interval *m* in response to question *j* in wave *t*. |

The $\beta_{j,m}$ coefficients capture the average probability reported in any interval for each of the questions, after controlling for time and individual specific effects.

If respondents assign the same weight to each interval regardless of the specific question, then, holding the interval constant (i.e., for a given *m*), the value of the $\beta_{j,m}$ coefficients across questions should be similar. In other words, a test to check whether respondents mechanically assign the same probability to a given growth interval across different variables implies the following null hypothesis:

$$H_{0,m}: \beta_{1,m} = \beta_{2,m} = ...\beta_{7,m} \text{ for all } m.$$

Since the regression includes a constant term, the test for the significance of the correlation of

probabilities across questions effectively tests whether, for $m$, the $\beta_{j,m}$ are all equal to zero (with the dummy for the consumption question excluded).

Table D3 presents the results of the 11 panel regressions (one for *each* interval) in model (D.1). The baseline and omitted categories in each regression are the probability weights attached to the specific *interval in the distribution* of expected consumption growth. Table D4 shows that the coefficients vary considerably across regressions.

The null hypothesis that for given $m$ the $\beta_{j,m}$ coefficients are all equal to zero is overwhelmingly rejected in each regression (i.e. for all $m$). The fraction of total variance explained by fixed effects in al regressions ranges from 10% to 30% - with the central interval (reporting "no change") explaining the largest proportion - highlighting the considerable individual-level variability in the responses across intervals.

Overall, the analysis of the correlation across the intervals of the distributions suggests genuine individual variability in responses across questions. As a result, the relation between consumption risk and risk indicators identified in this paper is unlikely to reflect mechanical correlation across questions.

**Figure D1. Average probability in each interval**




Note. The graphs display the probabilities reported for each interval across the seven questions, all using a common format.

## Table D1. Correlation matrix of risk indicators

**Panel A - Levels**

| Variance of | Consumption | Income | Health | Energy | Interest rate | GDP | Inflation | Unempl. | House price |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consumption | 1.000 | | | | | | | | |
| Income | 0.735 | 1.000 | | | | | | | |
| Health | 0.830 | 0.706 | 1.000 | | | | | | |
| Energy | 0.794 | 0.690 | 0.823 | 1.000 | | | | | |
| Interest rate | 0.618 | 0.556 | 0.638 | 0.658 | 1.000 | | | | |
| GDP | 0.728 | 0.651 | 0.745 | 0.764 | 0.674 | 1.000 | | | |
| Inflation | 0.725 | 0.641 | 0.757 | 0.782 | 0.704 | 0.839 | 1.000 | | |
| Unemployment | 0.665 | 0.594 | 0.683 | 0.707 | 0.764 | 0.750 | 0.772 | 1.000 | |
| House price | 0.774 | 0.669 | 0.806 | 0.841 | 0.671 | 0.771 | 0.791 | 0.719 | 1.000 |

**Panel B – First differences**

| Variance of | Consumption | Income | Health | Energy | Interest rate | GDP | Inflation | Unempl. | House price |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consumption | 1.000 | | | | | | | | |
| Income | 0.499 | 1.000 | | | | | | | |
| Health | 0.651 | 0.439 | 1.000 | | | | | | |
| Energy | 0.590 | 0.415 | 0.630 | 1.000 | | | | | |
| Interest rate | 0.307 | 0.220 | 0.334 | 0.366 | 1.000 | | | | |
| GDP | 0.459 | 0.336 | 0.483 | 0.529 | 0.407 | 1.000 | | | |
| Inflation | 0.448 | 0.317 | 0.502 | 0.544 | 0.466 | 0.654 | 1.000 | | |
| Unemployment | 0.357 | 0.254 | 0.388 | 0.433 | 0.562 | 0.499 | 0.558 | 1.000 | |
| House price | 0.545 | 0.375 | 0.589 | 0.684 | 0.391 | 0.534 | 0.569 | 0.443 | 1.000 |

Note. Correlations are computed using sample weights. Sample includes all panel observations.

## Table D2. Sample means, by wave, risk type and growth intervals

**Wave 1**

| | g1 | g2 | g3 | g4 | g5 | g6 | g7 | g8 | g9 | g10 | g11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consumption | 8.71 | 3.94 | 4.28 | 4.52 | 5.17 | 33.58 | 8.84 | 8.32 | 7.19 | 5.7 | 9.75 |
| Energy | 4.48 | 2.19 | 2.28 | 2.92 | 3.52 | 29.67 | 10.91 | 11.32 | 9.65 | 8.15 | 14.92 |
| GDP | 15.36 | 5.69 | 6.98 | 9.08 | 11.09 | 27.03 | 11.66 | 4.64 | 2.85 | 2.07 | 3.55 |
| Health | 5.75 | 2.86 | 2.67 | 2.93 | 4.02 | 42.66 | 9.18 | 8.4 | 6.83 | 5.31 | 9.39 |
| House price | 7.27 | 3.36 | 3.77 | 4.51 | 5.62 | 46.91 | 7.78 | 5.95 | 4.86 | 3.77 | 6.2 |
| Income | 12.53 | 6.09 | 5.96 | 6.46 | 6.31 | 39.27 | 7.67 | 4.89 | 3.44 | 3.02 | 4.36 |
| Inflation | 4.86 | 2.64 | 3.69 | 5.25 | 6.94 | 23.68 | 11.44 | 12.26 | 9.69 | 6.96 | 12.58 |

**Wave 2**

| | g1 | g2 | g3 | g4 | g5 | g6 | g7 | g8 | g9 | g10 | g11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consumption | 6.37 | 3.13 | 3.65 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 36.55 | 9.68 | 10.82 | 7.11 | 4.77 | 8.71 |
| Energy | 4.54 | 2.03 | 2.77 | 3.82 | 4.79 | 36.56 | 12.37 | 11.65 | 7.82 | 4.91 | 8.74 |
| GDP | 10.96 | 3.84 | 5.76 | 7.84 | 10.42 | 35.72 | 14.59 | 4.55 | 2.27 | 1.5 | 2.56 |
| Health | 4.79 | 2.28 | 2.48 | 2.86 | 3.51 | 46.76 | 10.32 | 8.66 | 5.52 | 4.48 | 8.34 |
| House price | 4.83 | 2.55 | 3.23 | 4.19 | 5.86 | 54.93 | 8.09 | 5.93 | 3.66 | 2.27 | 4.46 |
| Income | 10.53 | 5.12 | 5.68 | 5.78 | 6.01 | 46.11 | 7.79 | 4.52 | 3.03 | 1.99 | 3.42 |
| Inflation | 3.56 | 2.41 | 3.5 | 5.35 | 7.36 | 29.12 | 13.6 | 12.8 | 8.34 | 4.54 | 9.42 |

**Wave 3**

| | g1 | g2 | g3 | g4 | g5 | g6 | g7 | g8 | g9 | g10 | g11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consumption | 5.04 | 2.82 | 3.14 | 4.13 | 5.61 | 38.65 | 11.66 | 10.6 | 7.25 | 4.23 | 6.86 |
| Energy | 4.13 | 2.35 | 2.78 | 4.34 | 6.23 | 39.62 | 13.42 | 11.51 | 6.19 | 3.44 | 5.98 |
| GDP | 9.79 | 3.95 | 5.64 | 7.81 | 10.5 | 36.34 | 15.52 | 4.93 | 1.85 | 1.31 | 2.37 |
| Health | 4.18 | 2.04 | 2.4 | 3.08 | 4.12 | 49.06 | 10.83 | 8.22 | 5.62 | 3.73 | 6.72 |
| House price | 4.02 | 2.4 | 3.26 | 4.29 | 6.24 | 54.57 | 9.37 | 6.1 | 3.42 | 2.28 | 4.05 |
| Income | 8.54 | 4.73 | 5.12 | 5.83 | 6.92 | 48.53 | 8.17 | 4.93 | 2.62 | 1.74 | 2.88 |
| Inflation | 3.51 | 2.06 | 3.05 | 5.47 | 7.7 | 29.5 | 15.06 | 13.11 | 7.95 | 4.25 | 8.35 |

**Wave 4**

| | g1 | g2 | g3 | g4 | g5 | g6 | g7 | g8 | g9 | g10 | g11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consumption | 4.85 | 2.57 | 3.28 | 4.3 | 5.19 | 40.12 | 12.43 | 10.99 | 6.68 | 3.94 | 5.64 |
| Energy | 2.93 | 1.67 | 2.06 | 3.53 | 4.84 | 41.95 | 15.7 | 11.31 | 6.18 | 3.86 | 5.98 |
| GDP | 8.9 | 3.65 | 5.12 | 8.28 | 11.52 | 37.61 | 14.39 | 5.02 | 2.09 | 1.3 | 2.12 |
| Health | 3.93 | 1.98 | 2.22 | 3.09 | 4.51 | 50.15 | 11.05 | 8.16 | 5.5 | 3.08 | 6.33 |
| House price | 3.83 | 2.06 | 2.84 | 4.3 | 5.89 | 56.45 | 9.76 | 6.21 | 3.42 | 1.97 | 3.28 |
| Income | 8.24 | 4.59 | 4.57 | 5.66 | 6.69 | 50.87 | 8.19 | 4.25 | 2.36 | 1.61 | 2.98 |
| Inflation | 2.79 | 1.91 | 2.88 | 4.6 | 7.35 | 31.81 | 16.49 | 13.55 | 6.96 | 3.96 | 7.71 |

**Wave 5**

| | g1 | g2 | g3 | g4 | g5 | g6 | g7 | g8 | g9 | g10 | g11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consumption | 4.77 | 2.49 | 2.95 | 4.08 | 5.43 | 39.67 | 12.81 | 11.47 | 6.78 | 3.75 | 5.82 |
| Energy | 2.45 | 1.4 | 1.81 | 3.12 | 4.37 | 40.23 | 16.66 | 12.3 | 6.89 | 4.14 | 6.63 |
| GDP | 8.74 | 3.26 | 5.68 | 8.14 | 12.47 | 37.75 | 14.56 | 4.13 | 1.98 | 1.27 | 1.99 |
| Health | 3.85 | 1.83 | 2.05 | 3.02 | 3.74 | 49.67 | 11.56 | 8.57 | 5.63 | 3.76 | 6.32 |
| House price | 3.66 | 1.85 | 2.94 | 4.38 | 5.92 | 55.38 | 10.07 | 6.53 | 3.54 | 2.32 | 3.41 |
| Income | 8.66 | 4.43 | 4.54 | 6.33 | 6.85 | 49.31 | 8.75 | 4.36 | 2.39 | 1.59 | 2.8 |
| Inflation | 2.44 | 1.82 | 2.67 | 4.71 | 7.68 | 30.94 | 17.33 | 13.59 | 7 | 3.98 | 7.83 |

Note. The table presents the average probability reported for each of the 11 intervals, broken down by risk question and wave, for each of the seven expectations questions.

**Table D3. Panel regressions for specific intervals**

| | p<-8 | -8<p<-6 | -6<p<-4 | -4<p<-2 | -2<p<0 | No change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Income growth | 3.752 | 2.003 | 1.714 | 1.747 | 1.298 | 9.101 |
| | (0.158)*** | (0.090)*** | (0.111)*** | (0.139)*** | (0.159)*** | (0.329)*** |
| Health exp growth | -1.448 | -0.789 | -1.099 | -1.269 | -1.280 | 9.943 |
| | (0.158)*** | (0.090)*** | (0.111)*** | (0.139)*** | (0.159)*** | (0.329)*** |
| Energy price growth | -2.243 | -1.062 | -1.124 | -0.718 | -0.509 | -0.111 |
| | (0.158)*** | (0.090)*** | (0.111)*** | (0.139)*** | (0.159)*** | (0.329) |
| House price growth | -1.227 | -0.544 | -0.254 | 0.069 | 0.646 | 15.930 |
| | (0.158)*** | (0.090)*** | (0.111)** | (0.139) | (0.159)*** | (0.329)*** |
| GDP growth | 4.802 | 1.089 | 2.374 | 3.964 | 5.941 | -2.826 |
| | (0.158)*** | (0.090)*** | (0.111)*** | (0.139)*** | (0.159)*** | (0.329)*** |
| Inflation | -2.516 | -0.821 | -0.305 | 0.811 | 2.147 | -8.707 |
| | (0.158)*** | (0.090)*** | (0.111)*** | (0.139)*** | (0.159)*** | (0.329)*** |
| Wave 2 | -1.691 | -0.688 | -0.325 | -0.230 | 0.039 | 5.811 |
| | (0.143)*** | (0.082)*** | (0.100)*** | (0.125)* | (0.144) | (0.297)*** |
| Wave 3 | -2.318 | -0.737 | -0.515 | -0.085 | 0.684 | 6.916 |
| | (0.146)*** | (0.083)*** | (0.103)*** | (0.128) | (0.147)*** | (0.304)*** |
| Wave 4 | -3.096 | -1.047 | -0.939 | -0.280 | 0.596 | 9.288 |
| | (0.151)*** | (0.086)*** | (0.106)*** | (0.132)** | (0.151)*** | (0.313)*** |
| Wave 5 | -3.425 | -1.255 | -1.015 | -0.204 | 0.793 | 8.452 |
| | (0.154)*** | (0.088)*** | (0.108)*** | (0.135) | (0.155)*** | (0.320)*** |
| Constant | 8.054 | 3.734 | 4.020 | 4.425 | 4.837 | 31.623 |
| | (0.148)*** | (0.084)*** | (0.104)*** | (0.129)*** | (0.148)*** | (0.306)*** |
| *N* | 175,182 | 175,182 | 175,182 | 175,182 | 175,182 | 175,182 |
| Explained $\mu_{i,m}$ | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| F test | 689.08 | 323.93 | 295.83 | 321.01 | 450.82 | 1360.27 |
| p-value | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

**Table D3 - continued**

| | 0<p<2 | 2<p<4 | 4<p<6 | 6<p<8 | p>8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Income growth | -2.971 | -5.848 | -4.236 | -2.491 | -4.068 |
| | (0.214)*** | (0.183)*** | (0.141)*** | (0.107)*** | (0.163)*** |
| Health exp growth | -0.497 | -2.036 | -1.183 | -0.407 | 0.065 |
| | (0.214)** | (0.183)*** | (0.141)*** | (0.107)*** | (0.163) |
| Energy price growth | 2.727 | 1.179 | 0.342 | 0.422 | 1.097 |
| | (0.214)*** | (0.183)*** | (0.141)** | (0.107)*** | (0.163)*** |
| House price growth | -2.070 | -4.294 | -3.222 | -1.957 | -3.075 |
| | (0.214)*** | (0.183)*** | (0.141)*** | (0.107)*** | (0.163)*** |
| GDP growth | 3.059 | -5.786 | -4.794 | -2.989 | -4.839 |
| | (0.214)*** | (0.183)*** | (0.141)*** | (0.107)*** | (0.163)*** |
| Inflation | 3.700 | 2.622 | 0.985 | 0.258 | 1.824 |
| | (0.214)*** | (0.183)*** | (0.141)*** | (0.107)** | (0.163)*** |
| Wave 2 | 1.237 | 0.452 | -1.032 | -1.508 | -2.066 |
| | (0.193)*** | (0.165)*** | (0.127)*** | (0.097)*** | (0.147)*** |
| Wave 3 | 2.368 | 0.419 | -1.552 | -2.031 | -3.148 |
| | (0.197)*** | (0.169)** | (0.130)*** | (0.099)*** | (0.150)*** |
| Wave 4 | 2.996 | 0.399 | -1.900 | -2.332 | -3.687 |
| | (0.203)*** | (0.174)** | (0.134)*** | (0.102)*** | (0.155)*** |
| Wave 5 | 3.772 | 0.668 | -1.780 | -2.286 | -3.728 |
| | (0.208)*** | (0.178)*** | (0.137)*** | (0.105)*** | (0.158)*** |
| Constant | 9.010 | 10.052 | 8.255 | 6.110 | 9.881 |
| | (0.199)*** | (0.170)*** | (0.131)*** | (0.100)*** | (0.152)*** |
| *N* | 175,182 | 175,182 | 175,182 | 175,182 | 175,182 |
| Explained $\mu_{i,m}$ | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.23 |
| F test | 304.15 | 698.67 | 552.31 | 348.40 | 533.73 |
| p value | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |

Note. The table presents the fixed effects panel estimates of the reported probability for each of the 11 intervals across the seven expectation questions. In all regressions, the omitted category is the probability assigned to the interval of expected consumption growth. The F-test and associated p-values tests whether the coefficients are all equal to zero. "Explained $\mu_{i,m}$" is the fraction of total variance explained by fixed effects. Standard errors in parentheses. * significance at 10%, ** significance at 5%, *** significance at 1%.