

Research question

- Why do not most of typical households and some rich participate in risky investments?

Extensions on Merton (1969) budget constraint

- We follow CRRA utility, but extend the budget constraints.
 - Consumption is for luxury goods consumption,
 - Households choose luxury consumption before investment.

Budget constraint in our study

- Household allocate resources to satisfy daily life cash outflows in three categories: basic, psychological, and self-actualization needs.
 - Basic needs are food, shelter, and security.
 - Psychological needs are to signal its superior social status. luxury goods consumption satisfy psychological needs.
 - Investments could fit in household's self-actualization needs.
- Three needs are in a **hierarchy** of order, as in Maslow (1970).
 - Labor incomes cover cash outflows for basic needs.
 - Households borrow to maintain luxury goods consumption and expose debt payment dues (DPD).
 - Household investment returns to service DPD.
- Households may or may not earmark a **cash reserve** from wealth.
 - A cash reserve is to keep existing lifestyle cash outflows when households expose cash flow shocks.

Two households: Self-disciplined vs. self-indulgence

- **Self-disciplined Household₁** prioritizes financial safety.
 - 1 Set $Reserve_1 > 0$, so $Wealth_1 - Reserve_1 = iWealth_1$;
 - 2 take temperate lifestyle (DPD_1) s.t. $(iWealth_1 - Treasury_1) \times \overline{Ret}_{fund} = DPD_1 + Growth_1$, with $Growth_1 > 0$.
- **Self-indulgence Household₂** prioritizes psychological needs.
 - 1 Set luxury lifestyle (DPD_2) as $(Wealth_2) \times \overline{Ret}_{fund} = DPD_2$.
 - 2 $Reserve_2 = 0$, $Treasury_2 = 0$, and $Growth_2 = 0$.
- Household₂ will **drop out of investment** on any additional cash outflow $(Wealth_2) \times \overline{Ret}_{fund} < DPD_2 + \epsilon$.

Proposition

- Cash reserve is necessary to engage long-term risky investments. Or dropout happens on below-average returns.
 - Proof at page 14-15.

Typical households and some rich don't participate in risky investments because

- They naturally allocate resources to satisfy luxury goods consumption before considering investments.
- Lack of **cash reserves**, households have to withdraw investments when investment returns are lower than their tolerance level.

Self-disciplined households invest in risky assets in equilibrium as in Merton (1969)

- **Self-disciplined Household₁** with $Reserve_1 > 0$
- A low return ($Ret_{t,low} < \overline{Ret}$) **causes** cash outflow shortages $(iWealth_1 - Treasury_1) \times Ret_{t,low} < DPD_1$.
- However, a **cash reserve replenishes** cash outflow gap.
 - $(iWealth_1 - Treasury_1) \times Ret_{t,low} + Reserve_1 > DPD_1$.
- Household₁ can **practice mean-variance optimization in equilibrium** and holds risky assets $\alpha(P, t)$ as in (Merton 1969).
 - $\alpha(P, t) = \frac{\mu - r_f}{\sigma^2 \gamma}$.

Testable insight

- Two investors share the same wealth ($Wealth_1 = Wealth_2$).
- Investor₁ sets higher reserve ($Reserve_1^H > Reserve_2^L$),
 - so investor₁ lives a lifestyle of lower DPD ($DPD_1^L < DPD_2^H$).
- When the investment returns are above the mean level, both investors keep their engagements.
- On the arrival of a certain low return, there must be
 - 1 $iWealth_1^L \times Ret_{t,low} + Reserve_1^H > DPD_1^L$;
 - 2 $iWealth_2^H \times Ret_{t,low} + Reserve_2^L < DPD_2^H$.
- Investor₁ can keep its investment but investor₂ has to withdraw.

Two-player game design

- Player 1:** Fixed income mutual funds choose high or low-risk assets.
- Player 2:** Investors with high or low tolerance on low returns. Player 2 make decision **after** player 1's decisions are public information

Flow differences when fund returns vary

- Black (Str tol, Wk tol) inflows; Red (**Wk tol**) **outflows**.
- Fund flows when fund returns are **above** tolerance levels.

	High risk funds		Low risk funds
Maj investors	Existing	Str tol	Wk tol
	New	Str tol	Wk tol
Min investors	Existing	Wk tol	Str tol
	New	Wk tol	Str tol

- Fund returns are **lower** than the tolerance of (Wk tol) investors.

	High risk funds		Low risk funds
Maj investors	Existing	Str tol	Wk tol
	New	Str tol	Wk tol
Min investors	Existing	Wk tol	Str tol
	New	Wk tol	Str tol

- SIUSTGF:** Short/intermediate-term US Treasury and government funds. Benchmark risk exposure to (1) Treasury (2) Agency bonds.
- SICFIF:** Short/intermediate-term US corporate fixed income funds. Benchmark risk exposure to (1) Treasury, (2) Agency bonds, (3) **Corporate bonds**, and (4) **Securitized bonds**.

Empirical results

- T5 and T6: Fund flows across risk categories in 1992-2015 and 2003-2015 are **significant**.
 - Why did fund flow **disappear** in 1992-2002?
 - We split funds to institutional class and retail investor class.
- T7-1: When SIUSTGF took more credit risk than suggested by the benchmark in 1992-2002, cross-category flow differences were **insignificant** for institutional or retail investors.
- T7-2: When SIUSTGF follow benchmark in 2003-2015, cross-category flow differences were **insignificant** for institutional investors because of higher reserve. The flow differences were **significant** for retail investors because some of them have low reserves.
- T7-3: **retail investors rather than their advisors** make decisions.
- T8: Cross-category flow difference is **significant** when past returns are consistently low, captured by interaction term.
- T9: Cross-category flow difference is **significant** when funds delivered left tail returns, captured by interaction term.
- T10: Fund return performance contribution analysis.