



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Family and government insurance: wage, earnings, and income risks in the Netherlands and the U.S.

De Nardi, M.; Fella, G.; Knoef, M.G.; Paz-Pardo, G.; Ooijen, R. van

Citation

De Nardi, M., Fella, G., Knoef, M. G., Paz-Pardo, G., & Ooijen, R. van. (2022). *Family and government insurance: wage, earnings, and income risks in the Netherlands and the U.S. Netspar Design Papers*. Tilburg: Netspar. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3570752>

Version: Publisher's Version


License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3570752>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Family and government insurance: Wage, earnings, and income risks in the Netherlands and the U.S.

*Mariacristina De Nardi, Giulio Fella, Marike Knoef,
Gonzalo Paz-Pardo and Raun Van Ooijen*



DESIGN PAPER 181

DESIGN PAPERS are part of the **refereed Industry Paper Series**, which are refereed by the Netspar Editorial Board. Design Papers discuss the design of a component of a pension system or product. A Netspar Design Paper analyzes the objective of a component and the possibilities for improving its efficacy. These papers are easily accessible for industry specialists who are responsible for designing the component being discussed. Authors are allowed to give their personal opinion in a separate section. Design Papers are presented for discussion at Netspar events. Representatives of academic and private sector partners, are invited to these events. Design Papers are published at the Netspar website.

Colophon

Netspar Design Paper 181, August 2021

Editorial Board

Rob Alessie – University of Groningen
Mark-Jan Boes – VU Amsterdam
Paul Elenbaas – Nationale Nederlanden
Arjen Hussem – PGGM
Bert Kramer – University of Groningen & Ortec Finance
Fieke van der Lecq (Chair) – VU Amsterdam
Raymond Montizaan – Maastricht University
Alwin Oerlemans – APG
Martijn Rijnhart – AEGON
Maarten van Rooij – De Nederlandsche Bank
Peter Schotman – Maastricht University
Koen Vaassen – Achmea
Peter Wijn – APG
Jeroen Wirschell – PGGM
Tim van de Zandt – MN
Marianne Zweers – a.s.r.

Design

B-more Design

Lay-out

Bladvulling, Tilburg

Editors

Frans Kooymans, Frans Kooymans–Text and Translation
Netspar

Design Papers are publications by Netspar. No reproduction of any part of this publication may take place without permission of the authors.

CONTENTS

<i>Abstract</i>	4
<i>Samenvatting</i>	5
1. <i>Introduction</i>	7
2. <i>Data and empirical approach</i>	10
3. <i>Results: Netherlands</i>	14
4. <i>Results: Netherlands versus U.S.</i>	27
5. <i>Conclusions</i>	30
<i>References</i>	31

This paper is published (Gold Open Access) in the *Journal of Public Economics* (2021): <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104327>. This version is made available under the CC BY 4.0 license.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the editor and anonymous referees for helpful comments, and Netspar and Instituut Gak for support. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research, any agency of the federal government, the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, or the European Central Bank.

Affiliations

Mariacristina De Nardi – University of Minnesota, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, CEPR, and NBER
Giulio Fella – Queen Mary University of London, CFM, and IFS
Marieke Knoef – Leiden University, Tilburg University
Gonzalo Paz-Pardo – European Central Bank
Raun Van Ooijen – University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen

Abstract

We document new facts about risk in male wages and earnings, household earnings, and pre- and post-tax income in the Netherlands and the United States. We find that, in both countries, earnings display important deviations from the typical assumptions of linearity and normality. Individual-level male wage and earnings risk is relatively high at the beginning and end of the working life, and for those in the lower and upper parts of the income distribution. Hours are the main driver of the negative skewness and, to a lesser extent, the high kurtosis of earnings changes. Even though we find no evidence of added-worker effects, the presence of spousal earnings reduces the variability of household income compared to that of male earnings. In the Netherlands, government transfers are a major source of insurance, substantially reducing the standard deviation, negative skewness, and kurtosis of income changes. In the U.S. the role of family insurance is much larger than in the Netherlands. Family and government insurance reduce, but do not eliminate non-linearities in household disposable income by age and previous earnings in either country.

Samenvatting: Loon en inkomensrisico's in Nederland en de V.S.

Loon en inkomensschokken zijn een belangrijke bron van onzekerheid gedurende het werkzame leven. Werknemers kunnen positieve schokken ondervinden, bijvoorbeeld vanwege promotie, of negatieve schokken, bijvoorbeeld vanwege ziekte of het verliezen van een baan. Inzicht in de omvang en aard van inkomensschokken en de mate waarin deze kunnen worden opgevangen door werknemers is van belang voor hervormingen van de sociale zekerheid en pensioenen. Bijvoorbeeld als veranderingen in lonen voornamelijk worden verklaard door veranderingen in arbeidsaanbod heeft wetgeving op het gebied van arbeidsbescherming een grotere verzekeringsswaarde dan regulering van lonen.

De dynamiek en omvang van inkomensschokken heeft daarnaast direct gevolgen voor de pensioenopbouw van werknemers. Een belangrijke vraag is daarbij hoe het beleggingsbeleid (Wet verbeterde premieregeling) en de toedeling van overrendementen in het nieuw pensioencontract moet worden ingericht voor verschillende leeftijdsgroepen. Volgens de standaard beleggingstheorie is bij een risicovrij en constant arbeidsinkomen 'levensloop beleggen' optimaal. Het pensioenvermogen van jongere deelnemers wordt daarbij meer belegd in risicodragende beleggingen omdat zij meer resterend arbeidsvermogen (menselijk kapitaal) hebben dan oudere deelnemers. Hierbij wordt geen rekening gehouden met de inkomensdynamiek op individueel en huishoudniveau, en daarmee de risicocapaciteit van mensen.

Met behulp van unieke administratieve gegevens bepalen we de dynamiek en omvang van inkomensschokken over de levenscyclus in Nederland. Dit doen we voor mensen aan de onderkant, in het midden, en aan de bovenkant van de inkomensverdeling. Tevens gaan we na in welke mate inkomensschokken worden verklaard door een verandering in gewerkte uren en lonen, en in hoeverre inkomensschokken worden opgevangen binnen het huishouden of door de overheid. We vergelijken onze resultaten met cijfers voor de V.S. – een land met een veel minder uitgebreide welvaartsstaat.

De resultaten laten zien dat inkomensschokken aanzienlijk verschillend zijn voor mensen van verschillende leeftijden en voor mensen aan de onderkant en de bovenkant van de inkomensverdeling. Oudere werknemers en mensen in de top van de inkomensverdeling ondervinden relatief vaak grote negatieve inkomensschokken. Onder oudere werknemers komt dit voornamelijk door een daling in het aantal gewerkte uren, als gevolg van werkloosheid, ziekte, of een vrijwillige keuze. Bij mensen in de top van de inkomensverdeling gaat het vaker om een relatief grote daling van het uurloon. Ook jonge werknemers met een lager inkomen hebben een

relatief onzeker inkomen, mogelijk vanwege het grote aandeel flexibele contracten binnen deze groep. Na het veertigste levensjaar zijn inkomensschokken vaak blijvend. Dat is prettig voor mensen met een hoog inkomen, dat vaak langdurig hoog blijft, maar nadelig voor mensen met een laag inkomen: zij blijven vaak langdurig een laag inkomen behouden.

We zien dat in Nederland voor lagere inkomens negatieve schokken gedeeltelijk opgevangen worden binnen het huishouden door het combineren van inkomens. We zien echter niet dat de partner daadwerkelijk meer gaat werken wanneer de hoofdverdiener bijvoorbeeld werkloos wordt of arbeidsongeschikt raakt. Daarnaast worden schokken in Nederland grotendeels opgevangen door sociale zekerheid, vroegpensioen en progressieve belastingen. Dat geldt vooral voor werknemers aan de onderkant van de inkomensverdeling en voor oudere werknemers.

Wanneer we deze resultaten vergelijken met cijfers uit de V.S. dan valt op dat in de V.S. de verzekering binnen het huishouden groter is dan in Nederland (partners vangen negatieve en positieve schokken vaker op). In Nederland speelt de overheid juist een grotere rol. Hoewel de inkomensschokken groter zijn in de V.S., zien we vergelijkbare patronen over de levenscyclus – en voor lage en hoge inkomens. Ondanks grote verschillen op de arbeidsmarkt zijn er dus vergelijkbare mechanismen die inkomensschokken teweegbrengen. Wanneer we voor Nederland inzoomen op oudere werknemers en een uitsplitsing maken naar verschillende sociale regelingen, dan zien we dat met name arbeidsongeschiktheidsuitkeringen negatieve inkomensschokken opvangen voor huishoudens aan de onderkant van de inkomensverdeling (laagste 20%).

Werkloosheidsuitkeringen en vroegpensioen dempen negatieve schokken voor alle inkomens. Voor werknemers in de onderste helft van de inkomensverdeling worden grote negatieve schokken volledig opgevangen door de overheid en door vroegpensioenregelingen, daarboven worden ze slechts gedeeltelijk opgevangen. Met het toenemen van de AOW-leeftijd, het afschaffen van vroegpensioenregelingen, en de versoering van de sociale zekerheid moeten we er rekening mee houden dat grote negatieve schokken in de toekomst waarschijnlijk toe zullen nemen, met name onder oudere werknemers. Dit heeft gevolgen voor het optimale spaarpatroon en het beleggingsbeleid van pensioenvermogen. Enige flexibiliteit in de opname van pensioenvermogen aan het einde van het werkende leven zou daarom kunnen helpen om inkomensschokken te verzachten.¹

1 De minimale pensioenleeftijd en de fiscale gevolgen van het opnemen van aanvullend pensioen voor de AOW-gerechtigde leeftijd is daarbij van belang (Knoef et al., Flexibel met pensioen. Netspar Occasional paper 02-2019).

1. Introduction

Wage risk affects key economic decisions, including consumption, saving, and labor supply, and is an important determinant of household's welfare. Households can self-insure against wage shocks: single people can adjust their own labor supply and savings and couples can adjust the labor supply of both partners, in addition to savings. Furthermore, governments can supplement or partly replace the need for self-insurance through progressive taxes and transfers.

This paper studies the distribution of wage shocks and the role of insurance mechanisms against them in the Netherlands and the United States. We start by documenting the distribution of wage shocks at the individual level by analyzing distributional measures of wage changes, including the standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, and persistence, by age and previous earnings. To understand the role of individual-level labor supply and fluctuations in hours, we compare the distribution of individual wage shocks with that of individual-level earnings. To analyze the role of family insurance through the labor supply of both partners, we compare the distributions of individual-level and household-level earnings. To examine the role of government insurance, we compare the distribution of household income, pre- and post-taxes, and transfers, by age group and previous earnings.

We use administrative data on income, taxes, and government transfers on individuals and households for the Netherlands (IPO) to get precise estimates of the dynamics of wage shocks and the role of private and public insurance mechanism to mitigate these shocks. We compare the results with estimates for the U.S. Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), and find that the distribution of wage and earnings shocks display rich dynamics and, particularly, depend on age and previous earnings in both countries, as was previously documented for earnings in the U.S. (Guisar et al., 2015, Arellano et al., 2017).

Our contribution to the literature is threefold. First, whereas most previous studies investigated shocks to individual earnings, we distinguish between changes in wages and changes in hours worked. As the two may have different dynamics, this provides us with a better understanding of the nature of income risk. Using high-quality Dutch administrative data on hours worked derived from payroll administration, we find that hours are the main driver of the variability at the bottom of the earnings distribution, the negative skewness and, to a lesser extent, the high kurtosis of earnings. This differs from what we find in Dutch household survey data (DNB Household Survey) or the PSID, and suggests that accurate measurement of earnings and hours worked is crucial to properly account for wage dynamics.

Second, we investigate the degree of insurance provided by spousal labor supply and by the tax and transfer system. We find that the family is a relevant source of insurance in the Netherlands, but most of this insurance comes from income pooling rather than labor supply reactions of secondary earners or added worker effects. Taxes and, particularly, the transfer system play an even larger role in reducing income risk.

Third, we compare two countries: the Netherlands and the U.S. This is an interesting comparison because these two countries differ substantially in the size of their welfare state and the progressiveness of their tax system.² We find that family insurance is more relevant in the U.S. than in the Netherlands, whilst in the latter the government is responsible for the bulk of the reduction in income risk. This also holds if we compare survey data across both countries. Finally, our analysis provides data that rich models of risks and insurance should match to be consistent with the key features of the micro-data that we document.

Our paper contributes to a growing literature on higher-order moments of income shocks. Guvenen et al. (2015) investigate higher order earnings risk using US Social Security administrative data. They find substantial nonlinearities and non-normalities, but they can only study gross individual earnings process, so they cannot separate hours and wages or study additional insurance mechanisms. Hoffman and Malacrino (2019) use Italian administrative data to decompose earnings growth in changes in employment time and changes in weekly earnings. Like us, they find that changes in employment time are the main driver of earnings growth. Halvorsen et al. (2019) analyze Norwegian data and attribute changes in earnings mostly to changes in wages. These international differences suggest that country-specific institutional features are important to determine whether wages or hours are the most important margin of adjustment. Similarly to our results, Halvorsen et al. (2019) find that the benefit system is particularly important to insure workers against earnings fluctuations. Pruitt and Turner (2018), use administrative data from the U.S. and find that the probability of the secondary earner entering employment rises when the primary earner experiences earnings losses.

There is mounting interest in the higher-order moments of income shocks. They are key input for models on asset prices (Mankiw, 1986, Constantinides and Ghosh,

2 Although eligibility requirements have become more restrictive over the past two decades, the Dutch welfare system is one of the most comprehensive in Europe; see *Kalwij et al. (2018)* for a detailed and up-to-date description of social security reforms in the Netherlands. The OECD Social Expenditure Database 2016 shows that public social expenditure on family support, disability, unemployment and active labor market policies as a percentage of GDP is twice as high in the Netherlands compared with the U.S.

2017, Schmidt, 2016), monetary policy (Kaplan et al., 2018), and optimal social insurance and taxation (Golosov et al., 2016). Taking into account higher-order moments also influence estimates on the welfare costs of earnings fluctuations (De Nardi et al., 2019 find that they are smaller when taking into account higher-order moments). These rich features derive from important economic mechanisms (Postel-Vinay and Turon, 2010, Graber and Lise, 2015). For instance, a job ladder model can explain negative skewness and some kurtosis because most people stay on the job and experience small wage raises, while a small number of people lose their job and face large wage and earnings drops. In addition, the persistence of these wage changes might depend on one's age (a young worker is more likely to experiment and switch jobs to figure out what he or she is best at while an old worker might switch to a part-time or less demanding job).

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 describes our data and approach, Sections 3 Results: Netherlands, 4 Results: Netherlands versus U.S. present the results and Section 5 concludes.

2. Data and empirical approach

This section provides an overview of the data we employ, the sample selection criteria, the variables used in our empirical analysis, and our empirical approach.

2.1 The data

The Dutch data We use two data sets for our main analysis: (1) administrative tax records from the Dutch Income Panel Study (IPO) which contain detailed information of various income sources and (2) administrative data on hours worked from the Dutch payroll administrations (DPA). The IPO data set contains detailed information on, amongst others, personal income, household income, demographics, and labor market status for a representative 1% population sample (about 95,000 individuals) and their household members. While the data is available since 1989, we use it starting in 2001, due to a change in the income definition in that year, and until 2014.

The IPO data set has several important advantages over survey data. First, the data is often collected or checked by a third party. For instance, income measures are derived from tax records complemented with information provided by banks and other financial institutions. In addition, Statistics Netherlands performs several checks on the data to guarantee their quality. This drastically reduces or even eliminates measurement error and errors due to non-reporting. Second, individuals are in the panel from the year of birth (for immigrants, the year of arrival) and are followed for as long as they are residing in the Netherlands (as of December 31 of the sample year). Thus, attrition only occurs as a result of migration or death. Third and very importantly, unlike other administrative data sets such as the US Social Security Administration's, the IPO data set tracks households rather than only individuals and contains a detailed decomposition of labor and asset income, taxes and social insurance premia paid, as well as government transfers (broken down into unemployment insurance, disability insurance, social assistance, and pensions) received for all household members. This feature crucially allows us to investigate the role of both the family and government insurance in reducing income fluctuations.

The DPA payroll data provides very rich information on the number of days and hours worked. It is obtained directly from employers. Dutch legislation mandates that all employers maintain up-to-date payroll records and report them to the relevant government agencies on a monthly basis. The payroll records include information on (a) the start and end date of the employment spell, (b) earnings, (c) the number of regular hours and (d) the number of overtime hours that each employee has worked in a given month. These data are not only salient for processing and paying salaries,

but also for the computation of holiday entitlement, social insurance benefit payments, and pensions (see Appendix A for an extensive documentation on this). From 2006 onwards, we have access to the complete payroll records for each employee, and thus have as accurate information on hours as possible. For the period before 2006, Statistics Netherlands provides researchers with a summary measure of hours that has two limitations: (a) it is normalized by “typical” working hours in a sector and (b) it is capped at fulltime hours. We address the first limitation of the pre-2006 data by computing the typical workweek in each sector in the post-2006 data and using it to re-normalize the data for each sector in the pre-2006 data. Concerning the cap at full-time hours, it constrains the measurement of overtime hours for full-time workers, but not for part-time workers, as long as the total number of hours worked does not exceed full time hours.³

The U.S. data For the U.S., we use data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID).⁴ This data set began in 1968 with a representative sample of 18,000 individuals living in 5,000 households. We use it for the period 1968 to 1992. We exclude the years 1993–1997, because of a major redesign of the survey, and those after 1997 because the PSID became bi-yearly after that date. To confirm that our results are not driven by the different sample periods between the U.S. and the Netherlands (see Heathcote et al., 2010 for a discussion of changes in the distribution of wages and earnings in the U.S. across this period of time), in Appendix D.1 we compare our statistics of interest for the period after 1997 for two-years income changes in both countries. This robustness check shows that the cross-country differences that we document are driven by country-specific differences rather than different sample periods.

2.2 Empirical approach

To investigate the role of various insurance mechanisms, we conduct our analysis on male wages and earnings, household earnings, and household after-tax (disposable) income. Comparing individual wages and earnings is informative about self-insurance through labor supply, while comparing individual- and household-level earnings conveys information about family insurance through the labor supply of the spouse. Finally, comparing household pre- and post-tax income sheds light on the role of government-provided insurance through transfers and progressive taxation.

3 To evaluate the effects of missing overtime hours for full-time workers before 2006, *Appendix B* compares our results for our complete sample period with those we obtain using only the post-2006 sample period. The results are extremely close.

4 *Appendix C* documents our findings using survey data for the Netherlands.

To capture, in line with recent contributions (Guvenen et al., 2015, Arellano et al., 2017, De Nardi et al., 2019), richer patterns of risks than typically assumed in the previous literature, we follow Guvenen et al. (2015) and report key moments of the distribution of the (one-year) changes of the log of each variable of interest by age group and percentile of the distribution of male earnings in the previous year.⁵

To be consistent with the related literature on rich earnings risk, we follow similar sample selection, variable definition, purging of age and time effects, and moment computation. In terms of sample selection, for each country we select working-age male earners with some labor market attachment and who are not self-employed. More specifically, for an individual-year observation to be in our sample, the individual (a) must be between 25 and 60 years old, (b) have annual labor earnings above a minimal threshold (2200 euro in 2014 prices, which is around 4% of median earnings), and (c) not receive self-employment income as a main income source. Appendix D.6 reports results when we do not impose this minimal earnings threshold and we compute arc-percentage changes instead of changes in logs. The results show that government insurance is stronger when we consider zeros.

In terms of variables definition, we define individual gross earnings as the total remuneration received by an employee in a given year, which includes his contributions to social security.⁶ We compute household gross earnings by aggregating individual earnings of all household members.⁷ By adding income from savings, we obtain household pre-tax income. Finally, household after-tax income equals household pre-tax income minus income taxes (including allowances, such as healthcare, rent, child and child care, study costs, and alimony), plus transfers. Transfers are the sum of unemployment benefits, disability benefits, social assistance, and pension benefits. Finally, wages are computed by dividing yearly labor earnings by hours worked within the year.

To purge age and time effects from yearly changes and from the distribution of previous earnings, we take residuals from a regression on a (quadratic) polynomial in age and time dummies.

5 *Appendix D.2* also reports those conditioning on earnings over the past 5 years rather than past year.

6 In the Netherlands, employee's contributions to social security include a contribution for health insurance and a premium for unemployment, disability, and pension benefits.

7 We equalize all of our earnings measures using the equivalence scales provided by Statistics Netherlands for the Dutch data and the OECD equivalence scales for the U.S. data. The two equivalence scales are very similar to each other.

The moments that we consider include second and higher-order moments and quantile-based measures.⁸ Our quantile-based measures of skewness and kurtosis are Kelley's coefficient of skewness

$$S_K = \frac{(P_{90} - P_{50}) - (P_{50} - P_{10})}{P_{90} - P_{10}} \quad (1)$$

and the Crow-Siddiqui measure of kurtosis

$$S_{CS} = \frac{P_{97.5} - P_{2.5}}{P_{75} - P_{25}} \quad (2)$$

Kelley skewness is positive (right skewness) if the probability mass between the median and the top decile exceeds the probability mass between the median and the bottom decile, while Crow-Siddiqui kurtosis, if large, denotes heavy tails, that is $P_{97.5} - P_{2.5}$ is large relative to the probability mass that is concentrated between P_{75} and P_{25} . For a normal distribution, Kelley skewness equals zero and Crow-Siddiqui kurtosis equals 2.91.

Quantile-based measures have the advantage of being both (i) easier to interpret and (ii) more robust to outliers than centered moment. We also report standardized third and fourth centered moments whenever they convey a qualitatively different picture than their quantile-based counterparts.

⁸ *Appendix E* reports formal definitions of standardized moments and of the moments that we omit from the main text.

3. Results: Netherlands

In this section, we first study the properties of male earnings changes and the contribution of hours and wages to their dynamics. We then contrast the properties of male earnings, household earnings, and after-tax household income and discuss their implications for family and government insurance.

3.1 Male earnings, wages, and hours

3.1.1 Second moments

Fig. 1 reports the standard deviation of male earnings (left), wage (middle), and hour (right) changes by percentile of previous earnings for various age groups. It reveals important patterns by age and previous earnings.

Focusing on age, the dispersion of earnings changes is particularly high for those in the bottom third of the previous earnings distribution in the youngest age group (25–34) and for those in the upper two thirds of the previous earnings distribution in the oldest age group (55–59). This pattern by age is mostly driven by differences in the dispersion of hour, rather than wage, changes. Two institutional features of the Dutch labor market are likely important in generating these findings. First, flexible contracts are common among young workers and might generate more variability in their hours and earnings. Second, older workers are more likely to become eligible for partial disability benefits, which are reflected in the data as a reduction in hours whilst keeping the same wage.

The standard deviation by previous earnings displays a pronounced U-shaped pattern. It is more than twice as large for workers in the bottom decile of previous earnings than for workers around the median. Comparing it to the dispersion of wage and hours changes suggests that earnings fluctuations for lower earners are mostly accounted for by fluctuations in hours, be they temporary unemployment, demand-induced reductions in working time, or labor supply decisions. Workers with

Fig. 1. Netherlands: standard deviation of male earnings, wages, and hours.





Fig. 2. Netherlands: Variance of changes in male earnings, wages, and hours.



previous earnings above the 90th percentile also have higher dispersion of earnings changes than workers around the median, though substantially less than workers in the bottom decile. In the latter case, however, the pattern appears mostly due to a higher dispersion of wages, rather than hours, which likely reflects variable or performance-related components of earnings such as bonuses.

Simply comparing the variances of earnings, wages, and hours changes does not account for the potential correlation between wage and hours changes. Fig. 2 decomposes the variance of earnings changes, across the distribution of previous earnings, into the contribution of the respective variances and their covariance. It confirms that the relatively higher dispersion of earnings changes for the bottom and top decile are mostly accounted by the higher relative variance of, respectively, hours and wage changes.

The covariance between wage and hour changes is negative throughout most of the distribution; it lies between -0.02 and 0 for all but the bottom two deciles. A negative covariance can be due to either measurement error in hours or to a strong income effect in labor supply (inter-temporal substitution elasticity smaller than one) that induces workers to increase hours in response to imperfectly insured falls in wages. Our finding that this covariance is more negative at low levels of previous earnings implies that measurement error would need to have a more elaborate form

than classical in order to explain this feature of the data.⁹ Additionally, the fact that wages (which are constructed as earnings divided by hours) are less variable than both of the elements that are used to compute them suggests that it is unlikely that the negative covariance is a byproduct of significant measurement error in hours. In contrast, our observations are consistent with plausible economic forces. Namely, workers previously experiencing lower earnings are less able to self-insure through borrowing, more likely to need to finance a minimum level of consumption, and more likely to be on hourly contracts and thus are willing and able to increase hours to stabilize earnings in response to falls in wages. These considerations, together with the high reliability of our hour data (see Appendix A) indicate that this negative correlation between hours and wage changes in the Netherlands is consistent with economic mechanisms linked to a negative income effect, rather than merely being the outcome of measurement error.¹⁰

A complementary way of understanding the drivers of earnings changes is to decompose them into the contribution of wage and hours changes. Fig. 3 reports this decomposition by plotting the (log) change in wage and hours on the vertical axis against the associated change in earnings on the horizontal axis. Each dot on a line represents a decile of earnings *changes*. The three panels refer to workers at three different points in the distribution of earnings *levels in the previous year*. Specifically, they refer to workers in the first, fifth and top deciles. For instance, the leftmost data point in the left panel of Fig. 3 shows that workers in the lowest decile of previous earnings who experience the worst earnings change suffer on average an 80% decrease in their earnings (read off the horizontal axis). Of these, almost 70 percentage points are accounted for by a reduction in hours, and 10 percentage points are due to a reduction in wages (both read off the vertical axis). For these workers

9 We cannot rule out that low income workers, whose hours are more volatile, are more affected by measurement error, which could increase the variance of their wage changes and make the covariance more negative. However, under the extreme assumption that the variance of true wage changes is zero, and as long as measurement error is uncorrelated with true hours and wage changes, the ratio between the variance of wage changes and hours changes (0.38 for the lowest decile) provides an upper bound to the contribution of measurement error to the observed variance of hours changes. In that scenario, it would still be the case that hours are much more volatile at the lowest decile than at higher ones.

10 Averaging across the distribution of previous earnings the covariance between wages and hours is -0.02 which is in line with, but smaller in absolute value, than -0.04 (we compute such a value from the approximate correlation (-0.3) and variances of wage (0.15) and hour (0.1) changes taken from their Fig. 2) reported by Heathcote *et al.* (2014) for the U.S. PSID. They argue, quantitatively, that such a number is consistent with a model with endogenous labor supply in which the income effect is large and measurement error in hours is small.

Fig. 3. Netherlands: Male earnings changes versus hours and wage changes. Each dot represents a decile of changes in male earnings. The three panels represent, starting from the left, the first, fifth, and ninth decile of previous earnings, respectively.






Fig. 4. Netherlands: persistence of male earnings and wages as function of age.



with low previous earnings, changes in hours are the major driver of all changes in earnings, independently of the size of the earnings change. The opposite is true for workers in the ninth decile of previous earnings (right panel) for which wages account for the larger share of all earnings changes. These are likely mainly full-time workers who remain in full-time employment and whose hours, therefore, vary much less. For workers at the median of the previous earnings distribution (middle panel), large negative earnings shocks are associated more with drops in hours (e.g., temporary unemployment) whilst positive earnings shocks are driven by changes in wages.

Finally, the right- and left-hand side panels of Fig. 4 report the persistence, measured by the first-order autoregressive coefficient, of earnings and wage changes, respectively. Similarly to what Karahan and Ozkan, 2013, De Nardi et al., 2019 document for the U.S., in the Netherlands the persistence of earnings is lowest for the young and increases until about age 40 when it stabilizes. The same is true for wages,

Fig. 5. Netherlands: Skewness and kurtosis of male earnings, wages, and hours. Kelley skewness (top row), skewness (middle row), and Crow-Siddiqui kurtosis (bottom row).



though their persistence is even lower until age 30, but then rises faster between 30 and 40.

In sum, male workers experience significant earnings variability, especially at lower levels of earnings and during the earliest and latest phases of the working life. This variability displays rich dynamics which, at low earnings levels, are mainly driven by the behavior of hours rather than wages.

3.1.2 Higher order moments

Turning to higher order moments, the first and second row of panels in Fig. 5 study the asymmetry of the distribution of earnings, wages, and hours changes by reporting two measures of skewness: Kelley skewness (which is less sensitive to outliers) and the third standardized moment. For earnings, Kelley skewness is zero or positive for most age groups and for most of the distribution of previous earnings, with the noticeable exception of workers in the 55–59 age bracket, for whom it is significantly

negative. Turning to wages and hours reveals that negative skewness is driven by the behavior of hours. Hours changes are more negatively skewed, particularly for the 55–59 age group, while wage changes are mostly positively skewed.

While Kelley skewness does not take into account asymmetries in the top versus bottom 10 percent of the distribution, the third standardized moment, reported in the middle row of Fig. 5, provides a measure of asymmetry over the whole distribution. According to that metric, earnings changes display large and negative skewness.¹¹ Comparing the skewness of earnings changes to that of wages and hours reveals that it is again hours, rather than wages that drive the negative skewness of earnings. The skewness of wage changes is mostly non-negative with the exception of workers in the top decile of previous earnings.


Finally, the last row of panels reports the Crow–Siddiqui kurtosis.¹² The kurtosis of earnings changes is highest towards the bottom of the distribution of previous earnings (up to the 20th percentile). The large kurtosis that we observe suggests that earnings shocks are very infrequent but that, when they happen, they tend to be of a large magnitude. This is particularly true for older workers, for whom employment protection is strongest in the Netherlands. Perhaps not surprisingly, kurtosis is even higher for hours than for earnings, suggesting that hour fluctuations are infrequent, but when they do happen they are relatively large (note the different scale in the graph).

As for the variance, comparing higher-order moments of earnings, wage and hours changes does not account for the co-movement between wage and hours. To address this, Fig. 6 decomposes the skewness and kurtosis of earnings changes, as measured by the third and fourth standardized moments, into the contribution of the corresponding moments of wage and hours changes and their interaction. As far as skewness is concerned, the left panel in Fig. 6 reveals that the negative skewness in earnings changes is mostly driven by changes in hours rather than in wages, while

11 This skewness, as measured by the third moment rather than by Kelley measure, is substantially more negative than found in *Guvenen et al. (2015)* for the US or *Halvorsen et al. (2019)* for Norway. This feature of the data is due to the fact that we plot the skewness of earnings over the distribution of earnings in the previous year, while these studies plot it over a measure of recent earnings that represents an average over the previous 5 years. As a result, our sample selection is less stringent (we only require earnings in t and $t-1$ to be above the minimum earnings level, and the ordering of percentiles is different). In *Appendix D.2* we show that, using earnings over the last 5 years, skewness is much closer to the values found in those studies.

12 For completeness, *Appendix E* reports the centered Pearson's measure of kurtosis, which we do not include amongst these results for brevity.

Fig. 6. Netherlands: Skewness and kurtosis of changes in male earnings, wages and hours.




the contribution of the (negative) co-skewness is limited.¹³ Thus, the negative earnings skewness likely reflects persistent non-employment spells or reductions in the numbers of hours worked per week. This is consistent with the evidence presented in Hoffman and Malacrino (2019) for Italy,¹⁴ but at odds with the findings of Halvorsen et al. (2019) for Norway, where both the skewness of wage changes and co-skewness play a substantial role in explaining the negative skewness of earnings growth. These international differences suggest that the institutional framework that governs the labor market is crucial to determine the sources of earnings fluctuations and whether adjustment occurs at the hour or wage margin.

Finally, the kurtosis of earnings changes, reported on the right-hand-side panel of Fig. 6, is driven by both hours and wages, although the contribution of hours is somewhat higher for individuals below the 90th percentile of previous earnings. Most individuals do not experience changes in either between one year and the next and this leads mainly to relatively small changes in earnings. As Eq. (E.3) in Appendix E.1 makes clear, the large negative co-kurtosis reflects that very large absolute changes in hours (wages) are associated with changes in wages (hours) of the opposite sign.

¹³ Appendix E.1 defines this decomposition, including co-skewness and co-kurtosis.

¹⁴ Hoffman and Malacrino (2019), as well as Busch et al. (2018) for Germany, are mainly concerned with the cyclicity of skewness. Yet, table A.3 in Hoffman and Malacrino (2019) reports the decomposition of the skewness of earnings changes in every year in their sample.

Fig. 7. Netherlands: Decomposition of variance, skewness, and kurtosis, separating the role of days worked and hours worked per day. Days worked refers to the number of days, during the year, in which the employee was under an employment contract.



Taken together, these moments provide strong evidence in favor of age-variation, non-linearity, and non-normality of earnings changes and suggest that hours, more than wages, play an important role in the Netherlands.


3.1.3 Separating days worked and hours per day

Our richer data starting 2006 (see Appendix A for details) allows us to further decompose yearly working hours between the number of days worked per year and the average number of hours per day worked. This decomposition (Fig. 7) illustrates that most of the fluctuations are driven by the number of days worked, rather than changes in average hours per day. Thus, in the Netherlands, partial spells of unemployment or non-employment are the key drivers of the non-linear and non-normal patterns that we study. Changes in hours worked per day are less quantitatively relevant, with the only exception of lower-income workers (see left panel), for whom hour fluctuations within or across jobs are more frequent.

3.2 Household insurance

Income pooling within households is a potential source of insurance against individual earnings fluctuations. There are two main reasons why a second earner can reduce the impact on household earnings of shocks to male earnings. The first is due to income pooling: a second earner being present implies that a share of household earnings is not affected by a change in male earnings. The second, often called the added worker effect, implies that the second earner might react to positive or negative shocks to her partner's earnings by changing participation or the number of hours worked.

Fig. 8. Netherlands: male earnings (left), household earnings (center), post-tax income (right). Persistence (top row), standard deviation (second row), Kelley skewness (third row), skewness (fourth row), and Crow-Siddiqui kurtosis (bottom row).




We investigate the effects of insurance within the household, by comparing male versus household earnings. The left and central panels in Fig. 8 report moments for male and household earnings respectively.¹⁵ The top row of the figure shows that persistence is very similar for male and household earnings. Turning to the second row we can see that, among older workers, the standard deviation is a bit lower for household earnings than for male earnings and that, with the exception of younger households, Kelley skewness (third panel) is less negative for changes in household than male earnings. Interestingly, for younger workers in the top two thirds of the earnings distribution we find higher standard deviations and more negative Kelley skewness for household earnings compared with male earnings, which could be possibly be due to female spouses reducing working hours after the birth of a child.

The bottom two panels of Fig. 8 show that the secondary earner plays an important role in reducing the impact on household earnings of *large* shocks to male earnings. Household earnings display substantially less negative skewness (as measured by the third standardized moment) and lower kurtosis than male earnings. This means that, at the household level, changes in earnings are relatively more frequent but smaller, while at the individual level changes in earnings are more infrequent but, when they happen, they are large. Thus, in the Netherlands the family plays a significant role in reducing the risks that households face.

Fig. 9 disentangles the role of income pooling and added worker effects in generating within-household insurance. It reports the average change in women's hours between years t and $t+2$, for those who were working in both years, as a response to changes in male earnings between t and $t+1$. Because women are typically the secondary earner, if there were an added worker effect, the number of hours worked by the woman in the household would respond to earnings shocks suffered by the man. By looking at two-year windows we can capture changes in female labor supply which are not exactly contemporaneous to the man's earnings shock. We do not find any association between changes in male earnings and changes in women's hours worked, indicating that it is mostly income pooling which explains the reduction in earnings risk at the household level that we have documented in the previous set of graphs. This is in line with findings for Norway (Halvorsen et al., 2019), and may be due to correlated labour market opportunities of spouses. The only noticeable, but small, labor supply reaction in the Netherlands is for women who reduce hours

¹⁵ The sample pools single males and those who are cohabiting or married. *Appendix D.4* shows that results are very similar if we just consider those who live in couples, who form the majority of our sample. Household earnings include adult children labor income whenever they are present in the household.

Fig. 9. Netherlands: Male earnings changes and female labor supply. Each dot represents a decile of changes in male earnings. Lowest decile of previous male earnings (left), median decile of previous male earnings (center), 9th decile of previous male earnings (right).



worked in response to large positive changes in male earnings, if the husband is in the top decile of the distribution of previous earnings (right panel). In Appendix D.5 we show that the same conclusions are true for contemporaneous hours changes of the spouse and her labor market participation decision.


3.3 Insurance from taxes and transfers

We also investigate the role of government insurance in reducing labor income risk. To investigate this effect the central and right panels in Fig. 8 report corresponding moments respectively for household earnings before taxes and benefits and disposable, after taxes and benefits, income.¹⁶

The comparison of the rightmost two columns in Fig. 8 shows that taxes and transfers make a very large difference for the measures of risk that we focus on, especially at the lower end of the income distribution and for households in the oldest age group. Concerning disposable income, the standard deviations (second row of the figure) are lower and both measures of skewness (third and fourth row) become less negative relative to pre-tax household earnings. For instance, the standard deviation at the lowest percentiles of previous earnings declines from about 0.59 before taxes and transfers to a little over 0.37 after taxes and transfers. The reduction in the standard deviations and both measures of skewness is especially apparent for workers in

¹⁶ Household disposable income also contains net income from savings. This consists of the following components: interests from saving accounts and bonds, dividends, the rental value of the residential property, income from other real estate, income from other assets, and mortgage interest payments. It does not include capital gains from stocks or other financial assets. In Appendix D.3 we show that this capital income makes little difference for the dynamics of household income.

Fig. 10. Netherlands: Household before- vs after-tax income. Each dot represents a decile of changes in male earnings. 1st decile of previous male earnings (left), 5th decile of previous male earnings (center), 9th decile of previous male earnings (right).




the oldest age group. For them, skewness becomes almost zero. The Crow-Siddiqui kurtosis (fourth row) at the household level falls from about 8 before taxes and transfers (it peaked at about 17 for wages and male earnings) to well below 7 after taxes and transfers.

Fig. 10 explores further the roles of household and government insurance by showing the pass-through of changes in male earnings to before- and after-tax household income. It shows that taxes and transfers offset positive and negative changes in male earnings, especially for households at the bottom of the distribution of previous earnings. For example, households in the first decile of previous earnings with a negative earnings shock of 80% experience on average a 50% drop in pre-tax household income, but only a 10% drop in disposable household income. Households in the fifth and ninth decile of previous male earnings experience smaller changes in male earnings (the dots are closer to zero). Households in the 9th decile of previous male earnings receive, as expected, less insurance from progressive taxation and transfers in case of a negative shock in male earnings (the difference between the slopes of the blue and the red lines is smaller). Instead, positive shocks in male earnings are also more cushioned by the government for households in the first decile of previous male earnings (most likely reflecting benefit withdrawal), compared with households in the fifth and ninth decile of previous male earnings.

Given that government insurance is especially prevalent in the Netherlands and especially so at older ages, Fig. 11 further breaks down the role of various government programs for our 55–59 age group by sequentially adding specific transfer programs and taxes. The graphs show that disability insurance greatly reduces the standard deviation of household earnings changes below the 20th percentile of previous earnings, while unemployment insurance generates a significant reduction even at higher levels of previous earnings. It also shows that, for this age group, (early) retirement

Fig. 11. Netherlands, age 55–59: Relative contribution of transfers and taxes to the standard deviation of household income. Red line, household gross income, gold line: including disability insurance, green line: also including unemployment insurance, dotted green line: also including social assistance, dotted blue line also including pensions, dotted red line: also net of taxes.



transfers, associated with early access to occupational pensions, play a much larger role in reducing variation in household income than progressive taxes. The right-hand-side graph of Fig. 11 shows that negative skewness is largely offset by taxes and transfers.

Our analysis makes it clear that the government and private pensions provide a lot of insurance in the Netherlands. Progressive taxation reduces earnings variability and the benefit system (unemployment insurance, disability insurance, and welfare) and early access to occupational pensions reduce income variability. In particular for older workers and for the bottom of the distribution of previous earnings, transfers effectively eliminate large negative shocks, such that negative skewness disappears and the kurtosis is reduced. The breakdown of transfer programs or taxes suggest that progressive taxation plays less of a role in reducing earnings variability.

4. Results: Netherlands versus U.S.

While Section 3 focuses on risks and insurance in the Netherlands, this section compares risks and insurance in the Netherlands and the U.S. Fig. 12 reports our summary statistics for the Netherlands (left) and the U.S. (right), pooling across all age groups for clarity. A first noticeable feature is that the standard deviations of wages, hours, earnings, household income and disposable income are, respectively, much larger in the U.S. than in the Netherlands.

Looking more into the top panel and comparing male wages to earnings also reveals that moments for earnings and wages are substantially closer to each other in the U.S. data than in the Dutch data. To better understand this phenomenon, Fig. 13 decomposes the relative contributions of hours and wages to second and higher moments of earnings changes in the U.S. Its left panel shows that, in the U.S., the variance of wages is much closer to that of hours (compare with Fig. 2, Fig. 6), suggesting that wage adjustments are more frequent in the U.S. than in the Netherlands. Its center and left panel highlight that in the U.S. too hours are the largest contributor to skewness and kurtosis.¹⁷ It is worth noting that hours are measured less precisely in the PSID data than in our Dutch data and this might affect some of these results.

Turning back to Fig. 12 and comparing male to household earnings reveals a larger role for spousal insurance in the U.S. in terms of reducing the standard deviation and skewness of male earnings at all levels of previous earnings. The presence of spousal earnings tends to compress both the volatility and the tails of the household earnings distribution in the U.S (in line with Pruitt and Turner, 2018, who use administrative data from the U.S.). These patterns are present in both countries, except that in the Netherlands Kelley skewness becomes more negative after including spousal earnings. Finally, comparing gross to disposable income reveals that while government insurance reduces the variability and negative skewness of earnings changes in both countries, this role is much larger in the Netherlands and particularly so for households at the bottom of the (previous) earnings distribution.

To confirm that results are driven by cross-country differences and not by period of observation, we also examine income dynamics for the PSID in the post 1997 period, which covers the same time frame as the IPO data. The results are very similar (see Appendix D.1), thus indicating that the results are mainly driven by cross-country differences rather than by different time periods.

To evaluate whether our cross-country comparison is affected by the fact that we use administrative data for the Netherlands and survey data for the U.S., we also

¹⁷ We report centered kurtosis in *Appendix E*.

Fig. 12. Summary statistics for various income definitions, by previous earnings. Netherlands (left), U.S. (right).





Fig. 13. U.S.: Variance, skewness and kurtosis of changes in male earnings, wages and hours.



compare Dutch survey data (DHS) with those from our administrative Dutch data. Most of the patterns across the income distribution are similar (see Appendix C). The main differences are that, in the survey data, the differences between pre-tax income and disposable income are smaller, and the role of wages in earnings dynamics are larger than in our administrative data. Given that wages are constructed by dividing earnings and hours, and that the survey data do not account for the number and duration of employment spells in a year, this is likely to be related to measurement error in changes in hours worked in the survey data. Thus, our results suggest that properly capturing employment spells is crucial to properly decompose earnings fluctuations between hours and wages.

5. Conclusions

We study the nature of labor income risk in the Netherlands and the U.S. For the Netherlands, we use high-quality administrative data to disentangle the contribution of wages and hours to the dynamics of male earnings. Furthermore, we investigate the degree of insurance provided by spousal labor supply and by the tax and transfers system in both countries.

We document that the dynamics of individual male earnings is similar in both countries and displays important deviations from the typical assumptions of linearity and normality. Individual-level male wage and earnings risk is relatively high at the beginning and end of the working life, and for those in the lower and upper parts of the income distribution. Importantly, we find that hours are the main driver of the negative skewness and, to a lesser extent, the high kurtosis of earnings changes. In the Netherlands, hours also account for most of the variability of earnings for workers in the bottom two deciles of the earnings distribution.

Turning to family and government insurance, in the Netherlands women's earnings reduce the standard deviation of labor income risk at the household level only if the husband's earnings are in the bottom third of the earnings distribution. Indeed, for the age group 25–34 the variance of household earnings exceeds that of the husband's earnings if the latter are in the top two-thirds of the distribution. This is probably due to the birth of children. However, income pooling within the household makes skewness substantially less negative, thus suggesting that the presence of a secondary earner in the household can smooth out large negative shocks. This effects appear stemming from income pooling alone, as we do not find evidence of an added worker effect in the Netherlands.

Comparing family and government insurance we find that the government plays a much larger role in reducing wage risk in the Netherlands compared with the U.S. A breakdown in government programs for older workers in the Netherlands shows that DI and UI programs reduce income risk, especially for the lowest quarter of the male earnings distribution. Pensions and taxes (to a lower extent) reduce earnings risk across the whole distribution. Instead, in the U.S. the role that the family plays is much more important. The results suggest that taxes and transfers may crowd out insurance that could be generated within the family.

References

- Arellano, Manuel, Blundell, Richard, Bonhomme, Stéphane, 2017. Earnings and consumption dynamics: a non-linear panel data framework. *Econometrica* 85 (3), 693–734.
- Constantinides, George M., Ghosh, Anisha, 2017. Asset pricing with countercyclical household consumption risk. *J. Finance* 72 (1), 415–460.
- De Nardi, Mariacristina, Fella, Giulio, Paz-Pardo, Gonzalo, 2019. Nonlinear household earnings dynamics, self-insurance, and welfare. *J. Eur. Econ. Assoc* 18 (2), 890–926.
- Golosov, Mikhail, Troshkin, Maxim, Tsyvinski, 2016. Redistribution and social insurance. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 106, 359–386.
- Graber, Michael, Lise, Jeremy, 2015. Labor Market Frictions, Human Capital Accumulation and Consumption Inequality. mimeo, University College London.
- Guvenen, Fatih, Karahan, Fatih, Ozkan, Serdar, Song, Jae, 2015. What do data on millions of U.S. workers reveal about life-cycle earnings risk?, Working Paper 20913, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Busch, Christopher, Domeij, David, Guvenen, Fatih, Madera, Rocio, 2018. Asymmetric business-cycle risk and social insurance, Working Paper 24569, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Halvorsen, Elin, Holter, Hans, Ozkan, Serdar, Storesletten, Kjetil, 2019. Dissecting idiosyncratic income risk. Mimeo.
- Heathcote, Jonathan, Perri, Fabrizio, Violante, Giovanni L., 2010. Unequal we stand: an empirical analysis of economic inequality in the united states. *Rev. Econ. Dyn.*, 1967–2006 13 (1), 15–51.
- Heathcote, Jonathan, Storesletten, Kjetil, Violante, Giovanni L., 2014. Consumption and labor supply with partial insurance: an analytical framework. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 104 (7), 2075–2126.
- Hoffman, Eran B., Malacrino, Davide, 2019. Employment time and the cyclical of earnings growth. *J. Public Econ.* 169, 160–171.
- Kalwij, Adriaan, Kapteyn, Arie, de Vos, Klaas, 2018. Why Are People Working Longer in the Netherlands? University of Chicago Press, pp. 179–204.
- Kaplan, Greg, Moll, Benjamin, Violante, Giovanni L., 2018. Monetary policy according to hank. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 108 (3), 697–743.
- Karahan, Faith, Ozkan, Serdar, 2013. On the persistence of income shocks over the life cycle: evidence, theory and implications. *Rev. Econ. Dyn.* 16 (3), 452–476.
- Mankiw, N. Gregory, 1986. The equity premium and the concentration of aggregate shocks. *J. Finance Econ.* 17, 211–219.
- Postel-Vinay, Fabien, Turon, Hélène, 2010. On-the-job search, productivity shocks, and the individual earnings process. *Int. Econ. Rev.* 51 (3), 599–629.
- Pruitt, Seth, Turner, Nick, 2018. The nature of household labor income risk. In: Finance and Economics Discussion series working paper 2018–034.
- Schmidt, Lawrence, 2016. Climbing and falling off the ladder: asset pricing implications of labor market event risk. Working paper University of Chicago.

OVERZICHT UITGAVEN IN DE DESIGN PAPER SERIE

- 1 Naar een nieuw pensioencontract (2011)
Lans Bovenberg en Casper van Ewijk
- 2 Langlevensrisico in collectieve pensioencontracten (2011)
Anja De Waegenaere, Alexander Paulis en Job Stigter
- 3 Bouwstenen voor nieuwe pensioencontracten en uitdagingen voor het toezicht daarop (2011)
Theo Nijman en Lans Bovenberg
- 4 European supervision of pension funds: purpose, scope and design (2011)
Niels Kortleve, Wilfried Mulder and Antoon Pelsser
- 5 Regulating pensions: Why the European Union matters (2011)
Ton van den Brink, Hans van Meerten and Sybe de Vries
- 6 The design of European supervision of pension funds (2012)
Dirk Broeders, Niels Kortleve, Antoon Pelsser and Jan-Willem Wijckmans
- 7 Hoe gevoelig is de uittredeleeftijd voor veranderingen in het pensioenstelsel? (2012)
Didier Fouarge, Andries de Grip en Raymond Montizaan
- 8 De inkomensverdeling en levensverwachting van ouderen (2012)
Marieke Knoef, Rob Alessie en Adriaan Kalwij
- 9 Marktconsistente waardering van zachte pensioenrechten (2012)
Theo Nijman en Bas Werker
- 10 De RAM in het nieuwe pensioenakkoord (2012)
Frank de Jong en Peter Schotman
- 11 The longevity risk of the Dutch Actuarial Association's projection model (2012)
Frederik Peters, Wilma Nusselder and Johan Mackenbach
- 12 Het koppelen van pensioenleeftijd en pensioenaanspraken aan de levensverwachting (2012)
Anja De Waegenaere, Bertrand Melenberg en Tim Boonen
- 13 Impliciete en expliciete leeftijdsdifferentiatie in pensioencontracten (2013)
Roel Mehlkopf, Jan Bonenkamp, Casper van Ewijk, Harry ter Rele en Ed Westerhout
- 14 Hoofdlijnen Pensioenakkoord, juridisch begrepen (2013)
Mark Heemskerk, Bas de Jong en René Maatman
- 15 Different people, different choices: The influence of visual stimuli in communication on pension choice (2013)
Elisabeth Brüggén, Ingrid Rohde and Mijke van den Broeke
- 16 Herverdeling door pensioenregelingen (2013)
Jan Bonenkamp, Wilma Nusselder, Johan Mackenbach, Frederik Peters en Harry ter Rele
- 17 Guarantees and habit formation in pension schemes: A critical analysis of the floor-leverage rule (2013)
Frank de Jong and Yang Zhou
- 18 The holistic balance sheet as a building block in pension fund supervision (2013)
Erwin Fransen, Niels Kortleve, Hans Schumacher, Hans Staring and Jan-Willem Wijckmans
- 19 Collective pension schemes and individual choice (2013)
Jules van Binsbergen, Dirk Broeders, Myrthe de Jong and Ralph Koijen
- 20 Building a distribution builder: Design considerations for financial investment and pension decisions (2013)
Bas Donkers, Carlos Lourenço, Daniel Goldstein and Benedict Dellaert

- 21 Escalerende garantietoezeggingen: een alternatief voor het StAr RAM-contract (2013)
Servaas van Bilsen, Roger Laeven en Theo Nijman
- 22 A reporting standard for defined contribution pension plans (2013)
Kees de Vaan, Daniele Fano, Heriaht Mens and Giovanna Nicodano
- 23 Op naar actieve pensioenconsumenten: Inhoudelijke kenmerken en randvoorwaarden van effectieve pensioencommunicatie (2013)
Niels Kortleve, Guido Verbaal en Charlotte Kuiper
- 24 Naar een nieuw deelnemergericht UPO (2013)
Charlotte Kuiper, Arthur van Soest en Cees Dert
- 25 Measuring retirement savings adequacy; developing a multi-pillar approach in the Netherlands (2013)
MARIKE Knoef, Jim Been, Rob Alessie, Koen Caminada, Kees Goudswaard, and Adriaan Kalwijn
- 26 Illiquiditeit voor pensioenfondsen en verzekeraars: Rendement versus risico (2014)
Joost Driessen
- 27 De doorsneesystematiek in aanvullende pensioenregelingen: effecten, alternatieven en transitiepaden (2014)
Jan Bonenkamp, RYANNE COX en Marcel Lever
- 28 EIOPA: bevoegdheden en rechtsbescherming (2014)
Ivor Witte
- 29 Een institutionele beleggersblik op de Nederlandse woningmarkt (2013)
Dirk Brounen en Ronald Mahieu
- 30 Verzekeraar en het reële pensioencontract (2014)
Jolanda van den Brink, Erik Lutjens en Ivor Witte
- 31 Pensioen, consumptiebehoeften en ouderenzorg (2014)
MARIKE Knoef, Arjen Hussem, Arjan Soede en Jochem de Bresser
- 32 Habit formation: implications for pension plans (2014)
Frank de Jong and Yang Zhou
- 33 Het Algemeen pensioenfonds en de taakafbakening (2014)
Ivor Witte
- 34 Intergenerational Risk Trading (2014)
Jiajia Cui and Eduard Ponds
- 35 Beëindiging van de doorsneesystematiek: juridisch navigeren naar alternatieven (2015)
Dick Boeijen, Mark Heemskerk en René Maatman
- 36 Purchasing an annuity: now or later? The role of interest rates (2015)
Thijs Markwat, Roderick Molenaar and Juan Carlos Rodriguez
- 37 Entrepreneurs without wealth? An overview of their portfolio using different data sources for the Netherlands (2015)
Mauro Mastrogiacomo, Yue Li and Rik Dillingh
- 38 The psychology and economics of reverse mortgage attitudes. Evidence from the Netherlands (2015)
Rik Dillingh, Henriëtte Prast, Mariacristina Rossi and Cesira Urzì Brancati
- 39 Keuzevrijheid in de uittreedleeftijd (2015)
Arthur van Soest
- 40 Afschaffing doorsneesystematiek: verkenning van varianten (2015)
Jan Bonenkamp en Marcel Lever
- 41 Nederlandse pensioenopbouw in internationaal perspectief (2015)
MARIKE Knoef, Kees Goudswaard, Jim Been en Koen Caminada
- 42 Intergenerationele risicodeling in collectieve en individuele pensioencontracten (2015)
Jan Bonenkamp, Peter Broer en Ed Westerhout
- 43 Inflation Experiences of Retirees (2015)
Adriaan Kalwijn, Rob Alessie, Jonathan Gardner and Ashik Anwar Ali
- 44 Financial fairness and conditional indexation (2015)
Torsten Kleinow and Hans Schumacher
- 45 Lessons from the Swedish occupational pension system (2015)
Lans Bovenberg, RYANNE COX and Stefan Lundbergh

- 46 Heldere en harde pensioenrechten onder een PPR (2016)
Mark Heemskerk, René Maatman en Bas Werker
- 47 Segmentation of pension plan participants: Identifying dimensions of heterogeneity (2016)
Wiebke Eberhardt, Elisabeth Brüggem, Thomas Post and Chantal Hoet
- 48 How do people spend their time before and after retirement? (2016)
Johannes Binswanger
- 49 Naar een nieuwe aanpak voor risicoprofiel-meting voor deelnemers in pensioenregelingen (2016)
Benedict Dellaert, Bas Donkers, Marc Turlings, Tom Steenkamp en Ed Vermeulen
- 50 Individueel defined contribution in de uitkeringsfase (2016)
Tom Steenkamp
- 51 Wat vinden en verwachten Nederlanders van het pensioen? (2016)
Arthur van Soest
- 52 Do life expectancy projections need to account for the impact of smoking? (2016)
Frederik Peters, Johan Mackenbach en Wilma Nusselder
- 53 Effecten van gelaagdheid in pensioen-documenten: een gebruikersstudie (2016)
Louise Nell, Leo Lentz en Henk Pander Maat
- 54 Term Structures with Converging Forward Rates (2016)
Michel Vellekoop and Jan de Kort
- 55 Participation and choice in funded pension plans (2016)
Manuel García-Huitrón and Eduard Ponds
- 56 Interest rate models for pension and insurance regulation (2016)
Dirk Broeders, Frank de Jong and Peter Schotman
- 57 An evaluation of the nFTK (2016)
Lei Shu, Bertrand Melenberg and Hans Schumacher
- 58 Pensioenen en inkomensongelijkheid onder ouderen in Europa (2016)
Koen Caminada, Kees Goudswaard, Jim Been en Marike Knoef
- 59 Towards a practical and scientifically sound tool for measuring time and risk preferences in pension savings decisions (2016)
Jan Potters, Arno Riedl and Paul Smeets
- 60 Save more or retire later? Retirement planning heterogeneity and perceptions of savings adequacy and income constraints (2016)
Ron van Schie, Benedict Dellaert and Bas Donkers
- 61 Uitstroom van oudere werknemers bij overheid en onderwijs. Selectie uit de poort (2016)
Frank Cörvers en Janneke Wilschut
- 62 Pension risk preferences. A personalized elicitation method and its impact on asset allocation (2016)
Gosse Alserda, Benedict Dellaert, Laurens Swinkels and Fieke van der Lecq
- 63 Market-consistent valuation of pension liabilities (2016)
Antoon Pelsser, Ahmad Salahnejhad and Ramon van den Akker
- 64 Will we repay our debts before retirement? Or did we already, but nobody noticed? (2016)
Mauro Mastrogiacomio
- 65 Effectieve ondersteuning van zelfmanagement voor de consument (2016)
Peter Lapperre, Alwin Oerlemans en Benedict Dellaert
- 66 Risk sharing rules for longevity risk: impact and wealth transfers (2017)
Anja De Waegenaere, Bertrand Melenberg and Thijs Markwat
- 67 Heterogeniteit in doorsneeproblematiek. Hoe pakt de transitie naar degressieve opbouw uit voor verschillende pensioenfondsen? (2017)
Loes Frehen, Wouter van Wel, Casper van Ewijk, Johan Bonekamp, Joost van Valkengoed en Dick Boeijen
- 68 De toereikendheid van pensioenopbouw na de crisis en pensioenhervormingen (2017)
Marike Knoef, Jim Been, Koen Caminada, Kees Goudswaard en Jason Rhuggenaath

- 69 De combinatie van betaald en onbetaald werk in de jaren voor pensioen (2017)
Marleen Damman en Hanna van Solinge
- 70 Default life-cycles for retirement savings (2017)
Anna Grebenchtchikova, Roderick Molenaar, Peter Schotman en Bas Werker
- 71 Welke keuzemogelijkheden zijn wenselijk vanuit het perspectief van de deelnemer? (2017)
Casper van Ewijk, Roel Mehlkopf, Sara van den Bleeken en Chantal Hoet
- 72 Activating pension plan participants: investment and assurance frames (2017)
Wiebke Eberhardt, Elisabeth Brüggen, Thomas Post en Chantal Hoet
- 73 Zerotopia – bounded and unbounded pension adventures (2017)
Samuel Sender
- 74 Keuzemogelijkheden en maatwerk binnen pensioenregelingen (2017)
Saskia Bakels, Agnes Joseph, Niels Kortleve en Theo Nijman
- 75 Polderen over het pensioenstelsel. Het debat tussen de sociale partners en de overheid over de oudedagvoorzieningen in Nederland, 1945–2000 (2017)
Paul Brusse
- 76 Van uitkeringsovereenkomst naar PPR (2017)
Mark Heemskerk, Kees Kamminga, René Maatman en Bas Werker
- 77 Pensioenresultaat bij degressieve opbouw en progressieve premie (2017)
Marcel Lever en Sander Muns
- 78 Bestedingsbehoeften bij een afnemende gezondheid na pensionering (2017)
Lieke Kools en Marike Knoef
- 79 Model Risk in the Pricing of Reverse Mortgage Products (2017)
Anja De Waegenaere, Bertrand Melenberg, Hans Schumacher, Lei Shu and Lieke Werner
- 80 Expected Shortfall voor toezicht op verzekeraars: is het relevant? (2017)
Tim Boonen
- 81 The Effect of the Assumed Interest Rate and Smoothing on Variable Annuities (2017)
Anne G. Balter and Bas J.M. Werker
- 82 Consumer acceptance of online pension investment advice (2017)
Benedict Dellaert, Bas Donkers and Carlos Lourenço
- 83 Individualized life-cycle investing (2017)
Gréta Oleár, Frank de Jong and Ingmar Minderhoud
- 84 The value and risk of intergenerational risk sharing (2017)
Bas Werker
- 85 Pensioenwensen voor en na de crisis (2017)
Jochem de Bresser, Marike Knoef en Lieke Kools
- 86 Welke vaste dalingen en welk beleggings-beleid passen bij gewenste uitkeringsprofielen in verbeterde premieregelingen? (2017)
Johan Bonekamp, Lans Bovenberg, Theo Nijman en Bas Werker
- 87 Inkomens- en vermogensafhankelijke eigen bijdragen in de langdurige ouderenzorg: een levensloopperspectief (2017)
Arjen Hussem, Harry ter Rele en Bram Wouterse
- 88 Creating good choice environments – Insights from research and industry practice (2017)
Elisabeth Brüggen, Thomas Post and Kimberley van der Heijden
- 89 Two decades of working beyond age 65 in the Netherlands. Health trends and changes in socio-economic and work factors to determine the feasibility of extending working lives beyond age 65 (2017)
Dorly Deeg, Maaïke van der Noordt and Suzan van der Pas
- 90 Cardiovascular disease in older workers. How can workforce participation be maintained in light of changes over time in determinants of cardiovascular disease? (2017)
Dorly Deeg, E. Burgers and Maaïke van der Noordt
- 91 Zicht op zzp-pensioen (2017)
Wim Zwinkels, Marike Knoef, Jim Been, Koen Caminada en Kees Goudswaard
- 92 Return, risk, and the preferred mix of PAYG and funded pensions (2017)
Marcel Lever, Thomas Michielsen and Sander Muns

- 93 Life events and participant engagement in pension plans (2017)
Matthew Blakstad, Elisabeth Brüggén and Thomas Post
- 94 Parttime pensioneren en de arbeids-participatie (2017)
Raymond Montizaan
- 95 Keuzevrijheid in pensioen: ons brein wil niet kiezen, maar wel gekozen hebben (2018)
Walter Limpens en Joyce Vonken
- 96 Employability after age 65? Trends over 23 years in life expectancy in good and in poor physical and cognitive health of 65–74-year-olds in the Netherlands (2018)
Dorly Deeg, Maaïke van der Noordt, Emiel Hoogendijk, Hanneke Comijs and Martijn Huisman
- 97 Loslaten van de verplichte pensioenleeftijd en het organisatieklimaat rondom langer doorwerken (2018)
Jaap Oude Mulders, Kène Henkens en Harry van Dalen
- 98 Overgangseffecten bij introductie degressieve opbouw (2018)
Bas Werker
- 99 You're invited – RSVP! The role of tailoring in incentivising people to delve into their pension situation (2018)
Milena Dinkova, Sanne Elling, Adriaan Kalwij en Leo Lentz
- 100 Geleidelijke uittreding en de rol van deeltijdpensioen (2018)
Jonneke Bolhaar en Daniël van Vuuren
- 101 Naar een model voor pensioen-communicatie (2018)
Leo Lentz, Louise Nell en Henk Pander Maat
- 102 Tien jaar UPO. Een terugblik en vooruitblik op inhoud, doelen en effectiviteit (2018)
Sanne Elling en Leo Lentz
- 103 Health and household expenditures (2018)
Raun van Ooijen, Jochem de Bresser en Marike Knoef
- 104 Keuzevrijheid in de uitkeringsfase: internationale ervaringen (2018)
Marcel Lever, Eduard Ponds, Rik Dillingh en Ralph Stevens
- 105 The move towards riskier pension products in the world's best pension systems (2018)
Anne G. Balter, Malene Kallestrup-Lamb and Jesper Rangvid
- 106 Life Cycle Option Value: The value of consumer flexibility in planning for retirement (2018)
Sonja Wendel, Benedict Dellaert and Bas Donkers
- 107 Naar een duidelijk eigendomsbegrip (2018)
Jop Tangelder
- 108 Effect van stijging AOW-leeftijd op arbeidsongeschiktheid (2018)
Rik Dillingh, Jonneke Bolhaar, Marcel Lever, Harry ter Rele, Lisette Swart en Koen van der Ven
- 109 Is de toekomst gearriveerd? Data science en individuele keuzemogelijkheden in pensioen (2018)
Wesley Kaufmann, Bastiaan Starink en Bas Werker
- 110 De woontevredenheid van ouderen in Nederland (2018)
Jan Rouwendal
- 111 Towards better prediction of individual longevity (2018)
Dorly Deeg, Jan Kardaun, Maaïke van der Noordt, Emiel Hoogendijk en Natasja van Schoor
- 112 Framing in pensioenkeuzes. Het effect van framing in de keuze voor beleggingsprofiel in DC-plannen naar aanleiding van de Wet verbeterde premieregeling (2018)
Marijke van Putten, Rogier Potter van Loon, Marc Turlings en Eric van Dijk
- 113 Working life expectancy in good and poor self-perceived health among Dutch workers aged 55–65 years with a chronic disease over the period 1992–2016 (2019)
Astrid de Wind, Maaïke van der Noordt, Dorly Deeg and Cécile Boot
- 114 Working conditions in post-retirement jobs: A European comparison (2019)
Ellen Dingemans and Kène Henkens

- 115 Is additional indebtedness the way to increase mortgage-default insurance coverage? (2019)
Yeorim Kim, Mauro Mastrogiacomio, Stefan Hochguertel and Hans Bloemen
- 116 Appreciated but complicated pension Choices? Insights from the Swedish Premium Pension System (2019)
Monika Böhnke, Elisabeth Brüggén and Thomas Post
- 117 Towards integrated personal financial planning. Information barriers and design propositions (2019)
Nitesh Bharosa and Marijn Janssen
- 118 The effect of tailoring pension information on navigation behavior (2019)
Milena Dinkova, Sanne Elling, Adriaan Kalwij and Leo Lentz
- 119 Opleiding, levensverwachting en pensioenleeftijd: een vergelijking van Nederland met andere Europese landen (2019)
Johan Mackenbach, José Rubio Valverde en Wilma Nusselder
- 120 Giving with a warm hand: Evidence on estate planning and bequests (2019)
Eduard Suari-Andreu, Raun van Ooijen, Rob J.M. Alessie and Viola Angelini
- 121 Investeren in menselijk kapitaal: een gecombineerd werknemers- en werkgeversperspectief (2019)
Raymond Montizaan, Merlin Nieste en Davey Poulissen
- 122 The rise in life expectancy – corresponding rise in subjective life expectancy? Changes over the period 1999–2016 (2019)
Dorly Deeg, Maaïke van der Noordt, Noëlle Sant, Henrike Galenkamp, Fanny Janssen and Martijn Huisman
- 123 Pensioenaanvullingen uit het eigen woningbezit (2019)
Dirk Brounen, Niels Kortleve en Eduard Ponds
- 124 Personal and work-related predictors of early exit from paid work among older workers with health limitations (2019)
Nils Plomp, Sascha de Breij and Dorly Deeg
- 125 Het delen van langlevensrisico (2019)
Anja De Waegenaere, Agnes Joseph, Pascal Janssen en Michel Vellekoop
- 126 Maatwerk in pensioencommunicatie (2019)
S.K. Elling en L.R. Lentz
- 127 Dutch Employers' Responses to an Aging Workforce: Evidence from Surveys, 2009–2017 (2019)
Jaap Oude Mulders, Kène Henkens and Hendrik P. van Dalen
- 128 Preferences for solidarity and attitudes towards the Dutch pension system – Evidence from a representative sample (2019)
Arno Riedl, Hans Schmeets and Peter Werner
- 129 Deeltijdpensioen geen wondermiddel voor langer doorwerken (2019)
Henk-Wim de Boer, Tunga Kantarcı, Daniel van Vuuren en Ed Westerhout
- 130 Spaarmotieven en consumptiegedrag (2019)
Johan Bonekamp en Arthur van Soest
- 131 Substitute services: a barrier to controlling long-term care expenditures (2019)
Mark Kattenberg and Pieter Bakx
- 132 Voorstel keuzearchitectuur pensioensparen voor zelfstandigen (2019)
Jona Linde
- 133 The impact of the virtual integration of assets on pension risk preferences of individuals (2019)
Sesil Lim, Bas Donkers en Benedict Dellaert
- 134 Reforming the statutory retirement age: Policy preferences of employers (2019)
Hendrik P. van Dalen, Kène Henkens and Jaap Oude Mulders
- 135 Compensatie bij afschaffing doorsnee-systematiek (2019)
Dick Boeijen, Chantal de Groot, Mark Heemskerk, Niels Kortleve en René Maatman
- 136 Debt affordability after retirement, interest rate shocks and voluntary repayments (2019)
Mauro Mastrogiacomio

- 137 Using social norms to activate pension plan members: insights from practice (2019)
Joyce Augustus-Vonken, Pieter Verhallen, Lisa Brüggem and Thomas Post
- 138 Alternatieven voor de huidige verplichtstelling van bedrijfstakpensioenfondsen (2020)
Erik Lutjens en Fieke van der Lecq
- 139 Eigen bijdrage aan ouderenzorg (2020)
Pieter Bakx, Judith Bom, Marianne Tenand en Bram Wouterse
- 140 Inrichting fiscaal kader bij afschaffing doorsneesystematiek (2020)
Bastiaan Starink en Michael Visser
- 141 Hervorming langdurige zorg: trends in het gebruik van verpleging en verzorging (2020)
Pieter Bakx, Pilar Garcia-Gomez, Sara Rellstab, Erik Schut en Eddy van Doorslaer
- 142 Genetic health risks, insurance, and retirement (2020)
Richard Karlsson Linnér and Philipp D. Koellinger
- 143 Publieke middelen voor particuliere ouderenzorg (2020)
Arjen Hussem, Marianne Tenand en Pieter Bakx
- 144 Emotions and technology in pension service interactions: Taking stock and moving forward (2020)
Wiebke Eberhardt, Alexander Henkel en Chantal Hoet
- 145 Opleidingsverschillen in levensverwachting: de bijdrage van acht risicofactoren (2020)
Wilma J. Nusselder, José Rubio Valverde en Johan P. Mackenbach
- 146 Shades of Labor: Motives of Older Adults to Participate in Productive Activities (2020)
Sonja Wendel and Benedict Dellaert
- 147 Raising pension awareness through letters and social media: Evidence from a randomized and a quasi-experiment (2020)
Marika Knoef, Jim Been and Marijke van Putten
- 148 Infographics and Financial Decisions (2020)
Ruben Cox and Peter de Goeij
- 149 To what extent can partial retirement ensure retirement income adequacy? (2020)
Tunga Kantarcı and Jochem Zweerink
- 150 De steun voor een 'zwareberoepenregeling' ontleed (2020)
Harry van Dalen, Kène Henkens en Jaap Oude Mulders
- 151 Verbeteren van de inzetbaarheid van oudere werknemers tot aan pensioen: literatuuroverzicht, inzichten uit de praktijk en de rol van pensioenuitvoerders (2020)
Peter Lapperre, Henk Heek, Pascal Corten, Ad van Zonneveld, Robert Boulogne, Marieke Koeman en Benedict Dellaert
- 152 Betere risicospreiding van eigen bijdragen in de verpleeghuiszorg (2020)
Bram Wouterse, Arjen Hussem en Rob Aalbers
- 153 Doorbeleggen met garanties? (2020)
Roderick Molenaar, Peter Schotman, Peter Dekkers en Mark Irwin
- 154 Differences in retirement preferences between the self-employed and employees: Do job characteristics play an explanatory role? (2020)
Marleen Damman, Dieuwke Zwier en Swenne G. van den Heuvel
- 155 Do financial incentives stimulate partially disabled persons to return to work? (2020)
Tunga Kantarcı and Jan-Maarten van Sonsbeek
- 156 Wijzigen van de bedrijfstakpensioenregeling: tussen pensioenfondsbestuur en sociale partners (2020)
J.R.C. Tangelder
- 157 Keuzes tijdens de pensioenopbouw: de effecten van nudging met volgorde en standaardopties (2020)
Wilde Zijlstra, Jochem de Bresser en Marika Knoef
- 158 Keuzes rondom pensioen: implicaties op uitkeringssnelheid voor een heterogeen deelnemersbestand (2020)
Servaas van Bilsen, Johan Bonekamp, en Eduard Ponds
- 159 Met big data inspelen op woonwensen en woongedrag van ouderen: praktische inzichten voor ontwerp en beleid (2020)
Ioulia V. Ossokina en Theo A. Arentze

- 160 Economic consequences of widowhood: Evidence from a survivor's benefits reform in the Netherlands (2020)
Jeroen van der Vaart, Rob Alessie and Raun van Ooijen
- 161 How will disabled workers respond to a higher retirement age? (2020)
Tunga Kantarcı, Jim Been and Arthur van Soest
- 162 Deeltijdpensioen: belangstelling en belemmeringen op de werkvloer (2020)
Hanna van Solinge, Harry van Dalen en Kène Henkens
- 163 Investing for Retirement with an Explicit Benchmark (2020)
Anne Balter, Lennard Beijering, Pascal Janssen, Frank de Jong, Agnes Joseph, Thijs Kamma and Antoon Pelsser
- 164 Vergrijzing en verzuim: impact op de verzekeringsvoorkeuren van werkgevers (2020)
Remco Mallee en Raymond Montizaan
- 165 Arbeidsmarkteffecten van de pensioen-premiesystematiek (2020)
Marika Knoef, Sander Muns en Arthur van Soest
- 166 Risk Sharing within Pension Schemes (2020)
Anne Balter, Frank de Jong en Antoon Pelsser
- 167 Supporting pension participants: Three lessons learned from the medical domain for better pension decisions (2021)
Jelle Strikwerda, Bregje Holleman and Hans Hoeken
- 168 Variable annuities with financial risk and longevity risk in the decumulation phase of Dutch DC products (2021)
Bart Dees, Frank de Jong and Theo Nijman
- 169 Verloren levensjaren als gevolg van sterfte aan Covid-19 (2021)
Bram Wouterse, Frederique Ram en Pieter van Baal
- 170 Which work conditions can encourage older workers to work overtime? (2021)
Raymond Montizaan and Annemarie Kuenn-Nelen
- 171 Herverdeling van individueel pensioen-vermogen naar partnerpensioen: een stated preference-analyse (2021)
Raymond Montizaan
- 172 Risicogedrag na een ramp; implicaties voor pensioenen (2021)
Martijn de Vries
- 173 The Impact of Climate Change on Optimal Asset Allocation for Long-Term Investors (2021)
Mathijs Cosemans, Xander Hut and Mathijs van Dijk
- 174 Beleggingsbeleid bij onzekerheid over risicobereidheid en budget (2021)
Agnes Joseph, Antoon Pelsser en Lieke Werner
- 175 On the Resilience of ESG Stocks during COVID-19: Global Evidence (2021)
Gianfranco Gianfrate, Tim Kievid & Mathijs van Dijk
- 176 De solidariteitsreserve juridisch ontrafeld (2021)
Erik Lutjens en Herman Kappelle
- 177 Hoe vertrouwen in politiek en maatschappij doorwerkt in vertrouwen in pensioen-instituten (2021)
Harry van Dalen en Kène Henkens
- 178 Gelijke rechten, maar geen gelijke pensioenen: de gender gap in Nederlandse tweedepijlerpensioenen (2021)
Suzanne Kali, Jim Been, Marika Knoef en Albert van Marwijk Kooy
- 179 Completing Dutch pension reform (2021)
Ed Westerhout, Eduard Ponds and Peter Zwaneveld
- 180 When and why do employers hire and rehire employees beyond normal retirement age? (2021)
Orlaith C. Tunney and Jaap Oude Mulders
- 181 Family and government insurance: Wage, earnings, and income risks in the Netherlands and the U.S. (2021)
Mariacristina De Nardi, Giulio Fella, Marika Knoef, Gonzalo Paz-Pardo and Raun van Ooijen



Network for Studies on Pensions, Aging and Retirement

This is a publication of:

Netspar

Phone +31 13 466 2109

E-mail info@netspar.nl

www.netspar.nl

February 2022