

Intergenerational Linkages in Household Credit

Andra C. Ghent
University of Wisconsin-
Madison
ghent@wisc.edu

Marianna Kudlyak
Federal Reserve Bank of San
Francisco
marianna.kudlyak@sf.frb.org

This Draft: January 9, 2018

We document important correlations between children's future credit risk scores, default, and homeownership status and their parents' credit characteristics measured when children are in their late teens. These linkages persist after controlling for parental income and are stronger in cities with lower intergenerational income mobility. State-level educational policies do not affect the strength of the linkages. Using evidence from a sample of siblings, we conclude that the linkages are largely due to family fixed effects rather than to any long-lasting effects of transitory changes in parental credit conditions on children's outcomes.

JEL: D14, E21, G10.

Keywords: Household Finance. Intergenerational Mobility. Credit Constraints. Inequality.

We thank our discussant Joanna Hsu and audiences at the Boulder Summer Conference on Consumer Financial Decision Making, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and the University of Illinois-Chicago for their generous comments. Helen Irvin, David Min, and Peter Debbaut provided excellent research assistance. The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not reflect those of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, the Federal Reserve System, or any other institution with which the authors are affiliated.

1. Introduction

We study intergenerational linkages in household credit by exploiting the rich administrative panel data on individual credit records from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax (CCP). To our knowledge, ours is the first study to explore intergenerational linkages in credit. Using household identifiers available in the CCP, we link individuals' credit records to the records of the adults (i.e., parents) in their household when the individuals were 18 or 19 years old, the earliest age at which an individual's information enters the credit report data. We refer to the former individuals as "children" and use the panel dimension of the data to follow children's credit outcomes – default behavior, homeownership, credit card behavior, and the credit risk score as measured by Equifax Risk Score (hereafter, risk score) – for ten years.¹ We define the intergenerational linkage as the slope of the linear relationship between the child's future credit outcome (up to the age of 29) and the parents' credit characteristics (the incidence of serious default, the degree of credit constraints, or risk score) at the time when the child was 18 or 19 years old and lived in the household with the parents.

We first document economically and statistically significant linkages between children's future credit outcomes and their parents' credit risk scores, default, and credit constraints. Children of parents with high credit scores, low levels of credit utilization, and no serious defaults are less likely to default, have higher credit scores, are more likely to become homeowners in their 20s, and are more likely to have credit cards. Controlling for the household's location (zip code) weakens the relationships only slightly, suggesting the linkages are not merely caused by access to local amenities such as schools or the affluence of the child's peers. Furthermore, the relationships persist into the 25-to-29 age bracket.

The magnitudes of the effects are large. For example, after controlling for zip code and cohort fixed effects, a one standard deviation increase in parental credit risk score is associated with a 35 percent reduction in the child's likelihood of bankruptcy, a 49 percent decrease in the child's likelihood of other serious default, and a 6 percent increase in the child's credit score by the time the child is 25 years old. It is also associated with a 12 percent increase in the likelihood of becoming a homeowner by age 25 and a 23 percent increase by age 29. Conversely, a one

¹ The data span allows us to study child credit outcomes up to the time when the children are 29 years old.

standard deviation increase in the extent to which parents are credit constrained is associated with an 8 percent reduction in the likelihood of a child becoming a homeowner by age 25 and a 14 percent reduction by age 29. We also find that weaker parental credit conditions are positively correlated with the child having student debt, with the relationship being much stronger in higher quintiles of parental income distribution.²

We next explore local factors that correlate with the strength of the intergenerational linkages in household credit. We consider a broad range of local characteristics correlated with income mobility as well as the income mobility measures of Chetty, Hendren, Kline, and Saez (2014). Overall, we find that the linkages are stronger in cities with lower levels of income mobility suggesting that some of the same factors that drive intergenerational linkages in household credit also drive income mobility. The linkages, however, are not consistently stronger in cities with more income inequality as measured by the Gini coefficient.

We then ask about the impact of educational policies on the intergenerational linkages in household credit. The identification strategy exploits state-level differences over time in economic, financial, and quantitative literacy programs that Brown, Grigsby, van der Klaauw, Wen, and Zafar (2016) and Urban and Schmeiser (2015) document. We also examine whether the quality of public schooling affects the linkages, as high-quality public schooling is often perceived as the main equalizer of opportunity for children. Among the four policy interventions that we study (financial literacy, economic education, mathematics education, and school spending per pupil), we find that higher economic education requirements is the only policy that slightly weakens the intergenerational linkages in household credit.

Finally, we study the factors that drive the intergenerational linkages in household credit. First and most importantly, we find that the linkages persist and are only slightly weaker after controlling for parental income.³ Second, we examine whether the correlations can be explained by family heterogeneity, i.e., underlying factors that drive both the credit attributes of parents and the future credit outcomes of their children. The linkages, alternatively, may arise because

² The data, however, do not contain information on college attendance.

³ We supplement our data with the income data from Equifax Credit Risk Insight™ Servicing McDash (CRISM). Our data do not contain information on household's assets.

the credit conditions parents experience directly affect their children's outcomes because more credit-constrained parents have less resources available to invest in their children.

To control for family fixed effects, we construct a sample of siblings that gives us observations on more than one child-parent pair from within the same family. We then exploit between-sibling variation in their parents' credit characteristics, measured when each sibling is 19. How the future credit outcomes vary across siblings as parental credit conditions change informs us as to whether the linkages arise because parental credit conditions directly affect their children's outcomes.

In the sample of siblings, we cannot reject the hypothesis that the linkages are due to family fixed effects. These results do not necessarily imply that parental credit constraints do not matter because the sibling results are picking up the effect of changes in parental credit conditions late in childhood.⁴ Rather, the siblings' results show that there are parental endowments beyond current financial resources that are important for child outcomes.

In summary, we find economically important intergenerational linkages between children's future credit outcomes and their parent's credit attributes when the children are in their late teens. The linkages persist after controlling for zip code fixed effects and parental income and are little affected by differential state-level educational policies. Our investigation from a sample of siblings suggests that these linkages are largely due to family heterogeneity.

Our finding of economically significant intergenerational linkages in household credit echoes a large literature in labor economics on the intergenerational economic linkages. In the same way, we find that a large component of the intergenerational correlation remains unexplained by external factors or shocks and has to be attributed to family heterogeneity. Additional support for this view comes from the literature that finds that strong intergenerational economic linkages and, subsequently, low social mobility are not specific to the U.S. or to the modern era. Economic historian Gregory Clark studies social mobility over the last eight centuries and finds that social mobility rates are typically low, do not vary across societies, and cannot be easily affected by social policies (see, for example, Clark, 2015). Furthermore, recent advances in the literature allow researchers to track intergenerational correlations in economic behavior (i.e.,

⁴ For example, Lochner and Monge-Naranjo (2012) argue that credit constraints matter most early in life.

saving, investment) to primitives, i.e., preferences and risk attitudes. Dohmen, Falk, Huffman, and Sunde (2012) and Zumbuehl, Dohmen, and Pfann (2013) use German survey data and find that attitudes toward risk are linked across generations. Cesarini, Dawes, Johannesson, Lichtenstein, and Wallace (2009), Barnea, Cronqvist, and Siegel (2010), and Cesarini, Johannesson, Lichtenstein, Sandewall, and Wallace (2010) use data on twins and find strong evidence that preferences for risk taking and giving are broadly heritable. Kuhnen and Chiao (2009) and Zhong, Israel, Xue, Ebstein, and Chew (2009) link risk-taking behavior with particular genes. Such similarity in preferences manifests itself in household fixed effects and suggests a reason why we observe intergenerational linkages in credit even if changes to parental credit conditions do not affect children.

Perhaps the most relevant evidence of genetics driving the intergenerational linkages in credit that we document comes from De Neve and Fowler (2014). They show that a specific gene is associated with credit card borrowing behavior as evidenced by an increased likelihood of reporting credit card debt. Credit card borrowing is an important indicator because it is typically used in the finance literature to measure individuals' rate of time preferences. More broadly, neuroscientists Bouchard Jr. and McGue in their extensive surveys of the genetic literature conclude that "behavioral genetic research supports the heritability, not the genetic determination, of behavior" (McGue and Bouchard Jr., 1998; Bouchard Jr. and McGue, 2003). Given rapid advances in consumer financial technology (FinTech) and genetic research, intergenerational linkages in credit may have important welfare consequences if lenders use genetic information in lending decisions. The Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008, "the first major new civil rights bill of the new century,"⁵ prohibits the use of genetic information in health insurance and employment settings but does not address lending.⁶

1.1.Related Literature

To our knowledge, ours is the first study of intergenerational linkages in household credit. The study is related to the extensive literature on intergenerational mobility in income, wealth, and

⁵ Senator Ted Kennedy on the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (Lee, 2008).

⁶ De Neve and Fowler (2014) are the first to bring attention to the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act and possible welfare consequences based on their findings that a specific gene is associated with credit card borrowing behavior.

consumption.⁷ Similar to our conclusions, the existing evidence points towards a large unexplained component – family heterogeneity. In a seminal review, referring to intergenerational mobility of income, Solon (1999) concludes “[...] A comparison of sibling and intergenerational correlations suggests that much, perhaps most, of the intergenerational influence on earnings is unrelated to parental income. Where it does come from remains a fascinating and important puzzle for future research.”

Similarly, Charles and Hurst (2003) use the Panel Survey of Income Dynamics (PSID) to document intergenerational linkages in wealth and find that more than a third of the relationship between parental and child wealth remains unexplained after controlling for income, propensity to own assets, education, gifts, and expected bequests. Even after controlling for income, there are similarities in the types of assets that children and parents hold, a finding that they attribute to similarities in risk preferences. Fagereng, Guiso, Malacrino, and Pistaferri (2016) use Norwegian data to document heterogeneity and persistence in returns to wealth and find that the permanent component of the return to wealth is correlated across generations. Waldkirch, Ng, and Cox (2004) use data from the PSID to report that there are similarities in familial consumption patterns even after controlling for parental income. Charles, Danziger, Li, and Schoeni (2014) similarly find that intergenerational linkages in consumption patterns persist after controlling for intergenerational linkages in income. Cox (1990) studies the relationship between inter-vivos intergenerational transfers and liquidity constraints and finds that empirical transfer patterns match those predicted from a model in which transfers are allocated to liquidity-constrained consumers. His finding indicates that a primary reason why some households may face liquidity constraints is the absence of linkages to nonliquidity-constrained households.

Our work is also related to a literature in labor economics that studies intergenerational linkages in labor market outcomes or transmission of human capital.⁸ For example, Keane and Wolpin

⁷ See, among others, Solon (1992), Chadwick and Solon (2002), Aaronson and Mazumder (2008), Lee and Solon (2009), Lovenheim (2011), Corak (2013), Chetty, Hendren, Kline, and Saez (2014), Chetty, Hendren, Kline, Saez, and Turner (2014), Dahl, Kostol, and Mogstad (2014), Cooper and Luengo-Prado (2015), Olivetti and Paserman (2015), and Olivetti, Paserman, and Salisbury (2015).

⁸ For example, Oreopolous, Page, and Stevens (2008) find that children of parents displaced from a job during plant closures have lower long-run earnings. Hilger (2016) finds that layoffs dramatically reduce family income but only slightly reduce college enrollment, college quality and early career earnings, consistent with a weak estimated propensity to spend on college out of marginal parental income. More

(2001) study whether the documented positive relationship between parents' and children's higher education is causal (i.e., more educated parents may invest more heavily in their children's human capital, perhaps due to their own preferences for more educated children and/or higher wealth) or due to family heterogeneity (i.e., due to the heritability of traits such as abilities, personalities, and preferences). Keane and Wolpin find that while some of the intergenerational correlation in schooling can be attributed to the larger college-attendance-contingent transfers made by more educated parents, essentially none of the correlation can be attributed to credit market constraints (i.e., the relaxation of borrowing constraints induces students to work less while in college, but it does little to affect attendance decisions). Perhaps even more strikingly, Cesarini, Lindqvist, Ostling, and Wallace (2015) and Bulman, Fairlie, Goodman, and Isen (2016) find that the lottery windfalls of parents in Sweden and the US have negligible effects on children's long-run outcomes. Because lottery windfalls relax parental credit constraints, the results in these papers indicate that the correlations between parental income and wealth and children's educational outcomes (see, for example, Lochner and Monge-Naranjo, 2011) are not due to credit constraints. Our findings from the sample of siblings are consistent with this conclusion as we find that the extent to which parents are credit constrained does not have a causal effect on children's longer run credit market outcomes.

Parents may also transmit financial literacy to their children. Lusardi, Mitchell, and Curto (2010) use the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) to conclude that financial literacy among youth is generally low. Moreover, they report that youth financial literacy is strongly associated with family financial sophistication. Consistent with transmitting financial literacy across generations, Fagereng, Mogstad, and Ronning (2015) use a sample of adopted children to document that, even after controlling for parental income and child income, the share of wealth invested in stocks and stock market participation of children is correlated with the parent's share of investment in stocks.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 describes the framework for measuring the intergenerational linkages in household credit and the data. Section 3 documents our benchmark measurement of linkages in household credit markets. Section 4 explores

generally, Vosters and Nybom (forthcoming) find intergenerational persistence in socioeconomic status rather than merely income, wealth, or education.

environmental factors that affect the strength of the intergenerational linkages. Section 5 studies the effect of educational policy interventions on the linkages. Section 6 re-estimates the benchmark specifications with controls for parental income and examines the mechanism behind the intergenerational linkages using a sample of siblings. Finally, Section 7 concludes.

2. Framework for Measuring Intergenerational Linkages in Household Credit

2.1. New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax Data

The data are from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax (CCP). The CCP is an individual-level panel dataset that contains detailed records of individual debt and borrowing on a quarterly basis from the first quarter of 1999 to the most recent quarter. The CCP is a 5 percent random sample of all U.S. consumers with a credit record. These individuals constitute the primary sample. In addition, the CCP has information about individuals who reside at the same address as individuals in the primary sample. This sample is known as the full sample. We use the full sample and link individual records to a household. We then use individuals' ages to identify children's and parents' records as described below.⁹

The advantage of the CCP relative to survey data (e.g., PSID, Health and Retirement Study, NLSY) is its sample size and accuracy. The data in the study cover the period from the first quarter of 1999 to the fourth quarter of 2013. The resulting dataset on children contains over 300,000 individual records that we follow for a full decade starting in 1999-2003 and even more individual records that we follow for five years.

The CCP data contain detailed credit records data but no information on income. In Sections 3 and 6, we supplement the analysis with data from Equifax Credit Risk Insight™ Servicing McDash (CRISM) which is a subset of the CCP data matched to the mortgage-level McDash servicing data. The CRISM dataset contains the income variable, Personal Income Model (PIM), which is a measure from a proprietary algorithm that exploits a large national sample of employer-provided incomes to predict consumer incomes using credit bureau attributes. The CRISM data are available starting in 2005.

⁹ Lee and van der Klaauw (2010) provide an excellent description of the CCP data and contains additional details on the CCP.

2.2. Construction of Intergenerational Records

To link the data records of children and parents, we combine individual records that correspond to the same mailing address into household records. The earliest age of the individuals included in the CCP is generally 18. In the paper, we refer to the individuals for whom we have records at age 18 or 19 as children. An individual who resides in a household with a 19-year-old child and is 34 years or older is considered a parent (i.e., an adult in the household). The adult might not be a genetic parent of the child. However, the analysis in the paper is concerned with the transmission of credit market behavior within the household in which the child grows up rather than solely genetic transmission (for a similar focus, see, for example, Solon, 1992).^{10,11} Having identified children and their parents from the household identifiers at the time when children are 18 or 19 years old, we follow the individual records over time even when children and their parents no longer reside in the same household. We present results from the sample of the individuals whom we identify as children at 19 years old.¹² While our identification limits us to children that live with their parents at age 19, a high fraction of young adults live with their parents at age 19.¹³ Our data also do not contain information on “unbanked” individuals.

2.3. Measurement Framework for Intergenerational Linkages

We define the intergenerational linkages in household credit as the slope of the linear relationship between an individual’s (i.e., child’s) credit outcomes and the individual’s parents’ credit characteristics at the time when the individual was 19 years old and lived in the same household as the parents.

¹⁰ To decrease the probability of capturing some nontraditional living arrangements (for example, military bases), we restrict our analysis to the individuals who at the age of 19 live in households with at most two adults. We also drop households with more than 10 members.

¹¹ Dettling and Hsu (2014) use the household dimension of the CCP data to study debt and parental co-residence among young adults.

¹² In unreported analyses we use 18-year-olds (with parents being 33 or over) instead of 19-year-olds. The results using 18-year-olds are very similar to those with 19-year-olds. The results from this sample are available from the authors upon request.

¹³ In the 2000 US Census, 57% of men and 47% of women aged 18-24 lived with their parents. In the 2010 Census, 57% of men and 48% of women aged 18-24 lived with their parents.

We focus on measuring the children’s credit outcomes at two different time horizons: (1) a short-term horizon, which covers the first five years after we identify an individual as a child in our sample, i.e., the period when the children are 19 to 24 years old; and (2) a long-term horizon, which covers the second five-year period after we identify an individual as a child in our sample, i.e., the period during which children are between 25 and 29 years old.¹⁴ Since the data in the study cover the first quarter of 1999 to the fourth quarter of 2013, we can identify five cohorts of children – cohorts who are 19 in 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 – whom we can follow for the full 10 years and thus construct both the short- and long-term horizon outcomes. We use data from the fourth quarter of each year.

We consider the following children’s credit outcomes: default patterns (delinquencies and serious default), credit risk score (Equifax Risk Score), homeownership status, having a credit card, and being credit constrained. We use the maximum value of the ratio of credit used to available credit between date $t_0 + 5$ for the 5 year horizon and between $t_0 + 6$ and $t_0 + 10$ for the long horizon outcome as our measure of whether a child is credit constrained. We define indicators of default, homeownership, or having a credit card using the information from the years between t_0 and $t_0 + 5$ for short horizon outcomes and from the years between $t_0 + 6$ and $t_0 + 10$ for long horizon outcomes. For the credit risk score, we consider the average risk score over the respective horizon as well as the end-of-horizon risk score.

We define parents’ credit attributes using information from the year when the child is 19 years old (t_0). For parents, we create variables that summarize whether a parent has a default and its severity (e.g., bankruptcy, foreclosure, or delinquency), the extent to which the parent is credit-constrained, and the parents’ average credit score.

In the benchmark analysis, we estimate the following relationship

$$C_{iaT} = \alpha + \beta P_{iat_0} + \delta A_{iat_0} + D_{t_0} + D_a + D_{at_0} + \varepsilon_{iaT} \quad (1)$$

where C_{iaT} is the outcome of child i over horizon T (T is between t_0 and $t_0 + 5$ for the short horizon and between $t_0 + 6$ and $t_0 + 10$ for the long horizon), P_{iat_0} is the outcome of child i ’s

¹⁴ In the appendix Table A8, we consider child outcomes over a range of possible horizons since age 19.

parents in year t_0 , A_{iat_0} is the age of the parents of child i in year t_0 , D_{i_0} is the cohort effect of children who are 19 in year t_0 , D_a is the location-specific effect of location a where the child resides when he or she is 19, and D_{at_0} is the cohort- and location-specific effect. In the estimation below, we also allow the linear relationship described in (1) to differ by quartile of the distribution of the parents attribute for continuous attributes.

The child's credit outcomes we analyze are indicators of bankruptcy, serious default, and delinquency in any of the years during the short- or long-term horizon, an indicator of homeownership, an indicator for having a credit card, and, finally, the average risk score over the horizon and the end-of-the-horizon risk score.¹⁵ We use three alternative variables to summarize the parents' credit attributes at the time their child is 19 years old. First, we consider a binary variable, $P_{iat_0}^D$, that takes value 1 if any parent has a serious default at t_0 , where the serious default is defined when a parent has a 90-day or greater delinquency, a bankruptcy, or a foreclosure. The second measure, $P_{iat_0}^C$, is the credit balance as a percentage of credit limit available for use at time t_0 . It captures the extent to which a parent may be able to borrow to improve their children's outcomes. Finally, $P_{iat_0}^R$, is the parents' risk score (the average of the scores if there are two parents).

2.4. Summary Statistics

Table 1 shows the summary statistics of the parental variables when the children are 19 years old. Panel A of Table 1 shows the summary statistics for the parents for the sample of 19-year-olds that we can follow until age 24. Panel B shows the statistics for the parents of the 19-year-olds that we can follow until age 29. If a child has two parents in the CCP, the summary statistics in Table 1 are calculated using both observations; see the appendix for details. In general, the samples in Panel A and B are very similar.

For comparison, the last column of Table 1 presents analogous statistics for adults 34 years or older who have at least one child 18 years or older in the 1998 through 2010 waves of the Survey of Consumer Finances (SCF). The parents in our sample look broadly similar to those in the

¹⁵ Appendix A contains a detailed description of the variables.

SCF. Our parents' homeownership rate is slightly lower than the homeownership rate in the SCF (55 percent vs. 65 percent), largely because in our data we define homeownership as having a mortgage. In both samples, 8.0 percent of parents have experienced a bankruptcy in the last 10 years (the longest time a bankruptcy can be retained on a credit record). The average age of parents in our sample is 48 while it is 45 in the SCF. The most substantial difference is that only 22 percent of parents in our sample are single parents, while 30 percent of parents in the SCF are single parents.

Table 2 presents key statistics for the children in our sample at ages 24 and 29. Panel A presents these statistics for the sample of children that we follow to age 24, i.e., those children who turn 19 in 1999 through 2003. In this sample, 34 percent experience a serious default sometime between ages 19 and 24, 10 percent become homeowners by age 24, and 84 percent have a credit card at some point between ages 19 and 24.¹⁶ The average Equifax Risk Score at age 24 is 636. Panel B presents the same statistics for individuals who are 25 to 29 years old, that is, those individuals who turn 19 sometime between 1999 and 2003 and whom we can follow to age 29 – the long horizon sample.¹⁷ The long horizon sample has fewer observations than the short horizon sample because fewer individuals can be followed for 10 years than can be followed for five years.¹⁸

Although the SCF has too few observations of any particular age to compare to our young individuals, we can get some sense of the representativeness of the children in our sample by comparing all individuals aged 24 and aged 29 in the CCP to those in our sample of children.

¹⁶ The rate of serious default in our sample is higher than the delinquency rate because we use only data from quarter four of the year. Serious default is akin to a stock variable while delinquency is a flow variable such that an individual could enter serious default in Q2 and remain there in Q4 without our ever having observed a delinquency. See Debbaut, Ghent, and Kudlyak (2016) for additional discussion of this feature of the CCP data.

¹⁷ Unlike the rest of the variables, the following variables - an indicator of whether the child left the parents' home, the age at which she left home, the age when she got her first card, and the age at which she bought her first home – are defined over the entire 10 years in the long horizon sample rather than just ages 25-29.

¹⁸ Also, the individuals in the long horizon sample are not strictly a subsample of the individuals in the short horizon sample or vice versa. To be included in the short or long horizon sample we require the individual to have a credit record at the end of the horizon (at 24 years old for the short horizon and at 29 years old for the long horizon) and at age 19. In the appendix Table A1 presents summary statistics for an alternative definition of the short horizon sample in which the short horizon sample is a subsample of the long horizon sample.

Table 3 presents these comparisons. The children in our sample are more likely to have a credit card and be homeowners than all young adults in the CCP. However, the individuals in our sample have similar credit scores, delinquency rates, and rates of serious default to the population as a whole.

3. Intergenerational Linkages in Household Credit

This section documents key empirical facts about intergenerational linkages in household credit. We first measure the strength of the linkage between parental and child credit outcomes controlling only for cohort effects without conditioning on geographic location. We then analyze how much of the linkage across generations is explained by the household's geographic location at t_0 versus differences in parental characteristics within the location and variation over time in the labor market opportunities available to individuals in different locations. Finally, to absorb differential changes in macroeconomic conditions over time, we estimate an equation with state-cohort fixed effects.

Tables 4 through 6 show the relationship between children's outcomes and parental credit attributes – parental default, the extent of parental credit constraints, and parental credit score, respectively. For each child outcome, we estimate three different specifications. The first row for each outcome shows the coefficients from the specification with cohort effects. The second row shows the coefficients from the specification with cohort and zip code fixed effects. Finally, the third row shows the coefficients from the specification with cohort, zip code, and state-cohort fixed effects. Depending on the child's outcome, including zip code fixed effects decreases the magnitude of the coefficients on parental variables by 10 to 30 percent. The results using cohort, zip code, and state-cohort fixed effects are virtually identical to those with only cohort and zip code fixed effects. All the results in the tables are based on specifications in which the standard errors are clustered by state. Finally, Table 7 aids in the interpretation of the effects by providing a summary of the magnitude of the estimated effect in response to a one standard deviation

increase in $P_{iat_0}^C$ and $P_{iat_0}^R$ for each of the child outcome variables from the regressions with zip code fixed effects presented in Tables 4 through 6.¹⁹

3.1. Children’s Default and Bankruptcy

As can be seen in Tables 4 through 6, there exist strong intergenerational linkages between children’s likelihood of default or bankruptcy and the parental credit attributes. The linkages are found between parental credit attributes and children’s outcomes measured when children are 19-24 years old and also children’s outcomes measured at 25-29.

In particular, focusing on the results with zip code fixed effects, we observe that children of parents with stronger credit characteristics (i.e., those without a serious default, those less credit constrained, and those with higher credit scores) are less likely to experience a bankruptcy or other serious default and less likely to be delinquent. For delinquency and other serious default, the magnitude of the effect is slightly larger in the 19- to 24-year-old sample than in the 25- to 29-year-old sample. For bankruptcy, the effect of parental credit is twice as large for 25- to 29-year-olds than for 19- to 24-year-olds in part because there are relatively few bankruptcies among those under the age of 25 (see Table 2).

The magnitudes of the intergenerational credit linkages are economically substantial. For example, children of parents with a serious default are 68 percent (1.3 percentage points) more likely to experience a bankruptcy by age 24 and 46 percent (2.4 percentage points) more likely to experience a bankruptcy between ages 25 and 29. A one standard deviation increase in $P_{iat_0}^R$ is associated with a 24-35 percent decrease in the risk of bankruptcy, a 36-49 percent decrease in the risk of other serious default, and a 23-36 percent decrease in the risk of delinquency for the child (see Table 6).

3.2. Children’s Homeownership and Credit Cards

¹⁹ In Tables 4-6 we present the results from the regressions in which children’s outcomes are measured at two horizons, i.e., when the children are 19-24 years old and when the children are 25-29 years old. In Table A8 in the appendix, we present results from the regressions estimated separately for each age between 20 and 29. All results carry through.

Children's participation in credit markets is also correlated with parental credit attributes. Children of parents with good credit characteristics are more likely to become homeowners or have a credit card early in life. For example, a one standard deviation increase in $P_{iat_0}^C$ is associated with an 8 percent decrease in the probability of the child becoming a homeowner by the age of 24 and a 14 percent decrease in the probability that the child becomes a homeowner by age 29. Similarly, a one standard deviation increase in $P_{iat_0}^R$ is linked to a 12 percent increase in the probability that a child is a homeowner by age 24 and a 23 percent increase by age 29. In the regressions for homeownership presented in Tables 4 through 6, the coefficients on parental age are all negative and statistically significant indicating that children of older parents are less likely to become homeowners.

3.3. Children's Credit Risk Scores

Children of parents with a serious default have Equifax Risk Score 51 points lower at age 24 and 46 points lower at age 29 than those of parents without default. A one standard deviation increase in the extent to which parents are credit constrained is associated with a child risk score 4 percent lower at age 24 and 3 percent lower at age 29. Similarly, a one standard deviation increase in the parental risk score is associated with child risk score that is 6 percent higher at age 24 and 5 percent higher at age 29.²⁰

One might be concerned that the documented linkages in household credit could mechanically arise due to children and parents sharing cosigned credit cards. We thus re-estimate the benchmark specification in equation (1) adding an indicator for whether a child has a cosigned account in retail trade or credit card and the interaction of this indicator with the parental credit variable. We find that the documented intergenerational linkages in credit are very similar to the ones estimated in our benchmark specification. Consequently, the benchmark results on the linkages are not driven by the joint accounts.²¹

3.4. Children's Student Debt

²⁰ We also estimate the relationship between $P_{iat_0}^C$ and children's risk scores as well as between $P_{iat_0}^R$ and children's risk scores using quantile regression. The relationships are similar at the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles. These results are available from the authors upon request.

²¹ These results are in Tables A2-A4.

A key outcome for young adults is whether they attend college and, if they do, whether they accumulate debt that has consequences later in life. Our data do not indicate whether the individual attends (or attended) a college; however, it contains information on whether the individual has a student loan. If all individuals who attended college did so using a student loan, we could use our data to measure the extent to which parental credit characteristics correlate with college attendance. However, less than 40% of youth that attend college have student debt (Avery and Turner, 2012). The relationship between student debt and college attendance is thus non-monotonic. Specifically, no student debt indicates one of two very different things: Either 1) the individual does not attend college, or 2) the individual attends college but is fortunate enough to not have to take on student debt to do so. To understand the relationship between parental credit characteristics and children's student debt, it is therefore important to condition on additional information.

We use information about parental income. Our logic is that the presence of student debt has a more homogeneous meaning for kids within a parental income group. For example, existing literature documents that children from higher income groups are much more likely to attend college. Carneiro and Heckman (2002) report that, in 1998, 80% of male 18-24-year-old high school graduates from parents in the top quartile of the income distribution attended college while only 50% of those from the bottom quartile attended college. Lochner and Monge-Naranjo (2011) also report that, within all AFQT score quartiles, children from higher income backgrounds are more likely to attend college.²² Consequently, we hypothesize that, for children of higher income parents, the lack of a student loan is not a good predictor that the individual does (or did) not attend college. However, the presence of a student loan in the records of children of higher income parents is likely to indicate that the individual is forced to borrow to go to college instead of getting parental cash transfers.

We estimate our benchmark regressions by parental income quintile. For this exercise, we use a subsample of the CCP that has predicted income via CRISM as described in Section 2. Since the

²² Since high school completion rates and AFQT scores increase with parental income (Belley and Lochner, 2007) and our data do not condition on high school completion or AFQT rates, we expect the relationship to be even stronger in our data than the one estimated in the conditional data reported by Carneiro and Heckman (2002) and Lochner and Monge-Naranjo (2011).

CRISM data are available only starting in 2005, we can follow children for only 5 rather than 10 years as in the benchmark sample.

Table 8 shows that weaker parental credit conditions are associated with a greater likelihood of the child having student debt by age 24 for all income quintiles. The relationship is much stronger as parental income increases. The relationship is highly statistically significant for all five quintiles in the regression on parental credit constraints. That is, the more credit constrained the parents are, the more likely the children have a student loan. The estimates from the regression on parental default and parental credit score are qualitatively similar but not statistically significant for the lowest parental income quintile.

4. Intergenerational Linkages in Household Credit and Local Characteristics

Recent literature on intergenerational economic mobility in the U.S. finds that intergenerational mobility varies substantially across areas within the U.S. and that less residential segregation, less income inequality, and better primary schools correlate with upward mobility (Chetty, Hendren, Kline, and Saez, 2014). In this section, we use the household's location information at the time the child is 19 years old to examine what local area characteristics are correlated with the strength of the intergenerational linkages in household credit.

4.1. Local Income Levels, Income Inequality, and Racial Composition

To estimate the role of the local area characteristics in the estimated intergenerational linkages, we estimate the following specification:

$$C_{iaT} = \alpha + \beta P_{iat_0} + \gamma P_{iat_0} L_a + \delta A_{iat_0} + D_{t_0} + D_a + D_{at_0} + \varepsilon_{iaT} \quad (2)$$

where L_a is the characteristic of area a in year t_0 and $P_{iat_0} L_a$ is the interaction term between the area characteristic and the parental credit attribute.

Tables 9 and 10 contain estimates of the benchmark regressions with the local characteristic interacted with the extent of parental credit constraints and parental risk score, respectively. Following Chetty, Hendren, Kline, and Saez (2014), we consider the following area

characteristics: per capita household income for working-age adults in the county, percent of middle class in the county (i.e., the fraction of parents in the county who have family incomes between the 25th and 75th percentiles of the national parent income distribution), county Gini coefficient, county-level income segregation, and the fraction of black residents in the county.²³

For all local characteristics, we find that the coefficient on the parental credit attribute remains economically and statistically significant. In addition, the coefficients on the interaction terms between local characteristics and parental credit attributes are statistically significant. In locations with higher income, we find stronger intergenerational linkages for children’s delinquency and risk score but weaker intergenerational linkages for homeownership and the presence of a credit card.

Intergenerational credit linkages are generally weaker in cities with higher inequality as measured by the Gini coefficient. They are also often weaker in cities with high income segregation. The coefficient on the interaction on the percent middle class is often statistically insignificant but sometimes also indicates that the linkages are stronger in cities with a larger middle class, consistent with our results for the Gini coefficient. Overall, the linkages are not much stronger in cities in which a higher share of the population is black. The only case in which the interaction term between the percent of the population that is black and the parental credit attribute is consistently statistically significant is with parent risk score in the regression for child delinquency.

4.2. Intergenerational Linkages in Household Credit and Income Mobility

Finally, we examine the extent to which intergenerational linkages in household credit are driven by factors that are also associated with intergenerational income mobility. We use the MSA-level estimates of intergenerational income mobility from Chetty, Hendren, Kline, and Saez (2014), which are based on data from IRS tax records. We estimate the following specification

$$C_{iaT} = \alpha + \beta P_{iat_0} + \gamma P_{iat_0} M_a + D_{t_0} + D_a + \varepsilon_{iaT}, \quad (3)$$

²³ See Chetty, Hendren, Kline, and Saez (2014) for the calculation of county income segregation indicators.

where M_a is the income mobility measure in area a and $P_{iat_0} M_a$ is the interaction between the mobility measure and the parental attribute variable.

We estimate equation (3) for 381 MSAs and use the two measures of mobility provided by Chetty, Hendren, Kline, and Saez (2014). The first, relative mobility, is the difference in outcomes for children with the wealthiest parents from those for children with the poorest parents. A higher number indicates a greater correlation between parent and child outcomes and may thus perhaps be thought of as a measure of immobility. The second measure, absolute mobility, is the predicted rank for a child born to parents at the 25th percentile and indicates a measure of upward mobility. The results of the estimation are contained in Tables 9 and 10 with the extent of parental credit constraints and parental risk score, respectively.

We find that intergenerational linkages in household credit are stronger in cities with lower intergenerational income mobility. While our analysis does not speak to the direction of the causality between intergenerational linkages in credit and income, the results suggest that common factors drive both. This conclusion is consistent with our finding in Section 6 that family heterogeneity drives the intergenerational linkages in household credit.

5. Intergenerational Linkages in Household Credit and Educational Policies

In this section, we examine whether local policy on financial education or, more generally, better school quality affect the strength of the intergenerational linkages.

5.1. Financial Literacy, Economic Education, and Math Education

To estimate the effect of educational policies on the strength of the intergenerational linkages in household credit, we augment equation (1) with interactions between parents' credit characteristics and state-level policy variables regarding financial education. Financial education may be associated with lower intergenerational linkages in household credit by reducing the influence of family background on financial decision-making.

The schooling curriculum regarding financial literacy, economic education or mathematical education varies by state and by year. We use the state-year classification for these three

components from Brown, Grigsby, van der Klaauw, Wen, and Zafar (2016).²⁴ For each state, Brown, Grigsby, van der Klaauw, Wen, and Zafar identify years in which each state changed requirements for each of the three components. Consequently, the educational policy varies across locations (states) as well as across time (for those states that experienced the policy change during the sample period). We estimate the following specification with different measures of local educational policy

$$C_{iat} = \alpha + \beta P_{iat_0} + \chi E_{at_0} + \gamma P_{iat_0} E_{at_0} + D_{t_0} + D_a + \varepsilon_{iat}, \quad (4)$$

where, for economic and financial literacy, E_{at_0} is a dummy variable for whether a financial literacy or economic education mandate was enacted or strengthened before the individual turned 18; for math, E_{at_0} takes values of 0, 1, or 2 for no reform, one reform, or two reforms.

Tables 11 and 12 contain the results of estimating educational policy equation (4) with two alternative parental credit attributes - the extent of parental credit constraints and parental risk score, respectively, separately for each educational policy. Each row of Tables 11 and 12 shows the results from separate regressions of the children's credit outcome on the policy treatment variable described in the second column. We separately consider the effects of four educational policies – school spending per pupil, financial literacy, economic literacy, and math curriculum improvement requirements. The third column shows the coefficient on the parental credit outcome (estimated separately for 5- and for 10-year horizons), the fourth column shows the coefficient on the educational policy variable of interest, and the fifth column shows the coefficient on the interaction of the parental credit outcome and policy variable.

If economic education improves decision-making in credit markets, the expected effect of the (level of) economic education on children's bankruptcy, delinquency, and serious default, *ceteris paribus*, is negative, while the expected effect on children's homeownership, likelihood of having a credit card, and risk score is positive. In addition, economic education might weaken intergenerational linkages in household credit by mitigating the influence of household endowments. That is, under the null hypothesis, the sign on the interaction term between the

²⁴ See Table 1 in Brown, Grigsby, van der Klaauw, Wen, and Zafar (2016).

economic education measure and the parental credit attribute is opposite of the sign of the coefficient on the parental credit attribute variable.

As Tables 11 and 12 show, the estimated coefficient on the economic education measure is small in magnitude and often not statistically significant for children credit outcomes except for end-period children risk score, for which the coefficient is statistically significant and has an expected positive sign. However, since we cannot include state-year fixed effects in a regression that also includes a state-specific and time-varying measure of economic education in levels and cohort fixed effects, the coefficient on the economic education measure might capture state effects other than educational policy. We thus focus on the interaction between the educational policy variables and parental credit attributes.

In the regressions with child delinquency, homeownership, and risk score, the interaction term and parental credit attribute variable have opposite signs. This suggests that a higher level of economic education is associated with weaker intergenerational linkages in household credit. The coefficient on the interaction term is close to zero and not statistically significant only in the regressions on the credit card indicator. Importantly, the inclusion of the interaction term of the economic education measure and a parental credit attribute in equation (1) leaves the coefficient on the parental credit attribute almost unchanged.

We next proceed to analyzing the effect of financial literacy. We estimate equation (4) using the financial literacy measure from Brown et al. (2016). As Tables 11 and 12 show, the estimated coefficient on the financial literacy measure is small in magnitude and often not statistically significant. The inclusion of the interaction terms between financial literacy and parental credit attributes in equation (1) leaves the coefficient on the parental credit attribute almost unchanged and the interaction term itself is rarely statistically significant. Consequently, it appears that the changes in the state-specific measures of financial literacy requirements do not affect intergenerational linkages in household credit.

Similarly, we find no statistically significant effect of existing measures of mathematical reform on intergenerational linkages in household credit.²⁵

5.2 School Quality

Finally, we examine the effects of school quality on intergenerational linkages in credit. In particular, we estimate

$$C_{iat} = \alpha + \beta P_{iat_0} + \gamma P_{iat_0} S_a + D_{i_0} + D_a + \varepsilon_{iat}, \quad (5)$$

where S_a is the average total spending per pupil on K-12 education in student i 's state of residence. The data on state-level spending per pupil is available from the U.S. Census Bureau tables "Public Elementary-Secondary Education Finance Data" for 2001-2012. We use the earliest year available, 2001-2002. As in estimating equations (3) and (4), the first-order effect of S_a is subsumed in the zip code fixed effects.

The results of the estimation are contained in Tables 11 and 12. In general, higher levels of school spending are associated with weaker transmission of parental credit characteristics on homeownership and participation in credit card markets. However, the effect of parental credit characteristics on delinquency and risk scores is actually *stronger* in states with higher spending per pupil. As such, high-quality schooling does not seem to level the playing field.

6. What Drives the Intergenerational Linkages in Credit?

Finally, in this section we examine the factors that drive the intergenerational linkages in credit. First, we study whether the documented linkages can be entirely explained by parental income. Second, we study the role of family heterogeneity in a sample of siblings.

6.1. The Role of Parental Income

²⁵ We also re-estimate educational policy equation (4) using alternative measures of financial and economic education across states. In particular, we use the state graduation requirement variables developed by Urban and Schmeiser (2015). However, the same conclusions carry through. These results are contained in Table A5 (for the extent of parents' being credit constrained) and Table A6 (for the parents' risk score).

We first examine whether the documented intergenerational linkages in credit are present even after controlling for income. To understand the relations between parental income and the intergenerational linkages in credit that we have documented, we use the data from CRISM, which is a subsample of the CCP that contains information on predicted individual income and is available from 2005-onwards.

First, we find that income and credit characteristics are closely related (Table 13). There is a monotonic relationship between predicted income and risk scores although there remains substantial individual heterogeneity around the means. Those in the lowest quintile of income have the lowest risk scores, averaging 624. The average risk score for those in the middle quintile of income is 738 while individuals in the top quintile of income average risk scores of 781. The strong relationship between income and credit scores persists within age categories indicating that it is not simply the case that young people have both low credit scores and lower income.

We now assess to what extent the estimated intergenerational linkages in credit are capturing the role of income rather than credit characteristics per se. We re-estimate our benchmark regressions in the sample from CRISM, without and with the parental income variable. Table 14 presents the results from estimating equation (1) for various children's outcome on the parental credit score and parent income using the CRISM sample for the horizon $t_0 + 5$. We find that higher parental income is associated with a lower likelihood of bankruptcy, delinquency, and other serious default and a greater likelihood of having a credit card. Higher parental income is also associated with higher credit scores for children. Most importantly, including parental income only slightly weakens the intergenerational linkages in credit or, in the case of homeownership, actually strengthens the linkage. Adding a control for parental income to the regressions where we use parental credit constraints or parental default for measurement of intergenerational linkages in credit also has a negligible effect on the benchmark estimates of the linkages.²⁶ This result echoes the result by Charles and Hurst (2003) who find that intergenerational wealth correlations also persist controlling for income.

6.2. Family Heterogeneity: Evidence from Siblings

²⁶ These results are available from the authors upon request.

The previous section documents that individuals whose parents are more credit-constrained at the time when individuals are in their late teens are more likely to be in default and have lower risk scores in the future. What factors drive such intergenerational linkages? There are a few potential mechanisms. One possibility is that the credit conditions experienced by the parents when the child is a teenager directly affect their children's outcome. Another possibility is that the correlations are entirely due to family heterogeneity, i.e., underlying factors that drive both the credit attributes of parents and the future credit outcomes of children. The two mechanisms are not mutually exclusive.

To better understand these alternatives, consider, for example, the case under which all individuals are homogeneous in terms of their preferences and endowments and are subject to similar shocks. Under this scenario, less credit-constrained parents have the means to invest more in their children's human capital or, more generally, are able to provide better insurance against shocks. As a result, children of less credit constrained parents are also less credit constrained, fare better when faced with negative shocks, and their measurable credit market outcomes are better – they have higher risk scores and lower default rates. Under such a scenario, the documented intergenerational linkages are caused by parental credit characteristics.

Alternatively, consider the scenario wherein there is no causal effect of parental credit on the children's credit market outcomes. Instead, households differ in their preferences and/or endowments such that measurable credit market characteristics – risk scores, default rates, delinquency rates, homeownership rates – differ systematically across households. That is, children of parents with high risk scores tend to also have higher risk score, children of less credit-constrained parents tend to be less credit constrained, and children from households where parents default less tend to also default less. However, higher parent risk score does not contribute to higher children's risk score and parents being less credit-constrained does not directly cause less credit-constrained children. Instead, the linkage arises due to, for example, some common saving and consumption habits passed from generation to generation or some other common factor. Under such a scenario, the documented intergenerational linkages are a result of family heterogeneity rather than being caused by parental credit market behavior or opportunities. Similarly, parental disadvantages in early childhood may manifest themselves as worse parental credit characteristics at the time the child is age 19.

The identification of which of the two scenarios better describes the estimated intergenerational linkages requires observations on more than one child-parent pair from the same household with some variability in the measured parents' credit characteristics in the pairs from the same household. We obtain such observations by constructing a sample of siblings. Using the sample of siblings, we estimate the following specification

$$C_{iaT} - \bar{C}_{iaT} = \alpha + \beta(P_{iat_0} - \bar{P}_{iaT}) + \delta(A_{iat_0} - \bar{A}_{iaT}) + D_{t_0} + D_a + D_{at_0} + \varepsilon_{iaT}, \quad (7)$$

where \bar{C}_{iaT} is the average outcome of all children in the household that child i is associated with at age 19, and \bar{P}_{iaT} is the average outcome of the parents at the time the children in the household are 19 years old. All other variable definitions are as described after equation (1).

The specification in equation (7) controls for the family fixed effect. Thus, any correlation between the difference in child i 's outcome and the average outcome of all children in the household, $(C_{iaT} - \bar{C}_{iaT})$, and $(P_{iat_0} - \bar{P}_{iaT})$ is the causal effect of the parental attribute on the child's outcome.

In our analysis, the parental characteristics are measured as transitory changes in parental credit conditions late in childhood. Since we can only see children in our data starting at the age 18-19, the identifying assumption in equation (7) is then that parental credit conditions have more influence on the child at age 19 than later in life. This is plausible as age 19 is a crucial age for educational investment relative to older years and older children are typically more financially independent from their parents. Another important consideration for identification in equation (7) is how much variability is in the data in parental credit characteristics across siblings. To get a sample of siblings in which there is more heterogeneity across kids, we thus also consider a subsample of our data in which the extent to which the parent is credit constrained differs significantly between two siblings. We choose to focus on siblings for which the variation in our measure of parental credit constraints is at least 0.32. The 0.32 threshold is the same as the overall standard deviation of parent credit constrained in our full parent sample (see Table 1).

Table 15 contains the results from estimating the intergenerational linkages in the sample of siblings with controls for household-level fixed effects. To construct the household-level fixed effect, we estimate the specifications with continuous parental variables only – parental risk

score and the extent of parental credit constraints. Panel A shows the results when we include all siblings. In panel B, we confine the sample to the set of households for which parent credit constraints differ by at least 0.32 across siblings. The limitation of this sample is that this restriction reduces our sample of siblings to only about 20% of our full sample of siblings.

Column 1 shows the estimates of equation (1) for the sample of siblings. We confirm that the benchmark results on intergenerational linkages described in Section 3 are present in the sample of siblings. Column 2 shows the results from estimating equation (2). When we control for family heterogeneity in the full sample of siblings, the estimated coefficient on the parental credit attribute, either parental risk score or parental credit constraint, is close to zero and not statistically significant across all child credit outcomes that we consider.

When we do not control for family heterogeneity in the subsample of siblings for which parental credit conditions change significantly across kids, the coefficients are slightly smaller when the parental credit variable is the risk score. When we control for family heterogeneity, however, the coefficients on parent risk score becomes small, statistically insignificant, and switches signs for two of our two child outcome measures. When the parental credit variable is credit constrained, the results of this test are inconclusive because the coefficients are statistically insignificant and much smaller than the coefficients from the full sample even when we do not control for family heterogeneity, likely due to the smaller sample.

Overall, the estimates reject the existence of linkages beyond family fixed effects. That is, the results suggest that the documented intergenerational linkages in household credit cannot be attributed to a causal link between parental credit conditions when the child is a teenager and future children credit outcomes. The same conclusion holds in the regressions without controls for zip code fixed effects (these results available upon request).

Table 16 repeats our student loan analysis in the sample of siblings for which we have CRISM data on predicted parental income. Because of the small sample size, we include state rather than zip code fixed effects in these specifications. In the specification in which we include family fixed effects, we see once again that parental credit conditions at the time the child is age 19 are not generally statistically significant predictors of whether a child has a student loan by age 24.

7. Conclusions

We document the existence and quantify the extent of intergenerational linkages in household credit – the slope of the linear relationship between children’s future credit outcomes and their parents’ credit risk scores, default, and the extent of credit constraints at the time when the children are in their late teens. The linkages persist even after controlling for zip code fixed effects, and more importantly, parental income. Using U.S. state variation in educational policies, we find that educational policy has a limited influence on the strength of the linkages.

The results from a sample of siblings suggest that these linkages are to a large extent a result of family heterogeneity rather than parental credit market conditions when the child is a teenager directly affecting the credit outcomes of children as adults. The results are encouraging as they indicate that credit market frictions for parents are not so severe that transitory shocks in their children’s late adolescence affect their children’s future outcomes. Rather, the effect parents have on their children’s outcomes arise due to, for example, (1) intergenerational transmission of preferences, or (2) disadvantages that parents face early in their children’s lives that are likely correlated with parental credit market conditions later in life. These disadvantages likely affect kids’ credit market conditions later in life consistent with the effect of parental income early in children’s lives on health outcomes (see Case, Lubotsky, and Paxson, 2002).

Our results indicate that any disadvantages children face from family endowments that manifest themselves in adverse credit market outcomes might be hard to overcome with conventional educational policies. Our work is the first study to document the intergenerational linkages in credit. In light of economically large and statistically significant documented linkages, our work invites further studies of the sources of the linkages. Finally, our results support the conclusions of DeNeve and Fowler (2014) that economists should consider the welfare consequences of lenders having the ability to use genetic information.

References

- Aaronson, Daniel, and Bhashkar Mazumder. 2008. Intergenerational Economic Mobility in the US: 1940 to 2000. *Journal of Human Resources* 43(1): 139-172.
- Avery, Christopher and Sarah Turner. 2012. Student Loans: Do College Students Borrow Too Much – Or Not Enough? *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 26(1): 165-92.
- Barnea, Amir, Henrik Cronqvist, and Stephan Siegel. 2010. Nature or Nurture: What Determines Investor Behavior? *Journal of Financial Economics* 98: 583-604.
- Belley, Philippe and Lance Lochner. 2007. The Changing Role of Family Income and Ability in Determining Educational Achievement. *Journal of Human Capital* 1(1): 37-89.
- Brown, Meta, John Grigsby, Wilbert van der Klaauw, Jaya Wen, and Basit Zafar. 2016. Financial Education and the Debt Behavior of the Young. *Review of Financial Studies* 29(9): 2490-2522.
- Bouchard Jr., Thomas J., and Matt McGue. 2003. Genetic and Environmental Influences on Human Psychological Differences. *Journal of Neurobiology*, Vol. 54(1): 4-45.
- Bulman, George, Robert Fairlie, Sarena Goodman, and Adam Isen. 2016. Parental Resources and College Attendance: Evidence from Lottery Wins. Working Paper, University of California-Santa Cruz.
- Carneiro, Pedro and James J. Heckman. 2002. The Evidence on Credit Constraints in Post-Secondary Schooling. *The Economic Journal* 112(October): 989-1018.
- Case, Anne, Darren Lubotsky, and Christina Paxson. 2002. Economic Status and Health in Childhood: The Origins of the Gradient. *American Economic Review* 92(5): 1308-34.
- Cesarini, David, Christopher T. Dawes, Magnus Johannesson, Paul Lichtenstein, and Bjorn Wallace. 2009. Genetic Variation in Preferences for Giving and Risk Taking. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124(2): 809-42.
- Cesarini, David, Magnus Johannesson, Paul Lichtenstein, Orjan Sandewall, and Bjorn Wallace. 2010. Genetic Variation in Financial Decision-Making. *Journal of Finance* 65(5): 1725-54.
- Cesarini, David, Erik Lindqvist, Robert Ostling, and Bjorn Wallace. 2016. Wealth, Health, and Child Development: Evidence from Administrative Data on Swedish Lottery Players. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 131(2): 687-738.
- Chadwick, Laura and Gary Solon. 2002. Intergenerational Income Mobility among Daughters. *American Economic Review* 92(1): 335-44.
- Charles, Kerwin Kofi and Erik Hurst. 2003. The Correlation of Wealth across Generations. *Journal of Political Economy* 111(6): 1155-82.

- Charles, Kerwin Kofi, Sheldon Danziger, Geng Li, and Robert Schoeni. 2014. The Intergenerational Correlation of Consumption Expenditures. *American Economic Review* 104(5): 136-40.
- Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, and Emmanuel Saez. 2014. Where is the Land of Opportunity? The Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129(4): 1553-1623.
- Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, Emmanuel Saez, and Nicholas Turner. 2014. Is the United States Still a Land of Opportunity? Recent Trends in Intergenerational Mobility. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 104(5): 141-7.
- Clark, Gregory. 2015. *The Son Also Rises: Surnames and the History of Social Mobility. The Princeton Economic History of the Western World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cooper, Daniel, and Luengo-Prado, María José. 2015. House Price Growth when Children are Teenagers: A Path to Higher Intergenerational Achievement? *Journal of Urban Economics* 86: 54-72.
- Corak, Miles. 2013. Income Inequality, Equality of Opportunity, and Intergenerational Mobility. *Journal of Economic Perspective* 27(3): 79-102.
- Cox, Donald. 1990. Intergenerational Transfers and Liquidity Constraints, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 105(1): 187-217.
- Dahl, Gordon, Andreas Ravndal Kostøl, and Magne Mogstad. 2014. Family Welfare Cultures. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129(4): 1711-1752.
- Debbaut, Peter, Andra C. Ghent, and Marianna Kudlyak. 2016. The Card Act and Young Borrowers: The Effects and the Affected. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 48(7): 1495-1513.
- De Neve, Jan-Emmanuel, and James H. Fowler. 2014. Credit Card Borrowing and the Monoamine Oxidase A (MAOA) Gene. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, Vol. 107 (Part B): 428-439.
- Dettling, Lisa J., and Joanne W. Hsu. 2014. Returning to the Nest: Debt and Parental Co-Residence Among Young Adults. *Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2014-80.* Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (U.S.).
- Dohmen, Thomas, Armin Falk, David Huffman, and Uwe Sunde. 2012. The Intergenerational Transmission of Risk and Trust Attitudes. *Review of Economic Studies* 79: 645-77.
- Fagereng, Andreas, Luigi Guiso, Davide Malacrino, and Luigi Pistaferri. 2016. Heterogeneity and Persistence in Returns to Wealth. Working Paper, Stanford University http://web.stanford.edu/~pista/FGMP_submission_econometrica.pdf
- Fagereng, Andreas, Magne Mogstad, and Marte Ronning. 2015. Why do Wealthy Parents have Wealthy Children? Working Paper, University of Chicago.

- Hilger, Nathaniel G. 2016. Parental Job Loss and Children's Long-Term Outcomes: Evidence from 7 Million Fathers' Layoffs. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 8(3): 247-283.
- Keane, Michael P., and Kenneth I. Wolpin. 2001. The Effect of Parental Transfers and Borrowing Constraints on Educational Attainment. *International Economic Review* 42(4): 1051-1103.
- Kuhnen, Camelia M. and Joan Y. Chiao. 2009. Genetic Determinants of Financial Risk Taking. *PLoS ONE* 4(2).
- Lee, Chul-In and Gary Solon. 2009. Trends in Intergenerational Mobility. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 91(4): 766-72.
- Lee, Donghoon and Wilbert van der Klaauw. 2010. An Introduction the FRBNY Consumer Credit Panel. Federal Reserve Bank of New York Staff Report No. 479.
- Lee, Jennifer J.. 2008. The First Civil Rights Act of the 21st Century: Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008. *A Journal of Law and Policy for the Information Society* 4(3): 779-802.
- Lochner, Lance J. and Alexander Monge-Naranjo. 2011. The Nature of Credit Constraints and Human Capital. *American Economic Review* 101: 2487-2529.
- Lovenheim, Michael. 2011. The Effect of Liquid Housing Wealth on College Enrollment. *Journal of Labor Economics* 29(4): 741 – 771.
- Lusardi, Annamaria, Olivia S. Mitchell, and Vilsa Curto. 2010. Financial Literacy among the Young. *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 44(2): 358-80.
- McGue, Thomas J. Jr., and Bouchard Jr., Thomas J. 1998. Genetic and Environmental Influences on Human Behavioral Differences. *Annual Review of Neuroscience* Vol. 21(1): 1–24.
- Olivetti, Claudia and M. Daniele Paserman. 2015. In the Name of the Son (and the Daughter): Intergenerational Mobility in the United States, 1850-1940. *American Economic Review* 105(8): 2695-724.
- Olivetti, Claudia, M. Daniele Paserman, and Laura Salisbury. 2015. Three-generation Mobility in the United States, 1850-1940: The Role of Maternal and Paternal Grandparents. Working Paper, Boston University.
- Oreopoulos, Philip, Marianne Page, and Ann Huff Stevens. 2008. The Intergenerational Effects of Worker Displacement. *Journal of Labor Economics* 26(3): 455-483.
- Solon, Gary. 1992. Intergenerational Mobility in the United States. *American Economic Review* 82(3): 393-408.
- Solon, Gary. 1999. Intergenerational Mobility in the Labor Market. In O. Ashenfelter and D. Card, eds., *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Vol. 3, Elsevier: 1761-1800.

Urban, Carly and Maximilian Schmeiser. 2015. Historical Graduation Requirements in High School Curricula: Personal Finance and Economics. Manuscript, accessed at <http://www.montana.edu/urban/research.html> on 10/01/2015.

Vosters, Kelly N., and Martin Nybom. Forthcoming. Intergenerational Persistence in Latent Socioeconomic Status: Evidence from Sweden. *The Journal of Labor Economics*.

Waldkirch, Andreas, Serena Ng, and Donald Cox. 2004. Intergenerational Linkages in Consumption Behavior. *Journal of Human Resources* 39(2): 355-81.

Zhong, Songfa, Salomon Israel, Hong Xue, Richard P. Ebstein, and Soo Hong Chew. 2009. Monoamine Oxidase A Gene (MAOA) Associated with Attitude Towards Longshot Risks. *PLoS ONE* 4(12).

Zumbuehl, Maria, Thomas Dohmen, and Gerard Pfann. 2013. Parental Investment and the Intergenerational Transmission of Economic Preferences and Attitudes. Working Paper, Maastricht University.

Table 1: Parent Summary Statistics

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	25th %	Median	75th %	Max	Obs.	Mean (SCF)
<i>Panel A: Parents of 19 year olds that can be followed to age 24</i>									
Parent Homeowner	0.56	0.50	0	0	1	1	1	862,835	0.64
Parent Bankrupt	0.08	0.27	0	0	0	0	1	862,835	0.08
Parent Serious Default	0.18	0.38	0	0	0	0	1	862,835	
Parent Delinquency	0.08	0.26	0	0	0	0	1	862,835	
Parent Credit Constrained	0.33	0.32	0	0.04	0.20	0.58	1	693,210	
Parent Equifax Risk Score	686.2	104.2	293	617	712	772	842	831,885	
Parent Age	48.4	8.6	34	43	47	52	102	862,835	45.2
Parent Single	0.20	0.40	0	0	0	0	1	862,835	0.30
Total Number in Household	2.8	0.4	2	3	3	3	5	862,835	3.0
<i>Panel B: Parents of 19-year-olds that can be followed to age 29</i>									
Parent Homeowner	0.55	0.50	0	0	1	1	1	682,324	0.64
Parent Bankrupt	0.08	0.27	0	0	0	0	1	682,324	0.08
Parent Serious Default	0.18	0.39	0	0	0	0	1	682,324	
Parent Delinquency	0.08	0.27	0	0	0	0	1	682,324	
Parent Credit Constrained	0.33	0.32	0	0.04	0.20	0.58	1	547,274	
Parent Equifax Risk Score	685.1	104.1	293	616	710	771	842	657,547	
Parent Age	48.4	8.7	34	43	47	52	102	682,324	45.2
Parent Single	0.22	0.41	0	0	0	0	1	682,324	0.30
Total Number in Household	2.8	0.4	2	3	3	3	5	682,324	3.0

Notes: 1) Authors' calculations using the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset and the Survey of Consumer Finance (SCF). 2) The table contains statistics of parents of 19-year-olds at time t0 (1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003). If an individual has two parents, an observation for each parent is included. 3) Mean (SCF) is the average for adults aged 34+ with one child aged 18+. 4) Mean (SCF) for Total Number in Household is the number of individuals in the household aged 18+. 5) Parent Credit Constrained is the credit balance as a percentage of credit limit available for use. 6) See appendix for additional details on variable construction.

Table 2: Child Summary Statistics

	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	25 th %	Median	75 th %	Max	Obs.
<i>Panel A: Between t0 and t0+5 (Ages 19-24)</i>								
Child Household Formation	0.50	0.50	0	0	0	1	1	523,980
Child Household Formation First Age	21.6	1.5	20	20	21	23	24	259,782
Child Has Credit Card	0.70	0.46	0	0	1	1	1	523,980
Child Has Credit Card First Age	19.8	1.6	15	19	19	20	24	440,434
Child Homeowner	0.09	0.28	0	0	0	0	1	523,980
Child Homeowner First Age	22.5	1.6	15	22	23	24	24	54,123
Child Bankrupt	0.018	0.134	0	0	0	0	1	523,980
Child Foreclosure	0.006	0.080	0	0	0	0	1	523,980
Child Other Serious Default	0.23	0.42	0	0	0	0	1	459,957
Child Delinquency	0.07	0.26	0	0	0	0	1	459,957
Child Risk Score Average	632.1	78.0	312	567	647.7	697.3	829	511,811
Child Risk Score End	635.7	98.45	288	563	648	721	834	504,753
Child Credit Constrained	0.386	0.343	0	0.059	0.298	0.692	1	346,934
<i>Panel B: Between t0+6 and t0+10 (Ages 25-29)</i>								
Child Household Formation	0.74	0.44	0	0	1	1	1	417,705
Child Household Formation First Age	22.9	2.7	20	20	22	25	29	309,428
Child Has Credit Card	0.66	0.48	0	0	1	1	1	417,705
Child Has Credit Card First Age	20.2	2.4	15	19	19	21	29	377,368
Child Homeowner	0.24	0.42	0	0	0	0	1	417,705
Child Homeowner First Age	25.2	2.6	15	23	25	27	29	123,488
Child Bankrupt	0.051	0.219	0	0	0	0	1	417,705
Child Foreclosure	0.019	0.136	0	0	0	0	1	417,705
Child Other Serious Default	0.22	0.41	0	0	0	0	1	360,164
Child Delinquency	0.06	0.24	0	0	0	0	1	360,164
Child Risk Score Average	644.1	94.7	312	565	645	732.4	833	411,339
Child Risk Score End	654.2	102.9	310	578	661	746	838	399,483
Child Credit Constrained	0.591	0.345	0	0.263	0.669	0.925	1	332,024

Notes: The individuals in Panel A are a subsample of the individuals for whom we have an observation at 19 and at 24 years of age. The individuals in Panel B are a subsample of the individuals for whom we have an observation at 19 and at 29 years of age. The sample in Panel B is not necessarily a subsample of the sample in Panel A or vice versa. See Table A1 for the summary statistics for individuals at 24 years old who are the subsample of the sample in Panel B.

Table 3: Representativeness of Sample of Children

	Age 24		Age 29	
	Sample	Full CCP	Sample	Full CCP
Child Has Credit Card	0.70	0.56	0.66	0.55
Child Homeowner	0.09	0.07	0.24	0.18
Child Bankrupt	0.018	0.015	0.051	0.038
Child Other Serious Default	0.23	0.24	0.22	0.24
Child Delinquency	0.071	0.074	0.062	0.061
Child Equifax Risk Score	636	625	654	644
Child Has Student Loan	0.54	0.53	0.49	0.41
Child Credit Constrained	0.39	0.41	0.39	0.40

Notes: 1) Authors' calculations using the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset. 2) The Full CCP refers to all individuals of the age indicated in the dataset while "Sample" refers to only those individuals that we use in our analysis. 3) The sample selection is based on the ability to match the children with their parents at age 19.

Table 4: Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Default

Child Outcome	Coef. On Parent Serious Default		Coef. On Parent Age		Fixed effects controls			R ²	
	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	State-Cohort	5-Year	10-Year
Bankruptcy	0.014***	0.028***	-0.022	-0.21***	Yes	No	No	0.5%	0.6%
	0.013***	0.024***	0.050	-0.0088	Yes	Yes	No	6.8%	8.8%
	0.013***	0.024***	0.050	-0.0066	Yes	Yes	Yes	6.9%	8.9%
Delinquency	0.14***	0.079***	-0.98***	-0.71***	Yes	No	No	2.1%	1.1%
	0.11***	0.057***	-0.72***	-0.49***	Yes	Yes	No	9.2%	9.0%
	0.11***	0.057***	-0.72***	-0.49***	Yes	Yes	Yes	9.3%	9.1%
Homeowner	-0.022***	-0.11***	-0.82***	-1.7***	Yes	No	No	0.2%	1.4%
	-0.017***	-0.085***	-0.35***	-0.97***	Yes	Yes	No	8.1%	11.0%
	-0.017***	-0.085***	-0.35***	-0.97***	Yes	Yes	Yes	8.1%	11.0%
Other Serious Default (Ex. Foreclos. and Bankruptcy)	0.30***	0.24***	-1.1***	-1.3***	Yes	No	No	7.3%	4.9%
	0.23***	0.18***	-0.87***	-0.98***	Yes	Yes	No	18.0%	16.0%
	0.23***	0.18***	-0.87***	-0.98***	Yes	Yes	Yes	18.0%	17.0%
Average Equifax Risk Score	-64.5***	-62.7***	0.31***	0.34***	Yes	No	No	13.0%	8.4%
	-50.2***	-46.9***	0.23***	0.25***	Yes	Yes	No	27.0%	23.0%
	-50.2***	-46.9***	0.23***	0.25***	Yes	Yes	Yes	27.0%	23.0%
Date T Equifax Risk Score	-67.3***	-62.3***	0.42***	0.33***	Yes	No	No	8.7%	6.9%
	-51.4***	-46.2***	0.31***	0.24***	Yes	Yes	No	21.0%	21.0%
	-51.4***	-46.2***	0.31***	0.24***	Yes	Yes	Yes	21.0%	21.0%
Has Credit Card	-0.094***	-0.14***	0.39***	0.42**	Yes	No	No	1.2%	2.3%
	-0.065***	-0.099***	0.14**	0.14	Yes	Yes	No	11.0%	13.0%
	-0.065***	-0.099***	0.14**	0.14	Yes	Yes	Yes	11.0%	13.0%

Notes: 1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset. 2) Each row of the table presents results from two regressions of child outcome variable on the indicated parental variables and fixed effects. 3) The coefficients on Parental Age for the Child Outcomes of Bankruptcy, Delinquency, Homeownership, Other Serious Default, and Has Credit Card are multiplied by 1000.

Table 5: Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Credit Constraints

Child Outcome	Coef. On Parent Credit Constrained		Coef. On Parent Age		Fixed effects controls			R ²	
	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	State-Cohort	5-Year	10-Year
Bankruptcy	0.016***	0.034***	-0.0027	-0.22**	Yes	No	No	0%	1%
	0.014***	0.028***	0.063*	-0.017	Yes	Yes	No	8%	10%
	0.014***	0.028***	0.062*	-0.014	Yes	Yes	Yes	8%	10%
Delinquency	0.20***	0.13***	-0.56***	-0.42**	Yes	No	No	3%	2%
	0.17***	0.11***	-0.38**	-0.24*	Yes	Yes	No	10%	10%
	0.17***	0.11***	-0.38**	-0.24*	Yes	Yes	Yes	11%	10%
Homeowner	-0.025***	-0.14***	-1.4***	-3.0***	Yes	No	No	0%	2%
	-0.025***	-0.12***	-0.76***	-2.0***	Yes	Yes	No	9%	11%
	-0.025***	-0.12***	-0.76***	-2.0***	Yes	Yes	Yes	9%	12%
Other Serious Default (Ex. Foreclos. and Bankruptcy)	0.33***	0.30***	-0.0027	-0.33	Yes	No	No	6%	5%
	0.26***	0.24***	0.015	-0.20	Yes	Yes	No	17%	17%
	0.26***	0.24***	0.015	-0.19	Yes	Yes	Yes	17%	17%
Average Equifax Risk Score	-79.6***	-85.2***	0.055	0.052	Yes	No	No	13%	10%
	-65.2***	-69.0***	0.011	0.0085	Yes	Yes	No	27%	23%
	-65.2***	-69.0***	0.012	0.0075	Yes	Yes	Yes	27%	23%
Date T Equifax Risk Score	-87.7****	-83.8****	0.14**	0.036	Yes	No	No	10%	8%
	-71.4***	-67.4***	0.079**	-0.0092	Yes	Yes	No	21%	21%
	-71.4***	-67.4***	0.078**	-0.0094	Yes	Yes	Yes	21%	21%
Has Credit Card	-0.095***	-0.14***	-0.39**	-0.40*	Yes	No	No	1%	2%
	-0.070***	-0.11***	-0.54***	-0.54***	Yes	Yes	No	10%	12%
	-0.069***	-0.11***	-0.53***	-0.54***	Yes	Yes	Yes	11%	13%

Notes: 1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset. 2) Each row in the table presents results from two regressions for child outcome variable on the indicated parental variables and fixed effects. 3) The coefficients on Parental Age for the Child Outcomes of Bankruptcy, Delinquency, Homeownership, Other Serious Default, and Has Credit Card are multiplied by 1000.

Table 6: Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Equifax Risk Score

Child Outcome	Coef. On Parent Equifax Risk Score		Coef. On Parent Age		Fixed effects controls			R ²	
	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	State-Cohort	5-Year	10-Year
Bankruptcy	-0.071***	-0.14***	0.052	-0.085	Yes	No	No	1%	1%
	-0.064***	-0.12***	0.12***	0.092	Yes	Yes	No	7%	9%
	-0.064***	-0.12***	0.12***	0.095	Yes	Yes	Yes	7%	9%
Delinquency	-0.97***	-0.57***	0.47***	0.15	Yes	No	No	5%	2%
	-0.86***	-0.46***	0.52***	0.18	Yes	Yes	No	12%	10%
	-0.86***	-0.46***	0.52***	0.18	Yes	Yes	Yes	12%	10%
Homeowner	0.12***	0.69***	-1.1***	-3.0***	Yes	No	No	0%	3%
	0.12***	0.62***	-0.63***	-2.1***	Yes	Yes	No	8%	12%
	0.12***	0.62***	-0.63***	-2.1***	Yes	Yes	Yes	8%	12%
Other Serious Default (Ex. Foreclos. and Bankruptcy)	-1.9***	-1.6***	1.7***	1.1***	Yes	No	No	16%	11%
	-1.6***	-1.3***	1.4***	0.88***	Yes	Yes	No	23%	20%
	-1.6***	-1.3***	1.4***	0.88***	Yes	Yes	Yes	23%	20%
Average Equifax Risk Score	0.42***	0.42***	-0.32***	-0.31***	Yes	No	No	30%	21%
	0.36***	0.35***	-0.29***	-0.27***	Yes	Yes	No	38%	30%
	0.36***	0.35***	-0.29***	-0.27***	Yes	Yes	Yes	38%	30%
Date T Equifax Risk Score	0.45***	0.42***	-0.26***	-0.32***	Yes	No	No	21%	17%
	0.38***	0.34***	-0.24***	-0.27***	Yes	Yes	No	29%	26%
	0.38***	0.34***	-0.24***	-0.27***	Yes	Yes	Yes	29%	26%
Has Credit Card	0.66***	0.93***	-0.72***	-1.1***	Yes	No	No	3%	6%
	0.50***	0.73***	-0.70***	-0.99***	Yes	Yes	No	12%	15%
	0.50***	0.73***	-0.69***	-0.99***	Yes	Yes	Yes	12%	15%

Notes: 1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset. 2) Each row of the table presents results from two regressions for the indicated child outcome variable on the indicated parental variables and fixed effects. 3) The coefficients on Parental Age for the Child Outcomes of Bankruptcy, Delinquency, Homeowner rate, Other Serious Default and Has Credit Card are multiplied by 1000. 4) The coefficients on Parental Equifax Risk Score for the Child Outcomes of Bankruptcy, Delinquency, Homeownership, Other Serious Default, and Has Credit Card are multiplied by 1000.

Table 7: Economic Effect of One Standard Deviation Increase in Parental Credit Attributes on Child Credit Outcomes

Child Outcome	Parent Credit Constrained				Parent Equifax Risk Score			
	5-Year Horizon		10-Year Horizon		5-Year Horizon		10-Year Horizon	
	Level	Percent of mean	Level	Percent of mean	Level	Percent of mean	Level	Percent of mean
Bankruptcy	0.004	24%	0.009	17%	-0.007	-35%	-0.012	-24%
Delinquency	0.055	22%	0.035	17%	-0.090	-36%	-0.048	-23%
Homeowner	-0.008	-8%	-0.039	-14%	0.013	12%	0.065	23%
Other Serious Default (Ex. Foreclosure and Bankruptcy)	0.083	25%	0.077	20%	-0.167	-49%	-0.135	-36%
Average Equifax Risk Score	-20.9	-3%	-22.2	-3%	37.5	6%	36.4	6%
End-of-period Equifax Risk Score	-22.9	-4%	-21.7	-3%	39.6	6%	35.4	6%
Has Credit Card	-0.022	-3%	-0.035	-4%	0.052	6%	0.076	9%

Notes: 1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset. 2) The table presents results from OLS estimation with zip code fixed effects from Tables 3-5.

Table 8: Parental Credit Characteristics and Presence of Student Loans for Child Within 5 Years

Panel A: Parental Credit Constrained

Child Outcome	Parental Income Quintile	Coef. On Parent Credit Constrained	Fixed effects controls		R ²
			Cohort	Zip Code	
Student Loan	Lowest	0.037***	Yes	Yes	7.1%
	2	0.076***	Yes	Yes	8.6%
	3	0.087***	Yes	Yes	8.9%
	4	0.13***	Yes	Yes	11.0%
	Highest	0.21***	Yes	Yes	11.0%

Panel B: Parental Default

Child Outcome	Parental Income Quintile	Coef. On Parent Default	Fixed effects controls		R ²
			Cohort	Zip Code	
Student Loan	Lowest	0.72	Yes	Yes	6.9%
	2	6.8	Yes	Yes	8.2%
	3	18*	Yes	Yes	8.5%
	4	28***	Yes	Yes	10.0%
	Highest	91***	Yes	Yes	10.0%

Panel C: Parental Equifax Risk Score

Child Outcome	Parental Income Quintile	Coef. On Parent Equifax Risk Score	Fixed effects controls		R ²
			Cohort	Zip Code	
Student Loan	Lowest	0.02	Yes	Yes	6.9%
	2	-0.14***	Yes	Yes	8.3%
	3	-0.29***	Yes	Yes	8.7%
	4	-0.50***	Yes	Yes	11.0%
	Highest	-1.3***	Yes	Yes	12.0%

Notes: 1) Sample of parents in 2005-2008 rather than benchmark sample of parents from 1999-2003. 2) Parental income quintiles are formed based on predicted parental income from CRISM sample. 3) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax and Equifax Credit Risk Insight Servicing McDash (CRISM). 4) The coefficients on Parental Default and Parental Equifax Risk Score are multiplied by 1000.

Table 9: Geographic Variables and Strength of Intergenerational Linkages between Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Credit Constraints

Child Outcome	Covariate Specification	Coef. On Parent Constrained		Coef. On (Parent Constrained) * Geographical Variable		Other Controls		
		5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	Parent Age
Delinquency	None (Benchmk)	0.20***	0.13***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	HH Inc. per Capita	0.15***	0.066***	0.48	1.0***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Middle Class	0.16***	0.100***	0.011	0.012	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Gini	0.20***	0.13***	-0.073***	-0.064***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Inc. Segregation	0.18***	0.11***	-0.15*	-0.088	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Black	0.17***	0.11***	-0.00099	-0.031	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Rel. Immobility	0.11***	0.071***	0.17***	0.10**	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Abs. Mobility	0.19***	0.095**	-0.44	0.26	Yes	Yes	Yes
Homeowner	None (Benchmk)	-0.025***	-0.14***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	HH Inc. per Capita	-0.066***	-0.18***	1.0***	1.3***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Middle Class	0.028*	-0.03	-0.11***	-0.19***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Gini	-0.041***	-0.17***	0.037	0.11***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Inc. Segregation	-0.042***	-0.15***	0.23***	0.43***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Black	-0.021***	-0.12***	-0.034*	-0.016	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Rel. Immobility	0.016	-0.029	-0.12**	-0.26***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Abs. Mobility	-0.14***	-0.30***	2.8***	4.5***	Yes	Yes	Yes
Date T Equifax Risk Score	None (Benchmk)	-87.7****	-83.8***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	HH Inc. per Capita	-65.3***	-60.2***	-150***	-180*	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Middle Class	-75.9***	-69.4***	9.17	4.04	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Gini	-75.1***	-72.0***	8.37	10.3	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Inc. Segregation	-73.0***	-69.4***	20.3	26.2	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Black	-69.9***	-65.8***	-13.0**	-13.9*	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Rel. Immobility	-44.9***	-38.3***	-78.0***	-85.5***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Abs. Mobility	-85.3***	-87.8***	340	510	Yes	Yes	Yes
Has Credit Card	None (Benchmk)	-0.095***	-0.14***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	HH Inc. per Capita	-0.11***	-0.18***	1.1***	1.8***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Middle Class	-0.040*	-0.062***	-0.06	-0.092**	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Gini	-0.076***	-0.091***	0.013	-0.039	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Inc. Segregation	-0.084***	-0.12***	0.18***	0.17***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Black	-0.071***	-0.10***	0.012	-0.055**	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Rel. Immobility	-0.041**	-0.065***	-0.080*	-0.12***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Abs. Mobility	-0.18***	-0.23***	2.6***	3.0***	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: (1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset and other data sources as described in the text. (2) The coefficients on Coef. On (Parent Constrained) * Geographical Variable for HH Inc. per Capita are multiplied by 100,000. (3) The coefficients on Coef. On (Parent Constrained) * Geographical Variable for Abs. Mobility are multiplied by 1000.

Table 10: Geographic Variables and Strength of Intergenerational Linkages between Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Equifax Risk Score

Child Outcome	Covariate Specification	Coef. On Parent Equifax Risk Score		Coef. On (Parent Equifax Risk Score) * Geographical Variable		Other Controls		
		5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	Parent Age
Delinquency	None (Benchmk)	-0.86***	-0.46***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	HH Inc. per Capita	-0.62***	-0.21***	-6.2e-06***	-6.5e-06***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Middle Class	-0.87***	-0.51***	0.015	0.085	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Gini	-1.1***	-0.61***	0.49***	0.33***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Inc. Segregation	-0.91***	-0.48***	0.55***	0.26	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Black	-0.90***	-0.50***	0.30***	0.26***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Rel. Immobility	-0.75***	-0.44***	-0.32*	-0.07	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Abs. Mobility	-0.55***	-0.026	-0.0075*	-0.011***	Yes	Yes	Yes
Homeownership	None (Benchmk)	0.12***	0.62***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	HH Inc. per Capita	0.36***	0.93***	-6.0e-06***	-7.8e-06***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Middle Class	-0.17**	0.065	0.58***	1.1***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Gini	0.21***	0.94***	-0.19*	-0.71***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Inc. Segregation	0.21***	0.81***	-1.2***	-2.5***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Black	0.11***	0.63***	0.1	-0.1	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Rel. Immobility	-0.11*	0.11	0.66***	1.4***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Abs. Mobility	0.75***	1.5***	-0.016***	-0.022**	Yes	Yes	Yes
Date T Equifax Risk Score	None (Benchmk)	380***	340***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	HH Inc. per Capita	200***	300***	0.0014***	0.0012***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Middle Class	390***	350***	-22	-8	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Gini	420***	380***	-97***	-93***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Inc. Segregation	390***	360***	-160***	-170***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Black	380***	340***	-47*	-19	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Rel. Immobility	300***	240***	230***	290***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Abs. Mobility	350***	350***	0.68	-0.19	Yes	Yes	Yes
Has Credit Card	None (Benchmk)	0.50***	0.73***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	HH Inc. per Capita	0.94***	1.2***	-0.000011***	-0.000011***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Middle Class	0.035	0.33***	0.94***	0.80***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Gini	0.65***	0.79***	-0.32**	-0.14	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Inc. Segregation	0.65***	0.86***	-1.9***	-1.8***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	% Black	0.52***	0.73***	-0.15	-3.6e-05	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Rel. Immobility	0.26**	0.47***	0.64**	0.68***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Abs. Mobility	1.3***	1.4***	-0.020***	-0.018***	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: (1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset and other data sources as described in the text. (2) All coefficients are multiplied by 1000.

Table 11: Educational Policies and Strength of Intergenerational Linkages between Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Credit Constraints

Child Outcome	Covariate Specification	Coef. On Parent Constrained		Coef. On Educational Policy		Coef. On (Parent Constrained) * Educational Policy		Other Controls		
		5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	Parent Age
Delinquency	None (Benchmark)	170***	110***	X	x	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Sch. Spending per Pupil	140***	72***	X	x	0.0035**	0.0043***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Financial Literacy	170***	110***	-4.1	5.2	5.3	-0.94	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Economic Literacy	170***	110***	17***	5.1***	-5.1	-16***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Math Curr. Improvement	170***	100***	3.1	-8.8*	7.4	11*	Yes	Yes	Yes
Homeownership	None (Benchmark)	-25***	-120***	X	x	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Sch. Spending per Pupil	-71***	-180***	X	x	0.0059***	0.0075***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Financial Literacy	-26***	-120***	-1.8	-12***	16***	29***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Economic Literacy	-24***	-120***	1.3	-0.16	-2.2	3.3	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Math Curr. Improvement	-23***	-120***	-8.5	-1	-7.3	-13	Yes	Yes	Yes
Date T Equifax Risk Score	None (Benchmark)	-71.4****	-67.4***	X	x	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Sch. Spending per Pupil	-55.5***	-53.3***	X	x	-0.0020***	-0.0018***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Financial Literacy	-71.0***	-67.2***	2.43*	-3.56***	-4.92**	-2.1	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Economic Literacy	-72.5***	-68.6***	-1.72	-4.54*	3.17	3.53	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Math Curr. Improvement	-70.2***	-66.1***	-1.36	0.71	-4.96**	-5.21**	Yes	Yes	Yes
Has Credit Card	None (Benchmark)	-70***	-110***	X	x	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Sch. Spending per Pupil	-120***	-160***	X	x	0.0069***	0.0064***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Financial Literacy	-70***	-110***	-12**	-1.5	8.1*	4.9	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Economic Literacy	-66***	-100***	41***	24***	-11	-16	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Math Curr. Improvement	-68***	-110***	5.6	-20***	-7.3	0.26	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: (1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset and educational policy variables from Brown et al. (2016). (2) All coefficients, except for the Child Outcome of Date T Equifax Risk Score, are multiplied by 1000.

Table 12: Educational Policies and Strength of Intergenerational Linkages between Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Equifax Risk Score

Child Outcome	Covariate Specification	Coef. On Parent Equifax Risk Score		Coef. On Educational Policy		Coef. On (Parent Equifax Risk Score) * Educational Policy		Other Controls		
		5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	Parent Age
Delinquency	None (Benchmark)	-0.86***	-0.46***	X	x	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Sch. Spending per Pupil	-0.64***	-0.30***	X	x	-0.000029***	-0.000021**	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Financial Literacy	-0.86***	-0.46***	17	27	-0.028	-0.026	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Economic Literacy	-0.89***	-0.49***	-28	0.37	0.063**	0.058***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Math Curr. Improvement	-0.86***	-0.45***	19	27*	-0.035	-0.042*	Yes	Yes	Yes
Homeownership	None (Benchmark)	0.12***	0.62***	X	x	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Sch. Spending per Pupil	0.38***	0.95***	X	x	-0.000033***	-0.000042***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Financial Literacy	0.13***	0.62***	50***	48	-0.067**	-0.071	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Economic Literacy	0.12***	0.63***	-11	26	0.013	-0.04	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Math Curr. Improvement	0.11***	0.59***	-36	-79**	0.037	0.10*	Yes	Yes	Yes
Date T Equifax Risk Score	None (Benchmark)	380***	340***	X	x	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Sch. Spending per Pupil	310***	300***	X	x	0.0084***	0.0061*	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Financial Literacy	370***	340***	-17200***	-12300**	26***	11*	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Economic Literacy	380***	350***	14000**	9880	-21**	-20*	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Math Curr. Improvement	370***	340***	-20600***	-20500***	26***	26***	Yes	Yes	Yes
Has Credit Card	None (Benchmark)	0.50***	0.73***	X	x	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Sch. Spending per Pupil	0.94***	1.1***	X	x	-0.000057***	-0.000043***	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Financial Literacy	0.51***	0.73***	62**	32	-0.10***	-0.043	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Economic Literacy	0.48***	0.71***	0.24	-38	0.047	0.051	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Math Curr. Improvement	0.49***	0.72***	-33	-50*	0.055	0.034	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: (1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset and educational policy variables from Brown et al. (2016). (2) All coefficients are multiplied by 1000.

Table 13: Parental Equifax Risk Score Conditional on Predicted Income Quintile, 2005-2008
CCP Sample with CRISM

Quintile	Mean	Std. Dev.	25th %	Median	75th %	Obs.
<i>All Ages:</i>						
Lowest	624	104	555	629	703	85,760
2	707	89	656	727	777	91,621
3	738	75	701	758	793	84,911
4	755	67	724	772	804	83,324
Highest	781	53	759	797	820	81,690
<i>Ages 35-39:</i>						
Lowest	597	103	525	601	672	9,853
2	677	91	623	694	749	5,995
3	715	79	675	733	773	3,896
4	733	74	697	749	788	2,550
Highest	770	56	743	786	810	1,436
<i>Ages 40-49:</i>						
Lowest	624	103	553	628	703	49,971
2	705	90	654	724	775	52,951
3	735	75	698	755	791	47,452
4	752	67	721	769	801	43,677
Highest	779	53	756	795	819	36,094
<i>Ages 50-59:</i>						
Lowest	636	102	568	642	715	21,855
2	716	87	667	737	783	29,042
3	745	73	710	765	798	30,412
4	760	64	731	777	808	33,963
Highest	783	52	762	800	822	40,479
<i>Ages 60+:</i>						
Lowest	635	99	571	640	710	4,081
2	716	85	669	734	782	3,633
3	742	73	707	760	796	3,151
4	761	65	731	778	810	3,134
Highest	781	56	758	799	822	3,681

Note: Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax and Equifax Credit Risk Insight Servicing McDash (CRISM).

Table 14: Parental Equifax Risk Score and Child Outcomes at t_0+5 , Controlling for Parental Income

Child Outcome	Coef. On Parent Equifax Risk Score	Coef. On Family's CRISM Income	Fixed effects controls		R ²
			Cohort	Zip Code	
Bankruptcy	-0.018***	-	Yes	Yes	2.4%
	-0.014***	-0.000018***	Yes	Yes	2.4%
Delinquency	-0.79***	-	Yes	Yes	6.9%
	-0.72***	-0.00039***	Yes	Yes	7.0%
Homeowner	0.082***	-	Yes	Yes	4.4%
	0.089***	-0.000032***	Yes	Yes	4.4%
Other Serious Default (Ex. Foreclosure and Bankruptcy)	-1.4***	-	Yes	Yes	17.0%
	-1.3***	-0.00081***	Yes	Yes	17.0%
Average Equifax Risk Score	330***	-	Yes	Yes	31.0%
	300***	0.18***	Yes	Yes	32.0%
Date T Equifax Risk Score	360***	-	Yes	Yes	23.0%
	320***	0.19***	Yes	Yes	24.0%
Has Credit Card	0.31***	-	Yes	Yes	5.2%
	0.29***	0.00012***	Yes	Yes	5.2%

Notes: 1) Sample of parents in 2005-2008 rather than benchmark sample. 2) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax and Equifax Credit Risk Insight Servicing McDash (CRISM). (3) All coefficients are multiplied by 1000.

Table 15: Intergenerational Linkages in Household Credit with and without Controls for Family Heterogeneity

Panel A: Full siblings sample

	Parental Equifax Risk Score				
Child Outcome	No controls for family heterogeneity	With controls for family heterogeneity	Cohort Fixed Effects	Zip Code Fixed Effects	N
Credit Constrained	-0.0012***	-0.0000021	Yes	Yes	31,510
Average Equifax Risk Score	0.35***	0.022*	Yes	Yes	35,438
Date T Equifax Risk Score	0.37***	-0.01	Yes	Yes	35,011
	Parental Credit Constraints				
Child Outcome	No controls for family heterogeneity	With controls for family heterogeneity	Cohort Fixed Effects	Zip Code Fixed Effects	N
Credit Constrained	0.27***	-0.005	Yes	Yes	28,220
Average Equifax Risk Score	-59.9***	-2.45	Yes	Yes	31,760
Date T Equifax Risk Score	-67.5***	0.47	Yes	Yes	31,453
Panel B: Sample constrained to siblings for whom parent constrained differs by at least 0.32 (one standard deviation)					
	Parental Equifax Risk Score				
Child Outcome	No controls for family heterogeneity	With controls for family heterogeneity	Cohort Fixed Effects	Zip Code Fixed Effects	N
Credit Constrained	-0.00052***	0.00006	Yes	Yes	5301
Average Equifax Risk Score	0.19***	0.0046	Yes	Yes	6183
Date T Equifax Risk Score	0.20***	-0.0022	Yes	Yes	6089
	Parental Credit Constraints				
Child Outcome	No controls for family heterogeneity	With controls for family heterogeneity	Cohort Fixed Effects	Zip Code Fixed Effects	N
Credit Constrained	0.017	-0.00039	Yes	Yes	4499
Average Equifax Risk Score	-6.69*	-3.11	Yes	Yes	5044
Date T Equifax Risk Score	-5.68	-2.1	Yes	Yes	4992

Notes: 1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset. 2) Regressions in this table are run on the sibling sample, i.e., the subsample of children who have at least one sibling in our data. 3) Column (2) shows the coefficient estimates from the regression of the child outcome on the parental credit attribute as described in eq. (1). Each regression in column (2) also controls for parental age in levels. 4) Column (3) shows the coefficient estimates from the regression of the demeaned child outcome on the demeaned parental credit attribute as described in eq. (2). Each regression in column (3) also controls for demeaned parental age. Demeaned variables subtract off within-family mean for that variable. 5) Table presents results for the 5-year horizon; results for the 10-year horizon are similar and available upon request. 6) Regressions shown in Panel B use at most two siblings per household and confine sample to subset of households where the parent's credit constraint differs by at least 0.32 (one standard deviation) between the two siblings.

Table 16: Presence of Student Loan Within 5 Years, With and Without Parent Fixed Effects
 Panel A: Parent Constrained

Child Outcome	Parental Income Quintile	Coef. On Parent Constrained	Cohort Fixed Effects	State Fixed Effects	Parent Fixed Effects	N
Student Loan	Lowest	27	Yes	Yes	No	3,235
		-47	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,235
Student Loan	2	57***	Yes	Yes	No	3,559
		55	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,559
Student Loan	3	62**	Yes	Yes	No	3,778
		-28	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,778
Student Loan	4	120***	Yes	Yes	No	3,910
		-33	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,910
Student Loan	Highest	200***	Yes	Yes	No	3,810
		62	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,810

Panel B: Parent Equifax Risk Score

Child Outcome	Parental Income Quintile	Coef. On Parent Riskscore	Cohort Fixed Effects	State Fixed Effects	Parent Fixed Effects	N
Student Loan	Lowest	0.037	Yes	Yes	No	3,906
		0.41	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,906
Student Loan	2	-0.022	Yes	Yes	No	3,920
		-0.29	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,920
Student Loan	3	-0.18*	Yes	Yes	No	3,883
		0.34	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,883
Student Loan	4	-0.49***	Yes	Yes	No	3,930
		0.039	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,930
Student Loan	Highest	-1.2***	Yes	Yes	No	3,825
		-0.53*	Yes	Yes	Yes	3,825

Notes: 1) Sample is children of parents from 2005-2008 CRISM sample. 2) Parental Income Quintile is based on predicted parental income. 3) Due to the small sample size, we include state rather than zip code fixed effects in these specifications. 4) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax and Equifax Credit Risk Insight Servicing McDash (CRISM). (5) All coefficients are multiplied by 1000.

Appendix A. Variables Definitions

The child credit outcomes that we study are

1. An indicator for having a credit card that is a dummy variable that takes a value of 1 if the child has a credit card between age 19 and 24 for the short horizon sample and between age 25 and 29 for the long horizon sample.
2. A dummy variable that takes value 1 if the child has a mortgage between age 19 and 24 for the short horizon sample and between 19 and 29 for the long horizon sample.
3. A dummy variable that takes value 1 if the child has a bankruptcy flag on his or her credit record between age 19 and 24 for the short horizon sample and between age 25 and 29 for the long horizon sample.
4. A dummy variable that takes value 1 if the child has an account 90DPD or greater default (excluding bankruptcy and foreclosure) on his or her credit record between age 19 and 24 for the short horizon sample and between age 25 and 29 for the long horizon sample.
5. A dummy variable that takes value 1 if the child has an account 30DPD or 60DPD on his or her credit record between age 19 and 24 for the short horizon sample and between age 25 and 29 for the long horizon sample.
6. The average Equifax Risk Score for the child between age 19 and 24 for the short horizon sample and between age 25 and 29 for the long horizon sample.
7. The child's Equifax Risk Score at the age 24 for the short horizon sample and at the age 29 for the long horizon sample.
8. The degree of a child being credit constrained is the maximum between ages 19 and 24 (for the short horizon) or between ages 25 and 29 for the long horizon of the ratio of credit balance to card limit on credit cards.

The parental attributes that we study are

1. An indicator for parents' bankruptcy that takes value 1 if a parent has any account in bankruptcy and 0 otherwise, measured when the child is 19 years old.
2. An indicator for parents' foreclosure that takes value 1 if a parent has a foreclosure and 0 otherwise, measured when the child is 19 years old.
3. An indicator for parents' serious default that takes value 1 if a parent has any account 90DPD or greater default (excluding bankruptcy and foreclosure) and 0 otherwise, measured when the child is 19 years old.
4. An indicator for parents' delinquency that takes value 1 if a parent has any account 30DPD or 60DPD and 0 otherwise, measured when the child is 19 years old.
5. The degree of parents being credit constrained is the ratio of credit balance to card limit, measured when the child is 19 years old. It is the maximum credit balance as a percentage of the combined credit limit available for use at time t_0 of the two parents if there are two.
6. Parents' credit Equifax Risk Score, measured when the child is 19 years old and the average if there are two parents in the household
7. Parents' age when the child is 19 years old, measured as the average age if there are two parents in the household.

Table A1: Summary Statistics for 5-year subsample of the original 10-year sample

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	25th %	Median	75th %	Max	Obs.
Child Forms Household	0.55	0.50	0	0	1	1	1	417,601
Child Forms Household First Age	21.5	1.4	20	20	21	23	24	228,739
Child Has Credit Card	0.84	0.37	0	1	1	1	1	417,601
Child Has Credit Card First Age	19.7	1.5	15	19	19	20	24	350,481
Child Homeowner	0.11	0.31	0	0	0	0	1	417,601
Child Homeowner First Age	22.5	1.6	15	22	23	24	24	46,247
Child Bankrupt	0.019	0.136	0	0	0	0	1	417,601
Child Foreclosure	0.066	0.249	0	0	0	0	1	417,601
Child Other Serious Default	0.33	0.47	0	0	0	1	1	399,357
Child Delinquency	0.25	0.44	0	0	0	1	1	399,357
Child Equifax Risk Score Average	630.6	77.7	295	566.8	645.7	695	827	408,162
Child Equifax Risk Score End	633.5	99.0	288	561	644	720	834	364,045
Child Credit Constrained	0.632	0.339	0	0.337	0.739	0.945	1	354,460

Note: Authors' calculations using the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset.

Table A2: Benchmark Regressions of the Intergenerational Linkages between Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Credit Constraints, with an Indicator for Cosigned Credit Cards

Child Outcome	Coef. On Parent Constrained		Coef. On Parent Age		Coef. On Indicator of Child Cosign Credit Card		Coef. On (Indicator of Child Cosign Credit Card) * (Parent Constrained)		Fixed effects		Adjusted R ²	
	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	5-Year	10-Year
Bankruptcy	14***	31***	-0.0021	-0.22**	-0.078	-10***	18***	20***	Yes	No	0.54%	0.65%
	12***	25***	0.061*	-0.020	-0.56	-12***	18***	21***	Yes	Yes	1.7%	2.5%
Delinquency	200***	120***	-0.56***	-0.43**	-29***	-25***	32***	19**	Yes	No	2.8%	1.6%
	160***	100***	-0.38**	-0.25*	-27***	-21***	33***	23***	Yes	Yes	4.6%	2.9%
Homeowner	-21***	-130***	-1.3***	-2.8***	98***	240***	34***	53***	Yes	No	2%	5.7%
	-21***	-110***	-0.77***	-1.9***	92***	220***	32***	52***	Yes	Yes	4.7%	8.2%
Other Serious Default (Ex. Foreclos. and Bankruptcy)	320***	310***	-0.0070	-0.43	-69***	-95***	-23***	-86***	Yes	No	6.5%	6.1%
	260***	240***	0.025	-0.23	-64***	-86***	-18**	-73***	Yes	Yes	12%	11%
Average Equifax Risk Score	-77100***	-84400***	57	79	21100***	30500***	-5810***	12400***	Yes	No	14%	12%
	-62800***	-68200***	10	20	20000***	28900***	-6890***	8100***	Yes	Yes	23%	19%
Date T Equifax Risk Score	-85500***	-83300***	150**	62	21100***	28700***	-3990**	12400***	Yes	No	10%	9.5%
	-69200***	-66800***	77**	1.3	19800***	27000***	-5310***	8560***	Yes	Yes	17%	16%
Has Credit Card	-94***	-150***	-0.37**	-0.27	100***	110***	62***	130***	Yes	No	2.7%	4.4%
	-69***	-120***	-0.55***	-0.49***	99***	110***	58***	110***	Yes	Yes	6.4%	8%

Notes: (1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset. (2) All coefficients are multiplied by 1000.

Table A3: Benchmark Regressions of the Intergenerational Linkages between Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Serious Default, with an Indicator for Cosigned Credit Cards

Child Outcome	Coef. On Parent Serious Default		Coef. On Parent Age		Coef. On Indicator of Child Cosign Credit Card		Coef. On (Indicator of Child Cosign Credit Card) * (Parent Serious Default)		Fixed effects		Adjusted R ²	
	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	5-Year	10-Year
Bankruptcy	13***	25***	-0.024	-0.21***	5.0***	-5.0**	16***	22***	Yes	No	0.58%	0.65%
	11***	22***	0.048	-0.0097	4.5***	-6.7***	16***	23***	Yes	Yes	1.6%	2.6%
Delinquency	130***	75***	-0.97***	-0.71***	-28***	-23***	39***	25***	Yes	No	2.1%	1.1%
	110***	53***	-0.71***	-0.49***	-24***	-17***	38***	27***	Yes	Yes	3.9%	2.4%
Homeowner	-17***	-95***	-0.85***	-1.6***	110***	260***	21***	24***	Yes	No	2.1%	5.9%
	-13***	-75***	-0.38***	-0.95***	110***	250***	20***	23***	Yes	Yes	4.6%	8.3%
Other Serious Default (Ex. Foreclos. and Bankruptcy)	290***	240***	-1.0***	-1.4***	-93***	-130***	0.76	-51***	Yes	No	7.8%	6.1%
	230***	180***	-0.84***	-0.99***	-82***	-120***	2.6	-43***	Yes	Yes	14%	11%
Average Equifax Risk Score	-62300***	-60900***	310***	360***	2400***	38500***	-6050***	6610***	Yes	No	14%	11%
	-48300***	-45600***	220***	250***	21500***	34600***	-6620***	3860**	Yes	Yes	24%	20%
Date T Equifax Risk Score	-65200***	-60800***	410***	340***	24600***	36500***	-4640**	6630***	Yes	No	9.4%	8.7%
	-49600***	-45100***	300***	240***	21700***	32800***	-5420***	3750*	Yes	Yes	17%	16%
Has Credit Card	-92***	-140***	0.36***	0.49***	140***	170***	65***	110***	Yes	No	3.4%	5.2%
	-65***	-100***	0.095	0.15	130***	160***	61***	100***	Yes	Yes	8.3%	9.7%

Note: Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset. (2) All coefficients are multiplied by 1000.

Table A4: Benchmark Regressions of the Intergenerational Linkages between Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Equifax Risk Score, with an Indicator for Cosigned Credit Cards

Child Outcome	Coef. On Parent Equifax Risk Score		Coef. On Parent Age		Coef. On Indicator of Child Cosign Credit Card		Coef. On (Indicator of Child Cosign Credit Card) * (Parent Equifax Risk Score)		Fixed effects		Adjusted R ²	
	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	5-Year	10-Year
Bankruptcy	-0.062***	-0.12***	0.056	-0.085	77***	87***	-0.097***	-0.12***	Yes	No	0.7%	0.77%
	-0.055***	-0.11***	0.12***	0.089	74***	84***	-0.095***	-0.12***	Yes	Yes	1.7%	2.6%
Delinquency	-0.94***	-0.54***	0.47***	0.14	180***	120***	-0.26***	-0.19***	Yes	No	5.4%	2.3%
	-0.83***	-0.43***	0.52***	0.17	170***	130***	-0.25***	-0.20***	Yes	Yes	6.3%	3.2%
Homeowner	0.098***	0.61***	-1.1***	-2.7***	240***	400***	-0.19***	-0.20***	Yes	No	2.1%	6.9%
	0.10***	0.56***	-0.61***	-1.9***	230***	380***	-0.17***	-0.20***	Yes	Yes	4.6%	9%
Other Serious Default (Ex. Foreclosure and Bankruptcy)	-1.8***	-1.6***	1.7***	0.97***	-110***	-360***	0.065	0.35***	Yes	No	16%	12%
	-1.6***	-1.3***	1.3***	0.82***	-94***	-330***	0.048	0.31***	Yes	Yes	19%	15%
Average Equifax Risk Score	410***	420***	-320***	-280***	-5820	60500***	31***	-41***	Yes	No	31%	22%
	350***	340***	-290***	-260***	-8420*	50600***	34***	-29***	Yes	Yes	35%	26%
Date T Equifax Risk Score	440***	410***	-260***	-280***	-2050	61000***	26***	-43***	Yes	No	22%	18%
	370***	340***	-240***	-250***	-6000	50600***	30***	-31***	Yes	Yes	25%	22%
Has Credit Card	0.67***	0.96***	-0.67***	-0.88***	470***	700***	-0.49***	-0.77***	Yes	No	5.3%	8.5%
	0.51***	0.76***	-0.67***	-0.90***	450***	670***	-0.45***	-0.72***	Yes	Yes	8.9%	11%

Notes: (1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset. (2) All coefficients are multiplied by 1000.

Table A5. Educational Policies (Urban and Schmeiser, 2015) and Strength of Intergenerational Linkages between Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Credit Constraints

Child Outcome	Covariate Specification	Coef. On Parent Constrained		Coef. On (Parent Constrained) * Educational Policy		Fixed effects			Adjusted R ²	
		5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	Parent Age	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon
Delinquency	None (Benchmark)	0.17***	0.11***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes	4.6%	2.9%
	Personal Finance	0.17***	0.10***	0.0083**	0.0076*	Yes	Yes	Yes	4.6%	2.9%
	Economic Education	0.17***	0.11***	-0.0069	-0.012**	Yes	Yes	Yes	4.6%	2.9%
Homeownership	None (Benchmark)	-0.025***	-0.12***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes	3.1%	4.5%
	Personal Finance	-0.027***	-0.12***	0.013**	0.016	Yes	Yes	Yes	3.1%	4.5%
	Economic Education	-0.027***	-0.13***	0.0071	0.018*	Yes	Yes	Yes	3.1%	4.5%
Date T Riskscore	None (Benchmark)	-71.4****	-67.4***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes	16%	15%
	Personal Finance	-70.5***	-66.8***	-5.61***	-3.72**	Yes	Yes	Yes	16%	15%
	Economic Education	-72.3***	-68.9***	2.36	4.05	Yes	Yes	Yes	16%	15%
Has Credit Card	None (Benchmark)	-0.070***	-0.11***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes	4.7%	5.6%
	Personal Finance	-0.071***	-0.11***	0.0090	0.013*	Yes	Yes	Yes	4.7%	5.6%
	Economic Education	-0.072***	-0.11***	0.0066	0.0060	Yes	Yes	Yes	4.7%	5.6%

Note: Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset and educational policy data from Urban and Schmeiser (2015).

Table A6: Educational Policies (Urban and Schmeiser, 2015) and Strength of Intergenerational Linkages between Child Credit Outcomes and Parental Equifax Risk Score

Child Outcome	Covariate Specification	Coef. On Parent Equifax Risk Score		Coef. On (Parent Equifax Risk Score) * Educational Policy		Controls			Adjusted R ²	
		5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon	Cohort	Zip Code	Parent Age	5-Year Horizon	10-Year Horizon
Delinquency	None (Benchmark)	-0.86***	-0.46***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes	6.3%	3.1%
	Personal Finance	-0.86***	-0.46***	-0.034***	-0.0023	Yes	Yes	Yes	6.3%	3.1%
	Economic Education	-0.86***	-0.46***	-0.0074	-0.0039	Yes	Yes	Yes	6.3%	3.1%
Homeownership	None (Benchmark)	0.12***	0.62***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes	3%	5.4%
	Personal Finance	0.13***	0.62***	-0.040**	-0.042	Yes	Yes	Yes	3%	5.4%
	Economic Education	0.12***	0.63***	-0.011	-0.032*	Yes	Yes	Yes	3%	5.4%
Date T Equifax Risk Score	None (Benchmark)	380***	340***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes	25%	21%
	Personal Finance	380***	340***	6.2	3.2	Yes	Yes	Yes	25%	21%
	Economic Education	380***	340***	-1.3	-4.1	Yes	Yes	Yes	25%	21%
Has Credit Card	None (Benchmark)	0.50***	0.73***	x	x	Yes	Yes	Yes	7.1%	8.8%
	Personal Finance	0.51***	0.73***	-0.050	-0.027	Yes	Yes	Yes	7.1%	8.8%
	Economic Education	0.51***	0.74***	-0.033*	-0.026	Yes	Yes	Yes	7.1%	8.8%

Notes: (1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset and educational policy data from Urban and Schmeiser (2015). (2) All coefficients are multiplied by 1000.

Table A7. Sibling Age Differences (19 year olds)

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	25th %	Median	75th %	Max	Obs.
5 Yr Horizon Sample	1.96	0.92	0	1	2	3	4	36,592
10 Yr Horizon Sample	1.92	0.92	0	1	2	2	4	16,943

Notes: 1) Results using data from the New York Federal Reserve Bank Consumer Credit Panel/Equifax dataset. 2) The summary statistics are from the sibling sample, i.e., the subsample of children who have at least one sibling in our data.

Table A8: Parental Equifax Risk Score at t0 and Child Outcomes, horizons from t0+1 to t0+10

Horizon (date T)		Child's Date T Bankruptcy	Child's Date T Delinquency	Child's Date T Other Serious Default (Ex. Foreclosure and Bankruptcy)	Child's Date T Equifax Risk Score
t0+1	β on Parent Age	0.0039**	0.19***	0.17***	-250***
	β on Parent Equifax Risk Score	-0.0012***	-0.25***	-0.25***	330***
	R ²	0%	3%	3%	26%
t0+2	β on Parent Age	0.0053**	0.078*	0.17***	-210***
	β on Parent Equifax Risk Score	-0.0019***	-0.23***	-0.24***	360***
	R ²	0%	2%	3%	28%
t0+3	β on Parent Age	0.0044	0.066**	0.048	-190***
	β on Parent Equifax Risk Score	-0.0025***	-0.21***	-0.23***	380***
	R ²	1%	2%	3%	28%
t0+4	β on Parent Age	-0.0044	0.0054	0.11***	-190***
	β on Parent Equifax Risk Score	-0.0031***	-0.19***	-0.23***	380***
	R ²	1%	2%	2%	28%
t0+5	β on Parent Age	-0.0056	-0.036	0.091**	-190***
	β on Parent Equifax Risk Score	-0.0032***	-0.18***	-0.21***	390***
	R ²	0%	2%	2%	27%
t0+6	β on Parent Age	0.0020	0.034	0.065	-210***
	β on Parent Equifax Risk Score	-0.0040***	-0.18***	-0.20***	380***
	R ²	1%	2%	2%	25%
t0+7	β on Parent Age	0.010*	0.0049	0.18***	-210***
	β on Parent Equifax Risk Score	-0.0034***	-0.18***	-0.20***	380***
	R ²	1%	2%	2%	24%
t0+8	β on Parent Age	0.018*	0.047	0.099**	-240***
	β on Parent Equifax Risk Score	-0.0032***	-0.18***	-0.21***	370***
	R ²	0%	2%	2%	23%
t0+9	β on Parent Age	-0.0036	0.076*	0.15**	-230***
	β on Parent Equifax Risk Score	-0.0031***	-0.17***	-0.20***	360***
	R ²	-1%	2%	2%	22%
t0+10	β on Parent Age	-0.012	-0.0071	0.14*	-290***
	β on Parent Equifax Risk Score	-0.0012*	-0.17***	-0.19***	350***
	R ²	0%	2%	2%	21%

Notes: (1) The table shows the children's outcomes at age 20 (t0+1), 21 (t0+2), etc... as a function of parental Equifax Risk Score at age 19. (2) Each column of the table presents results from 10 regressions for the indicated child outcome variable on parental variables indicated and year and zip code fixed effects. (3) All coefficients are multiplied by 1000.