Intergenerational Wealth Transmission and Mobility in Great Britain: What Components of Wealth Matter?

Ricky Kanabar
University of Bath
Rk735@bath.ac.uk

Paul Gregg
University of Bath
p.gregg@bath.ac.uk

Intergenerational wealth transmission and mobility in Great Britain: what components of wealth matter?

Paul Gregg* and Ricky Kanabar**

April 2022

Abstract

The rapid widening of intergenerational wealth inequalities has led to sharp differences in living standards in Great Britain. Understanding which components of wealth are driving such inequalities is important for improving wealth and social mobility. We show the change in the intergenerational persistence in wealth in Great Britain is due to inequality in offspring housing wealth and that offspring homeownership has become increasingly stratified by parental wealth even after controlling for individual's own characteristics. Our findings imply the intergenerational wealth elasticity in housing wealth is set to double in approximately one century and highlight the increasingly important role parental wealth has for determining whether offspring hold and the rate at which they accumulate particular types of wealth.

Keywords: Wealth, Housing, Inequality, intergenerational mobility, Great Britain.

JEL classification: D31, D63, I24

* Department of Social and Policy Sciences, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath, BA2 7AY.

**Corresponding author: Ricky Kanabar. Rk735@bath.ac.uk. Department of Social and Policy Sciences, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath, BA2 7AY. Telephone: 01225 385824.

1. Introduction

Wealth is an important determinant of individual living standards, for example it allows individuals to smooth consumption over the lifecycle and as such can help facilitate major lifecycle decisions. However, only recently has it been possible to show the extent to which wealth holdings differ across individuals at a point in time *and* how wealth accumulation varies over time for the same individual (Charles and Hurst, 2003, Boserup et al. 2017, Black et al. 2020). Importantly, evidence suggests wealth holdings are increasingly stratified by family background in advanced economies and a rapid widening of wealth inequalities which is concerning from a policy perspective, for example in the context of improving social mobility and living standards more generally (Killewald et al. 2017; Gregg and Kanabar, 2021).

When considering wealth inequalities across individuals at a point in time and from an intergenerational perspective it is important to note that certain *types* of wealth matter more than others. In Britain this is typically housing and pension wealth (ONS, 2019). Given the rapid increase in intergenerational wealth persistence in Britain (Blanden et al. 2021; Gregg and Kanabar 2021) it is therefore crucial to understand whether parental wealth is increasingly correlated with specific *types* of offspring wealth holdings, even after controlling for individuals own characteristics. Surprisingly, little research has focused on this issue. We address this gap in the literature using high quality British panel data covering a period post the Great Recession and prior to the Covid-19 pandemic.

We document a number of important and policy relevant findings. We show intergenerational wealth persistence in Britain is driven by differences in offspring housing wealth and this relationship is growing stronger across successively younger cohorts. We estimate that over a six-year period (2010/12-2016/18) parental wealth increases the Intergenerational Wealth Elasticity (IWE) in housing by 0.18 log points, which, if maintained will double the IWE in housing in roughly one century. The results based on a rank estimator implies an even faster rate of change, in this case the doubling of the intergenerational correlation will happen in approximately six decades. Separately, we show that for individuals with the same level or rank of parental wealth but born six years apart, relative to the slightly older cohort, parental wealth is increasingly associated with offspring homeownership.

We highlight two important issues in this respect. First, not only is parental wealth becoming increasingly associated with having housing wealth *but* conditional on having, is increasingly correlated with the level of offspring housing wealth. By comparing rates of accumulation

along both dimensions across cohorts we show homeownership and housing wealth accumulation varies significantly by parental wealth background. Those from the wealthiest parental backgrounds are *three* times more likely to report housing wealth by age 35 and the average level of housing wealth, conditional on holding, is roughly *ten* times higher on average (£105,296 versus £10,536) compared to individuals from the most disadvantaged background. Moreover, on a cohort basis those from the most advantaged backgrounds are no less likely to report housing wealth compared to older cohorts, whereas the opposite holds true for those from the least advantaged background even after controlling for individual factors including education and earnings, which have been shown to be important in determining wealth accumulation (Black et al. 2020; Davenport et al. 2021). Thus, we show the perceived notion regarding access to housing in GB is more nuanced than is generally understood.

Our findings highlight rapidly diverging fortunes for young people, the penalty for being born to parents of low wealth is growing rapidly in GB and is increasingly influencing major lifecycle events including homeownership, wealth accumulation and living standards. Indeed, our findings contribute to the debate on intergenerational fairness and the very fabric of the role and functions of society.

The rest of this paper is set out as follows, section two reviews the literature relating to intergenerational wealth transmission. Section three considers data and our methodological approach. In section four we present our findings in two parts. The first part considers intergenerational associations in parent and offspring wealth for different wealth types. We define age groups by six-year age windows to match the panel analysis presented in the second part of the analysis where we consider how intergenerational persistence changes over the sample period for the same individuals, and how rapidly this association is changing for individuals from the same parent background but born 6 years apart. Finally, we show how offspring housing wealth is largely responsible for the rapid change in intergenerational wealth persistence in Britain. Section five concludes.

2. Literature

A growing body of research has documented vast and growing inequalities in wealth over time and across cohorts, and this is strongly related to parental wealth (Charles & Hurst, 2003; Piketty, 2014, Black et al. 2020, Gregg and Kanabar, 2021). Therefore, understanding how parental wealth influences the rate at which individuals accumulate particular *types* of wealth is important. In Britain total net wealth is typically dominated by housing and pension wealth

(ONS, 2019). For example, average total individual net wealth among individuals aged 64 (peak wealth age) was £595,208 in (2016/18), of which 31% was attributable to housing and 50% to pension wealth. The equivalent statistic for an individual aged 30 was 19% and 28% respectively when only 22% (51%) report having housing (pension) wealth.[1] Even among individuals at peak wealth age 15% on average do not own their home and there is significant variation in both the level of housing and pension wealth holdings. Therefore two issues need to be considered to properly understand wealth accumulation from an intergenerational perspective, particularly with respect to housing wealth: having versus not having and conditional on having, the level, and how this varies by parental wealth.

Blanden et al. (2021) using the WAS show housing wealth has become increasingly important in explaining wealth inequalities in GB and Davenport et al. (2021) using the same dataset show there exists a strong correlation between the likelihood of offspring homeownership and parental wealth. Gritti and Cutulli (2021) using Italian microdata show declining levels of homeownership across successively younger cohorts, and that housing wealth is increasingly important for explaining within-cohort total wealth inequality. Their findings highlight the differing mechanisms by which housing wealth is transmitted from parent to offspring depending on family background. Specifically, offspring born to parents whose occupation is service based (professional) are more likely to receive direct financial transfers before, at the time of and after leaving the parental home in order to setup a new household. Whereas for those whose parents had low social class occupations this only occurred at the time of leaving the family home. Second, leaving the parental home was associated with a transfer of *housing* wealth from parents to children among the lowest social classes. Thus, parents transfer their own accumulated housing wealth at the time offspring leave the parental home. No such pattern was observed among those from the most advantaged backgrounds, who instead provide more sustained levels of financial transfers without having to transfer their own housing wealth. Offspring from such backgrounds may still receive housing wealth later in life in the form of inheritance. Such findings highlight not only the strong cultural norms in Italy but, importantly, that homeownership for younger people is socially stratified by family background. Taken together the evidence suggests family background will continue to explain an increasingly larger fraction of offspring total wealth across successively younger cohorts. We contribute to the literature by confirming this conjecture.

---

[1] Figures have been adjusted for inflation and refer to 2015 prices. Estimates are unweighted and include zero values for housing and pension holding.

A related set of studies highlight the importance of distinguishing and controlling for individual's own characteristics versus that of their parents in explaining wealth inequalities across cohorts (Killewald et al. 2017, Black et al. 2020, Davenport et al. 2021). Black et al. (2020) using Norwegian data show individual's *own* labour income and net capital gains on real assets such as housing play an important role when compared to parental transfers and inheritances in explaining wealth inequalities. This finding holds for all age cohorts though the relative importance of certain components of wealth does alter depending on which stage of the lifecycle is considered. The authors show that offspring from the wealthiest backgrounds are more likely to have higher levels of wealth, receive greater levels of inheritance and accumulate a disproportionate amount of wealth from investments and capital income. Parents also play an important role in affecting offspring wealth outcomes via early life investments in education which subsequently influence lifetime earnings and pension wealth. Studies based on Scandinavian data bear this out and show that over the lifecycle the intergenerational association in wealth between parents and their offspring is U-shaped (Boserup et al. (2016, 2018); Aderman et al. (2018)). However, whilst research has shown an association between income and wealth particularly at the top of both respective distributions, at an aggregate level there exists a non-correlation between income and wealth inequality (Killewald, Pfeffer and Schachner, 2017; Pfeffer and Waitkus, 2021).

Pfeffer and Waitkus (2021) using the Luxembourg Wealth Study decompose country differences in wealth inequality and consider the composition of wealth portfolios. Their results show that cross national variation in wealth inequality and concentration is driven by housing equity. Given the returns from homeownership over the lifecycle, the fact access is increasingly stratified by family background has implications for future wealth inequalities both from an intergenerational, cross section and lifecycle perspective (Killewald, Pfeffer and Schachner, 2017; Gritti and Cutulli, 2021). The channels by which parents' transfer resources go beyond direct transfers, for example residing in certain neighbourhoods with high quality schooling, which in turns influences future earnings and hence offspring wealth accumulation. Such relationships are also important for explaining aggregate level cross country differences in wealth-income inequality ratios (Piketty, 2014; Pfeffer and Killewald, 2015; Black et al. 2020; Palomino et al. 2021). Measured on this basis the UK, Italy and France exhibit significantly higher wealth-income ratios than Norway and the US (Black et al. 2020).

Another way to consider transfers and cultural norms jointly affecting intergenerational wealth inequalities is to consider cross country differences in lifetime transfers by family background.

Palomino et al. (2021) show such factors jointly explain between one-third and almost one-half of wealth inequalities in Great Britain and France respectively, and intergenerational transfers alone explain between 26% and 36%, whereas family background explains between 9% and 17% in France and the US respectively. Davenport et al. (2021) estimate roughly half of the intergenerational persistence in wealth in the UK can be explained by individual's own education and earnings, and thus transfers and savings play an important role in explaining wealth inequalities.

Collectively, the international evidence suggests that whilst lifecycle wealth accumulation is likely to be affected by the same individual, household and parental characteristics across countries, the extent and mechanisms by which these characteristics influence the accumulation of particular *types* of assets is likely to differ.

3. Data

Our analysis uses the biennial Wealth and Assets Survey (WAS) representative of Britain and managed by the Office for National Statistics (ONS, 2012). In wave 1 WAS contained 30,000 household and notably the survey oversamples wealthier households by a rate of between 2.5 and 3 times compared to other postal addresses to address the issue that household surveys inadequately capture the top part of the wealth distribution (ONS, 2012; Advani, Bangham and Leslie, 2020).

WAS measures of derived individual total net wealth include contributions of housing, pension and savings plus durable assets.[2] Information of mortgage and non-mortgage debt is also captured. The inclusion of durable assets means that net wealth is never zero or negative for those aged 25 plus.[3] Black et al. (2020) show total net wealth measures such as those provided

---

[2] Our measure of total net wealth includes pension wealth, Black et al. (2020) exclude this type of wealth (it is not available in their data) from their calculations and argues such wealth should not be included when modelling wealth accumulation. However, our interest is understanding the components of offspring wealth driving the rapid change in the intergenerational persistence in wealth. Even if pension wealth is not transferable, consider the parent generation who can expect income from such wealth (and/or a lump sum as is the case in the UK). This could act as security, or alternatively, parents knowing this wealth is available to them in the future, can utilise/transfer other sources of wealth for example via equity release of their main residence to help provide financial support to their offspring for example to purchase their first home. Turning to offspring, given our aim is to understand which components of wealth are correlated with parental wealth, and housing and pension wealth have been shown to be the two largest subcomponents of total wealth in GB (ONS, 2019), we also include offspring pension wealth in our measure of total wealth when analysing changes in intergenerational correlations over time. Pension wealth is strongly correlated with earnings/labour income and if the relationship between parental wealth and pension wealth is changing over time this is informative for understanding potential mechanisms (such as early life education investments and hence occupation/educational attainment) driving changes in wealth inequalities.
[3] Of the 35,700 individuals in the raw underlying wave 3 sample only 447 (1.25%) report negative or zero total net wealth.

in the WAS dataset which by construction include individual consumption and spending/saving decisions act as good proxies for 'potential wealth' based on actual future wealth accumulation which are not affected by such issues. In addition to asset and debt information WAS collects detailed individual and household level economic and sociodemographic data, including retrospective information relating to individual's parent's circumstances when they were teenagers (aged around 14) which we utilise to construct a measure of parental wealth.

Retrospective Questions

We seek to understand individual's trajectory of holding certain housing, pension and financial wealth as they age and their value by differing family origins. Whilst WAS does not collect information on parental wealth except in the case where adult children live in the same household as their parents, the survey does collect retrospective socioeconomic information relating to survey respondent's parents. We utilise these data to construct markers of parental wealth. The questions of interest are asked if an individual is age 25 or above at wave 2 or turns 25 in subsequent waves of the survey. Specifically, individuals are asked to recall circumstances in their early teenage years relating to:

(1) their parents housing tenure,
(2) their parent(s) education level,
(3) employment status of parents,
(4) whether they lived with one or both parents or some other arrangement,
(5) number of siblings.

Unfortunately, region of parents' residence, an important determinant of wealth and parental age were not asked.[4] For the purpose of this study we focus on (1) and (2) to construct measures of parental wealth. The rationale for choosing these markers is provided in the Methodology subsection.

These markers of parent characteristics are strongly correlated with available resources of the household in which the teenager grew up (see inter-alia Bladen et al. (2013), Jerrim and Macmillan, (2015) and Gregg et al. (2017)) and correspond to wealth accrual by family origin. As wealth accrual will continue after a young adult has left home (Pfeffer Killewald (2017);

---

[4] The questionnaire wording is as follows: "We are interested in how living standards compare across generations, so the following questions are about your family and parents. I'd like you to think back to when you were a young teenager, say between the ages of 12 and 16." An additional question also asked about presence of siblings which is not utilized for the purpose of this study.

Boserup, Kopczuk and Kreiner (2017); Aderman, Lindhal and Waldenstrom (2018); Black et al. (2020); Gregg and Kanabar, 2021), the age at which these were collected is not the focus but rather they are markers for assessing relative wealth position of the parents. Put differently, in order to estimate intergenerational wealth persistence, by wealth type, we need to assess if these characteristics are stable between when a child was aged around 14 and parents are in their 40s, to when the parents reach peak wealth age (64). With this stability the measures reflect differences in wealth holding across groups at ages 40 through to 64. This presents two methodological challenges. First, we do not observe true wealth of parents but rather proxy markers. Second, these are not measured at around the time of peak wealth but when parents were aged around 40. For most of the offspring sample we observe their reported wealth prior to peak wealth age however we do not correct for this, precisely because we seek to understand accumulation of particular wealth types by parental background at different offspring ages.

In online Appendix B we document trends in wealth accumulation by wealth type based on our parental markers using wave 3 of WAS. Figures B1-B4 therefore refer to wealth levels reported by different individuals at a single point in time. Similar to the pattern found for total wealth there is a clear difference across age groups in wealth levels reported by parent background and these differences tend to fan out at increasingly older ages. Importantly, the ordering by parent background holds across almost all age groups and wealth types. However, what Figures B1-B4 do not show is the proportions of individuals who do and do not report holding particular types of wealth by parent background. This distinction is important, particularly when trying to understand the factors driving the change in intergenerational associations in wealth. Online Appendix C reports coefficients from a logit regression modelling the likelihood of offspring holding particular wealth types and parental wealth and show a strong positive correlation across all age groups and successively younger cohorts.

Methodology

Starting from wave 3 onwards (2010-12) WAS released consistent measures of individual total wealth and its subcomponents including housing wealth, pension wealth and financial wealth (defined in online Appendix A)**.** When using wealth data two issues need be addressed (Pence, 2006). First, wealth data has a long thick right-hand tail where some very high values can lead to misleading conclusions when assessing at the mean such as with OLS, and so analysis across the distribution is important (Killewald, Pfeffer and Schachner, 2017). Second, individual total net wealth reported in WAS is not zero or negative except for a very small number of

individuals at young ages because a wide range of assets including durable goods and physical wealth are included.

However, subcomponents of wealth such as housing and pension wealth are zero especially at younger ages and this value is economically meaningful. Therefore, log transformation can only be applied for analysis involving total net wealth. Pence (2006) and Ravallion (2017) show transforming the data by applying the Inverse Hyperbolic Sine (IHS) for wealth values greater than or equal to zero allows one to estimate wealth regressions including all available data.[5] Depending on the specification the coefficients from these types of regressions can be interpreted as a type of elasticity (Bellemare and Wichman, 2020). We estimate log-log specifications for total net wealth and for all other types of wealth apply the IHS transformation to both offspring and parental wealth. In the case of financial wealth, a non-trivial proportion of individuals hold net negative values and as such we use a rank estimator to understand intergenerational correlations.[6]

We next set out our modelling approach. Starting with current wealth in the offspring generation and retrospective measures of parental wealth markers Equation (1) specifies the ideal regression form assessing the relationship between offspring's wealth and parent's characteristics:

$$IHSW_{current\ age} = \alpha + \beta\ IHSWh_{parent\ 64} + \varepsilon \tag{1}$$

Where:

$W_{current\ age}$ is true adult children's wealth at their current age, without reporting error.

$Wh_{parent64}$ is wealth of parents when they were aged 64, just before retirement of the main earner but unlike for offspring this is a household measure and without reporting error.

Our focus is to understand how family background affects accumulation of certain asset types and how this is changing across cohorts and time at *current* age of offspring. To estimate Equation 1 requires long panel data at both individual and household level which is unavailable in the UK.

---

[5] IHS is approximately equal to $\log(2y_i)$ or $\log(2) + \log(y_i)$ except for very small values and can be interpreted (in regression) in exactly same way as log. Very close to zero the IHS transformation is approximately linear.

[6] Whilst it has been shown the IHS transformation can be applied to negative values, the properties of the transformation imply values will spread out rather than be compressed given the transformation is concave over the entire real line (Ravallion, 2017).

Given this, the data available has two substantive issues which will deviate from this ideal. First, as discussed, parental wealth is not directly observed but estimated using a limited set of proxy indicators, consisting of a vector of five groupings of parent's characteristics based on their education level (high, medium and low) interacted with housing tenure status (homeowner or renter) and is an individual level measure. For the renter group we combine the medium and high educated groups due to sample size. We choose markers which can be thought of as being relatively stable given the point in the lifecycle at which they are measured and their correlation with parental wealth. Economic status and whether an individual grew up in a single or two parent household whilst related to parental wealth are transitory (job loss and relationship breakdown), moreover given we interact our markers additional groupings will lead to small groups and have non-trivial implications for what is feasible for analysis purposes. From a methodological perspective Jerrim et al. (2016) note additional covariates used in the first stage for regression purposes does not necessarily imply a smaller bias in TSTSLS estimates due to the fact these additional covariates may influence the second stage estimates (i.e. be endogenous).

Second, parents are also likely to deviate from the age of peak wealth which is just on retirement. These will create issues of measurement error and therefore attenuation bias and life-cycle bias follow from the age issues (see inter-alia Dearden, Machin and Reed (1997); Haider and Solon (2006) and Gregg et al (2017)).

We address each of these in turn. Equation (2) specifies the relationship of interest:

$$IHSW_{offspring,\ current\ age} = \pi + \beta IHSW_{parent\ 64} + \vartheta \qquad (2)$$

Where:

$W_{offspring,\ current\ age}$ is adult children's wealth, by type, at their respective age. Beyond age 45 there is little data for parents of adult children. $W_{parent\ 64}$ represents the wealth of parents at peak wealth age. This is not directly observed, instead we have

X_{wealth_parent}= parent's observed characteristics

These are the markers of family origin. To attach wealth values to these parental groupings we adopt the Two Sample Two Stage Least Squares (TSTSLS) estimator (Björklund and Jäntti, 1997). We estimate parental wealth using a sample of individuals aged 64 in WAS based on their own reported education and housing tenure (pseudo-parents). These are the same

retrospective parental markers which offspring report. The estimates from this regression allows us to estimate the unobserved wealth of parents, $IHS\ \widehat{W}_{parent\_wealth}$ in equation (3).

Measurement error and bias

Reporting error and/or transitory fluctuations in wealth create inconsistent estimates of β from Equation 1. Classical measurement error in the RHS variable would result in downward attenuation bias. The preferred approach to addressing this bias is averaging over repeat observations for the same individuals. For long panel data this is often not available in the parental generation except for certain countries such as those in Scandinavia and the US (Aderman, Lindhal and Waldenstrom (2018); Boserup, Kopczuk and Kreiner (2013, 2017); Black et al. (2020)).

The alternative approach is to predict earnings with markers of permanent differences in characteristics associated with earnings such as education, occupation, and industry (Dearden, Machin and Read (1997) do this using markers from within the same sample). The approach we follow (TSTSLS) does the same but in our case using wealth predicted in a separate sample albeit from the same survey. Jerrim, Choi and Rodriquez (2014) show there is an upward bias to estimates when there are a limited set of predicting variables because the reduced variance of $\sigma^2_{\overline{XW}}$ compared to σ^2_{XW} is not offset by the increase covariance in the numerator $\sigma_{\overline{xw},ow}$ from purging of the measurement error. Given our restricted set of predictors for parental wealth this is likely to be an issue. Whilst solutions have been proposed in the literature such as cross validating offspring and parental characteristics to ensure offspring recall their parent's characteristics correctly, this is not possible in WAS unless adult offspring live in the same household as their parents (only a small sample do this). One can also consider different combinations of imputer variables though we note WAS asks a limited set of questions relating to parental characteristics and using more detailed parental groupings leads to small sample issues for some age groups, nonetheless preliminary analysis shows our main findings hold.

Alternatively, Jerrim et al. (2014) note one can consider using a rank estimator which is not subject to the variance reduction issue, and relies solely on the ordering of parental characteristics as opposed to imputing parental wealth based on these characteristics to model intergenerational associations. We adopt this approach. Thus, Rank-Rank regression provides an accurate estimate of the intergenerational rank correlation and is more efficient but does not

capture wealth inequalities across generations, just the degree of re-ordering of individuals.[7] In the case of our wealth measures of interest whether the β estimate is likely to be larger or smaller than the Rank-Rank estimate will depend on the age at which wealth (type) is measured and the relative levels of inequality across cohorts. For certain components of wealth such as housing and pensions, individuals may report zero holdings particularly at young ages, the transformations we apply to the data mean that in these cases the β estimate will be larger than the corresponding estimate computed using a rank estimator.

Life-Cycle Bias

Our estimates will be affected by the profile of lifecycle wealth accumulation, which typically exhibits a rapid divergence before and after peak wealth age (64) and this is attributable to both age and cohort effects. The parental generation are assumed to be at peak wealth age for the purposes of the TSTSLS estimation in Equation 5. In terms of the offspring generation, we consider individuals up to peak wealth age.

The intergenerational earnings literature shows that in the offspring generation the lower inequality in earnings at younger ages produces a downward life-cycle bias to estimates of the β (Haider and Solon (2006) and Bohlmark and Lindquist (2006)). This is reflected by the regression coefficient where life-time earnings are regressed on point in time earnings lies below 1. Earnings in a person's late 30s gives an unbiased estimate of the intergenerational β and in the mid-40s estimates are upward biased. The expansion of wealth inequalities as people move closer to retirement, see online Appendix B, means this is also likely to hold true for wealth and to continue through to retirement age. Gregg and Kanabar (2021) show the inequality in wealth at younger ages in GB is such that it is sufficient to overturn the lifecycle bias. Separately, Boserup et al. (2016, 2018) and Aderman et al. (2018) using Scandinavian data find the intergenerational persistence in wealth follows a U-shape namely that the rank-rank measure is higher at younger ages, declines as individuals age up until their 40s and then increases following the death of their parents. Thus, the underlying ordering of people by own and parental wealth holdings is also heavily influenced by bequests and need not have the same

---

[7] A much more recent line of work has explicitly incorporated classical and non-classical forms of measurement error when estimating rank regressions, acknowledging the potential attenuation bias which may arise from using 'errors in variables' and noting the potential of using biased corrected estimators (see inter-alia Nybom and Stuhler, (2017); Kitigawa, Nybom and Stuhler, (2018)). These authors also note that potential biases are smaller for rank based estimators compared to elasticity type measures typically used and the importance of age when measuring elasticities (lifecycle effects), something we formally account for in our analysis. The complexity of these new methods, data requirements and the fact we use a TSTSLS approach mean we do not incorporate such estimators in our analysis though do attempt to deal with measurement error as set out in the text and emphasise careful interpretation of our findings in light of these works.

age relationship as the amounts of wealth held. In Rank-Rank regression life-cycle biases are much smaller as inequalities have no influence, just the rank ordering. Gregg and Kanabar (2021) using WAS data estimate the intergenerational persistence in wealth correcting for the lifecycle bias in both offspring and parent generation and show the lifecycle profile of the rank-rank measure for total net wealth based on WAS data follows a shallow U-shaped profile.

Our analysis includes offspring aged between 29 and 64, hence their parents are roughly aged between 59 and 94. If we predicted parental wealth at these ages using a separate sample of individuals in WAS this would lead to bias estimates due to lifecycle effects. The youngest parents would be just prior to peak wealth and the oldest well past peak wealth age (90+) and so selection would also be an issue. To avoid this we estimate parental wealth for all parents based on a sample of individuals aged 64 (corresponding to peak wealth age when inequalities in wealth holdings are greater) using the education and housing tenure reported by individuals themselves in WAS. This is changing the age for the TSTSLS estimation and is not a prediction of what pseudo-parent's wealth will be (or was) at age 64. As such the Rank-Rank estimates are unaffected by this, as the rank ordering across our vector of parental characteristics is stable at these ages. As parental characteristics are observed even if deceased, we can attach these values to all parents, including those offspring whose parents are aged over 75. This offers a common approach to estimating intergenerational wealth patterns for offspring for all ages. For the offspring generation no equivalent adjustment is required as our central interest is understanding how inequality in *current* wealth holdings by wealth type (not peak) relate to peak parental wealth.

The estimates for different age groups reported in the next section will both reflect life-cycle differences across age but also differences across cohorts. Such cohort differences in wealth accumulation have been shown to be significant from an intergenerational perspective (Resolution Foundation, 2017) and we return to this issue by considering wealth accumulation by wealth type across cohorts and over time in the final part of section 4. We also utilise the short panel to explore life-cycle changes within cohorts. Over a 6-year periods we show the evolution of the estimated intergenerational β and the Rank correlation, by wealth type, as people age and by a chain extension over the life-course. We pool wave 3 and round 6 of WAS to compare how the IWE is changing for each wealth type across the 6-year period between survey waves (2010/12 and 2016/18) for individuals at the same age except born 6-years apart. We use an identical approach to assess whether parental wealth is becoming increasingly associated with homeownership across successively younger cohorts.

4. Estimation results

We present our findings in two parts. First, we analyse intergenerational associations in parent and offspring wealth for different wealth types using wave 3 of WAS (2010-12), next we consider changes for the *same* individuals over time. In order to match the panel length we define age groups using six year age windows. By defining age groups in this way, we can compare cohort on cohort changes at the same age and by chain extension analyse the trend across the lifecycle. This allows us to highlight the role parental background has in explaining the change in the intergenerational persistence in wealth, by wealth type, across time rather than drawing inference based on a single cross section. We do this for both β and rank type regressions to highlight the rapid widening of wealth inequalities from a longitudinal perspective. An important aspect in this context is to consider offspring holding a certain type of wealth versus level differences conditional on holding and we show parental wealth plays an important role in this respect both from a cohort and intergenerational perspective.

Cross section analysis

Table 1 reports TSTSLS estimates of intergenerational β by wealth type for offspring across age groups. Table 1 shows that in the case of total net wealth at wave 3 between 34% and 46% of wealth differences in the parent generation are passed on to offspring aged between ages 29 and 64. The pattern (irrespective of time period analysed) suggests the strength of this association declines across successively older age groups and is consistent with recent evidence on intergenerational wealth transmission in Britain (see Gregg and Kanabar, 2021; Blanden, Eyes and Machin. 2021 and Davenport et al. 2021).

Turning to housing wealth, Table 1 shows parents' total wealth is strongly associated with offspring housing wealth and that this relationship is stronger at younger ages. The presence of individuals with zero values (no housing wealth) and some with very high levels of such wealth leads to the higher estimated elasticities compared to estimates reported for total net wealth. The elasticity computed for offspring aged between 29 and 34 is 1.82: implying a 1% increase in parental wealth increases offspring housing wealth by 1.82%, over double that of the oldest group. Whilst the β specification accounts for the variation in levels offspring housing wealth, from an intergenerational and lifecycle perspective, we measure wealth relatively early for younger age groups and thus housing wealth, both having versus not having, and conditional on the former the level- is likely to change. However, our interest is to understand differences in holdings at *current* ages and how this varies by parent background. The associations estimated at round 6 are similar in trend and magnitude as that reported for wave 3. The rate at

which individuals accumulate certain types of wealth by family background (if at all) is important if we are to understand how family background and wealth mobility are linked and we return to this issue later in the paper.

Table 1: Intergenerational elasticity in offspring and parent wealth, wave 3 and 6 [offspring current age, parents peak].

Age group	29-34	35-40	41-46	47-52	53-58	59-64
Central birth years	1979-1980	1973-1974	1967-1968	1960-1961	1954-1955	1948-1949
Wave 3 (2010-12)						
Total wealth	0.46*** [0.04]	0.43*** [0.03]	0.41*** [0.03]	0.37*** [0.03]	0.44*** [0.03]	0.34*** [0.02]
housing wealth	1.82*** [0.16]	1.57*** [0.15]	1.24*** [0.12]	1.20*** [0.11]	1.18*** [0.10]	0.86*** [0.08]
pension wealth	1.54*** [0.15]	1.39*** [0.14]	1.00*** [0.11]	0.83*** [0.1]	1.07*** [0.10]	0.57*** [0.10]
N_{total}	1299	1893	2362	2420	2364	2841
$N_{housing}$	1298	1902	2359	2425	2374	2846
$N_{pension}$	1340	1938	2386	2442	2377	2847
Age group	29-34	35-40	41-46	47-52	53-58	59-64
Central birth years	1985-1986	1979-1980	1973-1974	1967-1968	1960-1961	1954-1955
Wave 6 (2016-18)						
Total wealth		0.57*** [0.06]	0.43*** [0.06]	0.44*** [0.05]	0.43*** [0.04]	0.41*** [0.04]
housing wealth		2.20*** [0.25]	1.57*** [0.22]	1.32*** [0.17]	1.32*** [0.15]	1.23*** [0.12]

pension wealth		1.48*** [0.23]	1.15*** [0.20]	0.98*** [0.17]	0.78*** [0.13]	0.78*** [0.13]
N_{total}		573	894	1102	1266	1381
$N_{housing}$		575	898	1107	1269	1382
$N_{pension}$		579	899	1110	1270	1383

Notes: respective regressions model offspring wealth level on age and parent's wealth. Standard errors clustered at individual level. Log transformation applied to offspring and parent's wealth in specification modelling total net wealth. In all other regressions inverse sine transformation applied and elasticity computed at mean values of offspring and parent wealth as suggested by Bellemare & Wichman (2020) and standard errors adjusted accordingly. Samples restricted to observations with dependent variable greater than or equal to zero. Grey boxes refer to age groups where sample size is too small for estimation purposes. Wave 3 of WAS corresponds to (2010-12) and wave 6 (2016-18). Wealth values adjusted for inflation prior to transformation and reflect 2015 prices. Small discrepancy in number of observations due to negative values (affects total net wealth and net housing wealth) which are dropped for analysis purposes.

Table 1 also reports the IWE for pension wealth. Whilst parents may transfer wealth directly and thereby influence offspring total and housing wealth levels, pension wealth is driven by offspring's education and occupation. Parental wealth has been shown to influence the likelihood of early life investments in children's education, and from an intergenerational perspective research also suggests there is a strong link between parent's and children's job class (Killewald, Pfeffer and Schachner, 2017; Oren, Caduri, Tziner, 2013). Table 1 shows the intergenerational elasticity between total parent net wealth and offspring pension wealth has a similar pattern to that reported for housing, the estimated elasticity is much larger at younger ages versus older groups due to the presence of zero pension wealth holdings and because we observe offspring pension wealth below peak wealth age. The fact pension (and housing wealth) account for the majority of individual's total wealth (ONS, 2019) and is strongly associated with parental wealth underlines the importance of understanding how rapidly pension wealth is accumulated over time and how this is changing across cohorts. We return to this issue in a later section of the paper.

Table 2 reports rank estimates of intergenerational associations for different wealth types.[8] Importantly, zero holdings of certain wealth types which are economically meaningful can be

---

[8] We do not report results for financial wealth because a non-trivial proportion of individuals in our sample report negative holdings. Ravallion (2017) notes whilst the IHS transformation can be applied to negative values the

accommodated for and the estimates do not suffer from an upward bias as is the case for the IWE estimates (Jerrim et al., 2014). The main limitation of a rank estimator is that the magnitude of wealth differences in both generations are not accounted for in estimation and therefore one cannot get a sense of how this affects intergenerational relationships across different age groups. For example, comparing the rank-based estimates for housing shows these are largely stable across age groups versus the beta estimates, highlighting the significant variation in housing wealth among parent and offspring generations. In particular, for offspring groups and especially at younger ages the tails of the distribution (so zeros and very high values) are likely to lead to a divergence between rank and beta estimates. Table 2 shows that for total wealth family background becomes increasingly important in influencing offspring wealth based on rank-order across successively younger cohorts.

The magnitude of the estimated coefficients in Table 2 is remarkably stable across age groups in the case of housing and financial wealth. The estimates imply that increasing total parent wealth by one decile leads to offspring housing wealth (financial wealth) increasing by approximately 3-3.6 (2.1-3) rank points. In the case of pension wealth, across successively younger cohorts the rank estimate increases, from 0.17 for those aged between 59 and 64 to 0.3 among 29-34 year olds, which is identical to the rank estimate calculated for housing wealth for the latter group. However, the mechanisms which influence the rate at which offspring accumulate certain wealth types is unlikely to be the same and the results in Table 2 do not account for the magnitude of level differences in wealth holdings across individuals. Nonetheless, the results show at least at current ages, irrespective of wealth type and time period considered, parental wealth matters.

The widespread availability of generous pension schemes in the 1960s mean pension wealth levels observed among those in their late 50s and the rate at which these individuals accumulated this type of wealth is unlikely to be repeated by younger cohorts, in particular among individuals from less advantaged backgrounds who typically have much lower levels of lifetime pension wealth including just prior to retirement (see online Appendix B). In a later section of the paper we analyse pension wealth inequalities over time for the same individuals

---

properties of the transformation imply values will spread out rather than be compressed given the transformation is concave over the entire real line.

and consider whether parental wealth plays an increasingly important role in explaining disparities across individuals.

Table 2: Intergenerational rank in offspring and parent wealth, wave 3 and 6 [offspring current age, parents peak].

Age group	29-34	35-40	41-46	47-52	53-58	59-64
Central birth years	1979-1980	1973-1974	1967-1968	1960-1961	1954-1955	1948-1949
Wave 3						
Total wealth	0.40*** [0.03]	0.36*** [0.02]	0.33*** [0.02]	0.30*** [0.02]	0.37*** [0.02]	0.33*** [0.02]
housing wealth	0.30*** [0.03]	0.30*** [0.02]	0.31*** [0.02]	0.30*** [0.02]	0.36*** [0.02]	0.35*** [0.02]
pension wealth	0.30*** [0.03]	0.28*** [0.02]	0.20*** [0.02]	0.19*** [0.02]	0.23*** [0.02]	0.17*** [0.02]
financial wealth	0.21*** [0.03]	0.24*** [0.03]	0.22*** [0.02]	0.23*** [0.02]	0.30*** [0.02]	0.26*** [0.02]
N_{total}	1299	1893	2362	2420	2364	2841
$N_{housing}$	1298	1902	2359	2425	2374	2846
$N_{pension}$	1340	1938	2386	2442	2377	2847
$N_{financial}$	1340	1938	2386	2442	2377	2847
Wave 6						
Total wealth		0.44*** [0.04]	0.34*** [0.04]	0.33*** [0.03]	0.32*** [0.03]	0.33*** [0.03]
housing wealth		0.37*** [0.04]	0.33*** [0.04]	0.34*** [0.03]	0.36*** [0.03]	0.40*** [0.02]
pension wealth		0.32*** [0.04]	0.24*** [0.04]	0.23*** [0.03]	0.21*** [0.03]	0.20*** [0.03]
financial wealth		0.18*** [0.04]	0.23*** [0.04]	0.26*** [0.03]	0.26*** [0.03]	0.29*** [0.03]
N_{total}		573	893	1102	1266	1381

$N_{housing}$		575	898	1107	1269	1382
$N_{pension}$		579	899	1110	1270	1383
$N_{financial}$		579	899	1110	1270	1383

Notes: respective regressions model rank of offspring wealth level on age and rank of parent's wealth. Standard errors clustered at individual level. Log transformation applied to offspring and parents' wealth in specification modelling total net wealth. In all other regressions respective wealth levels inverse sine transformation applied and elasticity computed at mean values of offspring and parent wealth as suggested by Bellemare & Wichman (2020) and standard errors adjusted accordingly. Grey boxes refer to age groups where sample size is too small for estimation purposes. Wave 3 of WAS corresponds to (2010-12) and wave 6 (2016-18). Wealth values adjusted for inflation prior to transformation and reflect 2015 prices. Discrepancy in number of observations due to negative values (affects total net wealth and net housing wealth) which are dropped for analysis purposes.

Panel analysis

Tables 1 and 2 compare different individuals at two points in time. We next seek to understand how intergenerational wealth persistence for different wealth types is changing across time for the *same* individuals.

We construct short balanced panels using waves 3 and 6 of WAS (2010/12- 2016/18) and define age groups in such a way that we can compare changes in IWE and rank estimates for individuals at the same age but born exactly 6 years apart. This allows us to document the changing role parental wealth has in explaining the variation in offspring wealth by wealth type and as individuals age.

Table 3: IWE and rank estimates for total wealth based on cross section and 6-year panel by age (offspring current age, parents peak wealth).

Age group at wave 3	29-34	35-40	41-46	47-52	53-58	59-64
Central birth years	1979-1980	1973-1974	1967-1968	1960-1961	1954-1955	1948-1949
Log-Log						
β cross section full sample wave 3	0.46*** [0.04]	0.43*** [0.03]	0.41*** [0.03]	0.37*** [0.03]	0.44*** [0.03]	0.34*** [0.02]

β balanced panel wave 3	0.43*** [0.06]	0.41*** [0.05]	0.43*** [0.05]	0.36*** [0.04]	0.42*** [0.04]	0.33*** [0.03]
β balanced panel round 6	0.59*** [0.07]	0.43*** [0.06]	0.44*** [0.05]	0.40*** [0.05]	0.43*** [0.04]	0.36*** [0.03]
Rank-rank						
rank cross section full sample round 3	0.40*** [0.03]	0.36*** [0.02]	0.33*** [0.02]	0.30*** [0.02]	0.37*** [0.02]	0.33*** [0.02]
rank balanced panel wave 3	0.44*** [0.04]	0.33*** [0.04]	0.33*** [0.03]	0.30*** [0.03]	0.35*** [0.03]	0.34*** [0.02]
rank balanced panel round 6	0.47*** [0.05]	0.32*** [0.04]	0.34*** [0.03]	0.30*** [0.03]	0.35*** [0.03]	0.36*** [0.02]
$N_{offspring}$ cross section wave 3	1299	1893	2362	2420	2364	2841
$N_{offspring}$ balanced panel	460	784	974	1112	1269	1628

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. First row refers to regression of offspring wealth on parent's wealth controlling for age within 6-year age group. Both total offspring and parent net wealth have been log transformed. Second and third row is identical to first row except sample is based on balanced panel of individuals observed at wave 3 (2010/12) and round 6 (2016/18). Wealth values adjusted for inflation prior to transformation and reflect 2015 prices. Small discrepancy in number of observations due to negative values (affects total net wealth and net housing wealth) which are dropped for analysis purposes.

Table 3 shows the findings based on the cross-section sample largely hold for the balanced panel: parental wealth is playing an increasingly important role in explaining offspring total net wealth outcomes, especially for the youngest cohort in our sample. The top panel of Table 3 shows that the IWE increases from 0.33 for the oldest group who are just prior to peak wealth age to 0.44 for those aged 29-34, and within our six-year panel the IWE increases to 0.59 by 2016/18 for this age group which is high by international standards (Boserup, 2017). Whilst there is some variation across age groups, the general pattern is clear and suggests a divergence in fortunes for younger age groups, a key question then is to understand which types of wealth are driving this change, an issue we consider next. By defining age groups to match the panel length we can compare cohort on cohort changes in IWE for individuals at the same age but

born six years apart. The general pattern is such that the IWE is rising and the divergence in wealth outcomes even over this short period is significant for most age groups.

The bottom part of Table 3 reports rank estimates and here we see a relatively flat profile across groups except for the youngest age group. We note the magnitude of the change within the panel is less pronounced relative to the beta estimates. However, irrespective of the estimator used the analysis highlights the change in intergenerational wealth transmission taking place for the same individuals over time, which is not visible in the cross section estimates reported in Table 2. These results are consistent with recent evidence on intergenerational wealth inequality in Britain (see Gregg and Kanabar, 2021; Blanden et al. 2021; Davenport et al. 2021), our focus is to document which types of wealth are driving the trend in Table 3.[9]

Table 4: IWE and rank estimates for housing wealth based on cross section and 6-year panel by age (offspring current age, parents peak wealth).

Age group at wave 3 Central birth years	29-34 1979-1980	35-40 1973-1974	41-46 1967-1968	47-52 1960-1961	53-58 1954-1955	59-64 1948-1949
Log-Log						
β cross section full sample wave 3	1.67*** [0.2]	1.49*** [0.14]	1.18*** [0.12]	1.14*** [0.11]	1.14*** [0.10]	0.83*** [0.08]
β balanced panel wave 3	1.89*** [0.26]	1.54*** [0.22]	1.19*** [0.18]	1.22*** [0.16]	1.11*** [0.13]	0.76*** [0.10]
β balanced panel round 6	1.93*** [0.30]	1.49*** [0.22]	1.21*** [0.18]	1.26*** [0.16]	1.23*** [0.12]	0.86*** [0.10]
Rank-rank						

---

[9] We do not separately analyse physical wealth given the relatively small contribution this makes to total net wealth for the majority of individuals in our sample.

rank cross section full sample round 3	0.3*** [0.03]	0.30*** [0.02]	0.31*** [0.02]	0.30*** [0.02]	0.36*** [0.02]	0.35*** [0.02]
rank balanced panel wave 3	0.35*** [0.04]	0.29*** [0.04]	0.31*** [0.03]	0.31*** [0.03]	0.37*** [0.03]	0.36*** [0.02]
rank balanced panel round 6	0.37*** [0.05]	0.33*** [0.04]	0.34*** [0.03]	0.35*** [0.03]	0.40*** [0.03]	0.36*** [0.02]
$N_{offspring}$ cross section wave 3	1299	1893	2362	2420	2364	2841
$N_{offspring}$ balanced panel	460	784	974	1112	1269	1628

Notes: first row refers to regression of offspring housing wealth on parent's wealth controlling for age within 6-year age group. Both offspring and parent net wealth have been transformed using inverse hyperbolic sine transformation, elasticity computed at mean values of offspring and parent wealth as suggested by Bellemare & Wichman (2020) and standard errors adjusted accordingly. Second and third row is identical to first row except sample is based on balanced panel of individuals observed at wave 3 (2010/12) and round 6 (2016/18). Wealth values adjusted for inflation prior to transformation and reflect 2015 prices.

Table 4 reports IWE and rank estimates for housing wealth. The general pattern is clear: the IWE estimate is larger for successively younger cohorts *at the same age*. Thus, parental wealth is increasingly associated with housing wealth despite policies been introduced to specifically improving access to homeownership.

Table 4 also shows, as expected, that at higher ages the magnitude of the coefficient IWE and rank correlation falls. This is likely to be related to both lifecycle and cohort effects. For example, in our data 40% (10%) of individuals in the 29-34 (59-64) age group report zero housing wealth. The rank based estimates which are not affected any type of data transformation imply the intergenerational association is relatively stable.

The difference in the beta versus rank estimates suggests widening inequality in housing wealth, particularly at younger ages. There are two issues to consider: having versus not having such wealth and conditional on having, the level. Thus, one has to consider the age and rate at which offspring accumulate particular types of wealth. We return to this issue in a later section of the paper.

Table 5: IWE and rank estimates for Pension wealth based on cross section and 6-year panel by age (inverse hyperbolic sine specifications).

Age group at wave 3	29-34	35-40	41-46	47-52	53-58	59-64
Central birth years	1979-1980	1973-1974	1967-1968	1960-1961	1954-1955	1948-1949
Log-Log						
β cross section full sample wave 3	1.42*** [0.14]	1.32*** [0.13]	0.96*** [0.11]	0.79*** [0.10]	1.03*** [0.10]	0.55*** [0.10]
β balanced panel wave 3	1.55*** [0.24]	1.22*** [0.21]	1.13*** [0.18]	0.73*** [0.15]	1.00*** [0.14]	0.60*** [0.12]
β balanced panel round 6	1.58*** [0.26]	1.03*** [0.21]	0.99*** [0.17]	0.68*** [0.14]	0.77*** [0.14]	0.59*** [0.13]
Rank-rank						
rank cross section full sample round 3	0.30*** [0.03]	0.28*** [0.02]	0.20*** [0.02]	0.19*** [0.02]	0.23*** [0.02]	0.17*** [0.02]
rank balanced panel wave 3	0.35*** [0.04]	0.23*** [0.04]	0.22*** [0.03]	0.18*** [0.03]	0.22*** [0.03]	0.18*** [0.03]
rank balanced panel round 6	0.36*** [0.05]	0.23*** [0.04]	0.25*** [0.03]	0.19*** [0.03]	0.21*** [0.03]	0.20*** [0.03]
$N_{offspring}$ cross section wave 3	1299	1893	2362	2420	2364	2841
$N_{offspring}$ balanced panel	460	784	974	1112	1269	1628

Notes: first row refers to regression of offspring pension wealth on parent's wealth controlling for age within 6-year age group. Both offspring and parent wealth have been transformed using inverse hyperbolic sine transformation and elasticity computed at mean values of offspring and parent wealth as suggested by Bellemare & Wichman (2020) and standard errors adjusted accordingly. Second and third row is identical to first row except sample is based on balanced panel of individuals observed at wave 3 (2010/12) and round 6 (2016/18).

Wealth values adjusted for inflation prior to transformation and reflect 2015 prices.

Table 5 shows that there is a strong link between parental and offspring pension wealth. The estimated IWE coefficient falls for all groups, except the very youngest group, likely reflecting AE which has led to increased pension coverage among the lowest earners. AE could reduce pension wealth inequalities but only if middle and/or higher earners do not accumulate pension wealth at a faster rate over a given period, which is unlikely given the profile of pension wealth by parental wealth background (see online Appendix B). Comparing cohort-on-cohort estimates of the IWE suggests there is no clear evidence of an observable decline among individuals at the same age over the sample period. The estimates based on Rank-regression are mixed, although there is tentative evidence to suggest parental wealth plays an increasingly important role in explaining offspring position in the pension wealth distribution.

Table 6: Rank estimates for financial wealth based on cross section and 6-year panel by age (inverse hyperbolic sine specifications).

Age group at wave 3	29-34	35-40	41-46	47-52	53-58	59-64
Central birth year	1979-1980	1973-1974	1967-1968	1960-1961	1954-1955	1948-1949
Rank-rank						
rank cross section full sample round 3	0.21*** [0.03]	0.24*** [0.03]	0.22*** [0.02]	0.23*** [0.02]	0.30*** [0.02]	0.26*** [0.02]
rank balanced panel wave 3	0.25*** [0.05]	0.25*** [0.04]	0.26*** [0.03]	0.21*** [0.03]	0.30*** [0.03]	0.28*** [0.03]
rank balanced panel round 6	0.22*** [0.05]	0.23*** [0.04]	0.27*** [0.03]	0.27*** [0.03]	0.30*** [0.03]	0.32*** [0.02]
$N_{offspring}$ cross section wave 3	1340	1938	2386	2442	2377	2847
$N_{offspring}$ balanced panel	460	784	974	1112	1269	1628

Notes: first row refers to regression of rank of offspring pension wealth on rank of parent's wealth controlling for age within 6-year age group. Both offspring and parent wealth have been transformed using inverse

hyperbolic sine transformation and elasticity computed at mean values of offspring and parent wealth as suggested by Bellemare & Wichman (2020) and standard errors adjusted accordingly. Second and third row is identical to first row except sample is based on balanced panel of individuals observed at wave 3 (2010/12) and round 6 (2016/18). Wealth values adjusted for inflation prior to transformation and reflect 2015 prices.

Table 6 reports rank estimates of the intergenerational correlation between parental wealth and offspring financial net wealth over time, and shows a strong positive association between parental wealth and offspring total net financial wealth. The magnitude of this effect is broadly stable across time and for individuals of the same age but born six years apart.[10]

The mechanisms by which parents influence offspring wealth outcomes is likely to differ by wealth type and we consider the relative importance of parent versus individual characteristics in explaining wealth trajectories in a later section of the paper. Taken together, the cross section and panel evidence suggest parental wealth is strongly associated with all wealth types across the lifecycle, particularly in the case of housing wealth. In order to quantify much stronger, in Table 7 we pool waves/rounds 3-6 of WAS and interact our markers of parental wealth with time dummies and age for each type of wealth.[11]

Table 7: Rate of change in IWE and rank between offspring (aged 29-64) and parent wealth between wave 3 (2010/12) and round 6 (2016/18) by wealth type.

Wealth type	β [σ]	Rank [σ]
Total wealth		
Wave 4*Parent's wealth	0.013 [0.0109]	0.002 [0.00691]
Round 5*Parent's wealth	0.031** [0.0143]	0.013 [0.00907]
Round 6*Parent's wealth	0.039** [0.0189]	0.003 [0.0119]
Age*Parent's wealth	-0.003** [0.00120]	0.003*** [0.000709]
Parent's wealth	0.465*** [0.0278]	0.229*** [0.0145]
Property wealth		
Wave 4*Parent's wealth	0.052 [0.0389]	0.005 [0.00671]
Round 5*Parent's wealth	0.088* [0.0517]	0.0150* [0.00873]
Round 6*Parent's wealth	0.186*** [0.0677]	0.0302*** [0.0113]

---

[10] We estimate only rank estimates due to non-trivial proportion of our sample reporting negative financial wealth. Negative values mean the types of transformations used to compute the IWE are inappropriate (Ravallion, 2017; Bellemare and Wichman, 2020).

[11] In alternative specifications we control for various polynomials of age, parent's wealth and time (available on request).

Age*Parent's wealth	-0.026*** [0.00468]	0.004*** [0.000711]
Parent's wealth	1.724*** [0.112]	0.194*** [0.0148]
Pension wealth		
Wave 4*Parent's wealth	0.054 [0.0452]	0.006 [0.00810]
Round 5*Parent's wealth	0.084 [0.0568]	0.028*** [0.0103]
Round 6*Parent's wealth	0.0007 [0.0694]	0.008 [0.0129]
Age*Parent's wealth	-0.021*** [0.00463]	0.0003 [0.000779]
Parent's wealth	1.358*** [0.106]	0.181*** [0.0156]
Financial wealth		
Wave 4*Parent's wealth		0.006 [0.00865]
Round 5*Parent's wealth		-0.014 [0.0106]
Round 6*Parent's wealth		0.004 [0.0130]
Age*Parent's wealth		0.002*** [0.000765]
Parent's wealth		0.192*** [0.0165]
N_{total_wealth}	33,278	33,278
$N_{housing\_wealth}$	33,098	33,098
$N_{pension\_wealth}$	33,278	33,278
$N_{financial\_wealth}$		33,278

Notes: second and third column correspond to regression of offspring wealth (by type) on parent's total net wealth interacted with time and parent's total net wealth interacted with age, second column refers to IWE and third column rank estimate. Both regressand and regressors have been appropriately transformed using log or HIS depending on wealth type. All specifications also control for first and second order polynomial terms in age, parent's total net wealth and wave dummies (not reported). IWE estimates not reported for financial wealth due to proportion of sample reporting negative net financial wealth. Samples based on pooled data using wave 3-round 6 of WAS. Wealth values adjusted for inflation prior to transformation and reflect 2015 prices.

Table 7 shows housing wealth is driving the rapid pace at which intergenerational wealth persistence in Britain is growing over time.[12] Row 12 (column 2) shows that the strength of this relationship has grown by 0.186 log points between 2010/12-2016/18, or roughly 0.03 log points a year for an individual at the same age but born six-years later. The results imply that

---

[12] We do not discuss the results for total net wealth here as they reported in Gregg and Kanabar (2021).

among younger cohorts the IWE estimate increases from 1.72 to 1.91 over the sample period. Column 3 reports rank estimates and this mirrors the results reported for the IWE-type estimator. Therefore relying only on rank order and ignoring wealth inequalities in parent and offspring generations, the data suggest parental wealth is playing an increasingly important role in explaining offspring's position in the respective housing wealth distribution. In the case of pension wealth, Table 7 shows only limited evidence of parental wealth having an increasingly important role in influencing offspring pension wealth and this relationship does not hold at the end of the sample period.

We note the interaction effect between parental wealth and age affects intergenerational persistence in wealth differently across the regression specifications. In the case of IWE-type regressions which account for inequality in wealth holdings in both the offspring and parent generation, ceteris paribus, the IWE becomes smaller with increasing age. On the other hand, when only considering the rank order and not accounting for the magnitude of differences in wealth levels in either generation, the effect is the opposite, the joint effect is increasing in age. This is likely due to the fact the variance in the respective wealth distribution is rising across successively older cohorts. In the case of housing and pension the distinction between having and not having such wealth is important in this context. Given we control for first and second order polynomials in age, the rank specification only considers order, therefore even if the total net wealth distribution is becoming increasingly unequal the ordering may not change and hence the interaction effect in the rank specification is positive. Empirical evidence clearly shows declining homeownership and housing wealth across successively younger cohorts in Britain (Resolution Foundation, 2017). However, as we show in a later section of the paper this only holds for individuals from relatively less affluent backgrounds (see Figures 1 and 2). Collectively, the findings highlight both regression approaches are required to analyse and understand intergenerational persistence in wealth, specifically how the interaction between individual and parental characteristics explain the change in wealth persistence over time.

The findings in Table 7 are of policy relevance, if the change in offspring wealth inequalities is due to housing wealth and such wealth is being accumulated at different rates, which is increasingly determined by parental wealth then policymakers must understand the mechanisms responsible for this. There are two issues to consider. First, whether the findings reported in Table 7 are due to offspring having vs not having housing wealth. Second, the value of such wealth and how this is related to family background. We explore these issues next.

Figure 1: Proportion of individuals (aged 31-67) reporting housing wealth by family background over sample period (2010/12-2016-18).


Notes: proportion corresponds to individuals reporting housing wealth by single age year, each group defined by age and parent background. Based on unbalanced panel sample minimum of one observation per individual to be included in sample. N=36, 384. Proportions reported over 6 years corresponding with wave 3 (2010/12)-round 6 (2016/18) of WAS.

Figure 1 shows at younger ages there is a clear difference in the proportion of individuals reporting housing wealth by family background. Between ages 31 and 37 roughly 30% of individuals with low educated renter parents report such wealth, whereas the proportion increases from around 60% at age 31 to roughly 85% by age 37 among those who parents are high educated homeowners. Whilst Figure 1 shows a degree of convergence at older ages this refers to different cohorts who had greater absolute housing mobility and a substantial gap of around 15-20% nevertheless remains. The findings in Figure 1 are consistent with recent evidence suggesting that for the youngest age groups home ownership opportunities are becoming increasingly unequal and stratified by parental wealth (Blanden et al. (2021), Davenport et al. 2021) and based on current trends it is unlikely individuals born in the 1980s and onwards will experience the same homeownership opportunities as their parents.

Figure 1 suggests the gaps observed across cohorts is likely to widen further in the future. Comparing the youngest (31-37) and second youngest (37-43) cohorts clearly show individuals from the most disadvantaged backgrounds are less likely to report homeownership at the same age, no such pattern is found for the most advantaged groups. In fact, homeownership rates are *higher* based on this type of comparison. Among the very youngest cohort from the most advantaged background the proportion of individuals reporting homeownership at aged 37 in round 6 (2016/18) is roughly 10% higher than a slightly older cohort from the same family background. On the other hand, for cohorts whose parents are low educated renters there is a clear difference for the youngest group in the opposite direction, the proportion of individuals aged 37 in round 6 (2016/18) who report housing wealth is over 10% *lower* than a cohort slightly older from the same family background. Whilst this pattern is not evident at older ages, we note the most disadvantaged consistently report lower levels of homeownership relative to all other groups.

We next consider housing wealth accumulation utilising the panel aspect of WAS to plot housing wealth trajectories by cohort and parental characteristics.

Figure 2: Average housing wealth of individuals (aged 31-67) by six-year cohort and family background over sample period (2010/12-2016-18).

Notes: Average housing wealth reported by individuals by single age year, each group defined by age and parent background. Based on unbalanced panel. Minimum of one observation per individual to be included in sample. Values correspond to 2015 prices. N=36, 384. Levels reported over 6 years correspond with wave 3 (2010/12)-round 6 (2016/18) of WAS.

Whereas Figure 1 showed significant differences in homeownership rates, Figure 2 shows differences also exist when one considers the value and rate at which housing wealth is accumulated by family background. Between age 31 and 37 the average housing wealth for those whose parents are low educated renters (high educated homeowners) increased from £10,064 (£36,546) to £12,517 (£89,359), so an average increase of £2,500 or 25% albeit from a low base. On the other hand, for those from the most advantaged background the average increase is almost three times the level reported at age 31, in absolute terms around £53,000 and over 25 times the absolute gain reported by individuals from a low educated renter background. Therefore, even at relatively young ages there is vast inequality in housing wealth, consistent with the results in Table 4 and given the profile of housing wealth accumulation by

cohorts and parental background shown in Figure 2, this difference holds across the lifecourse. This also suggests the cross section differences in housing wealth reported in online Appendix B are set to widen in the future. These results are consistent with the findings reported in Table 7 and imply inequalities in housing wealth have been and are likely to continue driving the overall change in intergenerational wealth persistence in Britain.

Comparing across the lifecycle Figure 2 shows that the average rate of housing wealth accumulation among younger cohorts (below age 50) from more disadvantaged backgrounds is lower than for older groups. This does not hold for the most advantaged group. In fact, among the two youngest cohorts in this group (age 31-43) housing wealth is accumulated at a faster rate compared to individuals from the same background aged between 43 and 55. We also note the sharp increase in the levels of housing wealth reported among individuals aged 55+ from the most advantaged background, which may reflect proceeds from inheritance. How such funds are used is an under researched area for example whether such monies are used to purchase additional property or, alternatively, passed on to younger generations to purchase their first home.

Our findings underline significant differences in homeownership and housing wealth from a cohort perspective and that housing wealth is largely responsible for driving the change in the intergenerational persistence in wealth. An important issue then is to quantify how parental wealth is influencing homeownership opportunities across successively younger cohorts. To answer this, we interact our markers of parents wealth and survey wave dummies to directly compare how homeownership differs for individuals at the same age but born six-years apart.

Table 8: Likelihood of reporting housing wealth for offspring aged 29-64 and parent wealth between wave 3 and round 6 across wealth types.

	β $[\sigma]$	Rank $[\sigma]$
Whether reports housing wealth		
Wave 4*Parent's wealth	0.0119 [0.0111]	0.0345 [0.0431]
Round 5*Parent's wealth	0.0119 [0.0145]	0.0312 [0.0549]
Round 6*Parent's wealth	0.0373** [0.0186]	0.126* [0.0700]
Age*Parent's wealth	-0.00387*** [0.00132]	-0.0103** [0.00481]

Parent's wealth	0.373*** [0.0287]	1.322*** [0.102]
N	33,098	

Table 8 reports probit regression coefficients and shows the likelihood of reporting housing wealth is increasingly influenced by family background for individuals at the same age but born 6 years apart. Estimating this relationship using an IWE-type estimator allows us to incorporate inequality in parental wealth levels in explaining the variation in offspring homeownership, whereas the rank estimator highlights how parents' position in the parental wealth distribution rather than the magnitude of parental wealth differences is important. Table 8 shows the likelihood of reporting housing wealth is 0.037 log points higher among individuals born 6 years later to the same parental background, and 0.126 in rank terms by round 6 (2016/18) both significant at conventional levels. Thus, parental wealth is playing an increasingly important role in explaining the likelihood of whether offspring are likely to report homeownership. Table 7 shows this finding holds when we consider offspring housing wealth inequality i.e., conditional on having housing wealth. The sixth row of Table 8 highlights the negative relationship between age and parental wealth, consistent with recent evidence underlining the difficulty for younger cohorts in Britain to get on the housing ladder (Resolution Foundation, 2018). Taken together, the evidence presented in Tables 7 and 8 suggests rapidly diverging fortunes in homeownership and housing wealth by parent background between 2010 and 2018.

The ability to purchase a home is related to both individual and parental characteristics. To understand the relative importance of parental background we estimate a regression which also includes controls for individual's own education, earnings, social class, economic status, marital status, sex and region.[13] These have been shown to be important in explaining homeownership from an intergenerational perspective in Britain (Blanden et al. 2021; Davenport et al. 2021). Our interest is to understand the additional importance of family background over time and across cohorts, once we control for such characteristics. Full results

---

[13] Adding individual levels controls to the regression will bias down the effect of parental wealth on offspring wealth.

which can be found in online Appendix D show that even after controlling for these additional factors our qualitative findings do not change. In fact, the coefficient estimated on the interaction effect between time and parental wealth by the end of our sample period is even *larger* (0.055** [0.027] in the case of the beta regression) implying a joint positive correlation between individual's own and their parent's characteristics, and collectively their influence on the relative likelihood of offsrping reporting homeownership.

Online Appendix D also includes a specification which regresses the same set of individual and parental characteristics on value of offspring housing wealth and here we also find a strong positive association between parental wealth and the interaction between time dummies and parental wealth with offspring housing wealth. The latter becoming stronger over time (significant at conventional levels for beta and rank regressions, see online Appendix D for further details). Collectively, our findings show parental wealth is becoming increasingly important for determining homeownership *and* the level of housing wealth among individuals born to the same parental background but born 6 years apart, consistent with the results in Table 7.

5. Conclusion

Britain like many advanced economies has seen a rapid widening in wealth inequalities from a cohort perspective (Boserup, 2017; Black et al. 2020, Gregg and Kanabar, 2021). The fact wealth significantly affects an individual's living standards and is easily transferable implies that inequalities early in life will have profound implications over time, such as influencing major lifecycle events including homeownership. Therefore understanding which components of wealth drive wealth persistence from an intergenerational perspective is of paramount importance if policymakers are to design effective policies to improve wealth and social mobility. To our knowledge no studies have attempted to understand the relative importance of different wealth *types* in driving intergenerational wealth persistence, something we address in this paper. We show that in the case of Britain the change is largely attributable to growing inequalities in housing wealth and this is becoming increasingly stratified by parental wealth. Between 2010/12 and 2016/18 we estimate parental wealth increases the IWE in housing by 0.18 log points and if this rate is maintained implies the IWE in housing will double in roughly one century.

A second major finding is that across successively younger cohorts homeownership and housing wealth accumulation is becoming increasingly associated with parental wealth. Cohort

analysis shows that among younger individuals in their early 30s from the wealthiest backgrounds housing wealth is being accumulated at a similar or even *faster* rate than older cohorts. On the other hand, individuals from the most disadvantaged backgrounds in their early 30s are not only *less* likely to report homeownership compared to slightly older cohorts but the rate at which housing wealth is being accumulated is also falling compared to individuals from the same parental background but who are slightly older. By age 35 homeownership levels are *three* times higher among offspring whose parents are high educated homeowners compared to those whose parents are from a low educated renter background. In terms of housing wealth the former group holds approximately *ten*-times the level reported by the latter. Such differences in housing wealth between the most and least advantaged persist between ages 30 and 64 and our results imply they are set to widen further. Importantly, we show that our findings hold even after controlling for a range of individual characteristics which are likely to influence homeownership such as earnings and education.

Taken together the results imply the penalty for being born to parents of low wealth is growing rapidly over time in GB and is influencing major lifecycle decisions such as the ability to own a home and so accumulate housing wealth. Such findings have implications for the structure of society in the long run and raise serious political economy questions related to social cohesion and civic participation. Indeed, the historic returns from wealth versus human capital and its implication for individual social mobility has garnered international debate in recent times (Piketty, 2017). In the context of our study the returns to housing are non-trivial, over our sample period (2010 and 2018) average house prices in Britain grew by over 37% and by over 11% in the year to September 2021 alone (ONS, 2021). Despite policies targeted at young people to improve access to homeownership in the UK such as Help to Buy, our findings suggest parental wealth influences the likelihood of homeownership and the strength of this relationship is *growing* over time. A key question then is to understand whether the relative importance of individual versus parent characteristics, including transfers, is changing over time and driving wealth inequalities. Separately, we also need to better understand household level wealth dynamics across cohorts and over time. Both issues are part ongoing research.

References

Adermon, A., Lindahl, M., & Waldenström, D. (2018). Intergenerational wealth mobility and the role of inheritance: Evidence from multiple generations. The Economic Journal, 128(612), F482-F513.

Advani, A., Bangham, G., & Leslie, J. (2020). The UK's wealth distribution and characteristics of high-wealth households. Resolution Foundation.

Bellemare, M. F., & Wichman, C. J. (2020). Elasticities and the inverse hyperbolic sine transformation. Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 82(1), 50-61.

Black, S. E., Devereux, P. J., Lundborg, P., & Majlesi, K. (2020). Poor little rich kids? The role of nature versus nurture in wealth and other economic outcomes and behaviours. The Review of Economic Studies, 87(4), 1683-1725.

Blanden, J., Gregg, P., & Macmillan, L. (2013). Intergenerational persistence in income and social class: the effect of within-group inequality. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, *176*(2), 541-563.

Blanden, J., Eyles, A., & Machin, S. (2021). Trends in intergenerational home ownership and wealth transmission (No. 21-05). Centre for Education Policy and Equalising Opportunities, UCL Institute of Education.

Björklund, A., & Jäntti, M. (1997). Intergenerational income mobility in Sweden compared to the United States. The American Economic Review, 87(5), 1009-1018.

Böhlmark, A., & Lindquist, M. J. (2006). Life-cycle variations in the association between current and lifetime income: Replication and extension for Sweden. Journal of Labor Economics, 24(4), 879-896.

Boserup, S. H., Kopczuk, W., & Kreiner, C. T. (2013). Intergenerational wealth mobility: Evidence from Danish wealth records of three generations. Univ. of Copenhagen mimeo.

Boserup, S. H., Kopczuk, W., & Kreiner, C. T. (2016). The role of bequests in shaping wealth inequality: evidence from Danish wealth records. American Economic Review, 106(5), 656-61.

Boserup, S. H., Kopczuk, W., & Kreiner, C. T. (2017). Intergenerational wealth formation over the life cycle: Evidence from danish wealth records 1984-2013. Working Paper, University of Copenhagen.

Boserup, S. H., Kopczuk, W., & Kreiner, C. T. (2018). Born with a silver spoon? Danish evidence on wealth inequality in childhood. The Economic Journal, 128(612), F514-F544.

Charles, K. K., & Hurst, E. (2003). The correlation of wealth across generations. Journal of political Economy, 111(6), 1155-1182.

Davenport, A., Levell, P., & Sturrock, D. (2021). Why do wealthy parents have wealthy children? *The Institute for Fiscal Studies*.

Dearden, L., Machin, S., & Reed, H. (1997). Intergenerational mobility in Britain. The Economic Journal, 107(440), 47-66.

Gregg, P., Macmillan, L., & Vittori, C. (2017). Moving towards estimating sons' lifetime intergenerational economic mobility in the UK. Oxford bulletin of economics and statistics, 79(1), 79-100.

Gregg, P., & Kanabar, R. (2021). Intergenerational wealth transmission in Great Britain. *Centre for Education Policy and Equalising Opportunities, Working Paper*, 21-06.

Jerrim, J., Choi, Á., & Simancas Rodríguez, R. (2014). Two-Sample Two-Stage Least Squares (TSTSLS) estimates of earnings mobility: how consistent are they?

Jerrim, J., & Macmillan, L. (2015). Income inequality, intergenerational mobility, and the Great Gatsby Curve: Is education the key? Social Forces, 94(2), 505-533.

Gritti, D., & Cutuli, G. (2021). Brick-by-brick inequality. Homeownership in Italy, employment instability and wealth transmission. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 100417.

Haider, S., & Solon, G. (2006). Life-cycle variation in the association between current and lifetime earnings. American Economic Review, 96(4), 1308-1320.

Killewald, A., Pfeffer, F. T., & Schachner, J. N. (2017). Wealth inequality and accumulation. Annual review of sociology, 43, 379-404.

Kitagawa, T., Nybom, M., & Stuhler, J. (2018). *Measurement error and rank correlations* (No. CWP28/18). Cemmap working paper.

Nybom, M., & Stuhler, J. (2017). Biases in standard measures of intergenerational income dependence. *Journal of Human Resources*, *52*(3), 800-825.

Palomino, J. C., Marrero, G. A., Nolan, B., & Rodríguez, J. G. (2021). Wealth inequality, intergenerational transfers, and family background. *Oxford Economic Papers*.

Pence, K. M. (2006). The role of wealth transformations: An application to estimating the effect of tax incentives on saving. The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 5(1).

Piketty, T., & Saez, E. (2014). Inequality in the long run. Science, 344(6186), 838-843.

ONS. (2012). Wealth and Assets Survey Review Report.

ONS. (2019). Wealth in Great Britain Round 8: 2016 to 2018. https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/wealthingreatbritainwave62016to2018

ONS. (2021). UK House Price Index: September 2021. https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/inflationandpriceindices/bulletins/housepriceindex/september2021

Oren, L., Caduri, A., & Tziner, A. (2013). Intergenerational occupational transmission: Do offspring walk in the footsteps of mom or dad, or both? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *83*(3), 551-560.

Pfeffer, F. T., & Killewald, A. (2015). How rigid is the wealth structure and why? Inter-and multigenerational associations in family wealth. *Population Studies Center Research Report*, (15-845).

Piketty, T. (2017). Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Harvard University Press.

Killewald, A., Pfeffer, F. T., & Schachner, J. N. (2017). Wealth inequality and accumulation. *Annual review of sociology*, *43*, 379-404.

Pfeffer, F. T., & Waitkus, N. (2021). The wealth inequality of nations. *American Sociological Review*, *86*(4), 567-602.

Ravallion, M. (2017). A concave log-like transformation allowing non-positive values. Economics Letters, 161, 130-132.

Resolution Foundation. (2018). House of the rising son (or daughter): the impact of parental wealth on their children's homeownership.

Online Appendix A: Definition of derived variables used from Wealth and Assets Survey

Table A1: Definition of derived variables.

| Variable	Definition
Total net wealth	Total sum of: Individual net value of all (main and other) property, individual net financial wealth (includes endowment), individual physical wealth (including durable goods) and individual pension wealth.
Pension wealth	Total sum of occupational Defined Benefit (DB), occupational Defined Contribution, retained rights in DB schemes, retained rights in DC schemes, value of additional voluntary contributions (AVCs), value of personal pensions, value of retained rights in defined benefit pensions, value of retained rights in defined contribution pensions, value of retained rights in drawdown, value of pensions in payment and value of pension from former spouse of partner.
Net property wealth	Individual net value of all (main and other) property
Net financial wealth	Total value of all formal assets (current account, savings, ISAs, national savings product, shares, insurance, bonds, employee

	shares, unit and investment trusts, overseas shares, bonds/gilts (home and abroad), any other investments) PLUS total value of informational assets PLUS child trust funds, other children's assets, endowments.
	MINUS
	Total financial liabilities (total credit card balance, total value of store cards, mail order, hire purchase, total amount of all loans, mail order arrears, hire purchase arrears, loan arrears, total bill arrears, current account overdraft, total value of student loans).
Proportion reporting housing wealth	Proportion of individuals in sample who report having a strictly positive amount of net housing wealth.
Proportion with pension wealth	Proportion of individuals in sample who report having a strictly positive amount of pension wealth.
Proportion with financial wealth	Proportion of individuals in sample who report having a strictly positive amount of financial wealth.

Figure B1 plots total net wealth by age in wave 3 (2010-2012) of WAS. There are clear level differences and a general pattern of fanning out across the lifecourse by parental wealth background. Those from medium and high educated homeowner backgrounds steadily pull away from other groups. In particular, the latter group sees a rapid increase in wealth levels in their 50s and 60s. By the time individuals reach peak wealth age, around 64 in our data, those from high educated homeowner background report on average three times the amount of wealth (£1.2M vs £400,000) relative to individuals from a low educated renter background. What is striking is that based on this simple cross section average wealth levels among those aged 41-46 from the most advantaged background equals peak wealth (at age 64) from the most disadvantaged background. For the former group this is before the arrival of pension wealth and inheritance which typically takes place when individuals are in their 50s. However, Figure B1 reports average wealth based on different individuals at one point in time, hence compares individuals across age groups with slightly older parents. Thus, the differences could reflect cohort specific factors as well as stage in the lifecycle. For a full discussion of total net wealth from a cross section perspective see Gregg and Kanabar (2021).

Figure B1: Total wealth by parent background

Notes: figures based on wave 3 (2010-12) of WAS. Figures correspond to 2015 prices.

We produce similar Figures for individual's total levels of (net) housing, pensions and financial wealth and find a similar trend in terms of parental wealth as we did for individual total net wealth. Figure B2 shows that individuals aged between 41 and 46 in wave 3 from a high educated homeowner background had on average similar levels of total net housing wealth as an individual at peak wealth in their early 60s from a low educated renter household. Moreover, the average levels of net housing wealth reported among the former group increases rapidly across individuals aged in their 50s, from 228K to 400K, so almost doubling. Whereas for individuals from a low educated renter background it increased from 68K to 94K. Again, it is important to stress we are not observing individuals own trajectories over time but average levels across different individuals with successively older parents. By the time individuals reach peak wealth age in our dataset, average total net housing wealth is three times greater among individuals from high educated homeowner backgrounds versus those who grew up in a low educated renter household. Whilst Figures B1-B3 include those without housing wealth (zeros), what these figures does not show is the proportion of individuals who report vs do not report housing wealth by age and parent background. This is an important distinction which we discuss in the paper.

**Figure B2**: Total net housing wealth by parental background

Notes: figures based on wave 3 (2010-12) of WAS. Figures correspond to 2015 prices. Includes zeros.

We next turn to pension wealth, here again we see a clear difference in pension wealth by parent background. Given its close link with earnings and how it is accumulated it is not surprising to see that differences emerge when individuals are in their 50s.[14] It is clear individuals whose parents are high educated and homeowners report high levels of pension wealth relative to all other groups. Similar to the finding for housing wealth, individuals in this group report average pension wealth at age 50 which corresponds to the average pension wealth reached by those from low educated renter backgrounds at peak wealth age. Thus, given the evidence seen in Figure B3 this is *before* the rapid increase (based on a cross section perspective so different individuals) the former group reports in their pension wealth. The absolute difference in levels is large: by early-mid 40s the difference between top and bottom group is roughly two-fold. By the time individuals reach their mid-50s it is roughly three-fold and the absolute difference just prior to retirement between these groups is vast: £552,000 vs £192,000 (in 2015 prices).

There are certain issues which should be considered when interpreting the findings in Figure B3. First, like housing wealth it is important to distinguish between having and not having pension wealth by age and parent background. The second is that the introduction of Auto Enrolment (AE) into a workplace pension took place in the UK starting in October 2012. Whilst this policy is likely to address the issue of not having pension wealth and possibly affect pension level, the initial roll out of the policy focused on coverage with relatively low levels of individual contribution. Moreover, AE is unlikely to address pension wealth gaps for individuals in their 50s given their stage in the lifecycle and the fact pension wealth is closely linked to lifetime earnings. Moreover, it is not entirely clear whether AE will address the vast differences in pension wealth by family background even for those just entering the labour market. For example, if we produce the same chart as Figure B3 but instead use round 6 data covering the period 2016-2018, a time period when the policy had been rolled out more extensively we still see the same trends as reported in Figure B3.

---

[14] In the UK pension wealth is accessible typically from mid 50s though there is significant heterogeneity in pension scheme eligibility rules including age of receipt.

Figure B3: Total pension wealth by parental background

Notes: figures based on wave 3 (2010-12) of WAS. Figures correspond to 2015 prices. Includes zeros.

The final component of wealth we consider is financial wealth. Evidence suggests this type of wealth is concentrated in the top three deciles of the household wealth distribution in GB (ONS, 2019). Again, similar to property and pension wealth Figure B4 shows clear level differences which fan out across age groups and by parent background. Individuals from high educated homeowner households report significantly higher levels of financial wealth, roughly four-times the average level of financial wealth compared to those who grew up in low educated renter households at ages 29-34. The former group (as well as those from medium educated homeowner backgrounds) steadily pull away across age groups and Figure B4 shows a sharp increase in financial wealth levels for those in their 50s. This could reflect inheritances and transfers or stage in lifecycle, note here we are comparing different individuals at a single point in time and not accumulation by the same individuals. Just prior to retirement the average level of financial wealth for individuals from high educated homeowner (low educated renter) households is £203,060 (£44,302) an almost five-fold difference.

Figure B4: Total financial wealth by parent background

Notes: figures based on wave 3 (2010-12) of WAS. Figures correspond to 2015 prices. Includes zeros and negative values.

Online Appendix C: Likelihood offspring reporting wealth type by parental wealth

Table C1: Likelihood of having positive level of net wealth type by parent's wealth

	29-34	35-40	41-46	47-52	53-58	59-64
Age group	1979-1980	1973-1974	1967-1968	1960-1961	1954-1955	1948-1949
Wave 3						
Housing wealth	0.61*** [0.07]	0.54*** [0.05]	0.44*** [0.05]	0.47*** [0.05]	0.52*** [0.05]	0.42*** [0.05]
Pension wealth	0.54*** [0.06]	0.49*** [0.05]	0.38*** [0.05]	0.34*** [0.05]	0.43*** [0.05]	0.19*** [0.04]
Financial wealth	0.79*** [0.18]	0.69*** [0.21]	0.81*** [0.21]	0.55*** [0.21]	0.68*** [0.18]	0.24*** [0.22]
$N_{housing}$	1298	1902	2359	2425	2374	2846
$N_{pension}$	1340	1938	2386	2442	2377	2847
$N_{financial}$	828	1126	1730	1915	1980	2179
Wave 6						
Housing wealth	0.33*** [0.62]	0.78*** [0.10]	0.59*** [0.09]	0.49*** [0.07]	0.54*** [0.07]	0.63*** [0.08]
Pension wealth	0.32*** [0.16]	0.52*** [0.10]	0.48*** [0.09]	0.41*** [0.08]	0.33*** [0.08]	0.31*** [0.07]
Financial wealth	0.07 [0.15]	0.14 [0.09]	0.30*** [0.08]	0.20*** [0.07]	0.36*** [0.07]	0.27*** [0.08]
$N_{housing}$	240	575	898	1107	1269	1382
$N_{pension}$	242	579	899	1110	1270	1383
$N_{financial}$	242	579	899	1110	1270	1383

Notes: logit regression modelling likelihood of holding wealth type controlling for age and parent's wealth (measured in log). Wave 3 corresponds to (2010-12) and wave 6 (2016-18). Robust standard errors reported in parenthesis.

Table C1 shows that the likelihood of holding wealth is strongly associated with family background. This holds across almost all age groups and wealth types. Whilst the results based on wave 3 (2010-12) data suggest the strength of this association is growing across successively younger cohorts, this does not hold at round 6 (2016-18) where the strength of the relationship is stable.

Online Appendix D: Homeownership, parental wealth and individual characteristics

Table D1: Regression of whether individual holds property wealth and housing value for beta and rank specifications.

Covariates	Dependent variable: has property wealth		Dependent variable: housing value	
	$\beta(\sigma)$	$rank(\sigma)$	$\beta(\sigma)$	$rank(\sigma)$
Age	0.0780***	0.0559***	0.485***	0.0126***
	(0.0245)	(0.00819)	(0.0682)	(0.000988)
Age square	-0.000358**	-0.000378**	-0.00246***	-8.61e-05***
	(0.000173)	(0.000175)	(0.000467)	(2.19e-05)
Parent's wealth/rank	0.215***	0.717***	0.926***	0.0400**
	(0.0365)	(0.130)	(0.115)	(0.0159)
Wave 4	-0.277	-0.0837*	-0.932	-0.0469***
	(0.242)	(0.0427)	(0.631)	(0.00540)
Wave 5	-0.467	-0.176***	-2.991***	-0.0815***
	(0.293)	(0.0531)	(0.804)	(0.00696)
Wave 6	-0.858**	-0.250***	-3.901***	-0.113***
	(0.351)	(0.0639)	(0.987)	(0.00845)
Wave 4* Parent's wealth/rank	0.0161	0.0166	0.0492	0.0115
	(0.0193)	(0.0736)	(0.0493)	(0.00845)
Wave 5* Parent's wealth/rank	0.0268	0.0806	0.206***	0.0379***
	(0.0233)	(0.0875)	(0.0627)	(0.0107)
Wave 6* Parent's wealth/rank	0.0556**	0.161	0.271***	0.0447***
	(0.0279)	(0.105)	(0.0766)	(0.0129)
Age* Parent's wealth/rank	-0.00197	-0.00329	-0.0195***	0.00436***
	(0.00177)	(0.00656)	(0.00490)	(0.000768)
Unemployed	0.417**	0.410**	0.215	0.0503**
	(0.173)	(0.174)	(0.477)	(0.0235)
Inactive	0.525***	0.524***	0.776***	0.0621***
	(0.136)	(0.136)	(0.292)	(0.0161)
Cohabiting (inc same sex couples)	-0.465***	-0.462***	-1.201***	-0.0292***
	(0.0500)	(0.0499)	(0.152)	(0.00703)
Single	-0.970***	-0.971***	-2.948***	-0.0461***
	(0.0463)	(0.0462)	(0.174)	(0.00798)
Widowed	-0.577***	-0.576***	-1.192***	0.0527**
	(0.121)	(0.121)	(0.427)	(0.0219)
Separated/divorced	-0.868***	-0.869***	-2.428***	-0.0490***
	(0.0498)	(0.0498)	(0.182)	(0.00872)
Other qual (below degree level)	-0.323***	-0.305***	-0.851***	-0.0713***
	(0.0404)	(0.0405)	(0.0841)	(0.00499)
No qualification	-0.634***	-0.614***	-1.973***	-0.109***
	(0.0518)	(0.0520)	(0.149)	(0.00729)
North West	-0.190**	-0.195**	-0.305	0.0122
	(0.0866)	(0.0862)	(0.223)	(0.00988)

Yorkshire and The Humberside	0.0614	0.0634	0.299	0.0373***
	(0.0917)	(0.0913)	(0.224)	(0.00994)
East Midlands	-0.124	-0.126	-0.122	0.0286***
	(0.0904)	(0.0900)	(0.229)	(0.0104)
West Midlands	-0.0288	-0.0279	0.128	0.0501***
	(0.0915)	(0.0910)	(0.229)	(0.0105)
East of England	-0.158*	-0.166*	0.0876	0.0945***
	(0.0906)	(0.0902)	(0.229)	(0.0107)
London	-0.382***	-0.396***	-0.104	0.157***
	(0.0948)	(0.0944)	(0.256)	(0.0128)
South East	-0.175**	-0.186**	0.169	0.129***
	(0.0866)	(0.0863)	(0.215)	(0.0101)
South West	-0.133	-0.141	0.104	0.0826***
	(0.0949)	(0.0945)	(0.239)	(0.0114)
Wales	-0.0356	-0.0353	0.145	0.0403***
	(0.103)	(0.103)	(0.256)	(0.0120)
Scotland	-0.0646	-0.0804	0.0602	0.0267***
	(0.0892)	(0.0888)	(0.227)	(0.00997)
Intermediate occupation	-0.183***	-0.180***	-0.417***	-0.0218***
	(0.0419)	(0.0419)	(0.100)	(0.00545)
Routine manual occupation	-0.590***	-0.588***	-1.975***	-0.113***
	(0.0385)	(0.0385)	(0.110)	(0.00529)
Never worked & LT unemployed	-0.975***	-0.959***	-3.789***	-0.158***
	(0.123)	(0.123)	(0.407)	(0.0176)
Not classified	-0.567***	-0.570***	-1.712***	-0.0722***
	(0.120)	(0.121)	(0.412)	(0.0196)
Net earnings (all jobs, annual)	0.100***	0.100***	0.213***	0.00903***
	(0.0130)	(0.0131)	(0.0255)	(0.00148)
Female	-0.0310	-0.0338	-0.0664	-0.000107
	(0.0341)	(0.0341)	(0.0855)	(0.00441)
Constant	-2.574***	-0.286	-5.228***	0.194***
	(0.501)	(0.189)	(1.546)	(0.0219)
Observations	23,140	23,140	23,140	23,140

Notes: regression specification identical to Table 7 except additional offspring characteristics controlled for. Base groups: wave 3, employed, married/civil partnership, degree, North East, professional occupation and male. Net earnings transformed using inverse hyperbolic sine, adjusted for inflation and correspond to 2015 prices.