The Effect of Failure sites in the Asset Exchange Model

Jan Makkinje Boston University

- We use an **agent-based** mode to understand economic inequality.
- Set up a system of **N** agents.
- Choose two agents at random.
- Interaction: Each agent has equal probability of winning *α* percent of the poorer agents wealth.







- Correlation Function
- Relationship between rank and rank at previous times.
- $\Omega = 0.99.$



0.8

0.2

- Real economies have growth: Introduce constant growth to the system.
- After ever trade, each agent gets wealth k.
- No trading here. 5 trades after shock. 1
- Rich agents are growth independent, but poor agents are Ω independent for certain values of growth.
- Growth is too low to offset wealth they are losing,







Constant Growth

- What if we add trading?
- Same qualitative behavior holds
- *Q* = 1.00



Constant Growth

- We are interested in the results in the **extremes**.
- We see that increasing the failure rate **increases** the number of poor agents.
- Dichotomy in wealth.
 Especially for high growth systems.



Constant Growth

ð

ð

- Reintroduce trading
- Fixed growth **k** = **0.10**.
- Relationship between **trading** percent and **failure** percent.
- Rich agents don't care about failure! They want high *α*.
- Poor agents really don't want a_{0.2}
 high failure rate.



Flat Tax

- Fix *k* = 0.1. *α* = 0.01. What does the wealth distribution look like?
- Introduce a flat tax, take a percent ψ from all agents, redistribute equally.



Flat Tax

- Take a percent of every agents wealth ψ .
- Redistribute equally
- With no growth, no failure sites, we get:
- Growth gives same rescaled
 wealth distribution



Flat Tax

- Let $\Psi = 0.10$. **k** = 0.10, $\alpha = 0.01$
- Shrinks the dichotomy by lowering the wealth of the richer agents.
- Evens out the wealth.



Sales Tax

- Take a portion of interaction \circ 0.5 wealth, determined by β .
- Redistribute evenly to all agents
- No failure, no growth gives phase transition!



Wealth Condensation Ste

Steady state

Sales Tax

- Sales tax in effect with failing sites results:
- $\alpha = 0.01$ here.
- Nothing. Sales tax is weak, masked by growth.
- Most agents independent of beta.



-2

-2.5

-3

-3.5

2.05

2.04

2.03

2.02

2.01

Sales Tax

- No failed sites or growth: Phase transition.
- $\alpha = 0.99$ here.
- Rich agents: Little β dependence, but they would prefer less.
- Poor agents want $\widehat{}^{}$ high β , want high or low failure rate.



0.6

0.4

0.2







- Used to measure economic inequality.
- **G** = 1 —> Completely equal
- **G** = 0 —> Completely unequal.
- Measure 5 trades after shock.
- No growth: lpha / Ω



- Used to measure economic inequality.
- **G** = 1 —> Completely unequal
- $G = 0 \longrightarrow$ Completely equal.
- $\alpha = 0.99$, Growth/ Omega
- Low α —> Almost completely equal.



- Used to measure economic inequality.
- **G** = 1 —> Completely unequal
- **G** = 0 —> Completely equal.
- $\alpha = 0.01$, β / Ω



- Used to measure economic inequality.
- **G** = 1 —> Completely unequal
- **G** = 0 —> Completely equal.
- $\alpha = 0.99, \beta / \Omega$



- Used to measure economic inequality.
- **G** = 1 —> Completely unequal
- **G** = 0 —> Completely equal.
- $\alpha = 0.01$, ψ/Ω



- Used to measure economic inequality.
- **G** = 1 —> Completely unequal
- **G** = 0 —> Completely equal.
- $\alpha = 0.99, \ \psi/\Omega$



Conclusions:

- Ω , lpha , eta , ψ , eta , lots of ways to go with this data
- So far we have seen:
 - Time-recovery of a "shock".
 - Failures affect which agents prefer a constant growth, affects wealth distribution.
 - Failures break phase transition in sales tax model.
 - Wealth distribution becomes independent of sales tax with failures.
 - After shock equality is dependent on α even with growth. Depends on β only for high α .

Questions?