

# What is progressive price indexing?

Authors: Alicia Haydock Munnell, Mauricio Soto

Persistent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/bc-ir:104484>

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](#),  
Boston College University Libraries.

---

Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Center for Retirement Research at Boston College, April 2005

These materials are made available for use in research, teaching and private study, pursuant to U.S. Copyright Law. The user must assume full responsibility for any use of the materials, including but not limited to, infringement of copyright and publication rights of reproduced materials. Any materials used for academic research or otherwise should be fully credited with the source. The publisher or original authors may retain copyright to the materials.

# JUST THE FACTS

## *On Retirement Issues*

APRIL 2005, NUMBER 17

CENTER FOR  
RETIREMENT  
RESEARCH  
AT BOSTON COLLEGE

## WHAT IS PROGRESSIVE PRICE INDEXING?

BY ALICIA H. MUNNELL AND MAURICIO SOTO\*

### Introduction

As just reiterated in the 2005 *Trustees Report*, Social Security faces a 75-year deficit equal to roughly 2 percent of taxable payrolls. Closing this gap requires either a cut in benefits or an increase in taxes. One approach to cutting benefits under consideration by the administration is to change how benefits are indexed. An earlier *Just the Facts* explored the implications for benefits of moving from “wage indexing” of benefits to “price indexing.” This *Just the Facts* describes a proposal for “progressive price indexing.” The notion is that benefits for low-wage earners would continue to rise in line with wages, while those for maximum earners would rise in line with prices; everyone in between would see some combination of the two. The implication is that replacement rates — benefits as a percent of pre-retirement earnings — for low earners would remain constant over time, but replacement rates for high earners would decline sharply. The higher the earnings, the sharper would be the decline.

### How Progressive Price Indexing Works

Keeping benefits up to date with prices means that future retirees will be able to buy the same bundle of goods and services as today’s retirees. Adjusting benefits in line with wages means that the program replaces a similar share of a worker’s pre-retirement income. Progressive price indexing combines both approaches.

Under current law, initial benefits received by each group of new retirees rise at the rate of wage growth. The procedure involves three steps.<sup>1</sup> First, a worker’s previous earnings are restated in terms of today’s wages by indexing past earnings to wage growth. Second, earnings for the highest 35 years are then averaged and divided by 12 to calculate “Average Indexed Monthly Earnings.” Finally, the Social Security benefit formula is applied to Average Indexed Monthly Earnings to yield the benefit payable at the normal retirement age. The benefit formula is progressive in that the factor applied to the first dollars of earnings is higher than those applied to additional amounts. So, the formula replaces a larger share of the income of low-wage workers compared to high-wage workers. Specifically, benefits for workers reaching the normal retirement age in 2005 equal:

- 90 percent of the worker’s first \$627 of Average Indexed Monthly Earnings, plus
- 32 percent of indexed monthly earnings between \$627 and \$3,779, plus
- 15 percent of any indexed monthly earnings in excess of \$3,779

The so-called “bend points”— \$627 and \$3,779 — are adjusted each year in line with the growth in average wages over the previous year. Once this

---

\* Alicia H. Munnell is the director of the Center for Retirement Research at Boston College and the Peter F. Drucker Professor in Management Sciences at Boston College’s Carroll School of Management. Mauricio Soto is a graduate student in economics at Boston College.

initial benefit is awarded, it is adjusted each year in line with the Consumer Price Index so that beneficiaries can maintain their purchasing power in retirement.

Under progressive price indexing, the bottom 30 percent of workers — those that make less than about \$20,000 today — would have their benefits calculated under the current formula. Those workers who earn the taxable maximum — currently \$90,000 — over their lifetime would have their benefits calculated using price indexing.<sup>2</sup> Those earning between \$20,000 and \$90,000 would get a benefit somewhere between the benefit provided under current law and that provided under price indexing.

Table 1 shows the replacement rates scheduled under current law, those that emerge from price

indexing, and those that emerge from progressive price indexing. (Note that replacement rates are already scheduled to decline under current law as a result of the increase in the normal retirement age from 65 to 67.) As described, low earning individuals get the same replacement rates as they would under current law, and maximum earners get the same replacement rates as they would under price indexing. Those in between do better than they would under price indexing, but experience substantial cuts relative to current law.

Figure 1 shows the percent reductions relative to current law for the progressive price indexing proposal. These reductions are for a medium earner (one who makes \$36,600 today) retiring at age 65 in various years.

### Mechanics of Progressive Price Indexing

Reading the technical detail in this Box will make most people miserable! Under the progressive indexing proposal, Average Indexed Monthly Earnings (AIME) would continue to be calculated as under current law. But the procedure would introduce a new “bend point” to isolate low-income workers from benefit changes. If progressive indexation were to start immediately, the benefit of workers reaching normal retirement age in 2005 would equal:

#### Old Formula

- 90 percent of the worker’s first \$627 of AIME, plus
- 32 percent of AIME between \$627 and \$3,779, plus
- 15 percent of any AIME in excess of \$3,779.

#### New Formula

- 90 percent of the worker’s first \$627 of AIME, plus
- 32 percent of AIME between \$627 and \$1,528, plus
- *32 percent of AIME between \$1,528 and \$3,779, plus*
- *15 percent of any AIME in excess of \$3,779.*

The \$1,528 “bend point” was selected so that 30 percent of workers have AIMEs below that amount. (The approach is flexible in that the 30 percent threshold could be made higher or lower.) Progressive indexing works by reducing the factors in the benefit formula above the newly introduced “bend point” — that is, the 32 percent between \$1,528 and \$3,779 and the 15 percent above \$3,779. This is done by calculating the amount necessary to keep the benefit of a maximum earner constant in real terms, and backing out the factors that would produce that amount. The two factors are required to be reduced by the same proportion. Note that under progressive indexing, as under current law, the bend points — \$627, \$1,528, and \$3,779 — would be adjusted each year in line with the growth in average wages.

The result is a hybrid indexing between the current method of indexing and price indexing. Initial benefits received by each group of low-income retirees still rise at the rate of wage growth, while the initial benefits of those with earnings at the maximum will only increase with prices. For those in between, initial benefits will increase slower than the rate of growth of wages, but faster than price increases.

| Year | Factor<br>1 | Factor<br>2 | Factor<br>3 | Factor<br>4 |
|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 2005 | .90         | .32         | .32         | .15         |
| 2035 | .90         | .32         | .20         | .09         |
| 2075 | .90         | .32         | .05         | .02         |

## Implications for the Benefit Structure


Progressive price indexing would dramatically change the benefit structure over time. Today, high earners contribute more in payroll taxes and receive a larger dollar benefit than medium earners. As shown in Figure 2 (see page 4), by 2100 virtually all Social Security beneficiaries with earnings above the medium would receive the same dollar benefit regardless of how much they contributed to the system. Thus, if progressive price indexing were to continue beyond the 75-year period, Social Security would eventually provide a flat benefit rather than an earnings related benefit for much of the population.<sup>3</sup>

## Implications for Social Security Solvency

Progressive price indexing would reduce future benefits enough to eliminate roughly three quarters of the 75-year shortfall. Pure price indexing would more than eliminate the entire 75-year deficit. The remaining shortfall under progressive price indexing thus would require either some new revenues or further benefit cuts during the 75-year period.

FIGURE 1. PROGRESSIVE INDEXING REDUCES BENEFITS BY INCREASING AMOUNTS OVER TIME

*Percentage Reduction from Current Law for Medium Earner*



Source: Authors' calculations.

TABLE 1. SHIFT FROM WAGE TO PROGRESSIVE PRICE INDEXING CUTS REPLACEMENT RATES FOR MOST WORKERS BUT PROTECTS LOW EARNERS

*Percentage of Pre-Retirement Earnings Replaced by Social Security Benefits*


| Year | Type of Indexing     | Earnings          |                      |                    |                       |
|------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|      |                      | Low<br>(\$16,470) | Medium<br>(\$36,600) | High<br>(\$58,560) | Maximum<br>(\$90,000) |
| 2005 | Current Law          | 57                | 42                   | 35                 | 30                    |
| 2015 | Current Law          | 53                | 39                   | 32                 | 26                    |
|      | Progressive Indexing | 53                | 38                   | 31                 | 25                    |
|      | Price Indexing       | 50                | 37                   | 31                 | 25                    |
| 2035 | Current Law          | 49                | 36                   | 30                 | 24                    |
|      | Progressive Indexing | 49                | 32                   | 24                 | 19                    |
|      | Price Indexing       | 38                | 28                   | 23                 | 19                    |
| 2055 | Current Law          | 49                | 36                   | 30                 | 24                    |
|      | Progressive Indexing | 49                | 29                   | 21                 | 15                    |
|      | Price Indexing       | 31                | 23                   | 19                 | 15                    |
| 2075 | Current Law          | 49                | 36                   | 30                 | 24                    |
|      | Progressive Indexing | 49                | 26                   | 18                 | 12                    |
|      | Price Indexing       | 25                | 18                   | 15                 | 12                    |

Source: Authors' calculations.

Note: The reduction in the replacement rate is scheduled to drop under the current system between 2005 and 2025 due to the increase in the "full benefits" retirement age from 65 to 67. Progressive and price indexation are assumed to start in 2012.

FIGURE 2. PROGRESSIVE INDEXING FLATTENS BENEFITS

*Benefits as Percent of Medium Earner Benefit*



Source: Authors' calculations based on presentation in Furman (2005).

## Conclusion

Progressive price indexing has the advantage of protecting the benefits of low earning workers. These workers would be assured of receiving the same amount relative to previous earnings as they do today. The cuts under progressive price indexing come increasingly from those with higher earnings. Ultimately, high earners will receive the same dollar benefit as those making much less. The policy question is whether it is possible to cut the benefits of higher wage workers so drastically and still retain their support for the program. For this reason, proponents suggest combining progressive price indexing with diverting part of the current payroll tax to voluntary personal accounts as a "sweetener." To the extent that higher income individuals can earn more than a real return of 3 percent — the rate used to offset traditional benefits under President Bush's personal account proposal — they will be able to compensate for some of the reduction in their benefit. But some recent studies suggest a 3 percent real return may be a high hurdle.<sup>4</sup>

## Endnotes

- 1 For a detailed explanation of how to calculate Social Security benefits, see Social Security Administration (2004).
- 2 As described in the earlier *Just the Facts*, the mechanics of price indexing are as follows: Average Indexed Monthly Earnings would continue to be calculated as under current law. But the benefit formula would be changed. Each year, the factors in the benefit formula — that is, the 90 percent, the 32 percent, and the 15 percent — would be adjusted to offset the growth of real wages. This is done by multiplying each factor by the ratio of the change in the consumer price index over the previous year to the change in nominal wages. Since wages typically increase faster than prices, this number will generally be less than one. For example, if in the year after price indexing was enacted the Consumer Price Index increased by 3 percent and wages increased by 4 percent, the ratio would be 1.03 divided by 1.04, or 0.99 percent. The factors would then be multiplied by .99. And the effect on benefits would be cumulative over time.
- 3 Benefits become flat once the two upper factors used in the calculation of the primary insurance amount reach zero. Since the factors would likely not go below zero, at this point the flat benefit would begin increasing again at the rate of wage growth.
- 4 Shiller (2005); Andrews (2005); Whitehouse (2005); and Goldman Sachs (2005).

## References

- Andrews, Edmund L. “Social Security, Growth and Stock Returns.” *New York Times* (March 31, 2005).
- Furman, Jason. 2005. “An Analysis of Using “Progressive Price Indexing” to Set Social Security Benefits.” Center for Budget and Policy Priorities (March 21).
- Goldman Sachs. 2005. “Social Security Reform: Are Personal Savings Accounts Attractive?” *US Daily Financial Market Comment*. (February 23, 2005).
- Shiller, Robert J. 2005. “The Life-Cycle Personal Accounts for Social Security: An Evaluation.” unpublished mimeo (March).
- Social Security Administration. 2004. *Annual Statistical Supplement, 2003*. Office of Policy (<http://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/statcomps/supplement/>).
- Social Security Administration. 2005. “Estimated Financial Effects of a Comprehensive Social Security Reform Proposal Including Progressive Price Indexing.” Memorandum from Stephen C. Goss to Bob Pozen (February 10).
- Whitehouse, Mark. 2005. “Social Security Overhaul Plan Leans on a Bullish Market.” *Wall Street Journal*. (February 28).

The Center for Retirement Research thanks its research partners for support of this project: CitiStreet, Prudential Financial, AMVESCAP, New York Life Investment Management, AARP, TIAA-CREF Institute, AXA Financial, and Standard & Poor's.

© 2005, by Trustees of Boston College, Center for Retirement Research. All rights reserved. The research reported herein was supported by the Center's Corporate Partnership Program. The opinions and conclusions expressed are solely those of the authors and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of the Center for Retirement Research at Boston College.

CENTER FOR RETIREMENT RESEARCH AT BOSTON COLLEGE

Fulton Hall 550, 140 Commonwealth Avenue, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467-3803  
phone 617.552.1762 fax 617.552.0191 [crr@bc.edu](mailto:crr@bc.edu) [www.bc.edu/crr](http://www.bc.edu/crr)