

Firm-to-firm Price Rigidity within a Network

Alvaro Castillo

Central Bank of Chile

Luis-Felipe Céspedes

Central Bank of Chile

Jorge Miranda-Pinto

IMF and UQ

Javier Turen

Catholic University of Chile

BSE Summer Forum, Networks in Macro and Trade

June 12, 2024

The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the International Monetary Fund, the Central Bank of Chile or its board members

Introduction

Question

- Does the **structure of buyer-supplier** relationships affect firms **price adjustment** decisions?

Introduction

Question

- Does the **structure of buyer-supplier** relationships affect firms **price adjustment** decisions?
 - Heterogeneity in firm/sector price rigidity is key to understanding monetary non-neutrality and inflation dynamics (e.g., Pasten et al., 2020; Mongey, 2021; Rubbo, 2023; Ghassibe, 2024)
 - Significant within industry/product concentration and cyclical in firm-to-firm relationships (e.g., Dhyne, Kikkawa, and Magerman, 2022; Hunneus, 2020; Taschereau-Dumouchel, 2024)

Introduction

Question

- Does the **structure of buyer-supplier** relationships affect firms **price adjustment** decisions?
 - Heterogeneity in firm/sector price rigidity is key to understanding monetary non-neutrality and inflation dynamics (e.g., Pasten et al., 2020; Mongey, 2021; Rubbo, 2023; Ghassibe, 2024)
 - Significant within industry/product concentration and cyclicity in firm-to-firm relationships (e.g., Dhyne, Kikkawa, and Magerman, 2022; Hunneus, 2020; Taschereau-Dumouchel, 2024)

Approach

- Use transaction level data from Chile: prices at the **supplier-client-variety** level, monthly frequency

Introduction

Question

- Does the **structure of buyer-supplier** relationships affect firms **price adjustment** decisions?
 - Heterogeneity in firm/sector price rigidity is key to understanding monetary non-neutrality and inflation dynamics (e.g., Pasten et al., 2020; Mongey, 2021; Rubbo, 2023; Ghassibe, 2024)
 - Significant within industry/product **concentration and cyclicity** in firm-to-firm relationships (e.g., Dhyne, Kikkawa, and Magerman, 2022; Hunneus, 2020; Taschereau-Dumouchel, 2024)

Approach

- Use transaction level data from Chile: prices at the **supplier-client-variety** level, monthly frequency
 - Study the **extensive** and intensive **margin of price adjustment** at different horizons as a function of suppliers, clients, and supplier-client characteristics

Introduction

Question

- Does the **structure of buyer-supplier** relationships affect firms **price adjustment** decisions?
 - Heterogeneity in firm/sector price rigidity is key to understanding monetary non-neutrality and inflation dynamics (e.g., Pasten et al., 2020; Mongey, 2021; Rubbo, 2023; Ghassibe, 2024)
 - Significant within industry/product concentration and cyclicity in firm-to-firm relationships (e.g., Dhyne, Kikkawa, and Magerman, 2022; Hunneus, 2020; Taschereau-Dumouchel, 2024)

Approach

- Use transaction level data from Chile: prices at the **supplier-client-variety** level, monthly frequency
 - Study the **extensive** and intensive **margin of price adjustment** at different horizons as a function of suppliers, clients, and supplier-client characteristics
 - Use **oil price shocks** as a laboratory

Introduction

Question

- Does the **structure of buyer-supplier** relationships affect firms **price adjustment** decisions?
 - Heterogeneity in firm/sector price rigidity is key to understanding monetary non-neutrality and inflation dynamics (e.g., Pasten et al., 2020; Mongey, 2021; Rubbo, 2023; Ghassibe, 2024)
 - Significant within industry/product **concentration and cyclicity** in firm-to-firm relationships (e.g., Dhyne, Kikkawa, and Magerman, 2022; Hunneus, 2020; Taschereau-Dumouchel, 2024)

Approach

- Use transaction level data from Chile: prices at the **supplier-client-variety** level, monthly frequency
 - Study the **extensive** and intensive **margin of price adjustment** at different horizons as a function of suppliers, clients, and supplier-client characteristics
 - Use **oil price shocks** as a laboratory

Answer

- **Bilateral market shares and firms' size** are important determinants of the

Introduction

Question

- Does the **structure of buyer-supplier** relationships affect firms **price adjustment** decisions?
 - Heterogeneity in firm/sector price rigidity is key to understanding monetary non-neutrality and inflation dynamics (e.g., Pasten et al., 2020; Mongey, 2021; Rubbo, 2023; Ghassibe, 2024)
 - Significant within industry/product concentration and cyclicity in firm-to-firm relationships (e.g., Dhyne, Kikkawa, and Magerman, 2022; Hunneus, 2020; Taschereau-Dumouchel, 2024)

Approach

- Use transaction level data from Chile: prices at the **supplier-client-variety** level, monthly frequency
 - Study the **extensive** and intensive **margin of price adjustment** at different horizons as a function of suppliers, clients, and supplier-client characteristics
 - Use **oil price shocks** as a laboratory

Answer

- **Bilateral market shares and firms' size** are important determinants of the
 - Probability of price adjustment and its **asymmetry** ($|up| > |down|$)
 - Implications for theory: **Kimball (1995) + menu costs at the firm-to-firm relationships**

Related literature

① Micro origins of price stickiness

- Bils and Klenow (2004), Nakamura and Steinsson (2008), Goldberg and Hellerstein (2011), Bhattara and Schoenle (2014), Midrigan, (2011); Eichenbaum, Jaimovich, and Rebelo, (2011); Alvarez and Lippi (2014), Turen (2023), Afrouzi (2023)

Contribution: using new data, confirm previous results and document the **relevance of market structure and network structure**

② Monetary non-neutrality in multisector models with sticky prices

- Nakamura and Steinsson (2010), Pasten et al. (2020), Rubbo (2023), Alvarez and Lippi (2014), Blanco et al. (2022), Mongey (2022), Ghassibe (2022), Minton and Wheaton (2023)

Contribution: highlight the role of **market power in bilateral firm-to-firm relationships** as a determinant of price rigidity and, therefore, shaping the amplification of cost-push shocks and monetary policy shocks

Idea in one slide





Figure: Network graph of an oil supplier (J_0).

The data

The data

- Universe of **firm-to-firm** (**seller-customer**) transactions in Chile, from 2018-2023 at a **Daily Frequency**.
- Use Machine Learning tools to identify prices at the **variety** level, [Acevedo et.al. (2022)]
- The price "triplet" p_{ijv} , i : *seller*, j : *buyer* and v : *variety*
 - Restrict varieties to be associated with products in the official CPI and PPI baskets.
 - Each variety must appear at least 24 times (for any supplier)
 - Drop change in prices ($d\ln(p)$) for percentiles 1 and 99
- Balance Sheet information about **both** seller and client
 - Total Sales, employment, industries, input purchases


Example: Classes, Subclasses, Products, and varieties (INE-PPI)



► Varieties and subclasses relationship

Descriptive statistics

Representativeness of the data (PPI)



Note: The sum of weights is 0.97 of 100, and there are 165 of 173 products

Descriptive statistics: supplier characteristics


	Mean	Std. Dev.	p10	p25	p50	p75	p90	Obs.
Average sales (CLP millions)	6,825	129,685	34.6	85.3	244.4	860.9	3,603	15,369
Number of customers	46	972.9	1.0	1.4	3.3	11.5	35.8	15,369
Number of products sold	2.4	3.2	1.0	1.0	1.3	2.5	4.8	15,369

By sector


We have 15,369 firms and a total of **10,348,986 supplier-client-variety triplets**. Average annual sales are 6825 million pesos (\approx 7.5 million USD), median sales 244 million pesos (0.21 million USD)

► Size and subclasses


Descriptive statistics: size and downstream customers




Large firms are more connected: up and downstream



Big connect to big, and big and star suppliers



Procyclical linkages and composition changes: fewer but better?



Frequency price change

Aggregate and sectoral desc. stats.

Frequency of price adjustment at supplier-client-variety level f_{ijv}


Table: Frequency price change at supplier-client-variety level f_{ijv}

	Mean	SD	P10	P25	P50	P75	P90	N
f_i	0.34	0.28	0.05	0.13	0.25	0.50	0.84	15,832
$dlogP_i$	0.13	0.19	0.05	0.07	0.10	0.14	0.21	15,832
f_{ijv}	0.33	0.29	0.00	0.10	0.25	0.50	0.77	10,348,986
$dlogP_{ijv}$	0.31	0.26	0.00	0.12	0.25	0.45	0.71	8,014,515

Note: We obtain f_{ijv} as follows $f_{ijv} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T_{ijv}} \mathbf{1}(\Delta \log P_{ijvt} > 0.005)}{T_{ijv}}$

- Average price frequency of f_i and f_{ijv} is 0.33 (price duration ≈ 3 months)
- Note the skewed distribution


Sectoral frequency price change: median vs weighted average



- Significant price stickiness heterogeneity across sectors
- Consistent with evidence from the US, [Nakamura and Steinsson (2010)]

► Sector-to-sector heterogeneity

Decomposing inflation: intensive vs extensive margin



Economy-wide frequency of price adjustment increased during COVID-19

The transmission of oil price shocks

► Cross-sectional results

The network of an oil supplier




Figure: Network graph of an oil supplier (J_0).

Extensive margin of price adjustment



Building on Karadi et al. (2022), we estimate the following regression:

$$I_{ijv,t+h}^{K,+,-} = \alpha_i + \alpha_j + \alpha_v + \beta_h (\Delta P_t^{oil} \times \mathbf{Z}_{ij}) + \gamma_h \mathbf{X}_{ij} + \phi w_t + \epsilon_{ijv},$$



Where $I_{ijv,t+h}^{K,+,-}$ is a dummy variable that takes the value of one if seller i changes the price charged to buyer j of variety v , between month t and $t+h$, and zero otherwise. K represents the network node

\mathbf{X}_{ij} are standard controls (e.g., # products, price age) and \mathbf{Z}_{ij} the relevant supplier-client relationship measures: supplier size, customer size, supplier's importance in customer's purchases

Probability of price adjustment (firms in J_1 and J_2)





Price adjustment probability: supplier size for big customers



Upward adjustment probability increases in firm size, except for big firms. Mild asymmetry
 $Pr(I_{ijv,t+h}^+) > Pr(I_{ijv,t+h}^-)$, except for micro firms.



Price adjustment probability: supplier size for small customers



Upward adjustment probability increases in firm size, except for big firms. Significant asymmetry $Pr(I_{ijv,t+h}^+) > Pr(I_{ijv,t+h}^-)$ for big firms.



► Customer size

Price adjustment probability: supplier relevance (bilateral market share)





Probability of price adjustment is significantly larger for suppliers representing a large fraction of customers' purchases

Price adjustment probability: supplier relevance (big firms)



Probability of price adjustment is significantly larger for suppliers representing a large fraction of customers' purchases. Significant asymmetry for big suppliers with high bilateral market share

Price adjustment probability: supplier relevance (small firms)



Probability of price adjustment is significantly larger for suppliers representing a large fraction of customers' purchases. Mild asymmetry



Cumulative price pass-through

We estimate the following local projection regression

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{t-1,t+h}^{K,ijv} = & \alpha + \beta_h^K (\Delta \ln P_{c,t}) + \phi_h^K (\Delta \ln P_{c,t} \cdot Z_{ijt}) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{12} \delta^j \pi_{t-j} + \sum_{j=1}^{12} \gamma^j \Delta P_{c,t-j} + \psi X_t + \varepsilon_t,\end{aligned}$$


where $\pi_{t-1,t+h}^{K,ijv}$ is the log change in $P^{K,ijv}$ between $t+h$ and $t-1$

Pass-through at node 0 (oil extraction) and 1 (refinery industries)



Full pass-through, after two months, to firms in node 0

Passthrough to different customers (supplier importance)



Price passthrough increases with bilateral market share

► Supplier and customer size

Taking stock

- Larger firms, except for the very big firms, have higher probability of price adjustment
- Higher bilateral market share, especially for larger firms, increases the probability of price adjustments
- Price adjustment probability is asymmetric, especially for:
 - Suppliers with high bilateral market share
 - Big supplier selling to small clients
- Given the large heterogeneity in firm-to-firm relationships and the cyclical/compositional variation in firm-to-firm linkages, macroeconomic implications could be important
 - For example, the increase in the frequency of price adjustment during COVID-19 could be explained by changes in bilateral market structure and firm-to-firm linkages

Implications for theory


- Heterogeneity and asymmetry in price adjustment to cost-push shocks could be rationalized with
 - Kimball (1995) demand for intermediate varieties + menu costs (Klenow and Willis, 2016)
 - Smaller price adjustment compared to standard CES demand
 - Conditional on higher (bilateral) market share, larger upward adjustment and smaller downward adjustment

Conclusion


- Market structure and firm-to-firm network structure are relevant when thinking about price stickiness and monetary non-neutrality
- We have showed that price stickiness varies considerably across firms, but also within a firm
- Probability of price adjustment is significantly larger for suppliers with high bilateral market share
 - Significant asymmetry for big suppliers with high bilateral market share

Appendix

Product varieties and subclasses




Representativeness of the data (PPI annual change)



Note: The sum of weights is 0.97 of 100, and there are 165 of 173 products


Representativeness of the data (CPI)




Note: The sum of weights is 71.83 of 100, and there are 254 of 303 products

Evolution frequency price change: CPI

[back](#)





Size and subclasses




Evolution frequency price change: PPI and CPI frequent transactions

Figure: Frequency of price change (left) and CPI (right) frequent transactions



Sectoral frequency of price change f_{IJ} (Chilean firm-to-firm data)




f_{IJ} : monthly frequency of price IJ changes ($> 0.5\%$) for all IJ transactions (average across goods and time: 2018.m1-2023.m6)

For example, firms in the copper mining sector change prices 19% of the time to firms in the specialized construction activities sector but 50% of the time to firms in the retail sector. [Back](#)

Competitor-price gap (strategic complementarities)

Back




Note: competitor gap truncated at 50 percent

Filtered of supplier-product and month FE, using OLS (Karadi, Schoenle and Wursten (2022)). Using subclasses (bundling varieties, keeping constant number of varieties)

Magnitude of adjustment as function of competitor price gap


Figure: Magnitude of adjustment ($t+1$) as function of the gap



Note: competitor gap truncated at 50 percent

Frequency of adjustment ($t+1$) as function of competitor price gap

Figure: Magnitude of adjustment as function of the gap



Note: competitor gap truncated at 50 percent

Descriptive statistics (freq. price increases)

Table: Frequency of price increases

	Mean	SD	P10	P25	P50	P75	P90	N
CPI product	0.24	0.21	0.00	0.06	0.20	0.38	0.56	12,947,624
PPI product	0.17	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.27	0.42	10,007,004
Total	0.21	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.33	0.50	22,954,628

Descriptive statistics (share of price increases)

Table: Share of price increases

	Mean	SD	P10	P25	P50	P75	P90	N
CPI product	0.72	0.29	0.33	0.50	0.75	1.00	1.00	10,486,557
PPI product	0.83	0.26	0.50	0.67	1.00	1.00	1.00	7,121,443
Total	0.77	0.28	0.40	0.57	0.86	1.00	1.00	17,608,000

Descriptive statistics (supplier characteristics)

	Mean	Std. Dev.	p10	p25	p50	p75	p90	Obs.
Average sales (CLP millions)	3,903	92,937	8	23	92	381	1,714	25,078
Number of customers	24.6	699.6	1.0	1.1	1.8	5.2	17.2	25,078
Number of subclasses sold	1.6	1.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.5	2.7	25,078

By sector

We have 25,078 firms and a total of 22,954,628 supplier-client-variety triplets

Descriptive statistics (supplier characteristics by sector)

Table 2: Supplier characteristics by economic sector

	Mean	Std. Dev.	p10	p25	p50	p75	p90	Obs.
1								
Average sales (CLP millions)	951	14,948	7	20	85	335	1,247	7,454
Number of customers	3.1	11.5	1.0	1.0	1.1	2.1	5.1	7,454
Number of subclasses sold	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.8	7,454
2								
Average sales (CLP millions)	95,645	805,937	43	125	372	1,329	5,040	234
Number of customers	5.6	26.5	1.0	1.0	1.4	2.6	6.8	234
Number of subclasses sold	1.2	0.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.6	234
3								
Average sales (CLP millions)	3,926	60,147	8	25	96	402	2,013	16,864
Number of customers	34.9	852.9	1.0	1.3	2.5	7.5	23.9	16,864
Number of subclasses sold	1.8	2.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.7	3.1	16,864
4								
Average sales (CLP millions)	4,157	32,407	3	7	25	120	1,164	526
Number of customers	8.7	42.1	1.0	1.2	2.1	5.2	12.9	526
Number of subclasses sold	1.2	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.4	526
Total								
Average sales (CLP millions)	3902.6	92937.2	7.6	22.8	92.0	381.4	1714.4	25,078
Number of customers	24.6	699.6	1.0	1.1	1.8	5.2	17.2	25,078
Number of subclasses sold	1.6	1.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.5	2.7	25,078

Note: 1 “Agriculture” 2 “Mining” 3 “Manufacture” 4 “Utilities”



Descriptive statistics (supplier characteristics, subsample)

Table: Supplier characteristics - Subsample



	Mean	Std. Dev.	p10	p25	p50	p75	p90	Obs.
Average sales (CLP millions)	13,134	118,547	24	90	404	2,088	12,585	4,109
Number of customers	123.9	1724.5	1.5	3.1	8.4	25.0	75.1	4,109
Number of subclasses sold	4.3	3.6	2.1	2.4	3.1	4.7	7.7	4,109

Firms selling more than one subclass


Frequency/magnitude price adj. and customer market share product level




Frequency/magnitude price adj. and customer market share (product truncated)





Size and subclasses





Variety and subclasses



Customer size - big suppliers





Customer size - small suppliers





▶ Back

Price passthrough: supplier size



Price passthrough: customer size



Cross-sectional heterogeneity in frequency/magnitude price change role of supplier-client-product characteristics

Heterogeneity in unconditional frequency price change



We assess the empirical relationship between firm-to-firm frequency/magnitude of price adjustment

$$y_{ijs} = \alpha \cdot \mathbf{X}_i + \beta \cdot \mathbf{Y}_j + \gamma \cdot \mathbf{Z}_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijs}$$

where y_{ijs} is *i*) the average frequency of price change of supplier *i* to client *j* in the subclass *s*, or *ii*) the average log change in the price of supplier *i* to client *j* in the subclass *s*.


The vectors $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}$ contain supplier, client, and supplier-client characteristics, respectively.

Frequency/magnitude price adj. and # of products sold




As in Bhattacharjee and Schoenle (2014): multiproduct firms adjust more frequently and in less magnitude (economies of scope in menu costs)

Frequency/magnitude price adj. and total sales



- As in Goldberg and Hellerstein (2011) large firms adjust more frequently and in smaller magnitude (e.g., returns to scale in price setting or better information; Zbaracki et al., 2004)
- Similar when considering industry/product market share

Frequency/magnitude price adj. and sales (one-product firms)



Size matters beyond its association to multiproduct firms

▶ Back