The Inflationary Effects of Sectoral Reallocation

Francesco Ferrante Sebastian Graves Matteo Iacoviello

Federal Reserve Board

November 10, 2022
De Nederlandsche Bank
Inflation Strikes Back: Drivers and Policy Reactions

Overview

1. Motivation

2. Model

3. COVID-Demand Shock

4. All Shocks

5. Experiments

Conclusion

Appendix

Fact 1: Sudden Shift in Consumption Expenditures





Fact 2: Rise in Inflation



Fact 3: Fall in Employment



Fact 4: Increase in Industry-level Dispersion



How Does Demand Reallocation Affect Inflation?

We study reallocation in New Keynesian model with

1. multi-sector input-output structure
2. costly input adjustment (hiring costs)
3. heterogeneous price rigidity across sectors

We estimate the model with three shocks:

1. Preference shift from services to goods ("COVID demand shock")
2. Sector-specific TFP shocks
3. Aggregate Labor Supply Shock ("Great Resignation")

How Does Demand Reallocation Affect Inflation?

We study reallocation in New Keynesian model with

1. multi-sector input-output structure
2. costly input adjustment (hiring costs)
3. heterogeneous price rigidity across sectors

We estimate the model with three shocks:

1. Preference shift from services to goods ("COVID demand shock")
2. Sector-specific TFP shocks
3. Aggregate Labor Supply Shock ("Great Resignation")

How Do Reallocation Shocks Affect Inflation?

Main Results:

- Demand reallocation explains a large portion of the rise in US inflation
  1. Hiring frictions $\Rightarrow$ goods sectors struggle to expand/services sectors cut employment sharply $\Rightarrow \uparrow$ inflation
  2. Goods prices more flexible than services $\Rightarrow \uparrow\uparrow$ inflation
- Demand reallocation also explains cross-sectional dynamics for many industries
- TFP shocks and labor supply shock explain less of aggregate inflation
- Unexpected shift in demand back to services may be inflationary

How Do Reallocation Shocks Affect Inflation?

Main Results:

- Demand reallocation explains a large portion of the rise in US inflation
- Demand reallocation also explains cross-sectional dynamics for many industries
- TFP shocks and labor supply shock explain less of aggregate inflation
- Unexpected shift in demand back to services may be inflationary

How Do Reallocation Shocks Affect Inflation?

Main Results:

- Demand reallocation explains a large portion of the rise in US inflation
- Demand reallocation also explains cross-sectional dynamics for many industries
- TFP shocks and labor supply shock explain less of aggregate inflation
- Unexpected shift in demand back to services may be inflationary

How Do Reallocation Shocks Affect Inflation?

Main Results:

- Demand reallocation explains a large portion of the rise in US inflation
- Demand reallocation also explains cross-sectional dynamics for many industries
- TFP shocks and labor supply shock explain less of aggregate inflation
- Unexpected shift in demand back to services may be inflationary

Overview

1. Motivation

2. Model

3. COVID-Demand Shock

4. All Shocks

5. Experiments

Conclusion

Appendix

Model Summary: Households

- Households consume goods and services
- Each are a bundle of output of the N sectors of the economy
- Time-varying preferences for goods/services (demand reallocation shock)

$$C_t = \left(\frac{C_t^g}{\omega_t}\right)^{\omega_t} \left(\frac{C_t^s}{1-\omega_t}\right)^{1-\omega_t}$$

Model Summary: Households

- Households consume goods and services
- Each are a bundle of output of the N sectors of the economy
- Time-varying preferences for goods/services (demand reallocation shock)
- Supply labor to firms (labor supply shock)

$$U(C, N) = \frac{C^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} - \chi_t \frac{N^{1+\psi}}{1+\psi}$$

Model Summary: Firms

In each sector there are 3 types of firms:

1. Representative Competitive Producer
2. Monopolistically Competitive Firms
3. Labor agencies

▸ Model Details

Model Summary: Firms

In each sector there are 3 types of firms:

1. Representative Competitive Producer
2. Monopolistically Competitive Firms (sectoral productivity shocks)

$$Y_t^i = A_t^i \left(\alpha_i^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_Y}} \left(M_t^i\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_Y - 1}{\epsilon_Y}} + (1-\alpha_i)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_Y}} \left(L_t^i\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_Y - 1}{\epsilon_Y}} \right)^{\frac{\epsilon_Y}{\epsilon_Y - 1}}$$

$$M_t^i = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \Gamma_{i,j}^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_M}} \left(M_{j,t}^i\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_M - 1}{\epsilon_M}} \right)^{\frac{\epsilon_M}{\epsilon_M - 1}}$$

3. Labor agencies

▸ Model Details

Model Summary: Firms

In each sector there are 3 types of firms:

1. Representative Competitive Producer
2. Monopolistically Competitive Firms
3. Labor agencies (hiring costs)

$$\text{Profits} = P_t^{L,i} L_t^i - W_t L_t^i \left(1 + \mathbb{1}(L_t^i > L_{t-1}^i) \frac{c}{2} \left(\frac{L_t^i}{L_{t-1}^i} - 1 \right)^2 \right)$$

▸ Model Details

Taking the Model to the Data: Calibration

- Calibrated Parameters
  - Many parameters set to standard values ($\beta, \gamma, \phi, \psi$ etc)
  - Use $N = 66$ private industries
  - Factor/consumption shares: BEA I-O Tables & PCE Bridge
  - Sector price stickiness from Pasten, Schoenle and Weber (2020):
    - Key feature: goods prices more flexible than services
- Calibrated Shocks
  1. Demand reallocation shock $\uparrow \omega_t$: match $\uparrow$ in goods expenditure share
  2. Sectoral Productivity shocks ΔA_t^i: calibrated to sectoral TFP data

Taking the Model to the Data: Calibration

- Calibrated Parameters
  - Many parameters set to standard values ($\beta, \gamma, \phi, \psi$ etc)
  - Use $N = 66$ private industries
  - Factor/consumption shares: BEA I-O Tables & PCE Bridge
  - Sector price stickiness from Pasten, Schoenle and Weber (2020):
    - Key feature: goods prices more flexible than services
- Calibrated Shocks
  1. Demand reallocation shock $\uparrow \omega_t$: match $\uparrow$ in goods expenditure share
  2. Sectoral Productivity shocks ΔA_t^i: calibrated to sectoral TFP data

Taking the Model to the Data: Estimation

- Estimated Parameters
  - Production function elasticities (ϵ_M and ϵ_Y)
  - Hiring costs (c)
- Estimated Shocks
  1. Labor supply shock ($\uparrow \chi_t$)
- Estimated parameters/shocks chosen to minimize distance between model and data:
  1. Cross-section of goods prices
  2. Cross-section of services prices
  3. Cross-section of output
  4. Cross-section of employment
  5. Aggregate employment
  6. Goods inflation less services inflation

▸ Parameters

Taking the Model to the Data: Estimation

- Estimated Parameters
  - Production function elasticities (ϵ_M and ϵ_Y)
  - Hiring costs (c)
- Estimated Shocks
  1. Labor supply shock ($\uparrow \chi_t$)
- Estimated parameters/shocks chosen to minimize distance between model and data:
  1. Cross-section of goods prices
  2. Cross-section of services prices
  3. Cross-section of output
  4. Cross-section of employment
  5. Aggregate employment
  6. Goods inflation less services inflation

▸ Parameters

Taking the Model to the Data: Estimation

- Estimated Parameters
  - Production function elasticities (ϵ_M and ϵ_Y)
  - Hiring costs (c)
- Estimated Shocks
  1. Labor supply shock ($\uparrow \chi_t$)
- Estimated parameters/shocks chosen to minimize distance between model and data:
  1. Cross-section of goods prices
  2. Cross-section of services prices
  3. Cross-section of output
  4. Cross-section of employment
  5. Aggregate employment
  6. Goods inflation less services inflation

▸ Parameters

Overview

1. Motivation

2. Model

3. COVID-Demand Shock

4. All Shocks

5. Experiments

Conclusion

Appendix

COVID Demand Reallocation Shock ($\uparrow \omega_t$)



COVID Demand Reallocation Shock ($\uparrow \omega_t$)



▸ Homogeneous Price Adjustment Costs

COVID Demand Reallocation Shock: Cross-Section



▸ Details

Overview

1. Motivation

2. Model

3. COVID-Demand Shock

4. All Shocks

5. Experiments

Conclusion

Appendix

Industry Dispersion in Price and Output Growth

For some industries, price and quantity dynamics are hard to explain with the dynamics following demand reallocation shock:



Adding TFP Shocks and Labor Supply Shocks

- We measure evolution of TFP at the industry level between 2019 and 2021 and feed estimated idiosyncratic TFP into model
- We estimate the size of the aggregate labor supply shock required to match decline in aggregate employment

All Three Shocks: Aggregates



▸ TFP Shocks ▸ Labor Supply Shock

All Three Shocks: Cross-Section



Overview

1. Motivation

2. Model

3. COVID-Demand Shock

4. All Shocks

5. Experiments

Conclusion

Appendix

What if demand shifts back unexpectedly?

- We have assumed demand reallocation shock is persistent ($\rho = 0.975$)
- Now assume that this falls to $\rho = 0.5$ after 8 quarters

$$\rightarrow$$

- **Inflation rises again**: services sectors had cut employment too much and now face hiring costs

▸ Unexpected Persistence Experiment

Reversal Experiment



Overview

1. Motivation

2. Model

3. COVID-Demand Shock

4. All Shocks

5. Experiments

Conclusion

Appendix

Conclusion

- Demand reallocation shock
  1. Explains a large portion of the rise in US inflation
  2. Can also explain cross-sectional developments
- TFP shocks improve cross-sectional fit further
- TFP and labor supply shocks explain less of aggregate inflation
- Unexpected reversal of demand may be inflationary

Overview

1. Motivation

2. Model

3. COVID-Demand Shock

4. All Shocks

5. Experiments

Conclusion

Appendix

Model: Households

- Consume goods and services
- Each are a bundle of output of the N sectors of the economy
- Time-varying preferences for goods services (reallocation shock)
- Supply labor to firms

Households

Households problem:

$$\max E_t \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{C_{t+i}^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma} - \chi_t \frac{(N_{t+i})^{1+\psi}}{1+\psi} \tag{1}$$

where

$$C_t = \left(\frac{C_t^g}{\omega_t}\right)^{\omega_t} \left(\frac{C_t^s}{1-\omega_t}\right)^{1-\omega_t} \tag{2}$$

$$C_t^g = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{C_{i,t}^g}{\gamma_i^g}\right)^{\gamma_i^g} \text{ and } C_t^s = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{C_{i,t}^s}{\gamma_i^s}\right)^{\gamma_i^s} \tag{3}$$

subject to

$$P_t C_t + B_{t+1} = W_t N_t + (1 + i_{t-1}) B_t + Profits_t \tag{4}$$

Model: Firms

In each sector there are 3 types of firms:

1. Representative Competitive Producer
2. Monopolistically Competitive Firms
3. Labor Agencies

Model: Monopolistically Competitive Firms

$$Y_t^i = A_t^i \left(\alpha_i^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_Y}} \left(M_t^i\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_Y - 1}{\epsilon_Y}} + (1-\alpha_i)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_Y}} \left(L_t^i\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_Y - 1}{\epsilon_Y}} \right)^{\frac{\epsilon_Y}{\epsilon_Y - 1}} \tag{5}$$

$$M_t^i = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \Gamma_{i,j}^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_M}} \left(M_{j,t}^i\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_M - 1}{\epsilon_M}} \right)^{\frac{\epsilon_M}{\epsilon_M - 1}} \tag{6}$$

Sector-specific Rotemberg price adjustment costs (κ_i) $\rightarrow$

$$1 - \epsilon + \epsilon \frac{MC_t^i}{P_t^i} - \kappa_i (\Pi_t^i - 1)\Pi_t^i + E_t \left(M_{t+1} \Pi_{t+1}^i (\Pi_{t+1}^i - 1) \frac{Y_{t+1}^i}{Y_t^i} \right) = 0 \tag{7}$$

Model: Monopolistically Competitive Firms

$$Y_t^i = A_t^i \left(\alpha_i^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_Y}} \left(M_t^i\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_Y - 1}{\epsilon_Y}} + (1-\alpha_i)^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_Y}} \left(L_t^i\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_Y - 1}{\epsilon_Y}} \right)^{\frac{\epsilon_Y}{\epsilon_Y - 1}} \tag{5}$$

$$M_t^i = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \Gamma_{i,j}^{\frac{1}{\epsilon_M}} \left(M_{j,t}^i\right)^{\frac{\epsilon_M - 1}{\epsilon_M}} \right)^{\frac{\epsilon_M}{\epsilon_M - 1}} \tag{6}$$

Sector-specific Rotemberg price adjustment costs $(\kappa_i) \rightarrow$

$$1 - \epsilon + \epsilon \frac{MC_t^i}{P_t^i} - \kappa_i (\Pi_t^i - 1)\Pi_t^i + E_t \left(M_{t+1} \Pi_{t+1}^i (\Pi_{t+1}^i - 1) \frac{Y_{t+1}^i}{Y_t^i} \right) = 0 \tag{7}$$

Model: Labor Agencies

- Labor agency in each sector hires labor from HHs at W_t and supplies it to monopolistically competitive firms at $P_t^{L,i}$
- Subject to convex hiring costs

$$V_t(L_{t-1}^i) = \max_{L_t^i} P_t^{L,i} L_t^i - W_t L_t^i \left(1 + \mathbb{1}(L_t^i > L_{t-1}^i) \frac{c}{2} \left(\frac{L_t^i}{L_{t-1}^i} - 1\right)^2\right) + E_t[M_{t+1} V_{t+1}(L_t^i)] \quad (8)$$

Monetary Policy and Equilibrium

Monetary policy follows a standard Taylor rule.

$$log(i_t) = log(R_{ss}) + \phi \log \Pi_t \tag{9}$$

where $\Pi_t = \frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}}$. Goods market clearing:

$$Y_t^i = C_{i,t}^g + C_{i,t}^s + \sum_{j=1}^{N} M_{i,t}^j \quad \forall i \tag{10}$$

Labor market clearing:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} L_t^i \left(1 + \mathbb{1}(L_t^i > L_{t-1}^i)\frac{c}{2}\left(\frac{L_t^i}{L_{t-1}^i} - 1\right)^2\right) = N_t \tag{11}$$

◂ Back

TFP Shocks: Aggregates



◂ All Shocks

TFP Shocks: Cross-section



◂ All Shocks

Labor Supply Shock: Aggregates



◂ All Shocks

Labor Supply Shock: Cross-section



◂ All Shocks

Parameters

Calibrated Parameters/Shocks	Value	Target/Source
γ	2	Standard
χ	1	Normalization
ψ	1	Standard
ϕ	1.5	Standard
β	0.995	Standard
ϵ	10	Standard
$\bar{\omega}$	0.31	Goods Expenditure Share
α_i	0.11 to 0.83	BEA
κ_i	0.05 to 98	**?**
ρ_ω	0.975	Path of Goods Expenditure Share
ρ_χ	0.95	Standard
ρ_A	0.95	Standard
Δ_ω	0.045	Δ Goods Expenditure Share
ΔA_t^i	-0.29 to 0.25	Measured Sectoral TFP
Estimated Parameters/Shocks	**Value**	**Target/Source**
c	35.6 (19.8)	Estimated (s.e.)
ϵ_M	0.01 (0.25)	Estimated (s.e.)
ϵ_Y	0.59 (0.04)	Estimated (s.e.)
$\Delta\chi$	0.10 (0.04)	Estimated (s.e)

◂ Back

Both I-O and Het Price Stickiness Important











Back

What if demand shift was surprisingly persistent?

- We assumed persistence of demand reallocation shock known on impact
- Now assume that everyone thought it was $\rho = 0.5$ for first 8 quarters
- Households and firms are repeatedly surprised about the persistence for two years (true persistence still $\rho = 0.975$)

$\rightarrow$

- **Demand reallocation less inflationary**: services sectors cut employment less and prices more

Unexpected Persistence



Back

COVID Demand Reallocation Shock ($\uparrow \omega_t$)



Back