Structural Transformation and the Transmission of Monetary Policy

Tiago Bernardino

IIES, Stockholm University

October 22, 2025

Job Market Mock Talk

Economic Growth Goes Hand in Hand with Structural Transformation

Source: U.S. B.E.A. Table 2.3.5

How does Structural Transformation Change MP Effectiveness?

How does Structural Transformation Change MP Effectiveness?

► **Why does the shift toward services matter?**

1. Price dynamics
   – prices in the services sector adjust less frequently than in the goods sector

2. Demand composition
   – services share increases along the income distribution

How does Structural Transformation Change MP Effectiveness?

▶ **Why does the shift toward services matter?**

   1. Price dynamics
      – prices in the services sector adjust less frequently than in the goods sector

   2. Demand composition
      – services share increases along the income distribution

▶ **Dynamic quantitative macro model**

   1. Build a two-sector Heterogeneous-Agent New Keynesian model
      – sectors differ in terms of price rigidities
      – households have non-homothetic preferences matching demand composition differences

How does Structural Transformation Change MP Effectiveness?

► **Why does the shift toward services matter?**

1. Price dynamics
   – prices in the services sector adjust less frequently than in the goods sector
2. Demand composition
   – services share increases along the income distribution

► **Dynamic quantitative macro model**

1. Build a two-sector Heterogeneous-Agent New Keynesian model
   – sectors differ in terms of price rigidities
   – households have non-homothetic preferences matching demand composition differences
2. Estimate the model for different service shares
   – calibrate for sectoral productivity growth $\Rightarrow$ endogenous shift toward services

How does Structural Transformation Change MP Effectiveness?

► **Why does the shift toward services matter?**

1. Price dynamics
   – prices in the services sector adjust less frequently than in the goods sector
2. Demand composition
   – services share increases along the income distribution

► **Dynamic quantitative macro model**

1. Build a two-sector Heterogeneous-Agent New Keynesian model
   – sectors differ in terms of price rigidities
   – households have non-homothetic preferences matching demand composition differences
2. Estimate the model for different service shares
   – calibrate for sectoral productivity growth $\Rightarrow$ endogenous shift toward services
3. Monetary policy contraction shocks
   – compare monetary policy transmission across economies with different service shares

Preview of Results

1. **Structural Transformation and MP Transmission:**
   – in the last 50 years, due to the rise in the serv. share, MP transm. became 21% more powerful

Preview of Results

1. **Structural Transformation and MP Transmission:**
   – in the last 50 years, due to the rise in the serv. share, MP transm. became 21% more powerful

2. **Mechanisms:**
   – price rigidities: structural transformation $\implies$ ↑ price rigidities $\implies$ ↑ MP non-neutrality
   – demand composition: additional precautionary savings motive $\implies$ ↓ aggregate effects

Preview of Results

1. **Structural Transformation and MP Transmission:**
   – in the last 50 years, due to the rise in the serv. share, MP transm. became 21% more powerful

2. **Mechanisms:**
   – price rigidities: structural transformation $\implies$ ↑ price rigidities $\implies$ ↑ MP non-neutrality
   – demand composition: additional precautionary savings motive $\implies$ ↓ aggregate effects

3. **Heterogeneity and Welfare:**
   – structural transformation enlarges the inequalities generated by contractionary monetary policy

Related Literature and Contribution

1. **Long-run trends and monetary policy transmission**
   e.g: Boivin and Giannoni (2006), Galesi and Rachedi (2019), Pancrazi and Vukotić (2019), Leahy and Thapar (2022), Mangiante (2025)
   $\Rightarrow$ Study the impact of structural transformation

2. **Household heterogeneity and monetary policy transmission**
   e.g: Gornemann et al. (2016), McKay et al. (2016), Kaplan et al. (2018), Auclert (2019), Hagedorn et al. (2019), Broer et al. (2020), Cravino et al. (2020), Luetticke (2021)
   $\Rightarrow$ Study the role of heterogeneous demand composition for MP transmission

3. **Non-homotheticities for business cycle analysis**
   e.g: Jaimovich et al. (2019), Andreolli et al. (2024), Olivi et al. (2024), Orchard (2025), Boehnert et al. (2025), Orchard (2025), Becker (2024)
   $\Rightarrow$ HANK with non-homothetic preferences

Plan of the Talk

Motivating Evidence:
Why Sectoral Composition Matters

Sectoral Price Rigidities
Prices in the service sector are less flexible

Data: Summary statistics on price frequency (Nakamura and Steinsson, 2008)

Sectoral Price Rigidities

Prices in the service sector are less flexible

Data: Summary statistics on price frequency (Nakamura and Steinsson, 2008)

Heterogeneous Demand Composition

Services share increases along the income distribution

Data: US Consumer Expenditure Survey

Heterogeneous Demand Composition

Services share increases along the income distribution

Data: US Consumer Expenditure Survey

Consumption Impulse Response Function

$$\Delta \log C_{t+h|t} = \alpha_h + \beta_h \epsilon_t^M + \gamma_h X + \varepsilon_t, \text{ for } h = \{0, 1, ..., 12\}$$

Consumption Impulse Response Function

$$\Delta \log C_{t+h|t} = \alpha_h + \beta_h \epsilon_t^M + \gamma_h X + \varepsilon_t, \textbf{ for } h = \{0, 1, ..., 12\}$$

Model

Model Overview
A Two-Sector HANK Model with non-homotheticities

I. Households
Overview

- ► **Incomplete markets:** idiosyncratic productivity shocks and a borrowing constraint

- ► **Income sources:** labor earnings, asset returns, and dividends

- ► **Preferences:** consumption (c_t), and labor (h_t):

$$\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{E}_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t, h_t)$$

  – c is implicitly defined through a non-homothetic CES aggregator (Comin et al., 2021):
  $$1 = (\Omega C^{\epsilon})^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} c_s^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + (c)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} c_g^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}}$$

- ► **Two-stage budgeting:**
  – Intertemporal consumption-savings decision with endogenous labor supply choice
  – Intratemporal consumption allocation between goods and services

I. Households
The intratemporal sectoral expenditure allocation

▶ Given $\{p_i\}_{i \in \{g,s\}}$ and C, households solve the following **expenditure minimization problem**:

$$\min_{\{c_s, c_g\}} E\left(c_s, c_g; p_s, p_g\right) = p_g c_g + p_s c_s$$

$$\text{s.t. } (\Omega c^\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} c_s^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + (c)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} c_g^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} = 1$$

    – Note: if $\epsilon = 1$, we recover the standard (homothetic) CES aggregator

▶ Solution: (Hicksian) **demands**

$$c_g = \left(\frac{p_g}{E}\right)^{-\sigma} c^{1-\sigma} \text{ and } c_s = \left(\Omega \frac{p_s}{E}\right)^{-\sigma} c^{\epsilon(1-\sigma)}$$

I. Households

Static non-homothetic CES illustration

Stone-Geary

I. Households
The intertemporal consumption-savings decision problem

The intertemporal recursive representation of the household problem:

$$V(\omega, b; \Xi) = \max_{\{c, b', h\}} \; u(c, h) + \beta \mathbb{E} \left[V(\omega', b'; \Xi') \right]$$

$$\text{s.t.} \; E + p_b b' = w\omega h + (p_b + i)b + T + D$$

$$E = \left[(p_g c)^{1-\sigma} + \Omega \left(p_s c^\epsilon \right)^{1-\sigma} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}$$

$$\Xi' = \Psi(\Xi)$$

$$c \geq 0, \; b' \geq 0, \; h \in (0, 1),$$

with $u(C, h) = \frac{c^{1-\gamma} - 1}{1 - \gamma} - \chi \frac{h^{1+\eta}}{1+\eta}$ and $\omega \sim$ log-AR(1)

— Dividends are distributed according to households' productivity

II. Firms
The final producer

- ▶ Two representative final sector producers: **goods** and **services**

- ▶ Each **final producer** aggregates a continuum of intermediate inputs, j:

$$Q_m = \left(\int_0^1 q_m(j)^{\frac{\theta_m-1}{\theta_m}} dj \right)^{\frac{\theta_m}{\theta_m-1}}$$

- ▶ Given sectoral demand Q_m and prices $p_m(j)$, the **demand for the intermediate input** j is

$$q_m(j) = \left(\frac{p_m(j)}{P_m} \right)^{-\theta_m} Q_m,$$

with $P_m = \left(\int_0^1 p_m(j)^{1-\theta_m} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\theta_m}}$ being the price in sector m

II. Firms
Intermediate producers

▶ Operate under **monopolistic competition** producing with a linear technology on labor
$$q_m(j) = Z_m n_m(j)$$

▶ Intermediate firms adjust prices subject to an **adjustment cost** as in Rotemberg (1982):
$$\Phi_m\left(p_{m,t}(j), p_{m,t-1}(j)\right) = \frac{\theta_m}{2\kappa_m}\left[\log\left(\frac{p_{m,t}(j)}{p_{m,t-1}(j)}\right)\right]^2 Q_{m,t} P_{m,t}$$

▶ The solution of the firm's problem yields the **New-Keynesian Phillips Curve**:
$$\log(1 + \pi_{m,t}) = \frac{\kappa_m}{\theta_m}\left(1 - \theta_m + \theta_m \frac{w_t}{Z_m P_{m,t}}\right) + \frac{1}{1 + i_t}(1 + \pi_{m,t+1})\log(1 + \pi_{m,t+1})\frac{Q_{m,t+1}}{Q_{m,t}}$$

III. Government and Monetary Authority

▶ There is a **government** that collects taxes to finance interest on public debt

$$p_{b,t}B = \int (p_{b,t} + i_t)b_t d\Xi + T_t$$

▶ The **monetary authority** sets nominal interest rate according to a **Taylor rule**

$$i_t = i_{SS} + \phi\pi_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t^M$$

with $\varepsilon^M \sim$ AR(1).

Equilibrium definition

Taking the Model to the Data

Model Estimation
Strategy and Procedure

- ▶ Goal of the model: represent the U.S economy...
  - – **long-run:** economic activity shift towards services
  - – **short-run:** cross-section heterogeneity on income, wealth, and demand composition

Model Estimation
Strategy and Procedure

- ▶ Goal of the model: represent the U.S economy…
  - – **long-run:** economic activity shift towards services
  - – **short-run:** cross-section heterogeneity on income, wealth, and demand composition

- ▶ … to study how **structural transformation** changes **MP transmission**
  - – Compare dynamics around two steady-states: 1970 vs. 2019
  - – Steady-states only differ in terms of sectoral productivity levels

Model Estimation

Strategy and Procedure

- ► Goal of the model: represent the U.S economy...
  - **long-run:** economic activity shift towards services
  - **short-run:** cross-section heterogeneity on income, wealth, and demand composition

- ► ... to study how **structural transformation** changes **MP transmission**
  - Compare dynamics around two steady-states: 1970 vs. 2019
  - Steady-states only differ in terms of sectoral productivity levels

- ► Three steps:
  1. **Demand estimation:** to obtain the price and income elasticities
     - using price and consumption data, estimate the level of non-homotheticity

  2. **Pre-estimated parameters:** directed observed parameters in the data
     - including sectoral productivity growth rates and price rigidities

  3. **Simulated Method of Moments:** hours worked and service share
     - match the values in 2019

1. Demand Estimation
The relative Hicksian demand

▶ Preferences depend on the income elasticity, ϵ, and price elasticity, σ

1. Demand Estimation
The relative Hicksian demand

- ▶ Preferences depend on the income elasticity, ϵ, and price elasticity, σ
- ▶ The relative **Hicksian demand** between the service sector and the goods sector is:

$$\log\left(\frac{\nu_{s,t}}{\nu_{g,t}}\right) = (1-\sigma)\log\left(\frac{p_{s,t}}{p_{g,t}}\right) + (1-\sigma)(\epsilon-1)\log\left(\frac{E_t}{p_{g,t}}\right) + (\epsilon-1)\log\nu_{g,t} + \log(\Omega),$$

where $\nu_i t$ is the expenditure share in sector i at time t

1. Demand Estimation
The relative Hicksian demand

- ▶ Preferences depend on the income elasticity, ϵ, and price elasticity, σ

- ▶ The relative **Hicksian demand** between the service sector and the goods sector is:

$$\log\left(\frac{\nu_{s,t}}{\nu_{g,t}}\right) = (1-\sigma)\log\left(\frac{p_{s,t}}{p_{g,t}}\right) + (1-\sigma)(\epsilon-1)\log\left(\frac{E_t}{p_{g,t}}\right) + (\epsilon-1)\log\nu_{g,t} + \log(\Omega),$$

  where νit is the expenditure share in sector i at time t

- ▶ Using GMM, estimate σ and ϵ
    1. Use household-level consumption data (CEX)
    2. Controls: dummies for age groups, number of earners, and family size
    3. IV Rel. Prices: average price across regions excluding the own region
    4. IV Expenditure: annual household income and the income quintile of the household

- ▶ Estiamtion results: $\epsilon = 1.73$ and $\sigma = 0.234$ Details

2. External parameters

Parameter	Description	Value	Source
I. Household			
β	Discount factor	0.99	Standard (quarterly model)
γ	CRRA	1.20	Standard
η	Frisch elasticity	1.00	Chetty et al. (2011)
ρ_z	Persistence of idiosync. productivity	0.99	Krueger et al. (2016)
σ_z	Std. dev. of idiosync. productivity	0.10	Krueger et al. (2016)
II. Firm			
θ_g	Elasticity of substitution (goods)	5.8	Marto (2024)
θ_s	Elasticity of substitution (services)	4.7	Marto (2024)
κ_g	Price adjustment cost (goods)	8.5	Section 2
κ_s	Price adjustment cost (services)	89.2	Section 2
III. Government and Monetary Authority			
i_{SS}	Steady-state interest rate	0.75%	3% annual rate
ϕ_π	Taylor rule weight on inflation	1.5	Standard NK literature
ρ_M	Persistence of MP innovations	0.5	Standard NK literature

3. Simulated Method of Moments

▶ Parameters with SMM: χ, and Ω

▶ Use them to match 2 moments: average hours worked and agg. service share in 1970 and 2019

▶ Goal: minimize loss function

$$\min_{\chi, \Omega} \mathcal{L} = ||M_m - M_d||$$

3. Simulated Method of Moments

▶ Parameters with SMM: χ, and Ω

▶ Use them to match 2 moments: average hours worked and agg. service share in 1970 and 2019

▶ Goal: minimize loss function

$$\min_{\chi, \Omega} \mathcal{L} = ||M_m - M_d||$$

Moment	Model Mom.	Data Mom.	Data Source	Parameter	Param. Value
Average hours worked	0.217	0.212	OECD	χ	30.0
Average service share 2019	0.673	0.678	BEA	Ω	7.0

Model Fit
Long-run

▶ Heterogeneous sectoral productivity growth rates: goods = 2.2%/year, services = 1.1%/year

▶ My theory of structural transformation:
1. **Cost-disease channel:** productivity growth differentials change the relative price
2. **Non-homotheticity channel**: creates an inc. effect that shifts consumption toward "luxuries"

Model Fit
Long-run

- ► Heterogeneous sectoral productivity growth rates: goods = 2.2%/year, services = 1.1%/year
- ► My theory of structural transformation:
    1. **Cost-disease channel:** productivity growth differentials change the relative price
    2. **Non-homotheticity channel**: creates an inc. effect that shifts consumption toward "luxuries"

Model Fit Engel curve 2000

Short-run

Model Fit `Engel curve 2000`

Short-run

▶ **Average annual MPC**: 28% (data: 20 – 60%) `MPC distribution`
▶ **Share of Hand-to-Mouth**: 23.4% (data: 17.3%) `Wealth Dist.`

Structural Transformation & Monetary Policy Transmission

Response to Monetary Policy SS policy functions   Demand Composition

Aggregate Responses to a 100 bp Contractionary Shock: 1970 vs 2019

Structural Transformation and Monetary Policy More years

**Aggregate Responses to a 100 bp Contractionary Shock: 1970 vs 2019**

The Role of **Non-Homotheticity** and Heterogeneous **Price Rigidities**

|	(1) Baseline		(2) Homog. κ_m		(3) Homothetic	
	1970	2019	1970	2019	1970	2019
Service share	51.3	67.3	51.3	67.3	51.0	67.2
MPC	8.1	7.6	8.1	7.6	8.6	8.4
Consump. response (% change vs. 1970)	20.6		3.5		24.1	
Price of goods response (% change vs. 1970)	13.7		5.9		6.3	
Price of serv. response (% change vs. 1970)	10.7		5.9		3.5	

Inc. & Sub. effects

Sectoral Consumption Responses by Wealth Position

Low-wealth households decrease their consumption more than high-wealth households

Goods consumption — Services consumption

Sectoral Consumption Responses by Wealth Position

Low-wealth households decrease their consumption more than high-wealth households

**Goods consumption**

**Services consumption**

1970-economy
2019-economy

Welfare Cost of Monetary Policy

Structural Transformation and the Welfare Costs of Monetary Policy

Structural Transformation increases the welfare inequality costs of MP

Structural Transformation & Negative Supply Shocks

Extension: What is the Role of Services for Economic Resilience?

▶ **Goal:** Compare the effects of supply shocks with different demand compositions
  – compare the 1970-economy (50% services) and the 2019-economy (68% services).

▶ **Setup:**
  1. Economy is at the Steady-State
  2. Unexpected shock in the sectoral productivity (same for both sectors: $\Delta Z_m / Z_m = -5\%$)
     ✛ Unexpected and never to occur again
     ✛ Once it is realized, agents have full information about its path
     ✛ Shock is persistent, but after one year is halfway to the SS value

Structural Transformation and Supply Shocks

Aggregate responses to a negative 5% aggregate TFP shock

Structural Transformation and Supply Shocks Back

Higher services share makes the economy less responsive to supply shocks

Sectoral prices

Sectoral consumptions

Legend:
- 1970 Goods
- 1970 Serv.
- 2019 Goods
- 2019 Serv.

x-axis: Quarter

The Role of **Non-Homotheticity** and Heterogeneous **Price Rigidities**

	(1) Baseline		(2) Homog. κ_m		(3) Homothetic	
	1970	2019	1970	2019	1970	2019
Service share	51.3	67.3	51.3	67.3	51.0	67.2
MPC	8.1	7.6	8.1	7.6	8.6	8.4
Consump. response (% change vs. 1970)	-37.3		-9.2		-19.9	
Price of goods response (% change vs. 1970)	8.3		0.9		4.9	
Price of serv. response (% change vs. 1970)	6.9		0.9		4.1	

Conclusion

Conclusion

▶ **Structural transformation** shifts economic activity towards services

▶ **This paper:** What are the implications for the transmission of MP
  – prices in the service sector are stickier
  – services share increase along the income distribution

▶ Using a quantitative dynamic model:
  – The rise in the services share from 1970 to 2019 increased monetary non-neutrality by 21%

Conclusion

- ▶ **Structural transformation** shifts economic activity towards services

- ▶ **This paper:** What are the implications for the transmission of MP
    - prices in the service sector are stickier
    - services share increase along the income distribution

- ▶ Using a quantitative dynamic model:
    - The rise in the services share from 1970 to 2019 increased monetary non-neutrality by 21%

- ▶ **Policy implications**: common monetary policy with countries at different development levels

Conclusion

▶ **Structural transformation** shifts economic activity towards services

▶ **This paper:** What are the implications for the transmission of MP
  – prices in the service sector are stickier
  – services share increase along the income distribution

▶ Using a quantitative dynamic model:
  – The rise in the services share from 1970 to 2019 increased monetary non-neutrality by 21%

▶ **Policy implications**: common monetary policy with countries at different development levels

Thank You!

Appendix

Fact #1: Prices in the service sector are stickier
Data and Methodology

▶ **Data:** Summary statistics about price frequency assembled by Nakamura and Steinsson, 2008
  – Source: BLS monthly microdata that underlies the U.S. CPI
  – covers 70% of consumer expenditures

▶ **Methodology**
  1. Aggregate by goods and services categories (BEA classification)
 2. Compute implied duration using a Poisson distribution

Fact #1: Robustness `Back`

Implied Duration

Fact #1: Robustness Back

Using Bils and Klenow (2004) dataset

Fact #2: Data details

- ▶ **Consumer Expenditure Survey (CEX)**
  - – curated by the US BLS
  - – used to compute the relative importance of goods and services in the CPI basket

- ▶ **Coverage**
  - – time frame: between 2000 and 2022
  - – each wave has between 5 000 – 8 000 households

- ▶ **Consumption and Expenditure data**
  - – household expenditure by broad categories (e.g., food at home, education)
  - – demographic variables (income, age, household composition, etc)

Fact #2: Methodology details

1. Household **sample selection**:
   - keep those who participate in the 4 waves
   - household head age between 25 and 64

2. Divide households into **5 income groups** (similar to Aguiar and Bils, 2015):
   - income = pre-tax income + alimony + gifts + gambling winnings + inheritance
   - regress income on household size, average age of household earners head, and no income earners
   - from the regression residuals build 5 income groups

3. Classify expenditure by **economic activity**:
   - <u>Services:</u> Food Away, Shelter, Education, Public Transportation, Health Care, Utilities, Personal Care, Entertainment, Other Vehicle Expenses
   - <u>Goods:</u> Food and Alcohol at Home, Motor Vehicles, Apparel, Tobacco and Gasoline

4. Compute the **average share of consumption** in services along time

Fact #2: Robustness Back

Excluding old households

Fact #2: Robustness `Back`

Including bottom and top 5%

Suggestive Motivation Details

▶ **Local Projections exercise**
  – Data:
    + Total personal expenditure from the BEA Tables
    + Romer and Romer (2023) narrative MP shocks

  – Using Jordà (2005) local projections, I estimate:

  $$\Delta \log E_{t+h|t} = \alpha^h + \beta_h \, \epsilon_t^M + \sum_{j=1}^{12} \gamma_j^h \, y_{t-j} + \sum_{j=1}^{12} \delta_j^h \, \epsilon_{t-j}^M + \mu_m + \varepsilon_t, \text{ for } h = \{0, 1, ..., 24\}$$

▶ **Cross-country correlation exercise**
  – Galesi and Rachedi (2019) SVAR model (Y_t, π_t, i_t) estimates with sign restriction identification
  – 20-year average service share from national accounts

Corr: -0.39 (0.061)

Scatter plot with x-axis "Share of consumption in services" (range 40 to 70) and y-axis "Response of output" (range -0.6 to -0.4). Country data points: MEX, JPN, KOR, LTU, BEL, PRT, DEU, IDN, BGR, AUT, ESP, LVA, BRA, SWE, NLD, DNK, FIN, GBR, CAN, AUS, FRA, LUX.

Static non-homothetic CES illustration Back

Comparison with Stone-Geary class

Competitive Equilibrium Back

Definition: A competitive equilibrium is a sequence of lump-sum transfers T_t; interest rates i_t; value functions V_t with policy functions $\hat{c}_{g,t}, \hat{c}_{s,t}, \hat{h}_t$ and $\hat{b}_t$; prices p_t^b, p_t^g, p_t^s, and w_t; profits $\pi_{g,t}$ and $\pi_{s,t}$; and a law of motion Ψ, such that:

1. V_t satisfies the Bellman Equation, with the solution given by the policy functions $\hat{c}_{g,t}, \hat{c}_{s,t}, \hat{h}_t$ and $\hat{b}_t$ given sequences of lump-sum taxes, prices, interest rate and dividends.

2. Firms maximize profits, which are distributed in the form of dividends to households.

3. The government runs a balanced budget.

4. For all Ξ_t, the asset, labor, and goods markets clear.

5. The aggregate law of motion of the distribution, Ψ, is generated by the savings policy function.

1. Demand Estimation `Back`

Results

$$\log\left(\frac{\nu_{s,t}^n}{\nu_{g,t}^n}\right) = (1-\sigma)\log\left(\frac{p_{s,t}^n}{p_{g,t}^n}\right) + (1-\sigma)(\epsilon-1)\log\left(\frac{E_t^n}{p_{g,t}^n}\right) + (\epsilon-1)\log\nu_{g,t}^n + \zeta^n + \tilde{\zeta}_t^n,$$

	(1)	(2)	(3)
σ	0.209	0.176	0.234
	(0.044)	(0.039)	(0.051)
ϵ	1.619	1.667	1.731
	(0.061)	(0.058)	(0.080)
Region FE	N	Y	Y
Year $\times$ Quarter FE	N	N	Y

Model Fit Back

Engel curve 2000

# Model Fit Back

Short-run household behavior: marginal propensity to consume

Model Fit

Short-run household behavior: wealth distribution

Wealth Statistic	Data	Model
Mean wealth	4.1	4.5
Median wealth	1.5	1.8
Wealth, bottom 50%	2.5%	3.1%
Wealth, top 10%	49.9%	48.6%
HtM share	17.3%	23.4%

Steady-State Policy Functions Back

Frontier: MP response and services share Back

# Monetary Policy and Demand Composition Back

MP contractions shift expenditure towards goods

# Demand Composition: Decomposition Back

Non-homotheticity accounts for around half of the differences in the response

Goods consumption

Services consumption

Demand Composition: Decomposition Back

Differences in the price rigidities account for the other half

Counterfactuals: income vs substitution effects

Two forces that drive the increase in services:

1. Higher **income** makes consumption shift toward "luxuries"
2. changes in the **relative prices** change consumption composition

	(1) 1970 (bsl)	(1) 2019 (bsl)	(2) Income effect	(3) Substitution effect
Consump. response (vs. 1970)	–	20.64	11.52	14.02
Relative price	1.00	1.68	1.00	1.68
SS consumption	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.03
Service share	51.34	67.30	58.09	61.22

$\Rightarrow$ Income and price effect have the same relevance for the amplification of MP transmission

References

Aguiar, M. and Bils, M. (2015). Has Consumption Inequality Mirrored Income Inequality? *American Economic Review*, 105(9):2725–2756.

Andreolli, M., Rickard, N., and Surico, P. (2024). Non-essential business-cycles. *Mimeographed, London Business School*.

Auclert, A. (2019). Monetary Policy and the Redistribution Channel. *American Economic Review*, 109(6):2333–2367.

Becker, J. (2024). Do Poor Households Pay Higher Markups in Recessions? *Working paper*.

Bils, M. and Klenow, P. J. (2004). Some Evidence on the Importance of Sticky Prices. *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(5):947–985.

Boehnert, L., de Ferra, S., Mitman, K., and Romei, F. (2025). High Non-Tradable Consumption, Inequality, and Weak Monetary Policy. *Working Paper*.

Boivin, J. and Giannoni, M. P. (2006). Has Monetary Policy Become More Effective? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 88(3):445–462.

Broer, T., Harbo Hansen, N.-J., Krusell, P., and Öberg, E. (2020). The New Keynesian Transmission Mechanism: A Heterogeneous-Agent Perspective. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 87(1):77–101.

Chetty, R., Guren, A., Manoli, D., and Weber, A. (2011). Are Micro and Macro Labor Supply Elasticities Consistent? A Review of Evidence on the Intensive and Extensive Margins. *American Economic Review*, 101(3):471–475.

Comin, D., Lashkari, D., and Mestieri, M. (2021). Structural Change with Long-run Income and Price Effects. *Econometrica*, 89(1):311–374.

Cravino, J., Lan, T., and Levchenko, A. A. (2020). Price Stickiness along the Income Distribution and the Effects of Monetary Policy. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 110:19–32.

Galesi, A. and Rachedi, O. (2019). Services Deepening and the Transmission of Monetary Policy. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 17(4):1261–1293.

Gornemann, N., Kuester, K., and Nakajima, M. (2016). Doves for the Rich, Hawks for the Poor? Distributional Consequences of