Nonparametric Measurement of Long-Run Growth in Consumer Welfare

Xavier Jaravel*, Danial Lashkari†

*LSE, †Boston College

July 18, 2022

How to Measure Long-Run Growth in Welfare?

- Classical demand theory:
  - Price index formulas approximate inflation in the cost-of-living without parametric assumptions

How to Measure Long-Run Growth in Welfare?

- Classical demand theory:
  - Price index formulas approximate inflation in the cost-of-living without parametric assumptions
  - If demand composition independent of income, approximate long-run welfare growth (via chaining)

How to Measure Long-Run Growth in Welfare?

- Classical demand theory:
  - Price index formulas approximate inflation in the cost-of-living without parametric assumptions
  - If demand composition independent of income, approximate long-run welfare growth (via chaining)

    ... but there is much evidence that household-level inflation measures vary with income

    e.g., Argente & Lee (2021); Jaravel (2019); Kaplan & Schulhofer-Wohl (2017); Klick and Stockburger (2021)

How to Measure Long-Run Growth in Welfare?

- Classical demand theory:
  - Price index formulas approximate inflation in the cost-of-living without parametric assumptions
  - If demand composition independent of income, approximate long-run welfare growth (via chaining)

    ... but there is much evidence that household-level inflation measures vary with income

    e.g., Argente & Lee (2021); Jaravel (2019); Kaplan & Schulhofer-Wohl (2017); Klick and Stockburger (2021)
  - Alternative: estimate parametric model or impose constraints on demand

    e.g., Baqaee & Burstein (2021); Atkin, Faber, Fally, and Gonzelez-Navarro (2018); Fajgelbaum & Khandelwal (2016)

How to Measure Long-Run Growth in Welfare?

- Classical demand theory:
  - Price index formulas approximate inflation in the cost-of-living without parametric assumptions
  - If demand composition independent of income, approximate long-run welfare growth (via chaining)

    ... but there is much evidence that household-level inflation measures vary with income

    e.g., Argente & Lee (2021); Jaravel (2019); Kaplan & Schulhofer-Wohl (2017); Klick and Stockburger (2021)
  - Alternative: estimate parametric model or impose constraints on demand

    e.g., Baqaee & Burstein (2021); Atkin, Faber, Fally, and Gonzelez-Navarro (2018); Fajgelbaum & Khandelwal (2016)
- Questions: can we nonparametrically generalize the price index strategy to...
  - ... settings in which demand composition varies with income?

How to Measure Long-Run Growth in Welfare?

- Classical demand theory:
  - Price index formulas approximate inflation in the cost-of-living without parametric assumptions
  - If demand composition independent of income, approximate long-run welfare growth (via chaining)

    ... but there is much evidence that household-level inflation measures vary with income

    e.g., Argente & Lee (2021); Jaravel (2019); Kaplan & Schulhofer-Wohl (2017); Klick and Stockburger (2021)
  - Alternative: estimate parametric model or impose constraints on demand

    e.g., Baqaee & Burstein (2021); Atkin, Faber, Fally, and Gonzelez-Navarro (2018); Fajgelbaum & Khandelwal (2016)
- Questions: can we nonparametrically generalize the price index strategy to...
  - ... settings in which demand composition varies with income?
  - ... settings in which demand composition varies with other (changing) observables?

Outline

Exact Measurement of Welfare Growth:

- Express welfare (real consumption) as expenditure under constant prices in base period

Outline

Exact Measurement of Welfare Growth:

- Express welfare (real consumption) as expenditure under constant prices in base period
- Correct for nonhomotheticity: elasticity of cost-of-living index w.r.t real consumption

Outline

Exact Measurement of Welfare Growth:

- Express welfare (real consumption) as expenditure under constant prices in base period
- Correct for nonhomotheticity: elasticity of cost-of-living index w.r.t real consumption
- Characterize the dependence of measured real consumption growth on the choice of base period

Outline

Exact Measurement of Welfare Growth:

- Express welfare (real consumption) as expenditure under constant prices in base period
- Correct for nonhomotheticity: elasticity of cost-of-living index w.r.t real consumption
- Characterize the dependence of measured real consumption growth on the choice of base period

Approximating Welfare Growth with Price Indices:

- Develop algorithm to nonparametrically estimate the correction with cross-sectional household data
- Derive approximation error bounds for the measures of real consumption growth

Outline

Exact Measurement of Welfare Growth:

- Express welfare (real consumption) as expenditure under constant prices in base period
- Correct for nonhomotheticity: elasticity of cost-of-living index w.r.t real consumption
- Characterize the dependence of measured real consumption growth on the choice of base period

Approximating Welfare Growth with Price Indices:

- Develop algorithm to nonparametrically estimate the correction with cross-sectional household data
- Derive approximation error bounds for the measures of real consumption growth

Application to Measuring Average US Real Consumption Growth:

- Negative income elasticity of inflation in the US based on CEX/BLS data (new evidence prior to 2000)
- Sizable nonhom. correction over 1955-2019 (e.g., growth with 2019 base: 294% $\rightarrow$ 251%)

Prior Work

Nonhomotheticity Bias: highlights the importance of cov. bet. income elasticity & price change

Baqaee & Burstein (2021); Atkin, Faber, Fally, and Gonzelez-Navarro (2018); Fajgelbaum & Khandelwal (2016) & others

Inflation Inequality: documents cross-sectional variation bet. inflation and income

Argente & Lee (2021); Jaravel (2019); Kaplan & Schulhofer-Wohl (2017); Klick and Stockburger (2021); McGrahan & Paulson (2006); Hobijn & Lagakos (2005) & others

Classical Index Number Theory: approximating welfare change for flexible preferences

Diewert (1993); Pollak (1990); Diewert (1976); Samuelson & Swamy (1974) & many others

Nonparametric Welfare Measurement: general consumer heterogeneity (typically single good)

Hausman & Newey (2017, 2016); Blundell, Horowitz, & Parey (2017, 2012); Lewbell (2001) & others

Roadmap

Exact Measurement of Welfare Growth

Approximating Welfare Growth with Price Index Formulas

Empirics

Conclusion

Setting

Prices $\boldsymbol{p}_t$, expenditure y_t, and shares $\boldsymbol{s}_t$ rationalized by expenditure function $E(u; \boldsymbol{p})$

Setting

Prices $\boldsymbol{p}_t$, expenditure y_t, and shares $\boldsymbol{s}_t$ rationalized by expenditure function $E(u; \boldsymbol{p})$

Real Consumption: money metric $M_b(\cdot)$ for welfare under prices $\boldsymbol{p}_b$ (with $0 \leq b \leq T$)

$$c^b = M_b(u) \equiv E(u; \boldsymbol{p}_b)$$

Setting

Prices $\boldsymbol{p}_t$, expenditure y_t, and shares $\boldsymbol{s}_t$ rationalized by expenditure function $E(u; \boldsymbol{p})$

Real Consumption: money metric $M_b(\cdot)$ for welfare under prices $\boldsymbol{p}_b$ (with $0 \leq b \leq T$)

$$c^b = M_b(u) \equiv E(u; \boldsymbol{p}_b)$$

- Express expenditure function under prices $\boldsymbol{p}$ in terms of real consumption:

$$\widetilde{E}^b\left(c^b; \boldsymbol{p}\right) \equiv E\left(M_b{}^{-1}\left(c^b\right); \boldsymbol{p}\right)$$

Setting

Prices $\boldsymbol{p}_t$, expenditure y_t, and shares $\boldsymbol{s}_t$ rationalized by expenditure function $E(u; \boldsymbol{p})$

Real Consumption: money metric $M_b(\cdot)$ for welfare under prices $\boldsymbol{p}_b$ (with $0 \leq b \leq T$)

$$c^b = M_b(u) \equiv E(u; \boldsymbol{p}_b)$$

- Express expenditure function under prices $\boldsymbol{p}$ in terms of real consumption:

$$\widetilde{E}^b\left(c^b; \boldsymbol{p}\right) \equiv E\left(M_b{}^{-1}\left(c^b\right); \boldsymbol{p}\right)$$

True cost-of-living index for real consumption c^b between periods t_0 and t (under base b):

$$\mathcal{P}^b_{t_0,t}\left(c^b\right) \equiv \frac{\widetilde{E}^b\left(c^b; \boldsymbol{p}_t\right)}{\widetilde{E}^b\left(c^b; \boldsymbol{p}_{t_0}\right)}$$

Nonhomotheticity Correction

Proposition: real consumption growth as correction to deflated nominal expenditure growth

$$\frac{d \ln c_t^b}{dt} = \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_t^b \left(c_t^b\right)} \left(\frac{d \ln y_t}{dt} - \sum_i s_{it} \frac{d \ln p_{it}}{dt} \right)$$

Nonhomotheticity Correction

Proposition: real consumption growth as correction to deflated nominal expenditure growth

$$\frac{d \ln c_t^b}{dt} = \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_t^b \left(c_t^b\right)} \left(\frac{d \ln y_t}{dt} - \sum_i s_{it} \frac{d \ln p_{it}}{dt} \right)$$

- Correction: elasticity of true index (from base b to t) w.r.t real consumption c^b

$$\Lambda_t^b \left(c^b\right) = \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{b,t}^b \left(c^b\right)}{\partial \ln c^b}$$

Nonhomotheticity Correction

Proposition: real consumption growth as correction to deflated nominal expenditure growth

$$\frac{d \ln c_t^b}{dt} = \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_t^b \left(c_t^b\right)} \left(\frac{d \ln y_t}{dt} - \sum_i s_{it} \frac{d \ln p_{it}}{dt} \right)$$

- Correction: elasticity of true index (from base b to t) w.r.t real consumption c^b

$$\Lambda_t^b \left(c^b\right) = \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{b,t}^b \left(c^b\right)}{\partial \ln c^b}$$

Under homothetic preferences: $\mathcal{P}_{t_0,t}^b \left(c^b\right) \equiv \overline{\mathcal{P}}_{t_0,t}$ for all $c^b \Rightarrow \Lambda_t^b \left(c^b\right) \equiv 0$

Nonhomotheticity Correction

Proposition: real consumption growth as correction to deflated nominal expenditure growth

$$\frac{d \ln c_t^b}{dt} = \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_t^b \left(c_t^b\right)} \left(\frac{d \ln y_t}{dt} - \sum_i s_{it} \frac{d \ln p_{it}}{dt} \right)$$

- Correction: elasticity of true index (from base b to t) w.r.t real consumption c^b

$$\Lambda_t^b \left(c^b\right) = \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{b,t}^b \left(c^b\right)}{\partial \ln c^b}$$

Under homothetic preferences: $\mathcal{P}_{t_0,t}^b \left(c^b\right) \equiv \overline{\mathcal{P}}_{t_0,t}$ for all $c^b \Rightarrow \Lambda_t^b \left(c^b\right) \equiv 0$

Under nonhomothetic preferences:

$\Lambda_t^b \left(c^b\right) < 0 \Rightarrow$ base-to-current cumulative inflation decreasing in real consumption

$\Rightarrow$ higher real consumption growth

Real Consumption Growth and the Choice of Base

Corollary: instantaneous real consumption growth for different base periods:

$$\frac{d \ln c_t^{b_2}}{d \ln c_t^{b_1}} = 1 + \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{b_1,b_2}^{b_1}\left(c_t^{b_1}\right)}{\partial \ln c_t^{b_1}}$$

Real Consumption Growth and the Choice of Base

Corollary: instantaneous real consumption growth for different base periods:

$$\frac{d \ln c_t^{b_2}}{d \ln c_t^{b_1}} = 1 + \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{b_1,b_2}^{b_1}\left(c_t^{b_1}\right)}{\partial \ln c_t^{b_1}}$$

- If inflation decreasing in real consumption:

$$\frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{b_1,b_2}(c_t)}{\partial \ln c_t} < 0 \Rightarrow \text{lower real consumption measured from the perspective of later period } b_2$$

Real Consumption Growth and the Choice of Base

Corollary: instantaneous real consumption growth for different base periods:

$$\frac{d \ln c_t^{b_2}}{d \ln c_t^{b_1}} = 1 + \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{b_1,b_2}^{b_1}\left(c_t^{b_1}\right)}{\partial \ln c_t^{b_1}}$$

- If inflation decreasing in real consumption:

$$\frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{b_1,b_2}(c_t)}{\partial \ln c_t} < 0 \Rightarrow \text{lower real consumption measured from the perspective of later period } b_2$$

- Intuition: food and mobile phones

Extension to Covariates | Illustrative Example

Roadmap

Exact Measurement of Welfare Growth

Approximating Welfare Growth with Price Index Formulas

Empirics

Conclusion

Index Formulas

Observe sequences of prices and expenditure shares: $(\boldsymbol{p}_t)_{t=0}^{T}$ & $(\boldsymbol{s}_t)_{t=0}^{T}$ for $t \in \{0, 1, \cdots, T\}$

$$\max_{1 \le i \le I,\, 1 \le t \le T} |\Delta \ln p_{i,t}| \le \Delta_p \qquad \max_{1 \le t \le T} |\Delta \ln y_t| \le \Delta_y \qquad \Delta \equiv \Delta_p + \Delta_y < 1$$

Index Formulas

Observe sequences of prices and expenditure shares: $(\boldsymbol{p}_t)_{t=0}^T$ & $(\boldsymbol{s}_t)_{t=0}^T$ for $t \in \{0, 1, \cdots, T\}$

$$\max_{1\leq i\leq I,\, 1\leq t\leq T} |\Delta \ln p_{i,t}| \leq \Delta_p \qquad \max_{1\leq t\leq T} |\Delta \ln y_t| \leq \Delta_y \qquad \Delta \equiv \Delta_p + \Delta_y < 1$$

Price index formula: positive-valued function of $(\boldsymbol{p}_t, \boldsymbol{s}_t)$ and $(\boldsymbol{p}_{t+1}, \boldsymbol{s}_{t+1})$

geometric : $\ln \pi_{G,t} \equiv \sum_i s_{i,t} \Delta \ln p_{i,t}$ Törnqvist: $\ln \pi_{T,t} \equiv \sum_i \frac{1}{2} (s_{i,t} + s_{i,t+1}) \Delta \ln p_{i,t}$

Index Formulas

Observe sequences of prices and expenditure shares: $(\boldsymbol{p}_t)_{t=0}^{T}$ & $(\boldsymbol{s}_t)_{t=0}^{T}$ for $t \in \{0, 1, \cdots, T\}$

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq I,\, 1 \leq t \leq T} |\Delta \ln p_{i,t}| \leq \Delta_p \qquad \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} |\Delta \ln y_t| \leq \Delta_y \qquad \Delta \equiv \Delta_p + \Delta_y < 1$$

Price index formula: positive-valued function of $(\boldsymbol{p}_t, \boldsymbol{s}_t)$ and $(\boldsymbol{p}_{t+1}, \boldsymbol{s}_{t+1})$

geometric : $\ln \pi_{G,t} \equiv \sum_i s_{i,t} \Delta \ln p_{i,t}$ Törnqvist: $\ln \pi_{T,t} \equiv \sum_i \frac{1}{2} (s_{i,t} + s_{i,t+1}) \Delta \ln p_{i,t}$

Under homotheticity, index formulas approximate true index for any real consumption c

Diewert (1976)

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \mathcal{P}_{t,t+1}(c) &= \ln \pi_{G,t} + O\left(\Delta_p^2\right) \\ &= \ln \pi_{T,t} + O\left(\Delta_p^3\right) \end{aligned}$$

Index Formulas

Observe sequences of prices and expenditure shares: $(\boldsymbol{p}_t)_{t=0}^T$ & $(\boldsymbol{s}_t)_{t=0}^T$ for $t \in \{0, 1, \cdots, T\}$

$$\max_{1\leq i\leq I,\, 1\leq t\leq T} |\Delta \ln p_{i,t}| \leq \Delta_p \qquad \max_{1\leq t\leq T} |\Delta \ln y_t| \leq \Delta_y \qquad \Delta \equiv \Delta_p + \Delta_y < 1$$

Price index formula: positive-valued function of $(\boldsymbol{p}_t, \boldsymbol{s}_t)$ and $(\boldsymbol{p}_{t+1}, \boldsymbol{s}_{t+1})$

$$\text{geometric}: \quad \ln \pi_{G,t} \equiv \sum_i s_{i,t} \Delta \ln p_{i,t} \qquad \text{Törnqvist}: \quad \ln \pi_{T,t} \equiv \sum_i \tfrac{1}{2} \left(s_{i,t} + s_{i,t+1}\right) \Delta \ln p_{i,t}$$

Under nonhomotheticity, index formulas approximate true index for local real consumption c

Diewert (1976)

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \mathcal{P}_{t,t+1}(c) &= \ln \pi_{G,t} + O\left(\Delta_p^2\right) && \text{if } c \in [c_t, c_{t+1}] \\ &= \ln \pi_{T,t} + O\left(\Delta_p^3\right) && \text{if } c = \sqrt{c_t c_{t+1}} \end{aligned}$$

Approximating Real Consumption Growth

Key Assumption: data from collection households $n \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$ with identical preferences

Approximating Real Consumption Growth

Key Assumption: data from collection households $n \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$ with identical preferences

Question: how to use the approximation

$$\Delta \ln c_t^n \approx \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_{t+1}(c_t^n)} \left(\Delta \ln y_t^n - \ln \pi_{G,t}^n \right)$$

Approximating Real Consumption Growth

Key Assumption: data from collection households $n \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$ with identical preferences

Question: how to use the approximation

$$\Delta \ln c_t^n \approx \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_{t+1}\left(c_t^n\right)} \left(\Delta \ln y_t^n - \ln \pi_{G,t}^n\right)$$

- In base period $t = b$, by definition $c_b^n \equiv y_b^n$

$$\mathcal{P}_{b,b+1}\left(c_b^n\right) \approx \pi_{G,b}^n \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \text{Nonparametrically estimate } \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,b+1}\left(\cdot\right) \text{ (e.g., order-}K_N \text{ power series)}$$

Approximating Real Consumption Growth

Key Assumption: data from collection households $n \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$ with identical preferences

Question: how to use the approximation

$$\Delta \ln c_t^n \approx \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_{t+1}\left(c_t^n\right)} \left(\Delta \ln y_t^n - \ln \pi_{G,t}^n\right)$$

- In base period $t = b$, by definition $c_b^n \equiv y_b^n$

$$\mathcal{P}_{b,b+1}\left(c_b^n\right) \approx \pi_{G,b}^n \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \text{Nonparametrically estimate } \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,b+1}\left(\cdot\right) \text{ (e.g., order-}K_N\text{ power series)}$$

- Approximate nonhomotheticity correction $\widehat{\Lambda}_{b+1}\left(c\right) \equiv \frac{\partial \ln \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,b+1}(c)}{\partial \ln c}$

$$\ln \widehat{c}_{b+1}^n = \ln c_b^n + \frac{1}{1 + \widehat{\Lambda}_{b+1}\left(c_b^n\right)} \left(\Delta \ln y_b^n - \ln \pi_{G,b}^n\right)$$

Approximating Real Consumption Growth

Key Assumption: data from collection households $n \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$ with identical preferences

Question: how to use the approximation

$$\Delta \ln c_t^n \approx \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_{t+1}\left(c_t^n\right)} \left(\Delta \ln y_t^n - \ln \pi_{G,t}^n\right)$$

- In base period $t = b$, by definition $c_b^n \equiv y_b^n$

$$\mathcal{P}_{b,b+1}\left(c_b^n\right) \approx \pi_{G,b}^n \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \text{Nonparametrically estimate } \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,b+1}(\cdot) \text{ (e.g., order-}K_N\text{ power series)}$$

- Approximate nonhomotheticity correction $\widehat{\Lambda}_{b+1}(c) \equiv \frac{\partial \ln \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,b+1}(c)}{\partial \ln c}$

$$\ln \widehat{c}_{b+1}^n = \ln c_b^n + \frac{1}{1 + \widehat{\Lambda}_{b+1}\left(c_b^n\right)} \left(\Delta \ln y_b^n - \ln \pi_{G,b}^n\right)$$

- Iterate the above steps for $t > b$, using $\ln \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t}(c) = \sum_{\tau=b}^{t-1} \ln \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{\tau,\tau+1}(c)$

Full Iterative Algorithm

Accuracy of the Approximation

- Assumption: For all t, pdf of real consumption c bounded away from 0 over an interval $[\underline{c}, \overline{c}]$

Bounds on the Approximation Error of the First-Order Algorithm

If $\widetilde{E}^b(\cdot;\cdot)$ continuously differentiable of order $m \geq 5$, then for any b, as N, $K_N \to \infty$:

$$\ln\left(\frac{c_{t+1}^n}{c_t^n}\right) = \ln\left(\frac{\widehat{c}_{t+1}^n}{\widehat{c}_t^n}\right) + O\left(\Delta_p^2\right) + O_p\left(K_N^3\left(K_N^{1-m} + \sqrt{\frac{K_N}{N}} \cdot \Delta_p^4\right)\Delta\right)$$

Accuracy of the Approximation

- Assumption: For all t, pdf of real consumption c bounded away from 0 over an interval $[\underline{c}, \overline{c}]$

Bounds on the Approximation Error of the First-Order Algorithm

If $\widetilde{E}^b(\cdot;\cdot)$ continuously differentiable of order $m \geq 5$, then for any b, as N, $K_N \to \infty$:

$$\ln\left(\frac{c_{t+1}^n}{c_t^n}\right) = \ln\left(\frac{\widehat{c}_{t+1}^n}{\widehat{c}_t^n}\right) + O\left(\Delta_p^2\right) + O_p\left(K_N^3\left(K_N^{1-m} + \sqrt{\frac{K_N}{N}} \cdot \Delta_p^4\right)\Delta\right)$$

Sources of error:

1. Original Taylor-series approximation error $\underset{\Delta_p \to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0$
2. Approximation error $\mathcal{P}_{b,t}(\cdot)$ based on cross-sectional nonparametric estimation $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t}(\cdot)$
   (i) Finite basis function error $\underset{K_N \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$
   (ii) Finite sample error $\underset{K_N^7/N \to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0$

Illustrative Example

Extensions

Second-order Algorithm:

- Relies on the Törnqvist (2nd order) index instead of the geometric (1st order) index
- Requires iterative procedure within each period
- Offers tighter error bounds

Error Bounds

Extensions

Second-order Algorithm:

- Relies on the Törnqvist (2nd order) index instead of the geometric (1st order) index
- Requires iterative procedure within each period
- Offers tighter error bounds

Error Bounds

Alternative index formulas:

- Results extend to Laspeyres, Paasche, Fisher, and Sato-Vartia indices

Extensions

Second-order Algorithm:

- Relies on the Törnqvist (2nd order) index instead of the geometric (1st order) index
- Requires iterative procedure within each period
- Offers tighter error bounds

Error Bounds

Alternative index formulas:

- Results extend to Laspeyres, Paasche, Fisher, and Sato-Vartia indices

Algorithms for cases with covariates:

- First-order and Second-order algorithms for the cases involving (changing) consumer covariates
- Provide error bounds in each case

Roadmap

Exact Measurement of Welfare Growth

Approximating Welfare Growth with Price Index Formulas

Empirics

Conclusion

Empirics

Linked Dataset:

- Construct CEX-CPI crosswalk for $\approx$ 600 product categories (1984-2019)
- CEX household-level data aggregated by percentile of pre-tax income reweighted consistent with:
  - CEX official expenditure summary tables by income quintiles (1984-2019)
  - BEA data on aggregate consumption expenditure growth (1955-2019)

Empirics

Linked Dataset:


- Construct CEX-CPI crosswalk for $\approx$ 600 product categories (1984-2019)
- CEX household-level data aggregated by percentile of pre-tax income reweighted consistent with:
  - CEX official expenditure summary tables by income quintiles (1984-2019)
  - BEA data on aggregate consumption expenditure growth (1955-2019)

Contributions:


- Evidence on the inequality inflation experienced across households (new evidence prior to 2000)
- Evaluate importance of nonhomotheticity correction in measuring real consumption growth in US
- Blueprint for including inflation inequality in Distributional National Accounts
  Piketty et al. (2018)

Inflation as Measured by Price Indices (1984-2019)

Chained Geometric w. Agg. Expenditure Shares




Chained Geometric by Income Group (Pecentile)




Pre vs. Post 1995

Annual Bias in Uncorrected Measures of Real Consumption Growth

Correction in 2019 (1984 as Base Prices)



Correction in 1984 (2019 as Base Prices)




Annual bias in uncorrected measure of real consumption growth $g_t^n \equiv \Delta \ln y_t^n - \ln \pi_t^n$


$$g_t^n - \Delta \ln c_t^n \approx \left(\frac{\Lambda_{t+1}(c_t^n)}{1+\Lambda_{t+1}(c_t^n)} \right) \times g_t$$

Nonhomotheticty Correction and the Consumption Deflator

1984 as Base Prices



2019 as Base Prices




Chained index formula ($\prod_\tau \pi_\tau^n$) vs. the corrected deflator ($\frac{y_t^n}{c_t^n}$)


Level of Real Consumption | Cumulative Growth | Comparison w. Group-Specific Indices

Bias in the Aggreate

Annual Bias in Avg. Real Consumption Growth



Bias in the Level of Avg. Real Consumption



Long-Run Growth: Extending to 1955-2019

Annual CEX not available prior to 1984

Correction using 1984 shares in prior years:

- BLS inflation data (matched to CEX in 1984)
- BEA avg. nominal consumption expenditure
- Extend correction (1984 & 2019 bases)


Long-Run Growth: Extending to 1955-2019

Annual CEX not available prior to 1984

Correction using 1984 shares in prior years:

- BLS inflation data (matched to CEX in 1984)
- BEA avg. nominal consumption expenditure
- Extend correction (1984 & 2019 bases)


Inequality in Inflation Prior to 1984 (1955-1984)




The specification includes year fixed effects. The sample run from 1955 to 1983.
Each bin represents 1% of households.

Long Run: Bias in Growth and Level of Real Consumption

Bias in Annual Avg. Real Consumption Growth




Bias in the Level of Avg. Real Consumption




Long Run: Corrections to Cumulative Real Consumption Growth

Cumulative Growth (1955-2019)



Avg. Annualized Growth (1955-2019)



Robustness

Results robust to data construction and aggregation choices:

- Official CPI category-level expenditure weights used by BLS (19 categories, 1984-2019)
- Nielsen data (consumer packaged goods) (9131 products, 2004-2019)

Results

Roadmap

Exact Measurement of Welfare Growth

Approximating Welfare Growth with Price Index Formulas

Empirics

Conclusion

Conclusion

Measuring real consumption growth:

- Provided theoretically-consistent correction for deflated nominal expenditure growth
- Characterized the precise dependence of real consumption growth on base year price

Contributions:

- Nonparametric approach to estimate income elasticity of inflation using cross-sectional data
- Analysis of the nonhomotheticity bias in measures of US power-war real consumption growth

Roadmap

Appendix

Extension to Covariates

Preferences depend on vector of covariates $\boldsymbol{x}$ with expenditure function $E(u; \boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{x})$

Extension to Covariates

Preferences depend on vector of covariates $\boldsymbol{x}$ with expenditure function $E(u; \boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{x})$

Real Consumption: generalize to define $c_t^b \equiv E(u_t; \boldsymbol{p}_b, \boldsymbol{x}_t)$ and the growth follows:

$$\frac{d \ln c_t}{dt} = \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_t(c_t; \boldsymbol{x}_t)} \left[\frac{d \ln y_t}{dt} - \sum_i s_{it} \frac{d \ln p_{it}}{dt} - \underbrace{\sum_k \Gamma_{kt}(c_t; \boldsymbol{x}_t) \frac{d \ln x_{kt}}{dt}}_{\text{Correction for covariate change}} \right]$$

- Nonhomotheticity correction and covariate-k correction:

$$\Lambda_t(c; \boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{b,t}(c; \boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \ln c}$$
$$\Gamma_{kt}(c; \boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{P}_{b,t}(c; \boldsymbol{x})}{\partial \ln x_k}$$

with generalized cost-of-living index defined as $\mathcal{P}_{t_0,t}(c; \boldsymbol{x}) \equiv \widetilde{E}(c; \boldsymbol{p}_t, \boldsymbol{x}) / \widetilde{E}(c; \boldsymbol{p}_{t_0}, \boldsymbol{x})$

back

Illustrative Example

Preferences: nhCES preferences calibrated with sectoral data

Comin, Lashkari, & Mestieri (2021)

$$E\left(u;\boldsymbol{p}_t\right)\equiv\left(\sum_{i\in\{a,m,s\}}\omega_i\left(u^{\varepsilon_i}p_{i,t}\right)^{1-\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}\qquad(\sigma,\varepsilon_a,\varepsilon_m,\varepsilon_s)=(0.26,0.2,1,1.65)$$

- Choose sectoral shifters ω_i to fit initial sectoral composition of US expenditure in 1953
- Compare against homothetic CES with $(\sigma,\varepsilon_a,\varepsilon_m,\varepsilon_s)=(0.26,1,1,1)$


Inflation Patterns: consider positive and negative inflation/income-elasticity covariances

- Inflation in manufacturing = 3.2% (average US 1953-2019)
- Inflation in services/agriculture = $\pm 1\%$ relative to manufacturing


Income Heterogeneity: 1000 HHs with log-normal nom. expenditure (SE = 0.5) growing at 4.5%

The Evolution of the Expenditure Function

Initial Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Last Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Positive Covariance

The Evolution of the Expenditure Function

Initial Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Last Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Positive Covariance

The Evolution of the Expenditure Function

Initial Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Last Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Positive Covariance

The Evolution of the Expenditure Function

Initial Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Last Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Positive Covariance

The Evolution of the Expenditure Function

Initial Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Last Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Positive Covariance

Nonhomotheticity Correction

Initial Year as Base (Negative Covariance)



Last Year as Base (Negative Covariance)



Positive Covariance | Back

Illustrative Example

Preferences: nhCES preferences calibrated with sectoral data

Comin, Lashkari, & Mestieri (2021)

$$E\left(u;\boldsymbol{p}_t\right)\equiv\left(\sum_{i\in\{a,m,s\}}\omega_i\left(u^{\varepsilon_i}p_{i,t}\right)^{1-\sigma}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}\qquad(\sigma,\varepsilon_a,\varepsilon_m,\varepsilon_s)=(0.26,0.2,1,1.65)$$

- Choose sectoral shifters ω_i to fit initial sectoral composition of US expenditure in 1953
- Compare against homothetic CES with $(\sigma,\varepsilon_a,\varepsilon_m,\varepsilon_s)=(0.26,1,1,1)$


Inflation Patterns: consider positive and negative inflation/income-elasticity covariances

- Inflation in manufacturing = 3.2% (average US 1953-2019)
- Inflation in services/agriculture = $\pm 1\%$ relative to manufacturing


Income Heterogeneity: 1000 HHs with log-normal nom. expenditure (SE = 0.5) growing at 4.5%

Illustrative Example: Approximation Errors

Initial Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Last Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Positive Covariance | 2nd Order Algorithm

Illustrative Example: Average Real Consumption

Initial Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Last Year as Base (Negative Covariance)



Positive Covariance


Illustrative Example: Error vs. Covariance




Back

Patterns of Inflation

Evolution of the Covariance




Chained Cumulative Price Indices by Quintile




Back

The Evolution of the Expenditure Function

Initial Year as Base (Positive Covariance)




Last Year as Base (Positive Covariance)




Back

Nonhomotheticity Correction

Initial Year as Base (Negative Covariance)



Last Year as Base (Negative Covariance)



Back

First-order Algorithm

Series of log-power functions $\left(f_k\left(x\right) \equiv \left(\ln x\right)^k\right)_{k=0}^{K_N}$ for data from N consumers:

First-order Algorithm

Series of log-power functions $\left(f_k(x) \equiv (\ln x)^k\right)_{k=0}^{K_N}$ for data from N consumers:

1. Base Period: let $\widehat{c}_b^n \equiv y_b^n$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,b}(c) \equiv 1$

First-order Algorithm

Series of log-power functions $\left(f_k(x) \equiv (\ln x)^k\right)_{k=0}^{K_N}$ for data from N consumers:

1. Base Period: let $\widehat{c}_b^n \equiv y_b^n$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,b}(c) \equiv 1$
2. For each $t \geq b$ (or $t \leq b$): assume known real consumption $\{\widehat{c}_t^n\}_n$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t}(\cdot)$

First-order Algorithm

Series of log-power functions $\left(f_k(x) \equiv (\ln x)^k\right)_{k=0}^{K_N}$ for data from N consumers:

1. Base Period: let $\widehat{c}_b^n \equiv y_b^n$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,b}(c) \equiv 1$
2. For each $t \geq b$ (or $t \leq b$): assume known real consumption $\{\widehat{c}_t^n\}_n$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t}(\cdot)$
   (i) Next-period $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t+1}(;\cdot)$: run OLS of $\left\{\ln \pi_{G,t}^n\right\}_n$ on $\{(f_k(\widehat{c}_t^n))_k\}_n \Rightarrow$ coefficients $(\widehat{\alpha}_{k,t})_{k=0}^{K_N}$

$$\ln \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t+1}(c) \equiv \ln \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t}(c) + \sum_{k=0}^{K_N} \widehat{\alpha}_{k,t} f_k(c)$$

First-order Algorithm

Series of log-power functions $\left(f_k(x) \equiv (\ln x)^k\right)_{k=0}^{K_N}$ for data from N consumers:

1. Base Period: let $\widehat{c}_b^n \equiv y_b^n$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,b}(c) \equiv 1$
2. For each $t \geq b$ (or $t \leq b$): assume known real consumption $\{\widehat{c}_t^n\}_n$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t}(\cdot)$
   (i) Next-period $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t+1}(;\cdot)$: run OLS of $\left\{\ln \pi_{G,t}^n\right\}_n$ on $\{(f_k(\widehat{c}_t^n))_k\}_n \Rightarrow$ coefficients $(\widehat{\alpha}_{k,t})_{k=0}^{K_N}$

$$\ln \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t+1}(c) \equiv \ln \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t}(c) + \sum_{k=0}^{K_N} \widehat{\alpha}_{k,t} f_k(c)$$

   (ii) Next-period $\widehat{c}_{t+1}^n$ using $\widehat{\Lambda}_{t+1}(c) \equiv \frac{\partial \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_{b,t+1}(c)}{\partial \ln c}$

Back

$$\ln \widehat{c}_{t+1}^n = \ln \widehat{c}_t^n + \frac{1}{1 + \widehat{\Lambda}_{t+1}(\widehat{c}_t^n)} (\Delta \ln y_t^n - \ln \pi_{G,t}^n)$$

Second-order Algorithm Accuracy


Approximation of the Second-Order Algorithm

$$\ln \mathcal{Q}_{RC}^{n}\left(t, t+1; \boldsymbol{p}_b\right) = \ln\left(\frac{\widehat{q}_{t+1}^{n}}{\widehat{q}_{t}^{n}}\right) + O\left(\Delta^3 + \epsilon\right) + O_p\left(K_N^3\left(\sqrt{\frac{K_N}{N}}\left(\Delta^3 + K_N^{4-m}\right)^2 + K_N^{1-m}\right)\Delta\right)$$


Back

Illustrative Example: Approximation Errors

Initial Year as Base (Positive Covariance)




Last Year as Base (Positive Covariance)




Back

Illustrative Example: 1st vs. 2nd Order Approximation Errors

Initial Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Last Year as Base (Negative Covariance)




Back

Illustrative Example: Average Real Consumption

Initial Year as Base (Positive Covariance)



Last Year as Base (Positive Covariance)




Back

Inequality in Inflation Measured by Price Indices

Weaker Negative Income-Inflation Relation


1984-1995



The specification includes year fixed effects. The sample run from 1984 to 1995.
Each bin represents 1% of households.

Stronger Negative Income-Inflation Relation

Post-1995




The specification includes year fixed effects. The sample run from 1995 to 2019.
Each bin represents 1% of households.


Back

Bias in the Level of Real Consumption

Bias in 2019 (1984 as Base Prices)



Bias in 1984 (2019 as Base Prices)




Bias in uncorrected measure of real consumption $y_t^n / \prod_{\tau=0}^{t} \pi_\tau^n$ relative to c_t^n

Back


Bias in Cumulative Real Consumption Growth

Bias in 2019 (1984 as Base Prices)



This graph shows that economic growth, expressed in 1984 prices, is underestimated over time absent the NH correction.


Bias in 1984 (2019 as Base Prices)




Back

Nonhomotheticity Bias vs. Group-Specific Index Bias

Bias in 2019 (1984 as Base Prices)



Bias in 1984 (2019 as Base Prices)




Back


Official BLS Data: Uncorrected Price Indices

Quantile-Level Data: lower inflation for higher income quantiles

Quantile Deviation of Price Indices



Quantile Uncorrected Real Consumption




Back


Official BLS Data: Bias without Correction

Quantile-Level ($K = 2$): annual λ_t^n error as share of common measure of growth

Initial Period as Base ($b = 1984$)



Final Period as Base ($b = 2019$)




Back


Official BLS Data: Bias without Correction

Quantile-Level ($K = 2$): cumulative $\lambda^n_{C,t}$ error as share of common measure of growth

Initial Period as Base ($b = 1984$)




Final Period as Base ($b = 2019$)




Back

Official BLS Data: Long-Run Growth without Correction

Quintile Deviation of Price Indices




Avg. Uncorr. Real Consumption Growth




Back

Official BLS Data: Bias in Long-Run Growth



Back

Long-Run Growth: Bias in Levels in the Long Run



Back