# IS THE PHILLIPS CURVE ALIVE AND WELL AFTER ALL? INFLATION EXPECTATIONS AND THE MISSING DISINFLATION

Olivier Coibion U.T. Austin and NBER Yuriy Gorodnichenko U.C. Berkeley and NBER

NBER Conference October 2013

## The Missing Disinflation in the $U.S. \label{eq:upper}$

# Benchmark: Expectations-Augmented Phillips Curve $\pi_t - E_t \pi_{t+1} = c + \kappa x_t + v_t$

#### THE MISSING DISINFLATION IN THE U.S.

#### Benchmark: Expectations-Augmented Phillips Curve $\pi_t - E_t \pi_{t+1} = c + \kappa x_t + v_t$



### THE MISSING DISINFLATION IN THE U.S.

## Benchmark: Expectations-Augmented Phillips Curve $\pi_t - E_t \pi_{t+1} = c + \kappa x_t + v_t$



### POTENTIAL EXPLANATIONS FOR THE MISSING DISINFLATION

- Core inflation (Ball and Mazumder 2011)
- Oil price shocks shifted Phillips curve
- Anchored expectations (Bernanke 2010, IMF 2013)
- Change in slope of the PC (Ball and Mazumder 2011, IMF 2013)
- Long-term unemployed and wage pressures (Llaudes 2005)
- Downward wage rigidity (Krugman 2012, Daly et al. 2012)
- Rise in natural rate of unemployment (Mulligan)
- Phillips curve is not structural

#### POTENTIAL EXPLANATIONS FOR THE MISSING DISINFLATION

- Core inflation (Ball and Mazumder 2011)
- Oil price shocks shifted Phillips curve
- Anchored expectations (Bernanke 2010, IMF 2013)
- Change in slope of the PC (Ball and Mazumder 2011, IMF 2013)
- Long-term unemployed and wage pressures (Llaudes 2005)
- Downward wage rigidity (Krugman 2012, Daly et al. 2012)
- Rise in natural rate of unemployment (Mulligan)
- Phillips curve is not structural?

$$\pi_t - E_t^{Firms} \pi_{t+1} = c + \kappa x_t + v_t$$

How do price-setting firms form their inflation expectations?

$$\pi_t - E_t^{Firms} \pi_{t+1} = c + \kappa x_t + \nu_t$$

How do price-setting firms form their inflation expectations?

# Quantitative Inflation Expectations Data:

Households: Michigan Survey of Consumers
Professional Forecasters: SPF, BCEI, Consensus Economics, ...
Financial Market Participants: TIPS spreads
Federal Reserve: Greenbook & FOMC forecasts

???

• Firms:



Conjecture: what if  $E_t^{Firms} \pi_{t+1} \approx E_t^{HH} \pi_{t+1}$ ?

Conjecture: what if 
$$E_t^{Firms} \pi_{t+1} \approx E_t^{HH} \pi_{t+1}$$
?



## Stable Phillips curve and no missing disinflation.

Conjecture: what if 
$$E_t^{Firms} \pi_{t+1} \approx E_t^{HH} \pi_{t+1}$$
?



Average predicted inflation since  $2009 \approx 2.5\%$ 

<u>Test #1</u>: Nested PC Regressions  $\pi_t = \beta_1 E_t^{MSC} \pi_{t+h} + \beta_2 E_t^{SPF} \pi_{t+h} + \kappa x_t + \varepsilon_t$ 

<u>Test #1</u>: Nested PC Regressions  $\pi_t = \beta_1 E_t^{MSC} \pi_{t+h} + \beta_2 E_t^{SPF} \pi_{t+h} + \kappa x_t + \varepsilon_t$ 

	Pre-Great Recession, 1981Q1-2007Q3
	(1)
$E_t \pi_{t+1,t+4}^{MSC}$	1.442***
	(0.218)
$E_t \pi^{SPF}_{t+1,t+4}$	0.018
	(0.200)
$UE_t$	-0.250**
	(0.106)
$\log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{OilP_{t-1}}\right) \times$	
400	
Observations	105
$R^2$	0.537

<u>Test #1</u>: Nested PC Regressions  $\pi_t = \beta_1 E_t^{MSC} \pi_{t+h} + \beta_2 E_t^{SPF} \pi_{t+h} + \kappa x_t + \varepsilon_t$ 

	Pre-Great Recession, 1981Q1-2007Q3			
	(1)	(2)		
$E_t \pi_{t+1,t+4}^{MSC}$	1.442***	1.089***		
	(0.218)	(0.210)		
$E_t \pi^{SPF}_{t+1,t+4}$	0.018	0.289*		
	(0.200)	(0.171)		
$UE_t$	-0.250**	-0.235**		
	(0.106)	(0.096)		
$\log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{V}\right) \times$		0.009***		
$OilP_{t-1}$		(0.003)		
400		, ,		
Observations	105	105		
$R^2$	0.537	0.612		

<u>Test #1</u>: Nested PC Regressions  $\pi_t = \beta_1 E_t^{MSC} \pi_{t+h} + (1 - \beta_1) E_t^{SPF} \pi_{t+h} + \kappa x_t + \varepsilon_t$ 

	Pre-Great Recession, 1981Q1-2007Q3				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
$E_t \pi_{t+1,t+4}^{MSC}$	1.442***	1.089***	1.128***	0.803***	
	(0.218)	(0.210)	(0.214)	(0.179)	
$E_t \pi^{SPF}_{t+1,t+4}$	0.018	0.289*	-0.128	0.197	
	(0.200)	(0.171)	(0.214)	(0.179)	
$UE_t$	-0.250**	-0.235**	-0.077	-0.095	
	(0.106)	(0.096)	(0.100)	(0.086)	
$\log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{V}\right) \times$		0.009***		0.010***	
$OilP_{t-1}$		(0.003)		(0.002)	
400					
Observations	105	105	105	105	
$R^2$	0.537	0.612	0.262	0.394	

<u>Test #1</u>: Nested PC Regressions  $\pi_t = \beta_1 E_t^{MSC} \pi_{t+h} + (1 - \beta_1) E_t^{SPF} \pi_{t+h} + \kappa x_t + \varepsilon_t$ 

	Pre-Great Recession, 1981Q1-2007Q3				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
$E_t \pi_{t+1,t+4}^{MSC}$	1.442***	1.089***	1.128***	0.803***	
	(0.218)	(0.210)	(0.214)	(0.179)	
$E_t \pi_{t+1,t+4}^{SPF}$	0.018	0.289*	-0.128	0.197	
	(0.200)	(0.171)	(0.214)	(0.179)	
$UE_t$	-0.250**	-0.235**	-0.077	-0.095	
-	(0.106)	(0.096)	(0.100)	(0.086)	
$\log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{OilP_t}\right) \times$		0.009***		0.010***	
$OilP_{t-1}$		(0.003)		(0.002)	
400					
Observations	105	105	105	105	
$R^2$	0.537	0.612	0.262	0.394	

Similar results obtain with UE gap and/or including Great Recession and/or using backward-expectations in place of SPF.

<u>Test #2</u>: Ongoing Survey of Firms' Inflation Expectations in New Zealand (CGK 2014)

- Ongoing survey of 3000 firms
- Preliminary trial run of 60 firms (20 manuf., 20 retail, 20 finance)
- Average age of 23 years (min of 3, max of 155)
- Average size of 23 full-time employees (min of 7, max of 85)
- Question: "During the next twelve months, by how much do you think prices will change overall in the economy? Please provide a quantitative answer."

	New Zealand (Sept. 2013)       Mean Median St. Dev.
Annual CPI Inflation	0.7
Central Bank Forecast of Year Ahead Inflation	1.7

-	New Z Mean	Zealand (S Median	Sept. 2013) St. Dev.	 
Annual CPI Inflation	0.7			
Central Bank Forecast of Year Ahead Inflation	1.7			
Professionals' Forecasts of Year Ahead CPI Inflation	1.9	1.9	0.2	

New Zealand (Sept. 2013)		United States (Feb. 201		eb. 2013)	
Mean	Median	St. Dev.	Mean	Median	St. Dev.
0.7			2.0		
1.7			1.5		
1.9	1.9	0.2	1.9	1.8	0.3
5.3 3.1	N.A. 3.0	5.4 1.7	4.4 3.8	3.0 3.0	4.4 3.0
	New Z Mean 0.7 1.7 1.9 5.3 3.1	New Zealand (S         Mean       Median         0.7	New Zealand (Sept. 2013)         Mean Median St. Dev.         0.7         1.7         1.9       1.9         5.3       N.A.         5.4         3.1       3.0	New Zealand (Sept. 2013)         United Mean           Mean         Median         St. Dev.         Mean           0.7         2.0         1.7         1.5           1.7         1.9         0.2         1.9           5.3         N.A.         5.4         4.4           3.1         3.0         1.7         3.8	New Zealand (Sept. 2013)         United States (F           Mean Median         St. Dev.         Mean Median           0.7         2.0         1.5           1.7         1.5         1.9           1.9         1.9         0.2         1.9           5.3         N.A.         5.4         4.4         3.0           3.1         3.0         1.7         3.8         3.0

	New Zealand (Sept. 2013)		United States (Feb. 2013)			
	Mean	Median	St. Dev.	Mean	Median	St. Dev.
Annual CPI Inflation	0.7			2.0		
Central Bank Forecast of Year Ahead Inflation	1.7			1.5		
Professionals' Forecasts of Year Ahead CPI Inflation	1.9	1.9	0.2	1.9	1.8	0.3
Households' Forecasts of Year Ahead Inflation						
All participants	5.3	N.A.	5.4	4.4	3.0	4.4
Truncated	3.1	3.0	1.7	3.8	3.0	3.0
Firms' Forecasts of Year Ahead Inflation						
All participants	<b>8.8</b>	5.0	<b>7.8</b>			
Truncated	5.3	4.5	3.3			

While there is no systematic time series of firms' inflation forecasts,

1. If Phillips curve represents firms' pricing decisions and expectations, then household forecasts appear to be the best proxy for time series of firms' inflation forecasts.

While there is no systematic time series of firms' inflation forecasts,

- 1. If Phillips curve represents firms' pricing decisions and expectations, then household forecasts appear to be the best proxy for time series of firms' inflation forecasts.
- 2.At one moment in time, the moments of the distribution of firms' inflation forecasts shares same properties as those of contemporaneous household forecasts:
  - High mean/median forecast relative to professionals and central bank
  - Very high levels of dispersion in forecasts

## WHY DID HOUSEHOLDS THINK INFLATION WOULD BE HIGH?

## WHY DID HOUSEHOLDS THINK INFLATION WOULD BE HIGH?



 $\rho(E_t^{HH}\pi_{t+12}, Oil_t) = 0.74$  from 2000-2013

Dependent variable: $E_t^{MSC} \pi_{t+1,t+4} - E_t^{SPF} \pi_{t+1,t+4}$	(1)
Panel A: Levels	
$OilP_t$	0.026***
·	(0.002)
$R^2$	0.523

Dependent variable: $E_t^{MSC} \pi_{t+1,t+4} - E_t^{SPF} \pi_{t+1,t+4}$	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A: Levels			
<i>OilP</i> <sub>t</sub>	0.026***	0.024***	
	(0.002)	(0.005)	
PriceAgro <sub>t</sub>		0.002	0.016***
		(0.004)	(0.002)
$R^2$	0.523	0.524	0.421

Dependent variable:	(1)	(2)	(3)
$\underline{E_t^{MSC} \pi_{t+1,t+4} - E_t^{SPF} \pi_{t+1,t+4}}$	(*)	(-)	(3)
Panel A: Levels			
$OilP_t$	0.026***	0.024***	
·	(0.002)	(0.005)	
PriceAgro <sub>t</sub>		0.002	0.016***
		(0.004)	(0.002)
$R^2$	0.523	0.524	0.421
Panel B: Growth rates			
$log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{1}\right) \times 100$	0.013**	0.011**	
$\log \left( OilP_{t-1} \right) $ (OilP_{t-1})	(0.005)	(0.005)	
$log\left(\frac{PriceAgro_{t}}{2}\right) \times 100$	`````	0.015	0.020
$Vog (PriceAgro_{t-1}) \times 100$		(0.017)	(0.016)
$R^2$	0.048	0.060	0.024

Dependent variable: $E_t^{MSC} \pi_{t+1,t+4} - E_t^{SPF} \pi_{t+1,t+4}$	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A: Levels			
OilP <sub>t</sub>	0.026***	0.024***	
	(0.002)	(0.005)	
PriceAgro <sub>t</sub>		0.002	0.016***
		(0.004)	(0.002)
$R^2$	0.523	0.524	0.421
Panel B: Growth rates $log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{OilP_{t-1}}\right) \times 100$ $log\left(\frac{PriceAgro_t}{PriceAgro_{t-1}}\right) \times 100$	0.013** (0.005)	0.011** (0.005) 0.015 (0.017)	0.020 (0.016)
$R^2$	0.048	0.060	0.024

The increase in oil prices since 2009 can fully account for the rise in household inflation expectations since then.

• Coibion and Gorodnichenko (2012) document heterogeneity in household inflation forecast updating after oil price shocks (rise in dispersion)

- Coibion and Gorodnichenko (2012) document heterogeneity in household inflation forecast updating after oil price shocks (rise in dispersion)
- <u>Explanation 1</u>: consumers use highly visible gasoline prices as signal of evolution of other prices
  - Households who buy gas more regularly should adjust inflation forecasts more than others.

- Coibion and Gorodnichenko (2012) document heterogeneity in household inflation forecast updating after oil price shocks (rise in dispersion)
- <u>Explanation 1</u>: consumers use highly visible gasoline prices as signal of evolution of other prices

 Households who buy gas more regularly should adjust inflation forecasts more than others.

Explanation 2: consumers forecast the prices of their own consumption bundles rather than aggregate inflation

 Households who spend larger share of income on gas should adjust their inflation forecasts more than others.

We use MSC individual data to distinguish between these.

 $E_t^i \pi_{t,t+12} - E_{t-6}^i \pi_{t-6,t+6} = \alpha + \beta \times \log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{OilP_{t-6}}\right) \times 100 + error_{i,t}$ 

 $E_t^i \pi_{t,t+12} - E_{t-6}^i \pi_{t-6,t+6} = \alpha + \beta \times \log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{OilP_{t-6}}\right) \times 100 + error_{i,t}$ 

Dependent variable	Main effect, $\beta$		Interact	ion, γ			Spending on fuel,	
$E_t^i \pi_{t,t+12} - E_{t-6}^i \pi_{t-6,t+6}$	coef	s e	Coef	S P	Obs.	R2	annual,	CEX, 2011
	0001.	5.0.	0001.	5.0.			\$	Share, %
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Panel A: Full sample								
All	1.686***	(0.177)			68,355	0.010		

 $E_t^i \pi_{t,t+12} - E_{t-6}^i \pi_{t-6,t+6} = \alpha + \beta \times \log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{OilP_{t-6}}\right) \times 100 + error_{i,t}$ 

Dependent variable	Main effect, $\beta$		Interaction, $\gamma$				Spending on fuel,	
$E_t^i \pi_{t,t+12} - E_{t-6}^i \pi_{t-6,t+6}$	coef	C A	Coef	S A	Obs.	R2	annual, (	CEX, 2011
		5.0.	0001.	5.0.			\$	Share, %
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Panel A: Full sample								
All	1.686***	(0.177)			68,355	0.010		
Panel B: Income quintiles								
HH income quintiles								
1 (bottom)							1,227	5.6
2							1,981	6.2
3							2,694	6.4
4							3,295	5.7
5 (top)							4,073	4.3

 $E_t^i \pi_{t,t+12} - E_{t-6}^i \pi_{t-6,t+6} = \alpha + \beta \times \log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{OilP_{t-6}}\right) \times 100 + error_{i,t}$ 

Dependent variable	Main effect, $\beta$		Interaction, $\gamma$				Spending on fuel,	
$E_t^i \pi_{t,t+12} - E_{t-6}^i \pi_{t-6,t+6}$	coef	S P	Coef	SP	Obs.	R2	annual, (	CEX, 2011
	0001.	5.0.	0001.	5.0.			\$	Share, %
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Panel A: Full sample								
All	1.686***	(0.177)			68,355	0.010		
		. ,						
Panel B: Income quintiles								
HH income quintiles								
1 (bottom)	0.665***	(0.257)			7,883	0.001	1,227	5.6
2	1.488***	(0.225)			10,979	0.007	1,981	6.2
3	1.956***	(0.282)			12,841	0.013	2,694	6.4
4	1.965***	(0.268)			15,918	0.014	3,295	5.7
5 (top)	2.066***	(0.202)			16,926	0.018	4,073	4.3

Consistent with use of gasoline prices as signals of other prices.

 $E_t^i \pi_{t,t+12} - E_{t-6}^i \pi_{t-6,t+6} = \alpha + \beta \times \log\left(\frac{OilP_t}{OilP_{t-6}}\right) \times 100 + error_{i,t}$ 

Dependent variable	Main ef	ffect, $\beta$ Interaction, $\gamma$		ion, γ			Spending on fuel,	
$E_t^i \pi_{t,t+12} - E_{t-6}^i \pi_{t-6,t+6}$	coef	SP	Coef	Se	Obs.	R2	annual, (	CEX, 2011
	0001.	5.0.		5.0.			\$	Share, %
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Panel A: Full sample								
All	1.686***	(0.177)			68,355	0.010		
Panel B: Income quintiles								
HH income quintiles								
1 (bottom)	0.665***	(0.257)			7,883	0.001	1,227	5.6
2	1.488***	(0.225)			10,979	0.007	1,981	6.2
3	1.956***	(0.282)			12,841	0.013	2,694	6.4
4	1.965***	(0.268)			15,918	0.014	3,295	5.7
5 (top)	2.066***	(0.202)			16,926	0.018	4,073	4.3
Interact with \$	0.484***	(0.099)	0.771***	(0.248)	64,547	0.010		
Interact with budget share	2.629***	(0.547)	-0.931*	(0.546)	64,547	0.010		

Consistent with use of gasoline prices as signals of other prices.

#### POTENTIAL EXPLANATIONS FOR THE MISSING DISINFLATION

- Core inflation (Ball and Mazumder 2011)
- Oil price shocks shifted Phillips curve
- Anchored expectations (Bernanke 2010, IMF 2013)
- Change in slope of the PC (Ball and Mazumder 2011, IMF 2013)
- Long-term unemployed and wage pressures (Llaudes 2005)
- Downward wage rigidity (Krugman 2012, Daly et al. 2012)
- Rise in natural rate of unemployment (Mulligan)
- Rise in firms' inflation expectations since 2009 due to oil price movements.

#### CONCLUSION

We can explain the missing disinflation through rising inflation expectations starting in 2009, due to rising oil prices.

Key assumption is firms have similar expectations as households, and we provide new econometric and survey evidence consistent with this conjecture.

#### CONCLUSION

We can explain the missing disinflation through rising inflation expectations starting in 2009, due to rising oil prices.

Key assumption is firms have similar expectations as households, and we provide new econometric and survey evidence consistent with this conjecture.

The absence of deflation after the Great Recession may therefore be the positive side-effect of the rise in oil prices (i.e. "good luck").

#### CONCLUSION

We can explain the missing disinflation through rising inflation expectations starting in 2009, due to rising oil prices.

Key assumption is firms have similar expectations as households, and we provide new econometric and survey evidence consistent with this conjecture.

The absence of deflation after the Great Recession may therefore be the positive side-effect of the rise in oil prices (i.e. "good luck").

"Unanchored" expectations also played a central role, so this experience is cautionary tale against overemphasizing benefits of "anchoring" expectations.