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Sluggish price inflation in the aftermath of the Great Recession

- Inflation remained subdued following the Great Recession
  - below the Fed’s 2% target despite historically low unemployment

- What explains this missing inflation?
  - Slack beyond unemployment: Moscarini and Postel-Vinay (2017), Abraham et al. (2020), Faberman et al. (2020)
  - Anchored expectations: Del Negro et al. (2015), Carvalho et al. (2017), Coibion et al. (2019)
  - Anchored expectations and low u*: Crump et al. (2019)
  - Boehm and Pandalai-Nayar (2020): Convex supply curves and declining capacity utilization

This paper: focus on declining pass-through from wages to prices in the goods sector
What we do (and find)

○ Analyze aggregate data on unemployment, wages, and inflation
  - show that \textit{missing} inflation is mostly due to core goods inflation
  - which is due to declining pass-through from wages to prices

○ Propose two explanations for low pass-through
  - increase in import competition
  - increase in market concentration

○ Set up a theoretical framework à la Atkeson and Burstein (2008)

○ Analyze pass-through at the industry-level
  - significant pass-through of wage changes to producer prices in services but no pass-through in manufacturing after 2003

○ Find lower pass-through in industries with higher import competition and concentration
  - both could reflect the same underlying mechanism as argued in Amiti and Heise (2020)
Aggregate Facts
Inflation in Economic Expansions

- Inflation has become slower to pick up over time

○ Speed of labor market recoveries vary across expansions
Inflation in Economic Expansions

- Inflation has become slower to pick up over time
- Speed of labor market recoveries vary across expansions
Was inflation slow to pick up because the labor market was slow to recover?

- Define *cumulative unemployment recovery*
  \[
  U_{\text{Recovery}} = \frac{u_{\text{peak}} - u_t}{u_{\text{peak}} - u_{\text{trough}}}
  \]

- It is the share of the rise in \( u \) during the recession that has been reversed during the expansion

- Study the evolution of prices and labor costs relative to \( U_{\text{Recovery}} \)
Inflation During Expansions

- Inflation has become slower to pick up over time
- Speed of labor market recoveries account for part of the change
- Inflation expectations important
Inflation vs. Unemployment in the Last Four Expansions

1982-1990

2003-2007

1991-2000

2009-2020
Inflation vs. Unemployment in the Last Four Expansions

- Inflation in services picks up as the unemployment recovery gap closes

- Weakening of inflation/unemployment relationship largely due to goods prices
  - Counterfactual that applies the 1982-1990 path for core goods inflation to the 2009-2020 period closes more than half of the inflation gap between these two expansions

- Changing nature of goods vs. services inflation is important in understanding missing inflation

- Evolution of wages (and unit labor costs) in the last two expansions suggests that it is pass-through

2003-2007

2009-2020
Aggregate Pass-Through

Estimate Jordà’s local projections for each quarter \( h = 0, \ldots, 20 \)

\[
\pi_{t+h}^{\text{price}} = \alpha + \beta_h \pi_t^{\text{wage}} + \sum_{j=1}^{8} \delta_j \pi_{t-j}^{\text{price}} + \sum_{j=1}^{8} \zeta_j \pi_{t-j}^{\text{wage}} + \eta z_t + \epsilon_t,
\]

- Use Core CPI (1964-2019) and Core goods PPI (1974-2019)
- Use average hourly earnings of production and supervisory workers
- Control for the CBO unemployment gap, \( z_t \)
- Interpret \( \beta_h \) as conditional correlations
Aggregate pass-through has on average been high...

Impulse Response of Core CPI to Earnings

Impulse Response of Core PPI to Earnings
...but disappeared in the early 2000s

○ Peak pass-through from wages to prices disappeared
○ Consider rising import competition and increasing concentration

---

PPI to CPI

---

12 / 31
Pass-through from Wages to Prices
Theoretical Framework
Economic Environment

- Imperfect competition with variable markups as in Atkeson and Burstein (2008)
- Two sectors, indexed by \( s \), goods and services, populated by a continuum of industries, indexed by \( k \)
- Finite number of firms indexed by \( i \) in industry \( k \), each face the demand curve for its variety

\[
y_s(k, i) = p_s(k, i)^{-\eta} p_s(k)^{-\sigma} P_s^{-\sigma} Y_s
\]

- \( \eta \): elasticity of substitution across varieties
- \( \sigma \): elasticity of substitution between industries
- Assume \( \eta > \sigma > 1 \)
- \( p_s(k) = (\sum_{i=1}^{N_s(k)} p_s(k, i)^{1-\eta})^{1/(1-\eta)} \) is industry \( k \)'s price index
Price Setting

○ Production using capital and labor at marginal cost of

\[ mc = \frac{1}{A} w^\alpha r^{1-\alpha} \]

○ Optimal price setting implies

\[ p_s(k, i) = \frac{\mathcal{E}_s(k, i)}{\mathcal{E}_s(k, i) - 1} \frac{1}{A} w^\alpha r^{1-\alpha} \]

\[ \mathcal{M}_s(k, i) = \text{markup} \]

○ Demand elasticity depends on firm \( i \)'s market share \( \varphi_s(k, i) \) in industry \( k \)

\[ \mathcal{E}_s(k, i) = \eta(1 - \varphi_s(k, i)) + \sigma \varphi_s(k, i) \]

○ Firms take into account their effect on the industry’s price index

\[ \rightarrow \text{firms with a larger market share set higher markups since } \eta > \sigma > 1 \]
Pass-through from Wages to Prices

Pass-through of shocks into prices

\[ d \log p_s(k, i) = d \log M_s(k, i) - d \log A + \alpha d \log w_i + (1 - \alpha) d \log r \]

- Increases in the factor prices pass through in proportion to their shares
- Productivity growth allows the firm to lower its price
- Pass-through depends on the adjustment of firm’s markup
Linking Changes in Market Structure to Pass-through

Theorem

Consider an industry populated by \( N_D \geq 1 \) domestic firms and \( N_F \geq 1 \) foreign firms with symmetric market shares. Consider a wage shock which only affects domestic firms.

1. If \( N < \infty \), pass-through is less than \( \alpha \). As \( N = N_D + N_F \) declines and firms’ market share increases, pass-through of the shock declines.

2. A higher share of domestic firms in the industry, \( N_D/N \), increases pass-through.
Implications

Rising market concentration $\rightarrow$ reduces pass-through
- firms become more sensitive to strategic interaction with competitors
- they adjust markups more to maintain market share

Foreign competition $\rightarrow$ reduces pass-through
- fewer competitors experience the cost shock
- firms absorb more of the shock into their markups to keep market share
Industry-level Analysis
Empirical Framework

Empirical specification:

\[ \Delta \ln(p_{it}) = \beta \Delta \ln(w_{it}) + \zeta \ln(A_{it}) + \gamma X_{it} + \delta_i + \rho_t + \epsilon_{it} \]

$p_{it}$: producer price index in industry $i$ and period $t$
$\Delta w_{it}$: change in industry $i$’s wage index

- **Period:** 2003-2016
- **Prices:** Industry-level Producer Price Index (PPI) for 255 5-digit NAICS industries (148 in manufacturing)
- **Wages:** Weekly earnings from QCEW
- **TFP:** Multifactor productivity (MFP) from the BLS/KLEMS
- **Controls:** Age, gender, and education composition from the QCEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) All</th>
<th>(2) Manuf/Serv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ Wage</td>
<td>0.0616***</td>
<td>0.0216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0167)</td>
<td>(0.0186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Wage Manuf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Wage Services</td>
<td>0.0917***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0286)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ TFP</td>
<td>-0.0793***</td>
<td>-0.0757***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0149)</td>
<td>(0.0141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.0184</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12727</td>
<td>12727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

- Positive pass-through driven by services
- Negligible pass-through in manufacturing
- IV strategy using newly available job-to-job transitions data confirms these findings
- Impulse responses show that pass-through is negligible at most horizons in manufacturing but positive in services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) All</th>
<th>(2) Manuf/Serv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \text{Wage} \times \text{LS} )</td>
<td>0.182**</td>
<td>0.0581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0760)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \text{Wage} \times \text{LS Manuf} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.197**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0852)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \text{Wage} \times \text{LS Services} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.182**</td>
<td>0.0581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0760)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \text{TFP} )</td>
<td>-0.0788***</td>
<td>-0.0778***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0155)</td>
<td>(0.0155)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) All</th>
<th>(2) Manuf/Serv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.0169</td>
<td>0.0170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12727</td>
<td>12727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors in parentheses

* \( p < 0.10 \), ** \( p < 0.05 \), *** \( p < 0.01 \)

- Manufacturing has a lower labor share and experienced a more pronounced decline in its labor share
- Lack of pass-through in manufacturing is not due to its declining labor share
- 20% pass-through for services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) All</th>
<th>(2) Pre/Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ Wage $\times$ LS</td>
<td>0.1402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1055)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ Wage $\times$ LS $\times Pre - 2003$</td>
<td>0.311**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ Wage $\times$ LS $\times Post - 2003$</td>
<td>-0.0607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.155)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$ TFP</td>
<td>-0.179***</td>
<td>-0.177***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0196)</td>
<td>(0.0195)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Can estimate pass-through for the 1993-2003 period for manufacturing
- Positive pass-through in manufacturing in the pre-2003 period
- The disappearance of pass-through coincides with the flattening of core goods inflation

Time Fixed Effects Yes Yes
Industry Fixed Effects Yes Yes
R2 0.0431 0.0418
Observations 12913 12913

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$
Why did Pass-through Disappear in Manufacturing?
Rising Import Competition and Increasing Concentration

Import penetration from China

Market share of top 20 firms
Import Penetration Channel

Recall that foreign competition reduces pass-through in our framework:

- fewer competitors experience the cost shock and firms absorb more of the shock into their markups to keep market share

Define industry $i$’s import penetration from China as

\[
IP_{it}^{CN} = \frac{\text{Imports}_{it}^{CN}}{\text{Sales}_{it} - \text{Exports}_{it} + \text{Imports}_{it}}
\]

Estimate the modified pass-through regression

\[
\Delta \ln(p_{it}) = \beta_0 \Delta \ln(w_{it}) + \beta_1 \Delta \ln(w_{it}) \times IP_{it}^{CN} + \alpha IP_{it}^{CN} + \zeta \ln A_{it} + \gamma X_{it} + \delta_i + \rho_t + \epsilon_{it}
\]

where $IP_{it}^{CN}$ is industry $i$’s import penetration from China in year $t$. 
Pass-Through and Import Penetration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) IP</th>
<th>(2) ΔIP_{97,t}</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>∆ Wage</td>
<td>0.0247*</td>
<td>0.0245*</td>
<td>(0.0139)</td>
<td>(0.0137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆ Wage × IP</td>
<td>-0.128*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0662)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆ Wage × ΔIP_{97,t}</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.115*</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0658)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∆ TFP</td>
<td>-0.169***</td>
<td>-0.170***</td>
<td>(0.0196)</td>
<td>(0.0196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
<td>0.0382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>12398</td>
<td>12305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Industries that experience high import penetration from China exhibit relatively lower pass-through.
- An industry without imports exhibits a pass-through from wages to prices of about 2.5%.
- Effect is similar in magnitude when considering change in import penetration from China since 1997.

Standard errors in parentheses
* \( p < 0.10 \), ** \( p < 0.05 \), *** \( p < 0.01 \)
Several recent papers have focused on the role of rising market concentration on the aggregate economy (e.g., Gutierrez and Philippon, 2017, Autor et al., 2020).

Rise in market concentration lowers pass-through from labor costs to prices: firms with higher market share internalize more the effects of price changes on market share → adjust markups more to maintain their competitive position.

Estimate the effect of rising market concentration on pass-through:

$$\Delta \ln(p_{it}) = \beta_0 \Delta \ln(w_{it}) + \beta_1 \Delta \ln(w_{it}) \cdot C_{it} + \alpha C_{it} + \zeta \ln A_{it} + \gamma X_{it} + \delta_i + \rho_t + \epsilon_{it}$$

where $C_{it}$ is the measure of concentration.
## Pass-Through and Sales Concentration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Top-4</th>
<th>(2) Top-20</th>
<th>(3) HHI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ Wage</td>
<td>0.143***</td>
<td>0.177***</td>
<td>0.114***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0347)</td>
<td>(0.0574)</td>
<td>(0.0279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Wage × SC 4</td>
<td>-0.205***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0566)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Wage × SC 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.185**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0762)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Wage × Sales HHI</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.690***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.233)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ TFP</td>
<td>-0.181***</td>
<td>-0.182***</td>
<td>-0.182***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0205)</td>
<td>(0.0204)</td>
<td>(0.0211)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Time Fixed Effects: Yes, Yes, Yes
- Industry Fixed Effects: Yes, Yes, Yes
- R²: 0.0626, 0.0588, 0.0623
- Observations: 8705, 8705, 8585

Standard errors in parentheses
* p < 0.10, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

- The effect of market concentration is negative and significant for all measures of market concentration.
- Going from the 25th to the 75th percentile of top-4 concentration (20% to 48%) lowers pass-through by about a third (−0.057).
Import Penetration Or Market Concentration?

Reference: Amiti and Heise (2020)
Concluding Remarks

- Change in behavior goods inflation changed in the 2000s
  - due to declining pass-through from wages to prices

- Strong support in the industry-level data for two channels
  - increase in import competition
  - increase in market concentration

- Consistent with a framework with variable markups such as Atkeson and Burstein (2008)

- Open issues:
  - Behavior of markups
  - Interaction of pass-through with inflation expectations
  - Effects of trade policy
## IV Regressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \Delta \text{ Wage} )</td>
<td>( \Delta \text{ Price} )</td>
<td>( \Delta \text{ Wage} )</td>
<td>( \Delta \text{ Price} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \text{ TFP} )</td>
<td>-0.0622</td>
<td>0.0223</td>
<td>0.0544***</td>
<td>-0.0190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0522)</td>
<td>(0.0528)</td>
<td>(0.0199)</td>
<td>(0.253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2J</td>
<td>1.030**</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.521)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.205)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \text{ Wage Services} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.234**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.560)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \text{ Wage Manuf} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Fixed Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.087</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>4994</td>
<td>4994</td>
<td>7730</td>
<td>7730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Statistic</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard errors in parentheses

* \( p < 0.1 \), ** \( p < 0.05 \), *** \( p < 0.01 \)
PPI vs CPI for Individual Sectors: 2009 Expansion
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Evolution of CPI Inflation During Economic Expansions

(a) Inflation over Time

(b) Inflation versus Unemployment Recovery

(a) 2003-2007 Expansion

(b) 2009-2020 Expansion

- Core CPI 2003
- Core CPI 2003 (1982 Goods Inflation)
- Core CPI 1982
Inflation vs. Time in the Last Four Expansions

1982-1990

1991-2000

2003-2007

2009-2020

Core CPI
Core Goods CPI
Core Services CPI

Cumulative Growth (%)
Quarters since Peak Unemployment Rate

Cumulative Growth (%)
Quarters since Peak Unemployment Rate

Cumulative Growth (%)
Quarters since Peak Unemployment Rate

Cumulative Growth (%)
Quarters since Peak Unemployment Rate
Cumulative growth in wages and in unit labor costs relative to unemployment recovery gap

(a) Wage Growth: 2003-2007 Expansion

(b) Wage Growth: 2009-2020 Expansion

(c) Unit Labor Cost: 2003-2007 Expansion

(d) Unit Labor Cost: 2009-2020 Expansion
Inflation vs. Epop in the Last Four Expansions

1982-1990

2003-2007

1991-2000

2009-2020
Pass-through from PPI to CPI

Impulse Response of CPI to PPI

Pass-through from PPI to CPI
Impulse Responses

Estimate impulse response functions for each quarter $h = 0, \ldots, 20$

$$
\Delta \ln(p_{i,t+h}) = \alpha + \beta_h \Delta \ln(w_{it}) + \sum_{j=1}^{8} \delta_j \Delta \ln(p_{i,t-j}) + \sum_{j=1}^{8} \zeta_j \Delta \ln(w_{i,t-j}) + \eta X_{it} + \delta_i + \rho_t + \epsilon_{it},
$$

$p_{it}$ is the producer price index in industry $i$ and period $t$

$\Delta w_{it}$ is the change in the industry’s wage index

$X_{it}$ is a set of time-varying controls

Manufacturing

Services
Sectors

○ Two sectors: goods (G) and services (S). Production carried out by a competitive firm using the output of a continuum of industries $k \in [0, 1]$:

$$Y_s = \left( \int_0^1 y_s(k)^{(\sigma-1)/\sigma} dk \right)^{\sigma/(\sigma-1)}$$

$y_s(k)$: output produced by industry $k$ in sector $s \in \{G, S\}$

$\sigma$: the elasticity of substitution between industries

○ The demand curve for goods of industry $k$

$$y_s(k) = \left( \frac{p_s(k)}{P_s} \right)^{-\sigma} Y_s$$

where $P_s = (\int_0^1 p_s(k)^{1-\sigma} dk)^{1/(1-\sigma)}$. 
Industries

- Industries populated by a finite number of firms, $N_s(k)$, indexed by $i$. The industry-specific aggregator of varieties is

$$ y_s(k) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_s(k)} y_s(k, i)^{(\eta-1)/\eta} \right)^{\eta/(\eta-1)} $$

$\eta$: the elasticity of substitution across varieties

$y_s(k, i)$: the quantity of firm $i$'s variety in industry $k$

- The demand for variety $(k, i)$ is then given by

$$ y_s(k, i) = p_s(k, i)^{-\eta} p_s(k)^{\eta-\sigma} P_s^{-\sigma} Y_s $$

where $p_s(k) = (\sum_{i=1}^{N_s(k)} p_s(k, i)^{1-\eta})^{1/(1-\eta)}$.

- Assume $\eta > \sigma > 1$
Firms

Each firm has a constant returns to scale production function that combines labor $l$ and capital $k$

$$y_s(k, i) = A l^\alpha k^{1-\alpha}$$

$A$ is total factor productivity, $l$ is labor, and $k$ is capital.

Standard cost minimization formulates the marginal cost of the firm to produce $y(k, i)$ amount of output as a function of wage, $w$, and the rental rate of capital, $r$, as

$$mc(y) = \frac{1}{A} w^\alpha r^{1-\alpha}$$

Factor prices are determined competitively and taken as given by the firm.
Market Structure: Firms

Each firm then faces an effective elasticity of demand of

\[ E_s(k,i) = \eta(1 - \varphi_s(k,i)) + \sigma \varphi_s(k,i), \]

\[ \varphi_s(k,i) = \frac{(p_s(k,i)y_s(k,i))}{(\sum_{i'} p_s(k,i')y_s(k,i'))}: \text{firm } i' \text{'s market share in industry } k. \]

- Since there is only a finite number of firms, each firm takes into account the effect of its price setting on the price index \( p_s(k) \).
- Firms with a higher market share face less competition within their industry, and are focused more on competition across industries, which lowers their effective demand elasticity.
Price Setting

Each firm solves

$$\max_p [p_s(k,i) - c(k,i)] \left( \frac{p_s(k,i)}{p_s(k)} \right)^{-\eta} \left( \frac{p_s(k)}{P_s} \right)^{-\sigma} Y_s.$$ 

The solution of this problem, taking into account that firms take into consideration the impact of their own price setting on the industry’s price index, is

$$p_s(k,i) = \frac{\mathcal{E}_s(k,i)}{\mathcal{E}_s(k,i) - 1} c(k,i),$$

where \( \mathcal{M}_s(k,i) \equiv \mathcal{E}_s(k,i)/(\mathcal{E}_s(k,i) - 1) \) is the firm’s markup. Firms with a larger market share set higher markups since they face less elastic demand.
Intuition

This equation highlights the key mechanisms that affect pass-through of wage shocks

\[ d \log p_s(k, i) = \frac{\Gamma_s(k, i)}{1 + \Gamma_s(k, i)} d \log p_s(k) - \frac{1}{1 + \Gamma_s(k, i)} d \log A + \frac{\alpha}{1 + \Gamma_s(k, i)} d \log w_i. \]

1. direct effect coming from the change in \( w_i \)
2. an indirect effect that operates via the change in the industry’s price index, \( p_s(k) \)
3. relative strength of the two channels is modulated by the markup elasticity \( \Gamma_s(k, i) \)
4. markup elasticity increases with market share, putting more weight on the price index
5. price index \( p_s(k) \) moves less if fewer firms are affected by the shock