

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

PRICE STICKINESS ALONG THE INCOME DISTRIBUTION AND THE EFFECTS  
OF MONETARY POLICY

Javier Cravino  
Ting Lan  
Andrei A. Levchenko

Working Paper 24654  
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w24654>

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH  
1050 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
May 2018

We are grateful to Andres Blanco, John Leahy, our discussant Indrajit Mitra, and workshop participants at different institutions for helpful comments, and to Sam Haltenhof for excellent research assistance. Financial support from the National Science Foundation under grant SES-1628879 is gratefully acknowledged. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

© 2018 by Javier Cravino, Ting Lan, and Andrei A. Levchenko. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Price Stickiness along the Income Distribution and the Effects of Monetary Policy  
Javier Cravino, Ting Lan, and Andrei A. Levchenko  
NBER Working Paper No. 24654  
May 2018  
JEL No. E31,E52

**ABSTRACT**

We document that the prices of the goods consumed by high-income households are more sticky and less volatile than those of the goods consumed by middle-income households. This suggests that monetary shocks can have distributional consequences by affecting the relative prices of the goods consumed at different points on the income distribution. We use a Factor-Augmented VAR (FAVAR) model to show that, following a monetary policy shock, the estimated impulse responses of high-income households' consumer price indices are 22% lower than those of the middle-income households. We then evaluate the macroeconomic implications of our empirical findings in a quantitative New-Keynesian model featuring households that are heterogeneous in their income and consumption patterns, and sectors that are heterogeneous in their frequency of price changes. We find that: (i) the distributional consequences of monetary policy shocks are large and similar to those in the FAVAR model, and (ii) greater income inequality increases the effectiveness of monetary policy, although this effect is modest for realistic changes in inequality.

Javier Cravino  
Department of Economics  
University of Michigan  
611 Tappan Street, Lorch Hall 365B  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109  
and NBER  
jcravino@umich.edu

Andrei A. Levchenko  
Department of Economics  
University of Michigan  
611 Tappan Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109  
and NBER  
alev@umich.edu

Ting Lan  
Department of Economics  
University of Michigan  
611 Tappan Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109  
tinglan@umich.edu

# 1 Introduction

There is growing recognition that monetary policy shocks have distributional consequences. An active literature argues that monetary policy can have differential effects across various types of agents: savers vs. borrowers (Doepke and Schneider, 2006), financially constrained vs. unconstrained (Williamson, 2008), or young vs. old (Wong, 2016). In turn, the heterogeneity in the impact of monetary policy across agents can determine its overall effectiveness (Auclert, 2017; Beraja et al., 2017; Kaplan et al., 2018). Coibion et al. (2017) show empirically that monetary contractions increase both income and consumption inequality. In all of these contributions, the distributional consequences of monetary policy arise from its heterogeneous impact on the value of agents' income or wealth.

This paper proposes and quantifies a novel mechanism through which monetary policy shocks have distributional consequences. If the effects of monetary shocks on prices are heterogeneous across types of goods (Boivin et al., 2009), and consumption baskets differ across the income distribution (e.g., Almås, 2012), then shocks will differentially affect the prices faced by households of different incomes. We document that the prices of the goods consumed by high-income households are (i) more sticky and (ii) less volatile than those of the goods consumed by middle-income households. We then use both a Factor-Augmented VAR (FAVAR) model and a quantitative New Keynesian DSGE model to quantify the distributional consequences of monetary policy shocks. Both methodologies indicate that these consequences are large relative to the aggregate impact of monetary policy on prices: a shock that increases inflation by 1% after a year also generates a  $-0.2\%$  difference in the inflation faced by households at the top vs. the middle of the income distribution.

Our analysis uses three main sources of data. The first is the US Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES), from which we obtain expenditure shares across detailed product categories for households at different percentiles of the income distribution. The second is the item-level consumer price data from the BLS, which are the most finely disaggregated consumer prices publicly available for the US. Finally, we employ the measures of price stickiness constructed by Nakamura and Steinsson (2008), who report the frequency of price adjustment (i.e. the probability that a price changes in a particular month) for every detailed product category in the US CPI.

We combine these data to compute the average frequencies of price changes for the baskets of goods purchased by households at each income percentile in the CES. We find systematic differences in the price-stickiness of the consumption baskets of different households. On average, 22% of the goods consumed by households in the middle

of the income distribution change prices in a given month. However, the frequency of price changes is 24% lower for the goods consumed by the richest percentile.<sup>1</sup> We also compute income-specific consumer price indices (CPIs) and show similar differences in the volatility of prices faced by different households: the standard deviation of the CPI of the top percentile is 38% lower than that of the CPI of the middle-income households.

These differences across consumption baskets imply that income-specific CPIs may respond differentially to monetary policy shocks. In particular, the CPIs of high-income households should be less responsive to monetary shocks than the CPIs in the middle of the income distribution. We evaluate this hypothesis both econometrically and quantitatively. We first implement a FAVAR model following [Bernanke et al. \(2005\)](#) and [Boivin et al. \(2009\)](#), that allows us to estimate the impulse responses of a large number of economic series to monetary policy shocks. Our interest is estimating the impact of monetary policy shocks on household-specific CPIs. We thus include 100 income-percentile-specific CPIs in the FAVAR. The estimates indeed show that after 12 months, the CPIs of high-income households respond about 22% less to the same monetary policy shocks than the CPIs of the middle-income households. Thus, the consumption basket differences in price stickiness and inflation volatility have the expected impact on the differential responses of household-specific CPIs to monetary policy shocks in the data.

We then perform a quantitative assessment using a multi-sector, multi-household model with Calvo-style nominal rigidities. In the model, sectors are heterogeneous with respect to their price stickiness, and households are heterogeneous with respect to their income levels and consumption baskets. We calibrate the model to the observed levels of price stickiness and observed cross-household differences in consumption patterns, and simulate the model's response to a monetary policy shock, paying special attention to how a monetary shock differentially affects households. As expected, high-income households' CPIs respond less to a monetary policy shock than middle-income households' CPIs. The difference is once again quantitatively large: after 12 months, the CPI of the households in the top percentile of the income distribution responds by 13% less than that of the middle-income households. We also show that shifting the distribution of income towards households that consume more sticky goods (i.e. more income inequality) would increase the effectiveness of monetary policy, although this effect is modest for realistic changes in inequality.

Our paper draws on, and contributes to, two literatures. The first is the research agenda on the distributional aspects of monetary policy reviewed above. The second is

---

<sup>1</sup>These numbers correspond to frequencies of regular price changes (i.e. excluding sales). The results are similar for the frequency of all price changes (including sales).

the literature on the differential responses of prices faced by different consumers following macroeconomic shocks. [Cravino and Levchenko \(2017\)](#) document that after a large devaluation in Mexico, consumption price indices of high-income households increased by far less than consumption price indices of the poor. [Argente and Lee \(2015\)](#) show that in the US Great Recession, prices of groceries and general merchandise items consumed by the poorer households increased by more than those consumed by the richer households, while [Jaravel \(2017\)](#) shows that over the past 15 years, product variety increased the most, and inflation was lowest, for the consumption basket of the high-income households. [Kaplan and Schulhofer-Wohl \(2017\)](#) document substantial cross-sectional dispersion in household inflation rates, while [Coibion et al. \(2015\)](#) study the impact of local economic conditions on the geographical variation in prices paid by consumers. Ongoing work by [Clayton et al. \(2018\)](#) focuses differences in price stickiness of goods consumed by, and produced by, college-educated workers. Our paper documents new facts and proposes a novel mechanism, that is based on differential price stickiness of consumption items along the income distribution.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 lays out a simple model that illustrates the main mechanism at work, and highlights the key objects of interest that should be the focus of the empirical analysis. Section 3 describes the data and documents consumption basket differences across households. Section 4 presents the FAVAR evidence, and Section 5 presents the quantitative model and reports the responses of household-specific inflation to an aggregate monetary shock. Section 6 concludes.

## 2 A simple sticky price model

Before presenting our data, we describe a simplified sticky price model to build intuition on how aggregate shocks can have distributional consequences when nominal rigidities are heterogeneous across goods and households consume different baskets of goods.

**Setup:** Consider a two-period economy populated by  $H$  types of households indexed by  $h$ , each consuming a different basket of goods. In the first period, the state of the world is known, and in the second period the economy can experience one of infinitely many shocks or states,  $s$ .<sup>2</sup> The (log) price of the consumption basket (i.e. the CPI) consumed by

---

<sup>2</sup>The set of shocks can include monetary shocks, but at this stage we do not need to specify the exact nature of the shocks.

household  $h$  in period  $t$  is given by

$$p_t^h(s) \equiv \sum_j \omega_j^h p_{j,t}(s),$$

where  $\omega_j^h$  is the share of goods from sector  $j$  in household  $h$ 's consumption basket. We define the aggregate price index as  $p_t(s) \equiv \sum_h s^h p_t^h(s) = \sum_j \omega_j p_{j,t}(s)$ , where  $s^h$  denotes household  $h$ 's share in the aggregate consumption expenditures, and  $\omega_j \equiv \sum_h s^h \omega_j^h$  is the economy-wide expenditure share in sector  $j$ .

Sectoral goods are aggregates of a continuum of intermediates that are produced by monopolistically competitive firms. We introduce price stickiness by assuming that in the second period, only a fraction  $\theta_j$  of producers in each sector  $j$  can observe the realization of the state before setting their prices. The remaining producers must set prices before observing the realization of the state. To isolate the role of sectoral differences in price rigidities, we assume all producers operate the same CRS technology and set constant markups. In the first period, all the producers know the state and so they set the same price, which we label  $p_1$ . In the second period, all producers that observe the state set the same price, which we label  $\bar{p}_2(s)$ . The producers that don't observe the state set a price that we label  $p_2^e$ . Note that  $p_2^e$  is not a function of the state. Without loss of generality we assume that the shocks are mean zero, so that  $p_2^e = p_1$ .

The average price in sector  $j$  in the second period is then given by:

$$p_{j,2}(s) = \theta_j \bar{p}_2(s) + [1 - \theta_j] p_1. \quad (1)$$

Let  $\pi^h \equiv p_2^h(s) - p_1$  define the household-specific inflation rate. The difference in inflation faced by two households,  $h$  and  $h'$ , is:

$$\pi^h(s) - \pi^{h'}(s) = [\bar{p}_2(s) - p_1] \sum_j [\omega_j^h - \omega_j^{h'}] \theta_j.$$

This expression highlights that the difference between two households' CPIs is driven by the covariance between the differences in their expenditure shares across sectors,  $\omega_j^{h'} - \omega_j^h$ , and the price stickiness of those sectors,  $\theta_j$ . Households that consume less price-sticky goods will experience larger CPI changes following a shock than households consuming relatively more price-sticky goods. Dividing by the aggregate inflation  $\pi(s) \equiv p_2(s) - p_1$ , yields an expression relating the differences in household-specific inflation to objects

that can be measured in the data:

$$\frac{\pi^h(s) - \pi^{h'}(s)}{\pi(s)} = \frac{\bar{\theta}^h - \bar{\theta}^{h'}}{\bar{\theta}}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\bar{\theta}^h \equiv \sum_j \omega_j^h \theta_j$  and  $\bar{\theta} \equiv \sum_h s^h \bar{\theta}^h$ . Note that this expression is independent of the realization of the state.

**Discussion:** Equation (2) shows how aggregate shocks can have distributional consequences when price rigidities are heterogeneous across goods and households consume different baskets of goods. In this simple model where all firms face the same costs and markups are constant, the weighted average frequencies of price changes,  $\bar{\theta}^h$ , are sufficient statistics for all the distributional consequences, irrespective of the nature of the aggregate shocks. Equation (2) states that, in response to a shock that generates positive inflation, inflation will be relatively high for households consuming goods with relatively more flexible prices (i.e. high  $\bar{\theta}^h$ ).

To get a sense of the magnitude of these distributional consequences we can do a back of the envelope calculation using US data (described in detail below). In our data,  $\bar{\theta}^t \approx 0.17$  for households in the top percentile of the income distribution,  $\bar{\theta}^m \approx 0.22$  for households at the middle of the income distribution, and  $\bar{\theta} \approx 0.21$ . These numbers result in  $\frac{\bar{\theta}^t - \bar{\theta}^m}{\bar{\theta}} \approx -0.24$ , which indicates that a shock that increases the aggregate CPI relative to its unconditional mean by 1% will also generate a  $-0.24\%$  gap between the price of the consumption baskets consumed by the top vs. the middle of the income distribution.

The simple model also illustrates the connection between sectoral price stickiness and sectoral price volatility. From (1), we can see that sectoral inflation,  $\pi_j(s) \equiv p_{j,2}(s) - p_1$ , is less volatile in more sticky-priced sectors:

$$\sigma_{\pi_j} = \theta_j \sigma_{\bar{p}},$$

where  $\sigma_{\pi_j}$  is the standard deviation of inflation in sector  $j$  price, and  $\sigma_{\bar{p}}$  is the unconditional standard deviation of  $\bar{p}_2(s)$ . The ratio of standard deviations of sectoral inflation relative to the standard deviation of aggregate inflation is then given by the ratio of the sectoral to the aggregate frequency of price changes:

$$\frac{\sigma_{\pi_j}}{\sigma_{\pi}} = \frac{\theta_j}{\bar{\theta}}, \quad (3)$$

Differences in sectoral price volatility translate into differences in household-level CPI

volatility. The standard deviation of household-specific inflation, normalized relative to the aggregate is:

$$\frac{\sigma_{\pi^h}}{\sigma_{\pi}} = \frac{\bar{\theta}^h}{\bar{\theta}}. \quad (4)$$

Households consuming more price-sticky goods experience less volatile price changes. The following section evaluates the relationships (3) and (4) in the data. Of course, these relationships may not hold if the standard deviation of the desired price change  $\sigma_{\bar{p}}$  is sector-specific (as would be the case for example if there are sector-specific shocks).

To summarize, our illustrative model establishes that in order to understand how the CPIs of different households react to monetary or other shocks, we must examine the differences in price stickiness of consumption baskets across households. In addition, it suggests a one-to-one relationship between sectoral price stickiness and sectoral price volatility. Thus, a closely related object to be examined in the data is differences in inflation volatility across households.

### 3 Empirical findings

This section describes our data sources and documents our two empirical findings on how consumption baskets differ across the income distribution. It then evaluates the relationship between frequencies of price changes and inflation volatility suggested by equations (3) and (4). Appendix A describes in detail the construction of expenditure shares from the CES and of the income-specific CPIs.

#### 3.1 Data

We combine data on expenditure shares from the CES with the item-level consumer prices from the BLS and with the frequency of price adjustment data from [Nakamura and Steinsson \(2008\)](#). The CES contains two main modules, the Interview and the Diary. The Interview module collects responses from about 30,000 households annually, and asks households about the purchases they make in all categories, as well as other demographic information. Each household is interviewed for up to 4 consecutive quarters in the Interview module. The Diary module surveys about 10,000 households per year, at weekly frequency. The Diary questionnaire contains detailed questions about daily purchases, such as groceries. All in all, there are questions on 350 distinct expenditure categories in the Interview module, and on 250 distinct grocery and related categories in the Diary module.

The large majority of households do not report expenditures in all possible categories in a given year. In addition, a different set of households is surveyed in the Interview and in the Diary files, so the full consumption profile (both Diary and Interview module expenditures together) of any particular household is never observed. This means that we cannot compute expenditure shares for each household. Rather, we aggregate households into percentiles and work with percentile-level expenditure shares. Each percentile contains about 300 households responding to the Interview questions, and 100 households responding to Diary questions. Appendix Table A1 reports the income cutoffs and average incomes in the selected quantiles of the income distribution. It is important to note that income categories in the CES (such as wage income) are subject to top-coding. Nonetheless, there is a great deal of variation in incomes of households present in the CES, with incomes of the top 5% of households an order of magnitude higher than those at the median. Throughout the paper, the percentiles of the income distribution are defined based on income information in the CES rather than any external data source.

We use these data to compute the measures of income-specific frequencies of price changes, price indices, and price volatility defined in Section 2. The average frequencies of price changes,  $\bar{\theta}^h = \sum_j \omega_j^h \theta_j$ , combine the income-specific expenditure weights  $\omega_j^h$  from the CES with the product-specific frequencies of price changes  $\theta_j$  from Nakamura and Steinsson (2008).<sup>3</sup> To compute them, we match CES expenditure categories to the Entry Level Items (ELIs), a basic category in the CPI for which Nakamura and Steinsson (2008) report frequencies. There are a total of 265 ELI categories. In this exercise, we use the expenditure shares from the year 2015, but the results are quite similar for expenditure shares in other years.

We calculate household-specific inflation as  $\pi_t^h \equiv p_t^h - p_{t-1}^h$ , where the household-specific price indices are given by  $p_t^h \equiv \sum_j \omega_j^h p_{j,t}$ . Again, we take the income-specific expenditure weights  $\omega_j^h$  from the CES, and use item-level price indices  $p_{j,t}$  obtained from the BLS. The item level is the finest publicly available level of disaggregation in the US CPI data (the BLS does not report inflation numbers at the ELI level), and is slightly more coarse than ELI, containing 178 distinct expenditure categories. The price data are monthly, for the period 1978-2008.<sup>4</sup> We take 12-month log-differences to obtain annual growth rates. We then compute the standard deviations of those annual growth rates for

---

<sup>3</sup>Nakamura and Steinsson (2008) calculate these frequencies as the fraction of prices that change in a given a month, both for all prices, and for regular prices (excluding sales).

<sup>4</sup>When building aggregate consumer price indices, the BLS periodically changes the base year for expenditure weights. In computing income-specific CPIs, we follow the BLS procedure for switching base years after 2004. The information on income is less reliable in the CES prior to 2004, and thus we use 2004 household-specific expenditure weights for CPIs prior to 2004. Using official BLS weights or 2004 aggregate weights produces nearly identical pre-2004 aggregate CPI. See Appendix A.2 for more detail.


the price indices at each income level.

### 3.2 Two facts about consumption basket differences across households

**Fact 1: Prices of goods consumed by middle-income households are relatively flexible.**

Figure 1 presents the scatterplot of the weighted mean frequency of price adjustment,  $\bar{\theta}^h$ , for households at each of the 20 quantiles of the income distribution in the CES. Thus, each dot corresponds to 5% of households. The solid line through the data is the local polynomial fit, and the shaded area is the 95% confidence interval. The left panel depicts  $\bar{\theta}^h$  when  $\theta_j$  is measured as the frequency of regular (non-sale) price changes, while the right panel measures  $\theta_j$  as the frequency of all price changes, including sales. Mean frequencies of price changes are hump-shaped along the income distribution: middle-income households consume goods with more frequent price changes, while high- and low-income households consume goods with less frequent price changes.

Figure 1: Weighted mean frequency of price changes



Notes: This figure plots the weighted mean frequency of price changes for households in 20 quantiles of the income distribution. Each dot represents 5% of the income distribution.

Table 1 summarizes the underlying magnitudes. It reports, for different slices of the income distribution, the weighted mean frequency of price adjustment. For the households around the median – the 40-60 income percentiles – the frequency of regular price adjustment is 22.16 percent per month. For all the households from the 1st to the 95th percentile, that frequency is 21.17 percent per month. By contrast, the frequency falls to 19.27 for the households in the 96th to 99th percentile, and further to 16.82 for the top percentile in the distribution. Thus, the weighted mean frequency of price adjustment is some 25% lower for the households in the top 1% of income compared to the households

around the median income. Including sales, the results are quite similar. In particular, the top 1% of the income distribution has an 18% lower weighted mean frequency of price adjustment than the middle of the income distribution.

Table 1: Weighted mean frequency of price changes and CPI volatility at different points on the income distribution

	Income percentile			
	40-60	1-95	96-99	100
<u>Frequency of price changes:</u>				
Regular prices	22.16	21.17	19.27	16.82
All prices (incl. sales)	26.90	26.16	23.75	22.17
Standard deviation of CPI:	0.021	0.020	0.015	0.013


Note: This table reports the weighted mean frequency of price changes, and the standard deviation of the 12-month log change in CPI for consumers of different incomes.

**Fact 2: Prices of goods consumed by middle-income households are relatively volatile.**

Figure 2 reports the standard deviation of  $\pi_t^h$ , the income-specific inflation. Inflation volatility is also hump-shaped along the income distribution. The households with middle incomes experience the highest inflation volatility, whereas the lowest volatility is found at the top of the income distribution. The bottom of Table 1 reports the values of the standard deviation of inflation faced by consumers of different incomes. The annual inflation rate has a standard deviation of 0.020 for consumers in the bottom 95% of the income distribution, and 0.021 for consumers in the middle (40-60th percentiles). By contrast, the standard deviation of annual inflation is 0.015 for households in the 96th to 99th percentile of the income distribution, and 0.013 for those in the top 1%.

**Discussion:** What consumption patterns are responsible for these differences in price stickiness and volatility across baskets? Table 2 reports the 10 consumption items with the largest differences in the expenditure shares between the middle 20% of the income distribution and the top 1% of the income distribution. The 10 items in the top panel are those for which the middle 20% of the income distribution consume the most relative to the top 1%, and the 10 items in the bottom panel report the opposite categories.

Figure 2: Standard deviation of the changes in consumption price indices



Notes: This figure plots the standard deviation of the 12-month log difference in the consumption price indices for households in 20 quantiles of the income distribution. Each dot represents 5% of the income distribution.

The top categories in which the middle-income consumers exhibit highest expenditure shares relative to the top 1% are mainly goods such as Gasoline, Electricity, Motor Vehicle Insurance, and Used Cars. The items with the largest expenditure shares of the top 1% relative to the middle income consumers are mostly services, such as Elementary School and College Tuition, Child Care, Airfare, Domestic Services, and Club Membership Fees.

Table 2: Expenditure share differences, frequency of price adjustment, and volatility of price changes


Category	Income percentile		Difference	Regular Price Change	Price Change	St. Dev.	
	40-60	100					
Top 10, larger expenditure shares by middle class							
Gasoline (all types)	0.084	0.038	-0.046		87.71	87.74	0.208
Electricity	0.050	0.025	-0.025		38.14	38.14	0.035
Limited service meals and snacks	0.037	0.018	-0.018		6.13	7.00	0.009
Wireless telephone services	0.032	0.014	-0.018		13.00	13.00	0.044
Motor vehicle insurance	0.039	0.021	-0.018		8.16	8.16	0.025
Hospital services	0.037	0.024	-0.013		6.26	6.26	0.014
Cable and satellite television and radio service	0.024	0.012	-0.013		12.35	12.83	0.015
Used cars and trucks	0.028	0.016	-0.012		100.00	100.00	0.052
Prescription drugs	0.022	0.011	-0.011		15.03	15.09	0.015
Cigarettes	0.012	0.001	-0.010		23.17	33.59	0.073
Mean					31.00	32.18	0.049
Median					14.02	14.04	0.030
Top 10, larger expenditure shares by top 1%							
College tuition and fees	0.012	0.051	0.039		5.77	5.77	0.018
Child care and nursery school	0.006	0.030	0.024		6.91	6.91	0.011
Elementary and high school tuition and fees	0.002	0.025	0.023		6.23	6.23	0.013
Watches	0.001	0.021	0.021		3.06	19.83	0.028
Airline fare	0.008	0.028	0.020		59.84	59.84	0.062
Domestic services	0.002	0.019	0.017		4.31	4.31	0.014
Club dues and fees for participant sports and group exercises	0.006	0.022	0.016		8.57	12.56	0.017
Other lodging away from home including hotels and motels	0.007	0.023	0.015		41.73	42.75	0.034
New vehicles	0.048	0.057	0.009		18.89	19.45	0.014
Admissions	0.005	0.013	0.008		8.07	8.39	0.017
Mean					16.34	18.60	0.023
Median					7.49	10.47	0.017

Note: This table reports the product categories with the largest differences in expenditure shares between the middle (40th-60th percentiles) and the top 1% of the income distribution, the frequency of price changes, and the standard deviation of 12-month log price changes for those products.

The last three columns report the frequency of the regular price adjustment, the overall price adjustment, and the standard deviation of price changes in these 20 categories. Among the 10 categories consumed more intensively at the middle of the income distribution, the frequency of monthly price adjustment is in excess of 30%. Among the 10 items most disproportionately consumed by the top 1%, the frequency of regular price adjustment is 16%, and total price adjustment 18%. In either case, the difference in average price adjustment frequency between these two sets of items is pronounced. Note that the pattern of price stickiness is not universal. Among the top 1%'s (relative) top 10 items is Airfare, with price adjustment frequency of almost 60% per month. On the flip side, General Medical Practice and Limited Service Meals are in the middle 20%'s top 10, and among the price-stickiest categories.

The left panel of Figure 3 plots the frequency of the regular price adjustment on the y-axis against the difference in the expenditure shares between the top 1% and the middle 20%, with positive values meaning that the top 1% has higher expenditure shares in that category. The majority of categories are concentrated on 0, implying that the high- and the middle-income categories have similar expenditure shares. There is a large range, however, and all in all the relationship between these relative shares and the frequency of price adjustment is negative. The correlation between the x-axis and y-axis variables is  $-0.251$ .

Figure 3: Expenditure differences, frequency of price changes, and standard deviation of price changes



Notes: The left panel plots the frequency of price changes against the difference in sectoral expenditure shares between households in the top 1% and the middle 20% of the income distribution. The right panel plots the standard deviation of 12-month log price change against the difference in sectoral expenditure shares between households in the top 1% and the middle 20% of the income distribution. Both panels include the OLS fit through the data.


The categories with the largest expenditure share differences also differ substantially in the standard deviation of item-level price changes. The mean standard deviation of 12-month log price changes in the set of goods consumed most disproportionately by the middle-income households is 0.049, more than double the 0.023 mean in the set of goods consumed by high-income households. The outlier sector here is Gasoline, whose standard deviation is 0.208, and which is also the sector with the single largest expenditure share discrepancy – in either direction – between the middle- and high-income households. But the differences persist even if we focus on the median standard deviation, or drop Gasoline when computing the mean. The right panel of Figure 3 displays the scatterplot of the standard deviation of log price change at the item level against the expenditure share difference between the high- and middle-income consumers. Once again, most expenditure share differences are close to zero. Nonetheless, the correlation between the expenditure share differences and standard deviation of price changes is negative at  $-0.255$ .

### 3.3 Frequency of price changes and inflation volatility

This section evaluates the relationship between frequency of price changes and inflation volatility suggested by equations (3) and (4) of Section 2, by providing the data counterparts of those postulated relationships. The left panel of Figure 4 plots the empirical counterpart of (3), along with a 45-degree line. As (3) expresses both the right- and left-hand side variables relative to the average, we rescale both the product-level standard deviation and the frequency of price adjustment by their means across items. Each dot represents one of the 178 disaggregated CPI items. A positive relationship with a slope close to unity is evident in this plot; the correlation coefficient between these two variables is 0.715.

The right panel plots the empirical counterpart of (4), once again with both y- and x-axis variables rescaled by their respective means and adding a 45-degree line. Each dot represents 5% of the income distribution, as in Figures 1-2. There is an evident positive relationship between these two variables, with the correlation coefficient of 0.643. Households consuming more flexible-priced goods tend to experience higher CPI volatility. This is not surprising, as we are in effect plotting the y-axes of Figures 1 and 2 against each other, and both follow a similar inverse U-shape with respect to income quantile.

Figure 4: Stickiness and volatility



Notes: The left panel plots the standard deviation of 12-month log price change at the item level vs. the frequency of price adjustment for that item. The right panel plots the standard deviation in the 12-month log change in overall household CPI against the weighed mean frequency of price adjustment for that household type; each dot represents 5% of the income distribution. Both plots include the 45-degree line.

## 4 FAVAR Evidence

The previous section shows that prices of goods consumed by high-income households are more sticky and less volatile than those of the goods consumed by middle-income households. This suggests that monetary shocks can have distributional consequences by affecting the relative prices of consumption baskets of households at different points on the income distribution. We now present evidence that monetary policy shocks indeed lead to smaller CPI changes for households at the top of the income distribution relative to the middle.

To do so, we adapt the Factor-Augmented Vector Autoregression (FAVAR) approach of [Bernanke et al. \(2005\)](#) and [Boivin et al. \(2009\)](#). Let there be a large number of economic series, whose behavior is driven by a vector of common components. This vector includes monetary policy in the form of the Federal Funds rate  $i_t$ , and a small number of unobserved common factors  $F_t$ . The joint evolution of the Federal Funds rate and the vector of factors,  $C_t$ , is characterized by a VAR:

$$\mathbf{C}_t \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{F}_t \\ i_t \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{C}_t = \Phi(L)\mathbf{C}_{t-1} + \mathbf{v}_t, \quad (5)$$

where  $\Phi(L)$  is a lag polynomial, and  $\mathbf{v}_t$  is an i.i.d. error term.

The vector  $\mathbf{F}_t$  is unobservable. What is observed is a large number of economic series  $\mathbf{X}_t$ . The FAVAR approach assumes that this set of economic series is characterized by a factor model:

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \Lambda\mathbf{C}_t + \mathbf{e}_t, \quad (6)$$


where  $\Lambda$  is the matrix of factor loadings. This representation provides a great deal of parsimony because in practice  $\mathbf{X}_t$  includes hundreds of series, whereas the dimensionality of the vector of common factors  $\mathbf{F}_t$  is typically small: in the [Boivin et al. \(2009\)](#) implementation there are 5 common unobserved factors. The significant benefit of estimating model (5)-(6) is that it yields impulse responses of each of the hundreds of series contained in  $\mathbf{X}_t$  to shocks to the elements of  $\mathbf{C}_t$ , including monetary policy.

In our application of this approach, the vector  $\mathbf{X}_t$  includes the 100 income-percentile-specific consumption price indices, as well as the additional variables included by [Bernanke et al. \(2005\)](#) and [Boivin et al. \(2009\)](#), such as sector-level industrial production, employment and earnings, and industry-product-level PPI series. The time frequency is monthly, and the time period is 1978m1-2008m12. [Boivin et al. \(2009\)](#) present a detailed evaluation of the performance of the FAVAR model. Here, we focus on the element new in our paper, namely the impulse responses of income-specific CPIs to monetary policy shocks.

The FAVAR produces 100 of those impulse responses, one for each income percentile. [Figure 5](#) plots those impulse responses for selected percentiles. The monetary policy shock is a 25-basis-point increase in the Federal Funds rate on impact, thus a contraction. The consumption price indices of the high-income households react substantially less to monetary policy shocks than those for the middle of the income distribution. The difference is economically meaningful. After 12 months, the top-1% households' CPI responds by 34% less, and the 96-99th percentile households by 22% less, than the CPI of the households in the middle of the income distribution (40-60th percentiles). After 24 months, the differences are still 12% and 6%, respectively.

A well-known feature of the VAR impulse responses of prices to monetary shocks is that the confidence intervals are wide, and it is often not possible to reject a zero impact of a monetary shock on aggregate CPI. This is the case in the [Boivin et al. \(2009\)](#) FAVAR model that forms our baseline analysis. However, our main object of interest is not the

Figure 5: Income-specific CPI impulse responses to a monetary policy shock



Notes: This figure plots the impulse responses of income-specific price indices to a monetary policy shock, estimated using a FAVAR.


overall response of prices to a monetary shock, but rather the differential response of the CPIs of different households. Figure 6 plots the difference in the impulse responses between the CPI of the top 1% and the CPI of the middle 20% of the income distribution (left panel), and the difference between the top 1% and aggregate CPI (right panel). Both panels include the 90% bootstrapped confidence intervals. The difference between impulse responses is significant at the 10% level for most of the lags between 8 and 21 months.<sup>5</sup>

## 5 Quantitative framework

This section sets up a sticky price model with multiple households and sectors to evaluate how monetary shocks affect consumption price indices for households at different points of the income distribution.

<sup>5</sup>Note that the impulse is a monetary contractions, and thus the changes in the CPIs are negative after an initial few months. Since the top-income CPIs respond by less in absolute terms, the difference between the top- and middle-income CPIs is positive.

Figure 6: Differences in inflation changes between income groups



Notes: The left panel plots the difference between the impulse responses of the price index of the top 1% of households and the middle 20% of households to a monetary shock, while the right panel plots the difference between the impulse responses of the price index of the top 1% of households and the aggregate price index, along the 90% bootstrapped confidence intervals.

## 5.1 Setup

**Preliminaries:** We consider an economy populated by  $H$  types of households indexed by  $h$ . Households get utility from consuming a bundle of goods produced by  $J$  different sectors of the economy indexed by  $j$ . Sectoral goods are produced by aggregating the output of a continuum of monopolistic intermediate producers indexed by  $i$ . The monetary authority sets the nominal interest rate following a Taylor rule.

**Households:** Each type of household  $h$  has preferences given by:

$$U^h = \mathbb{E}_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \left[ \ln C_t^h - N_t^h \right], \quad (7)$$

and faces the budget constraint:

$$P_t^h C_t^h + \Theta_{t,t+1} B_{t+1}^h = W_t A^h N_t^h + T_t^h + B_t^h. \quad (8)$$

Here,  $C_t^h$  is the bundle of goods consumed by households of type  $h$ , and  $P_t^h$  is the price of this bundle.  $N_t^h$  and  $A^h$  respectively denote labor supply and the efficiency of household  $h$ , and  $W_t$  is the nominal wage per efficiency unit.  $B_{t+1}^h$  is a bond that pays one dollar in  $t + 1$ , and  $\Theta_{t,t+1}$  is the date  $t$  price of that bond. Finally,  $T_t^h$  are transfers to the households from the government and from firms' profits.

The bundle of goods consumed by each type of household is:

$$C_t^h = \left[ \sum_j^J \left[ \omega_j^h \right]^{\frac{1}{\eta}} \left[ C_{j,t}^h \right]^{\frac{\eta-1}{\eta}} \right]^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}}, \quad (9)$$

where  $C_{j,t}^h$  denotes household  $h$ 's consumption of final goods from sector  $j$ , and  $\omega_j^h$  is a household-specific weight for sector  $j$ . The price index associated with this bundle is:

$$P_t^h = \left[ \sum_j^J \omega_j^h P_{j,t}^{1-\eta} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}},$$

where  $P_{j,t}$  is the price of the sector  $j$  aggregate. Note that both  $C_t^h$  and  $P_t^h$  are indexed by  $h$ , as the bundle (9) differs across households. Monetary shocks can differentially affect households if households put different weights across sectors and shocks have heterogeneous effects across sectoral prices  $P_{j,t}$ .

**Sectoral demands and technologies:** The demand function associated with the bundle (9) is given by:

$$C_{j,t}^h = \omega_j^h \left[ \frac{P_{j,t}}{P_t^h} \right]^{-\eta} C_t^h.$$

Adding across households, aggregate demand for the final good produced in sector  $j$  is

$$P_{j,t} C_{j,t} = \omega_{j,t} \left[ \frac{P_{j,t}}{P_t} \right]^{1-\eta} P_t C_t, \quad (10)$$

where  $P_t C_t$  are aggregate nominal expenditures,  $\omega_{j,t} \equiv \sum_h \omega_j^h s^h \frac{[P_t^h]^{\eta-1}}{\sum_h s_h [P_t^h]^{\eta-1}}$ , and  $P_t \equiv \left[ \sum_j \omega_{j,t} P_{j,t}^{1-\eta} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}$ . In these expressions,  $s^h$  is the share of household  $h$  in aggregate expenditures.

Sectoral goods are produced by aggregating the output of a continuum of intermediate producers according to

$$Y_{j,t} = \left[ \int Y_{j,t}(i)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} di \right]^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}.$$

Total demand faced by intermediate producer  $i$  is then:

$$Y_{j,t}(i) = \left[ \frac{P_{j,t}(i)}{P_{j,t}} \right]^{-\gamma} Y_{j,t}. \quad (11)$$

**Intermediate good producers:** Intermediate producers behave as monopolistic competitors and set prices as in [Calvo \(1983\)](#). The probability that a producer can change its price in any period depends on the sector in which it operates, and is given by  $\theta_j$ . The producers operate a linear technology

$$Y_{j,t}(i) = \bar{N}_{j,t}(i), \quad (12)$$

where  $\bar{N}_{j,t}(i)$  denotes the efficiency units of labor used by producer  $i$ . The profit-maximizing price for an intermediate producer that gets to adjust prices satisfies:

$$\bar{P}_{j,t} = \arg \max \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [1 - \theta_j]^k \mathbb{E}_t \left\{ \Theta_{t,t+k} [\bar{P}_{j,t} - W_{t+k}] Y_{j,t+k}(i) \right\} \right\} \quad (13)$$

subject to (11).

**Monetary policy:** The monetary authority sets nominal interest rates according to a Taylor rule:

$$\exp(i_t) = \exp(\rho_i i_{t-1}) \left[ \Pi_t^{\phi_\pi} \left[ \frac{Y_t}{\bar{Y}} \right]^{\phi_y} \right]^{1-\rho_i} \exp(v_t),$$

where  $i_t \equiv -\log Q_{t,t+1}$  is the nominal interest rate,  $\Pi_t \equiv P_t/P_{t-1}$  is aggregate inflation, and  $\bar{Y}$  is the efficient level of output. Finally,  $v_t$  is a monetary shock that satisfies

$$v_t = \rho_v v_t + \varepsilon_{v,t}, \quad (14)$$

with  $\varepsilon_{v,t} \sim N(0, \sigma_{\varepsilon_v})$ .

**Equilibrium:** An equilibrium for this economy is a set of allocations for the households  $\{C_t^h, C_{j,t}^h, N_t^h\}_{\forall j,h,t}$ , sectoral good producers  $\{Y_t^j, \{Y_t^j(i)\}_i, \{\bar{N}_t^j(i)\}_i\}_{\forall j,t}$ , and price policy functions for intermediate producers  $\{\bar{P}_{j,t}\}_{\forall j,t}$  such that given prices: (i) households maximize (7) subject to (8); (ii) sector  $j$  final producers minimize costs according to equations (10) and (11); (iii) intermediate producers maximize profits by solving (13); and (iv) goods and labor markets clear,  $\sum_h C_{j,t}^h = Y_t^j$  and  $\sum_h A^h N_t^h = \sum_j A^h \int \bar{N}_{j,t}(i) di$ .

We now characterize the equilibrium of a log-linearized version of this economy. In what follows, we use lower-case letters to denote the log-deviations of a variable from its non-stochastic steady state. The optimality conditions associated with the household problem are the labor-leisure condition:

$$P_t^h C_t^h = A^h W_t,$$

and the Euler equation:

$$\Theta_{t,t+1} = \beta \mathbb{E}_t \left\{ \frac{P_t^h C_t^h}{P_{t+1}^h C_{t+1}^h} \right\}.$$

Adding the labor-leisure condition across households we obtain that each type of household gets a constant share of nominal consumption expenditures,  $s^h \equiv \frac{P_t^h C_t^h}{P_t C_t} = \frac{A^h}{A}$ , where  $A \equiv \sum_h A^h$ . Substituting into the optimality conditions and log-linearizing we obtain:

$$w_t - p_t = c_t, \tag{15}$$

and

$$c_t = \mathbb{E}_t \{c_{t+1}\} - [i_t - \mathbb{E}_t \{\pi_{t+1}\} - \rho], \tag{16}$$

with  $\rho \equiv -\log \beta$ . Goods market clearing implies  $y_t = c_t$ . Substituting into equation (16) we obtain:

$$y_t = \mathbb{E}_t \{y_{t+1}\} - [i_t - \mathbb{E}_t \{\pi_{t+1}\} - \rho]. \tag{17}$$

The optimal log-price that solves (13) can be written recursively as:

$$\bar{p}_{j,t} = [1 - \beta [1 - \theta_j]] w_t + \beta [1 - \theta_j] \mathbb{E}_t [\bar{p}_{j,t+1}],$$

and the law of motion for the sectoral price indices is

$$p_{j,t} = \theta_j \bar{p}_{j,t} + [1 - \theta_j] p_{j,t-1}.$$

Combining we these two equations we obtain a sectoral Phillips curve,

$$\pi_{j,t} = \lambda_j [w_t - p_{j,t}] + \beta \mathbb{E}_t \{\pi_{j,t+1}\}, \tag{18}$$

with  $\lambda_j \equiv \frac{\theta_j[1-\beta(1-\theta_j)]}{[1-\theta_j]}$ . Finally, the Taylor rule is:

$$i_t = \rho_i i_{t-1} + [1 - \rho_i] [\rho + \phi_\pi \pi_t + \phi_y \tilde{y}_t] + v_t. \quad (19)$$

Equations (15)-(19) can be used to solve for all sectoral inflation rates, along with the output gap, real marginal costs, real wages, the nominal interest rate, and the aggregate inflation rate. Sectoral inflation rates can then be used to compute household-specific inflation according to:

$$\pi_t^h = \sum_j \omega_j^h \pi_{j,t}.$$

In what follows, we will use the model to ask two questions: (i) what is the effect of a monetary policy shock  $\varepsilon_{v,t}$  on household-specific inflation?, and (ii) how do changes in the distribution of income  $s^h$  affect the response of inflation  $\pi_t$  and the output  $y_t$  to a monetary shock?

## 5.2 Results

### 5.2.1 Calibration

To evaluate the impact of monetary shocks, we need to assign values for the discount factor  $\beta$ , the coefficients in the Taylor rule,  $\rho_i$ ,  $\phi_\pi$  and  $\phi_y$ , the process for the shocks,  $\rho_v$  and  $\sigma_{\varepsilon_v}$ , the sectoral frequencies of price changes,  $\theta_j, \forall j$ , the sectoral household-specific expenditure shares,  $\omega_j^h$ , and the household consumption shares,  $s^h$ . We calibrate the model to monthly data and use values for most of these parameters that are standard in the literature. In particular, we set  $\beta = 0.96^{1/12}$ , which corresponds to an annualized real interest rate of 4 percent, and take the Taylor rule parameters  $\rho_i = 0.95$ ,  $\phi_\pi = 1.5$  and  $\phi_y = 0.5/12$  and set the persistence of the shocks to  $\rho_v = 0$ , as in [Christiano et al. \(2010\)](#). Finally, we calibrate the model to 265 sectors and 20 household types, and calibrate the frequencies of price changes  $\theta_j$  and the expenditure shares  $\omega_j^h$  and  $s^h$  using the data from [Nakamura and Steinsson \(2008\)](#) and the CES data presented in Section 3. The parameter values are summarized in Table 3.

### 5.2.2 Distributional consequences of monetary shocks

We now evaluate the distributional consequences of a monetary shock in this model. Figure 7 plots the impulse response of the household-specific price indices to a one standard

Table 3: Parameter values

Parameter	Description	Value	Target/source
$\beta$	Discount factor	0.996	Christiano et al. (2010)
$\rho_i$	Interest smoothing coefficient	0.95	Christiano et al. (2010)
$\phi_\pi$	Inflation coefficient	1.50	Christiano et al. (2010)
$\phi_y$	output coefficient	0.04	Christiano et al. (2010)
$\rho_v$	Persistence of the shocks	0	Christiano et al. (2010)
$\theta_j$	Sector-specific frequency of price changes	Nakamura and Steinsson (2008)	
$\omega_j^h$	Household-specific expenditure shares	CES data	
$s^h$	Household share in aggregate expenditures	CES data	

Notes: This table lists the parameter values used to calibrate the model.

deviation shock to  $\varepsilon_{v,t}$ . The figure shows that the shock has distributional effects: prices of the middle-income households are the most sensitive to the shock, and prices are the least sensitive for the top-income households. This is not surprising, since in our model, as in the data, households at the top of the income distribution consume the goods that are the most sticky and thus respond more sluggishly to shocks.


Table 4 reports the price indices faced by households at different points of the income distribution following the monetary shock, expressed relative to the aggregate price index. The table shows that the cumulative response after 6 months of the prices faced by the top 1 percent is about 13% smaller than that of the aggregate price index, and almost 20% smaller than the response of the prices faced by the households at the middle 5 percent of the income distribution. These differences are quite persistent, the cumulative change in prices faced by the richest 1% is still 10% smaller than that faced by the middle income households 18 months after the shock.

### 5.2.3 Changes in the income distribution and the effectiveness of monetary policy

This section investigates how changes in the income distribution affect the effectiveness of monetary policy. With this in mind, we evaluate the response of aggregate prices to a monetary shock in a counterfactual calibration of the model with more income inequality. In this counterfactual, we set the shares  $s^h$  so that the richest 1% of households has 50% of the income of the economy, and rescale the remaining shares appropriately. That is, we set

$$s_{count}^h = \begin{cases} 0.5 & \text{if } h = \text{top 1\%} \\ \frac{s_{base}^h}{1-s_{base}^{1\%}} \times 0.5 & \text{else} \end{cases},$$

Figure 7: Impulse responses of household-specific CPIs to a monetary shock



Notes: This figure plots the impulse responses of income-specific CPIs to a monetary policy shock, simulated using the model in this section.

where  $s_{base}^h$  are the shares used in our baseline calibration described in Table 3 and  $s_{base}^{1\%}$  is the share of income held by the top 1% in the baseline calibration.

Figure 8 plots the impulse response of the aggregate price index in the two models to a monetary shock that increases the nominal interest rate by 0.125 basis points on impact. The figure shows that prices are more responsive to monetary shocks in the baseline than in the counterfactual calibration with more income inequality. This is expected, given that households at the top of the income distribution spend more of their income in sectors with more sticky prices. The magnitude of the difference between the two impulse responses is small but non-negligible. Prices decline by about 10% less in the counterfactual model with high income inequality for every horizon up to 24 months.

## 6 Conclusion

It has been known since at least Engel (1857, 1895) that households with different incomes consume different goods. This paper documents two novel patterns in how consumption baskets differ: in the United States, households at the top of the income distribution consume more sticky-priced goods and face substantially lower overall inflation volatility than households in the middle of the income distribution. Since the price stickiness, the


Table 4: Cumulative inflation, relative to aggregate

	Bottom 5%	Middle 5%	Top 5 %	Top 1%
6 months	0.990	1.058	0.932	0.873
12 months	1.001	1.035	0.947	0.897
18 months	1.003	1.022	0.959	0.917
24 months	1.003	1.014	0.970	0.934
30 months	1.002	1.009	0.978	0.948
36 months	1.001	1.006	0.984	0.959

Notes: The table reports the impulse responses of the household-specific price indices  $P_t^h$  for households at the bottom, middle, and 5% of the income distribution, and for households at the top 1% of the income distribution, expressed relative to the impulse response of the aggregate price index,  $P_t$ .

volatility condition and the response of prices to monetary policy differs across goods categories, these patterns suggest distributional consequences of monetary policy shocks. Because the prices of goods consumed by the high-income households are less responsive to monetary shocks, the overall CPIs of those households will react less to those shocks. We document both empirically and quantitatively that this is indeed the case. In a FAVAR model, CPIs of the high-income households react 22-34% less to a given monetary policy shock than CPIs of middle-income households 12 months after the shock. We then set up a multi-sector, heterogeneous-household model with sticky prices, parameterizing it to the observed sectoral heterogeneity in price stickiness and household heterogeneity in consumption baskets. In the model, the CPIs of high-income households respond 13% less to a monetary shock than the CPIs of middle-income households after 12 months.

Figure 8: Response of the aggregate CPI to a monetary shock: Baseline vs. counterfactual income distribution



Notes: This figure plots the impulse responses of the aggregate price indices in the baseline calibration and in counterfactual a calibration where the top 1% of households have 50% of the national income.

## References

- Almås, Ingvild**, “International Income Inequality: Measuring PPP Bias by Estimating Engel Curves for Food,” *American Economic Review*, 2012, 102 (2), 1093–1117.
- Argente, David and Munseob Lee**, “Cost of Living Inequality during the Great Recession,” June 2015. Kilts Booth Marketing Series Paper 1-032.
- Auclert, Adrien**, “Monetary Policy and the Redistribution Channel,” May 2017. mimeo, Stanford University.
- Beraja, Martin, Andreas Fuster, Erik Hurst, and Joseph Vavra**, “Regional Heterogeneity and Monetary Policy,” August 2017. Forthcoming, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*.
- Bernanke, Ben S., Jean Boivin, and Piotr Elias**, “Measuring the Effects of Monetary Policy: A Factor-Augmented Vector Autoregressive (FAVAR) Approach,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2005, 120 (1), 387–422.
- Boivin, Jean, Marc P. Giannoni, and Ilian Mihov**, “Sticky Prices and Monetary Policy: Evidence from Disaggregated US Data,” *American Economic Review*, March 2009, 99 (1), 350–84.
- Calvo, Guillermo A.**, “Staggered Prices in a Utility-Maximizing Framework,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 1983, 12 (3), 383–398.
- Christiano, Lawrence J., Mathias Trabandt, and Karl Walentin**, “DSGE Models for Monetary Policy Analysis,” in Benjamin M. Friedman and Michael Woodford, eds., *Handbook of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 3, Elsevier, 2010, chapter 7, pp. 285–367.
- Clayton, Christopher, Xavier Jaravel, and Andreas Schaab**, “Heterogeneous Price Rigidities and Monetary Policy\*,” May 2018. Mimeo, Harvard and LSE.
- Coibion, Olivier, Yuriy Gorodnichenko, and Gee Hee Hong**, “The Cyclicalities of Sales, Regular and Effective Prices: Business Cycle and Policy Implications,” *American Economic Review*, March 2015, 105 (3), 993–1029.
- , –, **Lorenz Kueng, and John Silvia**, “Innocent Bystanders? Monetary policy and inequality,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, June 2017, 88 (Supplement C), 70 – 89.
- Cravino, Javier and Andrei A. Levchenko**, “The Distributional Consequences of Large Devaluations,” *American Economic Review*, November 2017, 107 (11), 3477–3509.

- Doepke, Matthias and Martin Schneider**, "Inflation and the Redistribution of Nominal Wealth," *Journal of Political Economy*, December 2006, 114 (6), 1069–1097.
- Engel, Ernst**, "Die Produktions- und Ernteerträge und der Getreidehandel im preussischen Staate," *Zeitschrift des Königlichen preussischen statistischen Bureaus*, 1857, 2, 249–89.
- , "Das Lebenskosten belgischer Arbeiterfamilien früher und jetzt," *Bulletin de Institut International de Statistique*, 1895, 9, 1–124.
- Jaravel, Xavier**, "The Unequal Gains from Product Innovations: Evidence from the US Retail Sector," April 2017. mimeo, LSE.
- Kaplan, Greg and Sam Schulhofer-Wohl**, "Inflation at the household level," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, November 2017, 91, 19–38.
- , **Benjamin Moll, and Giovanni L. Violante**, "Monetary Policy According to HANK," *American Economic Review*, March 2018, 108 (3), 697–743.
- Nakamura, Emi and Jón Steinsson**, "Five Facts about Prices: A Reevaluation of Menu Cost Models," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2008, 123 (4), 1415–1464.
- Williamson, Stephen**, "Monetary policy and distribution," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2008, 55 (6), 1038–1053.
- Wong, Arlene**, "Transmission of Monetary Policy to Consumption and Population Aging," April 2016. Mimeo, Princeton University.

Table A1: Income cutoffs and averages for selected quantiles of the income distribution in the CES

	Cut-offs		Median	Mean
	Lower	Upper		
Bottom 5%	-23,297	5,838	2,343	2,450
Middle 40-60%	36,504	62,808	48,828	48,969
96-99%	212,148	332,196	249,677	253,900
Top 1%	332,279	846,706	392,148	414,011

Notes: The table the range and the averages of the incomes in selected quantiles of the income distribution in the CES data.

## Appendix A Data Appendix

### A.1 Constructing percentile-level expenditure weights

#### A.1.1 Consumer Expenditure Survey

We use data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES) to obtain the expenditure weights of consumers. The CES data are collected by the Census Bureau, and cover expenditures, income, and demographic characteristics of households in the United States. The CES is the primary source of data for constructing the weights for the US Consumer Price Index.

The CES contains two modules, the Diary and the Interview. The Diary is designed to measure expenditures on daily items, such as groceries, personal products, and other frequent purchases. The Interview is designed to measure large or durable expenditures, such as major appliances, vehicles, and other large infrequent purchases. The Diary records household spending for two consecutive survey reference weeks, while the Interview records purchases over the previous three months.

For each survey, we make use of expenditure, income, and characteristics files in computing expenditure weights. In the expenditure files, the CES collects household expenditures on about 600 Universal Classification Code (UCC) categories. Questions such as “How much did you spend on babysitting in the last quarter” are asked in the survey and the corresponding responses are saved in *UCC 340210 babysitting and child care*. Overall, there are questions on about 350 UCC categories in the Interview module, and on 250 UCCs in the Diary module. Income files record detailed information on household monthly income from different sources, such as wages and salaries, or interest and dividends. Characteristics files record demographic characteristics data for each member of the household, such as education, gender, race, etc. Income variables, which contain annual values for the 12 months prior to the interview month, are also included in the characteristics files.

Diary and Interview modules survey different households each year, so a household in the Diary will not appear in the Interview and vice versa. Thus we could never observe the full consumption profiles of an actual household and we could not compute expenditure shares for an actual household. Rather, we aggregate households into percentiles and work with the percentile-level household expenditure shares.

#### A.1.2 Constructing the concordance

The in-scope expenditures for CPI could be divided into 8 major groups, 70 expenditure classes, 211 item strata (item level) and 303 entry level items (ELI). CPI uses the item strata -- e.g. *SEFT04 Spices, seasonings, condiments, sauces* -- as the elementary level of its expenditure weights and price index calculation. Within each item stratum, one or more substrata are defined as ELIs, which are the ultimate sample units for products. For example, there are four ELIs under item *SEFT04*: *FT041 Salt and other seasonings and spices*, *FT042 Olives, pickles and relishes*, *FT043 Sauces and gravies* and *FT044 Other condiments*.

Using CES data to compute the item-level and ELI-level expenditure weights from

CES, we need a concordance between the UCC categories, item strata codes and the ELIs. The concordance is constructed by following the BLS document “*CPI requirements for CE*” Appendix B. The CES collects household expenditures on about 600 Universal Classification Code (UCC) categories, which could be concorded to 303 ELIs. To combine the expenditure weights with the frequency of price adjustment data from [Nakamura and Steinsson \(2008\)](#), we look at a subsample of 265 ELIs. And we could further aggregate the 265 ELIs to 178 item strata.

### A.1.3 Compiling the expenditure, income, and characteristics files

To obtain the expenditure shares at the detailed product category level for households at different percentiles of the income distribution, we take the following steps.

In the first step, we put together the quarterly expenditure, income, and characteristics files from the Interview survey. With the compiled interview data, for each household, we could observe its interviewed month and year, monthly expenditures on the UCC categories in the previous three months as well as annual income for the 12 months prior to the interview. One thing to note is that respondents are asked to report expenditures made since the first of the three months prior to the interview month. For example, if a household is interviewed in February of 2015, they are reporting expenditures for November and December of 2014, and January of 2015. Thus, to produce a 2014 annual estimate based on expenditures made in 2014 (calendar period), one needs to access five collection-quarter files, the first quarter of 2014 through the first quarter of 2015.

By the same token, we put together the expenditure, income, and characteristics files from the Diary survey. For each household in the Diary survey, we are able to observe its weekly expenditure on the detailed UCC categories and its annual income for the 12 months prior to the interview. Then we append the compiled Interview data file to the compiled Diary one to get the whole sample of UCCs.

### A.1.4 Adjusting the expenditure values

In the second step, we make several adjustments to the collected expenditures in order to meet the BLS’s requirements for the creation of CPI expenditure weights. The adjustments are made following the BLS document “*CPI Requirements of CE*”.

#### Housing

Two adjustments are made to housing categories.

- **Owners’ equivalent rent of primary residence**

UCC categories only collect the value of the house, its property taxes, real estate fees, and mortgage interests. Houses and other residential structures are capital goods and should not be considered as CPI items. Interest costs (such as mortgage interest), property taxes and most maintenance costs, are part of the cost of the capital good and are not consumption expenditures either. All of these are not useful in computing the expenditure weights for the item *Owners’ equivalent rent of primary residence*.

According to the BLS document “*How the CPI measures price change of Owners’ equivalent rent of primary residence (OER) and Rent of primary residence (Rent)*”, the expenditure weight in the CPI market basket for *Owners’ equivalent rent of primary residence (OER)* is based on the following question that the CES asks consumers who own their primary residence:

“If someone were to rent your home today, how much do you think it would rent for monthly, unfurnished and without utilities?”

CES collects the household responses to this question and saves them in the variable *RENTEQVX* in characteristics files. We construct an artificial UCC code “999999” to store the values of variable *RENTEQVX*, which provides the household expenditure on the owners’ equivalent rent of primary residence.

- **Homeowner insurance/maintenance/major appliance**

The BLS adjusts the expenditures on homeowner insurance, maintenance, and major appliances to separate the consumption components of those expenditures from the investment component. The BLS uses a factor of 0.43 to account for the consumption portion of a homeowner’s total expenditure on these housing categories. The factor is based on the likelihood that renters will purchase these types of appliances and perform these types of home maintenance and improvement. Thus, to reflect the consumption portion of a homeowner’s total expenditure on housing insurance, maintenance, and major appliances, we multiply the expenditures on the corresponding UCC categories by 0.43.

## **Medical care**

The BLS uses the National Health Expenditure (NHE) tables produced by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) to calculate the factors that redistribute the weights from private health insurance and Medicare premium to medical care services. Unfortunately, we do not have access to the underlying formulas the BLS used to calculate these factors. By way of approximation, we take the redistributing factors from the NHE *Table 20 Private Health Insurance Benefits and Net Cost; Levels, Annual Percent Change and Percent Distribution, Selected Calendar Years 1960-2015*.<sup>6</sup>

We redistribute the expenditures from private health insurance and Medicare premiums related UCC categories to health care services categories, such as nursing homes and adult day services, by using factors obtained from the table mentioned above. Note that medical reimbursements are allocated across all households to smooth the household expenditures on medical expenses. That is to say, a household may be reimbursed even during a period in which they had no medical expenses.

## **Transportation**

- **Used cars**

Expenditures on used cars and trucks should only reflect dealer value added. There-

---

<sup>6</sup>For more details see the link <https://www.cms.gov/research-statistics-data-and-systems/statistics-trends-and-reports/nationalhealthexpenddata/nhe-fact-sheet.html>

fore, the expenditure weights on used cars and trucks should be determined by spending on used cars and trucks, minus trade-in value of vehicles and other sales of consumer-owned vehicles.

CES does not provide data on trade-in values of vehicles (*UCC 450116* and *450216*) and other sales of consumer owned vehicles (*UCC 860100* and *860200*). Thus, we take the expenditure weight on used cars and trucks from the BLS released table *Relative Importance of Components in the Consumer Price Index* to recover the ratio of trade-in values and other sales of vehicles to spending on used cars and trucks, and we find the ratio is around 1/2. Thus, we reduce the spending on used cars and trucks to half to reflect only the dealer value added.

- **Gasoline**

Gasoline expenditures are not allocated into categories (regular, premium, midgrade, etc.) at collection. To distribute the total gasoline expenditures (*UCC 470111*) amongst the gasoline ELIs (*TB011 Regular Unleashed Gasoline*, *TB012 Midgrade Unleashed Gasoline* and *TB013 Premium Unleashed Gasoline*), the BLS constructed the distribution factors from expenditure habits in each primary sampling unit (PSU).

However, we don't have access to the expenditure habits of each PSU. Instead, we follow [Nakamura and Steinsson \(2008\)](#), and allocate the expenditures on gasoline to regular, premium, midgrade categories equally.

### A.1.5 Aggregating households into percentiles

In the third step, we aggregate households into percentiles. Because the Interview and the Diary survey different households, we sort the households into percentiles in two sub-steps. First, we aggregate the households in the Interview survey into percentiles based on imputed household annual income before tax, and then find the income cut-offs for each percentile. Second, we use the Interview survey income cut-offs to divide households from the Dairy survey into percentiles. In this case, each household in our data sample has been sorted into a percentile. We could get similar results by using income cutoffs from the Dairy survey to aggregate households in the Interview survey into percentiles.

The CES data start to include the imputed incomes since 2004. Before that it only publishes income data collected from households that are complete income reporters. Households are defined as complete reporters if they report one of the major sources of income, such as wages and salaries, Social Security income, or self-employment income. However, even a complete reporter might not provide information on all sources of income they indicate they received. Thus, in cases when the values of income are not reported, imputation allows them to be estimated. We sort households into percentiles based on the imputed household income before tax, which is only available since 2004. Because of this, therefore, we could only compute the percentile-level expenditure weights since 2004.

### A.1.6 Calculating the expenditure shares

In the final step, we calculate the expenditure shares at the detailed product category level for households at different income percentiles.

First, we calculate the average expenditure for each detailed UCC category for households at different income percentiles. Note that there is a distinction between survey period and expenditure reference period in the interview survey, as the CES collects household spending in the three months prior to the interview month. This distinction will affect the estimation procedure for producing household average expenditure during a calendar year. For example, households interviewed in February will report their spending for November and December of 2014 and January of 2015. Thus, to compute the average value for expenditures made on a certain UCC category during year 2015, they only contribute one month (January) of the expenditures they made during the expenditure reference period to the calculation. While households interviewed in May report their expense for February, March and April of 2015 and could contribute all their expenditures to compute the average expenditure this household made during 2015. To reflect the number of months a household can contribute to the mean value of a calendar year, we follow the BLS to create a variable called *MO\_SCOPE*. In the above example, *MO\_SCOPE*=1 for households interviewed in February and *MO\_SCOPE*=3 for households interviewed in May. There is no such distinction between the survey period and expenditure reference period in the Diary. We multiply each weekly expenditure by 13 to get a corresponding quarterly expenditure. As there is no lag between the survey period and the expenditure reference period, the number of months households in the Diary survey contribute to estimate of the mean value is 3, i.e. *MO\_SCOPE*=3. We could also interpret *MO\_SCOPE* as the number of months a household reports expenditures during a calendar year.

Following the BLS manual, we use the formula below to calculate the average expenditure for each UCC category  $k$  at each percentile  $h$ . First, for household  $i$  at percentile  $h$ , we sum over all the spending it made on good  $k$  during the calendar year. Second, we weight total expenditures made by household  $i$  in percentile  $h$  on good  $k$  up by its household-specific sampling weight. Third, we sum up the weighted household expenditures on good  $k$  over all the households at percentile  $h$ . Fourth, we divide the sum of weighted household expenditures on good  $k$  at percentile  $h$  by the sum of the weighted number of months household at percentile  $h$  reported expenditures during the calendar year, to get the monthly average income on good  $k$  of household at percentile  $h$ . Then multiplying the monthly average expenditure by 12, we get the annualized average expenditure for each UCC category  $k$  at percentile  $h$ :

$$\bar{X}_k^h = \frac{\sum_i FINLWT_i^h \cdot \sum_t C_{i,k,t}^h}{\sum_i FINLWT_i^h \cdot MO\_SCOPE_i^h} \times 12$$

where  $FINLWT_i^h$  is the sampling weight for household  $i$  at income percentile  $h$ ,  $C_{i,k,t}^h$  is the expenditure on good  $k$  of household  $i$  at income percentile  $h$  during month  $t$ , and  $MO\_SCOPE_i^h$  denotes number of months household  $i$  reports expenditures during a calendar year.

Second, we take percentile-level average expenditure for each UCC from above, and then aggregate according to the constructed concordance between UCC categories and ELIs (or Item Strata) to get percentile-level household average expenditure  $\bar{X}_j^h$  for each 265 ELIs (or 178 items) and the corresponding percentile-level expenditure share  $\omega_j^h = \frac{\bar{X}_j^h}{\sum_j \bar{X}_j^h}$ .

## A.2 Constructing income-percentile-specific CPIs

### A.2.1 Item-level consumer price data

To construct the income-percentile-specific consumer price indices (CPI), we need to combine the percentile-level expenditure share data computed above with the micro consumer price data. We obtain the consumer price data from the BLS. Each month, the BLS releases the consumer price index at all levels of aggregation. Each price index has a unique identifier called series id, CUUR0400AA0 for example. The series id can be broken down to: CU—survey abbreviation—current series, U—season code—seasonal unadjusted, R—periodicity code—monthly, 0400—area code—Western Urban and AA0—item code—all items. We use the U.S. city average, all urban consumers, seasonally adjusted item-level monthly price indices to construct the monthly income-percentile-specific CPIs.

### A.2.2 Concordance between old and new series

The revised consumer price data were introduced by the BLS in 1998, and the revision included an updated and revised item structure. For example, there were only 7 major groups of goods and services before 1997 and in 1998, a new group *Education and Communication* was created and the new group included components previously included in the *Recreation* and *Housing* groups. Here, we refer to the revised item structure as the new series and to the pre-revised item structure as the old series. Micro consumer price data are provided in the old series before 1997, and in new series since 1997.

To combine the item-level consumer price data from the old series with the expenditure share data, we manually construct a concordance from the new series to the old series at the item level. Note that there are some new series items that are more aggregated than the old ones, and in these cases one item in the new series is concorded to multiple items in old series. To deal with it, we construct a concordance weight by using the expenditure weight taken from the BLS table *Relative Importance of Components in the Consumer Price Index*. One example is as follows. Item *SEFF01 Chicken* in the new series is concorded to *SE0601 Fresh whole chicken* and *SE0602 Fresh/Frozen chicken parts* in the old series. We find that the average expenditure during years 1987 to 1989 on the two items are 0.152% and 0.220% respectively, and thus we assign the concordance weights based on their relative expenditure weights on the two items. The 265 new series items are concorded to 165 old series ones.

item code (new)	item name (new)	item code (old)	item name (old)	exp weight	concordance weight
SEFF01	CHICKEN	SE0601	FRESH WHOLE CHICKEN	0.152	0.409
SEFF01	CHICKEN	SE0602	FRESH/FROZEN CHICKEN PARTS	0.220	0.591

### A.2.3 Aggregation formula

We follow the BLS manual “*Chapter 17. The Consumer Price Index*” in constructing the income-percentile-specific CPI. The formula can be written as follows:

$$PIX_t^h = PIX_v^h \cdot \sum_{j \in J} (\omega_{j,\beta}^h \times \frac{P_{j,t}}{P_{j,v}}),$$

where:

$PIX_t^h$  = consumer price index for household at percentile  $h$  at time  $t$

$v$  = pivot year and month, usually December, prior to the month when expenditure weights from reference period ( $\beta$ ) are first used in the CPI

$\beta$  = predetermined expenditure reference period

$P_{j,t}$  = price of item  $j$  at time  $t$

$\omega_{j,\beta}^h$  = expenditure weights of household at percentile  $h$  on item  $j$  during the predetermined expenditure reference period  $\beta$ .

The BLS periodically updates its expenditure weight reference period. Historically, it updated approximately every ten years, and since 2002, it adopted a biennial rotation schedule to update the expenditure weight reference period. We follow the BLS expenditure reference period schedule after 2004, and prior to that, we use the 2004 percentile-level expenditure weights to construct the income-percentile-specific CPI. As mentioned in A.1.5, this is due to the availability of the imputed household income before tax. We have computed the pre-2004 aggregate CPI by taking the official expenditure weights from BLS table *Relative Importance of Components in the Consumer Price Index* for the pre-2004 expenditure reference period. And comparing it with the aggregate CPI constructed by using 2004 aggregate weights, we find the two CPI series are almost identical.

Due to the revision of item structure in 1998, we have to construct the income-percentile-specific CPI separately in two periods. We use old series item-level micro price data to compute the income-percentile-specific CPI for the period 1978m1-1997m12 and new series price data for the post-1998 period. In the year 1997, the BLS released item-level micro prices in both old and new series, which allows us to bridge the two periods by using one of the months in 1997 as the pivot month (based period) for the second period. We used both the old and new series micro price data to construct the aggregate CPIs in 1997 and found that they give us similar results in (log) price terms. We choose 1997m12 as the first pivot month for the construction of the post-1998 income-percentile-specific CPIs.

Table A2: Reference periods

pivot month ( $v$ )	reference period ( $\beta$ )	PIX ( $t$ )
1978M1	2004	1978-1997(Old series)
1997M12	2004	1998-2005(New series)
2005M12	2004-2005	2006-2007(New series)
2007M12	2006-2009	2008-2009(New series)
⋮	⋮	⋮
2015M12	2012-2015	2016-2017(New series)

Notes: This table lists the reference periods used to construct the CPI.