Economic Literacy and Inflation Expectations: Evidence from an Economic Experiment

Mary A. Burke¹ Michael Manz²

¹Federal Reserve Bank of Boston Research Department

> ²Swiss National Bank Research Department

November 18, 2010



Disclaimer: I do not speak for:



Eric Rosengren, President of Boston Fed



Ben Bernanke, Chairman of Federal Reserve

What drives variation in inflation expectations?

- Proximate factors
 - Demographic and socioeconomic factors
 - Bryan & Venkatu (2001), Pfajfar & Santoro (2008)
 - Economic/financial literacy
 - Bruine de Bruin et al. (2010)
- Causal factors in expectation-formation
 - Reliance on different information
 - · Personal experience vs. macro conditions
 - Differential use of same information
 - Sticky information (Mankiw and Reis 2002)
 - Different priors, learning rules (Giannitsarou 2003)

Goals of experiment

- Relate IE formation to economic literacy and demographics
 - · How much and why do these factors matter?
- Method: elicit prior beliefs/practices in incentivized setting
 - What information is relevant?
 - How does given data influence forecasts?
 - Analyze variation in revealed behaviors
- Access diverse subject pool
 - Experiments conducted at Harvard Decision Sciences Lab
 - 137 subjects, not just Harvard students
 - Initial run at Roxbury Community College served as test

Need for new experimental approach

- Limitations of surveys
 - Weak Incentives
 - Can't manipulate real-world conditions
 - Must rely on introspection to reveal info use
- Previous experiments have different focus
 - Can group learn to play REE in lab?
 - Pfajfar & Zakelj (2009), Adam (2007)
 - Data chosen for subjects, not by subjects
 - Did not measure economic literacy

Key findings

- Some demographic variation, but not as much as expected
 - · Women do not systematically predict higher inflation
 - Income not an important factor for most outcomes
 - Effects of age and race not very robust
- Economic literacy matters; adds explanatory power
 - Reduces positive inflation bias
 - Improves accuracy
 - Affects both selection and use of information
 - Dominates general educational attainment
 - Effects non-linear: driven by weakness at low end
- Variation in information selection an important factor

Contents of Experiment

- Questions about U.S. inflation
 - Past 5 years' average rate
 - Forecasts for 1- and 5-years-ahead
- Forecasting exercises in simulated economy
- Free-response questions about forecasting behavior
- Economic/financial literacy questions
- Demographic questionnaire

Design of forecasting exercises

- Series of exercises involving simulated time-series data (within-subjects design)
 - Use data to forecast inflation (1 or 5 years ahead)
 - Each exercise involves a new scenario
- Endogenous information exercises
 - Subjects select info "sources" from list
 - Up to 3 sources from list of 7
 - Each source shows 3 recent data points in a series
- Exogenous information exercises
 - All subjects see same information
- Ordering issues and other design features
 - · Endogenous exercises first to avoid bias in info choice
 - Time horizon: 1-year exercises, then 5-year; or vice-versa
 - Info sources: order randomized between subjects
 - Data overlap between 1-year and 5-year exercises













Years in the fictional economy.

Payoffs, learning, and motivation

- Subjects did not see answers or payoff from individual exercises
 - Prevents learning about model
 - Yields multiple data points per individual, knowledge constant
- To maintain motivation:
 - Cumulative payoffs revealed at several junctures
 - Payoff within an exercise was potentially high
 - Total payoff = average payoff across exercises
 - Payoff per exercise truncated at zero

Instructions for forecasting exercises

Payoffs per exercise: Your payoff per exercise will be between \$0 and \$45. The closer your forecast is to future inflation in the fictional economy (determined by the model), the more you will earn.

Keep in mind:

- If your forecast is exactly right, you get \$45 for that exercise.

- If your forecast is 3 or more percentage points too high or too low, your payoff is \$0.

- In between, you earn 15 cents (\$0.15) more for every 0.01 percentage points you get closer to the correct forecast.

The table below shows some examples.

Difference between your forecast and actual future inflation (in percentage points)	Your payoff
0.00	\$45.00
+1.00 or -1.00	\$30.00
+1.50 or -1.50	\$22.50
+2.00 or -2.00	\$15.00
+2.50 or -2.50	\$7.50
+3.00 or +3.00	\$0.00
+10.00 or -10.00	\$0.00



Model and data generation

- Reduced version of Boston Fed macro forecasting model
 - VAR on inflation, unemployment gap, output gap, real oil price, Fed Funds rate
 - Parameters estimated on U.S. for 1966-2006
- To generate simulated time series:
 - Select shocks randomly from residuals (1984–2006)
 - Select from simulated time series for desired properties (transform quarterly data to annual)
- "Correct" forecast = model-based forecast

"Decoy" data from outside model

- Milk price inflation
 - historical CPI (whole milk), 1966–2006
- Population growth rates from U.S. history
- Matched to other data randomly
 - s.t. constraints on correlations with inflation
- Model-based rank of given sources based on predictive power
 - recent inflation
 - unemployment
 - oil price inflation
 - Fed Funds rate
 - earlier inflation

Economic/financial literacy quiz

- Questions (total of 16) deal with
 - Inflation
 - Monetary policy
 - Interest on savings
 - General numeracy
 - Based on van Rooij et al. (2007), NY Fed instrument, other sources
- High item-rest correlations, good reliability
 - Cronbach's α = .74
 - Factor analysis supports single latent factor

Sample literacy questions

Questionnaire on economic and financial literacy

		Question	% correct
1.	The rat	te of inflation in an economy is best described as the rate of increase in the	65.7%
		overall price level of goods and services.	
		overall level of money wages.	
		the long term interest rate.	
		value of money.	
2.	A prim	ary purpose of monetary policy today is to	84.7%
		Stabilize the price level of goods and services.	
		Stabilize the price of corporate stocks.	
		Keep interest rates low and steady.	
		Reduce national debt.	
3.	Which	of the following is a tool of monetary policy?	51.8%
		Raising and lowering income taxes.	
		Increasing and decreasing unemployment benefits.	
		Buying and selling government securities.	
		Increasing and decreasing government spending.	
4.	Which	of the following measures is most likely to lead to lower inflation?	39.4%
		Raising the short-term interest rate.	
		Lowering the short-term interest rate.	
		Lowering income taxes.	
		Raising the level of government spending.	

Sample Characteristics $N=137$			
Age	28.533		
Female	0.610		
White	0.599		
Black	0.109		
Hispanic	0.022		
Asian	0.139		
Other Race	0.044		
Multiracial	0.088		
Not US-Born	0.175		
Economics Course	0.533		
Income \leq \$39,999	0.453		
Income $\overline{\$40,000} - \$79,999$	0.190		
Income \$80,000 - \$149,999	0.190		
Income \geq \$150,000	0.153		
HS Diploma	0.066		
Some College	0.394		
Bachelor's Deg.	0.387		
Advanced Deg.	0.153		
Mother HS Diploma	0.153		
Mother Some College	0.080		
Mother Bachelor's Deg.	0.343		
Mother Advanced Deg.	0.336		

Literacy Score Statistics				
Mean	0.663			
Std. Deviation	0.188			
Median	0.690			
Minimum	0.130			
Maximum	1.000			
Cronbach's α	0.740			

Demographic variation in economic literacy

Literacy Scores			
Female	-0.078**	-0.065**	
	(0.033)	(0.031)	
Age	-0.002	-0.002	
0	(0.002)	(0.002)	
Some College	0.141**	0.138**	
	(0.070)	(0.065)	
Bachelor's	0.172**	0.137**	
	(0.069)	(0.065)	
Advanced Degree	0.262***	0.238^{***}	
	(0.082)	(0.077)	
Black	-0.106^{**}	-0.105^{**}	
	(0.051)	(0.048)	
Hispanic	-0.008	0.074	
	(0.108)	(0.102)	
Asian	0.005	-0.006	
	(0.054)	(0.050)	
Multiracial	0.008	-0.007	
	(0.056)	(0.053)	
Other Race	-0.155^{*}	-0.117	
	(0.079)	(0.074)	
Not US-Born	0.060	0.061	
	(0.047)	(0.043)	
Income \$40,000-\$79,999	0.019	-0.005	
	(0.043)	(0.040)	
Income \$80,000-\$149,999	0.013	-0.015	
	(0.045)	(0.043)	
$Income \ge $150,000$	0.021	0.010	
	(0.047)	(0.044)	
Economics Course		0.139^{***}	
		(0.031)	
Constant	0.572^{***}	0.505^{***}	
	(0.087)	(0.082)	
R Squared	.240	.351	
N	136	136	

Analysis of within-subject mean outcomes

	Mean Error	Mean Error	% Overestimated	% Overestimated	Mean Abs. Error	Mean Abs. Error
Literacy Score		-11.954***		-1.001***		-8.407***
		(3.151)		(0.379)		(1.814)
Lit. Score Squared		8.444***		0.618**		5.217***
*		(2.256)		(0.281)		(1.287)
Age 32 and over	0.593^{*}	0.080	0.057	0.006	0.676^{***}	0.250
0	(0.325)	(0.295)	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.208)	(0.159)
Female	0.102	0.037	0.007	-0.008	0.097	-0.027
	(0.193)	(0.177)	(0.025)	(0.023)	(0.127)	(0.101)
Not US-born	0.286	0.391*	-0.000	0.016	0.047	0.176
	(0.232)	(0.221)	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.179)	(0.154)
Hispanic	1.100	1.143	0.139	0.141	1.971	1.991**
	(1.703)	(1.637)	(0.126)	(0.115)	(1.195)	(0.983)
Some College	0.510	0.859	0.103*	0.143**	0.241	0.573**
-	(0.507)	(0.549)	(0.059)	(0.060)	(0.343)	(0.262)
Bachelor's Deg.	0.468	0.760	0.131	0.161**	0.114	0.362
	(0.610)	(0.582)	(0.081)	(0.071)	(0.438)	(0.283)
Advanced Deg.	-0.010	0.751	0.070	0.159^{**}	-0.380	0.361
	(0.531)	(0.574)	(0.059)	(0.064)	(0.369)	(0.277)
Black	0.747^{**}	0.371	0.043	0.001	0.528^{**}	0.182
	(0.299)	(0.243)	(0.045)	(0.038)	(0.263)	(0.190)
Asian	0.178	0.252	0.073**	0.079^{***}	0.218	0.264^{**}
	(0.172)	(0.157)	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.134)	(0.124)
Other Race	0.449	0.322	0.107	0.081	0.226	0.008
	(0.519)	(0.388)	(0.070)	(0.059)	(0.459)	(0.303)
Multiracial	-0.103	-0.137	0.011	0.011	-0.139	-0.140
	(0.274)	(0.256)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.162)	(0.127)
	(0.236)	(0.219)	(0.032)	(0.029)	(0.177)	(0.161)
Constant	-0.123	3.576^{***}	0.141^{**}	0.483^{***}	1.680^{***}	4.542^{***}
	(0.510)	(1.243)	(0.059)	(0.137)	(0.342)	(0.606)
R Squared	0.133	0.280	0.152	0.261	0.345	0.570
N	135	135	135	135	135	135









Performance on exogenous vs. endogenous exercises

Mean Absolute Errors		
	Exogenous Exercises	Endogenous Exercises
Literacy Score	-9.492***	-13.278***
U U	(1.953)	(3.088)
Lit. Score Squared	5.970***	8.281***
	(1.523)	(2.408)
Female	0.129	-0.240
	(0.136)	(0.215)
Age 22-24	0.073	0.042
	(0.228)	(0.361)
Age 25-31	-0.102	0.323
	(0.252)	(0.398)
Age 32 and over	0.077	0.537
-	(0.237)	(0.375)
Some College	0.806***	0.916**
-	(0.292)	(0.462)
Bachelor's Deg.	0.423	0.635
	(0.311)	(0.491)
Advanced Deg.	0.625*	0.592
	(0.355)	(0.562)
Black	0.042	0.704**
	(0.215)	(0.341)
Hispanic	1.480***	2.589***
	(0.423)	(0.669)
Asian	0.234	0.655^{*}
	(0.211)	(0.333)
Multiracial	-0.074	-0.253
	(0.228)	(0.361)
Other Race	-0.241	0.086
	(0.318)	(0.502)
Not US-born	0.236	0.382
	(0.184)	(0.291)
Constant	4.887***	5.774***
	(0.649)	(1.026)
R Squared	0.444	0.458
N	135	135

Subject Ranking of Information Sources

(average choice rates; sum = 3)



Standard deviation of choice rates

Information source	σ of choice rate
Current/recent inflation	.26
Unemployment	.24
Fed Funds rate	.27
Earlier inflation	.32
Milk price inflation	.30
Oil price inflation	.27
Population growth rate	.14

Variation in selection-rate of "recent inflation"

Picked Inflation			
Literacy Score		3.123***	
		(0.503)	
Lit Score Squared		-2.113***	
		(0.393)	
Age 22–24	-0.189^{***}	-0.134**	
	(0.070)	(0.059)	
Age 25–31	-0.290***	-0.195^{***}	
	(0.077)	(0.065)	
Age 32 and over	-0.362^{***}	-0.212^{***}	
	(0.069)	(0.061)	
Female	-0.047	-0.016	
	(0.041)	(0.035)	
Not US-born	0.013	-0.020	
	(0.057)	(0.047)	
Some College	0.035	-0.077	
	(0.085)	(0.073)	
Bachelor's Deg.	0.236^{***}	0.081	
	(0.089)	(0.077)	
Advanced Deg.	0.298^{***}	0.058	
	(0.099)	(0.089)	
Hispanic	-0.418^{***}	-0.428^{***}	
	(0.131)	(0.109)	
Black	-0.134^{**}	-0.024	
	(0.063)	(0.054)	
Asian	-0.094	-0.114^{**}	
	(0.065)	(0.054)	
Multiracial	0.072	0.081	
	(0.071)	(0.059)	
Other Race	-0.151	-0.097	
	(0.097)	(0.082)	
Constant	0.878^{***}	-0.123	
	(0.091)	(0.165)	
R Squared	0.420	0.606	
N	136	136	

Summary and implications

- More economically literate subjects make better forecasts
 - Select more-relevant information
 - Make better use of given information
 - · Results driven by poor performance of bottom quartile
 - Modest educational interventions may be worthwhile
- Demographic variation
 - Few observed effects
 - Most effects explained by economic literacy
- Lower variance of accuracy in exogenous exercises
 - Directing subjects to relevant info helps
 - Info selection may drive large share of variation in consumers' IE



1-Year Ahead Inflation



5-Year Ahead Inflation

