Aggregation in the Presence of Demand and Supply Shocks

Emi Nakamura *

Harvard University

July 11, 2004

Preliminary and Incomplete

Comments welcome

Abstract

This paper points out that the real GDP statisics respond differently to sector-specific demand and supply shocks for the *exactly* same changes in physical quantities. The paper illustrates how this property arises from the theoretical quantity aggregates that real GDP is designed to approximate. The paper also presents an application to US data suggesting that these factors have contributed significantly to the behavior of US aggregate investment growth in the post-WWII period.

Keywords: macroeconomic growth, index number theory.

JEL Classifications: C43, O47, E23.

*I would like to thank W. Erwin Diewert for extremely helpful and inspiring comments on this paper. I would also like to thank Susanto Basu, Dan Benjamin, N.G. Mankiw, Robert Parker, Marc Prud'homme, Ricardo Reis, Julio Rotemberg, Michael Woodford, Jesse Shapiro, Assaf Ben Shoham, Martin Weitzman, seminar participants at Harvard University and Statistics Canada, and particularly Alice Nakamura and Jon Steinsson for helpful discussions and comments. I would like to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) for financial support. Contact information: Department of Economics, Harvard University, Littauer Center, Cambridge MA 02138. E-mail: nakamura@fas.harvard.edu. Homepage: http://www.harvard.edu/˜ nakamura.

1 Introduction

At an abstract level, macroeconomists have often interpreted real GDP as a measure of the *physical quantity* of output. For example, in a classic paper, Robert Solow (1957) notes that aggregate output is denominated in "physical" units. Yet, actual real GDP statistics have certain features that measures of “physical quantity” typically do not. In particular, the “quantity” concept seems to imply that a given change in disaggregated quantities would always have the *same* effect on real GDP. This is not, however, the case for current measures of US real GDP statistics.

First, real GDP statistics respond differently to demand and supply shocks for exactly the same change in physical quantities. To make things concrete, consider the following simple example. Suppose the economy produces only apples and oranges. There are two periods, and in the second period, either a demand shock– such as an increase in people’s taste for apples– or a supply shock– such as an improvement in apple-making technology– occurs. Let’s assume, furthermore, that both shocks lead to *exactly the same* changes in the numbers of apples and oranges produced. The demand shock, however, leads to an increase in the relative price of apples while the supply shock leads to a decrease in the relative price of apples. (Think of the standard Economics 101 diagram of downward sloping demand curves and upward sloping supply curve.) Since empirical quantity indexes such as real GDP use prices to weight quantites, the demand shock leads to a greater increase in real GDP for exactly the same change in disaggregated quantities. (See Section 3 for the details of this argument.)

Second, real GDP statistics respond differently to a given quantity increase depending on the *initial* level of production of that good. Once again, this effect works through the role of prices in empirical quantity indexes. The nature of the non-linearity depends on the source of the quantity increase. For the apple-orange economy above, the tenth apple contributes *more* to real GDP than the second apple in the demand shock case. In the supply shock case, however, the tenth apple contributes *less* to real GDP than the second apple. In contrast, the "quantity" of shoes in one’s closet always increases by the same amount in response to an additional pair– regardless of how many shoes one already owns.

One might refer to the property that the growth rate of an empirical quantity index depends only on the size of changes in physical quantities as a “quantity axiom”. Real GDP does not have this property, as I discuss above. This paper investigates the theoretical foundations for this feature of real GDP statistics. These issues have not previously been investigated in the index number theory literature because this literature typically views price changes as exogenous from the consumer's perspective. This framework implicitly assumes that relative price changes arise from supply shocks. Yet, allowing for *both* demand and supply shocks in a model of the economy has important implications for both the interpretation and properties of empirical quantity indexes.

The paper also presents an empirical application to US data on aggregate investment. The analysis shows that the factors described above have played an important role in the pattern of US investment growth in the post-WWII period. In this sense, analyses of growth statistics that focus only on the behavior of disaggregated quantities are incomplete.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides a motivating example for the analysis that follows. Section 3 presents the theoretical approaches to aggregation and demonstrates the violation of the "quantity" axiom described above. Section 4 presents the application to US aggregate investment data. Section 5 concludes.

2 A First Example

It is useful to first look directly at the formulas for empirical quantity indexes. For simplicity, let's consider a simple two-period example. Suppose the economy produces only apples and oranges and there is endogenous labor supply. Assume that the demand curves for apples and oranges are downward sloping and the supply curves are upward sloping all else constant.

Either a demand or a supply shock occurs in the second period. The demand shock increases people's taste for apples, while the supply shock improves the farmers' efficiency at growing apples. As in the introduction, let's assume that both shocks lead to *exactly the same* changes in the numbers of apples and oranges produced. However, the demand shock increases the relative price of apples resulting in a high weight on apples in the quantity index. In contrast, the supply shock lowers the relative price of apples, reducing the weight on apples.

Now let us consider the effect of these shocks on real GDP statistics. The well-known Laspeyres quantity index defined,

$$Q_L = \frac{p_0 q_1}{p_0 q_0}, \tag{1}$$

where p_t is a vector of period t prices and q_t is a vector of period t quantities. Notice that the Laspeyres quantity index uses period 0 price weights to aggregate quantities.[1] Similarly, the Paasche index is defined,

$$Q_P = \frac{p_1 q_1}{p_1 q_0}, \tag{2}$$

where the only difference is that the quantities are weighted by period 1 rather than period 0 prices. The US BEA currently uses the Fisher quantity index Q_F to measure real GDP, where this index is defined as the geometric mean of the Laspeyres and Paasche quantity indexes,

$$Q_F = (Q_L Q_P)^{0.5}. \tag{3}$$

The Laspeyres index depends on only period 0 prices, implying that Q_L is identical in the demand and supply shock scenarios since the quantity change is assumed to be identical in the two scenarios. In contrast, the Paasche index Q_P depends on period 1 prices, which react differently in the demand shock versus the supply shock scenario. Since the number of apples increases more than the number of oranges, the demand shock implies a higher weight on the more rapidly growing commodity– apples. Thus, Q_F increases more following the demand shock than the supply shock.[2]

Furthermore, the formula for Q_F implies that if subsequent supply shocks yield further declines in apple prices, then increases in apple production contribute non-linearly to Q_F since the weight on apples in Q_F is higher for the initial increases in production than for subsequent increases. The nonlinearity is reversed in the demand shock case since further demand shocks yield further *increases* in apple prices. Thus, the weight on apples in Q_F is lower for the initial increases in production than for subsequent increases.

3 Aggregation Theory

The main approach to motivating quantity aggregates in the theoretical macroeconomics literature is to assume that utility depends on a linearly homogenous consumption aggregate.

[1] To a macroeconomist, it may seem a little strange to define the quantity index directly, rather than deflating nominal GDP by a price index to compute real GDP, but since we are interested in the properties of real GDP, it is simpler to deal with the formulae for the quantity indexes directly, rather than viewing real GDP as deflated nominal GDP. A little algebra shows that dividing nominal GDP by a Laspeyres price index gives a Paasche quantity index (defined below); dividing nominal GDP by a Paasche price index gives a Laspeyres quantity index; dividing nominal GDP by a Fisher price index gives a Fisher quantity index. See Diewert and Nakamura (2002b) for a derivation of these results.

[2] I am envisioning an economy with endogenous labor supply so the number of both apples and oranges can be increased by increasing labor (and decreasing leisure). See the numerical example below.

For example, it is often assumed that utility depends on the Dixit-Stiglitz consumption index,

$$C(q_t) = \left[\int_0^1 q_t(j)^{\frac{\theta-1}{\theta}} dj \right]^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}, \tag{4}$$

where $q_t(j)$ is output of good j, and θ is a parameter destermining the substitutability of the consumption goods.

Suppose the household's utility $u(C)$ depends on a consumption aggregate C, where C is a linearly homogenous, concave function of the quantities consumed q_t. The household's expenditure minimization problem can then be written,

$$E(C_t, p_t) = \min_{q_t} \{p_t.q_t : C(q_t) \geq C_t\}, \tag{5}$$

where p_t is the vector of period t prices. The homotheticity assumption implies that,

$$q_t = C_t f(p_t), \tag{6}$$

where q_t is the vector of consumption goods. In other words, the household's consumption is simply a scaled up version of its consumption for $C_t = 1$. Thus, a natural choice for the consumption aggregate is

$$Q_D^* = \frac{C_{t+1}}{C_t}. \tag{7}$$

We can now use properties of the expenditure function to derive a well-known relationship between Q_D^* and observable prices and quantities. The expression (6) and the definition of the expenditure function imply that the expenditure function is separable in prices,

$$E(C_t, p_t) = C_t e(p_t), \tag{8}$$

where $e(p_t)$ is the expenditure for $C_t = 1$ at a given level of prices. The concavity of the expenditure function implies,

$$\begin{aligned} E(C_1, p_0) &\leq E(C_1, p_1) + \nabla_p E(C_1, p_1)(p_0 - p_1) && (9) \\ &= E(C_1, p_1) + q_1(p_0 - p_1) && (10) \\ &= p_0 q_1, && (11) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the envelope theorem. Dividing expression (11) by $E(C_0, p_0)$ and using the definition $E(C_0, p_0) = p_0 q_0$ we have,

$$\frac{p_0 q_1}{p_0 q_0} \geq \frac{E(C_1, p_0)}{E(C_0, p_0)} \tag{12}$$

$$= \frac{C_1 e(p_0)}{C_0 e(p_0)} \quad (13)$$

$$= \frac{C_1}{C_0}, \quad (14)$$

where the third line follows from the separability of the expenditure function in prices (8).

This expression can be rewritten using the definition of the demand-side aggregator Q_D^* as,

$$Q_L \geq Q_D^*, \quad (15)$$

where Q_L is the well-known Laspeyres quantity index defined above. A very similar line of reasoning shows that,

$$Q_P \leq Q_D^*, \quad (16)$$

where Q_P is the Paasche index defined above. Combining the two inequalities (15) and (16), we have the expression,

$$Q_L \geq Q_D^* \geq Q_P. \quad (17)$$

Expression (15) is the economic justification for the idea that there is an upward bias in the fixed-weighted Laspeyres measure of real GDP relative to the theoretical ideal. Thus, the discrepency between Q_L and Q_S^* is often referred to as "consumer substitution bias".

These result can be extended directly to the case of the aggregate investment component of real GDP under the assumption that the firm's production function, $G(L_t, K_t)$ depends on a capital aggregate K_t and $K_{t+1} = K_t(1 - \delta) + I_t$, where I_t is a linearly homogenous investment aggregate and δ is the depreciation rate. Notice that this is a rather unusual assumption on the form of the capital aggregate. Although the term "consumer substitution bias" is often used to describe discrepencies among alternative measures of real GDP as a whole, it is perhaps more appropriate to refer to thie discrepancy as "final demander substitution bias" for aggregate investment since in this case, the firm is the "final demander" of investment goods.

An important feature of the consumer substitution bias result is that relative price changes are taken as given. In this sense, the standard index number theory arguments proceed in a partial equilibrium framework. The theoretical macroeconomics literature also often abstracts from the issue of relative price change, and thus does not generally allow for factors generating fluctuations in relative prices and quantities. Let us now consider how the analysis of index numbers changes in a general equilibrium framework.

For simplicity, let us make the following assumptions about the supply side of the economy. Suppose that the production possibilities set for the economy can be represented as,

$$S_t = \{(y, x) : g(y) = f(x)\}, \tag{18}$$

where y is a vector of outputs and x is a vector of inputs. Let us assume, furthermore, that $g(y)$ is a linearly homogenous, convex function of the output vector y.[3] The convexity of $g(y)$ is an implication of the classical condition of increasing marginal rates of substitution between products, as discussed in Hicks (1946) pg. 87.

The firm's profit maximization problem can then be solved in two stages: in the first stage, the firm chooses revenue-maximizing output ratios given a particular level of $g(y)$; and in the second stage, the firm chooses a level of aggregate output. The problem of optimal factor demands can then be solved entirely separately from the problem of choosing output ratios by minimizing costs subject to the constraint $g(y) = f(x)$.

For a particular level of $g(y)$, the firm's optimization problem can be written,

$$R(p_t, g(y_t)) = \max_{y} \{p.y_t : g(y_t) = f(x_t)\}. \tag{19}$$

The resulting optimal outputs can be written,

$$y_t = g(y_t)h(p_t), \tag{20}$$

where h is a function of prices alone. In other words, the outputs at any given price vector are simply a scaled up version of outputs for the case where $g(y_t) = 1$. This expression is a direct analogy to the expression for consumption goods (6). In the case of the firm's outputs, the scaling property follows from the linear homogeneity of $g(y_t)$. Given this set-up, a natural concept for the theoretical output index Q_S^* is the ratio,

$$Q_S^* = \frac{g(y_1)}{g(y_0)}. \tag{21}$$

Moreover, the scaling property implies that the revenue function can be written,

$$R(p, g(y)) = r(p)g(y), \tag{22}$$

where $r(p_t)$ is the revenue function for $g(y_t) = 1$.

[3]These assumptions on technology provide a simple justification for the existence of theoretical output aggregate, as I discuss below.

Applying Shephard's lemma to this expression for the revenue function implies that,

$$y_t = g(y_t)\nabla r(p_t). \tag{23}$$

Furthermore, if we assume that the households minimize expenditure as descibed by equation (5), then consumption may be written,

$$c_t = C(y_t)\nabla e(p_t), \tag{24}$$

from Roy's identity. For simplicity, we assume that all output is consumed. Equilibrium in the goods market then requires,

$$g(y_t)\nabla r(p_t) = C(y_t)\nabla e(p_t). \tag{25}$$

Since the level of p_t is indeterminate without some further assumption, let us normalize the level of prices to, $p_t(1) = 1$. This system of $N + 1$ equations determines p_t and $C(y_t)$, given a pre-determined level of $f(x_t)$. We can also differentiate between aggregate and sector-specific shocks by writing, $r_t = A_t\tilde{r}(p_t)$ and $e_t = B_t\tilde{e}(p_t)$, where variation in A_t or B_t represent aggregate supply and demand shocks respectively, while shifts in $\tilde{r}_t$ or $\tilde{e}_t$ reflect sector-specific shocks. We can then rewrite the equilibrium condition as,

$$g(y_t)A_t\nabla\tilde{r}(p_t) = C(y_t)B_t\nabla\tilde{e}(p_t). \tag{26}$$

This vector equality implies that for any two goods j and k,

$$\frac{d\tilde{r}(p_t)/dp_t(j)}{d\tilde{r}(p_t)/dp_t(k)} = \frac{d\tilde{e}(p_t)/dp_t(j)}{d\tilde{e}(p_t)/dp_t(k)}. \tag{27}$$

This system of equations and the normalization $p_t(1) = 1$ can be solved for the vector of prices p_t. Moreover, the expressions (6) and (20) show that relative quantities depend only on prices. The punchline of this analysis is that if the revenue and expenditure functions R and E are stable over time, or if they vary only according to the multiplacative constants A_t and B_t then *relative prices and quantities are fixed in this economy.* Relative price and quantity changes *only* occur when either $\tilde{r}(p_t)$ or $\tilde{e}(p_t)$ shifts, or when the linear homogeneity assumptions on either the demand or supply side of the economy fail.

The standard index number theory framework assumes that preferences are stable i.e. $E_t = E$ for all t. However, relative prices and quantities are assumed to vary over time– indeed, it is this variation that makes the index number problem interesting. The implicit assumption in the literature is, thus, that variation in relative prices is caused by sector-specific supply shocks– shifts in $\tilde{r}_t$– or non-homotheticity on the supply side of the economy.

Let us now consider how the standard index number theory results change if relative price and quantity fluctuations are assumed to arise from demand rather than supply shocks. The argument is very similar to that for the supply shock case excpt that we are now dealing with a *convex* revenue function rather than a *concave* expenditure function. By the convexity of the revenue function,

$$R(p_0, f(x_1)) \geq R(p_1, f(x_1)) + \nabla_p R(p_1, f(x_1))(p_0 - p_1) \tag{28}$$

$$= R(p_1, f(x_1)) + y_1(p_0 - p_1) \tag{29}$$

$$= p_0 y_1, \tag{30}$$

where the second equality follows from the envelope theorem. Dividing expression (30) by $R(p_0, f(x_0))$ and using the separability assumption (22) we have the inequality,

$$\frac{p_0 q_1}{p_0 q_0} \leq \frac{R(p_0, f(x_1))}{R(p_0, f(x_0))} \tag{31}$$

$$= \frac{g(y_1) r(p_0)}{g(y_0) r(p_0)} \tag{32}$$

$$= \frac{g(y_1)}{g(y_0)}. \tag{33}$$

This expression can be rewritten simply as,

$$Q_L \leq Q_S^*, \tag{34}$$

where Q_L is the Laspeyres quantity index defined in Section 2. A very similar line of reasoning shows that,

$$Q_P \geq Q_S^*. \tag{35}$$

Combining the two inequalities (34) and (35), we have the expression,

$$Q_P \geq Q_S^* \geq Q_L. \tag{36}$$

Notice that these are exactly the *opposite* set of inequalities from those derived for the supply shock scenario discussed at the beginning of this section.

Let us now discuss the issue presented in the introduction– that is, the effect of demand versus supply shocks on empirical quantity indexes when both shocks have identical effects on disaggregated quantities. Let us denote by $Q_D^*(S)$ the value of Q_D^* in the supply shock scenario; and $Q_S^*(D)$ the value of Q_S^* in the demand shock scenario. Notice that the notation distinguishes *both* between theoretical aggregators on the demand versus the supply side of the economy, and between the value of these aggregators in the demand shock versus the supply shock scenarios. In this case, combining expressions (17) and (36) yields,

$$Q_D^*(S) \leq Q_L \leq Q_S^*(D). \tag{37}$$

This expression follows from noting that Q_L is identical in both scenarios.[4]

The expression (37) provides the basis for the differential response of the demand-side aggregator Q_D^* and the supply-side aggregator Q_S^* to identical changes in quantity. What remains to show is how these theore *theoretical* aggregators relate to empirical quantity indexes used in practice.

Let us begin with the standard case where relative price fluctuations are caused by supply shocks. In this case, a well-known result in the index number theory literature shows that the Fisher index corresponds exactly to the demand-side aggregator Q_D^* assuming that the demand-side aggregator $C(q)$ has the following "flexible functional form",

$$(q^T Aq)^{0.5}, \tag{38}$$

where A is a symmetric NxN matrix of constants.[5]

In the supply shock case, an exactly analagous argument can be made for the supply-side aggregator Q_S^* as I show in the following proposition.

Proposition 1: The Fisher index Q_F defined above corresponds exactly to the theoretical output aggregate (21) given a a stable, linearly homogenous $g_t(y)$ with the flexible functional form described by expression (38) above.

Proof: The proof is in Appendix A.

Thus, expression (37) can be rewritten as,

$$Q_F(S) = Q_D^*(S) \leq Q_S^*(D) = Q_F(D). \tag{39}$$

The inequality (39) demonstrates the violation of the "quantity axiom" discussed in the introduction: the Fisher index responds differently to demand and supply shocks for the

[4]To see this, note that Q_L depends only on q_0, q_1 and p_0, which are assumed to be the same in both scenarios.

[5]See Diewert (1976) for a proof of this result.

same changes in disaggregated quantities. Moreover, the expression shows that the asymmetry between demand and supply shocks follows directly from properties of the theoretical aggregator functions Q_D^* or Q_S^*.

In particular, since Q_D^* reflects growth in $C(q)$ while or Q_S^* reflects growth in $g(y)$, the aggregators have opposite curvature properties: the aggregator on the supply side is concave in current quantities, whereas the aggregator on the demand side is convex in current quantities. The inequality (39) shows that the Fisher index reflects *either* Q_D^* or Q_S^*, depending on the source of the economic fluctuation. Although either Q_S^* *or* Q_D^* individually satisfies the "quantity axiom", real GDP does not satisfy the axiom since it may alternately reflect either Q_D^* or Q_S^* in the presence of demand and supply shocks.

The curvature properties of $C(q)$ and $g(y)$ have clear economic intuitions. On the one hand, the concavity of $C(q)$ follows from diminishing marginal utility: an additional apple contributes less to C_t than the previous apple due to diminishing marginal utility. On the other hand, the convexity of $g(y)$ follows from the increasing martinal rate of substitution between products: an additional apple requires more resources to produce than the previous apple, and thus contributes more to the output aggregate $g(y)$.

It is useful to note that even if we do not assume that Q_S^* and Q_S^* take the flexible functional form (38) the inequalities (17), (36), and the definition of the Fisher index (3) imply that,

$$Q_P(S) \leq Q_F(S) \leq Q_L \leq Q_F(D) \leq Q_P(D). \tag{40}$$

Expression (40) demonstrates that the Fisher index responds asymmetrically to demand and supply shocks even if the cost and revenue functions do not take the form (38), though in this case the empirical quantity indexes only approximate the theoretical aggregator functions Q_D^* and Q_S^*.

4 Empirical Analysis

Table 1 compares the Laspeyres and Paasche measures of annualized aggregate investment growth for the time intervals 1958q1-1972q4, 1972q1-1982q4, and 1982q1-1987q4. The data are obtained from a "real-time" dataset developed by by Dean Crushore and Tom Stark (Crushore and Stark, 1999).[6] I focus on the aggregate investment series because differences

[6] In particular, the Laspeyres and Paasche indexes reflect different "vintages" of real GDP released by the BEA. I rely on comparisons between the Laspeyres and Paasche indexes rather than comparisons involving

among the alternative index number formulae tend to be particularly large for aggregate investment.

Table 1 shows that both the usual "consumer substitution bias" relationship $Q_L > Q_P$, derived in the supply shock case (17) and the alternative relationship $Q_P > Q_L$ derived in the demand shock case (36) are present in the data. Nakamura (2004) shows that if $Q_L > Q_P$, the data are consistent with the existence of a stable, linearly homogenous aggregator $C(q)$ on the demand side of the economy but not a stable, linearly homogenous output aggregator– indicating the presence of supply shocks. On the other hand, if $Q_P > Q_L$ the data are consistent with the a stable linearly homogenous aggregator $g(y)$ on ths supply side, but not a stable, linearly homogenous aggregator on the demand side– suggesting the presence of demand shocks. Note that in the case of aggregate investment, demand shocks are shocks to the "preferences" of the firms *buying* investment goods, while supply shocks are shocks to the technology of the firms *producing* investment goods.

Thus, the evidence suggests that over the period considered in the table the Fisher index cannot be interpreted as reflecting a stable, linearly homogenous aggregator on the demand side of the economy. However, the evidence is consistent with the interpretation of aggregate investment as reflecting Q_D^* during the period 1958q1-1972q4, and Q_S^* during the later periods.

Beyond the sign of the difference between the Laspeyres and Paasche indexes, Table 1 shows that the magnitude of the difference has changed dramatically over time. The difference between the Laspeyres and Paasche indexes falls from 0.21 for the 1958q1-1972q4 period to -0.91 for the 1982q1-1987q4 period. The generally acknowledged story for the large negative difference in the 1980's was the extremely rapid growth in quantities (and rapid decline in prices) of the "computers and associated products" category of investment during this period. Table 1 shows that the relationship between the prices and quantities of investment goods during the 1980's was, indeed, quite unusual during this period relative to historical experience.

Moreover, the large change in the nature of shocks generating long-term investment growth significantly exacerbated existing trends in aggregate investment growth. According

the chain-weighted Fisher index in order to avoid incorporating the effects of chaining. The different vintages of data are calculated using different "base periods", and can therefore be viewed as Laspeyres or Paasche indexes for particular time periods. See Nakamura (2004) for more details on the data. The main caveat to this type of data is that the different vintages of data incorporate some definitional changes in real GDP. I discuss these issues in detail in Nakamura (2004).

to the chain-weighted Fisher measure of aggregate investment, aggregate investment growth declined from 5.12 for the period 1958q1-1972q4 to 4.06 for the period 1972q1-1982q4, to 1.61 for the period 1982q1-1987q4. The fact that the investment growth during the 1980's was associated to such a great extent with supply shocks– and therefore led to movement along the concave demand-side aggregator $C(q)$– contributed significantly to the low aggregate investment growth during the 1982q1-1987q4 period. Indeed, Table 1 suggests that the growth rate would have been at least 0.46 percentage points higher during this period if *exactly* the same changes in quantity had been motivated by demand rather than supply shocks.[7]

Finally, the large differences between the Laspeyres and Paasche indexes during the 1982q1-1987q4 period indicate that the non-linearity of the demand-side aggregator function $C(q)$ played an important role in aggregate investment growth over this period. Assuming that the movements in price and quantity occurred incrementally over the 1982q1-1987q4 period, the initial increases in computer production contributed significantly more to aggregate investment growth than subsequent growth in this sector of the economy.

5 Conclusion

A great deal of confusion about real GDP statistics persists in the economics literature despite their obvious importance.[8] One reason for the confusion is probably the traditional analogy between real GDP and "physical quantities". As I discuss in this paper, the analogy between real GDP and the concept of quantity is problematic in a number of ways for the recently adopted Fisher chain-weighted measure of real GDP.

This paper shows that the Fisher index cannot be interpreted as reflecting growth in a stable consumption aggregate in the presence of sector-specific demand shocks. Rather, in the presence of both demand and supply shocks, the Fisher index reflects *either* a "demand-side aggregator" or a "supply-side aggregator" depending on the underlying cause of price

[7]This follows since in the demand shock case, expression (36) implies that $Q_F \geq Q_L$ and Q_L would be unchanged given the same growth in disaggregated quantities.

[8]For example, Paul Krugman (1996) comments in an article that the BEA's 1996 reforms to real GDP reduced growth by correcting for the fact that "while the computer on my desk may be 50 times as powerful as the one I had in 1985, it is nowhere nearly 50 times as useful." However, quality adjustments, such as those undertaken in 1999, tend to increase, not decrease, the growth rate of real GDP. (See Section **??**). The switch to Fisher chain-weighting, on the other hand, reduced growth by recognizing that a computer produced today is much less valuable than one produced twenty years ago, even if the modern computer is of far higher quality.

and quantity fluctuations at a given point in time. Since the demand-side aggregator and the supply-side aggregator have fundamentally different curvature properties, the Fisher index responds differently to demand and supply shocks for identical changes in disaggregated quantities.

This result shows that analyses of aggregate growth that focus only on the evolution of growth in disaggregated quantities are incomplete. The growth in chain-weighted Fisher measures of real GDP statistics is affected by the *source* of economic flucutations– demand or supply shocks– independently from the effects of these shocks on growth in disaggregated quantities.

A Proof of Proposition 1

Consider the revenue maximization problem given by,

$$R(p, f(x)) = \max_y \{p.y : g(y) = f(x)\}, \tag{41}$$

where the output aggregator $g(y)$ has the flexible functional form,

$$g(y) = (y^T Ay)^{0.5}, \tag{42}$$

where A is a symmetric NxN matrix of constants. The first order conditions for this maximization problem are,

$$p = \lambda \nabla g(y), \tag{43}$$

where λ is the Lagrange multiplier and ∇ denotes the vector of partial derivatives. Moreover, the linear homogeneity of $g(y)$ implies that,

$$\begin{aligned} p^T y &= \lambda \nabla g(y)^T y && (44) \\ &= \lambda g(y), && (45) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Euler's theorem. Dividing the expression (43) by the expression (45) implies that,

$$\begin{aligned} p/(p^T y) &= \nabla g(y)/g(y) && (46) \\ &= Ay/y'Ay, && (47) \end{aligned}$$

We can now use the relationship between prices and the parameters in A, given by equation (47) to rewrite the Fisher index as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} Q_F &\equiv \left[\frac{p_0' q_1}{p_0' q_0}\right]^{0.5} \left[\frac{p_1' q_1}{p_1' q_0}\right]^{0.5} && (48) \\ &= \left\{\frac{y_1' \left[p_0/p_0' y_0\right]}{y_0' \left[p_1/p_1' y_1\right]}\right\}^{0.5} && (49) \\ &= \left\{\frac{y_1^T A y_1}{y_0^T A y_0}\right\}^{0.5} && (50) \\ &= \frac{g(y_1)}{g(y_0)}, && (51) \end{aligned}$$

where the third line follows by substituting in expression (47) and the last line follows from the definition (42).

References

Afriat, S.N., "The Construction of Utility Functions from Expenditure Data," *International Economic Review*, 1967, *8*, 67–77.

Allen, R.G.D., *Index Numbers in Theory and Practice*, London: Macmillan, 1975.

Alterman, W. F., W. E. Diewert, and R. C. Feenstra, *International Trade Price Indexes and Seasonal Commodities*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1999.

Basu, Susanto and John G. Fernald, "Returns to Scale in U.S. Production: Estimates and Implications," *The Journal of Political Economy*, April 1997, *105* (2), 249–283.

__ **and** __ , "Aggregate Productivity and Aggregate Technology," May 2001. Working Paper.

Bortkiewicz, L.v., "Zweck und Stuktur einser Preinsindexzahl, Nordosk Statistik Tidskrift," in R.G.D. Allen, ed., *Index Numbers in Theory and Practice*, 1975, pp. 62–65.

Croushore, Dean and Tom Stark, "A Real-Time Data Set for Macroeconomists," *Journal of Econometrics*, November 2001, *105*, 111–130.

Diewert, W. E., "Afriat and Revealed Preference Theory," *The Review of Economic Studies*, 1973, *40*, 419–425.

__ , "Functional Forms for Profit and Transformation Functions," *Journal of Economic Theory*, 1973, *6* (3), 284–316.

__ , "Functional Forms for Revenue and Factor Requirement Functions," *International Economic Review*, 1974, *15*, 119–130.

__ , "Exact and Superlative Index Numbers," *Journal of Econometrics*, May 1976, (4), 115–146. and reprinted as Chapter 8 in Diewert and Nakamura (1993, pp. 223-252).

__ , "Superlative Index Numbers and Consistency in Aggregation," *Econometrica*, 1978, *46*, 883–900. and reprinted as Chapter 9 in Diewert and Nakamura (1993, pp. 223-252).

__ , "The Test Approach to Economic Comparisons," in "Measurement in Economics" 1988, pp. 67–86.

__ , "Fisher Ideal Output, Input and Productivity Indexes Revisited," *The Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 1992, (3), 211–248. and reprinted as Chapter 13 in Diewert and Nakamura (1993, pp.211-248).

__ , "Index Numbers," in M. Milgate In J. Eatwell and P. Newman, eds., *The New*

Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics Vol. 2, London: Macmillan, 1992, pp. 767–780. and reprinted as Chapter 5 in Diewert and Nakamura (1993, pp. 71-104).

__ , "Index number Issues in the Consumer Price Index," *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 1998, *12* (1), 47–58.

__ , "Harmonized Indexes of Consumer Prices: Their Conceptual Foundations," January 2002a. Working Paper http://www.econ.ubc.ca/diewert/other.htm.

__ **and A. O. Nakamura**, "The Measurement of Aggregate Total Factor Productivity Growth," *Handbook of Econometrics*, April 2002. Forthcoming in Elsevier Science *Handbook of Econometrics*, Volume 6, edited by J.J. Heckman and E.E. Leamer.

__ **and K. Fox**, "Can Measurement Error Explain the Productivity Paradox?," *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 1999, *32* (2), 251–281.

__ **and T. J. Wales**, "Flexible Functional Forms and Tests of Homogeneous Separability," *Journal of Econometrics*, 1995, *67*, 259–302.

Dixit, A.K. and Joseph E. Stiglitz, "Monopolistic Competition and Optimum Product Diversity," *American Economic Review*, 1977, *67*, 297–308.

Dynan, Karen E. and Douglas W. Elmendorf, "Do Provisional Estimates of Output Miss Economic Turning Points," September 2001. Working Paper.

Eichhorn, W., "Fisher's Tests Revisited," *Econometrica*, 1976, *44*, 247–256.

__ **and J. Voeller**, *Theory of the Price Index*, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1976. Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 140.

Faust, Jon, John H. Rogers, and Jonathan Wright, "News or Noise in G-7 GDP Announcements," August 2001. Working Paper.

Feenstra, Robert C., "Exact Hedonic Price Indexes," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1995, *78* (4), 634–653.

__ **and Marshall B. Reinsdorf**, "Should Exact Index Numbers have Standard Errors? Theory and Application to Asian Growth," December 2003. NBER Working Paper 10197.

__ **and Marshall Reinsdorf**, "An Exact Price Index for the Almost Ideal Demand System," *Economics Letters*, 2000, *66* (2), 159–162.

__ **and Matthew D. Shapiro**, "High-Frequency Substitution and the Measurement of Price Indexes," March 2001. NBER Working Paper 8176.

Fisher, Franklin M., "Aggregate Production Functions and the Explanation of Wages: A Simulation Experiment," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, November

1971, *LIII* (4), 305–325.

Fisher, Irving, *The Making of Index Numbers*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1922.

Forsyth, F. and R. Fowler, "The Theory and Practice of Chain Price Index Numbers," *The Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A*, 1981, *144* (2).

Gollop, Frank M. and Dale W. Jorgenson, "Sectoral Measures of Labor Cost for the United States, 1948-1978," in Jack E. Triplett, ed., *The Measurement of Labor Cost*, Vol. 44 of NBER Studies in Income and Wealth, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983, pp. 185–235 and 503–520.

Gordon, Robert J., "Has the 'New Economy' Rendered the Productivity Slowdown Obsolete," June 1999. Working Paper.

Hicks, J. R., *Value and Capital*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.

Jackson, Chris, "The Effect of Rebasing on GDP," Technical Report, Statistics Canada Second Quarter 1996. Catalogue no. 13-001-XPB.

Jorgenson, Dale W. and Barbara M. Fraumeni, "The Output of the Education Sector," in Zvi Griliches, ed., *Output Measurement in the Services Sector*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

__ , ed., *Productivity*, Vol. 1, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995.

__ , Frank Gollop, and Barbara Fraumeni, *Productivity and U.S. Economic Growth*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Koenig, Evan F., Sheila Dolmas, and Jeremy Piger, "The Use and Abuse of "Real-time" Data in Economic Forecasting," August 2001. Working Paper.

Konyus, A.A. and S.S. Byushgens, *K probleme pokupatelnoi cili deneg, Voprosi Konyunkturi II: 1, 151-172* 1926. English Title: On the problem of the purchasing power of money.

Landefeld, Steven J. and Robert P. Parker, "Preview of the Comprehensive Revision of the National Income and Product Accouts: BEA's New Featured Measures of Output and Prices," *Survey of Current Business*, July 1995, pp. 31–38. http://www.bea.gov/bea/an1.htm.

__ and __ , "BEA's Chain Indexes, Times Series, and Measures of Economic Growth," *Survey of Current Business*, May 1997, pp. 58–68. http://www.bea.gov/bea/an1.htm.

Lucas, Robert E. Jr., "Expectations and the Neutrality of Money," *Journal of Economic Theory*, April 1972, *4*, 103–124.

Mankiw, N. Gregory and Matthew D. Shapiro, "News or Noise: An Analysis of

GNP Revisions," *Survey of Current Business*, May 1986, pp. 20–25.

Nakamura, Emi, "Demand Shocks and Real GDP Measurement," June 2004. Working Paper.

Orphanides, Athanasios, "Monetary Rules Based on Real-Time Data," *American Economic Review*, 2001.

Parker, Robert P. and Jack E. Triplett, "Chain-Type Measures of Real Output and Prices in the U.S. National Income and Product Accounts: An Update," Technical Report, Bureau of Economic Analysis 1996. http://www.unece.org/stats/documents/ocde/std/na/rd.97/10.e.doc.

Reinsdorf, Marshall, "Formula Bias and Within-Stratum Substitution Bias in the US CPI," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1998, *8* (2), 175–187.

Romer, David, *Advanced Macroeconomics*, New York: McGraw Hill, 2001.

Roubini, Nouriel, "Productivity Growth, Its Slowdown in the 1973-90 Period and its Resurgence in the 1990s: Truth or a Statistical Fluke," 1998. Internet Article http://pages.stern.nyu.edu/ nroubini/MEASURE.HTM.

Solow, Robert M., "Technical Change and the Aggregate Production Function," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, August 1957, *39* (3), 312–320.

Syverson, Chad, "Product Substitutability and Productivity Dispersion," July 2003. Working Paper.

Szulc, Bohdan, "Linking Price Index Numbers," in W. Erwin Diewert and Claude Montmarquette, eds., *Price Level Measurement: Proceedings from a conference sponsored by Statistics Canada*, Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1983, pp. 537–566.

Tevlin, Stacey and Karl Whelan, "Explaining the Investment Boom of the 1990s," March 2000. Working Paper.

Tornqvist, Leo, "The Bank of Finland Consumption Price Index," *Bank of Finland Monthly Bulletin*, 1936, (10), 1–8.

Triplett, Jack E., "Economic Theory and BEA's Alternative Quantity and Price Indexes," *Survey of Current Business*, April 1992, pp. 49–52. http://www.bea.gov/bea/an1.htm.

Young, Allan H., "Alternative Measures of Change in Real Output and Prices," *Survey of Current Business*, April 1992, pp. 32–48. http://www.bea.gov/bea/an1.htm.

__ , "Alternative Measures of Change in Real Output and Prices, Quarterly Estimates for

1959-92," *Survey of Current Business*, March 1993, pp. 31–41.
http://www.bea.gov/bea/an1.htm.

Table 1

A Comparison of Laspeyres and Paasche Indexes

	Aggregate Investment	
Period	Laspeyres	Paasche
1958q1-1972q4	4.30	4.50
1972q1-1982q4	3.25	2.81
1982q1-1987q4	2.57	1.66