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## Motivation

- The Great Recession (2008-2009)
- increased unemployment, reduction in real incomes, shocks to asset prices
- household real expenditure on food fell substantially
- in the US, UK, Italy, (and others?)
- Is this a cause for concern?
- policy/media concern about "food poverty" (UK) and "food insecurity" (US)
- but relative prices of foods and time changed; households might e.g. substitute time for expenditure
- General interest in how economic downturns affect health


## Fall in non-durable expenditure (UK)

## food accounts for most of the difference across recessions
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## Breadline Britain



# Britain in nutrition recession as food prices rise and incomes shrink 

Families filling up on high-fat processed foods as 900,000 fewer in two years manage 'five-a-day' fruit and vegetables

The Guardian

## Food prices

- The Great Recession was contemporaneous with large changes in food prices
- world commodity prices rose
- in the UK depreciation of sterling led to increase in price of imported goods
- big changes in relative food prices
- Meat, poultry, eggs, dairy, cereals became relatively more expensive
- Prepared foods relatively less expensive


## How did households adjust?

- Over Great Recession (2008-2010) households experienced changes in
- real incomes
- opportunity cost of time
- relative prices of different foods
- In response to these changes households can:
- reduce the quantity of food they buy
- shift towards cheaper food (lower nutritional quality?)
- substitute time for expenditure
- If the relative price of time fell, consumers may engage in greater search or home production
- these mechanisms reduce price paid without necessarily changing nutritional composition of shopping basket
- and suggests that consumption is smoother than implied by expenditure


## There was substitution towards cheaper calories

## Price of "the average" UK grocery basket



## To simplify the empirics we focus on two time periods

Real expenditure on the average UK grocery basket


## Change in average UK grocery basket

| Real expenditure £per month |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| $2005-2007$ | 116.05 |
| $2010-2012$ | 108.05 |
| \% change | -6.9 |
|  |  |
| Calories per day | 2604 |
| 2005-2007 | 2543 |
| 2010-2012 | -2.4 |
| \% change |  |
|  |  |
| Real price per calorie (£per 1000 kcals$)$ | 1.50 |
| $2005-2007$ | 1.42 |
| 2010-2012 | -4.8 |
| \% change |  |

All figures per person (adult equivalent)

## How did households adjust?

- Outline a model of consumer behaviour in the grocery market:
- consumers can adjust behaviour along a number of margins
- reduce quantity
- reduce quality and other characteristics
- spend more time searching for a cheaper price
- Allows us to study the relative importance of different margins of adjustment


## A model of grocery shopping

- $v(C, \mathbf{z})$ : household utility from shopping basket
- C: total calories
- z: a vector of calorie characteristics
- $P=P(e, C, \mathbf{z} ; \phi)$ : price paid per calorie
- e: shopping effort
- C: total calories
- z: characteristics
- $z^{\prime}$ : cooking time is a characteristic
- $\phi$ : unobserved characteristics
- preferences over grocery basket are weakly separable from other arguments in household's utility function


## A model of grocery shopping

- Household chooses shopping effort, total calories and characteristics of grocery basket to minimise costs:

$$
\min _{e, C, \mathbf{z}} P(e, C, \mathbf{z} ; \phi) C+\omega\left(e+z^{\prime}\right)
$$

$$
\text { s.t. } \quad v(C, \mathbf{z})=\bar{v}
$$

- $\omega$ : opportunity cost of time


## A model of grocery shopping

## First order conditions

- shopping effort
- the household puts effort into shopping up to the point where the marginal gain in terms of lower food expenditure equals the opportunity cost of time

$$
-\frac{\partial P}{\partial e} C=\omega
$$

- as opportunity cost of time falls, shopping effort should rise


## A model of grocery shopping

## First order conditions

- shopping effort

$$
-\frac{\partial P}{\partial e} C=\omega
$$

- total calories
- household chooses number of calories that equates marginal cost of more calories with the marginal utility of calories

$$
\left(P+\frac{\partial P}{\partial C} C\right)=\lambda \frac{\partial v}{\partial C}
$$

## A model of grocery shopping

## First order conditions

- shopping effort

$$
-\frac{\partial P}{\partial e} C=\omega
$$

- total calories

$$
\left(P+\frac{\partial P}{\partial C} C\right)=\lambda \frac{\partial v}{\partial C}
$$

- characteristics:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{\partial P}{\partial z_{k}} C=\lambda \frac{\partial v}{\partial z_{k}} \\
\left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial z^{\prime}} C+\omega\right)=\lambda \frac{\partial v}{\partial z^{\prime}}
\end{gathered}
$$

- the marginal rate of substitution between calories and characteristic $k$ :

$$
\frac{\partial v / \partial z_{k}}{\partial v / \partial C}=\frac{\frac{\partial P}{\partial z_{k}} C}{\left(P+\frac{\partial P}{\partial C} C\right)}
$$

## Empirical functional form

- We approximate the price function with a log-log functional form:

$$
\ln P_{h t}=\alpha \ln \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{h t}}+\beta \ln \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{h t}}+\gamma \ln C_{h t}+\tau_{t}+\eta_{h}+\epsilon_{h t},
$$

- h: household, t : month
- $\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{h t}}, \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{h t}}$ : vectors of choice variables
- $C_{h t}$ : total calories purchased
- $\tau_{t}$ : common time (year-month) effects
- $\eta_{h}$ : household effects


## Data - Kantar World Panel

- all grocery purchases of a representative panel of British households, 2005-2012
- purchases recorded at bar code (UPC) level
- recorded using handheld scanner in home
- exact price and quantity
- nutritional and other product and store characteristics
- demographic characteristics of households
- over 28,000 households
- over 1.2 million grocery baskets (household-year-month)
- panel data
- allows us to control for permanent differences across households
- grocery basket is food at home


## Calories from food out and food at home

## Food out from Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS)

- food out is $36-37 \%$ of expenditure but $12-13 \%$ of calories
- food out also falls

| Real expenditure £per month | Food at home | Food out |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $2005-2007$ | 121.02 | 70.45 |
| $2010-2012$ | 114.00 | 63.76 |
| \% change | -5.8 | -9.5 |
|  |  |  |
| Calories per day |  |  |
| 2005-2007 | 2505 | 381 |
| 2010-2012 | 2478 | 342 |
| \% change | -1.1 | -10.3 |

All figures per person (adult equivalent)

## Data－price per calorie and total calories

－ $\ln P_{h t}=\alpha \ln \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{h t}}+\beta \ln \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{h t}}+\gamma \ln C_{h t}+\tau_{t}+\eta_{h}+\epsilon_{h t}$
－h：household， t ：month
－$P_{h t}$ ：per calorie price of households grocery basket
－$P_{h t}=\sum_{i s d \in t} P_{i s d} w_{h i s d}$
－$i$ ：product（barcode），$s$ ：store，$d$ ：day
－$P_{i s d}=\frac{p_{i s d}}{c_{i d}}$
－$w_{\text {hisd }}=\frac{c_{i d} b_{\text {hisd }}}{\sum_{\text {isd }} \in c_{i d} c_{\text {bisd }}}$
－$b_{\text {hisd }}:$ number of purchases
－$C_{h t}$ ：total calories purchased in shopping basket
－$C_{h t}=\sum_{i s d \in t} c_{i d} b_{h i s d}$

## Determinants of price per calorie

- Shopping effort ( $\mathbf{e}_{h t}$ )
- number trips
- number chains visited
- shop at discounter (Aldi, Lidl, ...)
- bought on sale
- (distance travelled)
- Characteristics ( $\mathbf{z}_{h t}$ )
- generic (non-branded) products
- large pack sizes
- nutrients
- protein, saturated fat, unsaturated fat, sugar, other carbs, fiber, salt
- food groups
- fruit, vegetables, grains, dairy, cheese and fats, poultry and fish, red meat, drinks, prepared sweet, prepared savoury, alcohol


## Identification

- we require that realisations of right hand side variables are uncorrelated with error:

$$
\mathbb{E}\left(\epsilon_{h t} \mid \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{h}}, \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{h}}, \eta_{h}\right)=0, \quad t=1, \ldots, T
$$

- our identification strategy
- rely on differential within household variation, this will control for many issues of potential concern
- there may be household-time varying omitted variables or measurement error that is correlated with the error term


## Identification

- total calories $C_{h t}$ appears on the right-hand side and as the denominator of the dependent variable
- measurement error $\Rightarrow$ inconsistent parameter estimates
- our data allow us to measure $C_{h t}$ well
- we instrument total calories with household's total caloric needs
- we require individual product prices ( $p_{\text {isd }}$ ) uncorrelated with choice variables ( $\left.\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{h t}}, C_{h t}, \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{h t}}\right)$
- common time effects
- regional variation in prices
- omitted choice variables


## Identification

- total calories $C_{h t}$ appears on the right-hand side and as the denominator of the dependent variable
- we require individual product prices $\left(p_{i s d}\right)$ uncorrelated with choice variables ( $\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{h t}}, C_{h t}, \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{h t}}$ )
- common time effects
- deal with general inflation and aggregate market conditions
- regional variation in prices (e.g. supermarkets may set higher prices in wealthy areas)
- omitted choice variables


## Identification

- total calories $C_{h t}$ appears on the right-hand side and as the denominator of the dependent variable
- we require individual product prices $\left(p_{i s d}\right)$ uncorrelated with choice variables ( $\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{h t}}, C_{h t}, \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{h t}}$ )
- common time effects
- regional variation in prices (e.g. supermarkets may set higher prices in wealthy areas)
- if cross sectional differences fixed over time then absorbed by household fixed effects
- a problem would arise if firms changed over time the extent to which they price discriminate between different groups of households in a way that was correlated with within household changes in choices
- omitted choice variables


## Identification

- total calories $C_{h t}$ appears on the right-hand side and as the denominator of the dependent variable
- we require individual product prices $\left(p_{i s d}\right)$ uncorrelated with choice variables ( $\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{h t}}, C_{h t}, \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{h t}}$ )
- common time effects
- regional variation in prices
- omitted choice variables
- problem if household transaction weights ( $w_{\text {hisd }}$ ) vary in ways correlated with ( $\mathbf{e}_{\mathrm{ht}}, C_{h t}, \mathbf{z}_{\mathrm{ht}}$ )
- time and household fixed effects $\Rightarrow$ problem arises only if vary over time differentially across households
- e.g. productivity differences in shopping technologies across households (some households better at search) and household effects don't fully account for this


## Coefficient estimates - preliminary

| dep var $\ln \left(P_{h t}\right)$ | (1) | (2) | (3) |  | (1) cont. | (2) cont. | (3) cont. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ntrips | -0.0107 | 0.0833 | 0.0619 | Fruit | 2.393 | 1.433 | 1.489 |
|  | (0.0006) | (0.0006) | (0.0021) |  | (0.0107) | (0.0088) | (0.0103) |
| Nstores | 0.0430 | 0.00379 | 0.00532 | Veg | 0.496 | 0.441 | 0.441 |
|  | (0.0006) | (0.0005) | (0.0006) |  | (0.0072) | (0.0058) | (0.0058) |
| Discounter | 0.0486 | -0.0458 | -0.0362 | Dairy | -0.292 | -0.00313 | 0.0196 |
|  | (0.0025) | (0.0023) | (0.0025) |  | (0.0092) | (0.0072) | (0.0076) |
| Sale | -0.471 | -0.128 | -0.144 | CheeseFats | -0.299 | 0.124 | 0.0952 |
|  | (0.0029) | (0.0024) | (0.0028) |  | (0.0098) | (0.0075) | (0.0079) |
| Generic | -0.996 | -0.406 | -0.422 | RedMeat | -0.275 | 0.282 | 0.233 |
|  | (0.0031) | (0.0030) | (0.0034) |  | (0.0098) | (0.0075) | (0.0088) |
| Large pack | -0.372 | -0.115 | -0.130 | PoultryFish | -0.848 | -0.373 | -0.463 |
|  | (0.0033) | (0.0025) | (0.0029) |  | (0.0134) | (0.0100) | (0.0132) |
| $C_{h t}$ | $-0.0466$ | $-0.147$ | $-0.100$ | Drinks | $1.128$ | $0.856$ | $0.865$ |
|  | $(0.0005)$ | (0.0007) | $(0.0044)$ |  | $(0.0132)$ | $(0.0105)$ | $(0.0106)$ |
| Sugar | 0.521 | 0.244 | 0.240 | PrepSweet | 0.140 | 0.187 | 0.166 |
|  | (0.0117) | (0.0087) | (0.0087) |  | (0.0071) | (0.0055) | (0.0058) |
| Sat Fat | 1.973 | 0.838 | 0.877 | PrepSavoury | 0.721 | 0.849 | 0.851 |
|  | (0.0138) | (0.0109) | (0.0116) |  | (0.0067) | (0.0054) | (0.00543) |
| Unsat Fat | 0.700 | -0.0124 | -0.0128 | Alcohol | 2.816 | 2.535 | 2.516 |
|  | (0.0136) | (0.0101) | (0.0102) |  | (0.0083) | (0.0078) | (0.0080) |
| Protein | 5.315 | 3.548 | 3.733 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.0196) | (0.0152) | (0.0232) |  |  |  |  |
| Fibre | 0.0132 | -0.0372 | -0.0431 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.0011) | (0.0009) | (0.0011) |  |  |  |  |
| Salt | -0.0284 | -0.00749 | -0.00840 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.0006) | (0.0004) | (0.0004) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Time effects | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |  | HH effects | No | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |  | IV | No | No | Yes |

## Determinants of change in price paid per calorie

- change in behaviour from 2005-2007 to 2010-2012
- led to a -2.69 log point change
- evaluate price per calorie in absence of switching $\ln \bar{P}_{h}=\widehat{\alpha} \ln \overline{\mathbf{e}}_{\mathbf{h}}+\widehat{\beta} \ln \overline{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{h}}+\widehat{\gamma} \ln \bar{C}_{h}+\widehat{\tau}_{t}+\widehat{\eta}_{h}$
- where ( $\overline{\mathbf{e}}, \overline{\mathbf{z}}, \bar{C}$ ) are means over 2005-2007
- What contribution of different factors
- $\widehat{\alpha} \ln \Delta \mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{h}}, \widehat{\beta} \ln \Delta \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{h}}, \widehat{\gamma} \ln \Delta C_{h}$

Contribution

| Shopping effort | $\mathbf{- 1 . 0 6}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Non-nutrient characteristics | -0.12 |
| Nutrient characteristics | $\mathbf{- 1 . 2 6}$ |
| Food groups | -0.25 |
| Total | -2.69 |

## Shopping effort

- an important determinant of the -2.69 log point reduction in price per calorie was an increase in goods purchased on sale

|  | $\hat{\alpha}$ <br> Affect on <br> $\ln \left(P_{h}\right)$ | $\hat{\alpha} \Delta \ln \left(e_{h}\right)$ <br> \% change <br> behaviour | Contribution |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Shopping trips | 0.06 | $0.3 \%$ | -0.04 |
| Chains visited | 0.01 | $3.9 \%$ | 0.02 |
| Discounter | -0.04 | $14.9 \%$ | -0.05 |
| Sales | $\mathbf{- 0 . 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 4 \%}$ | $-\mathbf{0 . 9 9}$ |
| Total |  |  | -1.06 |

## Opportunity cost of time

implied by the first order condition and estimates


## Nutrients

## Coefficient \% change Contribution

| Protein | $\mathbf{3 . 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 8 5}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Saturated fat | $\mathbf{0 . 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 2 0}$ |
| Unsaturated fat | -0.01 | $0.7 \%$ | -0.00 |
| Sugar | 0.24 | $0.0 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Fibre | $\mathbf{- 0 . 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 2 7}$ |
| Salt | -0.01 | $-1.4 \%$ | 0.06 |
| Total |  |  | -1.26 |

## Heterogeneity

- households with children versus adult only and pensioners
- rich versus poor households

| Households with children youngest child is: Pre-school School age |  |  | Adult | Pensioner |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Real expenditure £per month |  |  |  |  |
| 2005-2007 | 92.16 | 90.43 | 118.40 | 133.08 |
| 2010-2012 | 79.90 | 81.94 | 112.23 | 125.03 |
| \% change | -13.3 | -9.4 | -5.2 | -6.1 |
| Calories per day |  |  |  |  |
| 2005-2007 | 2197 | 2235 | 2586 | 2901 |
| 2010-2012 | 2085 | 2162 | 2583 | 2853 |
| \% change | -5.1 | -3.3 | -0.1 | -1.7 |
| Real price per calorie (£per 1000kcals) |  |  |  |  |
| 2005-2007 | 1.41 | 1.35 | 1.55 | 1.54 |
| 2010-2012 | 1.29 | 1.27 | 1.47 | 1.48 |
| \% change | -6.9 | -3.0 | -2.6 | -2.5 |
| Observations | 53,569 | 84,427 | 193,031 | 183,601 |
| Households | 2741 | 5014 | 7346 | 5897 |

All figures per person (adult equivalent)

## Determinants of change in price paid per calorie

|  | Households with children youngest child is: |  | Adult | Pensioner |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pre-school | School age |  |  |
| Shopping effort | -1.77 | -1.45 | -0.92 | -0.86 |
| Non-nutrients | -1.93 | -0.33 | -0.21 | 0.10 |
|  | -3.70 | -1.78 | -1.13 | -0.76 |
| Nutrients | -2.44 | -0.67 | -1.15 | -1.54 |
| Food groups | -0.85 | -0.58 | -0.28 | -0.19 |
|  | -3.29 | -1.25 | -1.43 | -1.73 |
| Total | -6.98 | -3.03 | -2.57 | -2.49 |


|  | High | Middle | Low |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Real expenditure | £per month |  |  |
| $2005-2007$ | 117.86 | 116.37 | 114.46 |
| $2010-2012$ | 111.87 | 108.42 | 107.51 |
| \% change | -5.1 | -6.8 | -6.1 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Calories per day |  |  |  |
| 2005-2007 | 2411 | 2568 | 2735 |
| 2010-2012 | 2419 | 2531 | 2668 |
| \% change | 0.3 | -1.5 | -2.5 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Real price per calorie (£per | $1000 \mathrm{kcals})$ |  |  |
| 2005-2007 | 1.65 | 1.52 | 1.40 |
| 2010-2012 | 1.55 | 1.43 | 1.35 |
| \% change | -5.9 | -5.4 | -3.7 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Observations |  |  |  |
| Households |  |  |  |

All figures per person (adult equivalent)

## Determinants of change in price paid per calorie

|  | High | Middle | Low |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Shopping effort | -0.98 | -1.10 | -1.02 |
| Non-nutrients | -0.72 | 0.27 | -0.25 |
|  | $\mathbf{- 1 . 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 3 5}$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Nutrients | -1.57 | -0.99 | -1.30 |
| Food groups | -0.14 | -0.15 | -0.38 |
|  | $\mathbf{- 1 . 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 6 8}$ |
| Total | -3.41 | $\mathbf{- 1 . 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 . 0 3}$ |

## Nutrients

- Protein
- all households reduced, those with young children and richest by most
- Vegetable purchases reduced
- by all income/education groups, households with children and pensioners by most
- Non-sugar carbohydrates
- all households increased, households with children, pensioners and poorest by most
- Drinks and alcohol
- reduced by all households, households with children by most (except alcohol for richer households increased)
- Saturated fats
- all households decreased, households with children and poorest by most


## Summary and concluding comments

- Consumption is smoother than expenditure suggests
- opportunity cost of time fell, and households used more time to substitute for expenditure
- Reduction in food expenditure through
- reduction in calories
- substantial for some households (e.g. those with young children and poorer households)
- but less than expenditure
- and some suggestion largest in households that purchase a high amount of calories
- shift towards cheaper calories
- significant share due to increased effort
- pretty similar across households (with a few exceptions), suggests may be more driven by changes in relative prices or other common time factors
- some impact on nutrition, though not all bad
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