



WP/18/177

IMF Working Paper

Inflation Expectations Anchoring Across Different Types of Agents: the Case of South Africa

by Ken Miyajima and James Yetman

***IMF Working Papers* describe research in progress by the author(s) and are published to elicit comments and to encourage debate.** The views expressed in IMF Working Papers are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the IMF, its Executive Board, or IMF management. The views in this paper also do not necessarily reflect those of the BIS.

I N T E R N A T I O N A L M O N E T A R Y F U N D

IMF Working Paper

African Department

**Inflation Expectations Anchoring Across Different Types of Agents:
the Case of South Africa**

Prepared by Ken Miyajima and James Yetman

Authorized for distribution by Ana Lucía Coronel

August 2018

***IMF Working Papers* describe research in progress by the author(s) and are published to elicit comments and to encourage debate.** The views expressed in IMF Working Papers are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the IMF, its Executive Board, or IMF management. The views in this paper also do not necessarily reflect those of the BIS.

Abstract

Inflation forecasts are modelled as monotonically diverging from an estimated long-run anchor point, or “implicit anchor”, towards actual inflation as the forecast horizon shortens. Fitting the model with forecasts by analysts, businesses and trade unions for South Africa, we find that inflation expectations have become increasingly strongly anchored. That is, the degree to which the estimated implicit anchor pins down inflation expectations at longer horizons has generally increased. Estimated inflation anchors of analysts lie within the 3–6 percent inflation target range of the central bank. However, the implicit anchors of businesses and trade unions, who are directly involved in the setting of wages and prices that drive the inflation process, have remained above the top end of the official target range. Possible explanations for these phenomena are discussed.

JEL Classification Numbers: E31, E58

Keywords: decay function, inflation anchoring, inflation expectations, inflation targeting.

Author’s E-Mail Address: KMiyajima@imf.org; James.Yetman@bis.org

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| II. INFLATION AND INFLATION EXPECTATIONS | 6 |
| Inflation Performance | 6 |
| Inflation Expectations | 9 |
| III. RELATED LITERATURE | 10 |
| IV. METHODOLOGY | 12 |
| V. THE DATA | 15 |
| VI. RESULTS | 15 |
| The Weight on the Implicit Anchor in Explaining Inflation Expectations | 17 |
| Different Forecast Horizons | 17 |
| Focusing on one- and two-year horizon forecasts | 19 |
| The Implicit Inflation Anchor | 20 |
| VII. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION | 22 |
| Figures | |
| 1. Headline Inflation and Official Inflation Target Range | 7 |
| 2. Indicators of South Africa's Inflation Performance | 8 |
| 3. Inflation Expectations and Inflation Target Range | 10 |
| 4. Weibull Decay Functions | 14 |
| 5. Weight on Anchor Over Different Forecast Horizons, Consensus Forecasts | 17 |
| 6. Weight on Anchor Over Different Forecast Horizons, BER Expectations | 18 |
| 7. Weight on Anchor 12 And 24 Months Ahead, Consensus Forecasts | 19 |
| 8. Weight on Anchor Four and Eight Quarters Ahead, BER Expectations | 20 |
| 9. Estimated Inflation Anchor Using Consensus Economics Forecasts | 20 |
| 10. Estimated Inflation Anchor Using BER Expectations | 21 |
| 11. Inflation Forecast Mean Squared Error | 22 |
| Tables | |
| 1. Inflation Facing Different Expenditure Quintiles in South Africa, 2009M01–2017M12 | 9 |
| 2. Estimation Results | 16 |
| References | 24 |