

A Service of

ZBW

Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Reiche, Lovisa

Working Paper Beyond Groceries: Financial Confidence and the Gender Gap in Inflation Expectations

CESifo Working Paper, No. 11588

Provided in Cooperation with: Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Reiche, Lovisa (2024) : Beyond Groceries: Financial Confidence and the Gender Gap in Inflation Expectations, CESifo Working Paper, No. 11588, CESifo GmbH, Munich

This Version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/10419/312098

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



WWW.ECONSTOR.EU



Beyond Groceries: Financial Confidence and the Gender Gap in Inflation Expectations

Lovisa Reiche



Impressum:

CESifo Working Papers ISSN 2364-1428 (electronic version) Publisher and distributor: Munich Society for the Promotion of Economic Research - CESifo GmbH The international platform of Ludwigs-Maximilians University's Center for Economic Studies and the ifo Institute Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany Telephone +49 (0)89 2180-2740, Telefax +49 (0)89 2180-17845, email office@cesifo.de Editor: Clemens Fuest https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded • from the SSRN website: www.SSRN.com

- from the RePEc website: <u>www.RePEc.org</u>
- from the CESifo website: <u>https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp</u>

Beyond Groceries: Financial Confidence and the Gender Gap in Inflation Expectations

Abstract

The gender gap in inflation expectations, women reporting systematically higher expectations in consumer surveys, has been attributed to traditional gender norms, and thus women's greater exposure to volatile food prices. This overlooks a crucial factor: financial answer confidence. Using data from German households, I show that the "grocery shopping" effect occurs only among those with low answer confidence, while there is no gap among those with high answer confidence. The interaction of financial answer confidence and the shopping experience can be explained through the lens of a simple Bayesian learning framework, where noisy signals only increase mean expectations when priors are imprecise.

JEL-Codes: E310, E710, G530.

Keywords: consumer inflation expectations, gender, financial literacy.

Lovisa Reiche Department of Economics University of Oxford Manor Road Building United Kingdom - OX1 3UQ, Oxford lovisa.reiche@economics.ox.ac.uk

December 11, 2024

I am grateful to Michael McMahon, Alexandre Kohlhas and Ryan Rholes for their supervision and advice. Further, I thank Martin Weidner for his feedback on the econometric modelling in this paper and Dmitry Vinogradov, Nicolò Maffei Faccioli and Maya Haran for their excellent comments. This work has also benefited from the feedback of conference and seminar participants at the University of Copenhagen, the Royal Economic Society, Bocconi University, the University of Bamberg, the National Bank of Belgium, Norges Bank, the CEPR Symposium, Stanford University, University of Bergamo, the Mannheim Institute for Financial Education and the ifo Institute. Declarations of interest: none.

1 Introduction

The gender gap in inflation expectations is an established phenomenon. Using a 1977 survey of Swedish households, Jonung (1981) first found that women had significantly higher inflation perceptions, attributing this to their "lived experiences" in grocery shopping as food prices rose faster in the 1970s. Since then, the gap has been observed across a wide range of geographies, survey designs and experimental settings.¹ On average, I find a gap of about 1pp. in Germany and 2pp. in the US,² a substantial size given inflation targets around 2%.

Understanding the potential causes of this gender gap is important. At the individual consumer level, higher inflation expectations have been associated with lower life satisfaction (Di Tella et al., 2001) and savings for retirement (Vellekoop & Wiederholt, 2019), for the latter the gender gap is an established fact (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2008). In addition, the gender gap concerns central bank communication with the general public (C. Binder, 2017; Coibion, Georgarakos, Gorodnichenko, & Weber, 2023; Coibion, Gorodnichenko, et al., 2023; Coibion et al., 2020, 2022; Lamla & Vinogradov, 2019). Women account for most of consumer spending in advanced economies (Silverstein & Sayre, 2009), so their consumption-savings plan has large macro-repercussions. Higher inflation, associated with higher economic uncertainty (Reiche & Meyler, 2022), can reduce consumer spending (Coibion, Georgarakos, Gorodnichenko, & van Rooij, 2023; Coibion et al., 2024). Efforts should thus be made to understand how women's expectations are formed.

The dominant interpretation of the gender gap is that traditional gender roles lead women to engage more in grocery shopping (D'Acunto, Malmendier, & Weber, 2021; Jonung, 1981), exposing them to more volatile price signals. This can cause overestimation due to a disproportional focus on price increases (Dräger et al., 2014). In this paper, I show that this *experience channel* alone is insufficient to explain the gender gap. Instead, I provide evidence for the *financial confidence channel* as an additional mechanism: Consumers with high financial confidence can listen to financial news and macroeconomic developments and thus have a more precise idea of possible inflation values, while those with lower confidence

¹Brischetto and de Brouwer (1999) for Australia; Bryan and Venkatu (2001) for a survey on Ohioan consumers; Palmqvist and Strömberg (2004) for Sweden, Pfajfar and Santoro (2010) for the US Michigan Survey; Blanchflower and MacCoille (2009) for the UK; Leung (2009) for New Zealand; Del Giovane et al. (2008) and Corduas (2022) for Italy; Bruine De Bruin et al. (2010) and Armantier et al. (2016) for the RAND American life panel; Arioli et al. (2017) and D'Acunto et al. (2024) for a range of EU countries; D'Acunto, Malmendier, and Weber (2021) for the Chicago Booth Expectations and Attitudes Survey; Dräger and Nghiem (2020) for Germany and Abildgren and Kuchler (2021) for Denmark are a non-exhaustive list of authors mentioning this empirical finding.

²Appendix C.1 shows that while older age, income, and education reduce the gender gap, even in combination they only close it for very extreme values.

may refer more to their recent price experiences, for instance, their grocery shopping. Thus, traditional gender norms are only relevant in explaining the gender gap for consumers with low financial education. Programs to improve women's financial confidence emerge as an effective policy tool to anchor their expectations and close the gender gap.

To formalize this hypothesis, I employ a Bayesian framework with log-normally distributed signals and a conjugate log-normal prior. Grocery shopping, i.e. observing volatile prices, is reflected in an agents signal volatility. As the noise of the unbiased signals increases, the expected value of the posterior distribution also increases, suggesting higher average expectations for women in traditional gender roles. This is a feature of the rightskewed log-normal distribution. However, this effect only occurs when the prior is flat. I interpret a flat prior as a sign of low financial confidence: Those who are less confident in their ability to understand financial and macroeconomic matters will have a wider range of possible values and are less inclined to rely on their own intuition; hence, they have greater uncertainty around their prior beliefs. This highlights the role of financial confidence as a second relevant channel in explaining the gender gap. The simple and intuitive framework thus captures two hypotheses to explain the observed differences between women and men.

I develop a composite measure for financial confidence that infers the answer confidence component of financial literacy; thus I will call my measure financial answer confidence. An empirical analysis using data from the Bundesbank Online Panel – Households (BOP-HH, 2019-2022)³ shows that grocery shopping actually increases mean expectations for people with low financial answer confidence while decreasing them for those with high answer confidence. Since women often have lower financial literacy and financial answer confidence, the effect of grocery shopping is amplified. This main empirical result is summarized in Figure 1, which shows the distribution of financial answer confidence among German male and female consumers, as well as the estimated effect of grocery shopping on inflation expectations. In isolation, the impact of financial answer confidence exceeds that of experience. A simple counterfactual exercise suggests that if women where to have the same financial answer confidence as men, the gender gap would reduce by 33%. In contrast, if traditional gender norms disappear but women still hold lower financial answer confidence the gap reduces by only 8%.

When possible, I complement the German data with evidence from the Survey of Consumer Expectations by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (SCE, 2013-2020) and the Michigan Survey of Consumers (MSC, 1978-2023), both set in the US. This provides ex-

 $^{^{3}}$ the survey is best suited for this analysis since it measures respondents household responsibilities, including grocery shopping, and includes a financial literacy test (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2007) from which confidence can be inferred



Semale Male

Figure 1: The effect of grocery shopping involvement on inflation expectations for different levels of financial answer confidence

Notes: The predicted effect of participation in grocery shopping on inflation expectations for different levels of financial answer confidence in the black line (f(x) = 1.4 - 1.99 * x). The complete regression results are shown in Table 4, column (5). The gray area indicates 95% confidence bands (standard error: 0.47). The way grocery shopping is measured will be explained in Section 3 and financial answer confidence in Section 3. The histograms show the density of the male (green) and female (orange, cross-hatched) distribution of financial answer confidence scores.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; own calculations

ternal validity for my results, geographically and historically. I provide evidence supporting the financial confidence channel by demonstrating, that there is no gender gap in inflation expectations in the high confidence sample. In addition, removing outliers beyond the 80th percentile in the inflation expectations distribution completely closes the gender gap. Further, I show that (a) the gender gap persists for singles, who can be assumed to engage symmetrically in grocery shopping, and (b) periods of high food price inflation are not correlated with an increase in the gender gap. For those exercises, I use all three household panels. Thus, I provide additional evidence that the experience hypothesis alone cannot account for the difference between male and female inflation expectations.

These results contribute to two areas of previous research: one that explains heterogeneity in inflation expectations through heterogeneity in signals and another that emphasizes the role of interpretation. Initially emphasized by Jonung (1981) and later formalized by the work of Malmendier and Nagel (2016), the heterogeneity of experiences (local price signals) may matter and explain systematic demographic differences (Cavallo et al., 2017; D'Acunto, Malmendier, Ospina, & Weber, 2021; D'Acunto & Weber, 2024; D'Acunto et al., 2024; Weber et al., 2022). With regard to the gender gap, D'Acunto, Malmendier, and Weber (2021) show using intra-household data of heterosexual married couples that the gender gap is indeed most prevalent within households when men do not participate in grocery shopping, while in households with an equal share, the gap disappears. In addition, heterogeneity may arise due to the differential ability to process signals received. Bruine De Bruin et al. (2010) suggest that people with lower financial literacy rely largely on personal experiences, while financially literate individuals interpret inflation as a more abstract macro concept. Using the same German data as this study, Conrad et al. (2022) highlight that receiving traditional news media is associated with lower expectations. Further, it has been established that there is a strong connection between cognitive abilities and inflation expectations (Burke & Manz, 2014; D'Acunto, Hoang, et al., 2022; D'Acunto et al., 2019).

I contribute to both strands empirically as well as theoretically. My Bayesian framework captures the effects of the noisy information literature and shows that when the prior is log-normal, making signals noisier can increase the posterior without introducing biases. However, it links this to the interpretation literature by pointing out that for signal volatility to matter, priors need to be flat. To my knowledge, I am the first to integrate financial confidence modeled as prior precision into a Bayesian framework to show that higher uncertainty about an outcome can indeed drive average expectations upwards and is an important condition for the pure experience channel to operate. This can be reconciled with the findings of D'Acunto, Malmendier, and Weber (2021) as women in "traditional" households may differ from those who share household chores equally in their financial confidence. Further, I run empirical tests on both channels with a focus on the gender gap in inflation expectations.

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 introduces the Bayesian framework, Section 3 describes the data and measurement, Section 4 presents the key empirical results, and Section 5 provides further evidence for the financial confidence channel. Finally, Section 6 highlights future research avenues and Section 7 concludes.

2 Bayesian Framework

I start with a Bayesian framework to illustrate the two hypothesized channels causing the gender gap in inflation expectations: experience and confidence. I model differences in experiences, such as grocery shopping activity, as differences in the distribution of the signals received. An agent who visits grocery stores frequently observes more volatile prices as food prices are fundamentally more volatile than the core component of the consumption basket; hence, the agent will receive more volatile signals. On the other hand, I capture differences in financial confidence as differences in prior precision. An agent with less confidence in their financial literacy will place less weight on their own forecast and is thus more reliant on the signals she receives. The framework highlights how these two channels can interact. Intuitively, if an agent's prior is imprecise, such that little weight is placed on own initial forecasts, signals matter more as they become the dominant source for information about inflation. I first present the basic framework and then explore the impact of changes in signal and prior precision. For simplification, the framework is shown for a representative agent.

Let θ denote inflation 12 months ahead, an unknown random variable. The representative agents prior belief about future inflation is assumed to follow a log-normal distribution, such that

$$\log \theta \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_0, \frac{1}{\tau_0}\right).$$

Lower prior precision, i.e. a smaller τ_0 could be caused by lower financial confidence leading to higher uncertainty around individual point forecasts. The framework allows me to test the consequences of lower prior precision on average expectations of agents. In addition, the agent receives a signal x about future inflation. Signals are unbiased but contain some noise, reflecting heterogeneity in inflation experiences given by heterogeneous consumption baskets,

$$\log x = \log \theta + \epsilon,$$

where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{1}{\tau_x}\right)$.

If the agent shops for goods with volatile prices (such as groceries) she will receive signals with lower precision, i.e. with a smaller τ_x . Notice, that unbiasedness of signals allows me to show that signal volatility alone can affect mean expectations, such that purely by observing more volatile grocery prices an individual's inflation expectation can increase. Relaxing this assumption would increase the effects discussed in the next section, which can thus be interpreted as "lower bound estimates". The log-normal prior is chosen because it is bounded at zero and features a heavy tail. This choice aligns with observations in the data: (1) there appears to be a zero lower bound in inflation expectations (Gorodnichenko & Sergeyev, n.d.);⁴ (2) a majority of agents have expectations in line with central bank targets, but there are possible tail events to the right; (3) the observed cross-section of inflation expectations is approximately log-normal (see Figure A.1 in the Appendix). Similarly, the log-normal signal is motivated by (1) behavioral biases that imply consumers pay more attention to price increases than price decreases (Dräger et al., 2014), requiring a heavy tailed asymmetric distribution, and (2) allowing for analytical tractability due to the conjugate prior. The asymmetry of the log-normal distribution is a key element of the framework.

The agent updates her beliefs about θ based on the observed signal using Bayes' rule (see Appendix A.2),

$$\log \theta | x \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\hat{\mu}, \frac{1}{\hat{\tau}}\right),$$

where $\hat{\mu}$ represents the mean of the logged posterior inflation expectations and $\hat{\tau}$ the corresponding precision given by:

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{\tau_0 \mu_0 + \tau_x \log x}{\tau_0 + \tau_x},\tag{1}$$

$$\hat{\tau} = \tau_0 + \tau_x. \tag{2}$$

The expected value of θ under the posterior distribution is simply the mean of its posterior distribution. It depends directly on the precision of priors and signals and thus on the agents confidence in her own beliefs and the price signals she receives.

$$\mathbb{E}(\theta|x) = \exp\left(\hat{\mu} + \frac{1}{2\hat{\tau}}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{\tau_0\mu_0 + \tau_x\log x + \frac{1}{2}}{\tau_0 + \tau_x}\right) \tag{3}$$

 $^{^{4}}$ In the surveys used in the empirical section of this paper reaches from 0.002% in the BOP-HH to 3.24% in the MSC and 7.04% in the SCE. This is in line with estimates from the authors for a range of EU countries, the US and Japan. This feature is a feature of the chosen functional form, relaxing the zero lower bound would not impact the results as long as the asymmetry is retained.

The framework can be used to explain heterogeneity in observed point forecasts, particularly those between men and women. I show comparative statics for the effects of shocks to prior precision and signal variance. While using a representative agent framework for illustrative purposes, the framework can easily be interpreted as featuring two groups of agents. For instance, let women experience greater shocks to both prior precision and signal volatility.

Beginning with the role of shopping experience, I assume that the composition of an agent's shopping basket may affect the signal precision parameter τ_x . Shopping for groceries is thus connected to a lower τ_x . In this application, the signal remains unbiased; groceries are assumed to have the same level of inflation as other goods. The framework reveals that the expected inflation expectation is increasing in signal volatility whenever log x exceeds μ_0 by less than half of the prior variance $\frac{1}{\tau_0}$.

$$\frac{d\mathbb{E}(\theta|x)}{d\tau_x} < 0 \iff \log x - \mu_0 < \frac{1}{2\tau_0} \tag{4}$$

The computations can be found in Appendix A.3.1. Notice that the condition in (4) will always be satisfied when $\mu_0 > \log x$. This indicates that when consumers prior expectations exceed the signal, making the signal more volatile will always increase expectations since the signal becomes less reliable. In other words, those with high prior expectations do not revise them downwards if the price signals they receive become more volatile. Further, the condition relaxes when the prior is flat, i.e., prior precision τ_0 is small, such that the agent relies more on the signals received. When priors are sufficiently flat, the agent may revise her expectations upwards as signals become more volatile even when signals on average exceed the prior.

Proposition 2.1 Consumer inflation expectations are increasing in signal volatility whenever $\log x - \mu_0 < \frac{1}{2\tau_0}$. This condition has two features:

- 1. The condition is always satisfied when average prior expectations exceed the average of the signal $\mu_0 > \log x$.
- 2. The condition relaxes when priors are imprecise and τ_0 is small.

In summary, under the assumption of a log-normal signal and its conjugate prior, increases in the noise of the signals can indeed increase the expected value of the posterior distribution. This captures and formalizes the argument of the experience hypothesis: women observing higher volatility through higher observed food prices have increased inflation expectations. However, this is facilitated by small prior precision. In contrast, a tight prior may cause mean expectations to decrease when the environment is noisier. Thus, it is important to analyze the consequences of prior heterogeneity, which may be caused by different levels of financial confidence.

Financial confidence may impact the parameters of the prior distribution μ_0 and τ_0 such that an agent with lower confidence has a flatter prior, i.e. a lower τ_0 . It has been shown that women have lower confidence about their own financial literacy (Bucher-Koenen et al., 2021).⁵ Low confidence may imply higher uncertainty around point forecasts which can be modelled as lower precision. Intuitively, this reflects that individuals with lower financial confidence may have a less formalized idea of price changes when observing prices. Subsequently, I will discuss the comparative statics of a decrease in τ_0 on $\mathbb{E}(\theta|x)$. The computations can be found in Appendix A.3.2.

$$\frac{d\mathbb{E}(\theta|x)}{d\tau_0} < 0 \iff \mu_0 - \log x < \frac{1}{2\tau_x} \tag{5}$$

Heterogeneity in priors can also give rise to heterogeneous expectations when signals received are identical. Reduced prior precision will always increase average expectations when signals exceed the prior. Similar to before, this makes the agent rely less on own forecasts and so the higher signals transmit directly to the expectations. Just as condition (4) relaxes with the prior being flat, condition (5) relaxes when signals are imprecise.

Proposition 2.2 Consumer inflation expectations are increasing in prior imprecision whenever $\mu_0 - \log x < \frac{1}{2\tau_x}$. This condition has two features:

- 1. The condition is always satisfied when signals exceed the average of the prior $\log x > \mu_0$.
- 2. The condition relaxes when signals are volatile and τ_x is small.

In the Bayesian framework with log-normal priors and signals, noisy environments caused by grocery shopping and low financial confidence can individually be a cause for higher inflation expectations. Moreover, they interact: The framework shows that noisy signals increase expectations when priors are flat. Simultaneously, low financial confidence (modelled as flat priors) increases expectations when signals are imprecise.

⁵The authors show that women perform equally well in financial literacy tests when no "don't know" answer is provided, but worse when such option is not available.

The conditions reveal that there is a combination of values for $\log x$, μ_0 , τ_x and τ_0 for which both conditions, (4) and (5) hold: $\mu_0 \in [\log x - \frac{1}{2\tau_0}, \log x + \frac{1}{2\tau_x}]$. Outside of this interval at least one of the conditions will always hold.

Proposition 2.3 For a given $\log x$, whenever $\mu_0 \in [\log x - \frac{1}{2\tau_0}, \log x + \frac{1}{2\tau_x}]$ the agent's inflation expectation $\mathbb{E}(\theta|x)$ are increasing in both, higher signal volatility $\frac{1}{\tau_x}$ and prior imprecision $\frac{1}{\tau_0}$. Otherwise, the agent's inflation expectation $\mathbb{E}(\theta|x)$ are increasing in either higher signal volatility $\frac{1}{\tau_x}$ or prior imprecision $\frac{1}{\tau_0}$.

The framework is well suited to explain the interaction of the two channels hypothesized to explain the gender gap in inflation expectations. It shows that if women on average observe more volatile price signals through greater involvement in grocery shopping, they may have higher expectations than men. Similarly, if women on average have lower confidence in their own forecasts they could also have higher expectations. Both channels complement each other: observing volatile prices will increase expectations when the individual is less confident. This makes sense intuitively if those confident about their own financial literacy rely more on aggregate news while those with lower confidence rely on their day-to-day experiences.

The remainder of this paper will show this complementarity empirically. For German consumers there is an interaction effect between grocery shopping and financial confidence when predicting inflation expectations.

3 Data

My primary data source is the Bundesbank Online Panel of German consumers from April 2019 until September 2022 (Research Data and Service Centre, 2022).⁶ This survey is particularly suited to analyze the gender gap in inflation expectations because it contains individuallevel data on financial literacy and household responsibilities including grocery shopping, thus allowing me to test both hypotheses on the same individuals. Data for the BOP-HH has been collected regularly since April 2020. I use data until September 2022. In addition, there are three months of pilot phase from April-June 2019. Approximately 2000 participants are initially drawn randomly from a larger pool of candidates recruited via telephone. Participants complete an online survey with various questions ranging from macroeconomic assessments and expectations to political issues. Demographic characteristics are recorded by self-assessment; therefore, the terms "female" and "women" in my analysis refer to self-

 $^{^{6}}$ Disclaimer: The results published and the related observations and analysis may not correspond to results or analysis of the data producers.

Survey	Time/Place	Participants	Wording
BOP-HH	Apr.2020-Sep.2022, DE	2000/month	inflation/deflation + (definition) from 0-100
			+ Financial literacy test
			+ Household responsibilities
SCE	Jun.2013-Nov.2020, US	1200/month	inflation/deflation from 0-100
			+ Financial literacy test
MSC	Jan.1978-Dec.2022, US	500/month	prices in general from 0-95, probing $> 5\%$

Table 1: Features of the three surveys

identified gender. The survey includes the option to not choose a binary gender and few candidates do so; these responses are excluded here. I also exclude all participants who do not give an inflation point forecast. Inflation expectations in the survey are measured quantitatively. At first, individuals are presented with a short definition of inflation⁷ and are asked if they expect inflation or deflation in the next 12 months. Subsequently, they indicate their anticipated inflation or deflation rate numerically. The answers are limited to a range of 0 to 100. Additionally, the survey elicits uncertainty around the point forecast through probabilistic bins.

I complement this survey with two established consumer surveys, the Michigan Survey of Consumers in the US from June 1978 until January 2023 (MSC, Survey Research Center, 2023); and the Survey of Consumer Expectations in the US from June 2013 until November 2020 (SCE, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 2020).⁸ Adding these surveys allows me to explore a longer time horizon than the short period of the BOP-HH, which was also heavily influenced by the Covid-19 pandemic, and provides external validity by benchmarking results for the US. In addition, including the SCE adds robustness to my computation of financial answer confidence and addresses internal validity concerns. All surveys are summarized in Table 1.

Although the BOP-HH is the only dataset that contains information on the respondents' grocery shopping experience, both SCE and BOP-HH contain financial literacy questions that help me compute a measure of confidence.

⁷Inflation is the percentage increase in the general price level. It is mostly measured using the consumer price index. A decrease in the price level is generally described as "deflation".

⁸Disclaimer: FRBNY did not participate in or endorse this work, and FRBNY disclaims any responsibility or legal liability for the administration of the survey and the analysis and interpretation of data collected.

	$shop_groceries$	$shop_major$	prep_meals	$decide_finance$	single
Men	0.47	0.59	0.35	0.70	0.41
Women	0.75	0.56	0.76	0.60	0.50

	Table 2:	Traditional	gender	norms i	in the	German	households
--	----------	-------------	--------	---------	--------	--------	------------

Non-single sample: N=26,595

Full sample: N=48,146

Notes: Average scores for household roles and experience variables for men and women not living alone. Variables are ranked from 0 (not involved) to 1 (solely responsible). The last column shows the share of single households for men and women from the full sample.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; own calculations

Measuring experience

Inference of differentiated experience is possible in the BOP-HH due to a question regarding household responsibilities introduced in April 2021, namely everyday purchases (*shop_groceries*), major purchases (*shop_major*), meal preparation (*prep_meals*) and financial decisions (*decide_finance*). Respondents indicate whether they are not involved in the task (0), engage jointly with other household members (0.5) or are solely responsible for all work (1). Since the question is only asked for the first time an individual participates in the survey, I assume that household chores remain constant over time in the panel. Further, the variable is only asked for non-singles. The analysis will show both full sample and non-single sub-samples separately and where household experiences are included focus on the households with more than one member.

The data reveal that traditional gender norms are still present in German households. Table 2 compares grocery shopping, meal preparation, financial decision making, and major purchases in male and female samples. As expected, the female respondents appear significantly more involved in grocery shopping and meal preparation, but less involved in financial planning in households that involve more than one member. Major purchases are balanced between the samples such that no clear gender roles emerge. Men in the data are less likely to live alone. The focus of this analysis is the variable *shop_groceries* as it is a direct measure of whether an individual frequently observes food prices.

Observation 3.1 Traditional gender norms persist in Germany. Women in the BOP-HH are more often responsible for grocery shopping in households with more than one member.

Measuring financial answer confidence

I compute a novel measure of financial confidence, which I call financial answer confidence. I utilize data from the BOP-HH and SCE, which include micro-level financial literacy via a standardised financial literacy test (Lusardi & Mitchell, 2007). The test score ranges from 0 to 3, calculated from three questions covering compound interest, inflation, and risk.⁹ Correct answers earn one point each, while "don't know" responses are marked as incorrect. The SCE provides a consistent financial literacy score over time, whereas the BOP-HH includes the test only in January 2022. To measure confidence and recover a measure for the full sample, I use a combination of variables related to confidence to predict financial literacy out-of-sample.¹⁰ This allows me to focus on the answer confidence components in financial literacy. I assume that answer confidence forms one component of financial literacy and can be recovered. Below, I introduce the variables used in the prediction exercise.

First, following C. C. Binder (2017) and Reiche and Meyler (2022), I derive a rounding measure (round). According to the "Round Numbers, Round Interpretations" hypothesis in linguistics (Krifka, 2009), individuals uncertain about the precise value use the nearest round number. In the context of inflation, this implies that those uncertain about future inflation may be inclined to predict inflation of around 0, 5 or 10 rather than more precise digits.¹¹ Most participants give non-rounded responses (79.43% in the BOP-HH and 66.70% in the SCE).¹² Second, I use self-reported interest (qinterest) and ease of survey (qeasy, only in BOP-HH) from feedback questions. These are about all the topics of the survey, inflation being one core element. Assuming interest correlates with answer confidence in answering, these responses help estimate financial answer confidence. Note, however, that feedback is not given purely on inflation. The surveys include many other political topics and economic indicators, so a respondent could be confident about inflation but have difficulty evaluating other topics. Lastly, I control for previous survey participation (refresher) as the learning-through-survey effect can be substantial in household panels (Kim & Binder, 2020) such that

⁹Detailed question wording can be found in Appendices B.1 and B.2.

¹⁰I compute robustness exercises for the BOP-HH measure using the SCE full sample.

¹¹Reiche and Meyler (2022) show in detail how the distribution of the responses indicates that there are indeed three groups of respondents, those responding in digits ("certain"), those responding in fives ("uncertain") and those responding in multiples of ten ("highly uncertain"). These can also be found in a histogram of the quantitative inflation expectations in both surveys (see Appendix Figure C.1). Most prominently, it displays a heavier tail for females.

¹²This differs from the findings of Reiche and Meyler (2022), who estimate a share of precise respondents of around 25% in 2019 and after. One possible explanation for the difference could be that the authors use data from the European Commission Consumer Survey which records an inflation expectation of zero for all respondents, qualitatively indicating that inflation "will stay about the same". In contrast, the BOP-HH and SCE do not directly link qualitative and quantitative questions. This explains the lower share of "zero" respondents in both surveys, which are classified as "rounders" in the analysis.

earlier involvement may boost confidence.

I run an ordered logit regression with the test score as dependent variable and the measures above as explanatory variables. This allows creating a larger BOP-HH sample while verifying results with the SCE. Appendix Table 8 shows that rounding lowers financial literacy scores, while interest and ease positively correlate with higher scores. Surprisingly, being a refresher has a negative coefficient in both surveys. Gender also impacts scores similarly across both surveys. Financial answer confidence is constructed as the predicted probability of scoring 3 out of 3 in the financial literacy test using the ordered logistic regression coefficients. To verify that low confidence is associated with higher uncertainty in point forecasts (as modeled in the Bayesian framework), I examine the inverse relationship between confidence scores and the interquartile range of fitted probability distributions.¹³ The Pearson correlation coefficient between the predicted financial answer confidence score and the fitted interquartile range is -0.1235 in the BOP-HH and -0.1312 in the SCE, both significant at p < 0.001. Appendix Figure B.1 illustrates this negative correlation.

Just as the experience hypothesis relies on the presence of traditional gender norms as shown above, the financial confidence hypothesis relies on two assumptions: (1) Women have lower financial confidence, and (2) low financial confidence increases expectations through a heavy right tail.

There is evidence that women perform worse in standardized financial literacy tests (Bucher-Koenen et al., 2017; Lusardi & Mitchell, 2008) which is driven by their lower confidence (Bucher-Koenen et al., 2021). Table 3 Panel A summarizes financial answer confidence scores and averages of the predictors discussed above for men and women in Germany and the US. In both countries, women have significantly lower financial answer confidence scores as they display much higher uncertainty and less interest in the topics around inflation. The only variable that shows no significant difference compared to men is *refresher*.

Observation 3.2 Women in the BOP-HH and SCE perform worse on standardized financial literacy tests. They are also shown to be less confident, have higher uncertainty of their expectations, round more often and find the questions less easy and interesting.

The hypothesis also assumes that financial answer confidence impacts inflation expectations through higher uncertainty, i.e., a flat prior. Financial literacy significantly influences inflation expectations (Burke & Manz, 2014; D'Acunto et al., 2019). One channel causing

¹³Probabilistic questions have been used in Engelberg et al. (2009) in the context of the Survey of Professional Forecasters and for consumers in Armantier et al. (2013). I follow the procedure applied in both papers to exploit the probabilistic question.

	BOP-HH N=91501		SC N=12	CE 1 <i>3165</i>
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Panel A: Financial answer confidence				
qeasy	3.28	3.01		
	(0.86)	(0.86)		
qinterest	3.78	3.59	3.78	3.68
	(0.86)	(0.89)	(0.98)	(1.00)
refresher	0.65	0.63	0.87	0.86
	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.34)	(0.35)
round	0.18	0.25	0.23	0.43
	(0.38)	(0.43)	(0.42)	(0.5)
P(test = 3)	0.71	0.53	0.27	0.17
	(0.13)	(0.15)	(0.3)	(0.21)
Panel B: Inflation Expectations				
π^E_t	4.66	5.64	4.01	6.04
U U	(4.42)	(6.31)	(8.01)	(13.73)
$\pi_t^E (\text{low } P(test = 3))$	4.98	5.84	4.34	6.3
	(5.17)	(6.68)	(8.03)	(13.37)
π_t^E (high $P(test = 3)$)	4.51	4.87	3.69	5.77
	(4.02)	(4.56)	(7.99)	(14.1)

Table 3:	Financial	answer	confidence	and	inflation	expectations	of m	en and	women

Standard deviation in parentheses.

Notes: Panel A: Average values of financial answer confidence variables of men and women in two surveys. P(test = 3) is the predicted probability of scoring 3 on the financial literacy test from the ordinal logit regression. *refresher* is a dummy for previous survey participation, *round* is a dummy for a rounded point forecast, and *qinterest* and *qeasy* are ordered categorical feedback responses on survey interest (1: very interesting - 4: not interesting at all) and difficulty (1: very difficult - 4: very easy). Difficulty is not asked in the SCE.

Panel B: Average inflation point forecasts (12 months ahead) for men and women as well as split by high or low financial answer confidence. High denotes P(test = 3) above the median.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; own calculations

this result is that lower financial answer confidence (naturally related to literacy) increases uncertainty, skewing expectations upward. The survey design influences this direction. Consumers typically provide point forecasts within the 0-100 range, asymmetrically around the 2% inflation target. If those with a flatter prior select a middle-range value, it results in an upward bias. This is demonstrated in Section 2, where a flatter log-normal prior increases average expectations despite unchanged signals.

Using the derived confidence measures, I split the sample into a high and a low financial answer confidence group (using the median predicted score as cutoff). Table 3 Panel B shows that for both men and women those with high confidence have lower inflation expectations.

Observation 3.3 There is a confidence gap in inflation expectations for both men and women.

4 The Effects of Financial Confidence and Shopping Experience

Heterogeneity in experiences and in financial confidence are not mutually exclusive hypotheses for explaining the gender gap in inflation expectations. The Bayesian framework in Section 2 demonstrates that these parameters are complementary: low financial confidence increases the impact of experiences, and the effect of a flat prior is amplified when signals are noisy.

4.1 Grocery experiences matter when financial answer confidence is low

Using the BOP-HH data, which includes information on grocery shopping and financial answer confidence, I test the interaction of financial answer confidence and grocery shopping with the following panel regression model:

$$\pi_{i,t}^{E} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 female_i + \beta_2 P(test = 3)_{i,t} + H_i \gamma_1 + P(test = 3)_{i,t} \times H_i \gamma_2 + X_{i,t} \gamma_3 + D_t \gamma_4 + R_i \gamma_5 + \bar{X}_i \theta + v_i + \rho_t,$$
(6)

where $\pi_{i,t}^E$ represents individual i's inflation expectation (point forecast, 12 months ahead) at time t, *female_i* is a dummy variable for self-identifying as female, $P(test = 3)_{i,t}$ is a measure of financial answer confidence, and H_i is a vector of individual level involvement in household activities such as grocery shopping, meal preparation, purchase of major items and financial decision-making (see Section 3). The focus here is on grocery shopping, the other activities are used as controls. Demographic controls¹⁴ are summarized in $X_{i,t}$, R_i denotes regional dummies, D_t denotes time dummies and \bar{X}_i denotes the time averages of individual i of age and income.¹⁵ Initially, I focus on respondents in non-single households, but show the full sample for comparison.

While the results in Table 4 show no significant role for grocery shopping and other household chores in column (3),¹⁶ financial answer confidence has a substantial impact on inflation expectations. Including financial answer confidence as an additional variable reduces the size of the gender gap considerably in column (2) compared to the baseline specification in column (1). Adding both experience controls and financial answer confidence in column (4) does not qualitatively change these observations. However, when interaction terms for experiences with financial answer confidence are included, the results show that experience does matter. Columns (5) and (6) introduce various experience variables and their interaction terms with financial answer confidence. The coefficient for female remains largely unchanged, while the coefficient for financial answer confidence slightly reduces, becoming insignificant due to increased standard errors. Grocery shopping, initially insignificant, becomes positively significant with a negative and significant interaction term. For respondents in the bottom 16.75% of financial answer confidence (share of women among those observations is 82.25%), grocery shopping significantly raises inflation expectations.¹⁷ Figure 1 visualizes this result. The reverse is true for purchasing major items, traditionally a male-dominated task. Different levels of financial answer confidence amplify the effects of experience on inflation expectations. Additionally, there are no significant effects of living in a single household beyond the involvement in chores.

Result 4.1 Grocery shopping and meal preparations increase inflation expectations only for

$$\bar{x}_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_t \tag{7}$$

¹⁶with the exception of financial decision making which is more a measure of financial literacy than price experiences

 $^{^{14}}age_{i,t}$ records the individual i's age at time t, $educ_i$ is an ordered categorical variable of i's education, $inc_{i,t}$ is an ordered categorical variable of the household income of observation i at time t

¹⁵All three surveys with microdata are of panel structure. Due to my interest in time invariant variables such as *female*, I cannot use fixed effects estimation. I employ an alternative estimator to estimate time invariant variables, while maintaining robustness to endogeneity caused by time-invariant observables: I incorporate between effects of time varying variables in the existing model and apply pooled OLS to the transformed model. Between effects are computed as follows:

¹⁷Using the coefficients in column (5) of Table 4 and the standard error of the sum of the coefficients on shop_groceries and $P(test = 3) \times shop_groceries$ (0.1203), the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval for the predicted effect of grocery shopping is positive for $P(test = 3) \leq 0.4636$. 16.75% of all observations satisfy $P(test = 3) \leq 0.4636$, the share of women of those who do is 82.25%)

	Inflation expectation (12 months ahead, point estimate)					
			Non-singles			Full sample
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Constant	4.69^{***} (0.22)	5.43^{***} (0.25)	4.65^{***} (0.28)	5.31^{***} (0.30)	5.16^{***} (0.71)	5.13^{***} (0.74)
female	0.80^{***} (0.06)	0.53^{***} (0.08)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.71^{***} \\ (0.07) \end{array}$	0.45^{***} (0.08)	0.42^{***} (0.08)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.43^{***} \\ (0.06) \end{array}$
P(test = 3)		-1.68^{***} (0.30)		-1.67^{***} (0.30)	-1.49^{**} (0.62)	-1.47^{**} (0.60)
shop_groceries			0.05	0.06	1.40^{***}	1.39^{***}
$shop_major$			(0.03) 0.04 (0.14)	(0.05) (0.14)	(0.42) -1.79^{***} (0.58)	(0.42) -1.84^{***} (0.58)
prep_meals			0.15 (0.10)	0.15 (0.10)	0.64 (0.40)	0.64 (0.40)
decide_finance			-0.18^{*} (0.11)	-0.14 (0.11)	-0.02 (0.46)	-0.04 (0.45)
single						-0.38 (1.45)
$P(test = 3) \times shop_groceries$					-1.99^{***}	-1.99^{***}
$P(test = 3) \times shop_major$					(0.62) 2.78^{***} (0.86)	(0.61) 2.83^{***} (0.85)
$P(test = 3) \times prep_meals$					(0.86) -0.76 (0.50)	(0.85) -0.75 (0.58)
$P(test = 3) \times decide_finance$					(0.59) -0.20	(0.58) -0.18 (0.67)
$P(test = 3) \times single$					(0.08)	(0.67) -0.01 (2.21)
age	-0.01^{***}	-0.01^{***}	-0.01^{***}	-0.01^{***}	-0.01^{***}	-0.01^{***}
educ	-0.08^{***} (0.01)	-0.06^{***} (0.01)	-0.08^{***} (0.01)	-0.06^{***} (0.01)	(0.002) -0.06^{***} (0.01)	(0.001) -0.05^{***} (0.01)
income	(0.01) -0.09^{***} (0.01)	(0.02) -0.04^{***} (0.02)	(0.01) -0.08^{***} (0.01)	(0.02) -0.04^{***} (0.02)	(0.02) -0.05^{***} (0.02)	(0.01) -0.06^{***} (0.01)
Observations P ²	26,595	26,595	26,595	26,595	26,595	48,146
n	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.16

Table 4: The role of financial answer confidence and experience

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Standard errors in parentheses.

Notes: Coefficients from a pooled OLS regression of individual 12-month inflation expectations in the BOP-HH. The full model is specified in Equation (6). All regressions incorporate regional controls, between effects, and time fixed effects.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; own calculations

the individuals in the lowest quintile of financial answer confidence distribution which is dominated by women.

In a simple counterfactual exercise, I compare the female dummy from column (1) with a counterfactual dummy where I reweight women in the sample such that their distribution of either financial answer confidence, grocery shopping or both matches that of men. Using this method I find that if women had the same grocery shopping involvement as men but continue to have different financial answer confidence, the gender gap reduces by approximately 9% (from 0.8 to 0.73). In contrast, if they had the same distribution of financial answer confidence but continued the differential shopping experience, the gender gap reduces by 33% (from 0.8 to 0.54). Finally, aligning both distributions reduces the gender gap by 43% (from 0.8 to 0.46).

4.2 Financial answer confidence can fully explain the gender gap

Having established that experience matters jointly with financial answer confidence, this section explores this channel further. It verifies that in both the BOP-HH and the SCE, there is no gender gap in inflation expectations among those with high financial answer confidence. Even if grocery shopping is unequally distributed among men and women in this sample, tight priors mitigate the mean-increasing effect of observing volatile signals.

To test whether the gender gap in inflation expectations diminishes when controlling for financial answer confidence, I use a pooled OLS estimation with point forecasts as the dependent variable and various demographic explanatory variables. Unlike the previous model, I include an estimate of financial answer confidence and interact it with the female dummy:

$$\pi_{i,t}^E = \alpha + \beta_1 female_i + \beta_2 P(test = 3)_{i,t} + \beta_3 female_i \times P(test = 3)_{i,t} + X_{i,t}\gamma_1 + D_t\gamma_2 + R_i\gamma_3 + \bar{X}_i\theta + v_i + \rho_t,$$
(8)

where all variables are defined as before. I test if the gender gap reduces when financial answer confidence increases: $\beta_3 \leq 0$.

The results are summarized in Table 5 for the BOP-HH. In the Appendix, Table 10 presents the SCE results. For both surveys, the interaction term in model (3) and (5) indicates that while women with low financial answer confidence have much higher expectations than their male counterparts, as confidence increases, the gap diminishes. This effect is stronger for the confidence score than for the pure literacy tests score. Figure 2 plots the predicted gender gap along different financial answer confidence scores computed as $\hat{\Delta}_{\pi^E}^{GG} = \beta_1 + \beta_3 \times$



Figure 2: The gender gap for different levels of financial answer confidence (BOP-HH)

Notes: The black line shows the predicted gender gap in inflation expectations across financial answer confidence scores $(\hat{\Delta}_{\pi^E}^{GG}(x) = 2.15 - 2.60x)$. The full regression results are in Table 5, column (3). The grey area represents the 95% confidence interval (standard error: 0.1468). The histograms display the distribution of financial answer confidence scores for men (green) and women (orange, crosshatched).

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; own calculations

 $P(test = 3).^{18}$

Result 4.2 The gender gap in inflation expectations diminishes as financial answer confidence increases and is zero (or negative) for those with high financial answer confidence.

5 Robustness Exercises

To examine the proposed mechanism behind the gender gap in inflation expectations, I conduct three robustness checks using all three available surveys:

(A) **Outlier Impact**: I test the sensitivity of the gender gap to trimming of outliers. The financial confidence hypothesis suggests that the gap may be driven by women with

¹⁸A similar plot for the SCE is in the Appendix (Figure C.3).

	Inflatio	on expectation	(12 month ahe	ead, point estir	nate)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Constant	$ \begin{array}{c} 4.69^{***} \\ (0.17) \end{array} $	5.39^{***} (0.18)	4.56^{***} (0.19)	8.03^{***} (0.56)	$7.58^{***} \\ (0.62)$
female	$\begin{array}{c} 0.87^{***} \\ (0.03) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.54^{***} \\ (0.04) \end{array}$	2.15^{***} (0.15)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.43^{***} \\ (0.16) \end{array}$	1.30^{**} (0.58)
P(test = 3)		-2.03^{***} (0.16)	-0.73^{***} (0.20)		
$P(test = 3) \times female$			-2.60^{***} (0.24)		
fin_lit_test				-0.70^{***} (0.11)	-0.53^{***} (0.15)
fin_lit_test \times female					-0.35 (0.22)
age	-0.01^{***} (0.001)	-0.01^{***} (0.001)	-0.01^{***} (0.001)	-0.01^{**} (0.01)	-0.01^{**} (0.01)
single	-0.34^{***} (0.04)	-0.21^{***} (0.04)	-0.23^{***} (0.04)	-0.17 (0.20)	-0.16 (0.20)
educ	-0.07^{***} (0.005)	-0.05^{***} (0.01)	-0.05^{***} (0.01)	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.03 (0.02)
income	-0.14^{***} (0.01)	-0.08^{***} (0.01)	-0.09^{***} (0.01)	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.04)
Time dummies Region dummies Between effects	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	No Yes No	No Yes No
Observations R ²	$91,501 \\ 0.16$	$91,501 \\ 0.16$	$91,501 \\ 0.16$	$2,916 \\ 0.03$	$2,916 \\ 0.03$

Table 5: The impact of financial answer confidence on the gender gap (BOP-HH)

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Standard errors in parentheses.

Notes: Regression coefficients from a pooled OLS estimation of individual 12-month-ahead inflation expectations in the BOP-HH. The full model is specified in Equation (8). Columns (4) and (5) replicate (2) and (3) with the computed test score for January 2022.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; own calculations 21

very high, rounded expectations, such that trimming should reduce the gender gap.

- (B) Singles Analysis: I investigate whether the gender gap exists among singles. According to the experience hypothesis, there should be no gender gap among singles since both men and women engage symmetrically in grocery shopping when living alone. However, a financial confidence gap may still exist among singles, leading to asymmetric expectations despite symmetric shopping.
- (C) Food Price Inflation Periods: I assess whether the gender gap widens during periods of high food price inflation, i.e. when women in traditional gender roles observe even higher price increases. This does not necessarily hold if financial confidence is the main channel causing the gender gap.

The confirmation of (1) and rejection of (2) and (3) support the financial confidence hypothesis proposed in this paper.

5.1 The gender gap driven by the tails

One implication of the financial confidence hypothesis is that the gender gap should disappear when the sample is trimmed to remove outliers in the right-skewed distribution. To test this, I compute the gender gap across deciles of the expectations distribution, controlling for demographics and time periods in three surveys (BOP-HH, SCE, and MSC). I run a regression for each decile of the expectations distribution, with the dependent variable defined as $I_{\pi_{i,t}^E \leq \pi_q^E} \times \pi_{i,t}^E$, where $I_{\pi_{i,t}^E \leq \pi_q^E}$ is an indicator variable for observations with inflation point forecasts below percentile q of the full sample:

$$I_{\pi_{i,t}^E \le \pi_q^E} \times \pi_{i,t}^E = I_{\pi_{i,t}^E \le \pi_q^E} \times (\alpha + \beta_1 female_i + X_{i,t}\gamma_1 + D_t\gamma_2 + R_i\gamma_3 + \bar{X}_i\theta + v_i + \rho_t).$$

$$(9)$$

I test whether the gender gap closes when outliers are removed: $\beta_1^{(q_1)} \leq \beta_1^{(q_2)} \Rightarrow q_1 \leq q_2$. Figure 3 plots the coefficient of *female* across percentiles, showing a steady increase as predicted by the financial confidence hypothesis. In samples limited to inflation expectations below the 50th percentile, no positive gender gap is observed. Conversely, for lower percentiles, the gender gap is negative. The regression table is in Appendix, Table 11.

Observation 5.1 The gender gap in means is driven by the heavy tail in the female distribution. When the sample is restricted to the lowest 50% of inflation expectations, there is no positive gap and at lower percentiles a significantly negative gender gap emerges.



Figure 3: The gender gap along deciles in the inflation expectations distribution

Notes: Estimated regression coefficients for the dummy variable *female* in decile regressions of the inflation expectations distribution (0.1 to 0.9) across three surveys: BOP-HH, MSC, and SCE in the green line. The regression model follows Equation (9). 95% confidence bands are shaded in grey. Orange bars represent the percentiles in the inflation expectations distribution.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, MSC, January 1978 - January 2023; own calculations

5.2 The gender gap amongst singles

One implication of the pure experience hypothesis is that there should be no gender gap in inflation expectations for single men and women, as singles are likely to engage in grocery shopping irrespective of gender and thus should experience similar inflation levels and volatility.

To test this, I run a panel regression of inflation expectations on a female dummy, controlling for age, income, and education. The model is specified as:

$$\pi_{i,t}^E = \alpha + \beta_1 female_i + X_{i,t}\gamma_1 + D_t\gamma_2 + R_i\gamma_3 + \bar{X}_i\theta + v_i + \rho_t, \tag{10}$$

where all variables are defined as before. The model is run on two subsamples of each survey, singles (S) and non-singles (N). Under the experience hypothesis, the gender gap should be larger in the non-single sample: $\beta_1^{(N)} - \beta_1^{(S)} > 0$.

Table 6 shows that for all surveys (a) there is a persistent and significant gender gap for both, singles and non-singles and (b) it is not statistically smaller for singles. In fact, in the SCE the gender gap is larger for singles. This is novel evidence as D'Acunto, Malmendier, and Weber (2021) show no evidence for non-married and single individuals, and Jonung (1981) shows no treatment of disaggregated data.

Observation 5.2 The gender gap is significant and no different between singles and nonsingles.

5.3 The gender gap correlated with historical food prices

Under the experience hypothesis, the gender gap is expected to widen in periods of higher food price inflation or price volatility compared to CPI core. This is because in those periods, household members with grocery shopping exposure observe particularly high/volatile prices which increases the level/noisiness of their signals in the Bayesian learning framework.

To analyze this, I use a regression model similar to the previous setup but replace time dummies with variables measuring the difference in food price inflation (CPI_t^{food}) and total inflation (CPI_t^{total}) , as well as the moving coefficients of variation of these variables:

$$\pi_t^E = \beta_0 + \beta_1 female_i + \beta_2 female_i \times (CPI_t^{food} - CPI_t^{total}) + \beta_3 (CPI_t^{food} - CPI_t^{total}) + \beta_4 female_i \times (\rho_{t,6}^{food} - \rho_{t,6}^{total}) + \beta_5 (\rho_{t,6}^{food} - \rho_{t,6}^{total}) + X_t \gamma_1 + R_i \gamma_2 + \bar{X}_i \theta + v_i + \rho_t,$$

$$(11)$$

where, $(CPI_t^{food} - CPI_t^{total})$ measures the gap between a given period's food inflation and total

	Inflation expectation (12 months ahead, point estimate)							
	BOP-	·HH	SC	E	MSC			
-	Ν	S	Ν	S	Ν	S		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		
Constant	5.57***	5.04***	8.66***	8.39***	7.27***	7.36***		
	(0.23)	(0.40)	(0.41)	(0.80)	(0.29)	(0.60)		
female	1.30***	1.27***	1.39***	2.01***	0.85***	0.89***		
	(0.04)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.13)	(0.03)	(0.05)		
age	-0.02^{***}	-0.01^{***}	0.01**	0.02***	-0.01^{***}	-0.02^{***}		
0	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.001)		
income	-0.20^{***}	-0.19^{***}	-0.37^{***}	-0.41^{***}	-0.00^{***}	-0.00***		
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.00)	(0.00)		
educ	-0.10^{***}	-0.08***	-0.46^{***}	-0.58^{***}	-0.24^{***}	-0.26^{***}		
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.01)	(0.02)		
$\overline{\beta_1^{(N)} - \beta_1^{(S)}}$	0.02	81	-0.61	-0 619***		-0 0398		
	(0.0.	92)	(0.154)		(0.057)			
Time dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Region dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Between effects	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes		
Observations	83,704	27,381	74,385	41,106	$195,\!107$	66,268		
\mathbb{R}^2	0.13	0.11	0.03	0.03	0.13	0.10		

Table 6: Comparing the gender gap in inflation expectations for singles and non-singles

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Standard errors in parentheses.

Notes: Regression coefficients from a pooled OLS estimation of individual inflation expectations (12 months ahead). The full model is detailed in Equation (10). Due to the SCE's panel structure limitations, no between effects are included for this survey. N indicates households with more than 1 member and S indicates single households. The italics below indicate the gap between the coefficient on female in non-single and single samples along with the standard error.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, MSC, January 1978 - January 2023; own calculations

inflation and $(\rho_{t,6}^{food} - \rho_{t,6}^{total})$ represents the gap between the coefficients of variation of food and total inflation over a 6-month moving window.¹⁹ The regression results are reported in Table 7. Under the experience hypothesis, $\beta_2 > 0$ and $\beta_4 > 0$. However, the analysis reveals that in both the BOP-HH and MSC surveys, the coefficient for the interaction term with the absolute inflation gap (β_2) is significantly negative. This suggests that the gender gap in inflation expectations actually diminishes when food prices are very high relative to core inflation. On the other hand, the interaction with the inflation variability gap (β_4) is found to be insignificant. Additionally, β_3 and β_5 show mixed results: they are significantly positive in the BOP-HH but negative in the MSC, indicating no clear effect on inflation expectations solely from these factors.

Observation 5.3 The magnitude of the gender gap is unresponsive to the size of food price inflation relative to total inflation.

6 Discussion

There could be additional channels to explain the gender gap in inflation expectations. Economic pessimism, defined by Hey (1984) as skewing expectations towards unfavorable outcomes, could influence inflation expectations. Although studies suggest women may exhibit greater pessimism in various contexts,²⁰ evidence specific to inflation is lacking. A simple t-test in the BOP-HH indicates no significant difference in general mood between men (mean = 2.12) and women (mean = 2.14, scale 1–4, p-value = 0.0544). Additionally, recent research (Garriga, 2023) suggests women may express less satisfaction with the Bank of England's work, potentially influencing their perception of inflation negatively. Future studies could also explore the concept of "pinkflation", where products predominantly purchased by women might experience higher inflation rates compared to those purchased by men. Research in this area is currently limited, and scanner data could provide insights into these questions.

$$\rho_{t,n} = \frac{\sigma_{t,n}}{\bar{x_{t,n}}} \times 100$$

Moving
$$SD_t = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=t-n+1}^t (x_i - \overline{x}_t)^2}$$

where x_i is the value at time *i*.

¹⁹The moving coefficient of variation is defined as follows:

where t denotes the current period, n is the number of periods over which to calculate the moving average and standard deviation, $x_{t,n}^-$ is the moving average and $\sigma_{t,n}$ describes the moving standard deviation computed as

 $^{^{20}}$ Jacobsen et al. (2014) on consumer sentiment and stock market performance, Chaney et al. (1998) on election outcomes, Garbarino and Strahilevitz (2004) on online shopping, Lin and Raghubir (2005) on marriage, Lyons et al. (2009) on health and Gwartney-Gibbs and Lach (2016) on war

Inflation expectation	(12 months)	ahead, poir	nt estimate)
	BOP-HH	SCE	MSC
Constant	6.94***	7.77***	7.13***
	(0.12)	(0.20)	(0.06)
female	1.32***	1.61***	0.75***
	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.02)
$\operatorname{CPI}_t^{food}$ - $\operatorname{CPI}_t^{total}$	0.44***	0.03	-0.06***
с с	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)
female x ($\operatorname{CPI}_t^{food} - \operatorname{CPI}_t^{total}$)	-0.01	-0.03	-0.09^{***}
	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.01)
ρ_{t6}^{food} - ρ_{t6}^{total}	0.10***	-0.01	-0.03***
,0	(0.005)	(0.01)	(0.01)
female x $(\rho_{t,6}^{food} - \rho_{t,6}^{total})$	-0.001	0.01	-0.01
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)
age	0.79***	0.01***	-0.04***
	(0.05)	(0.002)	(0.02)
income	0.03	-0.38***	-0.0000***
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.0000)
single	-0.40***	-0.09	-0.16***
	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.03)
educ	-0.08***	-0.50***	-0.34***
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)
Between effects	Yes	No	Yes
Regional dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	111,085	115,491	259,755
R^2	0.08	0.03	0.03

Table 7: Microlevel effects of high food prices

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Standard errors in parentheses.

Notes: Regression coefficients from a pooled OLS estimation of individual inflation expectations (12 months ahead) including the difference between food and total inflation, and their moving coefficient of variation. The full model is specified in Equation (11). Time dummies are omitted. The SCE lacks between effects as demographic questions are asked only once.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, MSC, January 1978 - January 2023; OECD, Prices: Consumer prices, Main Economic Indicators (database), January 1978 - January 2023; own calculations

The empirical section of this paper focuses on financial answer confidence by isolating it from the broader concept of financial literacy. However, the theoretical framework views this as a manifestation of a flat prior, suggesting it reflects uncertainty rather than confidence. Distinguishing between financial answer confidence, uncertainty about inflation concepts, and well-informed uncertainty about the future is challenging with the available data. In Section 3, I demonstrate that low financial answer confidence correlates with a wider interquartile range in probabilistic questions—a measure that could encompass both types of uncertainty. Thus, while financial answer confidence captures uncertainty to a significant extent, disentangling the specific effects of these drivers remains a promising avenue for future research.

Another avenue for future research is exploring the behavioral consequences of the gender gap in inflation expectations. The available data do not allow for a thorough analysis of the Euler equation's validity for men and women, as the surveys only capture intent to spend without information on actual spending. The literature is divided on whether consumers adhere to the Euler equation. For instance, Dräger and Nghiem (2020) find supporting evidence using a new survey of German consumers, while Bachmann et al. (2015) show that spending intent (as measured in the MSC) is unresponsive to changes in inflation expectations. These mixed results may stem from differences in survey design, such as the distinction between spending intent and actual spending, as well as geographical variations. In recent work Coibion et al. (2024) show how higher uncertainty reduces spending. Since I show that women's higher inflation expectations can be linked to economic uncertainty, these may translate into lower spending. It is plausible that spending behavior aligns with the Euler equation only for individuals who (a) are not liquidity constrained, (b) possess sufficient financial literacy to understand the impact of inflation on savings, and (c) trust their own literacy enough to base financial decisions on their beliefs.

7 Conclusion

This paper contributes both theoretically and empirically to the literature on inflation expectations. Theoretically, I demonstrate that heterogeneity in observed point forecasts can stem from noise in priors and received signals. Specifically, assuming a log-normal prior distribution, adjusting noise volatility can heighten average inflation expectations, aligning with the established experience hypothesis in literature (D'Acunto, Malmendier, & Weber, 2021; Jonung, 1981). However, this channel will only work when priors are sufficiently flat.

Empirically, in data from German households, I find that grocery shopping alone

inadequately explains inflation expectations. I introduce a new concept, financial answer confidence which measures the confidence component of financial literacy when households respond to surveys. Yet, interactions with financial answer confidence reveal grocery shopping elevates expectations among those with low confidence but depresses them for high-confidence individuals. My findings thus demonstrate the gender gap as a composite of traditional gender norms and women's lower financial confidence. Controlling for financial answer confidence can close the gender gap fully. This finding is important for the literature on inflation expectations beyond the gender gap: Low financial answer confidence causes an upward bias through rounding in periods of low inflation (choosing "5" overestimates 0% inflation), but the bias may in fact be downwards in high inflation periods ("5" underestimates 10% inflation). Thus, survey expectations may appear more anchored in high inflation periods. This may explain why Hajdini et al. (2024) do not find a positive gender gap in a new survey of indirect inflation expectations conducted during the recent inflation surge.

While the German data is collected during a period of increasing inflation, which can affect the attention consumers pay to inflation (Weber et al., forthcoming), I provide robustness checks using US data from the SCE and the MSC. Trimming the distributions of expectations reduces the gender gap significantly, demonstrating that the gap is driven by outliers. Contrary to implications from the standard experience hypothesis, my robustness checks also reveal that the gender gap does not vanish among singles nor heighten during periods of high food price inflation. The evidence suggests that the pure experience hypothesis is not enough to explain the gender gap in inflation expectations. Financial answer confidence emerges as pivotal, with grocery shopping heightening expectations solely within the lowconfidence subset, aligning with the framework's predictions.

The fact that the gender gap appears to be driven largely by financial answer confidence has policy implications. While many women have similar expectations to those of men and appear equally financially literate, there exists a large upper tail of women with lower confidence. This translates into rounded and less precise estimates and matters for female investment and saving behavior. Lusardi and Mitchell (2008) show that women often under-save for retirement, which is worsened by the fact that many reach an older age than male spouses. Expecting higher levels of inflation due to lower confidence rationalizes this result. Further, lower confidence may lead to lower perceptibly to policy communicated in expert language. If women pay less attention or are less likely to draw the correct conclusions from policy messages due to low levels of financial literacy in the tails and trust in own abilities, they will not adjust behavior as expected. This suggests that policy should focus on (a) improving financial literacy of women and (b) communicate monetary policy in simpler language to address individuals with lower literacy. A promising channel may be to increase the representation of women in policy institutions which has been linked to better outreach (D'Acunto, Fuster, & Weber, 2022).

References

- Abildgren, K., & Kuchler, A. (2021). Revisiting the inflation perception conundrum. Journal of Macroeconomics, 67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmacro.2020.103264
- Arioli, R., Lim, Y. C., Sek, S. K., Easaw, J., Golinelli, R., Malgarini, M., Morvan, C., Jenkins, B., Carroll, C. D., Axtell, R., Branch, W., Christ, C., Dickens, W., Dotsey, M., Epstein, J., Goodfriend, M., Manning, J., Mccallum, B., Mehra, Y., ... Schulhofer-Wohl, S. (2017). EU Consumers' Quantitative Inflation Perceptions and Expectations: an Evaluation. Occasional Paper Series, European Central Bank, 91(186). Retrieved September 23, 2024, from https://www.ecb.europa.eu/pub/pdf/scpops/ecb.op186. en.pdf?c58df51446c7605dd5f939bcc7cd35b3
- Armantier, O., Bruine De Bruin, W., Potter, S., Topa, G., Van Der Klaauw, W., & Zafar, B. (2013). Measuring inflation expectations. Annual Review of Economics, 5, 273–301. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-081512-141510
- Armantier, O., Nelson, S., Topa, G., van der Klaauw, W., & Zafar, B. (2016). The price is right: Updating inflation expectations in arandomized price information experiment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 98(3), 503–523. https://doi.org/10.1162/ REST{_}a{_}00499
- Bachmann, R., Berg, T. O., & Sims, E. R. (2015). Inflation Expectations and Readiness to Spend: Cross-Sectional Evidence. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 7(1), 1–35. https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20130292
- Binder, C. (2017). Fed speak on main street: Central bank communication and household expectations. Journal of Macroeconomics, 52, 238–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/J. JMACRO.2017.05.003
- Binder, C. C. (2017). Measuring uncertainty based on rounding: New method and application to inflation expectations. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 90. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.jmoneco.2017.06.001
- Blanchflower, D., & MacCoille, C. (2009). The formation of inflation expectations: an empirical analysis for the UK. NBER Working Paper. https://doi.org/10.3386/w15388
- Brischetto, A., & de Brouwer, G. (1999). Householders' Inflation Expectations. RBA Research Discussion Paper. Retrieved September 23, 2024, from https://catalogue.nla.gov.au/ Record/1434103/Details

- Bruine De Bruin, W., Van der Klaauw, W., Downs, J. S., Fischhoff, B., Topa, G., Armantier,
 O., Chien, S., Colvin, T., Forman, D., Fielding, P., Greenwald, D., Gutsche, T., Holbrook, M., & Weerman, B. (2010). Expectations of Inflation: The Role of Demographic Variables, Expectation Formation, and Financial Literacy. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 44 (2), 381–402. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1745-6606.2010.01174.X
- Bryan, M., & Venkatu, G. (2001). The Curiously Different Inflation Perspectives of Men and Women. *Economic Commentary*, (November 2001). Retrieved September 23, 2024, from https://www.clevelandfed.org/newsroom-and-events/publications/economiccommentary / economic - commentary - archives / 2001 - economic - commentaries / ec-20011101-the-curiously-different-inflation-perspectives-of-men-and-women
- Bucher-Koenen, T., Alessie, R. J., Lusardi, A., & Rooij, M. v. (2021). Fearless Woman: Financial Literacy and Stock Market Participation. NBER Working Paper. https: //doi.org/10.3386/W28723
- Bucher-Koenen, T., Lusardi, A., Alessie, R., & van Rooij, M. (2017). How financially literate are women? an overview and new insights. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 51, 255–283. https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12121
- Burke, M. A., & Manz, M. (2014). Economic Literacy and Inflation Expectations: Evidence from a Laboratory Experiment. Source: Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, 46(7), 1421–1456. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmcb.12144
- Cavallo, A., Cruces, G., & Perez-Truglia, R. (2017). Inflation Expectations, Learning, and Supermarket Prices: Evidence from Survey Experiments. American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, 9(3), 1–35. https://doi.org/10.1257/MAC.20150147
- Chaney, C. K., Alvarez, R. M., & Nagler, J. (1998). Explaining the gender gap in U.S. presidential elections, 1980-1992. *Political Research Quarterly*, 51(2), 311–339. https: //doi.org/10.1177/106591299805100202
- Coibion, O., Georgarakos, D., Gorodnichenko, Y., Kenny, G., & Weber, M. (2024). The Effect of Macroeconomic Uncertainty on Household Spending. *American Economic Review*, 114 (3), 645–677. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20221167
- Coibion, O., Georgarakos, D., Gorodnichenko, Y., & van Rooij, M. (2023). How Does Consumption Respond to News about Inflation? Field Evidence from a Randomized Control Trial. American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, 15(3), 109–152. https:// doi.org/10.1257/mac.20200445
- Coibion, O., Georgarakos, D., Gorodnichenko, Y., & Weber, M. (2023). Forward Guidance and Household Expectations. Journal of the European Economic Association, 21(5), 2131–2171. https://doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvad003

- Coibion, O., Gorodnichenko, Y., Knotek, E. S., & Schoenle, R. (2023). Average Inflation Targeting and Household Expectations. Journal of Political Economy Macroeconomics, 1(2), 403–446. https://doi.org/10.1086/722962
- Coibion, O., Gorodnichenko, Y., Kumar, S., & Pedemonte, M. (2020). Inflation expectations as a policy tool? Journal of International Economics, 124, 103297. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/J.JINTECO.2020.103297
- Coibion, O., Gorodnichenko, Y., & Weber, M. (2022). Monetary Policy Communications and their Effects on Household Inflation Expectations. *Journal of Political Economy*, 130(6), 1537–1584. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1086/718982
- Conrad, C., Enders, Z., & Glas, A. (2022). The role of information and experience for households' inflation expectations. *European Economic Review*, 143, 104015. https: //doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2021.104015
- Corduas, M. (2022). Gender differences in the perception of inflation. Journal of Economic Psychology, 90, 102522. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JOEP.2022.102522
- D'Acunto, F., Charalambakis, E., Geogarakos, D., Kenny, G., Meyer, J., & Weber, M. (2024).
 Household inflation expectations: an overview of recent insights for monetary policy.
 ECB Discussion Paper, (24). Retrieved September 23, 2024, from https://www.ecb.
 europa.eu/pub/pdf/scpdps/ecb.dp24~9b349a69b7.en.pdf
- D'Acunto, F., Fuster, A., & Weber, M. (2022). Diverse Policy Committees Can Reach Underrepresented Groups. *NBER Working Paper*, (29275). https://doi.org/10.3386/w29275
- D'Acunto, F., Hoang, D., Paloviita, M., & Weber, M. (2019). Cognitive Abilities and Inflation Expectations. AEA Papers and Proceedings, 109, 562–66. https://doi.org/10.1257/ PANDP.20191050
- D'Acunto, F., Hoang, D., Paloviita, M., & Weber, M. (2022). IQ, Expectations, and Choice. The Review of Economic Studies, 90(5), 2292–2325. https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/ rdac075
- D'Acunto, F., Malmendier, U., Ospina, J., & Weber, M. (2021). Exposure to grocery prices and inflation expectations. *Journal of Political Economy*, 129(5), 1615–1639. https: //doi.org/10.1086/713192
- D'Acunto, F., Malmendier, U., & Weber, M. (2021). Gender Roles produce divergent economic expectations. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, 118(21). https: //doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2008534118
- D'Acunto, F., & Weber, M. (2024). Why Survey-Based Subjective Expectations are Meaningful and Important. Annual Reveiw of Economics, 16(1), 329–357. https://doi.org/ 10.1146/annurey-economics-091523-043659

- Del Giovane, P., Fabiani, S., & Sabbatini, R. (2008). What's behind "inflation perceptions"? A survey-based analysis of Italian consumers. In *The euro, inflation and consumer's perceptions* (pp. 157–197). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78370-1{_}7
- Di Tella, R., MacCulloch, R. J., & Oswald, A. J. (2001). Preferences over inflation and unemployment: Evidence from surveys of happiness. *American Economic Review*, 91(1), 335–347. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.91.1.335
- Dräger, L., Menz, J. O., & Fritsche, U. (2014). Perceived inflation under loss aversion. *Applied Economics*, 46(3), 282–293. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2013.844328
- Dräger, L., & Nghiem, G. (2020). Are Consumers' Spending Decisions in Line with an Euler Equation? The Review of Economics and Statistics, 103(3), 580–596. https://doi.org/ 10.1162/rest{_}a{_}00909
- Engelberg, J., Manski, C. F., & Williams, J. (2009). Comparing the Point Predictions and Subjective Probability Distributions of Professional Forecasters. *Journal of Business* & Economic Statistics, 27(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1198/jbes.2009.0003
- Federal Reserve Bank of New York. (2020). Survey of Consumer Expectations. Retrieved September 23, 2024, from http://www.newyorkfed.org/microeconomics/sce
- Garbarino, E., & Strahilevitz, M. (2004). Gender differences in the perceived risk of buying online and the effects of receiving a site recommendation. Journal of Business Research, 57(7), 768–775. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00363-6
- Garriga, A. C. (2023). Box A: Public Confidence in the Bank of England. *National Institute* UK Economic Outlook.
- Gorodnichenko, Y., & Sergeyev, D. (n.d.). Zero Lower Bound on Inflation Expectations, NBER. https://www.nber.org/papers/w29496
- Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A., & Lach, D. H. (2016). Sex Differences in Attitudes toward Nuclear War: Journal of Peace Research, 28(2), 161–174. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343391028002003
- Hajdini, I., Knotek, E. S., Leer, J., Pedemonte, M., Rich, R., & Schoenle, R. (2024). Indirect consumer inflation expectations: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 145, 103568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2024.103568
- Hey, J. D. (1984). The Economics of Optimism and Pessimism. *Kyklos*, 37(2), 181–205. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-6435.1984.TB00748.X
- Jacobsen, B., Lee, J. B., Marquering, W., & Zhang, C. Y. (2014). Gender differences in optimism and asset allocation. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 107, 630–651. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JEBO.2014.03.007

- Jonung, L. (1981). Perceived and Expected Rates of Inflation in Sweden. American Economic Review, 71(5), 961–968. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1803477
- Kim, G., & Binder, C. (2020). Learning-through-Survey in Inflation Expectations. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.3790834
- Krifka, M. (2009). Approximate Interpretations of Number Words: A Case for Strategic Communication, Humboldt Universität, Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
- Lamla, M. J., & Vinogradov, D. V. (2019). Central bank announcements: Big news for little people? Journal of Monetary Economics, 108, 21–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/J. JMONECO.2019.08.014
- Leung, C. (2009). The demographics of household inflation perceptions and expectations. Reserve Bank of New Zealand Bulletin, 72(2), 34–42. Retrieved September 23, 2024, from https://www.rbnz.govt.nz/-/media/project/sites/rbnz/files/publications/ bulletins/2009/2009jun72-2leung.pdf
- Lin, Y. C., & Raghubir, P. (2005). Gender differences in unrealistic optimism about marriage and divorce: Are men more optimistic and women more realistic? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(2), 198–207. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271325
- Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2007). Baby Boomer retirement security: The roles of planning, financial literacy, and housing wealth. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54(1), 205– 224. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JMONECO.2006.12.001
- Lusardi, A., & Mitchell, O. S. (2008). Planning and Financial Literacy: How Do Women Fare? *American Economic Review*, 98(2), 413–417. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.98.2.413
- Lyons, K. S., Stewart, B. J., Archbold, P. G., & Carter, J. H. (2009). Optimism, Pessimism, Mutuality, and Gender: Predicting 10-Year Role Strain in Parkinson's Disease Spouses. *The Gerontologist*, 49(3), 378–387. https://doi.org/10.1093/GERONT/GNP046
- Malmendier, U., & Nagel, S. (2016). Learning from Inflation Experiences. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131(1), 53–87. https://doi.org/10.1093/QJE/QJV037
- Palmqvist, S., & Strömberg, L. (2004). Households' inflation opinions a tale of two surveys. *Economic Review*, (4), 23–42. Retrieved September 23, 2024, from https://archive. riksbank.se/Upload/Dokument_riksbank/Kat_publicerat/Artiklar_PV/ER04_2.pdf
- Pfajfar, D., & Santoro, E. (2010). Heterogeneity, learning and information stickiness in inflation expectations. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 75(3), 426–444. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2010.05.012
- Reiche, L., & Meyler, A. (2022). Making Sense of Consumer Inflation Expectations. ECB Working Papers, (2642). Retrieved September 23, 2024, from https://www.ecb.europa. eu/pub/pdf/scpwps/ecb.wp2642~f96823e5de.en.pdf?a6b9965facced0d1ecc25de9a5a4f94d

- Research Data and Service Centre. (2022, October). Bundesbank-Online-Panel-Households (BOP-HH). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.12757/Bbk.BOPHH.202204.01
- Silverstein, M. J., & Sayre, K. (2009). The Female Economy. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved September 23, 2024, from https://hbr.org/2009/09/the-female-economy
- Survey Research Center. (2023). University of Michigan Surveys of Consumers. Retrieved September 23, 2024, from https://sda.umsurvey.org/
- Vellekoop, N., & Wiederholt, M. (2019). Inflation Expectations and Choices of Households. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3383452
- Weber, M., Candia, B., Ropele, T., Lluberas, R., Frache, S., Meyer, B., Kumar, S., Gorodnichenko, Y., Georgarakos, D., Coibion, O., Kenny, G., & Ponce, J. (forthcoming). Tell Me Something I Don't Already Know: Learning in Low and High-Inflation Settings. *Econometrica*.
- Weber, M., D'Acunto, F., Gorodnichenko, Y., & Coibion, O. (2022). The Subjective Inflation Expectations of Households and Firms: Measurement, Determinants, and Implications. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 36(3), 157–184. https://doi.org/10.1257/ jep.36.3.157

A Additional Material for Bayesian Framework

A.1 Motivating Log-Normality

The cross-sectional distribution of point forecasts is in line with a log-normal posterior. Figure A.1 shows the histograms of the pooled cross-sections of three surveys, the BOP-HH, the MSC and the SCE. The fitted log-normal parameters are shown for each survey.



Figure A.1: Histogram and fitted distribution of inflation expectation point forecasts

Notes: Distribution of inflation expectations (measured as point forecasts over 12 months) pooled across all time periods in three surveys (BOP-HH, MSC and SCE). The log-normal distribution is fitted to the data.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, MSC, January 1978 - January 2023; own calculations

A.2 Algebraic manipulations to derive the log-normal posterior

The prior is defined as

$$\log \theta \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_0, \frac{1}{\tau_0}\right),$$
$$p(\theta) = \frac{\sqrt{\tau_0}}{\theta\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau_0(\log \theta - \mu_0)^2}{2}\right).$$

The unbiased signal is defined as

$$\log x = \log \theta + \epsilon,$$

where $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{1}{\tau_x}\right),$
$$p(x|\theta) = \frac{\sqrt{\tau_x}}{x\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau_x(\log x - \log \theta)^2}{2}\right)$$

I compute the posterior following Bayesian updating:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\theta|x) &\propto p(\theta)p(x|\theta) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{\tau_0}}{\theta\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau_0(\log\theta - \mu_0)^2}{2}\right) \frac{\sqrt{\tau_x}}{x\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{\tau_x(\log x - \log\theta)^2}{2}\right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{\tau_0}\sqrt{\tau_x}}{\theta x 2\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left[\tau_0\left((\log\theta)^2 - 2\mu_0\log\theta + \mu_0^2\right) + \tau_x\left((\log x)^2 - 2\log x\log\theta\right) + (\log\theta)^2\right)\right]\right) \\ &+ \tau_x \left((\log x)^2 - 2\log x\log\theta + (\log\theta)^2\right) \\ &\propto \frac{1}{\theta} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left[(\tau_0 + \tau_x)(\log\theta)^2 - 2(\tau_0\mu_0 + \tau_x\log x)\log\theta\right]\right). \end{aligned}$$

That this is proportional to a log-normal distribution,

$$p(\theta|x) \propto \frac{1}{\theta} \exp\left(-\frac{\hat{\tau}(\log \theta - \hat{\mu})^2}{2}\right),$$

where

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{\mu_0 \tau_0 + \tau_x \log x}{\tau_x + \tau_0},$$

and $\hat{\tau} = \tau_0 + \tau_x.$

A.3 Comparative statics

A.3.1 The effect of increasing signal volatility

$$E(\theta|x) = \exp\left(\hat{\mu} + \frac{1}{2\hat{\tau}}\right)$$

$$= \exp\left(\frac{\tau_0\mu_0 + \tau_x\log x + \frac{1}{2}}{\tau_x + \tau_0}\right)$$

$$\frac{dE(\theta|x)}{d\tau_x} = \left(\frac{2\tau_0(\log x - \mu_0) - 1}{2(\tau_x + \tau_0)^2}\right) \times E(\theta|x)$$

$$< 0 \text{ whenever } 2\tau_0(\log x - \mu_0) - 1 < 0 \Rightarrow \log x - \mu_0 < \frac{1}{2\tau_0}$$

A.3.2 The effect of decreasing prior precision

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(\theta|x) &= \exp\left(\hat{\mu} + \frac{1}{2\hat{\tau}}\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\tau_0 \frac{\mu_0 + \tau_x \log x + \frac{1}{2}}{\tau_x + \tau_0}\right) \\ \frac{d\mathbf{E}(\theta|x)}{d\tau_0} &= \left(\frac{2\tau_x(\mu_0 - \log x) - 1}{2(\tau_x + \tau_0)^2}\right) \times \mathbf{E}(\theta|x) \\ &> 0 \text{ whenever } 2\tau_x(\mu_0 - \log x) - 1 < 0 \Rightarrow \mu_0 - \log x < \frac{1}{2\tau_x} \end{aligned}$$

B Financial Literacy

B.1 Questions in BOP-HH survey wave 25, January 2022

W25: In the following section, we would like to ask you a few more questions on general economic topics.

Question: Let us assume you have a balance of C100 in your savings account. This balance bears interest at an annual rate of 2%, and you leave it there for five years. How high do you think your balance will be after five years? 1. Higher than C102

```
    2. Exactly €102
    3. Lower than €102
    Don't know
```

No answer

Question: Let us assume that the interest paid on your savings account is 1% per year and the inflation rate is 2% per year. After one year, do you think you will be able to buy just as much, more, or less than you could today with the balance in your savings account? 1.

More than today 2. Just as much as today 3. Less than today Don't know No answer

Question: Do you agree with the following statement? "Investing in shares of a single company is less risky than investing in a fund containing shares of similar companies." 1. Agree

2. Disagree Don't know No answer

B.2 Questions in the SCE, asked only new respondents

QnumIntro. Next, we would like to ask you five questions to see how people use numbers in everyday life. Please answer the following questions by filling in the blank.

QNUM2. Let's say you have \$200 in a savings account. The account earns ten percent interest per year. Interest accrues at each anniversary of the account. If you never withdraw money or interest payments, how much will you have in the account at the end of two years? $\underline{\$}$

No answer

QNUM8. Imagine that the interest rate on your savings account was 1% per year and inflation was 2% per year. After one year, how much would you be able to buy with the money in this account? 1. More than today

2. Just as much as today

3. Less than today

No answer

QNUM9. Please tell me whether this statement is true or false: Buying a single company's stock usually provides a safer return than a stock mutual fund. 1. True

2. False

No answer

B.3 Predicting financial answer confidence scores

	Correct answers in financial literacy test (
	BOP-HH	SCE			
	(1)	(2)			
age	-0.002	0.01^{***}			
	(0.003)	(0.0004)			
female	-0.59^{***}	-0.69^{***}			
	(0.08)	(0.01)			
single	0.28^{**}	0.06***			
	(0.11)	(0.01)			
income	0.12^{***}	0.10***			
	(0.02)	(0.003)			
educ	0.07^{***}	0.26***			
	(0.01)	(0.004)			
round	-0.16	-0.61^{***}			
	(0.10)	(0.01)			
refresher	-0.04	-0.41^{***}			
	(0.26)	(0.02)			
qeasy	0.44^{***}				
	(0.06)				
qinterest	0.25^{***}	0.06***			
	(0.05)	(0.01)			
Time dummies	No	Yes			
Between effects	No	No			
Region dummies	Yes	Yes			
Observations	2,916	113,165			

Table 8: Explaining financial literacy through financial answer confidence variables

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Notes: Regression coefficients of an ordered logistic regression of demographic variables (age, female, single, income and educ) and financial answer confidence predictors discussed in Section 3 on the number of correct responses in the financial literacy test.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; own calculations

B.4 Financial answer confidence and uncertainty

In the framework low financial answer confidence is modeled as a flat prior, i.e. as high uncertainty around one's point forecast. I show that my financial answer confidence score is indeed negatively correlated with uncertainty around point forecasts. For this is use the interquartile range of fitted probability distributions as in Engelberg et al. (2009) and Armantier et al. (2013) and plot a binscatter in Figure B.1.



Figure B.1: Binscatter of interquartile range and predicted financial answer confidence

Notes: Average interquartile range per predicted financial answer confidence bin, where the full sample is split into 10 bins of equal size. The BOP-HH is shown in the dots connected by the orange line and the SCE is connected by the blue line. The data is pooled across all time periods. No controls are included.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; own calculations

C Additional Empirical Material

C.1 The role of demographics

I verify that the gender gap in inflation expectations cannot be explained by standard demographic variables such as age, income and education, which may be distributed differently for men and women. To do so, Table 9 shows their interaction effects with female. For realistic values of age, income and education, despite a negative correlation with female, the gap persists.

		Inflation e	expectation (12	2 months ahead	, point estimate)	
	BOP	-HH	\mathbf{SC}	Е	MSC	C
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Constant	5.53^{***} (0.20)	4.66^{***} (0.22)	8.50^{***} (0.38)	7.66^{***} (0.41)	7.30^{***} (0.26)	6.20^{***} (0.26)
female	1.30^{***} (0.04)	3.63^{***} (0.21)	$\frac{1.64^{***}}{(0.07)}$	3.46^{***} (0.35)	0.86^{***} (0.02)	3.17^{***} (0.10)
age	-0.02^{***} (0.001)	-0.01^{***} (0.002)	0.01^{***} (0.002)	0.01^{***} (0.003)	-0.02^{***} (0.001)	-0.01^{***} (0.001)
income	-0.20^{***} (0.01)	-0.15^{***} (0.01)	-0.38^{***} (0.02)	-0.34^{***} (0.02)	-0.0000^{***} (0.0000)	-0.0000^{***} (0.0000)
educ	-0.09^{***} (0.01)	-0.06^{***} (0.01)	-0.50^{***} (0.02)	-0.33^{***} (0.03)	-0.24^{***} (0.01)	-0.10^{***} (0.01)
single	-0.45^{***} (0.05)	-0.45^{***} (0.05)	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.09 (0.08)	-0.004 (0.03)	$0.002 \\ (0.03)$
female x age		-0.01^{***} (0.003)		0.01^{*} (0.005)		-0.02^{***} (0.001)
female x income		-0.12^{***} (0.02)		-0.10^{***} (0.03)		-0.0000^{***} (0.0000)
female x educ		-0.09^{***} (0.01)		-0.36^{***} (0.05)		-0.30^{***} (0.02)
Year dummies Between effects	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No	Yes No
$\frac{\text{Observations}}{\text{R}^2}$	$111,085 \\ 0.12$	$111,085 \\ 0.12$	$115,491 \\ 0.03$	$115,491 \\ 0.03$	$261,375 \\ 0.12$	$261,375 \\ 0.12$

Table 9: The gender gap and demographic controls

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Notes: Regression coefficients of a pooled OLS estimation of individual inflation expectations (12 months ahead, point estimate), on the dummy variable female, a continuous variable age, and the ordered categorical variables education and household income. Standard errors in parentheses below.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, MSC, January 1978 - January 2023; own calculations





Figure C.1: Histogram of inflation expectation point forecasts of men and women

Notes: Distribution of male and female inflation expectations (measured as point forecasts over 12 months) pooled across all time periods. There is one plot per survey. The figures show that the distribution is more right skewed for women and rounded numbers (i.e. multiples of 5 or 10) are chosen more frequently.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, MSC, January 1978 - January 2023; own calculations

C.3 The role of financial answer confidence in the SCE

I replicate the results on financial answer confidence with data from the SCE to provide external validity by extending to a different time period and geography and internal validity by providing robustness of the financial answer confidence measure. Table 10 shows the regression output and Figure C.3 visualizes. Note, there are no between effects included in the SCE analysis, as demographic variables are only elicited once per respondent and thus never time varying.



I Female Male

Figure C.3: The gender gap for different levels of financial answer confidence (SCE)

Notes: The black line plots the predicted gender gap along all possible values of the financial answer confidence score in the black line $(\hat{\Delta}_{\pi^E}^{GG}(x) = 1.81 - 4.44x)$. The full regression results are shown in Table 10, column (3). The grey area indicates 95% confidence bands (standard error: 0.3725). The histograms show the density of the male (blue) and female (orange) distribution of financial answer confidence scores.

Sources: Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; own calculations

C.4 Regression in the deciles

Table 11 provides the full regression output for Figure 3 in the main body. The full model can be found in Equation 9.

Survey: SCE	Inflati	on expectation	(12 month ah)	ead, point fore	ecast)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Constant	8.40*** (0.37)	$7.13^{***} \\ (0.38)$	6.15^{***} (0.38)	$7.86^{***} \\ (0.37)$	7.68^{***} (0.37)
female	1.63^{***} (0.07)	1.10^{***} (0.07)	$\frac{1.81^{***}}{(0.09)}$	$\frac{1.37^{***}}{(0.07)}$	1.81^{***} (0.11)
P(test = 3)		-6.18^{***} (0.35)	-7.13^{***} (0.36)		
$P(test = 3) \times female$			-4.44^{***} (0.30)		
fin_lit_test				-1.02^{***} (0.05)	-0.86^{***} (0.06)
fin_lit_test \times female					-0.33^{***} (0.06)
age	0.01^{***} (0.002)	0.02^{***} (0.002)	0.02^{***} (0.002)	0.02^{***} (0.002)	0.02^{***} (0.002)
single	-0.05 (0.08)	-0.001 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.02 (0.08)	-0.03 (0.08)
educ	-0.51^{***} (0.02)	-0.33^{***} (0.03)	-0.24^{***} (0.03)	-0.41^{***} (0.02)	-0.41^{***} (0.02)
income	-0.37^{***} (0.01)	-0.29^{***} (0.02)	-0.25^{***} (0.02)	-0.33^{***} (0.01)	-0.33^{***} (0.01)
Time dummies Region dummies Between effects	Yes Yes No	Yes Yes No	Yes Yes No	Yes Yes No	Yes Yes No
	$113,165 \\ 0.03$	$113,165 \\ 0.03$	$113,165 \\ 0.03$	$113,165 \\ 0.03$	$113,165 \\ 0.03$

Table 10: The impact of financial answer confidence on the gender gap (SCE)

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Standard errors in parentheses below.

Notes: Regression coefficients of a pooled OLS estimation of individual inflation expectations (12 months ahead, point estimate) in the SCE on the dummy variable $female_i$, predicted confidence and actual financial literacy test scores. Since the SCE's panel structure cannot be used due to crucial demographic questions being asked only once, there are no between effects for this survey. The full model can be found in Equation 8.

Sources: Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; own calculations

	Bottom 20%	Inflation expectatio Bottom 40%	ns (12 months ahea Bottom 60%	ad, point estimate) Bottom 80%	Full Sample
Survey: BOP-HH					
female	-0.58^{***}	-0.40^{***}	-0.16***	-0.03	1.07***
	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)
single	0.32***	0.21***	0.11***	0.07***	-0.37^{***}
-	(0.07)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.05)
age	0.005^{***}	0.01***	0.004^{***}	0.01***	-0.02^{***}
	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
educ	0.05^{***}	0.03***	0.01^{***}	0.002	-0.07^{***}
	(0.01)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.01)
income	0.12***	0.07***	0.04***	0.01***	-0.17^{***}
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.004)	(0.01)
Observations	$25,\!186$	45,977	70,455	92,161	111,085
<u>R²</u>	0.06	0.06	0.10	0.25	0.15
Survey: MSC					
	0.00**	0.00***	0.07***	0.00***	0.00***
female	-0.03**	-0.06^{***}	0.07***	(0.03^{***})	0.83***
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)
single	-0.04°	$-0.02^{-0.02}$	-0.02°	-0.02	(0.02)
200	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)
age	(0.001)	(0.0003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)
educ	0.02***	0.04***	0.03***	0.03***	-0.30^{***}
ouuo	(0.01)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.01)
income	0.0000***	0.0000***	-0.0000^{***}	-0.0000***	-0.0000^{***}
	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0000)
Observations	73,834	143,278	199,150	213,444	261,374
\mathbb{R}^2	0.38	0.54	0.56	0.56	0.32
Survey: SCE					
female	-1.10^{***}	-0.75^{***}	-0.68^{***}	-0.33^{***}	2.17^{***}
	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.06)
single	0.16^{*}	0.13^{**}	0.12^{**}	0.05	-0.20^{***}
	(0.08)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.07)
age	-0.01***	-0.004**	-0.0003	0.003***	-0.002
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
educ	0.33***	0.21***	0.19***	0.08***	-0.71***
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.02)
income	0.21***	0.14***	0.12***	0.06***	-0.46^{+++}
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Observations	43,196	65,389	74,175	92,712	115,491
\mathbb{R}^2	0.37	0.41	0.42	0.43	0.24
Time dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Regional dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Between effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 11: Quantile regression

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Standard errors in parentheses.

Notes: Regression coefficients of the panel model in Equation 9 for the bottom 20% (1), 40% (2), 60% (3) and 80% (4) in the inflation expectations distribution.

Sources: Research Data and Service Centre (RDSC) of the Deutsche Bundesbank, BOP-HH, April 2020 - September 2022; Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY), SCE, June 2013 - November 2020; University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, MSC, January 1978 - January 2023; own calculations 47