Food Inflation, Agricultural Supply Shocks, and Household Welfare: Evidence from a Structural VAR Analysis of South Asian Economies
The Journal of Business, Management and Economics Engineering
Volume 123 | Article 102583 DOI: 10.1016/j.foodpol.2025.102583

Food Inflation, Agricultural Supply Shocks, and Household Welfare: Evidence from a Structural VAR Analysis of South Asian Economies

Siddharth Raghunathan Pillai[1], Dilnoza Yusupova[2], and Biplab Kumar Dey[3]

[1]Department of Agricultural Economics, Indian Agricultural Research Institute (IARI), New Delhi, India [2]Department of Economics, University of World Economy and Diplomacy, Tashkent, Uzbekistan [3]Department of Economics, Dhaka University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Corresponding Author: Siddharth Raghunathan Pillai, Department of Agricultural Economics, IARI, Pusa Campus, New Delhi 110012, India. Email: srp.aeco@iari.res.in

Abstract

Food inflation — the sustained increase in the prices of food commodities — poses severe welfare consequences for low-income households in South Asian economies, where food expenditure constitutes 40–60% of total household consumption and labor income is concentrated in agriculture. This study examines the macroeconomic dynamics of food inflation and its household welfare consequences across five South Asian economies (Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka) over 2005–2023 using a Structural Vector Autoregression (SVAR) approach with sign restrictions to identify agricultural supply shocks, global commodity price shocks, and monetary policy shocks driving food price dynamics. Household welfare consequences are quantified using disaggregated household survey data and a consumer price index decomposition that distinguishes food from non-food price components by household income quintile. Results indicate that agricultural supply shocks (domestic production shortfalls) account for approximately 41.2% of food price variance at a 1-year horizon, global commodity price shocks account for 28.7%, and monetary policy shocks account for 18.4%, with the remainder attributable to demand-side factors. A 10% food price increase reduces real household consumption by 4.7% for the lowest income quintile but only 1.8% for the highest quintile — confirming that food inflation is strongly regressive. Climate-related supply shocks (identified through precipitation anomaly instruments) have become significantly more important drivers of food inflation since 2015, accounting for approximately 22% of food inflation variance in the 2015–2023 subsample compared to 8% in 2005–2014.

Keywords: food inflation, agricultural supply shocks, SVAR, South Asia, household welfare, climate shocks, monetary policy transmission

1. Introduction

Food security and food price stability are not merely agricultural policy concerns — they

are macroeconomic, welfare, and development imperatives of the highest order in South Asia. The five economies examined in this study — Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka — collectively host approximately 1.9 billion people, more than a quarter of the global population, among whom hundreds of millions remain food insecure, with food expenditure representing 40–60% of household budgets for the bottom income quintiles (FAO, 2023; World Bank, 2023). In this context, food inflation — sustained increases in the price of food commodities — acts as a direct and powerful mechanism of welfare deterioration for the most vulnerable population segments, eroding real incomes, compromising nutritional adequacy, and pushing food-vulnerable households into crisis.

The determinants of food inflation in South Asia are complex and multidimensional, encompassing domestic agricultural supply dynamics (monsoon rainfall, pest outbreaks, farm productivity shocks), global commodity market developments (international grain prices, oil prices that affect fertilizer and transportation costs, global supply chain disruptions), monetary policy transmission (exchange rate changes affecting import costs, domestic credit expansion affecting demand), and structural factors (agricultural market infrastructure, storage capacity, distribution efficiency). Disentangling the relative contributions of these drivers is essential for designing appropriate policy responses: a food inflation episode driven by domestic supply shortfalls calls for different policy responses (import facilitation, strategic reserve release, production support) than one driven by global commodity price increases (exchange rate stabilization, targeted consumer subsidies) or monetary factors (interest rate adjustment, exchange rate management).

The SVAR methodology, with its ability to identify structural shocks from reduced-form VAR estimates using theoretically motivated identification restrictions, is the natural empirical framework for this analysis. Sign restrictions (Uhlig, 2005; Mountford & Uhlig, 2009) provide a particularly transparent identification strategy for food inflation dynamics: agricultural supply shocks that reduce production should simultaneously increase food prices and reduce agricultural output (negative sign for output, positive for price); global commodity price shocks should increase both food prices and import costs; monetary policy tightening should reduce inflation and output over time. These sign restrictions can be implemented without arbitrary identifying assumptions beyond the qualitative directional restrictions motivated by economic theory.

The climate dimension of this study reflects the growing importance of climate variability as a food inflation driver. South Asia is among the world's most climate-vulnerable regions, with agricultural production critically dependent on monsoon rainfall that has become more variable and less predictable as climate change progresses. Extreme weather events — droughts, floods, cyclones — have generated significant agricultural supply disruptions that translate into food price spikes. Quantifying the growing contribution of climate-related supply shocks to food inflation variance — and thereby to household welfare outcomes — is essential for understanding the economic welfare implications of climate change in the region.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Food Inflation Determinants

The literature on food price determination identifies three primary categories of drivers. Supply-side factors include domestic agricultural production shocks (weather, pests, input availability), agricultural productivity trends, land use changes, and storage and distribution infrastructure quality. Global commodity market factors include international grain prices (determined by global supply and demand, biofuel mandates, export restrictions, and financial speculation), oil prices (affecting fertilizer production costs and transportation), and exchange rate movements (affecting import prices). Demand-side factors include population growth, dietary transition (rising meat consumption associated with income growth), and macroeconomic conditions affecting purchasing power.

Headey and Fan (2008) analyzed the 2007–08 global food price crisis, attributing price spikes to a combination of supply disruptions, demand growth (especially from biofuel), export restrictions by major producing countries, and speculative financial flows into commodity futures markets. Ivanic and Martin (2008) quantified the household welfare consequences of the 2008 food price crisis, finding net negative welfare effects for poor households in most developing countries. De Hoyos and Medvedev (2011) estimated that the 2008 food price crisis pushed an additional 105 million people into poverty globally.

2.2 SVAR Identification of Commodity Price Shocks

The identification of structural shocks in commodity price VARs has employed multiple strategies. Kilian (2009) proposed a SVAR identification of oil market shocks using sign and exclusion restrictions, distinguishing supply shocks, aggregate demand shocks, and oil-specific demand shocks. Fernandez et al. (2017) applied principal component analysis to identify common commodity price shocks in emerging market panels. Sign restriction SVAR identification (Uhlig, 2005) imposes theoretically motivated qualitative constraints on the direction of shock effects, allowing simultaneous identification of multiple structural shocks without zero restrictions.

2.3 Household Welfare Consequences of Food Inflation

The welfare effects of food price changes depend critically on households' net market position: net food sellers (primarily rural farming households) may benefit from higher prices, while net food buyers (urban poor, landless rural laborers) are harmed. Deaton (1989) formalized this framework, showing that the welfare effect of a food price increase equals the difference between food produced and food consumed, scaled by household income. For the South Asian poor — predominantly landless laborers and subsistence farmers with small surpluses — the net effect of food price increases is predominantly negative and regressive, as the share of food expenditure in total consumption is highest for the poorest households (Torlesse et al., 2003).

3. Research Gap, Objectives, and Hypotheses

Three gaps motivate this study. First, a cross-country SVAR analysis decomposing food inflation sources in South Asian economies simultaneously has not been conducted. Second, the growing contribution of climate-related supply shocks to food inflation has not been quantified through a formal structural shock identification. Third, the distributional welfare consequences of identified structural food price shocks — disaggregated by income quintile — have not been estimated using this methodology.

H1: Agricultural supply shocks are the dominant driver of food price variance in South Asian economies.

H2: The welfare consequences of food price increases are significantly more severe for lower-income quintiles than for higher-income quintiles.

H3: The contribution of climate-related supply shocks to food inflation variance has increased significantly since 2015.

4. Methodology

Monthly VAR data (2005:M1–2023:M12) were compiled for five South Asian economies from national central banks, national statistics offices, FAO GIEWS, and World Bank Global Commodity Markets. SVAR with sign restrictions was estimated using the algorithm of Arias et al. (2018) with 2,000 posterior draws. Sign restrictions identified three structural shocks: agricultural supply shock (production↓, food price↑); global commodity price shock (global grain price↑, import costs↑, food price↑); monetary policy shock (interest rate↑, credit↓, food price↓). Variance decomposition quantified relative shock contributions. Household survey data (HIES/NSS) provided disaggregated consumption shares for welfare analysis. Climate attribution used precipitation anomaly (CHIRPS rainfall data) as external regressor to identify climate-related components of supply shocks.

5. Data Analysis and Findings

Table 1: SVAR Variance Decomposition of Food Price — Contribution by Shock Type

Shock Type	3-Month Horizon	12-Month Horizon	24-Month Horizon
Agricultural Supply Shock	38.4%	41.2%	37.8%
Global Commodity Price Shock	22.3%	28.7%	31.4%
Monetary Policy Shock	12.1%	18.4%	20.3%
Demand and Residual Shocks	27.2%	11.7%	10.5%

Note: H1 confirmed — agricultural supply shocks are the dominant driver at all horizons.

Table 2: Impulse Response — Food Price Response to 1 SD Agricultural Supply Shock

Food Inflation, Agricultural Supply Shocks, and Household Welfare: Evidence from a Structural VAR Analysis of South Asian Economies
The Journal of Business, Management and Economics Engineering
Volume 123 | Article 102583 DOI: 10.1016/j.foodpol.2025.102583

Months Post-Shock	Food Price Change (%)	90% CI
1	+3.41	[+2.12, +4.70]
3	+5.87	[+3.98, +7.76]
6	+4.23	[+2.87, +5.59]
12	+2.34	[+0.87, +3.81]
24	+0.87	[-0.34, +2.08]

Table 3: Welfare Consequences of 10% Food Price Increase by Income Quintile

Income Quintile	Real Consumption Loss (%)	Nutritional Adequacy Reduction (kcal/day)
Q1 (lowest)	-4.71***	-187
Q2	-3.87***	-143
Q3	-2.98***	-98
Q4	-2.31**	-54
Q5 (highest)	-1.83*	-21

*Note: H2 confirmed — strong regressive welfare pattern. *** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05.*

Table 4: Climate Shock Contribution to Food Inflation Variance (H3)

Period	Climate-Related Supply Shock Contribution	p-value
2005–2014	8.3% of food inflation variance	—
2015–2023	22.1% of food inflation variance	< 0.001 (Chow test)
Change	+13.8 percentage points	—

Note: H3 confirmed — climate shock contribution to food inflation variance has significantly increased.

6–11. Discussion Through Conclusion

The SVAR decomposition confirms that domestic agricultural supply shocks remain the primary driver of food price volatility in South Asia, with global commodity price shocks representing a growing secondary source — a finding consistent with the increasing integration of South Asian food markets into global commodity networks. The regressive welfare finding — Q1 households suffering 2.6 times the consumption loss of Q5 households — underscores the distributional urgency of food price stabilization policy. The climate attribution finding — that climate-related supply shocks account for 22% of food inflation variance in 2015–2023 compared to 8% in 2005–2014 — quantifies an increasingly important pathway through which climate change imposes welfare costs on the South Asian poor, strengthening the economic case for climate adaptation investment in South Asian agriculture. Policy implications include strategic food reserve management, agricultural insurance

expansion, climate-resilient crop variety promotion, and more effective international commodity market stabilization mechanisms.

References

Arias, J. E., Rubio-Ramirez, J. F., & Waggoner, D. F. (2018). Inference based on structural vector autoregressions identified with sign and zero restrictions: Theory and applications. *Econometrica*, 86(2), 685–720. https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA14468

De Hoyos, R. E., & Medvedev, D. (2011). Poverty effects of higher food prices: A global perspective. *Review of Development Economics*, 15(3), 387–402. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9361.2011.00615.x

Deaton, A. (1989). Rice prices and income distribution in Thailand: A non-parametric analysis. *Economic Journal*, 99(395), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.2307/2234014

FAO. (2023). *The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2023*. FAO.

Headey, D., & Fan, S. (2008). Anatomy of a crisis: The causes and consequences of surging food prices. *Agricultural Economics*, 39(S1), 375–391. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-0862.2008.00345.x

Ivanic, M., & Martin, W. (2008). Implications of higher global food prices for poverty in low-income countries. *Agricultural Economics*, 39(S1), 405–416. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-0862.2008.00347.x

Kilian, L. (2009). Not all oil price shocks are alike: Disentangling demand and supply shocks in the crude oil market. *American Economic Review*, 99(3), 1053–1069. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.99.3.1053

Mountford, A., & Uhlig, H. (2009). What are the effects of fiscal policy shocks? *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 24(6), 960–992. https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.1079

Torlesse, H., Kiess, L., & Bloem, M. W. (2003). Association of household rice expenditure with child nutritional status indicates a role for macroeconomic food policy in combating malnutrition. *Journal of Nutrition*, 133(5), 1320–1325. https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/133.5.1320

Uhlig, H. (2005). What are the effects of monetary policy on output? Results from an agnostic identification procedure. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 52(2), 381–419. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2004.05.007

World Bank. (2023). *Poverty and shared prosperity 2022*. World Bank.