An Analysis of the Structure and Dynamics of the Philippine Macroeconomy: Results from a DSGE-Based Estimation

Ruperto P. Majuca¹

De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines ruperto.majuca@dlsu.edu.ph

I use Bayesian methods to estimate a medium-scale closed economy dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) model for the Philippine economy. Bayesian model selection techniques indicate that among the frictions introduced in the model, the investment adjustment costs, habit formation, and the price and wage rigidity features are important in capturing the dynamics of the data, while the variable capital utilization, fixed costs, and the price and wage indexation features are not important.

I find that the Philippine macroeconomy is characterized by more instability than the U.S. economy. An analysis of the several subperiods in Philippine economic history also reveals some quantitative evidence that risk aversion increases during crisis periods. Also, I find that the inflation targeting (IT) era is associated with a more stable economy: the standard deviations of the technology shock, the risk-premium shock, and the investment-specific technology shock have significantly lower variability than the pre-IT era. Shock decomposition analysis also reveals that BSP's conduct of monetary policy appears to be more procyclical than countercyclical, for example, during the recent global financial and economic crisis.

JEL Classifications: D58, E23, E31, E32

Keywords: DSGE models, Bayesian estimation, monetary policy, macroeconomics, Philippines

Dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) modeling has recently become at the forefront of economic research both at central banks and academic circles, for example, the U.S. Federal Reserve Board's SIGMA model (Erceg, Guerrieri & Gust, 2006; Ireland, 2004; Christiano, Eichenbaum, & Evans, 2005), the European Central Bank's NAWM models (Christoffel, Coenen, & Warne, 2008; Smets & Wouters, 2003; 2007), the Sveriges Riksbank's (Swedish central bank) RAMSES model (Adolfson, Laseen, Linde & Villani 2007; Adolfson, Laseen, Christiano, Trabandt & Walentin 2013); and the Central Bank of Chile's MAS model (Medina & Soto, 2007a; 2007b; Medina, Munro, & Soto, 2008). DSGE models write out explicitly the "microfoundations" that characterize the behavior of the various actors of the economy (firms, households, monetary authorities), and the solution methods explicitly adopt the framework of "general equilibrium" theory. From the microfoundations flow the aggregate behavioral equations of the economy.²

One major advantage of such micro-founded approach over the more traditional tools of

macroeconomic policy analysis (such as, say, the simultaneous equations, vector autoregression [VAR], or structural VAR [SVAR] models), is that, by relating both the reduced-form parameters and shocks to the deeper structural parameters (e.g., the associated with household preferences and technology), these models are less susceptible to the Lucas critique, and thus, more appropriate for counterfactual analysis and alternative policy evaluations. DSGE models are thus designed to mimic the real world, as laboratories in order to examine, for example, what effect changing a policy will have on the different economic variables. This is very useful for the economics discipline, since experimenting a policy's effect on the real world is obviously very costly. DSGE models, in effect, enable researchers and policy makers to conduct alternative scenarios concerning counterfactuals in "economic laboratories" without tinkering with the "real world" itself.

Another advantage of the DSGE approach is that it is amenable to practical application like the traditional IS-LM model, but at the same time, it incorporates the rigorous microeconomic foundations and the quantitative advances of modern dynamic stochastic general equilibrium theory. Similar to the traditional Keynesian framework, nominal rigidities such as price and wage frictions enable monetary variables to affect the real economy in the short-run. At the same time, real rigidities are incorporated in the model and the impact of real shocks (for example, productivity shocks of the type stressed in real business cycle theory) on the economy are also captured in the model.

Also, a clearer understanding of economic fluctuations are possible because of the explicit coherent theoretical formulation, compared to the less theoretically grounded VAR and SVAR analyses. So too, the explicit microfoundations and the adoption of the Frisch-Slutsky shockpropagation-fluctuation paradigm enables one to have a clearer understanding of how the economy's response to different shocks depends on its structural features (such as, for example, how the labor supply elasticity affects the propagation of monetary policy shocks). This cannot be done in large-scale econometrics and VAR models, which are specified without clear theoretical foundations about the linkage of the economy's structural features with the reduced-form parameters (Erceg et al., 2006). Also, a DSGE model's theoretical formulation fully articulates the process by which shocks are transmitted to the economy, how this results to the fluctuations, and the transition back to the steady state afterwards (following the transitory imbalances).

Recent DSGE models have become sufficiently rich to incorporate numerous features and frictions that characterize the real world economy, and have been shown to have forecasting accuracies similar to BVARs. Also, the recent advances in modern computing have enabled computation of even large scale DSGE models to be implementable. Because of all these advantages, DSGE has become the standard workhorse in macroeconomics since the turn of the century.

In this paper, I use a medium-scale closed economy New Keynesian DSGE model to analyze the structure and the dynamics of the Philippine macroeconomy.³ I use Bayesian methods to estimate the model's parameters using Philippine quarterly data from 1987:1 to 2010:3. In addition to estimating the parameters of the model, I estimate different specifications of the model and use their marginal likelihood to analyze which of the model's different nominal and real frictions are important in the light of Philippines data. Also, the model is estimated for different subperiods (i.e., the power and Asian crises, and pre-inflation targeting vs. postinflation targeting eras) in order to shed light on whether or not there are important parameter changes or regime shifts during important episodes in Philippine macroeconomic history. The results indicate that, of the real frictions of the model, the investment-adjustment-costs and habit-formation features are important in explaining the dynamics of the Philippine data, while the variable-capital-utilization and fixedcosts features are not important. Among the nominal frictions, the price and wage rigidity

are important, while the indexation parameters are not important.

By comparing the model's estimates for the Philippine economy to that of the U.S. economy, I find that the Philippine economy is characterized by more instability, compared to the U.S. economy. That is, the Philippine economy is characterized by a much higher variability of shocks. However, the subperiod analyses also show that considerable gains to macroeconomic stabilization were achieved by the adoption of inflation targeting in the Philippines. In particular, the post-inflation targeting era in the Philippines is characterized by technology shocks that are less turbulent, while the risk premium, monetary policy, and investment-specific technology shocks can be described as much less turbulent, compared to the pre-inflation targeting era.

The other findings of the paper, however, question the timing and the counter cyclicality of monetary policy. In particular, the shock decomposition analysis seems to indicate that the monetary policy shocks are more procyclical than countercyclical, particularly during the Asian crisis and the global economic and financial crisis. If correct, this may indicate a need for quicker reaction to shocks, as well as improved forecasting of the forthcoming shocks and their effects on the economy, on the part of the monetary authorities.

The paper is organized into five parts. The next section describes the model. Section 3 describes the estimation methodology. Section 4 presents the results and interpretation. The last section summarizes the paper's findings and suggests possibility for future research.

THE MODEL

The model employed in this paper is mediumscale New Keynesian DSGE model, detrended and log-linearized around the stationary steady state.⁴ A ^ over a variable indicates a log deviation of the variable from its steady state, and a starred variable refer to its steady state value. Typical of New Keynesian models, firms producing differentiated goods are given some type of price-setting power, where it is assumed that for any given period, only a portion of suppliers can reoptimize their prices. Similarly, the specification of a labor union, which differentiates labor exercises on some monopoly power, generates sticky wages for the model. Price and wage frictions are thus modeled similar to Calvo (1983), with the additional assumption of (partial) indexation to past inflation for prices that are not reoptimized.⁵

The consumption Euler equation describes the dynamics of the economy-wide real consumption, *viz.*,

$$\hat{c}_{t} = \frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{\gamma}\right)} E_{t}[\hat{c}_{t+1}] + \frac{\left(\frac{\lambda}{\gamma}\right)}{\left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{\gamma}\right)} \hat{c}_{t-1} - \frac{\left(\sigma_{c} - 1\right) \left(\frac{w_{*}^{h}L}{c_{*}}\right)}{\sigma_{c} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{\gamma}\right)} \left(E_{t}[\hat{L}_{t+1}] - \hat{L}_{t}\right) - \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\gamma}\right)}{\sigma_{c} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{\gamma}\right)} \left(\hat{R}_{t} - E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + \hat{b}_{t}\right)$$

$$(1)$$

where λ is the habit consumption parameter, γ is the deterministic trend, and σ_c is the coefficient of relative risk aversion.

Typical of New Keynesian models, the expectations of future consumption positively affect its present consumption, because forward-looking households smooth consumption. With habit formation introduced into the model, the dynamics of present consumption depend on both the past and expected future consumption (if the habit formation parameter is set to zero, the consumption equation reduces to the traditional purely forward-looking model). Since the utility function is assumed to be nonseparable, the consumption dynamics also depend on the expected employment growth, $(E_t[\hat{L}_{t+1}] - \hat{L}_t)$. So too, as equation (1) indicates, aggregate consumption depends on the *ex ante* real interest

rate $(\hat{R}_t - E_t[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}])$. Since the model assumes a power felicity function, the elasticity of intertemporal substitution is by construction the reciprocal of the relative risk aversion coefficient,⁶ and the elasticity of consumption to the policy rates will be negatively related to the risk aversion parameter. In traditional models (without habit formation) the elasticity of intertemporal substitution determines the elasticity of the consumption to the interest rate. With habit formation introduced in the model, the elasticity of consumption to interest rates also depends on the habit persistence parameter. Higher habit persistence results in greater sensitivity of consumption to interest rates. Finally, present consumption also depends on the difference between the policy rates and the household's rate of return, \hat{b}_t . \hat{b}_t can be thought of as a risk-premium shock, which captures financial sector inefficiencies. It serves a similar role as the external finance premium of Bernanke, Gilchrist, and Gertler (1999), although in that paper, financial frictions were modeled explicitly, and here is modeled exogenously for simplicity. \hat{b}_t can thus be interpreted as a demand shock.

The dynamics of aggregate investment is described by the investment Euler equation, which comes from the loglinearization of the household's first-order condition with respect to the investment decision, thus,

$$\hat{\imath}_t = \frac{1}{\left(1 + \bar{\beta}\gamma\right)} \left(\hat{\imath}_{t-1} + \left(\bar{\beta}\gamma\right)\hat{\imath}_{t+1} + \frac{1}{\gamma^2\varphi}\hat{P}_t^k\right) + \hat{q}_t \qquad (2)$$

where $\bar{\beta} = (\beta / \gamma^{\sigma_c})$, where β is the household's discount factor; and $\varphi = S''$, is the steady state elasticity of the investment adjustment cost function, where $S(\cdot)$ is the investment adjustment cost function, with $S(\cdot) = 0, S' = 0, S'' > 0$; and \hat{p}_t^k refers to the value of existing (installed) capital stock. Following Christiano et al. (2005), the model specifies investment adjustments costs, rather than the capital adjustment costs found in the neoclassical investment literature. That is, the model assumes that it is costly to vary investment

and that the adjustment costs depend not on the level of investment but on the change in investment.⁷ Investment adjustment costs models introduce inertia in the investment dynamics and slows down its response to shocks.⁸ This can be seen from the equation above that shows that the response of investment to the variations in the value of existing (installed) capital is inversely related to $\varphi = \overline{S}^{\prime\prime}$, the steady state elasticity of the adjustment cost function. This feature enables the model to match the humped-shaped reaction of investment to shocks in the data, a feature not replicated by the capital adjustment cost specification (see Christiano et al., 2005). \hat{q}_t is the investment-specific technology shock, and indicates the relative efficiency of investment.

The Q equation for the value of installed capital is

$$\hat{P}_{t}^{k} = -(\hat{R}_{t} - E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + \hat{b}_{t}) + \frac{r_{*}^{k}}{r_{*}^{k} + (1 - \delta)} E_{t}[r_{t+1}^{k}] + \frac{(1 - \delta)}{r_{*}^{k} + (1 - \delta)} E_{t}[\hat{P}_{t+1}^{k}]$$
(3)

 \hat{P}_t^k , the price of installed capital (Tobin's q), depends negatively on the risk premium shock and the *ex ante* real rate of interest, and positively on the expected real rental rate of capital and the future value of installed capital.

The evolution of aggregate supply is given by the production function, where goods are produced using labor and capital services,

$$\hat{y}_t = \Phi \left(\alpha \hat{k}_t + (1 - \alpha) \hat{L}_t + \hat{a}_t \right), \tag{4}$$

where α denotes the share of capital in production, and \hat{a}_t is the total factor productivity (TFP).

Capital services is the sum of the previous period's accumulated installed capital and the utilization rate of capital,

$$\hat{k}_t = \hat{\bar{k}}_{t-1} + \hat{u}_t \tag{5}$$

where \hat{u}_t is the capital utilization rate.

The dynamics of installed capital, \hat{k}_t , evolves according to the capital accumulation equation,

$$\begin{split} \hat{k}_t &= \frac{(1-\delta)}{\gamma} \hat{k}_{t-1} + \left[1 - \frac{(1-\delta)}{\gamma} \right] \hat{\iota}_t \\ &+ \left[1 - \frac{(1-\delta)}{\gamma} \right] (1 + \bar{\beta}\gamma) \gamma^2 \varphi \hat{q}_t \ , \quad (6) \end{split}$$

where δ is the depreciation rate. That is, the stock of physical capital depends not only on the purchases of new investments during the period, but also on the relative efficiency of the transformation of these investments into installed capital, measured by \hat{q}_t .

The household's utilization of capital, on the other hand, depends on the rental rate of capital, \hat{r}_t^k , thus,

$$\hat{u}_t = \frac{1 - \psi}{\psi} \hat{r}_t^k \,. \tag{7}$$

In equation (7), $\frac{1-\psi}{\psi} = \frac{1}{a''}$, where the increasing, convex function $a(\cdot)$ relates to the cost of adjusting the capital utilization rate. In other words, ψ is an indicator of the relative difficulty of changing the capital utilization rate, normalized to fall between the zero and one range. $\psi = 1$ indicates that it is prohibitively costly to vary the capital utilization rate, so that the household adopts a constant capital utilization. Equation (7) suggests that the elasticity of the capital utilization rate to the capital rental rate, $\frac{1-\psi}{\psi}$, is a decreasing function of $\,\psi$, so that a large value of ψ (or, equivalently, a large elasticity of the capital utilization adjustment cost function, a''), is associated with a smaller elasticity of capital utilization rate to the capital rental rate.

The dynamics of inflation comes from the New Keynesian Phillips curve (NKPC), which in turn comes from the log-linearization of the first-order condition of monopolistically competitive pricesetting firms which reoptimize the price when they have the opportunity,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_{t} &= \frac{1}{\left(1 + \bar{\beta}\gamma\iota_{p}\right)} \left(i_{p}\hat{\pi}_{t-1} + \bar{\beta}\gamma E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}]\right. \\ &+ \frac{1}{\left(\left(\phi_{p} - 1\right)\varepsilon_{p} + 1\right)} \frac{\left(1 - \xi_{p}\bar{\beta}\gamma\right)\left(1 - \xi_{p}\right)}{\xi_{p}} \left(\widehat{m}c_{t}\right) + \hat{\lambda}_{p,t} \quad . \tag{8}$$

Price frictions are modeled via the Calvo scheme, whereby a firm has a probability of $1 - \xi_p$ that it may reoptimize its price. ξ_p is thus the natural measure of price stickiness. In between reoptimization, prices are assumed to be adjusted via a backward-looking rule of thumb by indexing them to lagged inflation. This dynamic indexation scheme for prices that are not reoptimized results in a lagged inflation term in the NKPC, generalizing previous NKPC specifications which force the AR parameter of inflation in the NKPC to be zero. Under this scheme, in effect, it is the differenced inflation (not inflation per se) that is related to the output gap. Previous studies have found that this feature improves the empirical fit of the model, in that it captures observed serial correlation in inflation (i.e., "inflation inertia"). The degree of indexation, i_p , measures the fraction of firms that are backward-looking. When the indexation parameter is zero, equation (8) reduces to the traditional purely forward-looking NKPC specification. As the equation shows, current inflation depends on the expectations of future inflation, similar to the traditional expectationsaugmented PC. This is because price-setting firms are forward-looking. The sensitivity of inflation to the marginal cost depends on the index of nominal price rigidity (ξ_n), the curvature of the Kimball aggregator (\mathcal{E}_p), and the steady-state goods market markup $(\phi_p - 1)$. A higher degree of price stickiness or greater curvature of the goods market aggregator decreases the elasticity of inflation to the marginal costs.

Iterating equation (8) forward, one can see that the current inflation depends on the expectations of future marginal costs; that is, current inflation relates not just to the present but also to the future economic conditions. So, for instance, if a firm expects marginal costs to be higher in the future, and understanding that because of price stickiness it may not be able to reoptimize its price tomorrow, its forward-looking behavior induces it to front-load the price changes today (see Christiano et al., 2005).

 $\hat{\lambda}_{p,t}$ is the price mark-up shock, and may be interpreted as a cost-push shock that shifts the aggregate supply curve and change inflation independently of excess demand.

From the first-order condition of the firm's optimization, the firm's real marginal cost will be equal to the difference between the real wage and the marginal product of labor, which in turn will be a function of the ratio of capital to labor and the total factor productivity,

$$\widehat{mc}_t = \widehat{w} - \widehat{mpl}_t = \widehat{w} - \alpha \left(\widehat{k}_t - \widehat{L}_t \right) - \widehat{a}_t \tag{9}$$

Also from the firm optimization, we have,

$$\hat{r}_t^k = -(\hat{k}_t - \hat{L}_t) - w_t \,. \tag{10}$$

Substituting equation (10) into equation (9) results in the equation for the marginal cost,

$$\widehat{mc}_t = (1 - \alpha)\widehat{w}_t + \alpha \widehat{r}_t^k - \widehat{a}_t \,. \tag{11}$$

Equation (11) implies that \widehat{mc}_t , which embody increases in the marginal cost associated with excess demand, increases with the linear combination of the wage rate and capital's rental rate. Equations (8) and (11) together therefore articulates that nominal wage stickiness engender inflation inertia.

Since previous U.S. results indicate that wage rigidity is the key in accounting for observed dynamics in inflation and output (see Christiano et al., 2005), the model also incorporates wage rigidity, by assuming that a union differentiates labor, which then results in some wage-setting power. Analogous to the goods market, the labor market optimization together with Calvo (1983) type of sticky nominal wages and partial indexation of wages to inflation generates the explicit wage equation,

$$\begin{split} \widehat{w}_{t} &= \frac{1}{1 + \bar{\beta}\gamma} \widehat{w}_{t-1} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \bar{\beta}\gamma}\right) (E_{t}[\widehat{w}_{t+1}] + E_{t}[\widehat{\pi}_{t+1}]) \\ &- \frac{1}{1 + \bar{\beta}\gamma} (1 + \bar{\beta}\gamma \iota_{w}) \widehat{\pi}_{t} \end{split} \tag{12} \\ &+ \frac{1}{1 + \bar{\beta}\gamma} (\iota_{w}) \widehat{\pi}_{t-1} - \frac{1}{1 + \bar{\beta}\gamma} \frac{(1 - \xi_{w} \bar{\beta}\gamma)(1 - \xi_{w})}{\xi_{w} ((\phi_{w} - 1)\varepsilon_{w} + 1)} \mu_{t}^{w} + \widehat{\lambda}_{w,t} \end{split},$$

where from the optimization in the labor market, the wage mark-up, μ_t^w , is equal to the wage minus the labor-consumption marginal rate of substitution, which in turn depends upon the amount of labor and the present and the previous period's consumption,

$$\mu_t^w = w_t - mrs_t = w_t - (\sigma_l \hat{L}_t + \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\lambda}{\gamma}} (\hat{c}_t - \lambda/\gamma \hat{c}_t)) , \quad (13)$$

where σ_l is the real wage elasticity of labor. As equation (12) shows, real wages depend on the past and expected future wages; the past, the present, and expected future inflation; the wage mark-up; and the shock to the wage mark-up shock, $\hat{\lambda}_{w,t}$. The wage mark-up shock, $\hat{\lambda}_{w,t}$, represent shifts in the preference for leisure or in the spread between real wages and the marginal rate of substitution between leisure and consumption (Clarida, Gali, and Gertler [2001 and 2002]). The non-optimized wages' level of indexation to past inflation (ι_w) help determine the relative weights; when it is zero, equation (12) shows that the previous period's inflation does not factor in the present real wage. Also, analogous to the goods sector, the elasticity of real wages to desired wage mark-up depends on the index of wage rigidity (ξ_w), the curvature of the aggregator for the labor market (ε_w), and the steady state mark-up for the labor market $(\phi_w - 1)$.

From the goods market equilibrium, we have production is equal to demand, thus,

$$\hat{y}_t = \frac{c_*}{y_*}\hat{c}_t + \frac{i_*}{y_*}\hat{\iota}_t + \frac{r_*^k k_*}{y_*}\hat{u}_t + \hat{g}_t , \qquad (14)$$

where \hat{g}_t is the exogenous spending shock, and can be interpreted as a demand shock. Since, this is a closed economy model, however, its data representation captures both the shock to government spending as well as to net exports.

The monetary reaction function, which in effect replaces the LM curve of the traditional Keynesian models, follows a generalize Taylor rule specification wherein the central bank responds to the inflation rate, the output gap, and the change in the output gap,

$$\hat{r}_{t} = \rho \hat{r}_{t-1} + (1-\rho) \left(r_{\pi} \hat{\pi}_{t} + r_{y} (\hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t}^{p}) \right) + r_{\Delta y} [(\hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t}^{p}) - (\hat{y}_{t-1} - \hat{y}_{t-1}^{p})] + \hat{\lambda}_{r,t} .$$
(15)

Here, potential output is calculated as the output that results when the price and wage rigidity features are shut off. A key feature of this monetary reaction function is the partial-adjustment specification, whereby the model specifies some type of partial adjustment dynamics to the policy rates, represented by ρ . ρ thus captures the degree of interest rate smoothing. This means that the policy rate reacts not just to the current economic circumstances, such as the inflation and output gap, but also to its own lag. Woodford (2003a; 2003b) explained that this does not imply that the central bank is slow to respond to new developments in the macroeconomic environment. Instead, a proper interpretation can be seen by iteratively solving the equation backward, which results in an equivalent recasted equation that articulates how the central bank sets the policy rates set in response to not just the current's period's inflation rates, but in response to a moving average of the past inflation rates. Thus, the central bank not only aspires to respond to the recent macroeconomic development, but also endeavors to achieve it in a way that results in a low variability to the policy rates. Woodford (2003a; 2003b) provided theoretical results that this more inertial response allows the central bank to lower the variance of inflation using less interest-rate variability. That is, with interest rate smoothing, the central bank can achieve larger movements of economic variables using a smaller policy lever.

Seven exogenous disturbances drive the system's stochastic behavior, namely, total factor productivity shock, \hat{a}_t ; risk premium shock, \hat{b}_t ; exogenous spending shock, \hat{g}_t ; investment-specific technology shock, \hat{q}_t ; price mark-up shock, $\hat{\lambda}_{p,t}$; wage mark-up shock, $\hat{\lambda}_{w,t}$; and monetary policy shock, $\hat{\lambda}_{r,t}$, which are assumed to follow the following process, with an IID normal error term, to wit,

$$\begin{split} \hat{a}_{t} &= \rho_{a}\hat{a}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{a} \\ \hat{b}_{t} &= \rho_{b}\hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{b} \\ \hat{g}_{t} &= \rho_{g}\hat{g}_{t-1} + \rho_{ga}\epsilon_{t}^{a} + \epsilon_{t}^{g} \\ \hat{q}_{t} &= \rho_{i}\hat{\iota}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{i} \\ \hat{\lambda}_{p,t} &= \rho_{p}\hat{\lambda}_{p,t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{p} - \mu_{p}\epsilon_{t-1}^{p} \\ \hat{\lambda}_{w,t} &= \rho_{w}\hat{\lambda}_{w,t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{w} - \mu_{w}\epsilon_{t-1}^{w} \\ \hat{\lambda}_{r,t} &= \rho_{r}\hat{\lambda}_{r,t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{r} \end{split}$$

ESTIMATION METHODOLOGY

Bayesian Estimation

We adopt Bayesian methods in estimating the model. The Bayesian approach combines the advantages of both calibration and maximum likelihood estimation approaches in that it allows the data to inform the researcher about the model parameters, while at the same time allowing the flexibility of incorporating prior knowledge or information. Also, it avoids the limitation of calibration approach (i.e., the choice of parameters are not informed by the data) as well as the maximum likelihood approach (i.e., not disciplined by the prior, and hence, among others, may result in estimates that are out of bounds or doesn't make sense [for example, the household's discount rate not being inside [0,1] range]). Moreover, since the Bayesian approach permits the use of priors, it has the practical

advantage in situations where the data sample period is short, in that it makes the estimation more stable.

In addition, Bayesian estimation allows the calculation of the marginal likelihood of the model, that is, the likelihood of the observed data conditional of the model, which can be used to compare different models or model specifications, to see whether the data prefers one model over another. Thus, previous studies have used the comparison of the marginal likelihood of different model specifications to, say, compare if wage frictions are more important than price frictions (see e.g., Christiano et al., 2005; Smets & Wouters, 2007).

We discuss briefly the actual mechanics of the method here (for a more elaborate introduction, see, e.g., Fernandez-Villaverde, 2010; An & Schorfheide, 2007; and Griffoli, 2013). Bayesian estimation combines prior information with the information provided by the data. We have prior beliefs represented by the probability density function, $\pi(\theta|\mathcal{M})$, where θ stands of the parameters of a particular model \mathcal{M} . We also have a likelihood function that captures the information available from the sample data, $\mathcal{L}(\theta|y^T, \mathcal{M}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} p(y^T|\theta, \mathcal{M})$, where $y^T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{y_t\}_{t+1}^T \in R^{NxT}$ represent our data.

We can use the Bayes' theorem and combine the prior density function with the likelihood function to get the posterior density function, thus, $(\theta|y^T, \mathcal{M}) = \frac{p(y^T|\theta, \mathcal{M})\pi(\theta|\mathcal{M})}{p(y^T|\mathcal{M})}$ $p(y^T|\mathcal{M}) = \int_{\Theta} p(\theta; y^T|\mathcal{M}) d\theta$, where $p(\theta; y^T|\mathcal{M}) = p(y^T|\theta, \mathcal{M})\pi(\theta)$, and hence the posterior density is equal to

$$\pi(\theta|y^{T},\mathcal{M}) = \frac{p(y^{T}|\theta,\mathcal{M})\pi(\theta|\mathcal{M})}{\int p(y^{T}|\theta,\mathcal{M})\pi(\theta|\mathcal{M})d\theta}$$

That is, in order to arrive at our posterior beliefs, $\pi(\theta|y^T, \mathcal{M})$, we combine our prior information, $\pi(\theta|\mathcal{M})$, with the data information available embodied in the likelihood function, $p(y^T|\theta, \mathcal{M})$. Since the marginal density of the

data, $\int p(y^T | \theta, \mathcal{M}) \pi(\theta | \mathcal{M}) d\theta$, is constant, the posterior density is proportional to the posterior kernel, which is the numerator in the above equation. Thus,

$$\mathcal{K}(\theta|y^{T},\mathcal{M}) \stackrel{\text{\tiny def}}{=} p(y^{T}|\theta,\mathcal{M})\pi(\theta|\mathcal{M}) \propto \pi(\theta|y^{T},\mathcal{M})$$

In practice, the posterior easily turns very complicated analytically even for simple DSGE models, and in most cases, the posterior distribution cannot be solved analytically. Hence, in actual applications, there is often a need to simulate. That is, the Kalman filter is utilized to estimate the likelihood function, and Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods such as the Metropolis-Hastings algorithmis utilized to simulate the posterior kernel. MCMC methods are convenient because a Markov chain that is irreducible (i.e., has positive probability of eventually reaching any state from any other state) and a periodic will reach a unique stationary distribution (Gelman, Carlin, Stern, & Rubin, 2004; Walsh, 2004). In practice, the Metropolis Hastings algorithm is particularly useful because its simulated sequence, in addition to being a Markov chain with a unique stationary distribution, also has the feature that the stationary distribution equals the target distribution (the proof of this is in, e.g., Gelman et al., 2004).

The actual estimation is done by linking the endogenous variables in the log-linearized model of the previous section to seven observable data series (in this paper, the gross domestic product [GDP], consumption, investment, wage, hours worked, inflation, and interest rates), via the following measurement equation,

$$\begin{bmatrix} dlGDP_t\\ dlCons_t\\ dlNV_t\\ dlWag_t\\ lHOURS_t\\ dlP_t\\ RRP_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\gamma}\\ \bar{\gamma}_c\\ \bar{\gamma}_i\\ \bar{\gamma}_w\\ \bar{l}\\ \bar{\pi}\\ \bar{r} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_{t-1}\\ \hat{c}_t - \hat{c}_{t-1}\\ \hat{i}_t - \hat{i}_{t-1}\\ \hat{u}_t - \hat{w}_{t-1}\\ \hat{L}_t\\ \hat{\pi}_t\\ \hat{r}_t \end{bmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

where $\overline{\gamma}$, $\overline{\gamma}_c$, $\overline{\gamma}_i$, $\overline{\gamma}_w$, are respectively, the quarterly trend growth rate of GDP, consumption,

investment, and wages; \bar{l} is the steady-state labor hours worked (normalized to zero); $\bar{\pi}$ is the steady-state quarterly inflation rate; \bar{r} is the steady-state quarterly nominal interest rate; and l and dl, respectively, correspond to 100 times the log and log difference. Thus, we utilized Philippine quarterly data from 1987:1 to 2010:3 for the following variables: the first difference of the natural logarithm of real output, real consumption, and real investment; the difference of the real wage index; the deviation from the mean of hours worked; the first difference of the log of the GDP deflator, and quarterly reverse repurchase agreement rate. A more elaborate description of the data is provided in Appendix 1.

Priors

Following the historical Philippine data, the ratio of exogenous spending to the gross domestic product (GDP) ratio is fixed at 0%.⁹

As to the depreciation rate, Bu (2006) argued that depreciation rates are higher for developing countries than developed ones because of undermaintenance of the capital stock. Using firmlevel data, he estimated the implied depreciation for the Philippines to be 0.0575 (on a quarterly basis), but cautioned that his estimation method may be overestimated for the three Asian countries he estimated, including the Philippines. Hence, we adopted a depreciation equal to 0.04 (on a quarterly basis), which is higher than the 0.025 depreciation rate adopted by Smets and Wouters (2007) for the U.S. economy. The other three fixed parameters were set according to the specification by Smets and Wouters (2007), namely the curvature of the aggregators in both the goods and labor markets (ε_p and ε_w) are set to 10, while the labor market steady state markup is set to 1.5.

For the shock processes, we adopted the same priors for the autoregressive (AR) parameters as Smets and Wouters (2007) adopted.¹⁰ We also adopted their priors for all the other parameters, except for the following. For α , the raw labor share as reported by the Philippine National Income and Product Accounts (NIPA), hovers around 0.2 to 0.3. However, as Felipe and Sipin (2004) argued, this figure does not include the share of labor income reported as operating surplus of the private unincorporated enterprises (e.g., the self-employed). They estimated that if part of the operating surplus is attributed to the labor share, the share of labor would be much higher, and in a declining trend, to hover around 0.54 in the early 2000s. Hence, following Felipe and Sipin (2004), I set the prior mean for α to be 0.45.¹¹ So too, in order that the model will match the Philippine data closely, I also adopted the following priors (in parenthesis) for the following parameters: $\bar{\pi}$ (1.536), $100(\beta^{-1}-1)$ (1.01), $\bar{\gamma}$ $(0.344), \ \overline{\gamma}_c \ (0.523), \ \overline{\gamma}_i \ (0.55), \ \text{and} \ \overline{\gamma}_w, \ (-0.149),$ for which, I adopted the means of the Philippine data series. Table 1 and Appendix 2C summarize the priors used in the estimation.

Posterior Estimates

For all estimations (full sample, subperiod estimations, sensitivity analyses), I ran 500,000 Metropolis-Hastings (MH) iterations, half of which that were used are burn-in.¹² Appendix 2 presents the prior and posterior distributions, and the multivariate convergence diagnostic testing of the full sample (base) estimation (1987Q1 to 2010Q3), while Table 1 presents its parameter estimates. As mentioned, we also conducted subperiod analyses, and ran estimations, for example, for the power and Asian crises (1990Q2 to 1993Q3, and 1997Q3 to 1999Q4, respectively),¹³ as well as the pre-inflation targeting (1987Q1 to 2001Q4), and post-inflation targeting (2002Q1 to 2010Q3) subperiods. I also conducted sensitivity analyses, presented in Table 4. Appendix 4 summarizes the estimated loglinearized equations for the full model, and the different subperiods, as well as the estimates for the U.S. economy by Smets and Wouters (2007).¹⁴

Table 1

Prior and Posterior Distributions of the Structural Parameters and Shock Processes: Full Sample

		Prior	r distribut	ion	Posterior distribution			
Structural parameters		type	mean	stdev	mode	mean	stdev	t-stat
Steady-state elasticity of the investment adjustment cost fi	n φ	normal	4.00	1.50	5.28	5.35	0.87	6.07
Coefficient of relative risk aversion	σ	normal	1.50	0.38	0.77	0.98	0.14	5.38
External habit formation parameter	λ	beta	0.70	0.10	0.68	0.61	0.08	8.76
Elasticity of labour supply with respect to the real wage	σ,	normal	2.00	0.75	1.95	1.73	0.34	5.83
Degree of wage stickiness	ξ	beta	0.50	0.10	0.69	0.67	0.04	15.47
Degree of price stickiness	Ĕ	beta	0.50	0.10	0.65	0.62	0.06	11.13
Wage indexation	i ^p	beta	0.50	0.15	0.25	0.27	0.07	3.38
Indexation to past inflation	<i>w</i> <i>L</i>	beta	0.50	0.15	0.18	0.21	0.11	1.71
Normalized elasticity of capital utiliz.adjustment cost fn	ψ^p	beta	0.50	0.15	0.42	0.50	0.07	5.63
1+ Share of fixed cost in production	Φ	normal	1.25	0.13	1.20	1.21	0.04	27.23
Adjustment in interest rate in response to inflation	<i>r_</i>	normal	1.50	0.25	1.24	1.37	0.12	10.66
Degree of interest rate smoothing	p	beta	0.75	0.10	0.67	0.68	0.03	21.35
Adjustment in interest rate in response to output gap	r,	normal	0.13	0.05	0.13	0.13	0.03	3.72
Feedback in interest rate from the change in output gap	r_{AV}	normal	0.13	0.05	0.15	0.15	0.03	4.40
Steady-state inflation rate	$\frac{\Delta y}{\overline{\pi}}$	gamma	1.54	0.10	1.56	1.57	0.07	21.04
(β is discount factor applied by households)	$100(\beta^{-1}-1)$	gamma	1.01	0.20	1.04	1.07	0.18	5.81
Steady-state hours worked	T	normal	0.00	2.00	-0.07	-0.11	0.97	0.07
Trend growth rate to real GDP	$\overline{\gamma}$	normal	0.34	0.05	0.34	0.34	0.03	12.93
Share of capital in production	α	normal	0.45	0.05	0.13	0.14	0.01	16.84
Trend growth rate to consumption		normal	0.52	0.20	0.39	0.39	0.04	10.13
Trend growth rate to investment	\Box_I	normal	0.55	1.00	0.65	0.65	0.10	6.76
Trend growth rate to wages	γ_w	normal	-0.15	0.20	-0.22	-0.23	0.04	5.56
Shock processes								
Total productivity	σ_{a}	invg	1.00	2.00	2.30	2.31	0.19	12.38
Risk premium	$\sigma_{_b}$	invg	1.00	2.00	2.35	2.21	0.28	8.45
Exogenous spending	σ_{g}	invg	1.00	2.00	2.06	2.13	0.20	10.13
Investment-specific technology	σ_{i}	invg	1.00	2.00	5.97	5.96	0.36	16.50
Monetary policy	σ_r	invg	1.00	2.00	1.59	1.67	0.15	10.91
Price mark-up	σ_p	invg	1.00	2.00	2.04	2.05	0.20	10.37
Wage mark-up	$\sigma_{_W}$	invg	1.00	2.00	1.98	2.05	0.25	7.80
Total factor productivity AR parameter	ρ_a	beta	0.50	0.20	0.91	0.94	0.03	34.09
Risk premium AR parameter	ρ_b	beta	0.50	0.20	0.12	0.15	0.10	1.18
Exogenous spending AR parameter	ρ_g	beta	0.50	0.20	0.93	0.92	0.04	20.85
Investment-specific technology shock AR parameter	ρ_i	beta	0.50	0.20	0.14	0.20	0.06	2.50
Monetary policy shocks AR parameter	ρ_r	beta	0.50	0.20	0.04	0.06	0.03	1.49
Price mark-up AR parameter	ρ_p	beta	0.50	0.20	0.21	0.30	0.11	1.87
Wage mark-up AR parameter	ρ_w	beta	0.50	0.20	0.35	0.35	0.13	2.73
Price mark-up MA parameter	μ_p	beta	0.50	0.20	0.39	0.51	0.11	3.38
wage mark-up MA parameter	μ_w	beta	0.50	0.20	0.4/	0.4/	0.17	2.81
Reaction of exogenous spending to productivity shock	ρ_{ga}	normal	0.50	0.10	0.23	0.23	0.07	3.09

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

In this section, I use the estimation results of the DSGE model to analyze the structure and the dynamics of the Philippine macroeconomy.

Analysis of the Structure of the Philippine Macroeconomy: Some General Observations

From the posterior estimates of the full sample estimation, it is noticeable that the posterior mean estimates for standard deviation of the shocks are much higher for the Philippines compared to the U.S. This is true for *all* shock processes. For example, the standard deviation of technology shocks is 2.31 for the Philippines compared to 0.45 for the U.S.. The same marked difference in variability can be said for the risk premium, exogenous spending, monetary policy, price mark-up, and wage mark-up shocks (see Table 1). Very noticeable is the tremendously high difference of the standard deviations of investment-specific technology shock between the two countries, which is 5.97 for the Philippines vs. 0.45 for the U.S., or a factor of more than 13.27 times.¹⁵

Table 2

Standard Deviation of Shock Processes: Philippines vs. U.S.

Standard deviation of shock processes	Philippines	U.S. ¹		
σ	2.31	0.45		
$\sigma_{\rm b}^{\rm a}$	2.21	0.23		
σ	2.13	0.53		
σ,	5.96	0.45		
σ,	1.67	0.24		
σ	2.05	0.14		
$\sigma_{\rm w}^{\rm P}$	2.05	0.24		

¹Values for the U.S. are from Smets-Wouters (2007)

These results thus suggest more instability in the Philippine economy compared to the U.S. economy. Consistent with this finding, I note too, that the estimate for the steady state (quarterly) inflation rate is higher for the Philippines (1.57) compared to the U.S.' (0.78) (Table 2).

As to the estimates of the autoregressive parameters of the shocks, I notice a high persistency of the TFP and exogenous spending shocks (with autoregressive parameters of 0.94 and 0.92, respectively), similar to the values for the U.S. economy. However, unlike the U.S. economy, the Philippine economy has significantly less persistent monetary policy, price mark-up, wage mark-up, and investment specific technology shocks, as well as lower response of exogenous spending to productivity improvements.

Turning to the structural parameters, the mean posterior estimate of the share of capital in the Philippines is 0.14, consistent with Felipe and Sipin's (2004) and Aldaba's (2009) findings of a much larger share of labor in the production than what the NIPA reports. This is slightly lower than the estimate for the U.S. (0.19). Also, an analysis of the subperiod estimates reveals that the share of labor is decreasing towards the later estimation periods (see, for example, Appendix 3, which shows a lower share of capital in the earlier period of pre-inflation targeting vs. the later period of post-inflation targeting¹⁶), also consistent with the findings of Felipe and Sipin (2004). This result appears to be robust. The mean estimate for the coefficient of relative risk aversion is about 1 (implying logutility), which is a little smaller than the U.S.' (1.38). By disaggregating the estimation into several periods, I notice that the coefficient of risk aversion seems to increase during the economic downturns associated with the power crisis and the Asian crisis, and considerably decrease after the adoption of the inflation targeting framework (Table 3).

This implies that at times of crisis, the elasticity of intertemporal substitution is lower, and other things equal, the elasticity of consumption to policy rate changes will be lower (see Appendix 4). Consequently, as can be seen from the comparison of impulse responses during the Asian and power crises, consumption was less responsive to the monetary policy shocks than in the base model.

The estimate of the steady-state elasticity of the investment adjustment cost function, φ , is 5.35, which implies that the elasticity of investment to the value of installed capital is 0.19, very similar to the estimate for the U.S. The estimate for the habit formation parameter, is 0.61, slightly higher than the 0.71 for the U.S. The Frisch elasticity of labor supply, $\frac{1}{\sigma_l}$, which measures the labor supply's responsiveness to the real wage, holding consumption constant, is 0.58, roughly similar to the estimate for the U.S. (0.55).The measures of price and wage rigidity,

Table 3

	Full Sample	Power Crisis	Asian Crisis	Post-Inflation Targeting		
	1987Q1-	1990Q2-	1997Q3-	2002Q1-		
	2010Q3	1993Q3	1999Q4	2010Q3		
Coefficient of Relative Risk						
Risk Aversion, σ_{c}	0.98	1.63	1.56	0.3		

Subperiod Comparison of the Coefficient of Relative Risk Aversion

Table 4

How Important are the Model's Nominal and Real Frictions?

	Base	ξ_=0.1	ξ _w =0.1	i _p =0.01	i _w =0.01	φ=0.1	λ=0.1	Ψ=0.99	Ф=1.1
Margina	al likelihood	d							
	-1695.32	-1702.17	-1732.30	-1664.95	-1660.99	-1783.18	-1667.34	-1676.63	-1665.45
Mean of	f the structu	iral param	eters						
φ	5.35	5.08	5.33	4.95	5.06	0.10	5.01	5.07	5.13
σ_{c}	0.98	1.05	1.26	0.99	0.97	0.68	1.70	0.98	0.98
λ	0.61	0.71	0.20	0.63	0.63	0.24	0.10	0.61	0.58
ξ_w	0.67	0.76	0.10	0.68	0.69	0.93	0.65	0.67	0.68
σ_l	1.73	1.71	0.29	1.93	1.99	0.39	2.01	1.67	2.18
ξ_n	0.62	0.10	0.54	0.61	0.61	0.87	0.65	0.60	0.66
i_w^P	0.27	0.20	0.36	0.29	0.01	0.20	0.27	0.31	0.25
i n	0.21	0.60	0.16	0.01	0.21	0.20	0.21	0.20	0.20
Ψ	0.50	0.38	0.61	0.43	0.39	0.19	0.44	0.99	0.44
Φ	1.21	1.55	1.17	1.21	1.20	1.20	1.12	1.23	1.10
r_{π}	1.37	1.33	1.75	1.35	1.32	1.07	1.36	1.34	1.36
ρ	0.68	0.70	0.63	0.67	0.66	0.56	0.64	0.66	0.67
r_{v}	0.13	0.10	0.07	0.13	0.13	0.00	0.16	0.14	0.14
r_{Av}	0.15	0.12	0.20	0.14	0.14	0.34	0.19	0.16	0.15
α	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.14	0.14
Mean of	f the autore	gressive pa	rameters o	f the shock	processes				
ρ_a	0.94	0.78	0.96	0.93	0.93	0.99	0.98	0.96	0.95
ρ_{b}	0.15	0.12	0.32	0.14	0.14	0.27	0.42	0.15	0.15
ρ_{o}	0.92	0.93	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.97	0.91	0.94
ρ_{I}°	0.20	0.17	0.27	0.22	0.20	0.24	0.19	0.46	0.22
ρ_r	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.06
ρ_{p}	0.30	0.83	0.37	0.36	0.27	0.13	0.25	0.28	0.28
ρ_w	0.35	0.30	0.84	0.30	0.31	0.33	0.32	0.31	0.30
μ_{p}	0.51	0.40	0.40	0.44	0.39	0.34	0.37	0.39	0.41
μ_w^P	0.47	0.56	0.45	0.41	0.44	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.49

 ξ_p and ξ_w , respectively, are estimated to be 0.65 and 0.69, respectively, indicating that prices and wages are not very flexible. This means that the average price duration of 2.7 quarters in between reoptimizations, and an average of about 3.2 quarters for wage duration. In comparison, the estimates for the U.S. average price and wage contract durations are 2.81 and 3.57, respectively. The normalized elasticity of the capital utilization adjustment function is 0.50, implying a unitary elasticity of the capital utilization rate to the capital rental rate; in comparison, the latter figure for the U.S. is 0.85 (see Smets & Wouters, 2007 for the U.S. estimates).

Turning to the estimated interest rate feedback rule, we find that the Philippine had noticeably less interest rate smoothing ($\rho = 0.68$) compared to the U.S.' ($\rho = 0.81$), for the full-sample period (although as will be explained later, the Philippines has greater interest rate smoothing than the U.S. during the former's inflation targeting era). Also, the Philippines' interest rate response to inflation, r_{π} , is lower (1.37) than the U.S.' (2.04).

How Important are the Nominal and Real Frictions in Explaining Philippine Data?

The Bayes factor can be used to compare different models or model specifications. This involves comparing the different marginal likelihood of the models, that is, the likelihood of the observed data conditional on the model. In this paper, Laplace's method is used to approximate the marginal likelihood of the different specifications of the model.

Table 4 reports the marginal likelihood and the parameter estimates of different model specifications. By comparing the marginal likelihood of the different model specifications, one can see if such feature of the model is important, as evidenced by the change in the marginal likelihood.

From Table 4, we can see that investment adjustment costs, which slows the adjustment of investment to shocks, turns out to be the most important feature of the model that helps in explaining the empirical behavior of the Philippine

data. Reducing the steady-state elasticity of the investment adjustment cost function to a very low value of 0.1 results in a significant deterioration of the marginal likelihood. Habit formation in consumption, on the other hand, turned out to be relatively unimportant in explaining the dynamics of the data, as lowering the habit formation parameter to 0.1 does not seem to matter much to the model's performance. Likewise, the introduction into the model of the other real frictions, such as variable capital utilization and the presence of fixed costs, does not seem to matter for the models empirical performance vis-à-vis the Philippine data, as shutting down these features of the model seems to come at no significant cost to the model's performance.

As to the nominal frictions, it appears that introducing both price and wage rigidities is important to capture the dynamics of Philippine data. Shutting down either of these features of the model is costly in terms of the deterioration of the marginal likelihood. Moreover, it appears that wage rigidity is more important in explaining the dynamic of Philippine data than price rigidity, as the marginal likelihood deteriorates by a larger amount. In contrast, the indexation parameters do not seem to be important, as fixing their value to a very low level results in no significant deterioration in the marginal likelihood (in fact, the marginal likelihood improves somewhat in both cases).

In summary, the most important frictions in explaining the dynamics of Philippine data are the investment adjustment costs (real friction), and the wage and the price rigidities (nominal frictions), in that order. All other frictions (nominal and real) seem to be relatively unimportant, as shutting them down does not seem to worsen the model's performance.

Analysis of the Dynamics of the Philippine Macroeconomy

To get a glimpse of the dynamics of the Philippine economy, I present the impulse responses, the variance decomposition, and the shock decomposition.

Impulse response analysis traces how a shock

increases are quite persistent, last

affects the different variables in the economy. Appendix 5 presents the impulse responses of the different endogenous variables to the different shocks, for the full sample, and the pre-inflation targeting and post-inflation targeting subperiods.

An increase in the central bank's policy rate reduces labor hours, consumption, output, and inflation on impact, with the negative effect waning and lasting for about 10 to 12 quarters. The maximum effect of the interest rates appears to occur two quarters after the shock. It also reduces investment and wages on impact, but the results have longer effect, affecting both variables even after 16 to 20 quarters. For both variables, the effect of the interest rate shock appears to peak after three or four quarters.

A positive productivity shock increases consumption, investment, output, and wages quite persistently, with the effect lasting more than 20 quarters. It, however, reduces labor hours on impact until about four quarters. It also reduces real marginal cost and inflation, and the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP) reacts by cutting interest rates.

A shock to the price mark-up reduces consumption, investment, and output from impact until about the six to eight quarters. It also increases inflation, and the central bank reacts by raising interest rates.

An increase in the efficiency of investment causes investment and output to increase. Capital services and real wage also increase, and both increases are quite persistent, lasting for more than 20 quarters. Working hours also increase, but not persistently, with the increase lasting only up to about eight quarters.

An increase in the wage mark-up decreases consumption, investment, labor hours, and output, with the effect dying out only after 20 quarters. The shock also causes an increase in the utilization of capital, capital services, and the rental rate of capital. Also, it increases the marginal cost and inflation, causing the BSP to increase policy rates.

An increase in exogenous spending increases output, but reduces both consumption and investment. It also increases working hours, wages, and inflation, causing the BSP to reduce policy rates.

A reduction in the risk premium increases consumption, investment, and working hours. It also increases the value of the existing capital stock, and increases rental rate of capital, capital services, installed capital, and capital utilization rate. However, wage, marginal cost, and inflation also increases, resulting in the increase of the policy rates by the BSP.

By decomposing the variation of each variable into to the component shocks, the variance decomposition presents information on how important is each shock in explaining the movement in the variable. Table 5 presents the variance decomposition (over long horizons).

About half of the movements in the output

Table 5

Variance Decomposition (in Percent)

	Macroeconomic Variable								
	Output	Inflation	Policy Rate	Consumption	Investment	Wage	Labor Hours		
Productivity	50.8	13.6	15.7	35.0	14.7	50.3	7.0		
Risk-premium	21.7	1.2	17.9	28.6	1.2	1.4	42.1		
Exogenous spending	9.9	0.8	1.7	18.3	0.6	0.0	20.2		
Investment-specific	4.6	0.2	0.6	4.3	79.8	2.3	6.9		
Monetary policy	11.0	3.8	53.6	11.8	3.1	2.6	20.5		
Price mark-up	1.2	73.4	7.3	1.2	0.1	12.1	1.8		
Wage mark-up	0.7	6.9	3.2	0.8	0.6	31.2	1.7		

can be explained by the total factor productivity shocks. Movements in the external finance premium accounts for 21.7%, while exogenous spending and monetary policy accounts for about 10% and 11%, respectively.

Over the long-run, price mark-up shocks are the dominant drivers of inflation, accounting for almost three-fourths of its variations. Total factor productivity and real wage shocks account for 13.6% and 6.9%, respectively, of its movements. Only around 4% of inflation's are driven by monetary policy.

Thirty five percent of consumption can be explained by total factor productivity, while 28.6%, 18.3%, and 11.8% of the same can be accounted for by the risk premium, exogenous spending, and monetary policy, respectively.

Investment-specific technology shocks account for almost 80% of the movements in investment, while 15% and 3.1% of the movements in investments are explained by total factor productivity and monetary policy, respectively.

Fifty percent of the movements in wages can be explained by total factor productivity shocks; 31.2% and 12.1%, are accounted for by wage mark-up and price mark-up shocks, respectively.

Monetary policy shocks account for 53.6% of movement in the interest rates, while 17.9% and 15.7% of the latter's fluctuations are driven by the risk premium and total factor productivity shocks, respectively.

Most of the movements in labor hours are explained by the risk premium (42%), exogenous spending (20.2%), monetary policy (20.5%), and total factor productivity (7%) shocks.

We next present the shock decomposition analysis for output and inflation for the quarters 1986Q1 to 2010Q3. In contrast to the variance decomposition, which gives information over long-run horizons, shock decomposition analysis decomposes the actual series into the component contributions of each of the shocks, and does this quarter by quarter, which enables for a more interesting analysis.

Figure 1 presents the shock decomposition for output. It is consistent with the information presented in the variance decomposition analysis, namely that output is driven mainly by the productivity, risk-premium, monetary policy, and exogenous spending shocks. For example, in Figure 1, we draw lines corresponding with 1991Q2, 1998Q1, 2001Q2, and 2008Q3, which are associated with the power crisis, Asian crisis, the fallout from the U.S. crisis, and the global financial and economic crisis, respectively. According to the graph, the large contractions in output during the power crisis (marked by the first line in the figure), were accounted for mainly by the risk-premium (eb), investment (eqs), and productivity (ea) shocks. Meanwhile, the output declines during the Asian crisis (marked in the figure by the second line) were accounted for mainly by risk-premium (eb), investment (eqs), productivity (ea), and monetary policy (em) shocks. In comparison, during the global economic and financial crisis, the output declines were driven by exogenous spending (eg), investment (eqs), and monetary policy (em) shocks. I note that the figure seems to say that monetary policy did not "lean against the wind" during the fallout from the 2001 U.S. recession and the global financial crisis, as the monetary policy shocks were negative during these episodes. (In contrast, see the countercyclical monetary policy shocks in the shock decomposition for the U.S. and Europe by Christiano, Motto, and Rostagno, 2008; see also Smets and Wouters, 2007).

In particular, I have argued elsewhere that the BSP cut it policy rates a little too late during the global economic and financial crisis (see Yap & Majuca, 2010). That is, as Figure 2 shows, the policy rates were reduced several months after the global crisis had already had its impact on the Philippine economy. The shock decomposition (Figure 1) shows that the positive monetary policy shock only kicked in the fourth quarter of 2009, when output growth was already positive. Thus, overall Figure 1 seems to put into question the counter cyclicality of Philippine monetary policy. If such is correct, perhaps a quicker reaction to







Source: National Statistical Office

Figure 2. Merchandise exports, inflation, and policy rates.

shocks, and improved forecasting of forthcoming shocks and their effects on the economy on the part of the BSP may serve well the Philippine economy.

This finding is consistent with the findings of other studies, both for the Philippines and other developing countries. Leitner (2005), studying the case of the Philippines and utilizing a different quantitative approach than what we use here, wrote:

[G]overnment expenditure as a fiscal policy tool, and M1 as a monetary policy tool, turn out to be clearly procyclical. This also means that for the sample period, no active countercyclical stabilization policy was conducted to swiftly overcome economic recessions. This policy stance directly contradicts theoretical prescription of counter cyclical policies during boom-bust period. (p.5)

She concluded that:

[T]he boom-bust cycle calls for a countercyclical approach. The Philippines contradicted this approach and applied procyclical stabilization policy. This claim is supported by the highly positive and strong correlation of government expenditures and money supply with output. This is tantamount to saying that the government failed in its role to stabilize the economy. (Leitner, 2005, p. 7)

See also the account by Yap and Majuca (2010) and Majuca, Manasan, Reyes, Yap, & Associates (2011).

As it turns out, this phenomenon is a problem not only for the Philippines but for many developing countries. Thus, Kaminsky, Reinhart, and Vegh (2005), in studying 104 countries including the Philippines, concludes:

With regard to fiscal policy, OECD countries are, by and large, either countercyclical or acyclical. In sharp contrast, developing countries are predominantly procyclical... With regard to monetary policy, most OECD countries are countercyclical, while developing countries are mostly procyclical or acyclical... In developing countries, the capital flow cycle and the macroeconomic policy cycle reinforce each other...(pp. 27-29)

Figure 3 shows the shock decomposition for inflation. It shows that most of inflations are



Figure 3. Shock decomposition of inflation.

driven by price mark-up (*epinf*), productivity (*ea*), and wage mark-up (*ew*) shocks, consistent with the information provided by the variance decomposition analysis. In particular, it shows that during second quarter of 2008, which is marked by a line in the figure, the price pressures on the economy were mainly driven by cost-push shocks.

Structural Changes Post-Inflation Targeting

Appendix 3 presents the estimation for both the pre-inflation targeting and post-inflation targeting era. The mean of the standard deviations of the technology shocks decreased from 2.41 to 1.75. Likewise, the estimate for the standard deviation of the risk-premium shocks fell from 2.28 to 0.41, a decrease by a factor of 5.6. Meanwhile, the investment-specific technology shocks have also exhibited significantly lower variability post the adoption of inflation targeting, falling from 6.86 to 2.98, a reduction by a factor 2.3.

The measure of the inertial behavior of the central bank is captured by the parameter, ρ . Bayesian estimation suggests that pre-IT, this parameter had a posterior mean of 0.62.¹⁸ Post-IT, the posterior mean estimate for this parameter is 0.94. In short, the central bank's adjustments of the policy rates have become more inertial post-IT; it had become even more inertial than the U.S. monetary authorities. The risk-aversion parameter significantly lowered from 1.27 pre-IT to 0.3 post-IT.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper investigated the structure and dynamics of the Philippine macroeconomy by estimating a medium-scale dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) model using Bayesian methods. Different specifications of the model were tested by comparing their marginal likelihood, and several subperiod analyses (crisis periods, and pre-inflation targeting vs. postinflation targeting era) were also conducted. Among the real frictions introduced in the model, the investment-adjustment-costs and habitformation features are important in capturing the dynamics of the Philippine data, while the variable-capital-utilization and fixed-costs features are not important. As to the nominal frictions, we find that both the price and wage rigidity features of the model are important, while the indexation to lagged inflation of both price and wage are not important.

We find that the Philippine macroeconomy is characterized by more instability than the U.S. economy. The analysis of several subperiods in Philippine economic history also enabled us to glean some important patterns of parameter shifts during important events. For example, by studying subperiods associated with recessions or downturns, we find quantitative evidence for the intuitive result that risk aversion increases during crisis periods.

Also, in analyzing what structural changes were brought about by the adoption of inflation targeting framework in the Philippines, we find that the post-inflation targeting (IT) era is associated with a substantially higher interest rate smoothing in the monetary reaction function. We find that the post-IT era is associated with a more stable economy: the standard deviations technology shocks, the risk-premium shock, and the investment-specific technology shock have significantly lower variability than the pre-IT era, with the last two shocks being reduced by a factor of 5.6 and 2.3, respectively. The IT era is also associated with lower risk aversion.

However, there is also some evidence that suggests that the *Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas* (BSP)'s conduct of monetary policy may be more procyclical than countercyclical, particularly during the Asian financial crisis, and the recent global financial and economic crisis. If correct, this suggests the need on the part of the monetary authority to have a better monitoring and forecasts of the recent and forthcoming shocks and their impact on the Philippine economy, as well as quicker reaction to the shocks.

One of the limitations of the model I used is the fact that it is a closed-economy model. As such, it cannot analyze issues related to the open-economy such as exports, exchange rates, exchange-rate pass through, etc. Also, being a closed-economy model, it cannot disentangle the effect of net exports and government spending, as both are lumped into "exogenous spending". Therefore, estimating an open-economy DSGE version will be helpful. Secondly, the cut-off dates for the subperiod analyses were chosen exogenously by this researcher, instead of endogenously determined. It would be thus be desirable to conduct a Markov-switching DSGE model estimation to allow the parameter changes to be endogenously determined (see, for example, Davig and Leeper, 2007), once the software developers of Dynare incorporate this feature in their software.

NOTES

- ¹ I gratefully acknowledge the able research assistance of Michael Angelo Cokee, Maureen Rosellon, and Danileen Kristel Parel. The usual disclaimer applies.
- DSGE models are thus "dynamic" in that there is an explicit focus on the intertemporal behavior of firms and households, and the role of these economic agents' forward looking behavior in the adjustment dynamics of the macroeconomic variables are explicitly captured. They are also "stochastic" in that they capture how the dynamics of the model are driven by the impulses or the shocks, how these impulses are propagated (this can be done through impulse response analysis, which enables one to analyze the dynamics of the economy, and its responses to different shocks), and how these in turn cause the fluctuations which characterize the dynamics of the model (Barnett & Ellison, 2005). This can be done, for example, through forecast-errorvariance decomposition which allows one to trace the contribution of shocks to the fluctuations in the variables and shock decomposition, which allows one to interpret the historical evolution of the variables using structural shocks.
- ³ The model I use is a slightly modified version of Smets and Wouters (2007), which is largely based on Christiano et al. (2005) and Smets and Wouters (2003). I modified by allowing the quarterly growth trend of the following variables to be different from each other, namely, real GDP, real consumption, real investment, and real wages. In Smets and Wouters (2007) all these

variables have a common quarterly growth trend. I think that this slight modification is more appropriate for the Philippine data.

- ⁴ For the microfoundations of the model, the reader is referred to the Appendix of Smets and Wouters (2007), as well as the papers of Christiano et al. (2005) and Smets and Wouters (2003).
- ⁵ To generate more reasonable degree of price and wage stickiness, the Kimball (1995) aggregator is used instead of the traditional Dixit-Stiglitz aggregator.
- ⁶ In principle, it may be possible to separate the two by using Epstein-Zin utility function specification, but empirical studies have some difficulties isolating the two (Schwartz & Torous, 1999).
- ⁷ Capital adjustment models, in contrast, assume that is it costly to vary the capital level.
- ⁸ They also involve a forward-looking investment decision, as the private sector has to bear costs in adjusting the level of investment (see Groth and Khan, 2010).
- ⁹ Recall that, in the model, exogenous spending represents government expenditures plus net exports.
- ¹⁰ However, for the standard errors of the shock processes, since it is clear from Smets and Wouters (2007) estimation, as well as from our initial estimation runs that the shock processes have higher mean standard errors than the priors means they adopted, I instead used a prior mean of 1.
- ¹¹ Notice that this prior specification is consistent also with the micro-studies estimates in Aldaba (2009) which estimated for all the manufacturing subsectors, labor's share of income to labor is larger than capital's.
- ¹² All estimations were done usingmode_compute=6in Dynare ver. 4 for Octave, as it is difficult to converge using Sims' csminwel (mode compute=4).
- ¹³ The data points for the recent global and financial crisis are too short to run a separate estimation for.
- ¹⁴ The impulse responses for the full sample are presented in Appendix 5.
- ¹⁵ In fact, the relatively large standard deviation of the investment data series is probably the reason why it is difficult to converge the estimation for Philippine data, when using for example Sims'csminwel. Thanks to Mike Cokee for this conjecture.
- ¹⁶ The decrease in the share of labor is not, however, a result of the adoption of inflation targeting, as breaking down the full sample into different subperiods consistently result in lower share of labor. For example, from the beginning of the sample to the onset of the Asian crisis (1987Q1 – 1997Q2), $\alpha = 0.19$; from the onset of the Asian crisis to the adoption of inflation targeting (1997Q3 – 2001Q4), $\alpha = 0.31$; from the adoption of inflation targeting to before the global economic and financial crisis (2002Q1 – 2008Q1), $\alpha = 0.36$.
- ¹⁷ The results on the impulse responses during the crisis sub-periods are not reported in this paper, for brevity reasons, but are available from the author upon request.

- ¹⁸ This is almost similar to the estimates for the corresponding U.S. value during the Greenspan era of the Federal Reserve, as reported in Woodford (1999).
- ¹⁹ Definitions: dy=GDP, dc=consumption, dinve=investment, labobs=labor hours (worked), pinfobs=inflation, dw=wages, robs=interest rate.
- ²⁰ Definitions: ea=productivity/TFP, eb=risk premium, eg=exogenous spending, eqs=investment-specific technology, em=monetary policy, epinf=price mark-up, ew=wage mark-up.
- ²¹ Definitions (refer to Table 1 for the definition of the parameters): SE_ea= σ_a , SE_eb= σ_b , SE_eg= σ_g , SE_eqs= σ_r , SE_em= σ_r , SE_epinf= σ_p , SE_ew= σ_w , crhoa= ρ_a , crhob= ρ_b , crhog= ρ_g , crhoqs= ρ_i , crhoms= ρ_r , crhopinf= ρ_p , crhow= ρ_w , cmap= μ_p , cmaw= μ_w , csadjcost= φ , csigma= σ_c , chabb= λ , cprobw= ξ_w , csigl= σ_L , cprobp= ξ_p , cindw= ι_w , cindp= ι_p , czcap= ψ , cfc= Φ , crpi= r_{π} , crr= ρ , cr= r_y , crdy= r_{dy} , constepinf= π , constebeta=100(β^{-1} -1), constelab=L, constec= γ_c , L consteinve = γ_i , constew= γ_w , ctrend= γ_c , cgy= ρ_{ga} , calfa= α .

REFERENCES

- Adolfson, M., Laseen, S., Christiano, L., Trabandt, M., & Walentin, K. (2013). RAMSES II
 Model description. Sveriges Riksbank Occasional Paper Series, 12. Available at http://www.riksbank.se/Documents/Rapporter/ Occasional_papers/2013/rap_occasional_ paper nr12 130306.pdf
- Adolfson, M., Laseen, S., Linde, J., & Villani, M. (2007). Bayesian estimation of open economy DSGE model with incomplete pass-through. *Journal of International Economics*, 72(2),481-511.
- Aldaba, R.M. (2009). Micro study: Philippines does trade protection improve firm productivity? Evidence from Philippine micro data. Retrieved from http://www.eria.org/pdf/research/y2009/ no2/CH05_Micro-Data.pdf
- An, S., & Schorfheide, F. (2007). Bayesian analysis of DSGE models. *Econometric Reviews*, 26 (2-4),113-172.
- Barnett, A., & Ellison, M. (2005). Practical DSGE Modeling. Retrieved from http://www. economics.ox.ac.uk/members/martin.ellison/ Boe/boe.html
- Bernanke, B.S., Gilchrist, S., & Gertler, M. (1999). The financial accelerator in a quantitative

business cycle framework. In J. B. Taylor & M. Woodford, *Handbook of macroeconomics, volume 1C*,(pp. 1314-1393). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, North-Holland.

- Bu, Y. (2006). Fixed capital stock depreciation in developing countries: Some evidence from firm level data. *Journal of Development Studies*, 42(5),881-901.
- Calvo, G.A. (1983). Staggered prices in a utilitymaximizing framework. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 12(3), 383-398.
- Christiano, L. J., Eichenbaum, M., & Evans, C. L. (2005). Nominal rigidities and the dynamic effects of a shock tomonetary policy. *Journal* of *Political Economy*, 113(1), 1-45.
- Christiano, L.J., Motto, R., & Rostagno, M. (2008). Shocks, structures or monetary policies? The Euro area and US after 2001. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 32(8), 2476-2506.
- Christoffel, K., Coenen, G., & Warne, A. (2008). *The new area-wide model of the Euro area: A micro-founded open-economy model for forecasting and policy analysis* (ECB Working Paper No. 944). Retrieved from http://www. ecb.int/pub/pdf/scpwps/ecbwp944.pdf
- Clarida, R., Gali, J., & Gertler, M. (2001). Optimal monetary policy in open vs. closed economies. *American Economic Review* 91(2), 253-257.
- ———. (2002). A simple framework for international monetary policy analysis. *Journal* of Monetary Economics 49(5), 877-904.
- Davig, T., & Leeper, E. M. (2007). Generalizing the Taylor principle. *American Economic Review*, 97(3), 607-635.
- Erceg, C. J., Guerrieri, L., & Gust, C. (2006). SIGMA: A new open economy model for policy analysis. *International Journal of Central Banking*, 2(1), 111-144.
- Felipe, J., & Sipin, G. C. (2004). Competitiveness, income distribution, and growth in the Philippines: What does the long-run evidence show? (Economics and Research Department Working Paper, No.53). Manila: Asian Development Bank. Retrieved from http:// www.adb.org/Documents/ERD/Working_ Papers/wp053.pdf

- Fernandez-Villaverde, J. (2010). The econometrics of DSGE models. *SERIEs*, *1*(1),3-49.
- Gelman, A., Carlin, J., Stern, H., & Rubin, D. (2004). *Bayesian data analysis* (2nd ed.). Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Griffoli, T. (2013). Dynare user guide: An introduction to the solution and estimation of DSGE models. Retrieved from http://www. dynare.org/documentation-and-support/user-guide/Dynare-UserGuide-WebBeta.pdf/view
- Groth, C., & Khan, H. (2010). Investment adjustment costs: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, 42*(8), 1469-1494.
- Ireland, P. (2004). A method for taking models to the data. *Journal of Economics Dynamics and Control*, 28(6), 1205-1226.
- Kaminsky, G., Reinhart, C., &Vegh, C. (2005). When it rains it pours: procyclical capital flows and macroeconomic policies. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2004, Vol. 19.* MIT Press.
- Kimball, M.S. (1995). The quantitative analytics of the basic neomonetarist model. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, 27*(4 Part 2), 1241-1277.
- Leitner, S. (2005). *The business cycle in the Philippines* (Discussion Paper Series No. 2005-10). Makati: Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Majuca, R., Manasan, R., Reyes, C., Yap, J., & Associates. (2011). Economic policy monitor 2010: Fiscal space, investment and poverty alleviation. Makati City: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. Retrieved from http://www.pids.gov.ph/books. php?id=4923&pubyear=2012
- Medina, J. P., & Soto, C. (2007a). Copper price, fiscal policy and business cycle in Chile. (Working Papers No. 458). Santiago, Chile: Central Bank of Chile.

- ——. (2007b).*The Chilean business cycle through the lens of a stochastic general equilibrium model*(Working Papers No. 457). Santiago, Chile: Central Bank of Chile.
- Medina, J., Munro, A., & Soto, C. (2008). What drives the current account in commodity exporting countries? The cases of Chile and New Zealand (Working Paper No. 247). Bank for International Settlements. Available at http://www.bis.org/repofficepubl/ apresearchjpmamcs080101.pdf
- Schwartz, E., & Torous, W. N. (1999). Can we disentangle risk aversion from intertemporal substitution in consumption? (Working Paper). Los Angeles: Finance, Anderson Graduate School of Management, UC Los Angeles. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/3qs6r307
- Smets, F., & Wouters, R. (2003). An estimated stochastic dynamic general equilibrium model of the Euro area. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, *1*(5),1123-1175.
- ———. (2007). Shocks and frictions in US business cycles: A Bayesian DSGE approach. *American Economic Review, 97*(3), 586-606.
- Walsh, B. (2004). Markov chain Monte Carlo and Gibbs sampling [Lecture Notes]. Retrieved fromhttp://web.mit.edu/wingated/www/ introductions/mcmc-gibbs-intro.pdf
- Woodford, M. (1999). Optimal monetary policy inertia. Available at http://www.columbia. edu/~mw2230/inertia.pdf
- ——. (2003a). *Interest and prices*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . (2003b). Optimal interest-rate smoothing. *Review of Economic Studies*, 70(4), 861-886.
- Yap, J., & Majuca, R. P. (2010). *The Philippine* economy in 2009 and prospects for 2010 (PIDS Development Research News XXVIII(1)). Makati, Philippines: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. Retrieved fromhttp:// dirp4.pids.gov.ph/ris/drn/pidsdrn10-1.pdf

APPENDIX 1.

Data Definition and Sources

In the measurement equation (equation 16), $dlGDP_t = \text{output} - \text{output}(-1)$, $dlCons_t = \text{consumption} - \text{consumption}(-1)$, dlINV = investment-investment(-1), $dlWag_t = \text{wage}$, $lHOURS_t = \text{hours-average}(\text{hours series})$, $RRP_t = \text{interest rate}$; where

output=LN(GDP_CO_SA/LNSIndex)*100 consumption==LN((PCE_CU_SA/GDP_DEF_SA)/LNSIndex)*100 investment=LN((CF_CU_SA/GDP_DEF_SA)/LNSIndex)*100 wage=WAGE_INDEX_SA-WAGE_INDEX_SA(-1) hours=LN(((3*HOURS_SA*CE160Index)/100)/LNSIndex)*100 inflation =(LN(GDP_DEF_SA)-LN(GDP_DEF_SA(-1)))*100 interestrate =RRP_4_SA;

and where

WAGE_INDEX_SA is the seasonally adjusted index of compensation by the National Statistical Coordination Board (NSCB),

GDP_CO_SA is the seasonally-adjusted GDP in constant prices,

LNSIndex, the labor force index = Labor force seasonally-adjusted index / Labor force seasonallyadjusted index (1992Q3),

PCE_CU_SA is the seasonally-adjusted personal consumption expenditure at current prices by the NSCB,

GDP_DEF_SA is the seasonally-adjusted GDP deflator,

CF_CU_SA is the seasonally-adjusted capital formation in current prices series from the NSCB,

HOURS_SA is the seasonally-adjusted average weekly hours worked (non-agriculture), from the National Statistics Office (NSO) (Labor Force Survey and Annual Survey of Establishments),

CE160Index=(EMPLOYED_SA/EMPLOYED_SA(1992Q3))*100, where EMPLOYED_SA is the seasonally-adjusted Number of Employed series from the Bureau of Labor and Employment Statistics (BLES) and the NSO.

RRP_4_SA is the seasonally-adjusted reverse repurchase agreement (RRP) rates (from the BSP) divided by four.

APPENDIX 2A.

Historical and Smoothed Variables¹⁹



APPENDIX 2B. Smoothed Shocks²⁰



APPENDIX 2C.

Prior and Posterior Distributions, Full Sample Estimation²¹







APPENDIX 2D. *Multivariate Convergence Diagnosting Testing*



APPENDIX 3.

Posterior Distributions of the Structural Parameters and Shocks Processes: Pre-Inflation Targeting vs. Post-Inflation Targeting

			Pre-Inflation Targeting				Post-Inflation Targeting			
Structural parameters		mode	mean	stdev	t-stat	mode	mean	stdev	t-stat	
Steady-state elasticity of the investment adjustment cost	Ŷ	2.45	3.42	1.44	1.71	5.35	5.77	1.13	4.73	
Coefficient of relative risk aversion	್	1.21	1.27	0.23	5.21	0.28	0.30	0.03	8.56	
External habit formation parameter	Y	0.51	0.51	0.11	4.90	0.57	0.58	0.05	11.35	
Elasticity of labour supply with respect to the real wage	σι	1.52	1.61	0.36	4.25	0.25	0.76	0.38	0.65	
Degree of wage stickiness	ξ	0.62	0.63	0.08	8.00	0.66	0.65	0.06	10.73	
Degree of price stickiness	ξp	0.62	0.61	0.05	13.08	0.39	0.55	0.05	8.69	
Wage indexation	lær	0.41	0.43	0.08	4.90	0.23	0.29	0.05	4.59	
Indexation to past inflation	lp .	0.28	0.31	0.12	2.36	0.31	0.37	0.09	3.36	
Normalized elasticity of capital utiliz, adjustment cost fn	Ψ	0.49	0.53	0.06	8.40	0.87	0.79	0.05	19.03	
1+ Share of fixed cost in production	Φ	1.28	1.29	0.07	19.42	1.19	1.25	0.06	19.47	
Adjustment in interest rate in response to inflation	7.	1.38	1.45	0.15	9.21	1.49	1.45	0.12	12.79	
Degree of interest rate smoothing	ρ	0.61	0.62	0.04	15.17	0.95	0.94	0.01	93.64	
Adjustment in interest rate in response to output gap	ty .	0.13	0.14	0.03	4.10	0.09	0.16	0.04	2.13	
Feedback in interest rate from the change in output gap	î ay	0.14	0.14	0.02	6.02	0.11	0.11	0.02	5.31	
Steady-state inflation rate	$\overline{\pi}$	1.59	1.60	0.05	30.96	1.49	1.48	0.05	27.88	
(β is discount factor applied by households)	100(β ^{-¶} -1)	1.09	1.15	0.18	6.15	0.93	0.90	0.12	7.75	
Steady-state hours worked	Ī	1.18	1.34	0.87	1.36	-3.51	-2.01	0.64	5.46	
Trend growth rate to real GDP	Ϋ́	0.33	0.33	0.03	12.42	0.35	0.34	0.03	10.98	
Share of capital in production	α	0.13	0.15	0.01	9.86	0.30	0.31	0.03	9.10	
Trend growth rate to consumption	y e	0.30	0.29	0.05	6.18	1.16	1.03	0.07	16.44	
Trend growth rate to investment	y 1	1.12	1.13	0.26	4.36	-0.66	-0.21	0.37	1.79	
Trend growth rate to wages	у ж	-0.31	-0.31	0.06	5.36	-0.07	-0.10	0.07	1.12	
Shock processes										
Total productivity	σ_a	2.38	2.41	0.21	11.32	1.58	1.75	0.20	7.95	
Risk premium	σ_b	2.26	2.28	0.35	6.54	0.37	0.40	0.09	4.28	
Exogenous spending	σ_g	1.90	2.07	0.19	9.77	1.84	2.06	0.26	7.00	
Investment-specific technology	σι	6.94	6.86	0.48	14.43	2.54	2.98	0.44	5.76	
Monetary policy	σ_r	1.90	2.01	0.19	10.15	0.29	0.32	0.06	4.72	
Price mark-up	σ_p	2.07	2.08	0.22	9.48	2.07	2.03	0.22	9.26	
Wage mark-up	$\sigma_{\rm W}$	1.97	2.04	0.25	7.78	2.09	2.23	0.26	8.14	
Total factor productivity AR parameter	ρa	0.74	0.77	0.09	7.88	0.63	0.74	0.10	6.34	
Risk premium AR parameter	ρs	0.10	0.14	0.13	0.78	0.82	0.85	0.04	18.97	
Exogenous spending AR parameter	ρ _g	0.75	0.75	0.07	10.08	0.65	0.67	0.08	8.26	
Investment-specific technology shock AR parameter	ρ,	0.09	0.13	0.05	1.74	0.44	0.32	0.12	3.58	
Monetary policy shocks AR parameter	p,	0.05	0.08	0.04	1.21	0.31	0.33	0.08	3.88	
Price mark-up AR parameter	ρp	0.25	0.26	0.12	2.06	0.43	0.37	0.11	3.83	
Wage mark-up AR parameter	ρ _{er}	0.39	0.38	0.11	3.71	0.32	0.34	0.09	3.72	
Price mark-up MA parameter	Ψp	0.54	0.56	0.12	4.38	0.41	0.74	0.09	4.36	
Wage mark-up MA parameter	μ _{er}	0.44	0.42	0.10	4.42	0.57	0.57	0.06	9.30	
Reaction of exogenous spending to productivity shock	ρ _{ge}	0.37	0.36	0.05	6.84	0.39	0.42	0.04	9.31	

Note: The prior distributions of the structural parameters and shock processes, for both pre-inflation and post-inflation targeting samples, are similar to the baseline (full-sample) model.

Appendix 4. Estimation Results

The log-linearized model with parameter values (mean)

Aggregate Demand

(1) <u>Consumption Euler equation:</u>

Full Smp $\hat{c}_t = 0.38\hat{c}_{t-1} + 0.62E_t\hat{c}_{t+1} - 0.27(\hat{l}_t - E_t\hat{l}_{t+1}) - 0.25(\hat{r}_t - E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1} + \hat{b}_t)$ Pre-IT $\hat{c}_t = 0.34\hat{c}_{t-1} + 0.66E_t\hat{c}_{t+1} + 3.22(\hat{l}_t - E_t\hat{l}_{t+1}) - 0.26(\hat{r}_t - E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1} + \hat{b}_t)$ Post-IT $\hat{c}_t = 0.36\hat{c}_{t-1} + 0.64E_t\hat{c}_{t+1} - 5.08(\hat{l}_t - E_t\hat{l}_{t+1}) - 0.89(\hat{r}_t - E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1} + \hat{b}_t)$ Power cr $\hat{c}_t = 0.37\hat{c}_{t-1} + 0.63E_t\hat{c}_{t+1} + 1.41(\hat{l}_t - E_t\hat{l}_{t+1}) - 0.16(\hat{r}_t - E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1} + \hat{b}_t)$ Asian cr $\hat{c}_t = 0.40\hat{c}_{t-1} + 0.60E_t\hat{c}_{t+1} + 0.70(\hat{l}_t - E_t\hat{l}_{t+1}) - 0.13(\hat{r}_t - E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1} + \hat{b}_t)$ U.S. $\hat{c}_t = 0.43\hat{c}_{t-1} + 0.57E_t\hat{c}_{t+1} + 1.19(\hat{l}_t - E_t\hat{l}_{t+1}) - 0.11(\hat{r}_t - E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1} + \hat{b}_t)$ Full Smp $\hat{b}_t = 0.15\hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^b$ Pre-IT $\hat{b}_t = 0.14\hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^b$ Power cr $\hat{b}_t = 0.29\hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^b$ Asian cr $\hat{b}_t = 0.29\hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^b$ Nus. $\hat{b}_t = 0.14\hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^b$

(2) <u>Investment Euler equation:</u>

$$\begin{split} \text{Full Smp } \hat{\imath}_t &= 0.50 \hat{\imath}_{t-1} + 0.50 \ E_t \hat{\imath}_{t+1} + 0.09 \ \hat{P}_t^k + \hat{q}_t \\ \text{Pre-IT} \quad \hat{\imath}_t &= 0.50 \hat{\imath}_{t-1} + 0.50 \ E_t \hat{\imath}_{t+1} + 0.15 \ \hat{P}_t^k + \hat{q}_t \\ \text{Post-IT} \quad \hat{\imath}_t &= 0.50 \hat{\imath}_{t-1} + 0.50 \ E_t \hat{\imath}_{t+1} + 0.09 \ \hat{P}_t^k + \hat{q}_t \\ \text{Power cr } \hat{\imath}_t &= 0.50 \hat{\imath}_{t-1} + 0.50 \ E_t \hat{\imath}_{t+1} + 0.12 \ \hat{P}_t^k + \hat{q}_t \\ \text{Asian cr } \hat{\imath}_t &= 0.50 \hat{\imath}_{t-1} + 0.50 \ E_t \hat{\imath}_{t+1} + 0.16 \ \hat{P}_t^k + \hat{q}_t \\ \text{U.S.} \quad \hat{\imath}_t &= 0.50 \hat{\imath}_{t-1} + 0.50 \ E_t \hat{\imath}_{t+1} + 0.09 \ \hat{P}_t^k + \hat{q}_t \\ \text{Full Smp } \hat{q}_t &= 0.20 \ \hat{q}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^i \\ \text{Pre-IT} \quad \hat{q}_t &= 0.13 \ \hat{q}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^i \\ \text{Power cr } \hat{q}_t &= 0.43 \ \hat{q}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^i \\ \text{Ower cr } \hat{q}_t &= 0.43 \ \hat{q}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^i \\ \text{U.S.} \quad \hat{q}_t &= 0.67 \ \hat{q}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^i \\ \text{U.S.} \quad \hat{q}_t &= 0.67 \ \hat{q}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^i \\ \end{split}$$

(3) <u>Q-equation: Capital arbitrage equation:</u>

Full Smp
$$\hat{P}_{t}^{k} = 0.95 E_{t} \hat{P}_{t+1}^{k} + 0.05 E_{t} r_{t+1}^{k} - (\hat{r}_{t} - E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + \hat{b}_{t})$$

Pre-IT $\hat{P}_{t}^{k} = 0.95 E_{t} \hat{P}_{t+1}^{k} + 0.05 E_{t} r_{t+1}^{k} - (\hat{r}_{t} - E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + \hat{b}_{t})$
Post-IT $\hat{P}_{t}^{k} = 0.95 E_{t} \hat{P}_{t+1}^{k} + 0.05 E_{t} r_{t+1}^{k} - (\hat{r}_{t} - E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + \hat{b}_{t})$
Power cr $\hat{P}_{t}^{k} = 0.94 E_{t} \hat{P}_{t+1}^{k} + 0.06 E_{t} r_{t+1}^{k} - (\hat{r}_{t} - E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + \hat{b}_{t})$
Asian cr $\hat{P}_{t}^{k} = 0.95 E_{t} \hat{P}_{t+1}^{k} + 0.05 E_{t} r_{t+1}^{k} - (\hat{r}_{t} - E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + \hat{b}_{t})$
U.S. $\hat{P}_{t}^{k} = 0.97 E_{t} \hat{P}_{t+1}^{k} + 0.03 E_{t} r_{t+1}^{k} - (\hat{r}_{t} - E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + \hat{b}_{t})$
Full Smp $\hat{b}_{t} = 0.15 \hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{b}$
Pre-IT $\hat{b}_{t} = 0.14 \hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{b}$
Power cr $\hat{b}_{t} = 0.29 \hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{b}$
Asian cr $\hat{b}_{t} = 0.29 \hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{b}$
LS. $\hat{b}_{t} = 0.14 \hat{b}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{b}$

Aggregate Supply

(4) <u>Aggregate production function:</u>

Full Smp
$$\hat{y}_t = 1.22(0.14\hat{k}_t^s + 0.86\hat{l}_t + \hat{a}_t)$$

Pre-IT $\hat{y}_t = 1.29(015\hat{k}_t^s + 0.85\hat{l}_t + \hat{a}_t)$
Post-IT $\hat{y}_t = 1.25(0.31\hat{k}_t^s + 0.69\hat{l}_t + \hat{a}_t)$
Power cr $\hat{y}_t = 1.42(0.26\hat{k}_t^s + 0.74\hat{l}_t + \hat{a}_t)$
Asian cr $\hat{y}_t = 1.48(0.32\hat{k}_t^s + 0.68\hat{l}_t + \hat{a}_t)$
U.S. $\hat{y}_t = 1.68(0.21\hat{k}_t^s + 0.79\hat{l}_t + \hat{a}_t)$
Full Smp $\hat{a}_t = 0.94\varepsilon_{t-1}^a + \varepsilon_t^a$
Pre-IT $\hat{a}_t = 0.77\varepsilon_{t-1}^a + \varepsilon_t^a$
Power cr $\hat{a}_t = 0.90\varepsilon_{t-1}^a + \varepsilon_t^a$
Power cr $\hat{a}_t = 0.54\varepsilon_{t-1}^a + \varepsilon_t^a$
U.S. $\hat{a}_t = 0.97\varepsilon_{t-1}^a + \varepsilon_t^a$

(5) <u>Capital services:</u>

$$\hat{k}_t = \hat{\bar{k}}_{t-1} + \hat{u}_t$$

(6) <u>Accumulation of capital:</u> Full Smp $\hat{k}_t = 0.96\hat{k}_{t-1} + 0.04\hat{i}_t + 0.46\hat{q}_t$ Pre-IT $\hat{k}_t = 0.96\hat{k}_{t-1} + 0.04\hat{i}_t + 0.30\hat{q}_t$ Post-IT $\hat{k}_t = 0.96\hat{k}_{t-1} + 0.04\hat{i}_t + 0.50\hat{q}_t$ Power cr $\hat{k}_t = 0.96\hat{k}_{t-1} + 0.04\hat{i}_t + 0.36\hat{q}_t$ Asian cr $\hat{k}_t = 0.96\hat{k}_{t-1} + 0.04\hat{i}_t + 0.27\hat{q}_t$ U.S. $\hat{k}_t = 0.97\hat{k}_{t-1} + 0.03\hat{i}_t + 0.33\hat{q}_t$ Full Smp $\hat{q}_t = 0.20 \varepsilon_{t-1}^i + \varepsilon_t^i$ Pre-IT $\hat{q}_t = 0.13 \varepsilon_{t-1}^i + \varepsilon_t^i$ Power cr $\hat{q}_t = 0.43 \varepsilon_{t-1}^i + \varepsilon_t^i$ Asian cr $\hat{q}_t = 0.43 \varepsilon_{t-1}^i + \varepsilon_t^i$

(7) <u>Capital utilization:</u>

Full Smp $\hat{u}_t = 1.00\hat{r}_t^k$ Pre-IT $\hat{u}_t = 1.62\hat{r}_t^k$ Post-IT $\hat{u}_t = 0.27\hat{r}_t^k$ Power cr $\hat{u}_t = 0.84\hat{r}_t^k$ Asian cr $\hat{u}_t = 0.74\hat{r}_t^k$ U.S. $\hat{u}_t = 0.96\hat{r}_t^k$

(8) <u>New-Keynesian Phillips curve:</u>

Full Smp
$$\hat{\pi}_{t} = 0.18\hat{\pi}_{t-1} + 0.82E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + 0.06\hat{m}c_{t} + \hat{\lambda}_{p,t}$$

Pre-IT $\hat{\pi}_{t} = 0.24\hat{\pi}_{t-1} + 0.76E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + 0.05\hat{m}c_{t} + \hat{\lambda}_{p,t}$
Post-IT $\hat{\pi}_{t} = 0.27\hat{\pi}_{t-1} + 0.73E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + 0.08\hat{m}c_{t} + \hat{\lambda}_{p,t}$
Power cr $\hat{\pi}_{t} = 0.31\hat{\pi}_{t-1} + 0.68E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + 0.07\hat{m}c_{t} + \hat{\lambda}_{p,t}$
Asian cr $\hat{\pi}_{t} = 0.35\hat{\pi}_{t-1} + 0.65E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + 0.04\hat{m}c_{t} + \hat{\lambda}_{p,t}$
U.S. $\hat{\pi}_{t} = 0.19\hat{\pi}_{t-1} + 0.81E_{t}[\hat{\pi}_{t+1}] + 0.02\hat{m}c_{t} + \hat{\lambda}_{p,t}$
Full Smp $\hat{\lambda}_{p,t} = 0.30\hat{\lambda}_{p,t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{p} - 0.51\epsilon_{t-1}^{p}$
Pre-IT $\hat{\lambda}_{p,t} = 0.26\hat{\lambda}_{p,t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{p} - 0.74\epsilon_{t-1}^{p}$
Power cr $\hat{\lambda}_{p,t} = 0.46\hat{\lambda}_{p,t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{p} - 0.51\epsilon_{t-1}^{p}$
Power cr $\hat{\lambda}_{p,t} = 0.50\hat{\lambda}_{p,t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{p} - 0.51\epsilon_{t-1}^{p}$
I.S. $\hat{\lambda}_{p,t} = 0.93\hat{\lambda}_{p,t-1} + \epsilon_{t}^{p} - 0.78\epsilon_{t-1}^{p}$

(9) <u>Marginal cost (real) (negative of the price mark-up):</u>

Full Smp $\widehat{mc}_t = \widehat{w}_t - \widehat{mpl}_t = \widehat{w}_t - 0.14(\widehat{k}_t^s - L_t) - \widehat{a}_t$ Pre-IT $\widehat{mc}_t = \widehat{w}_t - \widehat{mpl}_t = \widehat{w}_t - 0.15(\widehat{k}_t^s - \widehat{l}_t) - \widehat{a}_t$ Post-IT $\widehat{mc}_t = \widehat{w}_t - \widehat{mpl}_t = \widehat{w}_t - 0.31(\widehat{k}_t^s - \widehat{l}_t) - \widehat{a}_t$ Power cr $\widehat{mc}_t = \widehat{w}_t - \widehat{mpl}_t = \widehat{w}_t - 0.26(\widehat{k}_t^s - \widehat{l}_t) - \widehat{a}_t$ Asian cr $\widehat{mc}_t = \widehat{w}_t - \widehat{mpl}_t = \widehat{w}_t - 0.32(\widehat{k}_t^s - \widehat{l}_t) - \widehat{a}_t$ U.S. $\widehat{mc}_t = \widehat{w}_t - \widehat{mpl}_t = \widehat{w}_t - 0.21(\widehat{k}_t^s - \widehat{l}_t) - \widehat{a}_t$ Full Smp $\widehat{a}_t = 0.94\widehat{a}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^a$ Pre-IT $\widehat{a}_t = 0.77\widehat{a}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^a$ Power cr $\widehat{a}_t = 0.90\widehat{a}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^a$ L.S. $\widehat{a}_t = 0.97\widehat{a}_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^a$

(10) <u>Rental rate of capital:</u>

$$\hat{r}_t^k = -(\hat{k}_t - \hat{L}_t) + \hat{w}_t$$

(11) <u>Real wages:</u>

Full Smp $\hat{w}_t = 0.50\hat{w}_{t-1} + 0.50(E_t\hat{w}_{t-1} + E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) - 0.64\hat{\pi}_t + 0.14\hat{\pi}_{t-1} - 0.0032\hat{\mu}_t^w + \hat{\lambda}_{w,t}$ Pre-IT $\hat{w}_t = 0.50\hat{w}_{t-1} + 0.50(E_t\hat{w}_{t-1} + E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) - 0.71\hat{\pi}_t + 0.21\hat{\pi}_{t-1} - 0.0043\hat{\mu}_t^w + \hat{\lambda}_{w,t}$ Post-IT $\hat{w}_t = 0.50\hat{w}_{t-1} + 0.50(E_t\hat{w}_{t-1} + E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) - 0.65\hat{\pi}_t + 0.15\hat{\pi}_{t-1} - 0.0036\hat{\mu}_t^w + \hat{\lambda}_{w,t}$ Power cr $\hat{w}_t = 0.50\hat{w}_{t-1} + 0.50(E_t\hat{w}_{t-1} + E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) - 0.77\hat{\pi}_t + 0.27\hat{\pi}_{t-1} - 0.0053\hat{\mu}_t^w + \hat{\lambda}_{w,t}$ Asian cr $\hat{w}_t = 0.50\hat{w}_{t-1} + 0.50(E_t\hat{w}_{t-1} + E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) - 0.75\hat{\pi}_t + 0.24\hat{\pi}_{t-1} - 0.0055\hat{\mu}_t^w + \hat{\lambda}_{w,t}$ U.S. $\hat{w}_t = 0.50\hat{w}_{t-1} + 0.50(E_t\hat{w}_{t-1} + E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) - 0.84\hat{\pi}_t + 0.34\hat{\pi}_{t-1} - 0.0021\hat{\mu}_t^w + \hat{\lambda}_{w,t}$ $\begin{aligned} & \text{Full Smp } \hat{\lambda}_{w,t} = 0.35 \hat{\lambda}_{w,t-1} + \epsilon_t^w - 0.47 \epsilon_{t-1}^w \\ & \text{Pre-IT} \quad \hat{\lambda}_{w,t} = 0.38 \hat{\lambda}_{w,t-1} + \epsilon_t^w - 0.42 \epsilon_{t-1}^w \\ & \text{Post-IT} \quad \hat{\lambda}_{w,t} = 0.34 \hat{\lambda}_{w,t-1} + \epsilon_t^w - 0.74 \epsilon_{t-1}^w \\ & \text{Power cr } \hat{\lambda}_{w,t} = 0.49 \hat{\lambda}_{w,t-1} + \epsilon_t^w - 0.49 \epsilon_{t-1}^w \\ & \text{Asian cr } \hat{\lambda}_{w,t} = 0.39 \hat{\lambda}_{w,t-1} + \epsilon_t^w - 0.48 \epsilon_{t-1}^w \\ & \text{U.S.} \qquad \hat{\lambda}_{w,t} = 0.98 \hat{\lambda}_{w,t-1} + \epsilon_t^w - 0.88 \epsilon_{t-1}^w \end{aligned}$

(12) Wage mark-up:

Full Smp $\hat{\mu}_t^w = \hat{w}_t - \hat{mrs}_t = \hat{w}_t - (1.73\hat{L}_t + 2.59(\hat{c}_t - 0.61\hat{c}_{t-1}))$ Pre-IT $\hat{\mu}_t^w = \hat{w}_t - \hat{mrs}_t = \hat{w}_t - (1.61\hat{L}_t + 2.04(\hat{c}_t - 0.51\hat{c}_{t-1}))$ Post-IT $\hat{\mu}_t^w = \hat{w}_t - \hat{mrs}_t = \hat{w}_t - (0.76\hat{L}_t + 2.36(\hat{c}_t - 0.58\hat{c}_{t-1})))$ Power cr $\hat{\mu}_t^w = \hat{w}_t - \hat{mrs}_t = \hat{w}_t - (1.79\hat{L}_t + 2.48(\hat{c}_t - 0.60\hat{c}_{t-1})))$ Asian cr $\hat{\mu}_t^w = \hat{w}_t - \hat{mrs}_t = \hat{w}_t - (1.76\hat{L}_t + 2.98(\hat{c}_t - 0.66\hat{c}_{t-1})))$ U.S. $\hat{\mu}_t^w = \hat{w}_t - \hat{mrs}_t = \hat{w}_t - (1.64\hat{L}_t + 3.93(\hat{c}_t - 0.75\hat{c}_{t-1})))$

(13) <u>Aggregate resource constraint:</u>

Full Smp $\hat{y}_t = 0.88\hat{c}_t + 0.12\hat{i}_t + 0.14\hat{u}_t + \hat{g}_t$ Pre-IT $\hat{y}_t = 0.89\hat{c}_t + 0.11\hat{i}_t + 0.15\hat{u}_t + \hat{g}_t$ Post-IT $\hat{y}_t = 0.73\hat{c}_t + 0.27\hat{i}_t + 0.31\hat{u}_t + \hat{g}_t$ Power cr $\hat{y}_t = 0.80\hat{c}_t + 0.20\hat{i}_t + 0.26\hat{u}_t + \hat{g}_t$ Asian cr $\hat{y}_t = 0.75\hat{c}_t + 0.25\hat{i}_t + 0.32\hat{u}_t + \hat{g}_t$ U.S. $\hat{y}_t = 0.63\hat{c}_t + 0.19\hat{i}_t + 0.21\hat{u}_t + \hat{g}_t$ Full Smp $\hat{g}_t = 0.92\varepsilon_{t-1}^g + 0.23\epsilon_t^a + \epsilon_t^g$ Pre-IT $\hat{g}_t = 0.75\hat{g}_{t-1} + 0.36\epsilon_t^a + \epsilon_t^g$ Post-IT $\hat{g}_t = 0.54\hat{g}_{t-1} + 0.42\epsilon_t^a + \epsilon_t^g$ Power cr $\hat{g}_t = 0.64\hat{g}_{t-1} + 0.42\epsilon_t^a + \epsilon_t^g$ U.S. $\hat{g}_t = 0.97\hat{g}_{t-1} + 0.53\epsilon_t^a + \epsilon_t^g$

(14) Empirical monetary policy reaction function:

 $\begin{aligned} \text{Full Smp } \hat{r}_t &= 0.68 \hat{r}_{t-1} + 0.32 \{ \left(1.31 \hat{\pi}_t + 0.13 (\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p) \right) + 0.15 \left[\left(\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p \right) - \left(\hat{y}_{t-1} - \hat{y}_{t-1}^p \right) \right] + \hat{\lambda}_{r,t} \\ \text{Pre-IT} \quad \hat{r}_t &= 0.62 \hat{r}_{t-1} + 0.38 \{ \left(1.45 \hat{\pi}_t + 0.14 (\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p) \right) + 0.14 \left[\left(\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p \right) - \left(\hat{y}_{t-1} - \hat{y}_{t-1}^p \right) \right] + \hat{\lambda}_{r,t} \\ \text{Post-IT} \quad \hat{r}_t &= 0.94 \hat{r}_{t-1} + 0.06 \{ \left(1.45 \hat{\pi}_t + 0.16 (\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p) \right) + 0.11 \left[\left(\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p \right) - \left(\hat{y}_{t-1} - \hat{y}_{t-1}^p \right) \right] + \hat{\lambda}_{r,t} \\ \text{Power cr } \hat{r}_t &= 0.57 \hat{r}_{t-1} + 0.43 \{ \left(1.61 \hat{\pi}_t + 0.14 (\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p) \right) + 0.12 \left[\left(\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p \right) - \left(\hat{y}_{t-1} - \hat{y}_{t-1}^p \right) \right] + \hat{\lambda}_{r,t} \\ \text{Asian cr } \hat{r}_t &= 0.77 \hat{r}_{t-1} + 0.23 \{ \left(1.52 \hat{\pi}_t + 0.13 (\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p) \right) + 0.09 \left[\left(\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p \right) - \left(\hat{y}_{t-1} - \hat{y}_{t-1}^p \right) \right] + \hat{\lambda}_{r,t} \\ \text{U.S.} \quad \hat{r}_t &= 0.81 \hat{r}_{t-1} + 0.19 \{ \left(2.10 \hat{\pi}_t + 0.10 (\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p) \right) + 0.22 \left[\left(\hat{y}_t - \hat{y}_t^p \right) - \left(\hat{y}_{t-1} - \hat{y}_{t-1}^p \right) \right] + \hat{\lambda}_{r,t} \end{aligned}$

Full Smp $\hat{\lambda}_{r,t} = 0.06\hat{\lambda}_{r,t-1} + \epsilon_t^r$ Pre-IT $\hat{\lambda}_{r,t} = 0.08\hat{\lambda}_{r,t-1} + \epsilon_t^r$ Post-IT $\hat{\lambda}_{r,t} = 0.33\hat{\lambda}_{r,t-1} + \epsilon_t^r$ Power cr $\hat{\lambda}_{r,t} = 0.15\hat{\lambda}_{r,t-1} + \epsilon_t^r$ Asian cr $\hat{\lambda}_{r,t} = 0.38\hat{\lambda}_{r,t-1} + \epsilon_t^r$ U.S. $\hat{\lambda}_{r,t} = 0.18\hat{\lambda}_{r,t-1} + \epsilon_t^r$

(15) <u>Measurement equations:</u>

$$\begin{split} \text{Full Smp} \qquad & Y_{t} = \begin{bmatrix} dlGDP_{t} \\ dlCONS_{t} \\ dlWAG_{t} \\ lHOURS_{t} \\ dlP_{t} \\ RRP_{t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.34 \\ 0.34 \\ 0.34 \\ 0.34 \\ 0.34 \\ 0.34 \\ -0.11 \\ 1.57 \\ 3.00 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{w}_{t-1} \\ \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{w}_{t-1} \\ \hat{y}_{t} \\ \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{w}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ & \\ Pre-IT \qquad & Y_{t} = \begin{bmatrix} dlGDP_{t} \\ dlCONS_{t} \\ dlWAG_{t} \\ lHOURS_{t} \\ dlP_{t} \\ RRP_{t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.33 \\ 0.33 \\ 0.33 \\ 0.33 \\ 1.34 \\ 1.60 \\ 3.20 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t} \\ \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t} \\ \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t} \\ \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y$$

Asian cr
$$Y_{t} = \begin{bmatrix} dlGDP_{t} \\ dlCONS_{t} \\ dlINV_{t} \\ dlWAG_{t} \\ lHOURS_{t} \\ dlP_{t} \\ RRP_{t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.32 \\ 0.44 \\ 0.44 \\ 0.44 \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.44 \\ 0.67 \\ 0.81 \\ 0.55 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} - \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ 0.45$$

Full Smp # quarters firms reoptimize prices =
$$\frac{1}{1-\xi_p} = \frac{1}{1-0.62} = 2.74$$

quarters labor reoptimize wages = $\frac{1}{1-\xi_w} = \frac{1}{1-0.67} = 3.18$
Pre-IT # quarters firms reoptimize prices = $\frac{1}{1-\xi_p} = \frac{1}{1-0.61} = 2.66$
quarters labor reoptimize wages = $\frac{1}{1-\xi_w} = \frac{1}{1-0.63} = 3.02$
Post-IT # quarters firms reoptimize prices = $\frac{1}{1-\xi_p} = \frac{1}{1-0.55} = 2.21$
quarters labor reoptimize wages = $\frac{1}{1-\xi_w} = \frac{1}{1-0.65} = 2.89$
Power cr # quarters firms reoptimize prices = $\frac{1}{1-\xi_p} = \frac{1}{1-0.65} = 2.89$
quarters labor reoptimize wages = $\frac{1}{1-\xi_p} = \frac{1}{1-0.60} = 2.50$
Asian cr # quarters firms reoptimize prices = $\frac{1}{1-\xi_p} = \frac{1}{1-0.60} = 2.22$
quarters labor reoptimize prices = $\frac{1}{1-\xi_p} = \frac{1}{1-0.60} = 2.22$

U.S. # quarters labor reoptimize wages
$$\frac{1-\xi_w}{1-\xi_w} = 2.81$$

quarters labor reoptimize wages $=\frac{1}{1-\xi_w} = 3.57$

APPENDIX 5.

Impulse Responses: Full Sample

Variable definitions:

labobs = Labor hours worked (observable variable) robs = interest rate (observable variable) = RRP/4pinfobs = inflation (observable variable) dy = dlog of real GDP (observable variable)dc = dlog of real consumption (observable variable)dinve = dlog of real investment (observable variable) dw = growth rate of real wage (observable variable) zcapf = degree of capital utilization (flexible economy) rkf = rental rate of capital (flexible economy) kf = capital services used in production (flexible economy)pkf = current price of the existing installed capital stock (flexible economy) cf = (real) consumption (flexible economy) invef = (real) investment (flexible economy) yf = (real) output (flexible economy) labf = labor services (hours worked) (flexible economy) wf = real wages (flexible economy)rrf = interest rate (flexible economy) mc = (real) marginal costzcap = degree of capital utilization rk = rental rate of capitalk = capital services used in productionpk = current price of the existing installed capital stock c = (real) consumption inve = (real) investment y = (real) output lab = labor services (hours worked) pinf = inflationw = real wagesr = interest ratekpf = capital installed (flexible economy)kp = capital installed a = total factor productivity g = exogenous spendingb = risk premium disturbance epinfma=epinf= price mark-up disturbance spinf=price mark-up disturbance sw = wage mark-up disturbance qs = investment-specific technology disturbance ms = monetary policy disturbance



PRODUCTIVITY/TFP SHOCK









RISK-PREMIUM SHOCK



EXOGENOUS SPENDING SHOCK





12 14 16 18

12

14 19

18



MONETARY POLICY SHOCK









PRICE MARK-UP SHOCK





INVESTMENT-SPECIFIC TECHNOLOGY SHOCK









WAGE MARK-UP SHOCK



