

---

---

**NOTES D'ÉTUDES**

---

**ET DE RECHERCHE**

---

**CAN THE KYDLAND-PRESCOTT MODEL PASS  
THE COGLEY-NASON TEST?**

Patrick Fève and Julien Matheron

June 2005

**NER - R # 125**



**CAN THE KYDLAND-PRESCOTT MODEL PASS  
THE COGLEY-NASON TEST?**

Patrick Fève and Julien Matheron

June 2005

**NER - R # 125**

Les Notes d'Études et de Recherche reflètent les idées personnelles de leurs auteurs et n'expriment pas nécessairement la position de la Banque de France. Ce document est disponible sur le site internet de la Banque de France « [www.banque-France.fr](http://www.banque-France.fr) ».

The Working Paper Series reflect the opinions of the authors and do not necessarily express the views of the Banque de France. This document is available on the Banque de France Website "[www.banque-France.fr](http://www.banque-France.fr)".

# Can the Kydland–Prescott Model Pass the Cogley–Nason Test?

Patrick Fève<sup>1</sup>

University of Toulouse (CNRS–GREMAQ and IDEI)

and Banque de France (Research Division)

Julien Matheron

Banque de France (Research Division)

April, 2005

<sup>1</sup>Address: GREMAQ–Université de Toulouse I, manufacture des Tabacs, bât. F, 21 allée de Brienne, 31000 Toulouse, France. email: [patrick.feve@univ-tlse1.fr](mailto:patrick.feve@univ-tlse1.fr). We would like to thank F. Collard and M. Dupaigne for helpful discussions. The traditional disclaimer applies. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Banque de France.

**Résumé :**

Cet papier évalue de façon quantitative la capacité du modèle de Kydland et Prescott avec des chocs technologiques permanents et des chocs de préférence stationnaires à reproduire la persistance du produit ainsi que la réponse du produit à la fois à des chocs permanents et à des chocs transitoires. Etalonné de façon à reproduire les caractéristiques du marché du travail américain, ce modèle, où l'essentiel des fluctuations est d'origine technologique, passe avec succès le test de Cogley et Nason.

**Mots-clés :** Modèles RBC, formation des habitudes sur le loisir, chocs de préférence, persistance du produit.

**Abstract:**

This paper quantitatively evaluates the ability of a Kydland and Prescott type model with permanent technology shocks and labor wedges to reproduce output persistence together with persistent impulse response functions of output to permanent and transitory shocks. When calibrated on US labor market features, this model, in which technology shocks account for the bulk of output fluctuations, successfully passes the Cogley and Nason test.

**Keywords:** RBC Models, Habit Leisure, Labor Wedges, Output Persistence

**JEL Codes:** E32, C52.

## **Résumé non technique :**

Cogley et Nason (1995) ont montré que les modèles RBC usuels ne sont pas capables de reproduire simultanément la fonction d'autocorrélation du taux de croissance du produit et les réponses du produit à des chocs permanents et transitoires, tels qu'issus d'un modèle VAR structurel. Ces résultats remettent en cause profondément cette classe de modèles et mettent en lumière leurs faibles mécanismes internes de propagation des chocs. Ce résultat négatif a stimulé un vaste programme de recherche destiné à enrichir les propriétés dynamiques de ces modèles.

Cet papier propose de revenir sur les résultats de Cogley et Nason, et évalue de façon quantitative la capacité du modèle de Kydland et Prescott avec des chocs technologiques permanents et des chocs de préférence stationnaires à reproduire la persistance du produit ainsi que la réponse du produit à la fois à des chocs permanents et à des chocs transitoires.

Le modèle est étalonné de façon à reproduire les caractéristiques du marché du travail américain, ce modèle, à l'aide de la méthode des moments simulés. Les estimations suggèrent une forte complémentarité intertemporelle de l'offre de travail et ainsi une importante persistance des heures travaillées. Par ailleurs, ces estimations montrent que l'essentiel des fluctuations est d'origine technologique.

Le modèle ainsi estimé est ensuite soumis au test de Cogley et Nason. Le modèle parvient avec succès à passer ce test: il reproduit l'autocorrélation du taux de croissance du produit ainsi que les réponses de la production aux chocs permanents et transitoires. Nos résultats contredisent ceux de Cogley et Nason. Ceci s'explique de deux façons. Tout d'abord, la formation des habitudes permet d'obtenir des heures travaillées fortement autocorrélées, et donc d'enrichir les propriétés dynamiques du modèle. Au contraire, Cogley et Nason n'étudient que les implications quantitatives de la substituabilité intertemporelle du loisir. Ensuite, à la différence de Cogley et Nason, le choc stationnaire que nous considérons permet de reproduire l'essentiel des caractéristiques observées de l'emploi américain, permettant à nouveau d'enrichir les propriétés dynamiques du modèle.

**Non-technical summary:**

Cogley and Nason (1995) have shown that standard RBC models fail to reproduce autocorrelation function of output growth and impulse response functions of output to permanent and transitory shocks. These results challenge standard RBC models, as they show that their internal propagation mechanisms are rather weak. These findings have stimulated the development of dynamic stochastic general equilibrium models consistent with these stylized facts.

This paper questions the findings of Cogley and Nason, and investigates the dynamic properties of a simplified version of Kydland and Prescott's model with permanent technology shocks and transitory preference shocks.

The model is estimated so as to match US labor market features. Importantly, we obtain that the business cycle fluctuations of output originate mainly from the technology shock. We show that this model with leisure habit can pass the Cogley and Nason test, thus contradicting their previous findings. The reasons why are the following. First, our estimation emphasizes that the labor supply is complementary across time, while Cogley and Nason focus on specifications in which hours display strong intertemporal substitution. Second, Cogley and Nason consider a transitory shock that does not allow them to match the output persistence. To the contrary, the Kydland-Prescott model with persistent preference shocks and a powerful internal propagation mechanism (leisure habit) succeeds in reproducing these stylized facts.

# Introduction

Cogley and Nason (1995) (CN hereafter) have shown that standard RBC models as well as models that include real frictions and delays generally fail to reproduce autocorrelation function (ACF) of output growth and impulse response functions (IRFs) of output to permanent and transitory shocks. These findings challenge standard RBC models, as they show that their internal propagation mechanisms are rather weak, and thus suggest to abandon them in favor of models incorporating a host of additional frictions. Indeed, these results have stimulated the development of dynamic stochastic general equilibrium models consistent with these stylized facts: job search (Andolfatto, 1996), factor hoarding (Burnside and Eichenbaum, 1996), external increasing returns and indeterminacy (Benhabib and Wen, 2004, Schmitt–Grohe, 2000), sticky wages (Ambler, Guay and Phaneuf, 2003) among others. All these developments share the same idea that many frictions must be added to the basic model, at the cost of abandoning the simplicity of the original mechanisms.

This paper questions this common idea, and investigates the dynamic properties of a simplified version of the KP model with permanent technology shocks and transitory preference shocks. These latter shocks, labelled *labor wedges*, account for persistent shifts in the marginal rate of substitution between goods and labor. The model is estimated so as to match US labor market features (notably the negative correlation between labor productivity and hours). Importantly, we obtain that the business cycle fluctuations of output originate mainly from the technology shock. We show that this model with leisure habit can pass the CN test. This result contradicts the previous findings of CN. The reasons why are simple. First, our estimation emphasizes that the labor supply is complementary across time, while CN focus on specifications in which hours display strong intertemporal substitution. Under the intertemporal substitution hypothesis, hours are weakly serially correlated, thus shutting down the main channel of persistence.<sup>1</sup> Second, CN consider a technology shock and a government spending shock. This latter shock does not allow to match ACF and IRFs

---

<sup>1</sup>As emphasized by Benhabid and Wen (2004), while physical capital is highly serially correlated in RBC models, changes in output are not, because the elasticity of output to capital is small in standard specifications. This implies that output is persistent insofar as hours are.

of output growth estimated with US data for plausible calibrations. Notice also that an RBC model with government spending and technology shocks experiences troubles reproducing the salient features of US labor market fluctuations, e.g. Christiano and Eichenbaum (1992). To the contrary, the KP model with labor wedges and a powerful internal propagation mechanism (leisure habit) succeeds in reproducing these stylized facts. These two features need to be combined together in order for the model to successfully pass the CN test.

The paper is organized as follows. In a first section, we present our simplified KP model. The second section is devoted to the exposition of the calibration and the parameters estimation. In a third section, we present the results on the CN tests. The last section concludes.

## 1 A Kydland–Prescott Type Model

We consider a simplified version of the KP model with two shocks: a random walk productivity shock ( $Z_t$ ) and a stationary preference shock ( $\chi_t$ ). We assume that intertemporal leisure choices are not time separable – as in KP –, and that the service flows from leisure are a linear function of current and once-lagged leisure choices. The representative household maximizes

$$E_t \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \beta^i \{ \log(C_{t+i}) + \bar{\chi} \exp(\chi_{t+i}) \log(\mathcal{L}_{t+i}^*) \},$$

where  $\bar{\chi} > 0$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  denotes the discount factor and  $E_t$  is the expectation operator conditional on the information set available at  $t$ .  $C_t$  is consumption at  $t$  and  $\mathcal{L}_t^*$  is the service flow from leisure  $\mathcal{L}_t$ . The labor supply  $N_t \equiv 1 - \mathcal{L}_t$  is subject to a stochastic shock  $\chi_t$ , that follows the process

$$\chi_t = \rho_\chi \chi_{t-1} + \sigma_\chi \varepsilon_{\chi,t}, \quad |\rho_\chi| < 1, \quad \sigma_\chi > 0,$$

where  $\varepsilon_{\chi,t}$  is *iid* with zero mean and unit variance. As noticed by Galí (2004), this shock can be an important source of fluctuations, as it accounts for shifts in the marginal rate of substitution between goods and labor (see Hall, 1997). Such shifts capture persistent fluctuations in the labor supply following changes in labor market participation and/or



changes in the demographic structure. Notice that this shock is observationally equivalent to a tax shock on labor income, though it does not necessarily reduce to this interpretation. In particular, this preference shock allows us to account for other distortions on the labor market, labelled labor wedges in the words of Chari, Kehoe and McGrattan (2004a).<sup>2</sup> The service flow of leisure is assumed to evolve according to the law of motion  $\mathcal{L}_t^* = \mathcal{L}_t - b\mathcal{L}_{t-1}$ . Though simpler, this form of the utility function is similar to that considered by KP. The main difference with KP is the sign of  $b$ . KP require that  $b$  be strictly negative, implying that current and future leisure choices are intertemporally substitutable. We do not a priori impose this restriction and let the data select  $b$ .

The representative firm uses capital  $K_t$  and labor  $N_t$  to produce the homogeneous final good  $Y_t$ . The technology is represented by the following constant returns-to-scale Cobb–Douglas production function

$$Y_t = K_t^{1-\alpha} (Z_t N_t)^\alpha,$$

where  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .  $Z_t$  is assumed to follow an exogenous process of the form

$$\log(Z_t) = \gamma_z + \log(Z_{t-1}) + \sigma_z \varepsilon_{z,t}, \quad \sigma_z > 0,$$

where  $\varepsilon_{z,t}$  is *iid* with zero mean and unit variance. The constant  $\gamma_z$  is a drift term in the random walk process of  $Z_t$ . The capital stock evolves according to the law of motion  $K_{t+1} = (1 - \delta) K_t + I_t$ , where  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is the constant depreciation rate. Finally, the final good can be either consumed or invested,  $Y_t = C_t + I_t$ .

We first apply a stationary-inducing transformation for variables that follow a stochastic trend. Output, consumption and investment are divided by  $Z_t$ , and the capital stock is divided by  $Z_{t-1}$ . The approximate solution of the model is computed from a log-linearization of the stationary equilibrium conditions around the deterministic steady state.

---

<sup>2</sup>For example, they show that a sticky-wage economy or a real economy with unions will map it into a simple model economy with this type of shock.

## 2 Calibration

Let  $\theta$  denote the model parameters. We partition  $\theta$  into two groups  $\theta = \{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$ .

The first group, denoted  $\theta_1$ , is composed of  $\bar{\chi}$ ,  $\gamma_z$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\alpha$ , and  $\delta$ , which are calibrated prior to estimation (see Table 1). The parameter  $\bar{\chi}$  is pinned down so that the steady state labor supply amounts to one third of the time endowment. The quarterly growth rate of  $Z_t$ ,  $\gamma_z$ , is equal to 0.0036. We set  $\beta = 1.03^{-0.25}$ , which implies a steady state annualized real interest rate of 3%. We pin down  $\alpha$  so that the steady state capital's share in output is 40% ( $\alpha = 0.60$ ). Finally, we select  $\delta = 0.025$ , which implies an annual rate of depreciation of capital equal to 10%.

The second group of model parameters is  $\theta_2 = \{b, \rho_\chi, \sigma_\chi, \sigma_z\}$ . These four parameters are estimated using a method of moments on HP-filtered US data for the period 1954:1–2002:4. Output is measured as real GDP divided by civilian population over 16. Hours are defined as per capita non-farm business hours worked. Finally, labor productivity is measured as real GDP divided by hours. All measures are in logs. The four moments selected for estimation are the standard-error of output ( $\sigma_y = 0.016$ ), the standard-error of hours over that of output ( $\sigma_n/\sigma_y = 1.123$ ), the first order serial correlation of hours ( $\rho_n = 0.904$ ), and the correlation between labor productivity and hours ( $\text{Corr}(y/n, n) = -0.455$ ). The estimation results are reported in Table 1. The model exactly matches the data since the number of parameters to be estimated is equal to the number of selected moments.<sup>3</sup>

The labor supply parameter  $b$  is positive and large, indicating that labor supply is subject to strong intertemporal complementarities, as in Eichenbaum, Hansen and Singleton (1988), Bover (1991) and Wen (1998). The estimated value of the standard-error of the technology shock  $\sigma_z$  is comparable to those used in previous studies (Hansen, 1997, Erceg, Guerrieri and Gust, 2004). The estimated value of the autoregressive parameter  $\rho_\chi$  is rather large, yet close to previous estimates. For example, Chari, Kehoe and McGrattan (2004b) report estimated values between 0.94 and 0.97. Finally, the estimated value of  $\sigma_\chi$  is similar to what Erceg, Guerrieri and Gust (2004) and Chari, Kehoe and McGrattan (2004b) obtain.

---

<sup>3</sup>Notice that standard RBC models usually fail to replicate these moments.

Table 1 also reports the variance decomposition for the business cycle components of output and hours after HP filtering the series simulated from the estimated RBC model. The fraction of the variance of hours at business cycle frequencies explained by the technology shock  $V(n/\varepsilon_z)$  is rather small (15%), thus suggesting that labor wedges account for most of labor market fluctuations. In contrast, technology shocks account for the bulk of output fluctuations (more than 70%), as argued by Prescott (1986). In the remainder, we thus assess and test the ability of the model to reproduce the dynamics of output, keeping in mind that technology shocks are the main driving force of output fluctuations.

### 3 Output Dynamics

Using the above calibration, we now assess the ability of this simple model to pass the CN test, using the exact same methodology as theirs. We generate artificial data by simulating the model and we compute ACF of output growth and IRFs of output to permanent and transitory shocks. We then compare the population of these numbers (ACF and IRFs) to estimated values with actual data and we test their equality using the following  $\mathbf{Q}$  statistic:

$$\mathbf{Q}_i = (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_i - \mathbf{r}_i)' \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{r},i}^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_i - \mathbf{r}_i) \quad i = \{\text{acf}, \text{irf}\}$$

where  $\mathbf{r}_i$  is the sample autocorrelation function ( $i = \text{acf}$ ) of output growth or impulse response functions ( $i = \text{irf}$ ) of output to a permanent shock or a transitory shock.  $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_i$  denotes the sample estimate and  $\mathbf{r}_i = (1/S) \sum_{s=1}^S \mathbf{r}_{s,i}$  is the average over  $S = 100$  simulations from the model. The covariance matrix  $\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{r},i}$  is:

$$\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{r},i} = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S (\mathbf{r}_s - \mathbf{r})(\mathbf{r}_s - \mathbf{r})'$$

The ACF are obtained directly from the auto-covariance functions of per capita US output growth. In order to estimate the impulse response functions, we use the Structural VAR approach developed by Blanchard and Quah (1989). We first estimate a VAR model of output growth  $\Delta y_t$  and hours  $n_t$  with two lags, over the period 1954:1–2002:4. The number

of lags is selected according to the Hannan-Quinn criterion. The IRFs are thus computed using long run restrictions, i.e. innovations to hours worked have no long run effect on the level of output.<sup>4</sup> The same SVAR model is used in order to compute IRFs from artificial data. We follow CN and select height lags both for ACF and IRFs. Consequently each  $\mathbf{Q}_i$  statistic follows a chi-square with eight degrees of freedom.

Figure 1 reports the ACF of output growth from actual and artificial data. This Figure shows that the model reproduces well the observed persistence of output growth in the short run. The  $\mathbf{Q}_{\text{acf}}$  statistic indicates that the model is not rejected at conventional levels (see Table 2). This result is not surprising as Wen (1998) has already shown that a model with leisure habit possesses strong internal persistence mechanisms.

Figure 2 reports the IRFs of output to a permanent shock ( $y_P$ ) and to a transitory shock ( $y_T$ ). The model has a tendency to over-estimate the response to a permanent shock and to under-estimate the response to a transitory shock. However, both the  $\mathbf{Q}_{\text{irf}-y_P}$  and the  $\mathbf{Q}_{\text{irf}-y_T}$  statistics indicate that the two IRFs do not significantly differ (see Table 2). Thus, a streamlined version of the KP model with labor wedges easily passes the CN test.

This result is in sharp contrast with those of CN, who have shown that none of the RBC models (including the KP model or model with labor adjustment costs) can produce ACF or IRFs consistent with the data. First, they have shown that the KP model fails to match the observed ACF, but our results indicates that this need not be the case. The difference in the result can be simply explained by the difference in the calibration of the habit parameter  $b$ . In KP, this parameter is set to be negative, implying a strong intertemporal substitution in leisure but a weaker persistence of aggregate variables. Our estimation results suggest a positive value, implying more persistence in hours and output, so that the model is able to match satisfactorily the data. When we set  $b = 0$ , the  $\mathbf{Q}_i$  statistics takes on very large values and the model can reproduce neither the ACF nor the IRFs (see Table 2). Second, CN have shown that RBC models with employment lags or labor adjustment costs succeed at reproducing ACF, but fail to match IRFs. Our results contradict their findings. Again,

---

<sup>4</sup>A notable feature of these IRFs is the hump-shape and persistent pattern of the response of output to a non technology shock. See Figure 2.

this difference can easily be explained. In CN, the transitory shock is a government spending shock in deviation from the stochastic trend. The calibration they use allows them to match the variance of per capita GNP growth, but fails to properly account for labor market features, i.e. the negative correlation between the cyclical components of labor productivity and hours (see Christiano and Eichenbaum (1992), Table 4, p. 444). In contrast, the labor wedges shock in the KP type model does this job, together with persistence in hours provided by leisure habit.

To confirm this insight, Table 2 reports two complementary experiments. In the first one, we shut down the autocorrelation of  $\chi_t$ . Neither ACF nor IRFs are properly reproduced under this restriction. Notice that in this case, the  $\mathbf{Q}_{\text{irf}-y_T}$  statistic is in line with results reported by CN: the most patent failure of RBC models is their inability to reproduce the hump-shaped response to a transitory shock. In the second experiment, we set  $\sigma_\chi$  to a hundredth of its estimated value. The model is unable to match the IRFs under actual data. Yet, it delivers slightly more encouraging results when it comes to ACF, that can easily be explained by the strong intertemporal complementarity of the labor supply.

## 4 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have shown that a simplified version of the KP model with a technology shock and labor wedges is able to replicate the observed persistence in output. More precisely, our results shows that when estimated on labor market features, leisure habit and labor supply shocks account for the persistence of output growth and the hump-shaped response of output to a transitory shock.

## References

- Ambler S., Guay A. and L. Phaneuf (2003) “Labor Market Imperfections and the Dynamics of Postwar Business Cycles”, mimeo CIRPEE–UQAM.
- Andolfatto D. (1996) “Business Cycles and Labor-Market Search”, *American Economic Review*, 86(1), pp. 112-132
- Benhabib J., Wen Y. (2004) “Indeterminacy, Aggregate Demand and the Real Business Cycle”, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 51, pp. 503–530.
- Blanchard, O.J. and D. Quah (1989) “The Dynamic Effects of Aggregate Demand and Supply Disturbances” , *American Economic Review*, 79(4), pp. 655-673.
- Bover, O. (1991) “Relaxing intertemporal separability: a Rational Habit Model of Labor Supply Estimated from Panel Data”, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 9, pp. 85–100.
- Burnside, C. and M. Eichenbaum (1996) “Factor hoarding and the propagation of business cycle shocks”, *American Economic Review*, 86, pp. 1154–1174.
- Chari, V., Kehoe, P. and E. Mc Grattan (2004a) “Business Cycle Accounting”, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Research Department, Staff Report 328.
- Chari, V., Kehoe, P. and E. McGrattan (2004b) “A Critique of Structural VARs Using Real Business Cycle Theory”, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Research Department, Working Paper 631.
- Christiano L. and M. Eichenbaum (1992) “Current Real Business Cycle Theories and Aggregate Labor Market Fluctuations”, *American Economic Review*, 82(3), pp. 430–450.
- Cogley, T. and J. Nason (1995) “Output Dynamics in Real Business–Cycle Models”, *American Economic Review*, 85-3), pp. 495–511.

- Eichenbaum M., Hansen L. and K. Singleton (1988) “A Time Series Analysis of Representative Agent Models of Consumption and Leisure Choice under Uncertainty”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 103(1), pp. 51–78.
- Erceg, C., Guerrieri, L. and C. Gust (2004) “Can Long–Run Restrictions Identify Technology Shocks”, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, International Finance Discussion paper, Number 792.
- Galí, J. (2004) “Trends in Hours Worked and the Role of Technology in the Business Cycle Theory: Theory and International Evidence”, prepared for the 29th Economic Policy Conference on *Productivity, Labor and the Business Cycle*, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, October 20–21, 2004.
- Hall, R. (1997) “Macroeconomic Fluctuations and the Allocation of Time”, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 15(1), pp. 223–250.
- Hansen, G. (1997). “Technical Progress and Aggregate Fluctuations”, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 21, pp.1005-1023.
- Kydland, F. and E. Prescott (1982) “Time–to–Build and Aggregate Fluctuations”, *Econometrica*, 50(6), pp. 1345–1370.
- Prescott, E., (1986). “Theory Ahead of Business Cycle Measurement”, *Quarterly Review*, 10, pp. 9-22, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.
- Schmitt–Grohé S. (2000) “Endogenous Business Cycles and the Dynamics of Output, Hours and Consumption”, *American Economic Review*, 90(5), pp. 1136-1159.
- Wen, Y. (1998) “Can a Real Business Cycle Model Pass the Watson Test?”, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 42, pp. 185–203.

Table 1: Estimation Results

Parameters	Calibrated Value $\theta_1$	Parameters	Estimated Value $\theta_2$
$\beta$	0.9926	$b$	0.7254
$\alpha$	0.6000	$\rho_x$	0.9313
$\delta$	0.0250	$\sigma_x$	0.0187
$\gamma_z$	0.0036	$\sigma_z$	0.0136
$V(y/\varepsilon_z)$			73.9%
$V(n/\varepsilon_z)$			14.9%



Table 2: The Cogley and Nason Test

	$Q_{\text{acf}}$	$Q_{\text{irf}}$	
		$y_P$	$y_T$
Benchmark	6.33 (60.94%)	14.24 (7.56%)	3.21 (91.92%)
Case $b = 0$	27.73 (0.05%)	22.28 (0.44%)	106.31 (0.00%)
Case $\rho_\chi = 0$	28.12 (0.04%)	26.68 (0.08%)	900.04 (0.00%)
Case $\sigma_\chi/100$	15.79 (4.54%)	35.84 (0.00%)	1233.20 (0.00%)

Figure 1: ACF of output growth






Figure 2: IRFs of output growth



## Notes d'Études et de Recherche

1. C. Huang and H. Pagès, "Optimal Consumption and Portfolio Policies with an Infinite Horizon: Existence and Convergence," May 1990.
2. C. Bordes, « Variabilité de la vitesse et volatilité de la croissance monétaire : le cas français », février 1989.
3. C. Bordes, M. Driscoll and A. Sauviat, "Interpreting the Money-Output Correlation: Money-Real or Real-Real?," May 1989.
4. C. Bordes, D. Goyeau et A. Sauviat, « Taux d'intérêt, marge et rentabilité bancaires : le cas des pays de l'OCDE », mai 1989.
5. B. Bensaid, S. Federbusch et R. Gary-Bobo, « Sur quelques propriétés stratégiques de l'intéressement des salariés dans l'industrie », juin 1989.
6. O. De Bandt, « L'identification des chocs monétaires et financiers en France : une étude empirique », juin 1990.
7. M. Boutillier et S. Dérangère, « Le taux de crédit accordé aux entreprises françaises : coûts opératoires des banques et prime de risque de défaut », juin 1990.
8. M. Boutillier and B. Cabrillac, "Foreign Exchange Markets: Efficiency and Hierarchy," October 1990.
9. O. De Bandt et P. Jacquinet, « Les choix de financement des entreprises en France : une modélisation économétrique », octobre 1990 (English version also available on request).
10. B. Bensaid and R. Gary-Bobo, "On Renegotiation of Profit-Sharing Contracts in Industry," July 1989 (English version of NER n° 5).
11. P. G. Garella and Y. Richelle, "Cartel Formation and the Selection of Firms," December 1990.
12. H. Pagès and H. He, "Consumption and Portfolio Decisions with Labor Income and Borrowing Constraints," August 1990.
13. P. Sicsic, « Le franc Poincaré a-t-il été délibérément sous-évalué ? », octobre 1991.
14. B. Bensaid and R. Gary-Bobo, "On the Commitment Value of Contracts under Renegotiation Constraints," January 1990 revised November 1990.
15. B. Bensaid, J.-P. Lesne, H. Pagès and J. Scheinkman, "Derivative Asset Pricing with Transaction Costs," May 1991 revised November 1991.
16. C. Monticelli and M.-O. Strauss-Kahn, "European Integration and the Demand for Broad Money," December 1991.
17. J. Henry and M. Phelipot, "The High and Low-Risk Asset Demand of French Households: A Multivariate Analysis," November 1991 revised June 1992.
18. B. Bensaid and P. Garella, "Financing Takeovers under Asymmetric Information," September 1992.

19. A. de Palma and M. Uctum, "Financial Intermediation under Financial Integration and Deregulation," September 1992.
20. A. de Palma, L. Leruth and P. Régibeau, "Partial Compatibility with Network Externalities and Double Purchase," August 1992.
21. A. Frachot, D. Janci and V. Lacoste, "Factor Analysis of the Term Structure: a Probabilistic Approach," November 1992.
22. P. Sicsic et B. Villeneuve, « L'afflux d'or en France de 1928 à 1934 », janvier 1993.
23. M. Jeanblanc-Picqué and R. Avesani, "Impulse Control Method and Exchange Rate," September 1993.
24. A. Frachot and J.-P. Lesne, "Expectations Hypothesis and Stochastic Volatilities," July 1993 revised September 1993.
25. B. Bensaid and A. de Palma, "Spatial Multiproduct Oligopoly," February 1993 revised October 1994.
26. A. de Palma and R. Gary-Bobo, "Credit Contraction in a Model of the Banking Industry," October 1994.
27. P. Jacquinet et F. Mihoubi, « Dynamique et hétérogénéité de l'emploi en déséquilibre », septembre 1995.
28. G. Salmat, « Le retournement conjoncturel de 1992 et 1993 en France : une modélisation VAR », octobre 1994.
29. J. Henry and J. Weidmann, "Asymmetry in the EMS Revisited: Evidence from the Causality Analysis of Daily Eurorates," February 1994 revised October 1994.
30. O. De Bandt, "Competition Among Financial Intermediaries and the Risk of Contagious Failures," September 1994 revised January 1995.
31. B. Bensaid et A. de Palma, « Politique monétaire et concurrence bancaire », janvier 1994 révisé en septembre 1995.
32. F. Rosenwald, « Coût du crédit et montant des prêts : une interprétation en terme de canal large du crédit », septembre 1995.
33. G. Cette et S. Mahfouz, « Le partage primaire du revenu : constat descriptif sur longue période », décembre 1995.
34. H. Pagès, "Is there a Premium for Currencies Correlated with Volatility? Some Evidence from Risk Reversals," January 1996.
35. E. Jondeau and R. Ricart, "The Expectations Theory: Tests on French, German and American Euro-rates," June 1996.
36. B. Bensaid et O. De Bandt, « Les stratégies "stop-loss" : théorie et application au Contrat Notionnel du Matif », juin 1996.

37. C. Martin et F. Rosenwald, « Le marché des certificats de dépôts. Écarts de taux à l'émission : l'influence de la relation émetteurs-souscripteurs initiaux », avril 1996.
38. Banque de France - CEPREMAP - Direction de la Prévision - Erasme - INSEE - OFCE, « Structures et propriétés de cinq modèles macroéconomiques français », juin 1996.
39. F. Rosenwald, « L'influence des montants émis sur le taux des certificats de dépôts », octobre 1996.
40. L. Baumel, « Les crédits mis en place par les banques AFB de 1978 à 1992 : une évaluation des montants et des durées initiales », novembre 1996.
41. G. Cette et E. Kremp, « Le passage à une assiette valeur ajoutée pour les cotisations sociales : Une caractérisation des entreprises non financières "gagnantes" et "perdantes" », novembre 1996.
42. S. Avouyi-Dovi, E. Jondeau et C. Lai Tong, « Effets "volume", volatilité et transmissions internationales sur les marchés boursiers dans le G5 », avril 1997.
43. E. Jondeau et R. Ricart, « Le contenu en information de la pente des taux : Application au cas des titres publics français », juin 1997.
44. B. Bensaid et M. Boutillier, « Le contrat notionnel : efficience et efficacité », juillet 1997.
45. E. Jondeau et R. Ricart, « La théorie des anticipations de la structure par terme : test à partir des titres publics français », septembre 1997.
46. E. Jondeau, « Représentation VAR et test de la théorie des anticipations de la structure par terme », septembre 1997.
47. E. Jondeau et M. Rockinger, « Estimation et interprétation des densités neutres au risque : Une comparaison de méthodes », octobre 1997.
48. L. Baumel et P. Sevestre, « La relation entre le taux de crédits et le coût des ressources bancaires. Modélisation et estimation sur données individuelles de banques », octobre 1997.
49. P. Sevestre, "On the Use of Banks Balance Sheet Data in Loan Market Studies : A Note," October 1997.
50. P.-C. Hautcoeur and P. Sicsic, "Threat of a Capital Levy, Expected Devaluation and Interest Rates in France during the Interwar Period," January 1998.
51. P. Jacquinot, « L'inflation sous-jacente à partir d'une approche structurelle des VAR : une application à la France, à l'Allemagne et au Royaume-Uni », janvier 1998.
52. C. Bruneau et O. De Bandt, « La modélisation VAR structurel : application à la politique monétaire en France », janvier 1998.
53. C. Bruneau and E. Jondeau, "Long-Run Causality, with an Application to International Links between Long-Term Interest Rates," June 1998.
54. S. Coutant, E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, "Reading Interest Rate and Bond Futures Options' Smiles: How PIBOR and Notional Operators Appreciated the 1997 French Snap Election," June 1998.

55. E. Jondeau et F. Sédillot, « La prévision des taux longs français et allemands à partir d'un modèle à anticipations rationnelles », juin 1998.
56. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, "Estimating Gram-Charlier Expansions with Positivity Constraints," January 1999.
57. S. Avouyi-Dovi and E. Jondeau, "Interest Rate Transmission and Volatility Transmission along the Yield Curve," January 1999.
58. S. Avouyi-Dovi et E. Jondeau, « La modélisation de la volatilité des bourses asiatiques », janvier 1999.
59. E. Jondeau, « La mesure du ratio rendement-risque à partir du marché des euro-devises », janvier 1999.
60. C. Bruneau and O. De Bandt, "Fiscal Policy in the Transition to Monetary Union: A Structural VAR Model," January 1999.
61. E. Jondeau and R. Ricart, "The Information Content of the French and German Government Bond Yield Curves: Why Such Differences?," February 1999.
62. J.-B. Chatelain et P. Sevestre, « Coûts et bénéfices du passage d'une faible inflation à la stabilité des prix », février 1999.
63. D. Irac et P. Jacquinot, « L'investissement en France depuis le début des années 1980 », avril 1999.
64. F. Mihoubi, « Le partage de la valeur ajoutée en France et en Allemagne », mars 1999.
65. S. Avouyi-Dovi and E. Jondeau, "Modelling the French Swap Spread," April 1999.
66. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, "The Tail Behavior of Stock Returns: Emerging Versus Mature Markets," June 1999.
67. F. Sédillot, « La pente des taux contient-elle de l'information sur l'activité économique future ? », juin 1999.
68. E. Jondeau, H. Le Bihan et F. Sédillot, « Modélisation et prévision des indices de prix sectoriels », septembre 1999.
69. H. Le Bihan and F. Sédillot, "Implementing and Interpreting Indicators of Core Inflation: The French Case," September 1999.
70. R. Lacroix, "Testing for Zeros in the Spectrum of an Univariate Stationary Process: Part I," December 1999.
71. R. Lacroix, "Testing for Zeros in the Spectrum of an Univariate Stationary Process: Part II," December 1999.
72. R. Lacroix, "Testing the Null Hypothesis of Stationarity in Fractionally Integrated Models," December 1999.
73. F. Chesnay and E. Jondeau, "Does correlation between stock returns really increase during turbulent period?," April 2000.

74. O. Burkart and V. Coudert, "Leading Indicators of Currency Crises in Emerging Economies," May 2000.
75. D. Irac, "Estimation of a Time Varying NAIRU for France," July 2000.
76. E. Jondeau and H. Le Bihan, "Evaluating Monetary Policy Rules in Estimated Forward-Looking Models: A Comparison of US and German Monetary Policies," October 2000.
77. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, "Conditional Volatility, Skewness, and Kurtosis: Existence and Persistence," November 2000.
78. P. Jacquinet et F. Mihoubi, « Modèle à Anticipations Rationnelles de la CONjoncture Simulée : MARCOS », novembre 2000.
79. M. Rockinger and E. Jondeau, "Entropy Densities: With an Application to Autoregressive Conditional Skewness and Kurtosis," January 2001.
80. B. Amable and J.-B. Chatelain, "Can Financial Infrastructures Foster Economic Development?," January 2001.
81. J.-B. Chatelain and J.-C. Teurlai, "Pitfalls in Investment Euler Equations," January 2001.
82. M. Rockinger and E. Jondeau, "Conditional Dependency of Financial Series: An Application of Copulas," February 2001.
83. C. Florens, E. Jondeau and H. Le Bihan, "Assessing GMM Estimates of the Federal Reserve Reaction Function," March 2001.
84. J.-B. Chatelain, "Mark-up and Capital Structure of the Firm facing Uncertainty," June 2001.
85. B. Amable, J.-B. Chatelain and O. De Bandt, "Optimal capacity in the Banking Sector and Economic Growth," June 2001.
86. E. Jondeau and H. Le Bihan, "Testing for a Forward-Looking Phillips Curve. Additional Evidence from European and US Data," December 2001.
87. G. Clette, J. Mairesse et Y. Kocoglu, « Croissance économique et diffusion des TIC : le cas de la France sur longue période (1980-2000) », décembre 2001.
88. D. Irac and F. Sédillot, "Short Run Assessment of French Economic activity Using OPTIM," January 2002.
89. M. Baghli, C. Bouthevillain, O. de Bandt, H. Fraisse, H. Le Bihan et Ph. Rousseaux, « PIB potentiel et écart de PIB : quelques évaluations pour la France », juillet 2002.
90. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, "Asset Allocation in Transition Economies," October 2002.
91. H. Pagès and J.A.C Santos, "Optimal Supervisory Policies and Depositor-Preferences Laws," October 2002.
92. C. Loupias, F. Savignac and P. Sevestre, "Is There a Bank Lending Channel in France ? Evidence from Bank Panel Data," November 2002.
93. M. Ehrmann, L. Gambacorta, J. Martínez-Pagés, P. Sevestre and A. Worms, "Financial systems and The Role in Monetary Policy transmission in the Euro Area," November 2002.



94. S. Avouyi-Dovi, D. Guégan et S. Ladoucette, « Une mesure de la persistance dans les indices boursiers », décembre 2002.
95. S. Avouyi-Dovi, D. Guégan et S. Ladoucette, “What is the Best Approach to Measure the Interdependence between Different Markets? ,” December 2002.
96. J.-B. Chatelain and A. Tiomo, “Investment, the Cost of Capital and Monetray Policy in the Nineties in France: A Panel Data Investigation,” December 2002.
97. J.-B. Chatelain, A. Generale, I. Hernando, U. von Kalckreuth and P. Vermeulen, “Firm Investment and Monetary Policy Transmission in the Euro Area,” December 2002.
98. J.-S. Mésonnier, « Banque centrale, taux de l’escompte et politique monétaire chez Henry Thornton (1760-1815) », décembre 2002.
99. M. Baghli, G. Cette et A. Sylvain, « Les déterminants du taux de marge en France et quelques autres grands pays industrialisés : Analyse empirique sur la période 1970-2000 », janvier 2003.
100. G. Cette and C. Pfister, “The Challenges of the “New Economy” for Monetary Policy,” January 2003.
101. C. Bruneau, O. De Bandt, A. Flageollet and E. Michaux, “Forecasting Inflation using Economic Indicators: the Case of France,” May 2003.
102. C. Bruneau, O. De Bandt and A. Flageollet, “Forecasting Inflation in the Euro Area,” May 2003.
103. E. Jondeau and H. Le Bihan, “ML vs GMM Estimates of Hybrid Macroeconomic Models (With an Application to the “New Phillips Curve”),” September 2003.
104. J. Matheron and T.-P. Maury, “Evaluating the Fit of Sticky Price Models,” January 2004.
105. S. Moyen and J.-G. Sahuc, “Incorporating Labour Market Frictions into an Optimising-Based Monetary Policy Model,” January 2004.
106. M. Baghli, V. Brunhes-Lesage, O. De Bandt, H. Fraisse et J.-P. Villette, « MASCOTTE : Modèle d’Analyses et de préviSion de la Conjoncture TrimStrIelle », février 2004.
107. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, “The bank Bias: Segmentation of French Fund Families,” February 2004.
108. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, “Optimal Portfolio Allocation Under Higher Moments,” February 2004.
109. C. Bordes et L. Clerc, « Stabilité des prix et stratégie de politique monétaire unique », mars 2004.
110. N. Belorgey, R. Lecat et T. Maury, « Déterminants de la productivité par employé : une évaluation empirique en données de panel », avril 2004.
111. T. Maury and B. Pluyaud, “The Breaks in per Capita Productivity Trends in a Number of Industrial Countries,” April 2004.

112. G. Cette, J. Mairesse and Y. Kocoglu, "ICT Diffusion and Potential Output Growth," April 2004.
113. L. Baudry, H. Le Bihan, P. Sevestre and S. Tarrieu, "Price Rigidity. Evidence from the French CPI Micro-Data," September 2004.
114. C. Bruneau, O. De Bandt and A. Flageollet, "Inflation and the Markup in the Euro Area," September 2004.
115. J.-S. Mésonnier and J.-P. Renne, "A Time-Varying "Natural" Rate of Interest for the Euro Area," September 2004.
116. G. Cette, J. Lopez and P.-S. Noual, "Investment in Information and Communication Technologies: an Empirical Analysis," October 2004.
117. J.-S. Mésonnier et J.-P. Renne, « Règle de Taylor et politique monétaire dans la zone euro », octobre 2004.
118. J.-G. Sahuc, "Partial Indexation, Trend Inflation, and the Hybrid Phillips Curve," December 2004.
119. C. Loupias et B. Wigniolle, « Régime de retraite et chute de la natalité : évolution des mœurs ou arbitrage micro-économique ? », décembre 2004.
120. C. Loupias and R. Ricart, "Price Setting in France: new Evidence from Survey Data," December 2004.
121. S. Avouyi-Dovi and J. Matheron, "Interactions between Business Cycles, Stock Markets Cycles and Interest Rates: the Stylised Facts," January 2005.
122. L. Bilke, "Break in the Mean and Persistence of Inflation: a Sectoral Analysis of French CPI," January 2005.
123. S. Avouyi-Dovi and J. Matheron, "Technology Shocks and Monetary Policy in an Estimated Sticky Price Model of the US Economy," April 2005.
124. M. Dupaigne, P. Fève and J. Matheron, "Technology Shock and Employment: Do We Really Need DSGE Models with a Fall in Hours? ," June 2005.
125. P. Fève and J. Matheron, "Can the Kydland-Prescott Model Pass the Cogley-Nason Test? ," June 2005.

Pour tous commentaires ou demandes sur les Notes d'Études et de Recherche, contacter la bibliothèque du Centre de recherche à l'adresse suivante :

For any comment or enquiries on the Notes d'Études et de Recherche, contact the library of the Centre de recherche at the following address :

BANQUE DE FRANCE  
41-1391 - Centre de recherche  
75049 Paris Cedex 01  
tél : (0)1 42 92 49 55

fax : (0)1 42 92 62 92

email : [thierry.demoulin@banque-france.fr](mailto:thierry.demoulin@banque-france.fr)