Essays on Business Cycle Fluctuations

BY

Nopphawan Photphisutthiphong

THESIS

Submitted to the University of Adelaide in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

 in

Economics

October 2009

Table of Contents

| | Abs | tract | viii | |
|----------|---------------------------|--|------|--|
| | Acknowledgments | | | |
| 1 | Intr | roduction | 1 | |
| 2 | Bus | Business Cycle Accounting for Thailand | | |
| | 2.1 | Introduction | 8 | |
| | 2.2 | Literature Review | 12 | |
| | 2.3 | Model | 18 | |
| | | 2.3.1 Benchmark Prototype Model | 18 | |
| | | 2.3.2 Accounting Procedure | 22 | |
| | | 2.3.3 Data | 25 | |
| | | 2.3.4 Parameter Values | 26 | |
| | 2.4 | Findings | 28 | |
| | 2.5 | Concluding Remarks | 42 | |
| 3 | Bus | siness Cycle Accounting for Australia | 44 | |
| | 3.1 Introduction \ldots | | | |
| | 3.2 | 3.2 Literature Review | | |
| | | 3.2.1 Australian Business Cycles | 48 | |
| | | 3.2.2 Business Cycle Accounting Method | 50 | |
| | | 3.2.3 Parameter Values | 54 | |
| | 3.3 | Model | 55 | |

| | | 3.3.1 | Benchmark Prototype Model | 56 |
|---|------------|-----------|---|----------|
| | | 3.3.2 | Accounting Procedure | 60 |
| | | 3.3.3 | Data | 62 |
| | | 3.3.4 | Parameter Values | 64 |
| | 3.4 | Findin | ngs | 66 |
| | | 3.4.1 | Quantitative Analysis | 66 |
| | | 3.4.2 | Recessions and Booms in Australia | 81 |
| | 3.5 | Conclu | uding Remarks | 86 |
| 4 | Cor | stal La | abour Substitution and Indeterminacy in Two-Sector Mod | d |
| 4 | Cap els | Dital-La | abour Substitution and Indeterminacy in 1 wo-Sector Mod | u- 87 |
| | eis | | | 01 |
| | 4.1 | Introd | uction | 87 |
| | 4.2 | Literat | ture Review | 91 |
| | 4.3 | Model | | 94 |
| | | 4.3.1 | Firms | 95 |
| | | 4.3.2 | Consumers | 99 |
| | | 4.3.3 | Steady State | 100 |
| | | 4.3.4 | Dynamics Of The Model | 102 |
| | 4.4 | Findin | ngs | 104 |
| | | 4.4.1 | Model With $\varphi = 1$ | 104 |
| | | 4.4.2 | Model With Varying φ | 112 |
| | 4.5 | Conclu | uding Remarks | 120 |
| 5 | Cor | nclusio | n | 121 |
| | -001 | IOI UBIUI | | ⊥⊿⊥ |

List of Tables

| 2.1 | Summary of parameter vaules used in BCA studies | 27 |
|-----|---|-----|
| 3.1 | Standard deviation and cross correlation of the wedge with output | |
| | during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 70 |
| 3.2 | Cross correlation between the model output with one wedge and actual | |
| | output during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 70 |
| 3.3 | Cross correlation between the model output with two wedges and ac- | |
| | tual output during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 71 |
| 3.4 | Cross correlation between two wedges during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 72 |
| 3.5 | Cross correlation between two model outputs during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2. | 73 |
| 4.1 | Minimum externalities in investment for indeterminacy at different de- | |
| | grees of relative risk aversion and elasticities of substitution | 113 |
| 4.2 | Minimum requirement of externalities for indeterminacy at different | |
| | degrees of relative risk aversion and elasticities of substitution \ldots . | 116 |

List of Figures

| 2-1 | Annual real GDP per capita in Thailand vs. its linear time trend at | |
|------|--|-----|
| | 3.8% and cyclical component during 1971-2003 (Logarithm scale) | 9 |
| 2-2 | Detrended Thai output vs. Model with all wedges during 1979-2003 | 30 |
| 2-3 | Detrended Thai output vs. Three measured wedges during 1979-2003. | 31 |
| 2-4 | Detrended Thai output vs. Predictions of models with just one wedge | |
| | during 1979-2003 | 32 |
| 2-5 | Detrended Thai output vs. Predictions of models with two wedges | |
| | during 1979-2003 | 33 |
| 2-6 | Detrended Thai output vs. Predictions of model with three wedges | |
| | during 1979-2003 | 34 |
| 2-7 | Detrended Thai output vs. Predictions of models with just one wedge | |
| | during 1994-2003 | 37 |
| 2-8 | Detrended Thai output vs. Predictions of models with two wedges | |
| | during 1994-2003 | 37 |
| 2-9 | Commercial bank and finance company lending rate across industry . | 38 |
| 2-10 | Detrended Thai output vs. Efficiency wedge and terms of trade during | |
| | 1979-2003 | 41 |
| 3-1 | Annual real GDP per capita in Australia vs. its linear time trend at | |
| | 1.7% and cyclical component during 1960-2007 (Logarithm scale). | 49 |
| 3-2 | Detrended Australian output vs. Four measured wedges during 1980:Q3- | 2 |
| | 2008:Q2 | 74 |
| | | • • |

| 3-3 | Detrended Australian output vs. Predictions of models with just one | |
|------|--|-----|
| | wedge during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 75 |
| 3-4 | Detrended Australian output vs. Predictions of models with two wedges | |
| | during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 76 |
| 3-5 | Australian investment (as a ratio to output) vs. Predictions of models | |
| | with just one wedge during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 77 |
| 3-6 | Australian investment (as a ratio to output) vs. Predictions of models | |
| | with two wedges during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 78 |
| 3-7 | Australian hours worked vs. Predictions of models with just one wedge | |
| | during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 79 |
| 3-8 | Australian hours worked vs. Predictions of models with two wedges | |
| | during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 80 |
| 3-9 | Unemployment rate (LHS) vs. Measured labour wedge and real average | |
| | hourly earnings (RHS) during 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 84 |
| 3-10 | Australian output vs. Efficiency wedge and terms of trade during | |
| | 1980:Q3-2008:Q2 | 85 |
| 4-1 | Minimum externalities in investment for indeterminacy at different | |
| | elasticities of substitution. | 106 |
| 4-2 | Minimum requirement of externalities for indeterminacy at different | |
| | elasticities of substitution. | 107 |
| 4-3 | Impulse response of p, r, x, w to sunspot shocks | 108 |
| 4-4 | Impulse response of h,omega, c, k to sunspot shocks | 109 |
| 4-5 | Minimum externalities in investment for indeterminacy at different | |
| | elasticities of substitution and degrees of relative risk aversion | 114 |
| 4-6 | Minimum requirement of externalities for indeterminacy under Cobb- | |
| | Douglas technology. | 117 |

| 4-7 | Minimum requirement of externalities for indeterminacy when capital | |
|-----|---|-----|
| | and labour are complementary | 118 |
| 4-8 | Minimum requirement of externalities for indeterminacy when capital | |
| | and labour are substitutable | 119 |

Abstract

This thesis consists of three essays on business cycle fluctuations that are based on the market-clearing dynamic general equilibrium framework. The first two essays examine the ultimate source of economic fluctuations in Thailand and Australia, respectively. The tool of study is the Business Cycle Accounting (BCA) method developed by Chari et al. (2002; 2007a). The third essay investigates the relation between capital-labour substitution and sectoral externalities in self-fulfilling expectation equilibria. It employs a two-sector competitive model proposed by Benhabib and Farmer (1996).

The BCA method examines the transmission mechanisms of shocks within an economy. These transmission mechanisms are called wedges which are responsible for the deviation of aggregate variables from a competitive equilibrium. Four categories of wedges are defined in the BCA: 1) the efficiency wedge represents the input-financing frictions in production; 2) the labour wedge is the frictions between consumption-leisure trade-off and marginal product of labour; 3) the investment wedge is the frictions between the intertemporal marginal rate of substitution in consumption and the marginal product of capital; and 4) the government consumption wedge indicates the frictions in international borrowing and lending.

Chapter 2 applies the BCA method with deterministic wedges to examine the output variations in Thailand between 1971-2003. The efficiency wedge is found to be the most important driving force behind the output variations during episodes of boom and bust in Thailand over the studied period. In particular for the 1997 economic downturn, the evidence shows that the cost of credit intermediation for some firms was relatively high. This altered an acquisition of working capital and labour in these firms when compared to others, which likely caused inefficient reallocation of inputs across the economy. As such, the efficiency wedge appears to fall at aggregate level during the economic downturn. Chapter 3 applies the BCA method with stochastic wedges to examine the variations in output and investment in Australia. Although the efficiency wedge alone can account for these variations, it predicts much more volatility in output than the actual data. Upon allowing for the combination of efficiency and labour wedges, the model can replicate the amplitude of output variations better. The negative cross correlation between these two wedges suggests their interference.

Chapter 4 examines the effect of capital-labour substitution on the existence of indeterminacy in two-sector models and check whether the corresponding returns to scale are still empirically plausible. The main finding is that a higher requirement of sectoral externalities for indeterminacy is needed when capital and labour are less substitutable.

Intuitively, the low substitutability implies that capital and labour are complementary factors of production. This retards the mobility of factors between the consumption and investment sectors. In the belief driven equilibria, the consumers' optimistic expectation on returns is fulfilled as long as the rate of returns is sufficiently high such that current consumption is given up for investment. The rate of returns hereby indicates sectoral externalities. In such a production environment, the minimum requirement of externalities for indeterminacy therefore becomes larger so that it can successfully break the tightly coupling factors within sector, and raises the production of investment goods effectively. As a result, the current relative price of investment goods falls. In the next period, consumers enjoy more consumption goods and the relative price of investment good rises. The ascending pricing sequence yields capital gains and the consumers' belief is finally fulfilled. Based on the logarithmic utility in consumption and the elasticity of substitution of 0.5 as suggested in Klump et al. (2007) and Chirinko (2008), the minimum requirement of returns to scale for indeterminacy is 1.1236, and it still lies within the range in most empirical studies.

Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution to Nopphawan Photphisutthiphong and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Signature of Author

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to all those who contributed to the completion of this thesis. My utmost gratitude goes to my principal supervisor, Prof. Mark Weder, for his encouragement and continued valuable suggestions during this research. He first brought me into the frontiers of real business cycle research and shared with me a lot of his expertise as well as research insight. I also express my gratitude to my co-supervisor, Dr. Jacob Wong, who provided continued helpful suggestions. I would also like to thank Assoc. Prof. Ian McLean for his informative talk on the Australian and world economic history. Sincere thanks are extended to Dr. Ralph Bayer for his guidance during the year in coursework, Dr. Pataporn Sukontamarn for proofreading the early draft of this thesis and two examiners for their helpful comments.

I would like to thank the Faculty of Business Administration at Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi (Thailand) for the financial support during the whole period of study. I thank all seminar participants at Faculty of Economics (Thammasat University, Thailand) and the 13th Australasian Macroeconomic Workshop at University of Sydney for their helpful suggestions. I also thank Prof. Ellen McGrattan for her suggestions via emails and Prof. Masaru Inaba for sharing his MATLAB codes.

I thank all research students at school of Economics with whom I have shared experience in life. In particular, I thank Mickey Chan and Changxia Ke for their companionship and support. I also thank Mickey Chan for proofreading the early draft of this thesis. I like to thank Linda Christensen for proofreading the whole draft of this thesis.

Last but not least, I am forever indebted to my parents and grandmother for their understanding, endless love and encouragement. I dedicate this thesis to my grandmother for raising me with the greatest love of all.