

Answers to problem set on Clarida, Gali & Gertler (1999)

Section 3 model gives:

$$r_t = \frac{1}{\varphi} g_t + \frac{(1-\rho)\lambda q}{\varphi} u_t$$

$$i_t = \frac{1}{\varphi} g_t + \left(1 + \frac{(1-\rho)\lambda}{\rho \varphi \alpha}\right) \alpha q e u_t$$

$$x_t = -\lambda q u_t$$

$$\pi_t = \alpha q u_t$$

1) Write  $\pi_t$  in terms of  $x_t$ .

$$u_t = -\frac{1}{\lambda q} x_t$$

$$\pi_t = \alpha q \left(-\frac{1}{\lambda q} x_t\right) = -\frac{\alpha}{\lambda} x_t$$

Note: doesn't look like a Phillips curve.

2) Write  $i_t$  in terms of  $\pi_t$

$$u_t = \frac{1}{\alpha q} \pi_t$$

$$i_t = \frac{1}{\varphi} g_t + \left(1 + \frac{(1-\rho)\lambda}{\rho \varphi \alpha}\right) \alpha q e \left(\frac{1}{\alpha q} \pi_t\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\varphi} g_t + \left(1 + \frac{(1-\rho)\lambda e}{\rho \alpha}\right) \pi_t$$

In the regression, residuals would be  $\frac{1}{\varphi} g_t$ .

Answers (cont).

(2)

a) Coefficient on  $\pi_t$ :  $(1 + \frac{(1-\rho)\lambda}{\rho\phi\alpha})e$

b) It would be consistent with model: say  $\rho$  is small,  $\alpha$  big etc.

c) Taylor principle is that  $r_t > 0$  when  $\pi^e > \hat{\pi}$  where here  $\hat{\pi} = 0$ .

Recall  $\pi_t = \alpha q u_t$  so  $\pi_{t+1}^e = \alpha q \rho u_t$

Write  $r_t$  in terms of  $\pi^e$ .

$$u_t = \frac{1}{\alpha q \rho} \pi^e$$

$$r_t = \frac{1}{\rho} g_t + (1-\rho)q \left( \frac{1}{\alpha q \rho} \pi^e \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\rho} g_t + \frac{(1-\rho)\lambda}{\alpha \rho \phi} \pi^e$$

so Taylor principle is satisfied.

3

3) This VAR is equivalent to running a regression:

$$i_t = \beta_\pi \pi_t + \beta_x x_t + \text{lags} \dots + \epsilon_t$$

then regressing  $x_{t+1}, \pi_{t+1}$  etc, on  $\epsilon_t$ .

In first regression,  $\pi_t$  &  $x_t$  will be collinear because both are linear functions of  $u_t$ ,

so you can't say what  $\beta_\pi, \beta_x$  will be.

a) But you know "shock" to  $i_t$ :

$$\epsilon_t = g_t$$

b)  $g_t$  is uncorrelated with  $u_{t+1}$ , so it's uncorrelated with  $x_{t+1}, \pi_{t+1}$  etc.

So you'll find  $x_{t+1}, \pi_{t+1}$  appear to be unaffected by shocks to  $i$ .

4) Assuming  $g=0$ , put  $x_t$  in terms of  $r_t$ :

$$u_t = \frac{\varphi}{(1-\rho)\lambda q} r_t$$

$$x_t = -\lambda q \left( \frac{\varphi}{(1-\rho)\lambda q} r_t \right) = -\frac{\varphi}{(1-\rho)} r_t$$

So estimated coefficient is  $\nearrow$  not same as  $-\varphi$ !