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Disclaimer

The following presentation does not reflect the official opinions of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis or the Federal Reserve System.
Empirical Models of Monetary Policy

- Monetary policy is a major instrument for countercyclical policy
- Much of the literature assessing the efficacy of monetary policy takes place in linear (or linearized) models
- In these models, a decrease in the fed funds rate when growth is negative has the mirror effect of an increase when growth is positive
- Responses of macro aggregates are scaled by the shock magnitudes—a 50-basis-point increase has twice the effect of a 25-basis-point increase
Nonlinear Models of Monetary Policy

Nonlinear models (e.g., Markov-switching models) allow for the possibility of state-dependent dynamics [Hamilton (1989)].

This has led some to explore the effects of countercyclical policy in models with embedded cycles [e.g., Sims and Zha (2006), Ravn and Sola (2004), Owyang and Ramey (2004), Weise (1999)].

Modeling approaches include: discrete Markov-switching (MS) with exogenous states, MS with endogenous states, threshold models, and smooth-transition models [Weise (1999)].
Nonlinearities and Countercyclical Policy

- One criticism of the canonical MS model (e.g., the MS-VAR) is that the macro variables do not influence the state of the economy
  - The probability of transitioning between regimes is constant across time
- Lowering the fed funds rate when the economy is in recession has no effect over how long the economy stays in recession
- The resulting model is quasi-linear, with the same scaling and sign symmetry effects present in purely linear models
Issues to Explore

- Do the responses to monetary policy vary across business cycle phases?
- How do changes in monetary policy affect the probability of beginning or ending recessions?
- Is the response to countercyclical monetary policy dependent on the size (and sign) of the innovation?
- If so, does it make sense for the Fed to smooth interest rates?
- How does smoothing interest rates affect sentiment and expectations of future activity?
Previous studies have shown that uncertainty and expectations may also influence the efficacy of countercyclical policy [e.g. Galvao and Owyang (2014)]

Monetary models, and policy rules, also tend to be forward-looking

Smoothing in the (empirical) Taylor rule is often justified by the Fed’s desire to manage expectations and overall confidence [e.g., Woodford (1999)]

We construct a latent factor to summarize a small panel of variables meant to proxy overall sentiment and expectations of future economic dynamics
Our Approach

- Propose a model in which the macro variables in the VAR affect the state of the economy
  - Self-exciting time-varying transition probability VAR
- Changes in the state of the economy affect the dynamics
  - Countercyclical policy can affect the variables within state as well as affecting the latent state
- Include a factor meant to represent consumer and producer sentiment
- Compute impulse responses that take into account the possible changes in regime
What We Find

- Empirically relevant differences between the macroeconomic responses to contractionary and expansionary policy shocks, depending on the underlying state of the economy at the time of the shock
- Significant differences between gradual policy changes and one-time, large policy shocks
Model Overview

- Empirical policy analysis is often conducted in linear models (i.e., VARs or linearized DSGE models that are approximated by VARs)
- We start with the baseline linear VAR to fix notation
- We then consider both a standard Markov-switching VAR and a time-varying probability VAR
- The time variation in the transition probabilities is driven by output growth, a variable in the VAR
- We include a latent factor in the TVTP-VAR meant to proxy sentiment
The Reduced-Form VAR(\(P\))

The canonical VAR(\(P\)) can be expressed in the reduced form as

\[
y_t = B (L) y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t
\]

- \(y_t\) represent the \(N \times 1\) vector of period\(-t\) variables of interest
- \(\varepsilon_t \sim N (0, \Omega)\) is the reduced-form innovation
- \(\Omega\) is left unrestricted
- Any constant and trends are suppressed
The Reduced-Form VAR(P) with Regime-Switching

Suppose we believe that the model dynamics change over the cycle:

\[ y_t = [1 - S_t] B_0(L) y_{t-1} + S_t B_1(L) y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \]

- \( S_t = \{0, 1\} \) follows a irreducible first-order Markov process with time-varying transition probabilities
- \( p_{ji} = \Pr[S_t = j | S_{t-1} = i], \ i \in \{0, 1\} \)
- \( \varepsilon_t \sim N(0, \Omega_t) \) with regime-dependent covariance matrix
- \( \Omega_t = [1 - S_t] \Omega_0 + S_t \Omega_1 \)
Suppose that the transitions depend on lags of a variable, \( z_{t-d} \)

\[
p_{ji} = \Pr [S_t = j | S_{t-1} = i] = \frac{\exp (\gamma_{ji} + \gamma_{ji} z_{t-d})}{\sum_m \exp (\gamma_{jm} + \gamma_{jm} z_{t-d})}
\]

- Defined for each of the regimes, \( i \in \{0, 1\} \), with \( \sum_m p_{mi} = 1 \) for all \( i \)
- If, as we will hypothesize, \( z \) is a transformation of variables in the vector \( Y \), the system is deemed self-exciting [see, Potter (1995)]
- Shocks to the policy variable can affect the macro variables which, in turn, affect the state of the economy
Modeling Sentiment

- Include a factor $F_t$ to proxy overall sentiment
- Define $Y_t = [F_t, y'_t]'$; the VAR can be rewritten as:

$$Y_t = [1 - S_t] B_0 (L) Y_{t-1} + S_t B_1 (L) Y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$$

- $F_t$ summarizes the information in a panel of $M$ series, $X_t$:

$$X_{mt} = \lambda_m F_t + \zeta_{mt}, \text{ for } m = 1, \ldots, M$$

- Assume that the factor provides the sole source of correlation:

$$\zeta_{mt} \sim iid N (0, \sigma_m^2)$$
Identification of Shocks and Regimes

- Impose a within-regime causal ordering and use Cholesky-Decomposition
  - Sentiment factor ordered first and Fed funds rate ordered after output and inflation in the VAR
  - Allows the macro variables and the policy rate to respond contemporaneously to shocks to overall sentiment and consumer/producer confidence

- Need additional assumptions to identify (interpret) the regimes
  - Restrict $\gamma_{10}$ coefficient of the TVTP: An increase in output growth lowers the probability of switching from expansion into recession
Data

- Monthly VAR(12) with the factor, the Coincident Economic Index, PCE inflation, and the Fed Funds rate
- Sample period spans 1960:1 to 2008:12, truncated to avoid issues with the ZLB
- Augment the model with the factor summarizing an unbalanced panel of sentiment data
  - Conference Board Consumer Confidence Index, the University of Michigan Consumer Sentiment Index, the OECD Consumer Confidence Index, and the Institute for Supply Management Purchasing Managers Index
Estimation

- Model parameters are estimated with the Gibbs sampler.
- Sampler simulates draws from the full joint distribution by drawing from each parameter block’s conditional distribution.
- Employ five blocks:
  - VAR parameters (*Normal* – *Inverse Wishart*).
  - Factor loadings and variances (*Normal* – *Inverse Gamma*).
  - Transition probability parameters (*Normal*).
  - Regimes (Hamilton Filter).
  - Factors (Kalman Filter).
Posterior Regime Process
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Regime-Dependent Impulse Responses

- In the standard linear model, the response to a shock is invariant to the history of the shock and the future shocks.
- In MS-VARs with constant transition probabilities, the model is conditionally linear based on the regime.
- Ehrmann, Ellison, and Valla (2003) established the notion of a regime-dependent response.
  - Responses for each regime are computed assuming that the regime does not change after the incidence of the shock.
Regime-Dependent Impulse Responses
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Generalized Impulse Responses

- As an alternative to regime-dependent responses, Krolzig (2006) argued that one should take into account the probability of changing regime.
- Impulse responses can be thought of as the difference between two counterfactual expected paths.

\[ IR_i(h) = E_t \left[ Y_{t+h} \mid S_t = i, u_t = \delta, \{ u_{t+l} \}_{l=1}^h \right] \]

\[ -E_t \left[ Y_{t+h} \mid S_t = i, u_t = 0, \{ u_{t+l} \}_{l=1}^h \right] \]

- Compute separate responses for each path beginning regime \( i \).
- To obtain these expectations, integrate over the history of periods with realization \( S_t = i \).
- Integrate over 100 monte carlo simulated future paths from period \( t \).
Generalized Impulse Responses
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Generalized Impulse Responses: Output Growth in Recession

Generalized IRFs of 4-Variable FAVAR(12) : -100 bp and -25 bp Shock to FFR in Recession

![Graphs showing impulse responses for various metrics like Sent Factor, Z COIN Growth, PCE Infl, and FFR over 24 months.](image_url)
Generalized Impulse Responses: Inflation in Recession

![Graphs showing generalized IRFs of 4-Variable FAVAR(12): -100 bp and -25 bp shock to FFR in Recession]
The Effect of Interest Rate Smoothing

- Empirical evidence on Taylor rules and reaction functions suggests that the Fed smooths interest rates.
- Final experiment: consider the effect of interest rate smoothing in monetary policy.
- For example, the Fed may anticipate that it will reduce the funds rate, say, 100 basis points in the face of a recession.
- The Fed can drop the funds rate 100 basis points in one move or make a series of smaller moves.
- In most cases, the Fed has opted for a smooth approach to interest rate changes.
- As shown earlier, these two policies are not equivalent in a nonlinear model.
The Experiment

- Can compute the effect of compound (smoothed) policy in the GIRF framework
- Compute the path following the compound shock:
  \[
  \{u_{t+p-1} = -25\}_{p=1}^4
  \]

\[
Y_{t+h} \mid Y_{t-1}, \Theta, S_t = 1, \{u_{t+p-1} = -25\}_{p=1}^4, \{u_{t+l}\}_{l=1}^h
\]

- Compare this to the path following a single shock: \(u_t = -100\)

\[
Y_{t+h} \mid Y_{t-1}, \Theta, S_t = 1, u_t = -100, \{u_{t+l}\}_{l=1}^h
\]

- The difference between these paths shows the effect of smoothing countercyclical policy during the recession
Responses to Compound Shocks vs. Single Large Shock

100 BP vs. 4 x 25 BP Increase in FFR - Expansion

100 BP vs. 4 x 25 BP Decrease in FFR - Recession
Final Thoughts

- Empirically relevant differences between the macroeconomic responses to contractionary and expansionary policy shocks, depending on the underlying state of the economy
- Framework opens up the possibility for many policy experiments
  - Interest-rate smoothing
  - Managing sentiment and expectations with policy
  - Effects of policy in specific economic climates (inflation $> 3\%$ and output growth low, consistent periods of negative output growth, etc.)
The Structural-Form VAR

Inference on the effect of shocks is derived from the structural form of the VAR:

\[ A^{-1} y_t = A^{-1} B(L) y_{t-1} + u_t, \]

- \( u_t \sim N(0, \Sigma) \) are the structural shocks
- \( A^{-1} \) which represents the contemporaneous effects of the structural shocks
- \( AA' = \Omega \)
- \( \Sigma \) is diagonal and collects the variances of the structural shocks