Estudiando la Política Monetaria:
i) Modelos VAR y
ii) Modelos DSGE

Referencias:

- Bernanke, Ben S. y Alan S. Blinder, (1992), “The Federal Funds Rate and the Channels of Monetary Transmission”, *American Economic Review*, vol. 82, nº4, 901-921.
- Blanchard, Olivier J. y Danny Quah, (1989), “The Dynamic Effects of Aggregate Demand and Supply Disturbances”, *American Economic Review*, vol. 79, nº 4, 655-673.
- Chari, V.V., Patrick J. Kehoe y Ellen R. McGrattan, (2007), “Are Structural VARs with Long-Run Restrictions Useful in Developing Business Cycle Theory?”, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Research Department Staff Report 364. http://www.minneapolisfed.org/research/sr/sr364.pdf
  Ver también: *Journal of Monetary Economics* 55, 1337–52, November 2008.
- Christiano, L.J., M. Eichenbaum y C. L. Evans (2005), “ Nominal Rigidities and the Dynamic effects of a Shock to Monetary Policy”, *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 113, nº 1, 1-45.
- Favero, Carlo A., (2001), Applied Macroeconometrics, Ed. Oxford University Press.
- Galí, Jordi, (2009), Monetary Policy, Inflation and the Business Cycle. An introduction to the New Keynesian Framework, Princeton University Press.
- Hamilton, James, (1994), Time Series Analysis, Ed. Priceton University Press.
- Ireland, P.N. (2004), “Money’s Role in the Monetary Business Cycle”, *Journal of Money, Credit and*

Banking, vol. 36, nº 6, 969-983.

- Leeper, E.M., C. Sims y T. Zha, (1996), “What does Monetary Policy do?”, *Brookings Papers on Economic –Activity*, 2, 1-63
- Novales, Alfonso, Esther Fernández y Jesús Ruiz, (2009), Economic Growth: Theory and Numerical Solution Methods, Ed. Springer-Verlag.
- Walsh, Carl E. (2010), Monetary Theory and Policy, 3nd. ed., The MIT Press.

- A pesar de sus diferentes implicaciones de política, hay importantes similitudes entre el modelo RBC y el modelo monetario Neo-Keynesiano. Comparten el núcleo de su modelización, la microfundamentación en la toma de decisiones por parte de los agentes que componen la economía:

  i) Un hogar representativo de vida infinita que busca maximizar la utilidad que les da el consumo y el ocio, sujeto a una restricción presupuestaria intertemporal.

  ii) Un gran número de empresas con acceso a una tecnología idéntica sujeta a cambios aleatorios exógenos.

  Aunque en las versiones más estilizadas de los modelos neo-keynesianos la acumulación de capital físico no aparece (supuesto clave en los modelos RBC), es fácil incorporar a tales modelos.

  iii) Como en la teoría RBC, un equilibrio toma la forma de un proceso estocástico para todas las variables endógenas que conforman la economía modelizada consistente con decisiones intertemporales óptimas por parte de los hogares y las empresas, dados sus objetivos y sus restricciones y con el vaciado de los mercados.

- Sin embargo, el enfoque neo-keynesiano, combina las características de la estructura DSGE de los modelos RBC con supuestos que se separan de aquéllos que están en los modelos monetarios clásicos:

    i) **Competencia Monopolística**: los precios de los bienes y de los inputs son establecidos por agentes económicos privados para maximizar sus objetivos, en lugar de un subastador Walrasiano que busca vaciar todos mercados (competitivos) a la vez.

    ii) **Rigideces nominales**: las empresas están sujetas a algunas restricciones sobre la frecuencia con la cual pueden ajustar precios de los bienes y servicios que venden. Alternativamente, las empresas pueden enfrentarse a algunos costes de ajuste para estos precios. La misma clase de fricción se aplica a los trabajadores en presencia de salarios rígidos.

    iii) **No neutralidad a corto plazo de la política monetaria**: como consecuencia de la presencia de rigideces nominales, cambio en el tipo de interés a corto plazo (ya sea elegido directamente por la autoridad monetaria o inducido por cambio en la oferta monetaria), no son seguidos por cambios contemporáneos de igual tamaño en la inflación esperada, conduciendo a variaciones en los tipos de interés reales. En el largo plazo, todos los precios y salarios se ajustan y la economía vuelve a su equilibrio natural y la política monetaria es neutral a largo plazo.

- La presencia de rigideces nominales y los efectos reales implicados por la política monetaria son dos ingredientes clave en los modelos neo-keynesianos. Para que tenga sentido el uso de estos modelos, deberá darse alguna evidencia empírica de estas características.

  i) **Evidencia de rigideces nominales**
  Estudios microeconométricos no son concluyentes del todo sobre la frecuencia de ajuste en los precios para diferentes categorías de productos.

  ii) **Evidencia de no neutralidades de política monetária**
  ¿Es la evidencia consistente con los resultados que surgen de los modelos con rigideces nominales?
  Y si así fuera, ¿son los efectos de las intervenciones de política suficientemente importantes cuantitativamente como para ser relevantes?.

Sin embargo, identificar los efectos de cambios en la política monetaria no es una tarea fácil: una parte importante de los movimientos de cualquier variable que es tomada como un instrumento de la política monetaria es probablemente endógena, es decir, el resultado de la respuesta deliberada de la autoridad monetaria al estado de la economía. Es decir, simples correlaciones de los tipos de interés (o de la oferta de dinero) sobre el output u otras variables no pueden ser usadas como evidencia de no-neutralidades. La dirección de causalidad bien podría ir (totalmente o en parte) de los movimientos de la variable real (resultante de fuerzas no monetarias) a la variable monetaria.

Ver figura 1.1: estimaciones realizadas a partir de un VAR:



Figure 1.1 Estimated Dynamic Response to a Monetary Policy Shock

Source: Christiano, Eichenbaum, and Evans (1999).

A New Keynesian Monetary Model

The Ireland's (2004) model

[Ireland, P.N. (2004), "Money's role in the monetary business cycle",
Journal of Money, credit & Banking, 36(6), 969-983]

Nota: otra versión simple de presentar un modelo monetario neo-keynesiano puede verse en el capítulo 3 del libro ***Monetary Policy, Inflation, and the Business Cycle,*** *de Jordi Galí, en Princeton University Press, 2008.*

1. An Optimizing IS-LM-PC Specification

1.1 Overview

Here, the models of Ireland (1997) and McCallum and Nelson (1999) are modified to focus on the role of money in the monetary business cycle. The economy consists of a representative household, a representative finished goods-producing firm, a continuum of intermediate goods-producing firms indexed by $i \in [0,1]$, and a monetary authority. During each period $t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, each intermediate goods-producing firm produces a distinct, perishable intermediate good. Hence, intermediate goods may also be indexed by $i \in [0,1]$, where firm i produces good i. The model features enough symmetry, however, to allow the analysis to focus on the behavior of a representative intermediate goods-producing firm, identified by the generic index i.

1.2 The Representative Household

The representative household enters period t with money M_{t-1} and bonds B_{t-1}. At the beginning of the period, the household receives a lump-sum nominal transfer T_t from the monetary authority. Next, the household's bonds mature, providing B_{t-1} additional units of money. The household uses some of this money to purchase B_t new bonds at nominal cost B_t/r_t, where r_t denotes the gross nominal interest rate between t and $t+1$.

The household supplies $h_t(i)$ units of labor to each intermediate goods-producing firm $i \in [0,1]$, for a total of

$$h_t = \int_0^1 h_t(i)di$$

during period t. The household is paid at the nominal wage rate W_t. The household consumes c_t units of the finished good, purchased at the nominal price P_t from the representative finished goods-producing firm.

At the end of period t, the household receives nominal profits $D_t(i)$ from each intermediate goods-producing firm $i \in [0, 1]$, for a total of

$$D_t = \int_0^1 D_t(i)di.$$

The household then carries M_t units of money into period $t + 1$, subject to the budget constraint

$$\frac{M_{t-1} + T_t + B_{t-1} + W_t h_t + D_t}{P_t} \geq c_t + \frac{B_t/r_t + M_t}{P_t}. \tag{1}$$

The household's preferences are described by the expected utility function

$$E \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t a_t \{u[c_t, (M_t/P_t)/e_t] - \eta h_t\},$$

where $1 > \beta > 0$ and $\eta > 0$. The preference shocks a_t and e_t follow the autoregressive process

$$\ln(a_t) = \rho_a \ln(a_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_{at} \tag{2}$$

and

$$\ln(e_t) = (1 - \rho_e) \ln(e) + \rho_e \ln(e_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_{et}, \tag{3}$$

where $1 > \rho_a > -1$, $1 > \rho_e > -1$, $e > 0$, and the zero-mean, serially uncorrelated innovations ε_{at} and ε_{et} are normally distributed with standard deviations σ_a and σ_e.

Thus, the household chooses c_t, h_t, B_t, and M_t for all $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$, to maximize its utility subject to the budget constraint (1) for all $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$ Letting $m_t = M_t/P_t$ denote real balances, $\pi_t = P_t/P_{t-1}$ the inflation rate, $w_t = W_t/P_t$ the real wage rate, and λ_t the nonnegative multiplier on (1), the first-order conditions for this problem are

$$a_t u_1(c_t, m_t/e_t) = \lambda_t, \tag{4}$$

$$\eta a_t = \lambda_t w_t, \tag{5}$$

$$\lambda_t = \beta r_t E_t(\lambda_{t+1}/\pi_{t+1}), \tag{6}$$

$$(a_t/e_t)u_2(c_t, m_t/e_t) = \lambda_t - \beta E_t(\lambda_{t+1}/\pi_{t+1}), \tag{7}$$

and (1) with equality for all $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$

1.3 The Representative Finished Goods-Producing Firm

During each period $t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, the representative finished goods-producing firm uses $y_t(i)$ units of each intermediate good $i \in [0, 1]$, purchased at nominal price $P_t(i)$, to manufacture y_t units of the finished good according to the constant-returns-to-scale technology described by

$$\left[\int_0^1 y_t(i)^{(\theta-1)/\theta} di\right]^{\theta/(\theta-1)} \geq y_t,$$

where $\theta > 1$. Thus, the finished goods-producing firm chooses $y_t(i)$ for all $i \in [0, 1]$ to maximize its profits, given by

$$P_t \left[\int_0^1 y_t(i)^{(\theta-1)/\theta} di\right]^{\theta/(\theta-1)} - \int_0^1 P_t(i) y_t(i) di,$$

for all $t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. The first-order conditions for this problem are

$$y_t(i) = [P_t(i)/P_t]^{-\theta} y_t$$

for all $i \in [0,1]$ and $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$

Competition drives the finished goods-producing firm's profits to zero in equilibrium. This zero-profit condition implies that

$$P_t = \left[\int_0^1 P_t(i)^{1-\theta} di\right]^{1/(1-\theta)}$$

for all $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$

1.4 The Representative Intermediate Goods-Producing Firm

During each period $t = 0, 1, 2, ...,$ the representative intermediate goods-producing firm hires $h_t(i)$ units of labor from the representative household to manufacture $y_t(i)$ units of intermediate good i according to the constant-returns-to-scale technology described by

$$z_t h_t(i) \geq y_t(i). \tag{8}$$

The aggregate technology shock z_t follows the autoregressive process

$$\ln(z_t) = (1 - \rho_z)\ln(z) + \rho_z \ln(z_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_{zt}, \tag{9}$$

where $1 > \rho_z > -1$ and $z > 0$. The zero-mean, serially uncorrelated innovation ε_{zt} is normally distributed with standard deviation σ_z.

Since the intermediate goods substitute imperfectly for one another in producing the finished good, the representative intermediate goods-producing firm sells its output in a monopolistically competitive market; during each period $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$, the intermediate goods-producing firm sets the nominal price $P_t(i)$ for its output, subject to the requirement that it satisfy the representative finished goods-producing firm's demand. In addition, the intermediate goods-producing firm faces a quadratic cost of adjusting its nominal price, measured in terms of the finished good and given by

$$\frac{\phi}{2}\left[\frac{P_t(i)}{\pi P_{t-1}(i)} - 1\right]^2 y_t,$$

where $\phi > 0$ and where π denotes the steady-state inflation rate.

The cost of price adjustment makes the intermediate goods-producing firm's problem dynamic; it chooses $P_t(i)$ for all $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$ to maximize its total market value, given by

$$E \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \lambda_t [D_t(i)/P_t],$$

where $\beta^t \lambda_t / P_t$ measures the marginal utility value to the representative household of an additional dollar in profits received during period t and where

$$\frac{D_t(i)}{P_t} = \left[\frac{P_t(i)}{P_t}\right]^{1-\theta} y_t - \left[\frac{P_t(i)}{P_t}\right]^{-\theta} \left(\frac{w_t y_t}{z_t}\right) - \frac{\phi}{2}\left[\frac{P_t(i)}{\pi P_{t-1}(i)} - 1\right]^2 y_t \tag{10}$$

for all $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$ The first-order conditions for this problem are

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;=\; & (1-\theta)\lambda_t \left[\frac{P_t(i)}{P_t}\right]^{-\theta}\left(\frac{y_t}{P_t}\right) + \theta\lambda_t \left[\frac{P_t(i)}{P_t}\right]^{-\theta-1}\left(\frac{y_t w_t}{z_t P_t}\right) \\ & -\phi\lambda_t \left[\frac{P_t(i)}{\pi P_{t-1}(i)} - 1\right]\left[\frac{y_t}{\pi P_{t-1}(i)}\right] \\ & +\beta\phi E_t\left\{\lambda_{t+1}\left[\frac{P_{t+1}(i)}{\pi P_t(i)} - 1\right]\left[\frac{y_{t+1}P_{t+1}(i)}{\pi P_t(i)^2}\right]\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

for all $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$

1.5 The Monetary Authority

The monetary authority conducts monetary policy by adjusting the nominal interest rate r_t in response to deviations of output y_t, inflation π_t, and money growth

$$\mu_t = M_t/M_{t-1} \tag{12}$$

from their steady-state values y, π, and μ according to the policy rule

$$\ln(r_t/r) = \rho_r \ln(r_{t-1}/r) + \rho_y \ln(y_{t-1}/y) + \rho_\pi \ln(\pi_{t-1}/\pi) + \rho_\mu \ln(\mu_{t-1}/\mu) + \varepsilon_{rt}, \tag{13}$$

where r is the steady-state value of r_t and where the zero-mean, serially uncorrelated innovation ε_{rt} is normally distributed with standard deviation σ_r.

1.6 Symmetric Equilibrium

In a symmetric equilibrium, all intermediate goods-producing firms make identical decisions, so that $y_t(i) = y_t$, $h_t(i) = h_t$, $P_t(i) = P_t$, and $d_t(i) = D_t(i)/P_t = D_t/P_t = d_t$ for all $i \in [0,1]$ and $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$ In addition, the market-clearing conditions $M_t = M_{t-1} + T_t$ and $B_t = B_{t-1} = 0$ must hold for all $t = 0, 1, 2, ...$

After imposing these conditions (1)-(13) become

$$y_t = c_t + \frac{\phi}{2}\left(\frac{\pi_t}{\pi} - 1\right)^2 y_t, \tag{1}$$

$$\ln(a_t) = \rho_a \ln(a_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_{at}, \tag{2}$$

$$\ln(e_t) = (1 - \rho_e)\ln(e) + \rho_e \ln(e_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_{et}, \tag{3}$$

$$a_t u_1(c_t, m_t/e_t) = \lambda_t, \tag{4}$$

$$\eta a_t = \lambda_t w_t, \tag{5}$$

$$\lambda_t = \beta r_t E_t(\lambda_{t+1}/\pi_{t+1}), \tag{6}$$

$$(a_t/e_t)u_2(c_t, m_t/e_t) = \lambda_t - \beta E_t(\lambda_{t+1}/\pi_{t+1}), \tag{7}$$

$$y_t = z_t h_t, \tag{8}$$

$$\ln(z_t) = (1-\rho_z)\ln(z) + \rho_z \ln(z_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_{zt}, \tag{9}$$

$$d_t = y_t - w_t h_t - \frac{\phi}{2}\left(\frac{\pi_t}{\pi} - 1\right)^2 y_t, \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;\; = \;\; & (1-\theta)\lambda_t + \theta\lambda_t\left(\frac{w_t}{z_t}\right) - \phi\lambda_t\left(\frac{\pi_t}{\pi} - 1\right)\left(\frac{\pi_t}{\pi}\right) \\ & + \beta\phi E_t\left[\lambda_{t+1}\left(\frac{\pi_{t+1}}{\pi} - 1\right)\left(\frac{y_{t+1}}{y_t}\right)\left(\frac{\pi_{t+1}}{\pi}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$m_{t-1}\mu_t = m_t \pi_t, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\ln(r_t/r) = \rho_r \ln(r_{t-1}/r) + \rho_y \ln(y_{t-1}/y) + \rho_\pi \ln(\pi_{t-1}/\pi) + \rho_\mu \ln(\mu_{t-1}/\mu) + \varepsilon_{rt}. \quad (13)$$

These 13 equations determine equilibrium values for the 13 variables y_t, π_t, m_t, r_t, c_t, h_t, w_t, d_t, λ_t, μ_t, a_t, e_t, and z_t.

Use (4), (5), (8), and (10) to eliminate λ_t, w_t, h_t, and d_t. Then the system can be written more compactly as

$$y_t = c_t + \frac{\phi}{2}\left(\frac{\pi_t}{\pi} - 1\right)^2 y_t, \tag{1}$$

$$\ln(a_t) = \rho_a \ln(a_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_{at}, \tag{2}$$

$$\ln(e_t) = (1-\rho_e)\ln(e) + \rho_e \ln(e_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_{et}, \tag{3}$$

$$a_t u_1(c_t, m_t/e_t) = \beta r_t E_t[a_{t+1} u_1(c_{t+1}, m_{t+1}/e_{t+1})/\pi_{t+1}], \tag{6}$$

$$r_t u_2(c_t, m_t/e_t) = (r_t - 1) e_t u_1(c_t, m_t/e_t), \tag{7}$$

$$\ln(z_t) = (1-\rho_z)\ln(z) + \rho_z \ln(z_{t-1}) + \varepsilon_{zt}, \tag{9}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \theta - 1 &= \theta\left[\frac{\eta}{z_t u_1(c_t, m_t/e_t)}\right] - \phi\left(\frac{\pi_t}{\pi} - 1\right)\left(\frac{\pi_t}{\pi}\right) \qquad (11) \\ &\quad + \beta\phi E_t\left\{\left[\frac{a_{t+1} u_1(c_{t+1}, m_{t+1}/e_{t+1})}{a_t u_1(c_t, m_t/e_t)}\right]\left(\frac{\pi_{t+1}}{\pi} - 1\right)\left(\frac{y_{t+1}}{y_t}\right)\left(\frac{\pi_{t+1}}{\pi}\right)\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$m_{t-1}\mu_t = m_t \pi_t, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\ln(r_t/r) = \rho_r \ln(r_{t-1}/r) + \rho_y \ln(y_{t-1}/y) + \rho_\pi \ln(\pi_{t-1}/\pi) + \rho_\mu \ln(\mu_{t-1}/\mu) + \varepsilon_{rt}. \tag{13}$$

These 9 equations determine equilibrium values for the 9 variables y_t, π_t, m_t, r_t, c_t, μ_t, a_t, e_t, and z_t.

1.7 The Steady State

In the absence of shocks, the economy converges to a steady state, in which $y_t = y$, $\pi_t = \pi$, $m_t = m$, $r_t = r$, $c_t = c$, $\mu_t = \mu$, $a_t = a$, $e_t = e$, and $z_t = z$. The steady-state values a, e, and z are determined by (2), (3), and (9). The steady-state value π is determined by (13).

The steady-state value r is determined by (6) as

$$r = \pi/\beta.$$

The steady-state value μ is determined by (12) as

$$\mu = \pi.$$

The steady-state value c is determined by (1) as

$$c = y.$$

The steady-state values y and m are determined by (7) and (11):

$$ru_2(y, m/e) = (r-1)eu_1(y, m/e)$$

and

$$u_1(y, m/e) = \left(\frac{\theta}{\theta - 1}\right)\left(\frac{\eta}{z}\right).$$

1.8 The Linearized System

The system consisting of (1)-(3), (6), (7), (9), and (11)-(13) can be log-linearized around the steady state in order to describe how the economy responds to shocks. Let $\hat{y}_t = \ln(y_t/y)$, $\hat{\pi}_t = \ln(\pi_t/\pi)$, $\hat{m}_t = \ln(m_t/m)$, $\hat{r}_t = \ln(r_t/r)$, $\hat{c}_t = \ln(c_t/c)$, $\hat{\mu}_t = \ln(\mu_t/\mu)$, $\hat{a}_t = \ln(a_t/a)$, $\hat{e}_t = \ln(e_t/e)$, and $\hat{z}_t = \ln(z_t/z)$. The first-order Taylor approximations yield

$$\hat{y}_t = \hat{c}_t, \tag{1}$$

$$\hat{a}_t = \rho_a \hat{a}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{at}, \tag{2}$$

$$\hat{e}_t = \rho_e \hat{e}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{et}, \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y}_t \;\; = \;\; & E_t\hat{y}_{t+1} - \omega_1(\hat{r}_t - E_t\hat{\pi}_{t+1}) + \omega_2(\hat{m}_t - E_t\hat{m}_{t+1}) \\ & -\omega_2(\hat{e}_t - E_t\hat{e}_{t+1}) + \omega_1(\hat{a}_t - E_t\hat{a}_{t+1}), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$$\hat{m}_t = \gamma_1 \hat{y}_t - \gamma_2 \hat{r}_t + \gamma_3 \hat{e}_t, \tag{7}$$

$$\hat{z}_t = \rho_z \hat{z}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{zt}, \tag{9}$$

$$\hat{\pi}_t = \left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right) E_t \hat{\pi}_{t+1} + \psi \left[\left(\frac{1}{\omega_1}\right) \hat{y}_t - \left(\frac{\omega_2}{\omega_1}\right) \hat{m}_t + \left(\frac{\omega_2}{\omega_1}\right) \hat{e}_t - \hat{z}_t \right], \tag{11}$$

$$\hat{m}_{t-1} + \hat{\mu}_t = \hat{m}_t + \hat{\pi}_t, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\hat{r}_t = \rho_r \hat{r}_{t-1} + \rho_y \hat{y}_{t-1} + \rho_\pi \hat{\pi}_{t-1} + \rho_\mu \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{rt}, \tag{13}$$

where

$$\omega_1 = -\frac{u_1(y, m/e)}{yu_{11}(y, m/e)},$$

$$\omega_2 = -\frac{(m/e)u_{12}(y, m/e)}{yu_{11}(y, m/e)},$$

$$\gamma_1 = \left(\frac{yr\omega_2}{m\omega_1} + \frac{r-1}{\omega_1}\right)\gamma_2,$$

$$\gamma_2 = \frac{r}{(r-1)(m/e)}\left[\frac{u_2(y, m/e)}{(r-1)eu_{12}(y, m/e) - ru_{22}(y, m/e)}\right],$$

$$\gamma_3 = 1 - (r-1)\gamma_2,$$

and

$$\psi = \frac{\theta - 1}{\phi}.$$

Equation (6) is the IS curve, equation (7) is the LM curve, equation (11) is the Phillips curve, and equation (13) is the policy rule. Use (1) to eliminate c_t, and rewrite the system as

$$\hat{a}_t = \rho_a \hat{a}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{at}, \tag{2}$$

$$\hat{e}_t = \rho_e \hat{e}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{et}, \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{y}_t \quad = \quad & E_t \hat{y}_{t+1} - \omega_1(\hat{r}_t - E_t \hat{\pi}_{t+1}) + \omega_2(\hat{m}_t - E_t \hat{m}_{t+1}) \\ & -\omega_2(1-\rho_e)\hat{e}_t + \omega_1(1-\rho_a)\hat{a}_t, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$$\hat{m}_t = \gamma_1 \hat{y}_t - \gamma_2 \hat{r}_t + \gamma_3 \hat{e}_t, \tag{7}$$

$$\hat{z}_t = \rho_z \hat{z}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{zt}, \tag{9}$$

$$\hat{\pi}_t = \left(\frac{\pi}{r}\right) E_t \hat{\pi}_{t+1} + \psi \left[\left(\frac{1}{\omega_1}\right) \hat{y}_t - \left(\frac{\omega_2}{\omega_1}\right) \hat{m}_t + \left(\frac{\omega_2}{\omega_1}\right) \hat{e}_t - \hat{z}_t \right], \tag{11}$$

$$\hat{m}_{t-1} + \hat{\mu}_t = \hat{m}_t + \hat{\pi}_t, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\hat{r}_t = \rho_r \hat{r}_{t-1} + \rho_y \hat{y}_{t-1} + \rho_\pi \hat{\pi}_{t-1} + \rho_\mu \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{rt}. \tag{13}$$

Una versión reducida del modelo de Ireland (2004):

$$U\left(c_t, \underbrace{\frac{M_{t+1}}{P_t}}_{m_{t+1}} \frac{1}{e_t}\right) = \frac{\left[c_t \left(m_{t+1}/e_t\right)^{\varepsilon}\right]^{1-\sigma} - 1}{1-\sigma}$$

Bajo esta función de utilidad se tiene que:

$$\varpi_1 = 1/\sigma;\ \ \varpi_2 = \theta\frac{1-\sigma}{\sigma};\ \ \gamma_1 = 1;\ \ \gamma_2 = 1/(r-1);\ \ \gamma_3 = 0;$$

Si la ecuación de Taylor la expresamos de la siguiente forma más simple:

$$\hat{r}_t = \rho_y \hat{y}_t + \rho_\pi \hat{\pi}_t + \varepsilon_{rt}$$

y σ =1, entonces,

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1+\rho_y & \rho_\pi \\ -\dfrac{\theta-1}{\phi} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_t \\ \hat{\pi}_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & \beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} E_t \hat{y}_{t+1} \\ E_t \hat{\pi}_{t+1} \end{bmatrix} +$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1-\rho_a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\dfrac{\theta-1}{\phi} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{rt} \\ \hat{e}_t \\ \hat{a}_t \\ \hat{z}_t \end{bmatrix}$$

donde hemos supuesto que los valores (en niveles) de estado estacionario de los diferentes shocks es 1.

Ejercicio: Resuelva este sistema y obtenga las funciones de respuesta a un impulso para cada uno de los shocks. ¿Podemos decir algo acerca de equilibrios indeterminados?

La solución del sistema anterior es:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_t \\ \hat{\pi}_t \end{bmatrix} = \left[\left| \begin{matrix} \Phi_1 & \Phi_2 & \Phi_3 \\ \Psi_1 & \Psi_2 & \Psi_3 \end{matrix} \right]\right. \begin{bmatrix} \hat{z}_t \\ \hat{a}_t \\ \varepsilon_{rt} \end{bmatrix}$$

donde $\Phi_1 = \dfrac{\left(C_{21} + \dfrac{(1 - A_{22}\rho_z)}{A_{12}\rho_z} C_{11} \right)}{\left[\dfrac{(1 - A_{22}\rho_z)(1 - A_{11}\rho_z)}{A_{12}\rho_z} - A_{21}\rho_z \right]}; \quad \Psi_1 = \dfrac{(1 - A_{11}\rho_z)}{A_{12}\rho_z} \Phi_1 - \dfrac{C_{11}}{A_{12}\rho_z}$

$$\Phi_2 = \frac{\left(C_{22} + \dfrac{(1 - A_{22}\rho_z)}{A_{12}\rho_z} C_{12} \right)}{\left[\dfrac{(1 - A_{22}\rho_a)(1 - A_{11}\rho_a)}{A_{12}\rho_a} - A_{21}\rho_a \right]}; \quad \Psi_2 = \frac{(1 - A_{11}\rho_a)}{A_{12}\rho_a} \Phi_2 - \frac{C_{12}}{A_{12}\rho_a}$$

$$\Phi_3 = \frac{\left(C_{23} + \dfrac{(1 - A_{22}\rho_{\varepsilon_r})}{A_{12}\rho_{\varepsilon_r}} C_{13} \right)}{\left[\dfrac{(1 - A_{22}\rho_{\varepsilon_r})(1 - A_{11}\rho_{\varepsilon_r})}{A_{12}\rho_{\varepsilon_r}} - A_{21}\rho_{\varepsilon_r} \right]}; \quad \Psi_3 = \frac{(1 - A_{11}\rho_{\varepsilon_r})}{A_{12}\rho_{\varepsilon_r}} \Phi_3 - \frac{C_{13}}{A_{12}\rho_{\varepsilon_r}}$$

Siendo A_{ij} y C_{ik} los elementos de las matrices siguientes:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1+\rho_y & \rho_\pi \\ -\dfrac{\theta-1}{\phi} & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & \beta \end{bmatrix}$$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} & C_{13} \\ C_{21} & C_{22} & C_{23} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1+\rho_y & \rho_\pi \\ -\dfrac{\theta-1}{\phi} & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1-\rho_a & -1 \\ -\dfrac{\theta-1}{\phi} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Funciones de respuesta a un impulso:

Teniendo en cuanta que:

$$\hat{z}_t = \rho_z \hat{z}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{zt}$$
$$\hat{a}_t = \rho_z \hat{a}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{at}$$
$$\varepsilon_{r,t} = \rho_{\varepsilon_r} \varepsilon_{r,t-1} + u_t$$

Entonces de esta expresión es fácil deducir las funciones de respuesta un impulso:

$$\hat{y}_t = \Phi_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_z^j \varepsilon_{z,t-j} + \Phi_2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_a^j \varepsilon_{a,t-j} + \Phi_3 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_{\varepsilon_r}^j u_{t-j}$$

$$\hat{\pi}_t = \Psi_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_z^j \varepsilon_{z,t-j} + \Psi_2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_a^j \varepsilon_{a,t-j} + \Psi_3 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_{\varepsilon_r}^j u_{t-j}$$

Descomposición de la Varianza:

Dadas las expresiones:

$$\hat{y}_t = \Phi_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_z^j \varepsilon_{z,t-j} + \Phi_2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_a^j \varepsilon_{a,t-j} + \Phi_3 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_{\varepsilon_r}^j u_{t-j}$$

$$\hat{\pi}_t = \Psi_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_z^j \varepsilon_{z,t-j} + \Psi_2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_a^j \varepsilon_{a,t-j} + \Psi_3 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \rho_{\varepsilon_r}^j u_{t-j}$$

se tiene que, para $n > 0$:

$$\hat{y}_{t+n} - E_t \hat{y}_{t+n} = \Phi_1 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho_z^j \varepsilon_{z,t+n-j} + \Phi_2 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho_a^j \varepsilon_{a,t+n-j} + \Phi_3 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho_{\varepsilon_r}^j u_{t+n-j}$$

$$\hat{\pi}_{t+n} - E_t \hat{\pi}_{t+n} = \Psi_1 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho_z^j \varepsilon_{z,t+n-j} + \Psi_2 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho_a^j \varepsilon_{a,t+n-j} + \Psi_3 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho_{\varepsilon_r}^j u_{t+n-j}$$

$$Var(\hat{y}_{t+n} - E_t \hat{y}_{t+n}) = \frac{\Phi_1^2 \sigma_{\varepsilon_z}^2 (1-\rho_z^{2n})}{1-\rho_z^2} + \frac{\Phi_2^2 \sigma_{\varepsilon_a}^2 (1-\rho_a^{2n})}{1-\rho_a^2} + \frac{\Phi_3^2 \sigma_u^2 (1-\rho_{\varepsilon_r}^{2n})}{1-\rho_{\varepsilon_r}^2}$$

$$Var(\hat{\pi}_{t+1} - E_t \hat{\pi}_{t+n}) = \frac{\Psi_1^2 \sigma_{\varepsilon_z}^2 (1-\rho_z^{2n})}{1-\rho_z^2} + \frac{\Psi_2^2 \sigma_{\varepsilon_a}^2 (1-\rho_a^{2n})}{1-\rho_a^2} + \frac{\Psi_3^2 \sigma_u^2 (1-\rho_{\varepsilon_r}^{2n})}{1-\rho_{\varepsilon_r}^2}$$

Nótese que: $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \rho^2 = \dfrac{(1-\rho^{2n})}{1-\rho^2}$.

Por tanto, la descomposición de la varianza del error de predicción para cada variable será:

$$D.V.E.P.(\hat{y}_{t+n}) = 100 \times \left(\frac{\frac{\Phi_1^2 \sigma_{\varepsilon_z}^2 (1-\rho_z^{2n})}{1-\rho_z^2}}{Var(\hat{y}_{t+n} - E_t \hat{y}_{t+n})}, \frac{\frac{\Phi_2^2 \sigma_{\varepsilon_a}^2 (1-\rho_a^{2n})}{1-\rho_a^2}}{Var(\hat{y}_{t+n} - E_t \hat{y}_{t+n})}, \frac{\frac{\Phi_3^2 \sigma_u^2 (1-\rho_{\varepsilon_r}^{2n})}{1-\rho_{\varepsilon_r}^2}}{Var(\hat{y}_{t+n} - E_t \hat{y}_{t+n})} \right),$$

$$D.V.E.P.(\hat{\pi}_{t+n}) = 100 \times \left(\frac{\frac{\Psi_1^2 \sigma_{\varepsilon_z}^2 (1-\rho_z^{2n})}{1-\rho_z^2}}{Var(\hat{\pi}_{t+n} - E_t \hat{\pi}_{t+n})}, \frac{\frac{\psi_2^2 \sigma_{\varepsilon_a}^2 (1-\rho_a^{2n})}{1-\rho_a^2}}{Var(\hat{\pi}_{t+n} - E_t \hat{\pi}_{t+n})}, \frac{\frac{\Psi_3^2 \sigma_u^2 (1-\rho_{\varepsilon_r}^{2n})}{1-\rho_{\varepsilon_r}^2}}{Var(\hat{\pi}_{t+n} - E_t \hat{\pi}_{t+n})} \right).$$

2. Resolución del modelo original de Ireland (2004)

Let

$$f_t^0 = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{m}_t & \hat{r}_t & \hat{\mu}_t \end{bmatrix}',$$

$$s_t^0 = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t-1} & \hat{m}_{t-1} & \hat{\pi}_{t-1} & \hat{r}_{t-1} & \hat{\mu}_{t-1} & \hat{y}_t & \hat{\pi}_t \end{bmatrix}',$$

and

$$v_t = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{a}_t & \hat{e}_t & \hat{z}_t & \varepsilon_{rt} \end{bmatrix}'.$$

Then (7), (12), and (13) can be written as

$$Af_t^0 = Bs_t^0 + Cv_t, \tag{14}$$

where A is 3×3, B is 3×7, and C is 3×4.

$$A=\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \gamma_2 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix};\; B=\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ \rho_y & 0 & \rho_\pi & \rho_r & \rho_\mu & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix};$$

$$C=\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \gamma_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Equations (6) and (11) can be written as

$$DE_t s^0_{t+1} + FE_t f^0_{t+1} = Gs^0_t + Hf^0_t + Jv_t, \tag{15}$$

where D and G are 7×7, F and H are 7×3, and J is 7×4.

$$D=\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \omega_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \pi/r \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}; \quad F=\begin{bmatrix} -\omega_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$G=\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\psi/\omega_1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}; \quad H=\begin{bmatrix} -\omega_2 & \omega_1 & 0 \\ \psi(\omega_2/\omega_1) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}; J=\begin{bmatrix} -\omega_1(1-\rho_a) & \omega_2(1-\rho_e) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\psi(\omega_2/\omega_1) & \psi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Equations (2), (3), and (9) can be written as

$$v_t = P v_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \tag{16}$$

where

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_a & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_z & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\varepsilon_t = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{at} & \varepsilon_{et} & \varepsilon_{zt} & \varepsilon_{rt} \end{bmatrix}'.$$

Rewrite (14) as

$$f_t^0 = A^{-1} B s_t^0 + A^{-1} C v_t.$$

When substituted into (15), this last result yields

$$(D + FA^{-1}B)E_t s^0_{t+1} + FA^{-1}CPv_t = (G + HA^{-1}B)s^0_t + (J + HA^{-1}C)v_t$$

or, more simply,

$$E_t s^0_{t+1} = K s^0_t + L v_t, \tag{17}$$

where

$$K = (D + FA^{-1}B)^{-1}(G + HA^{-1}B)$$

and

$$L = (D + FA^{-1}B)^{-1}(J + HA^{-1}C - FA^{-1}CP).$$

If the 7×7 matrix K has five eigenvalues inside the unit circle and two eigenvalues outside the unit circle, then the system has a unique solution. If K has more than two eigenvalues outside the unit circle, then the system has no solution. If K has less than two eigenvalues outside the unit circle, then the system has multiple solutions. For details, see Blanchard and Kahn (1980).

Blanchard, O. and C.M. Kahn (1980), "The solution of linear difference models under rational expectations", ***Econometrica*****, 48(5), 1305-1311.**

Assuming from now on that there are exactly two eigenvalues outside the unit circle, write K as

$$K = M^{-1} N M,$$

where

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} N_1 & 0 \\ 0 & N_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The diagonal elements of N are the eigenvalues of K, with those in the 5×5 matrix N_1 inside the unit circle and those in the 2×2 matrix N_2 outside the unit circle. The columns of M^{-1} are the eigenvectors of K; M_{11} is 5×5, M_{12} is 5×2, M_{21} is 2×5, and M_{22} is 2×2. In addition, let

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} L_1 \\ L_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where L_1 is 5×4 and L_2 is 2×4.

Now (17) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} E_t s^0_{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} N_1 & 0 \\ 0 & N_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} s^0_t + \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_1 \\ L_2 \end{bmatrix} v_t$$

or

$$E_t s^1_{1t+1} = N_1 s^1_{1t} + Q_1 v_t \tag{18}$$

and

$$E_t s^1_{2t+1} = N_2 s^1_{2t} + Q_2 v_t, \tag{19}$$

where

$$s_{1t}^{1} = M_{11} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ \hat{m}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\pi}_{t-1} \\ \hat{r}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\mu}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + M_{12} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} \\ \hat{\pi}_{t} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{20}$$

$$s_{2t}^{1} = M_{21} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ \hat{m}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\pi}_{t-1} \\ \hat{r}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\mu}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + M_{22} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} \\ \hat{\pi}_{t} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{21}$$

$$Q_1 = M_{11}L_1 + M_{12}L_2,$$

and

$$Q_2 = M_{21}L_1 + M_{22}L_2.$$

Since the eigenvalues in N_2 lie outside the unit circle, (19) can be solved forward to obtain

$$s_{2t}^1 = -N_2^{-1} R v_t,$$

where the 2×4 matrix R is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
vec(R) &= vec \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} N_2^{-j} Q_2 P^j = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} vec(N_2^{-j} Q_2 P^j) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} [P^j \otimes (N_2^{-1})^j] vec(Q_2) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} [P \otimes N_2^{-1}]^j vec(Q_2) \\
&= \left[I_{(8\times 8)} - P \otimes N_2^{-1} \right]^{-1} vec(Q_2)
\end{aligned}$$

Use this result, along with (21), to solve for

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_t \\ \hat{\pi}_t \end{bmatrix} = S_1 \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ \hat{m}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\pi}_{t-1} \\ \hat{r}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\mu}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + S_2 v_t, \tag{22}$$

where

$$S_1 = -M_{22}^{-1} M_{21}$$

and

$$S_2 = -M_{22}^{-1} N_2^{-1} R.$$

Equation (20) now provides a solution for s^1_{1t}:

$$s^1_{1t} = (M_{11} + M_{12}S_1)\begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ \hat{m}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\pi}_{t-1} \\ \hat{r}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\mu}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + M_{12}S_2 v_t.$$

Substitute this result into (18) to obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t} \\ \hat{m}_{t} \\ \hat{\pi}_{t} \\ \hat{r}_{t} \\ \hat{\mu}_{t} \end{bmatrix} = S_3 \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ \hat{m}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\pi}_{t-1} \\ \hat{r}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\mu}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + S_4 v_t, \tag{23}$$

where

$$S_3 = (M_{11} + M_{12}S_1)^{-1} N_1 (M_{11} + M_{12}S_1)$$

and

$$S_4 = (M_{11} + M_{12}S_1)^{-1}(Q_1 + N_1 M_{12} S_2 - M_{12} S_2 P).$$

Finally, return to

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_t^0 &= A^{-1}Bs_t^0 + A^{-1}Cv_t \\
&= A^{-1}B\begin{bmatrix} I_{(5\times5)} \\ S_1 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_{t-1} \\ \hat{m}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\pi}_{t-1} \\ \hat{r}_{t-1} \\ \hat{\mu}_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + A^{-1}B\begin{bmatrix} 0_{(5\times4)} \\ S_2 \end{bmatrix} v_t + A^{-1}Cv_t,
\end{aligned}
$$

which can be written more simply as

$$
f_t^0 = S_5\hat{m}_{t-1} + S_6 v_t, \tag{24}
$$

where

$$S_5 = A^{-1}B \begin{bmatrix} I_{(5\times5)} \\ S_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$S_6 = A^{-1}B \begin{bmatrix} 0_{(5\times4)} \\ S_2 \end{bmatrix} + A^{-1}C.$$

Equations (16) and (22)-(24) provide the model's solution:

$$s_{t+1} = \Pi s_t + W\varepsilon_{t+1} \tag{25}$$

and

$$f_t = U s_t, \tag{26}$$

where

$$s_t = \left[\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \hat{y}_{t-1} & \hat{m}_{t-1} & \hat{\pi}_{t-1} & \hat{r}_{t-1} & \hat{\mu}_{t-1} & \hat{a}_t & \hat{e}_t & \hat{z}_t & \varepsilon_{Rt} \end{array}\right]',$$

$$f_t = \left[\begin{array}{ccccc} \hat{m}_t & \hat{r}_t & \hat{\mu}_t & \hat{y}_t & \hat{\pi}_t \end{array}\right]',$$

$$\varepsilon_t = \left[\begin{array}{cccc} \varepsilon_{at} & \varepsilon_{et} & \varepsilon_{zt} & \varepsilon_{rt} \end{array}\right]',$$

$$\Pi = \left[\begin{array}{cc} S_3 & S_4 \\ 0_{(4\times 5)} & P \end{array}\right],$$

$$W = \left[\begin{array}{c} 0_{(5\times 4)} \\ I_{(4\times 4)} \end{array}\right],$$

and

$$U = \left[\begin{array}{cc} S_5 & S_6 \\ S_1 & S_2 \end{array}\right].$$