

Journal of Monetary Economics 35 (1995) 159-192



Global versus country-specific productivity shocks and the current account

Reuven Glick*14, Kenneth Rogoff^b

*Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94105-9967, USA *Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544-1013, USA

Received August 1993, final version received July 1994).

Abstract

This paper develops an analytically tractable empirical model of investment and the current account, and applies it to data from the G-7 countries. The distinction between global and country-specific shocks turns out to be quite important for explaining current account behavior; overall the model performs surprisingly well. One apparent puzzle, however, is that the current account responds by much less than investment to country-specific shocks, despite the near unit root behavior of these shocks. We show theoretically that this apparent anomaly can be explained if the shocks have very slow mean reversion.

Key words: Current account: Productivity: Investment

JEL classification: F32; F41

1. Introduction

This paper develops an empirical model of the current account to explore the remarkably consistent correlation between investment and the current account

*Corresponding author

We are grateful to Shaghil Ahmed. David Backus, Marianne Baxter, Maurice Obstfeld, and Assaf Razin for comments on earlier drafts and to Robert Marquez for research assistance. Part of the research for this paper was performed while Rogoff was a visiting scholar at the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. The views presented in this paper are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect those of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco or the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Rogoff has benefited from the support of the National Science Foundation and the German Marshall Fund of the United States. 160

deficit, in differences, across major industrialized countries over the post-war period. Though the correlation is negative as the theory predicts, the main puzzle is why, with open capital markets, it is not larger. On average, a rise in investment tends to increase the current account deficit by only one third as much.

Our framework is in the tradition of Sachs (1981), Obstfeld (1986), and Frenkel and Razin (1987) who theoretically analyze the intertemporal effects of government spending and productivity shocks. The main departure here, aside from developing and implementing a highly tractable, empirical formulation, is the distinction between global and country-specific shocks. Global productivity shocks affect investment but should not have a significant effect on current accounts; we find this to be consistently the case in our structural regressions. The importance of global shocks, which account for roughly 50 percent of the variance of total productivity, appears to be an important explanation of why the current account-investment correlation is not closer to one. But it is not the entire story.

Even after controlling for global shocks, an interesting puzzle remains. A fundamental implication of the intertemporal model is that a permanent country-specific productivity shock will induce a rise in the current account deficit in *excess* of the corresponding rise in investment. Because it takes time for the capital stock to adjust, permanent income rises by more than current income; this implies that domestic savings should fall.

Empirically. country-specific productivity shifts indeed tend to be very longlasting. Using conventional unit root tests, the random walk hypothesis cannot be rejected for any country in our sample. But despite the near random walk behavior of country-specific productivity shocks, we find that empirically their effect on investment tends to be two to three times *larger* than on the current account. In other words, if one assumes random walk productivity, the data decisively reject a fundamental cross-equation restriction implied by the intertemporal model. Controlling for government consumption shocks does not reverse this result. Allowing for slight mean reversion in country-specific productivity – convergence – can, however, provide a resolution.

With adjustment costs, both the current account *and* investment depend on the present discounted value of future country-specific productivity shocks. Using closed-form solutions, we are able to show analytically that the current account response is more sensitive to the degree of persistence of the shocks. Quantitatively, with a real interest rate of 3 percent, the relative current account response falls by three-fourths when the first-order autocorrelation coefficient for (country-specific) productivity drops from 1.00 to 0.97, near the mean of our point estimates (a similar sensitivity to persistence arises in the consumption volatility literature; see Deaton, 1992).

Section 2 develops the model and Section 3 contains the empirical results for the random walk productivity case for the Group of Seven (G-7) major industrialized countries. In Section 4 we relax the random walk restriction, re-estimate the model, and demonstrate why the relative response of the current account depends very nonlinearly on persistence. In Section 5 we show that the model fits well the stylized facts on the correlations between changes in investment and the current account.

2. A one-good, small-country model with adjustment costs to investment

In this section we develop a structural model in which investment and the current account depend on exogenous shocks to productivity. The basic building blocks – a model of investment with adjustment costs and the random walk model of consumption – are quite familiar so our discussion of individuals' and firms' maximization problems will be quite brief. We will show that by using a linear-quadratic approach one can obtain extremely tractable estimating equations for investment and the current account. Initially, we will focus on the effects of country-specific productivity shocks; global shocks and government spending shocks will be incorporated later.

2.1. Capital markets

The representative agent in eacla country can borrow freely in world capital markets at the riskless (gross) world real interest rate r, which is denominated in interest of the single consumption good. If all shocks are country-specific (i.e., uncorrelated with global shocks), then for a small country r may be treated as exogenous. Only riskless bonds are traded internationally, so that agents cannot diversify away country-specific shocks.¹

2.2. Aggregate supply

....

The representative agent supplies labor inelastically so that net aggregate output Y is given by

$$Y_t = A_t^c K_t^x \left[1 - \frac{g}{2} \left(\frac{I_t^2}{K_t} \right) \right]$$
(1)

and the second second

¹Thus our model follows the classic inter-temporal approach in which country-specific productivity shocks cannot be diversified, rather than the complete markets open-economy real business cycle (RBC) approach. For RBC models, see Stockman and Tesar (1994), Backus, Kehoe, and Kydland (1992), and Mendoza (1991). Baxter and Crucini (1992) find that the two approacnes yield similar results for cross-country consumption correlations unless the degree of persistence of productivity shocks is very high.

where K_t is the capital stock at time t. A_t^c is the time-t country-specific productivity shock, and

$$I_t = K_{t+1} - K_t \tag{2}$$

is investment. (Introducing depreciation slightly complicates the empirical specification below, but does not appear to significantly affect our results.) The I^2/K term in Eq. (1) captures adjustment costs in changing the capital stock.

The representative firm chooses the path of $\{I_i\}$ to maximize the present discounted value of future profits discounted at the world interest rate.² The solution to this problem is well-known (see, for example, Abel and Blanchard, 1986; Meese, 1980; Shapiro, 1986). Taking a linear approximation to the first-order conditions yields³

$$\Sigma_t \cong \alpha_I J_t + \alpha_K K_t + \alpha_A A_t^c, \tag{3}$$

$$I_{t} \cong \beta_{1} I_{r-1} + \eta \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{s} (\Xi_{t} A_{t+s}^{c} - E_{t-1} A_{t+s-1}^{c}), \qquad (4)$$

where in Eq. (3) $\alpha_I < 0$ (due to costs of adjustment), and α_K , $\alpha_A > 0$. In Eq. (4), $0 < \beta_1 < 1, 0 < \eta$, and 0 < 1 < 1; E, denotes expectations based on time t information. The first term captures the effects on current investment of lagged productivity shocks, and the second term captures the impact of revisions in expectations about the future path of productivity.

2.3. Consumption

The representative agent chooses his path of consumption $\{C_i\}$ to maximize

$$E_{t} \sum_{s=0}^{r} \beta^{s} U(C_{t+s}), \qquad U = C - \frac{h}{2}C^{2}, \qquad (5)$$

subject to the intertemporal budget constraint

$$F_{t+1} = rF_t + y_t - C_t.$$
 (6)

where $y \equiv Y - I$ is net (of investment) income and F_t denotes foreign assets entering period t. For simplicity, we assume $\beta = 1/r$. The quadratic specification

²Our empirical specification implicitly assumes that the covariance of the marginal utility of consumption and investment is constant over time, since country-specific shocks to productivity cannot be diversified.

³Implicitly we assume that the productivity shocks are homoskedastic and that the variance terms that would appear in the second-order approximation are constant. Abel and Blanchard (1986) show that for reasonable parameter values a first-order approximation yields virtually the same empirical predictions as the more precise, but much more complicated, second-order approximation.

of utility in (5) is, of course, the same as in Hall's (1978) random walk model of consumption. The solution to the maximization problem embodied in (5) and (6) yields⁴

$$C_{t} = \frac{r-1}{r} \left(F_{t} + E_{t} \sum_{s=0}^{r} y_{t+s}/r^{s} \right) = + \frac{r-1}{r} F_{t} \tilde{y}_{t}.$$
 (7)

As in Hall (1978), the *ex post* rate of change of consumption depends only on unanticipated movements in permanent net income:

$$\Delta C_{t} = (\mathbf{E}_{t} - \mathbf{E}_{t-1}) \frac{r-1}{r} \left(\mathbf{E}_{t} \sum_{s=0}^{x} y_{t+s} / r^{s} \right) = \bar{y}_{t} - \mathbf{E}_{t-1} \bar{y}_{t}, \tag{8}$$

where $\Delta C_t \equiv C_t - C_{t-1}$.

2.4. Exogenous country-specific productivity shocks

It will be assumed that country-specific productivity shocks follow a firstorder autoregressive process:

$$A_{t}^{c} = \rho A_{t-1}^{c} + \varepsilon_{t}, \qquad 0 \le \rho \le 1.$$
(9)

Extending the analysis to higher-order ARMA processes is straightforward.

2.5. Deriving the reduced-form estimating equations for the current account and investment when $\rho = 1$

We are now prepared to solve (1) (9) to derive estimating equations for investment and the current account. For expositional purposes, it is convenient to initially focus attention on the case where $\rho = 1$. Aside from the advantage of analytical tractability, the random walk productivity assumption appears to provide a good empirical approximation for all the G-7 countries in our sample (see Table 2 in Section 3.2 below). Later, in Section 4, we will consider whether any of our empirical results may be sensitive to this restriction. Combining Eqs. (4) and (9) (with $\rho = 1$) yields simply

$$(+) (+) I_{t} = \beta_{1}I_{t-1} + \beta_{2}\Delta A_{t}^{c},$$
(10)

⁴In deriving (7) it is assumed r is nonstochastic. Otherwise second- rder terms would appear in our linearizations. In the empirical work below, we implicitly assume that the variance of productivity shocks is constant over time so that the second-order terms may be treated as constants.

where $\beta_2 \equiv \eta [\lambda/(1-\lambda)] > 0$. Since the empirical regularity we seek to explain involves changes in investment and the current account, we will subtract I_{t-1} from both sides of Eq. (10) to obtain⁵

$$(-) (+) \Delta I_t = (\beta_1 - 1)I_{t-1} + \beta_2 \Delta A_t^c.$$
(11)

We now proceed to obtain a similar reduced-form expression for ΔCA as a function of ΔA^{c} and lagged endogenous variables. Differencing the accounting identity for the current account, one obtains

$$\Delta CA_t = (r-1)\Delta F_t + \Delta Y_t - \Delta I_t - \Delta C_t.$$
⁽¹²⁾

Note that $\Delta F_t = CA_{t-1}$ and that ΔI_t is given by (11). ΔY_t is easily obtained by substitutin_E Eq. (2) into the first difference of Eq. (3), and then using (11) to solve out for ΔI_t :

$$(+) (+) (+)$$

$$\Delta Y_{t} = [\alpha_{I}(\beta_{1}-1) + \alpha_{K}]I_{t-1} + (\alpha_{I}\beta_{2} + \alpha_{A})\Delta A_{t}^{c}.$$
(13)

Substituting out for ΔC in Eq. (12) involves slightly more work. We begin with Eq. (8) which gives ΔC as a function of innevations to permanent (net) income. Using Eqs. (11) and (13) to substitute out for ΔI and ΔY , and Eq. (9) (with $\rho = 1$), one obtains (see Appendix 1)

$$\Delta C_{t} = \left\{ \frac{\beta_{2} \left[(\alpha_{I} - 1)(r - 1) + \alpha_{K} \right]}{r - \beta_{1}} + \alpha_{A} \right\} \Delta A_{t}^{c} \cdot$$
(14)

Since $r - \beta_1$, $\alpha_A > 0$, the coefficient on ΔA^c on the RHS of (14) is necessarily positive provided that $(\alpha_I - 1) + \alpha_k/(r - 1) > 0$; this corresponds to the condition that the adjustment costs to marginal investment do not exceed the present discounted value of the corresponding output gain, which follows from convexity. Since $\alpha_I < 0$, it follows that $\partial \Delta C/\partial \Delta A^c > \partial \Delta Y/\partial \Delta A^c > 0$ by comparing Eqs. (13) and (14).

The intuition behind the result that the coefficient on the country-specific productivity shock ΔA^c is greater in Eq. (14) for consumption than in Eq. (13) for output is simple but important. A permanent productivity shock has a greater effect on ΔC than on ΔY because a permanent rise in A^c induces investment and leads to a higher future capital stock, thereby causing permanent *net* income \bar{y}_t to rise by more than current gross income Y_t . Note that if the country were to

⁵Note that our procedure for transforming Eq. (10) for I into Eq. (11) for ΔI would have no effect on any error term in (10). We address the error specification of our estimating equations more systematically in Section 2.8 below.

hold investment constant in response to the shock, then \bar{y} and \bar{y} would rise by exactly the same amount. However, since it becomes profitable to raise investment after a positive productivity shock, \bar{y} and hence C must rise by more than Y.

Combining Eqs. (11)-(14) yields the estimating equation for the current account:

$$(+) (-) (+)$$

$$\Delta CA_{t} = \gamma_{1}I_{t-1} + \gamma_{2}\Delta A_{t}^{c} + (r-1)CA_{t-1}, \qquad (15)$$

where

$$\gamma_1 \equiv (\beta_1 - 1)(\alpha_I - 1) + \alpha_K > 0,$$

$$\gamma_2 \equiv \beta_2 [(\alpha_I - 1)(1 - \beta_1) - \alpha_K]/(r - \beta_1) < 0.$$

For exactly the same reasons that the coefficient on ΔA^c is greater in the consumption equation than in the income equation, one can show that the coefficient on ΔA^c in the current account Eq. (15) is greater in absolute value than the corresponding coefficient in the investment Eq. (11); that is $|\partial \Delta A^c| > \partial \Delta I/\partial \Delta A^c > 0.^6$ A permanent rise in productivity not only worsens the current account due to higher investment, but also, as we have already discussed, because it causes consumption to rise by more than gross output.⁷

Of course, this result can be traced to the random walk productivity shock assumption. If $\rho = 0$ - so that the country-specific productivity shock is temporary – then current income would rise by more than permanent income. Since there would be no investment response to a purely temporary shock, the current account would necessarily move into *surplus*. As we shall see, a random walk provides a good empirical approximation for the productivity shocks, so we will postpone discussion of the $\rho < 1$ case until Section 4. Instead, we first introduce global productivity shocks and (global and country-specific) government spending shocks.

⁶To show that $|\gamma_2| > \beta_2$, note that $[(x_I - 1)(1 - \beta_1) - x_K] (r - \beta_1) < -1$ iff $[(x_I - 1)(\beta_1 - 1) - x_K] > r - \beta_1$ iff $(x_I - 1)(r - 1) + (x_I - 1)(\beta_1 - r) + x_K > r - \beta_1$ iff $(x_I - 1)(r - 1) + x_K > (r - \beta_1)x_1$. This final condition holds provided $(x_I - 1)(r - 1) + x_K > 0$, which is again the condition that the present discounted value of higher output from investment exceeds the adjustment cost.

⁷Note also that the coefficient (γ_1) on I_{t-1} in ACA equation (15) is positive and larger in absolute value than the corresponding coefficient in the AI equation $(1 - \beta_1)$. (Recall that $\alpha_I < 0$ and $0 < \beta_1 < 1$.) A positive level of I_{t-1} causes the current account to improve both because I_t tends to revert to equilibrium and also because lagged investment raises current output. The change in consumption AC_t is, of course, enaffected by any variables dated t - 1 or earlier, including lagged investment.

2.6. Global productivity shocks

Suppose that in addition to the country-specific component A^c , the productivity shock contains a global component (common to ail countries) A^w , so that Eq. (1) is replaced by

$$Y_t^c = (A_t^w \cdot A_t^c) K_t^x \left[1 - \frac{g}{2} \left(\frac{I_t^2}{K_t} \right) \right].$$
(16)

for country c. If all countries have identical preferences, technology, and initial capital stocks, then the change in a country's current account depends on its country-specific shock A^c , but not on the global shock A^w since the latter impacts on all countries equally. (This assumes zero initial net foreign asset positions, which is a reasonable empirical approximation for the G-7 countries over the sample period.)

 A^w does, of course, affect investment, but by less than an idiosyncratic shock of the same duration, since A^w affects world interest rates. Eq. (11) is then replaced by

$$\Delta I_t = (\beta_1 - 1)I_{t-1} + \beta_2 \Delta A_t^c + \beta_3 \Delta A_t^w, \tag{17}$$

where, if both A^* and A^c follow random walks ($\rho = 1$), $0 < \beta_3 < \beta_2$ due to the interest rate effect of the global shock.⁸ If, he were, the global shock is permanent and the country-specific shock is sufficiently transitory, then, of course. β_3 may be greater than β_2 .

2.7. Government spending shocks

Introducing country-specific government (consumption) spending shocks is similarly straightforward. We assume that government spending is purely dissipative (or equivalently, that utility is separable in private and public consumption), and is financed by exogenous lump-sum taxes. In this case, countryspecific government spending shocks G^c should have no effect on *I*, though *transitory* global government spending shocks G^w can have an impact through the real interest rate. The reverse is true for the current account. Global shocks should not impact on the current account but country-specific government spending shocks may if they are temporary. (A permanent rise in G^c will be fully offset by a permanent fall in *C*.) Note that government spending shocks constitute pure aggregate demand shocks in our formulation.

⁸Since β_3 arises out of the standard closed-economy model, we do not present an explicit derivation here; see Abel and Blanchard (1986) or Blanchard and Fischer (1989) for further discussion.

Defining permanent country-specific government spending as $\bar{G}_t^c \equiv [(r-1)/r] \times E_t \sum_{s=0}^{r} G_{t+s}^c / r^s$, the current account equation, Eq. (15), becomes

$$\Delta CA_{t} = \gamma_{1}I_{t-1} + \gamma_{2}\Delta A_{t}^{c} + (\bar{G}_{t}^{c} - E_{t-1}\bar{G}_{t}^{c} - \Delta G_{t}^{c}) + (r-1)CA_{-1}.$$
 (18)

A temporary rise in country-specific government spending G^c leads to a deterioration in the current account since permanent after-tax income and therefore consumption declines by less than the rise in G^c (except for the global/local distinction, our approach to introducing government spending is similar to Ahmed, 1986).

Suppose, for example, that G^c is governed by the IMA(0, 1, 1) process:

$$G_t^c = G_{t-1}^c + \varepsilon_{Gt}^c - \theta^c \varepsilon_{Gt-1}^c.$$
⁽¹⁹⁾

Then one can show that in Eq. (18), the term $\bar{G}_t^c - E_{t-1}\bar{G}_t^c - \Delta G_t^c$ equals $\theta^c(\varepsilon_{G_t-1}^c - \varepsilon_{G_t}^c/r)$.

2.8. Error specification

As a final preparation for empirical estimation, we introduce additive error terms μ_{It} , μ_{Yt} , and μ_{Ct} to the investment, output, and consumption equations – (4), (3), and (7). The μ s are assumed independent of each other (although this assumption is not necessary for identification of the key parameters of interest). The error terms in Eqs. (11) and (13) for ΛI and ΛY become μ_{It} and $\alpha_I \mu_{It} + \Delta \mu_{Yt}$, respectively. The error term for the ΛC equation, Eq. (14), becomes

$$\left(\frac{(\alpha_I-1)(r-1)+\alpha_K}{r-\beta_1}\right)\mu_{II}+\frac{r-1}{r}\mu_{YI}+\Delta\mu_{CI}.$$
(20)

and the error term in the ΔCA equation, Eq. (15), becomes

$$\frac{(\alpha_I-1)(1-\beta_1)+\alpha_K}{r-\beta_1}\mu_{II}+\Delta\mu_{YI}-\left(\frac{r-1}{r}\right)\mu_{YI}-\Delta\mu_{CI}.$$
(21)

With this error specification, we see that I_{t-1} may be treated as a predetermined variable in the regression for ΔCA_t , but CA_{t-1} is endogenous.

3. Empirical results

Before turning to our estimates of structural equations for the current account and investment, it is helpful to first explore some simple correlations between these two variables. There is, in fact, a substantial literature starting from Sachs (1981) that attempts to use nonstructural current account/investment equations to draw inferences on international capital mobility. Using long-term averages of cross-country data, Sachs (1981, 1983) argues that for OECD countries there is indeed a high negative correlation between these two variables (Sachs divides both by output), casting doubt on Feldstein and Horioka's (1980) conclusion that capital markets are relatively insular.⁹ Subsequent writers, however, including Penati and Dooley (1984). Tesar (1991), and others, find that Sachs' correlations are quite sensitive to a couple of outliers; the general conclusion of this literature is that any correlation is tenuous at best.

3.1. Reduced-form regressions for ΔCA on ΔI

168

Is it indeed the case that the empirical correlatic n between investment and current accounts is so weak? One might argue that the type of decade-average data that is the focus of the post-Sachs literature looks at too long a horizon to capture the kind of dynamic effects emphasized by the model used here. In Table 1 below, which uses annual time series data instead of cross-country data (and where variables are expressed in levels rather than as ratios to output), we see that the *change* in the current account exhibits a strong and consistent negative correlation with the *change* in investment.¹⁰ For the G-7 industrialized countries in the top half of the table, regressing ΔCA on ΔI for the years 1961–90 yields coefficients ranging from -0.16 to -0.55, averaging -0.36; all the coefficients are significant at better than 5 percent. The negative correlation between ΔCA and ΔI generally remains intact across the subperiods 1961–74 and 1975–1990, rising slightly in the second half of the sample. Unreported regressions for the remaining sixteen OECD countries over the full period

⁹Sachs argues that the observed nonstructural correlations may be caused by productivity shocks; the structural equations presented here support his conjecture. Of course, a strong negative correlation between current accounts and investment only provides evidence on the degree of capital mobility if one is willing to make some very strong identifying assumptions. It is not enough to assume that the only driving variable is productivity shocks; it is necessary that they be permanent and not transitory, country-specific and not global. Even if the productivity shocks are permanent, country-specific government spending shocks (and more generally demand shocks) reduce the correlation by effecting the current account without affecting investment. Shocks to nontraded goods productivity, on the other hand, may affect investment without having a significant impact on the current account; see Tesar (1993).

¹⁰The construction of all variables is described in Appendix 2; GDP or GNP deflators are used to construct real variables. There is also evidence of negative correlation in the levels regressions, though it is less robust across time and countries. Baxter and Crucini (1993) report finding negative correlations in the levels regressions, but do not give significance levels. Roubini (1990) finds evidence of a significant negative correlation when one includes budget deficits in the nonstructural current-account investment level regressions.

Country	Sample period	<i>b</i>	R ²	D.W'.
U.S.	1961-90	- 0.16 (0.07)**	0.18	1.44
Japan	1961-90	- 0.32 (0.07)**	0.40	- 1.27
Germany	1961-90	- 0.29 (0.11)**	0.21	1.94
France	1968-90	-0.37(0.11)**	0.34	1.82
Italy	1961-90	- 0.55 (0.08)**	0.61	1.95
U.K.	1961-90	- 0.53 (0.09)**	0.53	2.08
Canada	1961 90	- 0.31 (0.08)**	0.37	2.06
U.S.	196174	0.04 (0.10)	0.01	2.67
Japan	196174	- 0.21 (0.11)*	0.24	0.89
Germany	1961 74	- 0.35 (0.09)**	0.58	2.22
France	196874	0.10 (0.51)	0.01	1.74
Italy	1251-74	- 0.50 (0.16)**	0.44	2.54
U.K.	1961 74	- 0.37 (0.20)*	0.22	1.39
Canada	1961-74	- 0.40 (0.11)**	0.52	3.04
U.S.	1975-90	- 0.20 (0.62)**	0.27	1.18
Japan	1975-90	- 0.37 (0.10)**	0.49	1.54
Germany	1975-90	-0.23(0.19)	9.10	1.60
France	1975-90	- 0.42 (0.12)**	0.47	1.42
Italy	1975-90	- 0.59 (0.10)**	0.71	1.19
U.K.	1975-90	- 0.60 (0.10)**	0.72	1.81
Canada	1975-90	- 0.30 (0.10)**	0.38	1.88

Table 1		
Time-series regressions of current	account on investmen	t. $\Delta CA_t = a + b\Delta I_t$

The dependent variable is the absolute change in the real current account and the independent variable is the absolute change in real gross investment. Constant terms are not reported. Figures in parentheses are standard errors. Significance levels at 5 and 10 percent are indicated by ****** and *****, respectively.

1961-90 yield negative coefficients in all cases. In all but three cases, the coefficients are highly significant.¹¹

Overall, the time series regressions on differences yield a remarkably consistent relationship between changes in current accounts and investment. The regression coefficient is well below one, but is impossible to draw any inferences on the validity of the intertemporal model without a more detailed investigation of the sources of the shocks.

¹¹See Glick and Rogoff (1992). The point estimates for the smaller countries tend to be slightly larger on average than for the larger G-7 countries. The negative coefficients are significant for Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia, and New Zealand. They are not significant at the 5 percent level for Belgium, the Netherlands, and Turkey.

3.2. Construction and time series properties of A^c and A^w

We consider two approaches to constructing Solow residuals, one that attempts to control for fluctuations in the capital stock and one that controls only for changes in labor. The labor-only measure is based on data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) on output and employment hours in manufacturing for major industrialized countries, 1960–90 (see Appendix 2). Following Backus, Kehoe, and Kydland (1992), we form productivity measures as the residuals from Cobb-Douglas production functions:

 $\ln Y - \pi \ln L,$

where π , the share of labor in manufacturing output, is based on data from the OECD intersectoral data base.¹² With the BLS data, one cannot control for changes in the capital stock, K, except to the limited extent of including trend terms in the regressions.

Our alternative measure of Solow residuals does attempt to control for capital inputs by using the OECD international sectoral data base (see Appendix 2), though our data only covers the years 1970-85. Backus, Kehoe, and Kydland argue that adjusting for capital inputs should not produce radically different results since, if one extrapolates from United States data, short-term movements in capital are small relative to short-term movements in labor. As Fig. 1 illustrates, the U.S. case is not entirely representative, though the two productivity measures are highly correlated for all the countries in our sample. [Baxter and Crucini (1992) and Reynolds (1993) discuss the significance of adjusting for capital inputs in more detail.] In any event, we will later show that results based on OECD total factor productivity residuals over the shorter time period are very similar to the results obtained with the PLS-based residuals over the full sample. For this reason, and because dynamic issues are so central to our analysis, our main results below will be based on the longer BLS data set. One might also argue that the problems in constructing comparable capital stock measures in cross-country data are so severe (see Griliches, 1988) that attempts to adjust for capital inputs are not that reliable, anyway.

A further limitation of our data set is that it only covers manufacturing. We note, however, that much more accurate cross-country data are available for manufacturing than for services, particularly over the earlier part of our sample. Productivity in services is notoriously difficult to measure, and international

¹²See Meyer-zu-Schlochtern (1988) and Englander and Mittelstädt (1988). The estimates for π used are labor share in the traded goods sector: United States, 0.66; Japan, 0.54; Germany, 0.64; France, 0.65; Italy, 0.48; U.K., 0.68⁻ Canada, 0.63; and are taken from Stockman and Tesar (1994).



Fig. 1. Total factor productivity in manufacturing constructed from BLS and OECD data (log changes).

comparisons are further complicated by the high variability in the relative price of nontraded goods across countries.

Our global productivity measure is formed by taking a GNP-weighted average of the seven individual-country measures,¹³ and the country-specific

.

¹³The weights were constructed from each country's share of total GDP in 1975, where local currency GDP figures were converted to dollars by the average dollar exchange rate for the year.

Country	DF t,	$ADFt_{r}$	ρ
U.S.	- 0.40	0.78	0.93 (0.026)
Japan	1.14	0.87	0.94 (0.020)
Germany	- 1.09	1.64	0.98 (0.078)
France	- 0.52	0.86	0.91 (0.048)
Italy	- 1.76	1.58	0.95 (0.042)
U.K.	- 1.29	1.51	0.89 (0.031)
Canada	- 2.43	- 1.76	1.01 (0.082)
Global	- 2.06	- 2.37	0.97 (0.012)

 Table 2

 Country-specific and global productivity unit root tests, 1961–90

The dependent variable is the percent change in country-specific or global productivity. $DF t_t$ is the *t*-statistic on b_1 in the regression $AA_t = b_0 + b_1A_{t-1} + b_2T$. ADF t_t is the *t*-statistic on b_1 in the augmented regression $AA_t = b_0 + b_1A_{t-1} + b_2T + b_3A_{t-1}$. Critical values for t_t (with 25 observations) are -3.60 at 5 percent and -3.24 at 10 percent. ρ is the coefficient on A_{t-1} in the regression $A_t = \alpha + \rho A_{t-1}$, with the standard ertor in parentheses.

component is then formed as the deviation from the global average.¹⁴ Table 2 presents Dickey-Fuller unit root tests (with a constant and trend) for our productivity measures for the eight countries in the sample, and for the world average. In none of the cases is one able to reject the unit root hypothesis at standard significance levels.¹⁵ The third column of the table presents estimates for a first-order autoregressive process. As one can see, the point estimates of ρ are all quite close to one.

¹⁵In addition to the Dickey Fuller test, we also employed the Phillips-Perron test with similar results. Another approach, based on Levin and Lin (1992), tests the joint hypothesis that there is a unit root in all of the country-specific productivity series. The ΛA^* regression in this method allows for different coefficients across countries on all variables (intercept and trend terms) except A_{1-1}^{i} . With this test, one still cannot in fact reject (at the 5 percent level) the joint hypothesis that $\rho = 1$ for all the countries. (Because the seven country-specific productivity series are linearly dependent by construction, it was necessary to drop one of the countries from the joint test.) Finally, we tested the unit root hypothesis against the alternative of a deterministic trend with a break, based on the procedure proposed by Christiano (1992), which does not impose priors on the point in time where the break occurs. One cannot reject the hypothesis of a unit root in favor of a trend break for any of the countries at the 10 percent level of s' gnificance. For a version of the test corresponding to an augmented Dickey. Fuller regression, one can reject the unit root null at the 5 percent level for Italy and 7 percent for the U.K. (These results included the Netherlands in the construction of ΛA^* .)

¹⁴We also considered a more elaborate experioach to decomposing A into A^{*} and A^{*}. We regressed A for each country on a GNP-weighted average of $A(A^{f})$ for the other six countries, treating the residual as the country-specific component. We found in all cases that one could not reject the hypothesis that both A and A^f have unit roots, and that they are not cointegrated. The more elaborate procedure gives very similar results in our current account and investment equations.

The estimates in Table 2 suggest that our earlier assumption that country-specific shocks follow a random walk is at least plausible. Now that by imposing that $\rho = 1$, we can avoid the issue of how uncertainty over ρ affects standard errors in the current account and investment equations. In Section 4, however, we tackle the more general serial correlation case and are thus able to test the robustness of our results.¹⁶

It must be emphasized that the exogeneity of productivity shocks is central to structural interpretation of the results below. Though often imposed in modern empirical macroeconomics (e.g., in the real business cycle literature), the assumption that the economy is operating along its equilibrium production function is admittedly extreme. Evans (1992), for example, has shown that Solow residuals are Granger-caused by other variables such as government spending. To the extent there is a large endogenous component to productivity, it would obviously affect the interpretation of our results.

3.3. Structural estimates of the ACA and AI equations

We are now prepared to estimate the central structural equations of our model, Eqs. (15) and (17) for ΔCA and ΔI . Table 3 presents individual country results under the assumption $\rho = 1.17$

For ΔI , the coefficients on ΔA^c and ΔA^w are all of the correct sign and are significant at the 5 percent level in almost 80 percent of the cases. The Ljung-Box Q-statistic does indicate serial correlation for Germany and the U.K.¹⁸ The fact that the coefficients on ΔA^w are typically larger than for ΔA^c in the investment equation might be attributable to the residual positive serial correlation in the first difference of the world productivity shocks. Otherwise, of

¹⁶There does appear to be some residual correlation in a couple of the series even after taking first differences, especially in .1.4°. Estimating a first-order MA process in .1.4° yields a point estimate of 0.52 (positive serial correlation), with a standard error of 0.16. There also appears to be some positive serial correlation in $\Lambda A'$ for France. Germany, and the U.K., though less than for $\Lambda A''$. (These results included the Netherlands in the construction of $\Lambda A''$.)

¹⁷ he results are not sensitive to the inclusion of time trends in the ACA regressions, but we excluded them on a priori grounds. The A1 results are only marginally worse without trends, though the results for the U.S. are actually markedly better. To facilitate the cross-country comparison of the coefficients on productivity (and trend) terms, for each country these variables were multiplied by the mean of local real GDP or GNP over the sample period. This gives the reported coefficients on A4' and A4" the interpretation of the change in the left-hand-side variable as a percent of mean GNP in response to a 1 percent increase in productivity.

¹⁸The heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation-consistent standard errors in Table 3 are obtained using the ROBUSTERRORS option to the LINREG command in RATS, with DAMP = 1 and L = 2. This provides Newey-West estimates of the covariance matrix corrected for heteroskedasticity and for serial correlation in the form of a moving average of order 2.

174

course, this would be a puzzle. The coefficients on the lagged investment level, I_{t-1} , are generally not significant. We note that if investment is nonstationary (say, due to a stochastic trend), the standard errors on the coefficient of I_{t-1} will not be meaningful. However, according to the theorem discussed in Stock and Watson (1988), the nonstationarity of I_{t-1} will not affect the standard errors on the other, stationary, variables in our regressions.

Table 3 also presents results for the ΔCA equation. To deal with possible simultaneity of CA_{t-1} in (15), we constrain its coefficient to equal its theoretically-predicted value r = 1.19 Given the near random walk behavior of the country-specific productivity shocks, one would expect the estimated coefficients on ΛA^c to be negative, as indeed they are in all \in ses. Except for France and Germany, the coefficients are all significant at the 10 percent level or better. As we discuss in Appendix 2, French current account data is available on a consistent basis only since 1967 so the French results are based on a much smaller sample. The model also predicts that world productivity shocks, ΔA^{w} , should have no effect on current accounts since they affect all countries equally. This hypothesis cannot be rejected for any country except the United Kingdom. but even for the U.K. the country-specific shock has a much larger effect. It should be noted that the seven countries included in our proxy for world productivity shocks, while constituting a significant share of world output, provide somewhat less than complete world coverage. Thus, one might not expect the coefficient on ΛA^{w} to literally be zero. It should, however, be much smaller than the coefficient on A^{c} .

Table 4 reports results for the full pooled time-series cross-section data set with and without country-specific time trends.²⁰ As in the individual country regressions, the coefficients in the ΛI equations are of the correct sign, and all are highly significant. ΛA^c is negative in the pooled ΛCA regressions, and is also highly significant. The point estimates for the world shock ΛA^w remain small in the pooled ΛCA equations and, as the model predicts, are insignificantly duferent from zero.

¹⁹As our proxy for r, we use the real world interest rate series constructed by Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1990). Fluctuations in $(r = 1)C4_{r-1}$ are quite small relative to fluctuations in ΔCA_r .

²⁰The pooled results are estimated using the SUR command in RATS, a GLS system procedure, with equality restrictions imposed across equations, excluding the constants and time trends. To adjust for cross-country hete, oskedasticity and to allow the pooling of data in different currency units, we scaled all variables in each equation in the system by the standard error of the corresponding OI S country regressions. In addition, as in the individual-country OLS regressions, variables without units, such as productivity changes and trend terms, were multiplied by the mean of local real GNP or GDP over the sample period. We used the SUP option LFER which begins with estimates of cross-country covariances based on the residuals from individual country OLS regressions and recomputes the covariances and system equation estimates iteratively. We set a maximum of 25 iterations, but all results converged before reaching this linal.

Country	ZV	<i>b</i> ₁	<i>b</i> 2	h3	$h_4 \times 10^2$	R ²	Q-msl
U.S.	Jl JCA	0.20 (0.11)* - 0.14 (0.08)*	0.40 (0.07)** 0.01 (0.07)	- 0.22 (0.18) 0.04 (0.04)	0.11 (0.09)	0.53 0.13	0.88 0.25
Japan	л ЛС А	0.43 (0.06)** - 0.14 (0.04)**	0.58 (0.11)** - 0.06 (0.07)	0.10 (0.08) - 0.04 (0.02)*	0.06 (0.10)	0.68 0.19	0.87 0.40
Germany	.11 .10.4	0.47 (0.10)** - 0.20 (0.13)	0.52 (0.12)** 0.00 (0.07)	- 0.15 (0.07)** 0.02 (0.07)	0.13 (0.04)**	0.55 0.11	0:00 0:16
France	. <i>11</i> .аС. 4 *	0.46 (0.12)** - 0.07 (0.13)	0.43 (0.15)** 0.03 (0.13)	- 0.14 (0.08)* 0.02 (0.06)	0.15 (0.05)**	0.36 0.03	0.53 0.16
Italy	<i>JI</i> .;С.4	0.60 (0.13)** - 0.30 (0.12)**	0.26 (0.19) - 0.10 (0.14)	- 0.18 (C.14) - 0.03 (0.C4)	0.16 (0.07)**	0.66 0.24	0.17 0.49
L.K.	 .1C.4	0.50 (0.11)** 0.46 (0.09)**	0.65 (0.07)** - J.20 (0.08)**	0.05 (0.08) 0.00 (0.05)	0.01 (0.04)	0.76 0.49	0.00 1.00
Canada	л1 АСА	0.41 t0.18)** - 0.24 (0.08)**	0.17 (0.15) 0.07 (0.10)	- 0.12 (0.16) - 0.04 (0.02)	0.13 (0.14)	0.44 0.30	0.17 0.68
The dependent country-specific level of real grow of covariance m level of the Box	variable is the a productivity, per is investment. Co atrix are in paren Ljung Q statisti	absolute change in real gr rcent change in global proc instant terms not reported. it heses. Significance levels i ic for serial correlation.	oss irvestment or cui fuctivity, and a time ti Stardard errors from at 5 and 10 percent are	rrent account. The in rend, all multiplied by Newey-West heterosk indicated by ** and *	dependent variables the mean of real GL edastic and autocorr . respectively. Q-msl	are the perce DP or GNP, al elation consist is the margina	nt change in id the lagge 1 ent estimates I significance

Table 3 Individual-courty time-series regressions, 1961-90, $AZ_{i} = b_{0} + b_{1}AA_{i}^{2} + b_{2}A_{i}^{2} + b_{1}A_{i}^{2}$ R. Glick, K. Rogoff / Journal of Monetary Economics 35 (1995) 159-192

175

1968-90.

Pooled time-se	ries regressions, 1961–90, .1Z	$= b_0 + b_1 A A_r^i + b_2 A A_r^w + b_3$	$I_{r-1} + h_{a}T$
ΔZ	b_1	h2	b ₃
With country-	specific time trends		
ΔΙ	0.35 (0.03)**	0.53 (0.06)**	- 0.10 (0.04)*1
ЛСА	- 0.17 (0.03)**	0.01 (0.02)	0.04 (0.03)
Without time t	rends $(b_4 = 0)$		
ЛI	0.36 (0.03)**	0.56 (0.05)**	0.08 (0.02)**
ЛСА	- 0.16 (0.02)**	~ 0.01 (0.02)	~ 0.01 (0.01)*

Pooled regressions are estimated by generalized least squares with equality restrictions imposed across the country equations, excluding the constant and trend terms, and with each equation scaled by the standard error of the corresponding OLS regression. Dependent and independent variables are the same as described in the note to Table 3. Constants and country-specific time trends are not reported. France is excluded from the ACA regressions. Figures in parentheses are standard errors. Significance levels at 5 and 10 percent are indicated by ** and *, respectively.

The main puzzle in Table 3 and 4 lies in the relative magnitudes of the coefficients on ΔA^c in the ΔI and ΔCA equations. Both in Table 4 and in the individual country results in Table 3 the coefficient on ΔA^c is *smaller* in absolute value in the current account regressions than in the ΔI regressions. For the pooled results, it is less than half as large. Given the evidence in Table 2 that productivity shocks (nearly) follow random walks, one might expect the current account response to be *larger* than the investment response, since consumption should move by more than output; we return to this issue in Section 4 below. Similarly, the coefficient on I_{t-1} in the ΔCA equation in Table 4, though of the correct sign, is smaller rather than larger (in absolute value) than the corresponding coefficient in the ΔI equation.

Our empirical analysis thus far has focused entirely on supply shocks: In the next section we attempt to control for changes in government spending, which constitutes one form of demand shock.

3.4. Temporary government spending shocks

Recall that in theory permanent country-specific government consumption spending shocks have no effect on investment, whereas global government spending shocks have no effect on current accounts. G^c shocks can affect ACAand G^w shocks can affect AI, but in each case only if they are temporary. (It would be interesting to extend the analysis to incorporate government investment, but we do not attempt this here.)

To estimate temporary shocks to government spending, we estimate the ARIMA(0, 1, 1) process given in Eq. (19) above, again forming G^{w} as a weighted

176

Table 4

 Pooled time-series regressions with government consumption, 1961–90

 b_1 b_2 b_3 b_s
 $AI_t = b_0 + b_1 AA_t^c + b_2 AA_t^w + b_3 I_{t-1} + b_4 T + b_5 (G_t^w - E_{t-1} G_t^w)$ $0.35 (0.03)^{**}$ $0.51 (0.06)^{**}$ $-0.10 (0.04)^{**}$ -0.51 (0.47)

 $ACA_t = b_0 + b_1 AA_t^c + b_2 AA_t^w + b_3 I_{t-1} + b_4 T + b_5 (G_t^c - E_{t-1} G_t^c - AG_t^c)$ $-0.17 (0.03)^{**}$ 0.01 (0.02) 0.04 (0.03) -0.40 (0.34)

Estimation procedure and variables are the same as described in the note to Table 4 with addition of the unanticipated change in permanent global real government consumption in the investment regression, and the difference between the unanticipated permanent change and actual change in country-specific real government consumption in the current account regression. France is excluded from ACA regressions. Figures in parentheses are standard errors. Significance levels at 5 and 10 percent are indicated by ** and *, respectively.

average of individual-country Gs, normalized by GNP.²¹ Given our assumption that ΔG follows an MA(1) process, $(\overline{G}_t^c - E_{t-1}\overline{G}_t^c - \Delta G_t^c)$ is then given by the formula below Eq. (19), $\theta^c(\varepsilon_{Gt-1}^c - \varepsilon_{Gt}^c/r)$. $\overline{G}_t^w - E_{t-1}\overline{G}_t^w$, the temporary component of changes in G^w , is given by $(r - \theta^w)\varepsilon_{Gt}^w/r$. The pooled time-series crosssection results are presented in Table 5, where G is measured by real government consumption (see Appendix 2); the θ s are allowed to vary across countries.²² The coefficients on ΔA^c , ΔA^w , I_{t-1} remain exactly as before, and the G shocks do not enter significantly. Individual country regressions (not reported) are also largely unaffected by the inclusion of G shocks.²³ The fact that government spending appears to have relatively little impact may be due to the difficulty of extracting the temporary component of changes in G. In any event, the main conclusion here is that our findings on productivity shocks are largely unaffected by controlling for government consumption shocks.

3.5. Alternative empirical measures of productivity

In addition to our BLS-based Solow residual estimates, we tried two alternative measures of productivity. The first was straight output/worker hour.

²⁴To form G^w , we normalized each country's G by the country's average level of GNP in the period, and then formed a world index using 1975 nominal dollar GNP weights.

 $^{^{22}}$ We measured the *r* in the *G* shock formulas by the mean over the period of the world real interest rate constrained by Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1990).

²³To check the tobustness of these results, we also enterege AG^{1} and AG^{2} in the form into the ACA and AI equations, respectively, but they remain insignment. We also tried controlling for world interest rates directly in the ACA and AI equations using the Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1990) measure of world real interest rates again the productivity coefficients were little affected.

Pooled time-series regressions using OECD total factor productivity data, 1971-85 subsample, $\Delta Z_t = b_0 + b_1 \Delta A_1^t + b_2 \Delta A_1^u + b_3 I_{t-3} + b_4 T$

ΔZ	\boldsymbol{b}_1	<i>b</i> .	h,
With country-sp	peofic time trends		
Л	0.36 (0.03)**	0.43 (0.06)**	- 0.06 (0.07)
ЛСА	- 0.27 (0.02)**	0.05 (0.02)**	0.05 (0.03)
Without time tr	ends $(b_4 = 0)$		
Л	0.39 (0.03)**	0.44 (0.06* *	0.02 (0.05)
АСА	0.28 (0.02)**	0.03 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
	a and a second		

Estimation procedure and variables are the same as described in note to Table 4. France is excluded from ACA regressions. Figures in parentheses are standard errors. Significance levels at 5 and 10 percent are indicated by ** and *, respectively.

without attempting to adjust for decreasing returns to labor inputs. The results are qualitatively extremely similar to those presented above, both for the time series of productivity and for Tables 3 and 4.

Next, we used data on total factor productivity in manufacturing from the OECD international sectoral data base, available for the years 1970-1985. These estimates attempt to account for changes in capital. Table 6 presents pooled results corresponding to those in Tab¹ 4 for the BLS-based Solow residual estimates. The results are quite similar to those in Table 4.²⁴ The coefficient on ΔA^{*} is actually significant in the ΔCA regression with a time trend, but it is much smaller in magnitude than the coefficient on the country-specific shock, ΔA^{c} . As mentioned above, one possible rationale why ΔA^{*} might ent t significantly with a very small coefficient is that the seven large industrialized countries here do not quite constitute 100 percent of world GNP, even among countries with relatively open capital markets. The individual-country results are also qualitatively similar, with only slightly fewer coefficients significant at the 5 percent level, due in part to the shorter sample.

Note that the coefficients on ΔA^{c} in the ΔCA and ΔI equations are actually much closer in magnitude in Table 6 than in Table 4, though they are tightly

178

²⁴We also estimated the regressions in Table 6 using business sector total factor productivity, despite the misgivings expressed above. For the AI equation with a time trend we obtained estimates of 1.08 for b_1 and 0.64 for b_2 with marginal significance levels of 0.00 in both cases. For the ACA equation without a time trend, we obtained estimates of -0.08 for b_1 and -0.04 for b_2 with marginal significance levels of 0.00 in both cases. For the ACA equation without a time trend, we obtained estimates of -0.08 for b_1 and -0.04 for b_2 with marginal significance levels of 0.04 and 0.44, respectively. It is not surprising that β_2 is larger relative to γ_2 when productivity is measured using the overall business sector rather than manufacturing; nontraded goods constitute a much smaller share of manufacturing. (These regressions included the Netherlands in the construction of AA^* and in the pooled country estimates.)

Pooled time-series regressions, 1975–90 subsample, $\Delta Z_t = b_0 + b_1 \Delta A_t^c + b_2 \Delta A_t^w + b_3 I_{t+1} + b_4 T$

AZ	h_1	<i>b</i> ₂	<i>b</i> 3
With country-spe	ecific time trends	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
ΔΙ	0.34 (0.04)**	0.66 (0.06)**	- 0.05 (0.05)
ΛCΑ	- 0.30 (0.02)**	0.02 (0.02)	0 02 (0.03)
Without time tre	nds $(b_4 = 0)$		
21	0.32 (0.03)**	0.62 (0.06)**	0.00 (0.04)
AC 4	0.26 (0.0.*)**	0.01 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)

Estimation procedure and variables are the same as described in note to Table 4. France is excluded from AC.4 regressions. Figures in parentheses are standard errors. Significance levels at 5 and 10 percent are indicated by ** and *, respectively.

estimated and remain smaller in the ACA equations. As a final check, we present in Table 7 pooled estimates using the BLS-based Solow residuals for the post-oil-shock period. Overall, the results are similar to the OECD-based results for the recent period in Table 6.

4. Mean-reverting country-specific productivity shocks ($\rho < 1$)

In this section, we explore the sensitivity of our results to the assumption that country-specific productivity shocks follow a random walk. While in Section 3.2 we could not reject the $\rho = 1$ hypothesis for any country using standard unit root tests, it is well known that these tests generally lack power against the alternative of a ρ slightly less than one; the available time series are simply too short to give reliable estimates for the low frequencies. Moreover even if country-specific productivity shocks contain a random walk component, it seems quite likely that they would contain a significant mean-reverting component as well. If one cannot separate the two components empirically, then the estimated consumption response will be a weighted average response.²⁵

In Section 4.1 below, we ask whether relaxing the $\rho = 1$ restriction would reverse our conclusion that empirically *unanticipated* productivity shocks have a greater impact on investment than on the current account; it turns out that the estimated responses change very little. Nevertheless, as we argue in Section 4.2, allowing for ρ slightly less than one can dramatically impact our cross-equation

²⁵That is, if one thought of productivity shocks as being the sum of a permanent component and a temporary component, consumers would still expect to see some mean reversion, on average (see Quah, 1990).

restriction. We show analytically that the current account response to productivity shocks is likely to be hypersensitive to small changes in their persistence.

4.1. Deriving estimating equations for innovations in investment and the current account

Deriving the impact effect of shocks on investment is again straightforward. Subtract t - 1 expectations from both sides of Eq. (4) and evaluate the resulting expression to obtain (Appendix 1 contains the formal derivations for this section):

$$(+)$$

$$\vec{I}_{t} = \beta_{2}' v_{t}, \qquad (22)$$

where \sim denotes the revision of expectations operator $E_t - E_{t-1}$, \tilde{I}_t is the innovation to investment, $\beta'_2 \equiv \eta \rho / (1 - \lambda \rho)$, and $v_t = \tilde{A}_t^c = A_t^c - \rho A_{t-1}^c$ is the country-specific productivity shock [see Eq. (9)]. Note that $\partial \beta'_2 / \partial \rho < 0$ for $0 < \rho < 1$; when $\rho = 0$, then $\beta'_2 = 0$. If the shock is entirely transitory, there is no investment response.

As before, the corresponding equation for the unanticipated change in the current account $\tilde{C}A = \tilde{Y} - \tilde{I} - \tilde{C}$ (note $\tilde{F}_{r-1} = 0$) must be constructed from its component parts. (Note that net foreign assets F_t are predetermined.) \tilde{I} is given $U_r \equiv E_1$. (22); \tilde{Y} can be derived using Eqs. (3) and (22),

$$\vec{Y}_i = (\alpha_i \beta_2' + \alpha_A) v_i, \tag{25}$$

where we have used the fact that $\vec{K}_r = 0$. Finally, the effect of ε on permanent income – and therefore on $\vec{C} (= AC)$ – is given by (see Appendix 1)²⁶

$$(+)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{t} = \delta'_{2} \varepsilon_{t}, \qquad (24)$$

where

$$\delta'_{2} = \frac{r-1}{r-\rho} \left[\beta'_{2} \frac{(\alpha_{I}-1)(r-1) + \alpha_{K}}{r-\beta_{1}} + \alpha_{A} \right] > 0.$$

Combining Eqs. (22)-(24) yields

$$\tilde{C}A_t \equiv \gamma_2' v_t, \tag{25}$$

where

$$\gamma'_{2} \equiv (\alpha_{1} - 1)\beta'_{2} + \gamma_{1} - \delta'_{2}$$

= $\alpha_{4} \frac{1 - \rho}{r - \rho} + \beta'_{2}(\alpha_{1} - 1) - \frac{r - 1}{r - \rho}\beta'_{2}\frac{(\alpha_{1} - 1)(r - 1) + \alpha_{k}}{r - \beta_{1}}.$

²⁶Note that when $\rho = 0$. Eqs. (23) and (24) imply $\tilde{C} = ((r - 1)(r - \rho)) \alpha_A \varepsilon < \alpha_A \varepsilon = \tilde{Y}$. As we have already diseased, the current account moves into surplus in response to a purely transitory shock.

It is easy to see that $\partial \gamma'_2 / \partial \rho > 0$ (for $0 < \rho < 1$); that is, the lower the serial correlation in the productivity disturbance, the smaller the increase in the current account deficit. For ρ small enough, γ'_2 must eventually become positive.

Of course, Eqs. (22) and (25) cannot be estimated directly since \tilde{I} and \tilde{CA} are not directly observable. Noting that $\Delta I_t = \tilde{I}_t + E_{t-1}I_t - I_{t-1}$, one can use Eq. (4) to transform Eq. (22) into

$$\Delta I_{t} = \beta'_{2} \varepsilon_{t} + (\beta_{1} - 1) I_{t-1} + \beta'_{2} (\rho - 1) A_{t-1}^{c} \text{ or}$$

$$A I_{t} = (\beta_{1} - 1) I_{t-1} + \beta'_{2} A A_{t}^{c}, \qquad (26)$$

which is exactly the same as Eq. (11) which we have already estimated, except that β_2 is replaced by β'_2 ! [With a higher-order autoregressive process more lags of A^c would enter into Eq. (26).] Thus we do not have to alter our investment equation at all to generalize the empirical analysis to the $\rho < 1$ case.

The current account equation, however, must be modified slightly. Noting that $\Delta CA_t = CA_t + E_{t-1}CA_t - CA_{t-1}$ and adding $E_{t-1}(Y - I - C)_t - (Y - I - C)_{t-1} + (r-1)(F_{t-1} - F_{t-2})$ to both sides of Eq. (25) yields (after some manipulation; see Appendix 1):

$$\Delta CA_{t} = \gamma_{1}I_{t-1} + \gamma_{2}'A_{t}^{c} + \gamma A_{t-1}^{c} + (r-1)CA_{t-1}, \qquad (27)$$

where $\gamma_1 \equiv (\beta_1 - 1)(\alpha_t - 1) + \alpha_K$, γ'_2 is the same as in Eq. (25), and $\gamma \equiv -\gamma'_2 + (\rho - 1)\delta'_2$, where δ'_2 is the coefficient on v_t in the \tilde{C} equation, Eq. (24). Intuitively, the reason why A'_t has the same coefficient in Eq. (27) as does v_t in Eq. (25) is that anticipated productivity depends on A'_{t-1} . Therefore, once the direct and indirect effects of A'_{t-1} are controlled for, A'_t affects the current account only through its manticipated component.

The system of equations for empirical estimation in the $\rho < 1$ case is thus given by Eqs. (26), (27), and (9) (the AR process for country-specific productivity). The extension to global shocks is immediate; global shocks enter exactly as before into the investment equation and, as before, they do not enter into the current account equation. Note that the system of estimating equations is just identified.²⁷

²⁷ The form in which we have written the current account and investment equation does not require any cross-equation restriction for identification. One could write the current account equation in terms of AA_i^* and $v_i (= A_{i-1}^*)$ instead of in terms of A_i^* and A_{i-1}^* as we have done. In this case one would have to impose the constraint that the coefficient on A_{i-1}^* is p times the coefficient on A_i^* to obtain identification. This equivalent approach (which yields identical estimates) is the conventional one. Note that there would be an overidentifying cross-equation restriction if the consumption equation. Eq. (24), were estimated jointly with (26), (27), and (9).

Table 8 presents joint estimates of Eq. (26) and Eq. (27) for each country (with global shocks included).²⁸ The investment results are, of course, identical to those in Table 3 since the modified investment equation, Eq. (26), is isomorphic to the earlier Eq. (11). Note that our estimates of γ'_2 (the coefficient on country-specific productivity in the ACA equation) are virtually identical to the estimates of γ_2 in Table 3 for the random walk case. (For the U.K., γ'_2 is now marginally larger in absolute value than β'_2 , but in all other cases β'_2 is larger.)

Table 8 also presents chi-square tests of the restriction $\beta'_2 = |\gamma'_2|$; β'_2 is significantly larger for all cases except the U.K. and the U.S. Thus, it appears that our empirical result that country-specific productivity shocks do not have a larger effect on the current account than on investment remains intact when one relaxes the $\rho = 1$ assumption.

4.2. The sensitivity of $|\gamma'_2|/\beta'_2$ to ρ

At first glance, it would seem that given the highly linear nature of the model, our estimated values of ρ (which average 0.94 in Table 2) are simply too close to one to explain why, empirically, γ'_2 appears to be less than half as large (on average) as β'_2 . It is well-known from the consumption literature, however, that the response of variables which depend on present discounted calculations (as is the case here for both the current account *and* investment) can depend in a very nonlinear fashion on the persistence of the exogenous variables.

The fundamental intuition is most easily seen by abstracting from investment and assuming that net output y is exogenous. In this case, Eq. (24) for the innovation in consumption ($\tilde{C} = AC$) reduces to

$$\tilde{C}_t = \frac{r-1}{r-\rho} x_A v_t. \tag{28}$$

If the gross real interest rate r is a number like 1.03, then when ρ falls from 1 to 0.97, the consumption response *halves* – the denominator in Eq. (28) goes from 0.03 to 0.06. At $\rho = 0.91$, the consumption response is one-fourth as large.²⁹ Endogenizing investment amplifies this difference (since the response of investment declines as ρ falls). Because the consumption response to an income shock drops sharply as ρ falls, the current response is likely to be similarly muted.

²⁸These joint estimates were obtained with the RATS SUR command. To adjust for cross-equation heteroskedasticity, each equation was scaled by the standard error of the corresponding OLS regression.

 $^{^{29}}$ For discussion of income persistence and its implications for consumption volatility, see Deaton (1992). Mankiw and Shapiro (1985) also stress the importance of stationarity in tests of the permanent income hypothesis.

Table 8 Individual-cou	intry time-serie	es regressions. 1961	90, $AI_1 = b_0 + b_1$	$AA_i^c + b_2 AA_i^c + b_1$	$_{I_{i-1}} + b_4 T$ and $_Z$	$\mathbf{ICA}_{\mathbf{t}} = b_0 + b_1 A_1^{\mathbf{t}} \cdot \mathbf{ICA}_1^{\mathbf{t}}$	$+ b_2 dA_1^{w} +$	$b_3 I_{i-1} + b_5 A_{i-1}$
Country	ŻĹ	<i>h</i> 1	<i>h</i> ;	b_3	$b_4 \times 10^2$	h,	R²	γ ²
U.S.	н Н.	0.22 (0.17) - 0.06 (0.07)	0.41 (0.11)** 0.01 (0.05)	- 0.17 (0.18) 0.13 (0.05)**	0.08 (0.09)	0.11 (0.07)*	0.53 0.32	0.88 (0.35)
Japan	.11 ЭСА	0.43 (0.07)** 0.13 (0.05)**	0.55 (0.12)** - 0.07 (0.09)	0.05 (0.06) - 0.07 (0.05)	0.12 (0.07)	0.15 (0.05)**	0.67 0.25	30.73 (0.00)**
Germany	.17 .3CA	0.47 (0.13)* * 0.20 40.12)*	0.52 (0.12)** 0.00 (0.11)	- 0.15 (0.11) 0.01 (0.08)	0.13 (0.04)**	0.20 (0.12)*	0.55 0.11	5.79 (0.02)**
Franco	л/ ЛСЭ	0.40 (0.18)** 0.11 (0.15)	0.39 (0.19)** 0.00 (0.15)	0.15 (0.15) 0.03 (0.11)	0.11 (0.05)**	0.08 (0.14)	0.34 0.00	3.31 (0.07)*
Italy	л ЛСэ	0.60 (0.09)** - 0.30 (0.10)**	0.28 (0.16)* - 0.05 (0.16)	- 0.16 (0.10) 0.09 (0.11)	0.15 (0.07)**	0.24 (0.11)**	0.66 0.27	20.74 (0.30)**
U.K.	л ЛСА	0.49 (0.10)** - 0.50 (0.10)**	0.64 (0.08)** - 0.19 (0.09)**	0.05 (0.08) - 0.03 (0.06)	0.01 (0.03)	0.48 (0.09)**	0.76 0.50	0.01 (0.93)
Canada	ACA ACA	0.43 (0.13)** - 0.21 (0.08)**	0.18 (0.16) 0.10 (0.09)	- 0.08 (0.14) 0.00 (0.05)	0.10 (0.11)	0.26 (0.07)**	0.28 0.28	4.24 (0.04)**
The dependen percent chang generalized lee Significance le the AI equation	t and independ e, of country-s ist squares with vels at 5 and 10 or equals min.	ent variables are the excific productivity is each equation scal percent are indicat is the coefficient of	e same as described are entered in the c ied by the standard ted by ** and *, res	t in the note to Table current account equertor of the curres pectively: χ^2 denote quation. with the n	e 3 with the different ation. For each co ponding OLS regre- ss chi-square statist	nce that the current untry, the two equa soion. Figures in pa is for the restriction is icvel in parenthe	t and lagged ations are es aren'neses at n that the co	levels, rather than timated jointly by e standard en crs. efficient on AA ⁶ in
41968-90.								

R. Glick, K. Rogoff / Journal of Monetary Economics 35 (1995) 159-192

183

Relative response of investment and the current account to productivity shocks as a function of ρ . $I = \beta_2 \epsilon_i$, $CA_r = \beta_2 \epsilon_i$, $\beta_2 = \eta \lambda \rho (1 - \lambda \rho)$, $\gamma_2 = \alpha_4 ((1 - \rho) (r - \rho)) + \beta_2 (\alpha_1 - 1) = ((r - 1)/(r - \rho))$ $> \beta_1 (((\alpha_1 - 1)(r - 1) + \alpha_k)/(r - \beta_1))$

p	β_2		$ \gamma_2 /\beta_2$
1.00	0.35	- 0.97	2.76
0.99	0.35	0.60	1.72
0.98	0.34	- 0.35	1.04
0.97	0.32	0.21	0.64
0.96	0.31	0.04	0.13
0.95	0.30	0.05	0.18

Parameter values:

 $x_r = -0.39, \quad x_h = 0.22, \quad x_h = 1.00, \quad \lambda = 0.72, \quad \beta_1 = 0.90, \quad \eta = 0.14, \quad r = 1.03$

The table reports the calculated effects of a given productivity innovation ε_i on the unanticipated levels of investment and the current account for varying degrees of productivity shock persistence as measured by ρ . The calculations are based on Shapiro (1986) values for x_1 , x_K , x_A , and λ . Since Shapiro's estimates were based on quarterly rates, annualized values were obtained by multiplying his value of x_K by 4 and by taking the fourth power of his estimate of λ , η was calibrated by equating the formula for β'_2 to 0.35, the point estimate from the pooled regression in Table 4, and assuming $\rho = 1$ and $\lambda = 0.72$. β_1 is taken from the pooled investment regression with country-specific time trends in Table 4.

Consumption is not the whole story since the investment response to a productivity account shock is also muted by a fall in ρ . Therefore, the preceding logic is not enough to show that

$$\hat{\mathbf{c}}(|\gamma_2|/\beta_2)/\hat{\mathbf{c}}\rho < 0. \tag{29}$$

We prove in Appendix 1, however, that (29) indeed holds and that $|\gamma'_2|/\beta'_2$ is monotonically decreasing in ρ for $\gamma'_2 < 0$, $0 < \rho < 1$.

Can slow convergence explain the apparent anomaly in Tables 3 and 8? In Table 9, we calculate implied values of β_2 and γ'_2 using estimates for the production function parameters in Eqs. (3) and (4) based on Shapiro (1986). (The parameters are listed in the table.) The unit e gives the value of $1\gamma'_2|/\beta_2$ corresponding to different values of ρ . For $\rho = 0.97$, the implied values of $\beta'_2 = 0.32$ and $\gamma'_2 = -0.21$ are very close to our pooled empirical estimates in Table 4. Thus the distinction between random walk and near random walk productivity may be central to explaining the small response of the current account.

5. Applying the model to explain the reduced form $\Delta CA - \Delta I$ correlations

Earlier in T: ble 1 we saw that there is a rather striking empirical regularity between changes in the current account and changes in investment. For the G-7

184

countries, the coefficient ΔI in the ΔCA regressions averaged around one-third (in absolute value). In this section we do some crude calculations to see if our simple intertemporal model based on productivity shocks is consistent with this regularity. For simplicity, it is helpful to focus on the random walk case ($\rho = 1$), and to further assume that $\beta_1 = 1$ (our point estimate in the pooled data in Table 4 was 0.90) and $\beta_2 = \beta_3$ (i.e., that global and country-specific shocks affect investment equally). One then can easily solve for the slope coefficient in the regression of ΔCA on ΔI :³⁰

$$U = \frac{\gamma_2}{\beta_2} \left(\frac{\sigma_{AA^*}^2}{\sigma_{AA^*}^2 + \sigma_{AA^*}^2} \right). \tag{30}$$

To implement (30), note that the pooled results in Table 4 provide an estimate of γ_2/β_2 roughly equal to -0.48. The ratio $\sigma_{AA'}^2/(\sigma_{AA'}^2 + \sigma_{AA'}^2)$ is 0.49 in our sample when averaged over the seven countries.³¹ Combining these two parameters, one obtains an estimate of b = -0.24. Thus, taking into account the fact that global shocks are roughly as important as local shocks – and only investment responds to global shocks – supplies half the explanation why the nonstructural coefficients in Table 1 are closer to -1/3 than to -1. The other half of the explanation lies in the estimate of $|\gamma_2|/\beta_2$, which instead of being greater than one is closer to 1/2. As we have argued, this estimate is quite plausible provided country-specific productivity shocks are not literally a random walk, so that there is some degree of long-run convergence.

6. Conclusions

Earlier attempts at empirical implementation of the intertemporal model of the current account have been limited to simulation or vector autoregression methods.³² The present paper introduces a tractable approach to structural estimation.³³ The ability to derive closed-form solutions helps clarify some

³⁰We have also assumed that AA^* is uncorrelated with AA^* , which holds exactly for a small country. ³¹The ratio $\sigma_{14^*}^2$ ($\sigma_{14^*}^2 + \sigma_{14^*}^2$) is as follows for the countries in our sample: U.S., 0.32; Canada, 0.56; Japan, 0.70; France, 0.42; Germany, 0.37; Italy, 0.63; U.K., 0.41.

³²Some examples of simulation studies include the open-economy real basiness cycles analyses of Backus, Kehee, and Kydland (1992). Baxter and Crucini (1992), Mendoza (1991). Stockman and Tesar (1994), and Tesar (1993). Ahmed, Ickes, Wang, and Yoo (1993) apply $\pm y$ at ψ in of the Blanchard Quah vector-autoregression methodology. It should be noted that in a world or complete goods and capital markets the current account and investment would move one for one in response to country-specific productivity shocks, regardless of their duration.

³³An insportant exception is Ahmed (1986), who focuses on the effects of permanent versus transitory government spending shocks. Ahmed's model, however, does not incorporate investment or productivity shocks.

interesting issues that may easily be obscured in simulation analysis or vector autoregression estimation. With the source of results less of a block box this class of models potentially becomes more useful for policy analysis.

Overall, our empirical model performs fairly well in explaining the stable correlation between investment and the current account, in differences, over the period 1961-1990. Investment consistently responds positively and significantly to both country-specific and global productivity shocks. The current account responds negatively and generally significantly to country-specific shocks; as the model predicts, there is little or no response to global shocks. The fact that investment responds by more than the current account to country-specific shocks would be a puzzle, if country-specific productivity shocks literally followed a random walk. But with even a small degree of mean reversion, the results can be fully explained. (Global shocks also tend to follow a near random walk, but since the current account impact is zero regardless, they do not present a similar puzzle.) Thus our empirical results may be construed as providing evidence that there is a significant convergent component to productivity across G-7 countries.

There are other possible explanations of the stylized fact we have established. Allowing for nontraded goods can reduce the relative response of the current account.³⁴ Even with perfectly integrated international capital markets, moral hazard problems at the microeconomic level can force home residents to self-finance a larger portion of domestic investment than they would under perfect information (see Gertler and Rogoff, 1990). It would be interesting to explore these issues in future research; hopefully the tractable empirical model presented here will provide a useful benchmark against which these alternatives may be compared.

Appendix 1: Derivations

A.I. Derivation of Eqs. (14) and (24) for AC

From Eq. (8),

$$\Delta C_t = \bar{y}_t - \mathbf{E}_{t-1}\bar{y}_t$$
, where $\bar{y}_t \equiv \left(\frac{r-1}{r}\right) \mathbf{E}_t \sum_{s=0}^r y_{t+s}/r^s$.

Denoting the revision of expectations operator $E_r - E_{r-1}$ by \sim , Eq. (3) implies that r/(r-1)AC equals

$$\sum_{s=0}^{r} \tilde{y}_{t+s} / r^{s} \equiv \sum_{s=0}^{r} (\tilde{Y}_{t+s} - \tilde{I}_{t+s}) / r^{s}$$

$$= \sum_{s=0}^{r} [(\alpha_{t} - 1) \tilde{I}_{t+s} + \alpha_{A} \tilde{A}_{t+s} + \alpha_{K} \tilde{K}_{t+s}] / r^{s}.$$
(A.1)

³⁴Stockman and Tesar (1994) introduce nontraded goods into an open-economy real business cycle model; see also Baxter and Crucini (1992) and Tesar (1993).

(In this appendix, we omit c superscripts on the A shocks for notational convenience.)

When $\rho = 1$, note that by Eqs (9) and (10)

$$\tilde{A}_{t+s} = \Lambda A_t, \qquad \forall s, \qquad (A.2)$$

and

$$\tilde{I}_{t+s} = \beta_2 \beta_1^s \Delta A_t, \quad \forall s.$$
(A.3)

By Eqs. (2), (A.2), and (A.3).

$$\tilde{K}_{t+s} = \sum_{i=0}^{s} \tilde{I}_{t+i-1} = (\beta_2/\beta_1) \Delta A_t \left[\left(\sum_{i=0}^{s} \beta_1^i \right) - 1 \right].$$
(A.4)

Eqs. (A.2) (A.4) imply

$$\sum_{s=0}^{r} \tilde{A}_{t+s}/r^{s} = \frac{r}{r-1} \Delta A_{t}, \qquad (A.5)$$

$$\sum_{s=0}^{r} \tilde{I}_{t+s}/r^{s} = \beta_{2} \left(\frac{r}{r-\beta_{1}}\right) \Delta A_{t}.$$
(A.6)

$$\sum_{s=0}^{4} \tilde{K}_{t+s}/r^{s} = \sum_{s=0}^{4} \sum_{i=0}^{s} \tilde{I}_{t+i-1}/r^{s} = \beta_{2} \left(\frac{r}{r-\beta_{1}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{r-1}\right) \Delta A_{i}.$$
 (A.7)

Substituting (A.5) (A.7) into (A.1) gives the reduced-form expression (14) for ΔC_t .

When $\rho < 1$, Eqs. (4) and (9) imply

$$I_{t} = \beta_{1}I_{t-1} + \eta \sum_{i=1}^{r} (\lambda \rho)^{i} \Delta A_{i} = \beta_{1}I_{t-1} + \beta_{2}^{r} \Delta A_{i}, \qquad (A.8)$$

where $\beta'_2 \equiv \eta \lambda \rho / (1 - \lambda \rho)$. Derivation of Eq. (22) for \tilde{I}_t and (26) for ΛI_t is immediate.

It follows from (9) and (A.8) that

$$\vec{A}_{t+s} = \rho^s \vec{A}_{ts}, \qquad \forall s, \qquad (A.9)$$

and

$$\tilde{I}_{t+s} = \beta_2' \sum_{j=0}^{s} \beta_1' A A_{t+s-j}, \quad \forall s,$$
(A.10)

where again by (9)

$$A\tilde{A}_{t+s} = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_t & \text{for } s = 0, \\ \rho^{s-1}(\rho - 1)\varepsilon_t & \text{for } s > 1. \end{cases}$$
(A.11)

By Eqs. (2), (A.10), and (A.11).

$$\tilde{K}_{l+s} = \sum_{i=0}^{s} \tilde{I}_{i+1+i} = \beta'_2 \sum_{i=0}^{s} \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta_1^j \Lambda \tilde{A}_{i+i-1-j}.$$
(A.12)

Eqs. (A.9)-(A.12) imply

$$\sum_{s=0}^{r} \tilde{A}_{t+s}/r^{s} = \sum_{s=0}^{x} \rho^{s} \varepsilon_{t}/r^{s} = \frac{r}{r-\rho} \varepsilon_{t}, \qquad (A.13)$$

$$\sum_{s=0}^{r} \tilde{I}_{t+s} r^{s} = \beta_{2}^{r} \sum_{s=0}^{r} \sum_{j=0}^{s} \beta_{1}^{j} \Delta \tilde{A}_{t+s-j} r^{s}$$
$$= \beta_{2}^{r} \left[\frac{r}{r-\beta_{1}} \right] \left[1 + \frac{\rho-1}{r-\rho} \right] \epsilon_{t}, \qquad (A.14)$$

$$\sum_{s=0}^{T} \tilde{K}_{t+s}/r^{s} = \beta_{2}' \sum_{s=0}^{T} \sum_{i=0}^{s} \sum_{j=0}^{i} \beta_{1}^{j} \Delta \tilde{A}_{t+i-1-j}/r^{s}$$
$$= \beta_{2}' \left[\frac{r}{r-\beta_{1}} \right] \left[\frac{1}{r-1} \right] \left[1 + \frac{\rho-1}{r-\rho} \right] \varepsilon_{t}.$$
(A.15)

Substituting (A.13)-(A.15) into (A.1) gives the reduced-form expression (24) for $\Delta C_t = \tilde{C}$.

A.2. Derivation of Eq. (27) for ΛCA

To derive expression (27) for $\Delta C.4$ note that

$$\Delta CA = C\widetilde{A}_{t} + E_{t-1}CA_{t} - CA_{t-1}$$

= $C\widetilde{A}_{t} + E_{t-1}(Y_{t} - I_{t} - C_{t}) - Y_{t-1} - I_{t-1}$
- $C_{t-1} + (r-1)CA_{t-1}.$ (A.16)

From (25),

$$\widetilde{CA}_t = \gamma_2' \varepsilon_t. \tag{A.17}$$

From (A.8) and (9),

$$\mathbf{E}_{t-1}I_t - I_{t-1} = \beta_1 I_{t-1} + \beta_2'(\rho - 1)A_{t-1} - I_{t-1}.$$
(A.18)

188

Using Eqs. (3) and (A.18),

$$E_{t-1}Y_{t} - Y_{t-1} = E_{t-1}[x_{t}I_{t} + x_{A}A_{t} + x_{K}K_{t}] - (x_{t}I_{t-1} + x_{A}A_{t-1} + x_{K}K_{t-1}] = x_{t}(E_{t-1}I_{t} - I_{t-1}) + x_{A}(E_{t-1}A_{t} - A_{t-1}) + x_{K}(E_{t-1}K_{t} - K_{t-1}) = (x_{t}\beta_{2}' + x_{A})(\rho - 1)A_{t-1} + [x_{t}(\beta_{1} - 1) + x_{K}]I_{t-1}, (A.19)$$

where we have used the fact that $E_{t-1}A_t - A_{t-1} = (\rho - 1)A_{t-1}$ and $E_{t-1}K_t - K_{t-1} = I_{t-1}$. Since $E_{t-1}C_t - C_{t-1} = 0$, substitution of (A.17)-(A.19) in (A.16) yields Eq. (27).

A.3. Proof that $\partial(|\gamma'_2|/\beta'_2)/\partial\rho > 0$

To evaluate $\hat{c}(|\gamma'_2|/\beta'_2)/\hat{c}\rho$, we first evaluate $\hat{c}\beta'_2/\hat{c}\rho$ and $\hat{c}|\gamma'_2|/\hat{c}\rho$. From the definitions of β'_2 and γ'_2 ,

$$\frac{\partial \beta'_2}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\eta \lambda}{(1-\rho\lambda)^2} > 0, \qquad (A.20)$$

$$\frac{\partial |\gamma'_2|}{\partial \rho} = -\alpha_A \frac{1-r}{(r-\rho)^2} - \frac{\partial \beta'_2}{\partial \rho} \left[\alpha_I - 1 - \frac{\phi(r-1)}{(r-\rho)(r-\beta_1)} \right]$$

$$+ \frac{\beta'_2 \phi(r-1)}{(r-\rho)^2 (r-\beta_1)} > 0, \qquad (A.21)$$

since $\phi \equiv (\alpha_1 - 1)(r - 1) + \alpha_K > 0$. [In (A.21), we evaluate in the region $\gamma'_2 < 0$.]

Differentiating $|\gamma'_2|/\beta'_2$ with respect to ρ gives

$$\frac{\partial |\gamma'_2|/\beta'_2}{\partial \rho} = \frac{1}{(\beta'_2)^2} \left[\beta'_2 \frac{\partial |\gamma'_2|}{\partial \rho} - |\gamma'_2| \frac{\partial \beta'_2}{\partial \rho} \right].$$
(A.22)

Substituting for $|\gamma'_2|$ with (25) and for $\hat{c} |\gamma'_2|/\hat{c}\rho$ with (A.21) yields

$$\frac{\hat{c}|\gamma'_2|/\beta'_2}{\hat{c}\rho} = \frac{1}{(\beta'_2)^2} \left[\beta'_2 \frac{\alpha_A(r-1)}{(r-\rho)^2} + \frac{\beta'_2 \phi(r-1)}{(r-\beta_1)(r-\rho)^2} + \alpha_A \frac{(1-\rho)}{r-\rho} \frac{\hat{c}\beta'_2}{\hat{c}\rho} \right] > 0.$$

Appendix 2: Data

Annual data for the years 1960–1990 for the current accounts of the balance of payments were obtained from International Financial Statistics (IFS), line 77a.d. Because the current accounts were expressed in dollars, they were converted to

local currencies using the average market exchange rates for the year (rf). Data on France's current account is available only from 1967, because of the absence of data on the transactions between metropolitan France and countries in the franc area in prior years.

Annual data on nominal investment, output, consumption, and government spending were obtained from the national accounts section of the IFS for each country. Investment was defined as the sum of gross fixed capital formation (line 93e) and changes in (inventory) stocks (line 93i). For the United States the investment total included government gross fixed capital formation (line 93 gf). Government spending was defined as government consumption (line 91f, or 91ff less 93gf in the case of the U.S.). Output was defined as GDP (line 99b) or when not available by GNP (line 99a).

All nominal aggregates were converted into real terms by the GDP or, where necessary, by the GNP deflator. The deflator was calculated as the ratio of real GDP (line 99b.r or 99b.p) or GNP (99a.r) to the corresponding nominal output aggregate.

To construct productivity, we used Bureau of Labor Statistics figures on manufacturing output and employment hours, as reported in 'International Comparisons of Manufacturing Productivity and Unit Labor Costs, 1990', Table 2 (BLS, U.S. Department of Labor, 91-406). We formed our basic measure of total factor productivity as the Solow residuals from Cobb-Douglas production functions, as described in the text, using the BLS data on manufacturing output and hours and the labor share figures of Stockman and Tesar (1994), and treating capital as following a constant trend

An alternative measure of total factor productivity in manufacturing for the years 1970-1985 controlling for capital inputs was constructed using data on output, employment, and the capital stock from the OECD international sectoral data base and the Stockman and Tesar labor share figures.

References

- Abel, A. and O. Blanchard, 1986, The present value of profits and cyclical movements in investment, Econometrica 54, 244-273.
- Ahmed, S., 1986, Temporary and permanent government spending in an open economy: Some evidence for the United Kingdom, Journal of Monetary Economics 17, 197-224.
- Ahmed, S., B. Ickes, P. Wang, and S. Yoo, 1993. International business cycles. American Economic Review 83, 335-359.
- Backus, D., P. Kehoe, and F. Kydłand, 1992, International real business cycles, Journal of Political Economy 100, 745–775.
- Barro, R. and X. Sala-i-Martin, 1990, World real interest rates, in: O. Blanchard and S. Fischer, eds., NBER macroeconomics annual 1990 (NBER/MIT Press, Cambridge, MA).
- Baxter, M. and M. Crucini, 1992, Business cycles and the asset structure of foreign trade, Discussion paper no. 59 (Institute for Empirical Macroeconomics, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, MN).

- Baxter, M. and M. Crucini, 1993, Explaining saving-investment correlations, American Economic Review 83, 416–436.
- Blanchard, O. and S. Fischer, 1989, Lectures on macroeconomics (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA).
- Christiano, L., 1992. Searching for a break in GNP, Journal of Business and Economic Statistics 10, 237-250.
- Deaton, A., 1992, Understanding consumption (Oxford University Press, Oxford).
- Englander, S. and A. Mittelstädt, 1988, Total factor productivity: Macroeconomic and structural aspects of the slowdown, OECD Economic Studies 10, 7–56.
- Evans, C. 1992, Productivity shocks and real business cycles, Journal of Monetary Economics 29, 191-208.
- Feldstein, M. and C. Horioka, 1980, Domestic savings and international capital flows, Economic Journal 90, 314-329.
- Frenkel, J. and A. Razin, 1987, Fiscal policies and the world economy (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA).
- Gertler, M. and K. Rogoff, 1990, North south lending and endogenous comestic capital market inefficiencies, Journal of Monetary Economics 26, 245-266.
- Glick, R. and K. Rogoff, 1992. Global versus country-specific productivity shocks and the current account, NBER working paper no. 4140.
- Griliches, Z., 1988, Productivity puzzles and R&D: Another nonexplanation, Journal of Economic Perspectives 2, 9–21.
- Hall, R., 1978, Stochastic implications of the life-cycle permanent income hypothesis: Theory and evidence, Journal of Political Economy 86, 971–987.
- Leiderman, L. and A. Razin, 1991, Determinants of external imbalances: The role of taxes, governmental spending and productivity, Journal of Japanese and International Economies 5, 421-450.
- Levin, A. and C. Lin, 1992. Unit root tests in panel data: Asymptotic and finite sample properties, Discussion paper no. 92-93 (Department of Economics, University of California, San Diego, CA).
- Mankiw. N. and M. Shapiro, 1985, Trands, random walks, and tests of the permanent income hypothesis. Journal of Monetary Economics 16, 165-174.
- Meese, R., 1980, Dynamic factor demand schedules for labor and capital under rational expectations, Journal of Econometrics 14, 141-158.
- Mendoza, E., 1991, Real business cycles in the small open economy, American Economic Review 81, 797-848.
- Meyer-zu-Schloch ern, F., 1988, An international sectoral data base for thirteen OECD countries, Working pape: no. 57 (Department of Economics and Statistics, OECD, Paris).
- Obstfeld, M., 1986, Capital mobility and the world economy: Theory and measurement, Carnegie Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy 24, 55-104.
- Penati, A. and M. Dooley, 1984, Current account imbalances and capital formation in industrial countries, 1949 81, IMF Staff Papers 31, 1-24.
- Quah, D., 1990, Permanent and transitory movements in labor income: An explanation for 'excess smoothness' in consumption, Journal of Political Economy 98, 449–475.
- Razin, A. and A. Rose, 1992, Business-cycle volatility and openness: An exploratory cross-section analysis, NBER working paper no. 4208.
- Revnolds, P., 1993, International comovements in aggregate productivity: An empirical analysis, Manuscript (Department of Finance and Business Economics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA).
- Roubini N., 1988, Current account and budget deficits in an intertemporal model of consumption and taxation smoothing: A solution to the 'Feldstein- Horioka puzzle'?, NBER working paper no. 2773.
- Sachs, J., 1981, The current account and macroeconomic adjustment in the 1970s, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 12, 201–268.

- Sachs, J., 1983. Aspects of the current account behavior of OECD countries, in: E. Classon and P. Salin, eds., kecent issues in the theory of flexible exchange rates (North-Holland, Amsterdam).
- Shapiro, M., 1986, Investment, output, and the cost of capital, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 17, no. 1, 111-152.
- Stock, J. and M. Watson, 1988, Variable trends in economic time series, Journal of Fconomic Perspectives 2, 147-174.
- Stockman, A. and L. Tesar, 1994, Tastes and technology in a two country model of the business cycle: Explaining international comovements, American Economic Review, forthcoming.
- Tesar, L., 1991. Savings, investment, and international capital flows, Journal of International Feonomics 31 55-78.
- Tesar, L., 1993, International risk-sharing and nontraded goods, Journal of International Economics 35, 69-89.