



---

THE ROLE OF MONETARY SHOCKS IN THE U.S.  
BUSINESS CYCLE

QAZI G.M. ZIAUL HAQUE (B. EC)  
SUPERVISOR: PROFESSOR MARK WEDER  
November 1, 2013

Thesis submitted in partial completion of the requirements for the degree of Honours in  
Economics

---

School of Economics

## DECLARATION

Except where appropriately acknowledged this thesis is my own work, has been expressed in my own words and has not previously been submitted for assessment.

Qazi G.M. Ziaul Haque  
November 1, 2013.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

First of all, I would like to take the privilege to thank my supervisor, Professor Mark Weder. His guidance and motivation has been invaluable in defining this journey. Second, I would also like to equally convey my gratitude to Dr. Jacob Wong for his guidance in the initial stage of my work and for further comments and advice along the way. Third, I am grateful to my family and also the staff in the School of Economics for all their advice and support. Lastly, I must also thank my Honours cohort for without their help and company this would not have been the year it was. Special thanks to Robert Garrard for helpful discussions.

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to illustrate how the basic Real Business Cycle (RBC) model can be modified to incorporate money in an attempt to construct monetary business cycle models of the U.S. economy. This is done for one case where money enters the model as direct lump-sum transfers to households and for the other case where money injections enter the economy through the financial system. Interestingly, the two channels generate very different responses to a money growth shock. In the first case, a positive money growth shock increases nominal interest rates and depresses economic activity, which is called the *anticipated inflation effect*. However, the popular consensus among economists is that nominal interest rates fall after a positive monetary shock. This motivates the construction of our second model where it is conjectured that the banking sector plays an important role in the monetary transmission mechanism and money is injected into the model through financial intermediaries. It is observed in this model that a positive monetary shock reduces interest rates and stimulates economic activity, which is called the *liquidity effect*. Furthermore, the statistics generated by the models show that monetary shocks have no effect on real variables when money enters as direct lump-sum transfers to households. On the contrary, such shocks have significant real impact when money enters through the financial system. Taken together, this implies that how money enters into the model significantly matters for the impact of monetary shocks and such shocks entering through financial intermediaries may be important in determining the cyclical fluctuations of the U.S. economy.

Keywords: Business cycle, money growth shock, monetary transmission mechanism, financial intermediaries, anticipated inflation effect, liquidity effect.

Word Count: 11995

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Literature review</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Data</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Stylized Facts of U.S. Business Cycles</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	The Hodrick-Prescott Filter . . . . .	8
4.2	Features of U.S. business cycles . . . . .	9
<b>5</b>	<b>Baseline Cash-in-Advance Model</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	The Structure . . . . .	12
5.2	The Full Model . . . . .	14
5.3	The Stationary State . . . . .	16
5.4	Calibration . . . . .	17
5.5	Impulse Responses for Cash-in-Advance Model . . . . .	20
5.5.1	Response to a technology shock . . . . .	21
5.5.2	Response to a money growth shock . . . . .	21
5.6	Assessing the baseline Cash-in-Advance Model . . . . .	24
<b>6</b>	<b>Working Capital Model</b>	<b>26</b>
6.1	The Structure . . . . .	26
6.1.1	Households . . . . .	26
6.1.2	Firms . . . . .	27
6.1.3	Financial Intermediaries . . . . .	27
6.1.4	Monetary Policy . . . . .	28
6.2	The Optimization Problem . . . . .	29
6.2.1	The Representative Household's Problem . . . . .	29
6.2.2	The Representative Firm's Problem . . . . .	30
6.3	The Competitive Equilibrium . . . . .	31
6.4	The Stationary State . . . . .	33
6.5	Impulse Responses for Working Capital Model . . . . .	36
6.5.1	Response to a technology shock . . . . .	36
6.5.2	Response to a money growth shock when $\eta = 0$ . . . . .	37
6.5.3	Response to a money growth shock when $\eta = 1$ . . . . .	37

6.6	Assessing the Working Capital Model when $\eta = 0$ . . . . .	40
6.7	Assessing the Working Capital Model when $\eta = 1$ . . . . .	43
<b>7</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>A</b>		
	<b>Tables</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>B</b>		
	<b>Figures</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>C</b>		
	<b>The Log Linearization</b>	<b>85</b>
	C.1 The Baseline Cash-in-Advance Model . . . . .	85
	C.1.1 Solving the Log-Linear System . . . . .	86
	C.2 The Working Capital Model . . . . .	88
	C.2.1 Solving the log-linear system . . . . .	89
<b>D</b>		
	<b>Data Sources</b>	<b>93</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

1	Output Construction (Y vs. C+I) . . . . .	7
2	HP filtering . . . . .	10
3	Response of cash-in-advance model to a technology shock . . . . .	22
4	Response of cash-in-advance model to a money growth shock . . . . .	23
5	Response of the working capital model to a money growth shock ( $\eta = 0$ ) .	38
6	Response of the working capital model to a money growth shock ( $\eta = 1$ ) .	39
7	Response of the working capital model to a technology shock ( $\eta = 0$ ) . . .	62
8	Response of the working capital model to a technology shock ( $\eta = 1$ ) . . .	63
9	Cyclical Comparisons . . . . .	64
10	Cash-in-Advance Model with only technology shock . . . . .	67
11	Cash-in-Advance Model with both technology and money growth shock .	70
12	Working Capital Model with only technology shock ( $\eta = 0$ ) . . . . .	73
13	Working Capital Model with both technology and money growth shock ( $\eta = 0$ ) . . . . .	76
14	Working Capital Model with only technology shock ( $\eta = 1$ ) . . . . .	79
15	Working Capital Model with both technology and money growth shock ( $\eta = 1$ ) . . . . .	82

## LIST OF TABLES

1	U.S. data . . . . .	11
2	Stationary state values of variables for the baseline cash-in-advance model	17
3	Parameter Values . . . . .	18
4	Summary Statistics: Actual data vs. Technology shock vs. Both shocks .	25
5	Stationary state values of variables for working capital model . . . . .	35
6	Summary Statistics ( $\eta = 0$ ): Actual data vs. Technology shock vs. Both shocks . . . . .	41
7	Summary Statistics ( $\eta = 1$ ): Actual data vs. Technology shock vs. Both shocks . . . . .	43
8	U.S. economy statistics . . . . .	52
9	Simulated statistics from cash-in-advance model with only technology shock and constant money growth . . . . .	53
10	Simulated statistics from cash-in-advance model with both technology and money growth shocks . . . . .	54
11	Simulated statistics from working capital model with only technology shock ( $\eta = 0$ ) . . . . .	55
12	Simulated statistics from working capital model with both technology and money growth shocks ( $\eta = 0$ ) . . . . .	56
13	Simulated statistics from working capital model with only money growth shock ( $\eta = 0$ ) . . . . .	57
14	Simulated statistics from working capital model with only technology shock ( $\eta = 1$ ) . . . . .	58
15	Simulated statistics from working capital model with both technology and money growth shocks ( $\eta = 1$ ) . . . . .	59
16	Simulated statistics from working capital model with only money growth shock ( $\eta = 1$ ) . . . . .	60