



FUNDAÇÃO
GETULIO VARGAS

EPGE

Escola de Pós-Graduação
em Economia

Ensaio Econômicos

Escola de

Pós Graduação

em Economia

da Fundação

Getulio Vargas

Nº 624

ISSN 0104-8910

***The Welfare Cost of Macroeconomic
Uncertainty in the Post–War Period***

***João Victor Issler, Afonso Arinos de Mello Franco,
Osmani Teixeira de Carvalho Guillén***

Setembro de 2006

**Os artigos publicados são de inteira responsabilidade de seus autores. As opiniões
neles emitidas não exprimem, necessariamente, o ponto de vista da Fundação
Getulio Vargas.**

The Welfare Cost of Macroeconomic Uncertainty in the Post-War Period*

João Victor Issler[†]
Graduate School of Economics - EPGE
Getulio Vargas Foundation
Praia de Botafogo 190 s. 1100
Rio de Janeiro, RJ 22253-900
Brazil

Afonso Arinos de Mello Franco
Graduate School of Economics - EPGE
Getulio Vargas Foundation
Praia de Botafogo 190 s. 1100
Rio de Janeiro, RJ 22253-900
Brazil

Osmani Teixeira de Carvalho Guillén
Banco Central do Brasil and IBMEC
Av. Presidente Vargas, 730 - Centro
Rio de Janeiro, RJ 20.071-001
Brazil

Keywords: Welfare costs of business cycles, Beveridge-Nelson decomposition.

JEL Codes: E32; C32; C53.

First Draft: December, 2005. Revised: September, 2006.

Abstract

With standard assumptions on preferences and a fully-fledged econometric model we computed the welfare costs of macroeconomic uncertainty for post-war U.S. using the Beveridge-Nelson decomposition. Welfare costs are about 0.9% per-capita consumption (\$175.00) and *marginal welfare costs* are about twice as large.

*We gratefully acknowledge the comments of an anonymous referee, Luís Braido, Larry Christiano, Wouter den Haan, Robert F. Engle, Daniel Ferreira, Pedro C. Ferreira, Antonio Fiorencio, Clive Granger, Soren Johansen, Rodolfo Manuelli, Samuel Pessoa and Octavio Tourinho on earlier versions of this paper. All remaining errors are ours. We thank CNPq-Brazil, PRONEX and CAPES for financial support. João Victor Issler thanks the hospitality of NYU-Stern, U. of Cergy-Pontoise, and of UCSD, where parts of this paper were written.

[†]Corresponding author. E-mail: jissler@fgv.br.

1. Introduction

Lucas (1987, 3) calculates the amount of extra consumption a rational consumer would require in order to be indifferent between the sequence of observed consumption under uncertainty and a cycle-free sequence with no uncertainty. For 1983 figures, using post-WWII data, extra consumption is about \$ 8.50 per person in the U.S. (or 0.04% of personal consumption per-capita), a surprisingly low amount. Subsequent work have either changed the environment of the problem or relaxed its basic assumptions. For example, Imrohoroglu (1989) recalculated welfare costs under incomplete markets. Obstfeld(1994), Van Wincoop(1994), Pemberton(1996), Dolmas(1998) and Tallarini(2000) have either changed preferences or relaxed expected utility maximization. Alvarez and Jermann(2004) have extended the initial framework proposed by Lucas to include what they have labelled the *marginal cost of business cycles*, where, in a more realistic exercise, observed consumption is compared with a convex combination of observed consumption and consumption with no uncertainty.

There are two points to note about previous research. First, the whole literature basically uses calibration-oriented methods, although the computation of welfare costs can be performed using econometric models. Second, in some of the subsequent papers, welfare costs reached up to 25% of per-capita consumption, a surprisingly high amount. As argued by Otrok(2001), “it is trivial to make the welfare cost of business cycle as large as one wants by simply choosing an appropriate form for preferences,” since, when time separability of the utility function is lost, consumers treat economic fluctuations as changes in growth rates.

We depart from the original exercise in Lucas and from the above literature in two different ways. First, we keep preferences as in the original exercise avoiding the critique by Otrok. Second, we base our welfare-cost computations on an fully-fledged econometric model. We employ the Beveridge and Nelson(1981) decomposition making the trend of the log of consumption to be a random walk¹, which is extracted considering the joint behavior of consumption and income, where the possibility of cointegration is entertained. A natural way to implement this is by using a cointegrated vector autoregressive (VAR) model.

Choosing consumption to be difference-stationary is consistent with the applied econometric literature on consumption, e.g., Hall(1978), Nelson and Plosser(1982), Campbell(1987), King et al.(1991), Cochrane(1994), Vahid and Engle(1997), Issler and Vahid(2001), Mulligan(2004), and it is also suggested by Lucas(1987, pp. 22-23). It is potentially interesting because the unconditional variance of (the log of) consumption will be infinite, which may lead to a high payoff for eliminating consumption variability. As noted by Obstfeld, using a stochastic-trend model can also reduce the variability of the cyclical component making it non-trivial to determine its impact on welfare costs.

¹Lucas(1987, pp. 22-23, footnote 1) explicitly considers the possibility that the trend in consumption is stochastic as in Nelson and Plosser(1982).

That would depend on the relative welfare-cost importance of short- versus long-term variability, which highlights the relevance of using a cointegrated VAR model. Finally, our econometric approach allows performing hypothesis testing on welfare costs. Since the latter are a non-linear function of VAR parameters, we apply the Delta Method to compute standard errors, testing whether welfare costs are statistically zero; see Duarte, Issler and Salvato(2005).

Sections 2 and 3 respectively provide the theoretical and statistical framework to compute welfare costs. Section 4 presents empirical results and Section 5 concludes.

2. The Problem

Lucas(1987) assumes that consumption (c_t) is *log-Normally* distributed about a deterministic trend:

$$c_t = \alpha_0 (1 + \alpha_1)^t \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\sigma_z^2\right) z_t,$$

where $\ln(z_t) \sim N(0, \sigma_z^2)$. Cycle-free consumption is defined as the sequence $\{c_t^*\}_{t=0}^\infty$, where $c_t^* = E(c_t) = \alpha_0 (1 + \alpha_1)^t$. Notice that c_t represents a mean-preserving spread of c_t^* . Lucas proposed measuring the welfare cost of business cycles λ as a solution to:

$$E\left(E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u((1 + \lambda) c_t)\right) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t^*), \quad (2.1)$$

where $E_t(\cdot)$ is the conditional expectation operator, β is the discount factor, and $u(\cdot)$ is the utility function.

Since Lucas modelled consumption trend as deterministic, eliminating *all the cyclical variability* in $\ln(c_t)$ is equivalent to eliminating *all* its variability. Under difference stationarity this equivalence is lost, since uncertainty comes both in the trend and the cyclical component of $\ln(c_t)$. Moreover, $E(c_t)$ is not defined, which led Obstfeld(1994) to propose using $E_0(\cdot)$ in defining welfare costs:

$$E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u((1 + \lambda) c_t) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(E_0(c_t)). \quad (2.2)$$

Now, λ is the welfare cost associated with all the uncertainty in consumption. For that reason, we label it the *welfare cost of macroeconomic uncertainty*.

Alvarez and Jermann(2004) propose offering the consumer a convex combination of $\{c_t^*\}_{t=0}^\infty$ and $\{c_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$: $(1 - \alpha) c_t + \alpha c_t^*$, where $c_t^* = E_0(c_t)$. They make the welfare cost to be a function of the weight α , $\lambda(\alpha)$, which solves:

$$E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u((1 + \lambda(\alpha)) c_t) = E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u((1 - \alpha) c_t + \alpha c_t^*). \quad (2.3)$$

In this setup $\lambda(0) = 0$, and λ , as defined by Lucas, is obtained as $\lambda = \lambda(1)$. They label $\lambda(1)$ as the *total cost of business cycles* and define the *marginal cost of business cycles*, obtained after differentiating (2.3) with respect to α as:

$$\lambda'(0) = \frac{E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} [\beta^t u'(c_t) \times E_0(c_t)]}{E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} [\beta^t u'(c_t) \times c_t]} - 1. \quad (2.4)$$

Using difference-stationary consumption, we maintain Lucas' assumption that the utility function is in the CES class and time separable, with relative risk-aversion coefficient ϕ :

$$u(c_t) = \frac{c_t^{1-\phi} - 1}{1-\phi}. \quad (2.5)$$

As shown in Beveridge and Nelson(1981), every difference-stationary process can be decomposed as the sum of a deterministic term, a random walk trend, and a stationary cycle (*ARMA* process):

$$\ln(c_t) = \ln(\alpha_0) + \ln(1 + \alpha_1) \cdot t - \frac{\omega_t^2}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^t \xi_i + \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} b_j \zeta_{t-j} \quad (2.6)$$

where $\ln[\alpha_0(1 + \alpha_1)^t \cdot \exp(-\omega_t^2/2)]$ is deterministic given past information, $\sum_{i=1}^t \xi_i$ is the pure random-walk trend component, $\sum_{j=0}^{t-1} b_j \zeta_{t-j}$ is the *MA*(∞) representation of the stationary part (cycle), and $\omega_t^2 = \sigma_{11} \cdot t + 2 \cdot \sigma_{12} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} b_j + \sigma_{22} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} b_j^2$ is the conditional variance of $\ln(c_t)$. The permanent and transitory shocks, ξ_t and ζ_t respectively, obey:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_t \\ \zeta_t \end{pmatrix} \sim IN \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{21} & \sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right), \quad (2.7)$$

i.e., shocks are Normal and independent across time but may be contemporaneously correlated if $\sigma_{12} \neq 0^2$.

If $\beta(1 + \alpha_1)^{1-\phi} \exp\left[-\frac{(1-\phi)\phi\sigma_{11}}{2}\right] < 1$ and $\beta(1 + \alpha_1)^{1-\phi} < 1$, the *total welfare cost of macroeconomic uncertainty* is:

$$\lambda(\beta, \phi) = \exp\left[\frac{\phi(2\tilde{\sigma}_{12} + \tilde{\sigma}_{22})}{2}\right] \left\{ \frac{\left(1 - \beta(1 + \alpha_1)^{1-\phi} \exp\left[-\frac{(1-\phi)\phi\sigma_{11}}{2}\right]\right)}{\left(1 - \beta(1 + \alpha_1)^{1-\phi}\right)} \right\}^{1/(1-\phi)} - 1, \quad (2.8)$$

if we replace $\sigma_{12} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} b_j$ and $\sigma_{22} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} b_j^2$ by their respective unconditional counterparts³, $\tilde{\sigma}_{12} = \sigma_{12} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_{22} = \sigma_{22} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j^2$. For the sake of simplicity, this is the way we chose to estimate $\lambda(\beta, \phi)$ in this

²In the scalar version of the Beveridge-Nelson representation ξ_t and ζ_t are perfectly correlated, which does not hold in general in a multivariate framework as ours.

³Notice that $\tilde{\sigma}_{12}, \tilde{\sigma}_{22} < \infty$ from wold's representation.

paper. The *marginal cost of macroeconomic uncertainty* $\frac{\partial \lambda(\alpha, \beta, \phi)}{\partial \alpha} \Big|_{\alpha=0} \equiv \lambda'(0, \beta, \phi)$ is:

$$\lambda'(0, \beta, \phi) = \frac{\exp(\phi(2\tilde{\sigma}_{12} + \tilde{\sigma}_{22})) \left[1 - \beta(1 + \alpha_1)^{1-\phi} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\phi(1-\phi)}{2}\sigma_{11}\right) \right]}{\left[1 - \beta(1 + \alpha_1)^{1-\phi} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{\phi(1+\phi)}{2}\sigma_{11}\right) \right]} - 1; \quad (2.9)$$

similar formulas apply when $\phi = 1$ in both cases.

Consumption non-stationarity leaves its imprint on welfare-cost formulas. Indeed, looking at convergence conditions for equations (2.8) and (2.9) shows a very different role for σ_{11} (variance of the permanent shock) than for $\tilde{\sigma}_{12}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_{22}$ (both related to transitory shocks). Although it would be interesting to isolate the effects of permanent and transitory shocks, computing their respective welfare-cost importance, this entails dealing with degenerate processes and performing counter-factual exercises in a much larger scale than done here, being the reason why we leave it for future research.

3. Reduced Form and Long-Run Constraints

Denote by $y_t = (\ln(c_t), \ln(I_t))'$ a 2×1 vector containing respectively the logarithms of consumption and disposable income per-capita. We assume that both series contain a unit-root and are possibly cointegrated as in $[-1, 1]'$ y_t because of the Permanent-Income Hypothesis (Campbell(1987)). A vector error-correction model ($VECM(p-1)$) is:

$$\Delta y_t = \Gamma_1 \Delta y_{t-1} + \dots + \Gamma_{p-1} \Delta y_{t-p+1} + \gamma [-1, 1]' y_{t-p} + \varepsilon_t. \quad (3.1)$$

Proietti(1997) shows how to extract trends and cycles from the elements in y_t using a state-space representation. Jumping to our results, system (3.1) is well described by a $VECM(1)$, with state-space form:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta y_{t+1} &= Z f_{t+1} \\ f_{t+1} &= T f_t + Z' \varepsilon_{t+1}, \text{ where,} \\ f_{t+1} &= \begin{bmatrix} \Delta y_{t+1} \\ \Delta y_t \\ \alpha' y_{t-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma_1 - \gamma \alpha' - \gamma \\ I_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha' & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Z = [\mathbf{I}_2 \ \mathbf{0} \ \mathbf{0}], \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

and α is the cointegrating vector. Labelling the random-walk trend and the cyclical component of y_t respectively by μ_t and ψ_t , the Beveridge and Nelson(1981) trends and cycles are:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_t &= -\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^l E_t [\Delta y_{t+i}] = -Z [I - T]^{-1} T f_t, \text{ and,} \\ \mu_t &= y_t - \psi_t. \end{aligned}$$

Apart from an irrelevant constant, the trend innovation in consumption ξ_t is simply $[1, 0] \times \Delta\mu_t$, because the trend is a random walk. Its variance σ_{11} equals $VAR([1, 0] \times \Delta\mu_t)$. Notice that:

$$\ln(c_t) - E_{t-1}(\ln(c_t)) = [1, 0] \times \varepsilon_t = \xi_t + \zeta_t,$$

identifies ζ_t up to an irrelevant constant using $[1, 0] \times (\varepsilon_t - \Delta\mu_t) = \zeta_t$, which allows computing σ_{12} and σ_{22} . A similar approach allows computing $\tilde{\sigma}_{12}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_{22}$ using the cycle in consumption.

Using the Delta Method we can compute the standard errors of the estimates of $\lambda(\cdot)$ and of $\lambda'(\cdot)$ in (2.8) and (2.9). We apply a standard Central-Limit Theorem for VAR estimates (e.g., Hamilton(1994)) coupled with the Delta Method to test the hypotheses that welfare costs are statistically zero; see Duarte, Issler and Salvato(2005).

4. Empirical Results

Annual data for U.S. consumption of non-durables and services, U.S. real GNP, and U.S. population, were obtained from DRI during 1947-2000. We fitted a bivariate VAR for the logs of consumption and income. Lag-length selection indicated a $VAR(2)$ containing a restricted time trend and an unrestricted constant; see Johansen(1991). Choosing one lag would have lead to serially correlated residuals. Cointegration test results (Johansen) show overwhelming evidence that income and consumption cointegrate using the *trace* and the λ_{\max} statistics. Further, testing that $[-1, 1]'$ is the cointegrating vector generated a p-value of 0.1089. Hence, we used a cointegrated VAR imposing $\alpha = [-1, 1]'$.

The total welfare cost of macroeconomic uncertainty are presented in Table 1; see also results using a linear trend and a Hodrick and Prescott(1997) filter to extract trends and cycles. For the Beveridge-Nelson decomposition they are about 0.9% of per-capita consumption, which amounts to \$175.77 per person in 2000 US\$. Although this is more than 20 times the benchmark value suggested by Lucas, it is still not very high. Compared to the linear time trend and the Hodrick and Prescott(1997) filter, we find that using the Beveridge-Nelson decomposition produces welfare costs three times bigger than those of the former and that the Hodrick-Prescott filter produces much smaller numbers matching those found by Lucas.

Table 2 presents estimates of the marginal welfare cost of macroeconomic uncertainty. They are about 1.9% of per-capita consumption using the Beveridge-Nelson decomposition – twice as big as total welfare costs. This result can be compared to those found by Alvarez and Jermann(2004). For the 1954-97 period, they find about 0.20% when an 8-year low-pass filter is used to extract cycles, about 0.30% when a one-sided filter is used, and about 0.77% and 1.40% when a geometric and a linear filter are used respectively. As we have argued in Section 2, we are computing the welfare costs of eliminating all consumption variation. Since the method used in Alvarez and Jermann

eliminates only uncertainty that occurs at business-cycle frequencies it is not surprising that our estimates are higher than theirs.

Using our estimates of standard errors of welfare costs presented in Tables 1 and 2, we conclude that welfare costs are not statistically zero. As far as we know, this is the first time that this hypothesis is actually tested using U.S. data.

One of the main contributions of this paper is to propose a proper and richer econometric model for non-stationary consumption in computing welfare costs. Therefore, it is interesting to compare our results in Tables 1 and 2 with those that would have been obtained considering a simpler model for non-stationary consumption. For example, Obstfeld(1994) and Tallarini(2000) model log consumption as a random walk with drift, while Dolmas(1998) models consumption growth about a constant mean as an $AR(1)$ process.

Using the utility function in equation (2.5), the models of Obstfeld and Tallarini and of Dolmas were re-estimated using our own data set. Welfare costs were then computed in both cases and results compared to those in Tables 1 and 2. The random-walk model of Obstfeld and Tallarini yields total welfare costs of macroeconomic uncertainty that are less than half of those obtained in Table 1. Moreover, as a rule, the difference between results is more than 20 times our estimate of the standard deviation of welfare costs, making it quantitatively large. When Dolmas' $AR(1)$ model is used, total welfare costs are about 55% of those obtained in Table 1. Again, differences are quantitatively large – about 15 times the standard deviation of total welfare costs. An almost identical pattern emerges when the same comparisons are made using the results of Table 2. Overall, it seems that using a proper econometric model for non-stationary consumption yields much higher welfare costs than previously found.

We can conjecture why we observe these increases in welfare costs. Here, a more elaborate model increases the dependence of the growth rate of consumption on the agent's information set. This can be illustrated when we move from the pure trend model of Obstfeld and Tallarini – with no cycle at all – to Dolmas' model, where the Beveridge-Nelson cyclical component is an $AR(1)$ process: $\frac{-\phi}{1-\phi} (\Delta \ln c_t - \mu)$, where ϕ is the first-order autoregressive coefficient in consumption growth and μ is its mean. The introduction of a cycle in this case serves to amplify the effects of macroeconomic uncertainty, increasing welfare costs. Indeed, we observe an increase in total welfare costs of at least 32% and in marginal welfare costs of at least 50% when we move from the random-walk model to the $AR(1)$ process in differences. By the same token, the multivariate model used in the paper ($VECM(1)$) has a much richer dynamics than the $AR(1)$ process used by Dolmas, which may explain the increase in welfare costs we have observed in our previous comparison.

5. Conclusions

Using only standard assumptions on preferences and an econometric approach for modelling consumption we computed the welfare costs of macroeconomic uncertainty for the post-WWII period using the Beveridge and Nelson(1981) decomposition. We found that the post-WWII era is a relatively quiet one, with total and marginal welfare costs being respectively about 0.9% and 1.9% of consumption. Although the benchmark values computed by Lucas are about 1/20 of our total-cost estimate, our basic conclusion is that deepening counter-cyclical policies is futile. Despite of these small welfare-cost values, we found them to be statistically significant.

The way we have proposed measuring welfare costs here can be interpreted as the cost of eliminating macroeconomic uncertainty. The challenge for future research is to find a suitable way of measuring welfare costs of business cycles when the trend function is credible and not deterministic. Notice that these remarks are similar to the closing remarks in Alvarez and Jermann(2004). If one accepts a permanent-transitory categorization for shocks, then a possible path is to use the Beveridge-Nelson decomposition for measuring the importance of these shocks separately. As we noted above, this is time- and space-consuming exercise, being the reason why we leave it for future research.

References

- Alvarez, F. and Jermann, U., 2004, "Using Asset Prices to Measure the Cost of Business Cycles," *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(6), pp. 1223-56.
- Beveridge, S. and Nelson, C.R., 1981, "A New Approach to Decomposition of Economic Time Series into a Permanent and Transitory Components with Particular Attention to Measurement of the 'Business Cycle'," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 7, 151-174.
- Campbell, J. 1987, "Does Saving Anticipate Declining Labor Income? An Alternative Test of the Permanent Income Hypothesis," *Econometrica*, vol. 55(6), pp. 1249-73.
- Cochrane, J.H., 1994, "Permanent and Transitory Components of GNP and Stock Prices," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 30, 241-265.
- Dolmas, J., 1998, "Risk Preferences and the Welfare Cost of Business Cycles", *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 1, 646-676.
- Duarte, A.M., Issler, J.V., and Salvato, M., 2004, "Are Business Cycles all Alike in Europe?," Mimeo., 2005, downloadable from <http://www.anpec.org.br/encontro2005/artigos/A05A031.pdf>.

- Hall, R.E., 1978, "Stochastic Implications of the Life Cycle-Permanent Income Hypothesis: Theory and Evidence," *Journal of Political Economy*, 86, pp. 971-987.
- Hamilton, 1994, "*Time Series Analysis.*" Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hodrick, R.J. and Prescott, E.C., 1997, "Postwar U.S. Business Cycles: An Empirical Investigation," *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, 29, 116.
- Imrohorglu, Ayse, 1989, "Cost of Business Cycles With Indivisibilities and Liquidity Constraints", *Journal of Political Economy*, 97 (6) , 1364-1383.
- Issler, J.V. and Vahid, F., 2001, "Common Cycles and the Importance of Transitory Shocks to Macroeconomic Aggregates," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 47, 449-475.
- Johansen, S., 1991, "Estimation and Hypothesis Testing of Cointegrated Vectors in Gaussian Vector Autoregressions", *Econometrica*, vol. 59-6, pp. 1551-1580.
- King, R.G., Plosser, C.I., Stock, J.H. and Watson, M.W., 1991, "Stochastic Trends and Economic Fluctuations", *American Economics Review*, 81, 819-840.
- Lucas, R., 1987, "*Models of Business Cycles,*" Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mulligan, C., 2004, "Robust Aggregate Implications of Stochastic Discount Factor Volatility," Working Paper # w10210: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Nelson, C.R. and Plosser, C., 1982, "Trends and Random Walks in Macroeconomics Time Series," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 10, 1045-1066.
- Obstfeld, M., 1994, "Evaluating Risky Consumption Paths: The Role of Intertemporal Substitutability," *European Economic Review*, 38, 1471-1486.
- Otrok, C., 2001, "On Measuring the Welfare Cost of Business Cycles," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 47, 61-92.
- Pemberton, J., 1996, "Growth Trends, Cyclical Fluctuations, and Welfare with Non-Expected Utility Preferences," *Economic Letters*, 50, 387-392.
- Proietti, T., 1997, "Short-run Dynamics in Cointegrated Systems", *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 59 (3), 405-422.
- Tallarini Jr., T.D., 2000, "Risk-sensitive Real Business Cycles", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 45, 507-532.

Vahid, F. and Engle, R.F., 1997, "Codependent Cycles," *Journal Econometrics*, vol. 80, pp. 199-121.

Van Wincoop, E., 1994, "Welfare Gains From International Risksharing", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 34, 175-200.

A. Tables

Table 1: Total Cost of Macroeconomic Uncertainty %

Standard Errors in Parenthesis

(a) Lucas Benchmark Values

β Equivalent in a Yearly Basis	$\phi = 1$	$\phi = 5$	$\phi = 10$	$\phi = 20$
$\beta = 0.950, 0.971, 0.985$	0.008	0.042	0.08	0.17

(b) Beveridge-Nelson Decomposition 1947-2000

β Equivalent in a Yearly Basis	$\phi = 1$	$\phi = 5$	$\phi = 10$	$\phi = 20$
$\beta = 0.950$	0.45	0.76	0.79	0.74
	(0.012)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.019)
$\beta = 0.971$	0.80	0.92	0.89	0.79
	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.021)
$\beta = 0.985$	1.59	1.06	0.96	0.83
.	(0.043)	(0.028)	(0.025)	(0.022)

(c) Hodrick-Prescott Filter 1947-2000

β Equivalent in a Yearly Basis	$\phi = 1$	$\phi = 5$	$\phi = 10$	$\phi = 20$
$\beta = 0.950, 0.971, 0.985$	0.01	0.04	0.08	0.16
.	(0.0002)	(0.0011)	(0.0022)	(0.0043)

(d) Linear Time Trend 1947-2000

β Equivalent in a Yearly Basis	$\phi = 1$	$\phi = 5$	$\phi = 10$	$\phi = 20$
$\beta = 0.950, 0.971, 0.985$	0.05	0.27	0.54	1.08
.	(0.001)	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.029)

Notes: (1) Panel (a) is extracted from Lucas(1987). (2) Panel (b) is a direct application of equation (2.8) under difference stationary log consumption. (3) For constructing Panels (c) and (d) we assumed that $c_t = \alpha_0 (1 + \alpha_1)^t \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\sigma_z^2) z_t$, where the trend in consumption is $c_t^* = E(c_t) = \alpha_0 (1 + \alpha_1)^t$, and $\ln(z_t) \sim N(0, \sigma_z^2)$. For Panel (c), $\ln(\widehat{1 + \alpha_1})$ is the estimated growth rate of HP-filtered log consumption. For Panel (d) $\ln(\widehat{1 + \alpha_1})$ is the estimated growth rate of log consumption. With this structure, we employed equation (2.1) to compute total welfare costs.

Table 2: Marginal Cost of Macroeconomic Uncertainty %
Standard Errors in Parenthesis

(a) Lucas Benchmark Values				
β Equivalent in a Yearly Basis	$\phi = 1$	$\phi = 5$	$\phi = 10$	$\phi = 20$
$\beta = 0.950, 0.971, 0.985$	0.008	0.042	0.08	0.17
(b) Beveridge-Nelson Decomposition 1947-2000				
β Equivalent in a Yearly Basis	$\phi = 1$	$\phi = 5$	$\phi = 10$	$\phi = 20$
$\beta = 0.950$	0.91 (0.024)	1.58 (0.042)	1.70 (0.047)	1.75 (0.055)
$\beta = 0.971$	1.63 (0.044)	1.92 (0.052)	1.92 (0.054)	1.90 (0.060)
$\beta = 0.985$	3.26 (0.091)	2.22 (0.061)	2.08 (0.059)	2.00 (0.064)
.				
(c) Hodrick-Prescott Filter 1947-2000				
β Equivalent in a Yearly Basis	$\phi = 1$	$\phi = 5$	$\phi = 10$	$\phi = 20$
$\beta = 0.950, 0.971, 0.985$	0.02 (0.0004)	0.08 (0.002)	0.16 (0.004)	0.32 (0.009)
.				
(d) Linear Time Trend 1947-2000				
β Equivalent in a Yearly Basis	$\phi = 1$	$\phi = 5$	$\phi = 10$	$\phi = 20$
$\beta = 0.950, 0.971, 0.985$	0.11 (0.003)	0.54 (0.014)	1.08 (0.029)	2.18 (0.059)
.				

Notes: (1) Panel (a) is extracted from Lucas(1987). (2) Panel (b) is a direct application of equation (2.9) under difference stationary log consumption. (3) For constructing Panels (c) and (d) we assumed that $c_t = \alpha_0 (1 + \alpha_1)^t \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\sigma_z^2) z_t$, where the trend in consumption is $c_t^* = E(c_t) = \alpha_0 (1 + \alpha_1)^t$, and $\ln(z_t) \sim N(0, \sigma_z^2)$. For Panel (c), $\ln(\widehat{1 + \alpha_1})$ is the estimated growth rate of HP-filtered log consumption. For Panel (d) $\ln(\widetilde{1 + \alpha_1})$ is the estimated growth rate of log consumption. With this structure, we employed equation (2.4) to compute marginal welfare costs.

Últimos Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE

- [599] Aloisio Pessoa de Araújo e Bruno Funchal. *Past and Future of the Bankruptcy Law in Brazil and Latin America*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 599, EPGE-FGV, Ago 2005.
- [600] Marco Antonio Cesar Bonomo e Carlos Carvalho. *Imperfectly Credible Disinflation under Endogenous Time-Dependent Pricing*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 600, EPGE-FGV, Ago 2005.
- [601] Pedro Cavalcanti Gomes Ferreira. *Sobre a Inexistente Relação entre Política Industrial e Comércio Exterior*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 601, EPGE-FGV, Set 2005.
- [602] Luiz Renato Regis de Oliveira Lima, Raquel Sampaio, e Wagner Gaglianone. *Limite de Endividamento e Sustentabilidade Fiscal no Brasil: Uma abordagem via modelo Quantílico Auto-Regressivo (QAR)*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 602, EPGE-FGV, Out 2005.
- [603] Ricardo de Oliveira Cavalcanti e Ed Nosal. *Some Benefits of Cyclical Monetary Policy*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 603, EPGE-FGV, Out 2005.
- [604] Pedro Cavalcanti Gomes Ferreira e Leandro Gonçalves do Nascimento. *Welfare and Growth Effects of Alternative Fiscal Rules for Infrastructure Investment in Brazil*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 604, EPGE-FGV, Nov 2005.
- [605] João Victor Issler, Afonso Arinos de Mello Franco, e Osmani Teixeira de Carvalho Guillén. *The Welfare Cost of Macroeconomic Uncertainty in the Post-War Period*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 605, EPGE-FGV, Dez 2005.
- [606] Marcelo Côrtes Neri, Luisa Carvalhaes, e Alessandra Pieroni. *Inclusão Digital e Redistribuição Privada*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 606, EPGE-FGV, Dez 2005.
- [607] Marcelo Côrtes Neri e Rodrigo Leandro de Moura. *La institucionalidad del salario mínimo en Brasil*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 607, EPGE-FGV, Dez 2005.
- [608] Marcelo Côrtes Neri e André Luiz Medrado. *Experimentando Microcrédito: Uma Análise do Impacto do CrediAMIGO sobre Acesso a Crédito*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 608, EPGE-FGV, Dez 2005.
- [609] Samuel de Abreu Pessôa. *Perspectivas de Crescimento no Longo Prazo para o Brasil: Questões em Aberto*. Ensaio Econômicos da EPGE 609, EPGE-FGV, Jan 2006.

- [610] Renato Galvão Flôres Junior e Masakazu Watanuki. *Integration Options for Mercosul – An Investigation Using the AMIDA Model*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 610, EPGE–FGV, Jan 2006.
- [611] Rubens Penha Cysne. *Income Inequality in a Job–Search Model With Heterogeneous Discount Factors (Revised Version, Forthcoming 2006, Revista Economia)*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 611, EPGE–FGV, Jan 2006.
- [612] Rubens Penha Cysne. *An Intra–Household Approach to the Welfare Costs of Inflation (Revised Version, Forthcoming 2006, Estudos Econômicos)*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 612, EPGE–FGV, Jan 2006.
- [613] Pedro Cavalcanti Gomes Ferreira e Carlos Hamilton Vasconcelos Araújo. *On the Economic and Fiscal Effects of Infrastructure Investment in Brazil*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 613, EPGE–FGV, Mar 2006.
- [614] Aloisio Pessoa de Araújo, Mario R. Páscoa, e Juan Pablo Torres-Martínez. *Bubbles, Collateral and Monetary Equilibrium*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 614, EPGE–FGV, Abr 2006.
- [615] Aloisio Pessoa de Araújo e Bruno Funchal. *How much debtors’ punishment?*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 615, EPGE–FGV, Mai 2006.
- [616] Paulo Klinger Monteiro. *First–Price Auction Symmetric Equilibria with a General Distribution*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 616, EPGE–FGV, Mai 2006.
- [617] Renato Galvão Flôres Junior e Masakazu Watanuki. *Is China a Northern Partner to Mercosul?*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 617, EPGE–FGV, Jun 2006.
- [618] Renato Galvão Flôres Junior, Maria Paula Fontoura, e Rogério Guerra Santos. *Foreign direct investment spillovers in Portugal: additional lessons from a country study*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 618, EPGE–FGV, Jun 2006.
- [619] Ricardo de Oliveira Cavalcanti e Neil Wallace. *New models of old(?) payment questions*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 619, EPGE–FGV, Set 2006.
- [620] Pedro Cavalcanti Gomes Ferreira, Samuel de Abreu Pessôa, e Fernando A. Veloso. *The Evolution of TFP in Latin America*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 620, EPGE–FGV, Set 2006.
- [621] Paulo Klinger Monteiro e Frank H. Page Jr. *Resultados uniformemente seguros e equilíbrio de Nash em jogos compactos*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 621, EPGE–FGV, Set 2006.
- [622] Renato Galvão Flôres Junior. *DOIS ENSAIOS SOBRE DIVERSIDADE CULTURAL E O COMÉRCIO DE SERVIÇOS*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 622, EPGE–FGV, Set 2006.
- [623] Paulo Klinger Monteiro, Frank H. Page Jr., e Benar Fux Svaiter. *Exclusão e multidimensionalidade de tipos em leilões ótimos*. Ensaios Econômicos da EPGE 623, EPGE–FGV, Set 2006.