

Firm entry, inflation and the monetary transmission mechanism



Working Paper Research

by Vivien Lewis and Céline Poilly

February 2011 **No 211**

Editorial Director

Jan Smets, Member of the Board of Directors of the National Bank of Belgium

Statement of purpose:

The purpose of these working papers is to promote the circulation of research results (Research Series) and analytical studies (Documents Series) made within the National Bank of Belgium or presented by external economists in seminars, conferences and conventions organised by the Bank. The aim is therefore to provide a platform for discussion. The opinions expressed are strictly those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bank of Belgium.

Orders

For orders and information on subscriptions and reductions: National Bank of Belgium,
Documentation - Publications service, boulevard de Berlaimont 14, 1000 Brussels.

Tel +32 2 221 20 33 - Fax +32 2 21 30 42

The Working Papers are available on the website of the Bank: <http://www.nbb.be>.

© National Bank of Belgium, Brussels

All rights reserved.

Reproduction for educational and non-commercial purposes is permitted provided that the source is acknowledged.

ISSN: 1375-680X (print)

ISSN: 1784-2476 (online)

Abstract

This paper estimates a business cycle model with endogenous firm entry by matching impulse responses to a monetary policy shock in US data. Our VAR includes net business formation, profits and markups. We evaluate two channels through which entry may influence the monetary transmission process. Through the competition effect, the arrival of new entrants makes the demand for existing goods more elastic, and thus lowers desired markups and prices. Through the variety effect, increased firm and product entry raises consumption utility and thereby lowers the cost of living. This implies higher markups and, through the New Keynesian Phillips Curve, lower inflation. While the proposed model does a good job at matching the observed dynamics, it generates insufficient volatility of markups and profits. Estimates of standard parameters are largely unaffected by the introduction of firm entry. Our results lend support to the variety effect; however, we find no evidence for the competition effect.

Key Words: entry, inflation, monetary transmission, monetary policy, extensive margin.

JEL Classification: E32, E52.

Corresponding author:

Vivien Lewis, Postdoctoral Fellow of the Fund for Scientific Research - Flanders (FWO). Institute for Monetary and Financial Stability (Department of Money and Macroeconomics), Goethe University Frankfurt, House of Finance, Grüneburgplatz 1, 60629 Frankfurt am Main, Germany.
vivien.lewis@ugent.be, <http://sites.google.com/site/vivienjlewis>.

Céline Poilly, Université catholique de Louvain, Department of Economics, Place Montesquieu 3, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.
celine.poilly@uclouvain.be, <http://perso.uclouvain.be/celine.poilly>.

Thanks to Florin Bilbiie, Martina Cecioni, Andrea Colciago, Grégory de Walque, Fabio Ghironi, Gert Peersman and Raf Wouters for very useful comments and discussions. We also are grateful to participants at the Canadian Economic Association Meeting 2010, the CEF conference 2010, and the European Economic Association Conference 2010, the National Bank of Belgium (NBB), Goethe University Frankfurt, the University of Milan-Bicocca. Part of this research was undertaken while Lewis was working at the NBB, whose hospitality is gratefully acknowledged.

The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of the National Bank of Belgium. All remaining errors are the authors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction..... | 1 |
| 2. SVAR Evidence | 2 |
| 3. Model..... | 4 |
| 3.1 Firms | 6 |
| 3.2 Households..... | 9 |
| 3.3 Market Clearing..... | 11 |
| 3.4. Monetary Policy | 12 |
| 4. Estimation Method..... | 12 |
| 4.1 Calibration..... | 12 |
| 4.2 Minimum Distance Estimation | 13 |
| 5. Results..... | 14 |
| 5.1 Overall Model Performance | 14 |
| 5.2 Parameter Estimates | 15 |
| 5.3 Love of Variety and Competition Effect | 18 |
| 5.4 Counterfactual Exercises..... | 19 |
| 6. Conclusion..... | 21 |
| References | 22 |
| Appendix 1: Markup Measure | 24 |
| Appendix 2: DSGE Model without Entry..... | 25 |
| Tables..... | 26 |
| Figures..... | 31 |
| National Bank of Belgium - Working papers series..... | 35 |

1 Introduction

This paper investigates how the extensive margin alters the monetary transmission mechanism by estimating a dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) model with endogenous firm entry.

Recent work on business cycle analysis puts forward firm and product turnover as an important factor affecting the transmission of shocks, see for example Bilbiie et al (2007) and Bergin and Corsetti (2008). This research has been mainly theoretical up to now, creating a need for empirical model validation. We contribute to filling this gap by answering three questions. First, how well does the model replicate the dynamics of profits, markups and entry? These variables are typically ignored by standard DSGE models. Second, how does endogenous entry affect the relative importance of different frictions in the transmission of monetary policy shocks? Bilbiie et al (2007) suggest that the stock of firms, through its sluggish adjustment to shocks, is a source of endogenous propagation that increases inflation persistence, thereby reducing the importance of price rigidities. Finally, we evaluate two channels through which entry might dampen inflation: the competition effect and the love of variety hypothesis. We explain these two effects in turn.

First, when there are only few producers in an industry, the arrival of a new entrant can lead to stronger competition, which reduces the price markups that firms are able to charge. This ‘competition effect’ of entry has been documented in the industrial organisation literature by Campbell and Hopenhayn (2005). It improves the capacity of business cycle models to replicate the unconditional moments of markups and profits, see Colciago and Etno (2010). Standard models predict that desired markups - the difference between prices and marginal costs in the absence of price rigidities - are constant. In contrast, the competition effect introduces variations in desired markups which are positively related to inflation. Cecioni (2010) shows that a rise in the number of firms significantly lowers US inflation.

Second, if consumer preferences display ‘love of variety’, this implies that a larger range of available products raises utility. Assuming that each entrant introduces a new differentiated good into the market, firm entry is associated with a more diverse consumption bundle. Consequently, a cost-of-living index that takes proper account of the variety effect, by tracking the composition of the consumption basket, should fall. If the prices of individual goods are unchanged while the price index falls, markups and profits increase. Under price stickiness, the markup and inflation are negatively related through the New Keynesian Phillips Curve. Thus, the variety effect implies that an increase in the number of firms has a negative effect on inflation. The Dixit and Stiglitz

(1977) preference specification adopted by the vast majority of business cycle models displays love of variety. In addition, Broda and Weinstein (2010) present scanner data evidence suggesting that the variety effect gives rise to a significant bias in the US price index.

Using US data, we estimate a structural VAR with net business formation, markups and real profits in addition to a set of standard macroeconomic variables (real GDP, real investment, real consumption, wage inflation, price inflation, and the interest rate). We identify a monetary policy shock using a conventional recursive method. The resulting impulse response functions are presented in Section 2.

We then develop a medium-sized DSGE model with endogenous entry that we subsequently confront with the data. The model extends Bilbiie et al (2007) to include wage rigidities, physical capital investment, indexation of prices and wages, investment adjustment costs, variable capital utilisation, working capital and habit persistence. Section 3 lays out the linearised model.

As explained in Section 4, we estimate the model using a minimum distance estimation (MDE) approach. More specifically, we search for the parameter values that minimise the distance between the model-based and the VAR-based impulse responses functions. Our exercise is comparable to Christiano et al (2005).

In Section 5, we discuss the estimation results. First, we evaluate the performance of the model at replicating the VAR impulse responses, in particular of net business formation, profits and markups. Second, we assess whether and how our parameter estimates are modified by the introduction of entry in the model. To do so, we compare our estimation results to an estimated model without entry. Third, we evaluate the two channels of how entry affects inflation: the love of variety effect and the competition effect. Finally, we report the results of various counterfactual exercises.

Our findings, summarised in Section 6, are the following. The model does a very good job at matching the empirical responses of all variables to monetary policy shocks. However, a substantial part of the volatility of markups and profits remains unexplained. The introduction of firm entry does not significantly alter the estimates of standard model parameters. Our results support the love of variety hypothesis, but not the competition effect.

2 SVAR Evidence

This section presents evidence on the responses of macroeconomic aggregates to a contractionary monetary policy shock. During the MDE procedure, these impulse response functions (IRFs) correspond to the empirical moments the model has to replicate. The recursively identified structural

VAR (SVAR) includes the following variables: real GDP, real investment, real consumption, wage inflation, price inflation, net business formation, corporate profits, markups, commodity prices and the nominal interest rate. Our model-consistent markup measure is inversely related to the labour share.¹ The purpose of using commodity prices in the regression is to mitigate the price puzzle by which inflation rises at first in response to a monetary contraction.² Let us define the data vector x_t ,

$$x_t = \begin{bmatrix} \ln(RGDP_t) \\ \ln(RFPI_t) \\ \ln(RPCE_t) \\ WINFL_t \\ PINFL_t \\ \ln(NBF_t) \\ \ln(RPROFITS_t) \\ \ln(MARKUP_t) \\ \ln(CRB_t) \\ FEDFUNDS_t \end{bmatrix}.$$

The data series are listed in Table 1. A detailed description of the data sources is provided in Table 2. The SVAR model is estimated using US quarterly data over the period 1954Q4-1995Q2. The sample is not updated due to a lack of more recent data on net business formation. All the variables are linearly detrended. First, we estimate the following canonical VAR(p) model

$$x_t = \Omega_1 x_{t-1} + \dots + \Omega_p x_{t-p} + \varepsilon_t,$$

where x_t is an ($n \times 1$) data vector with $n = 10$, p is the maximum lag (set to $p = 4$) and $\varepsilon_t \sim \text{iid}(0, \Sigma)$, where Σ is a symmetric positive definite matrix. Second, we identify monetary policy shocks. The relation between the reduced form residuals ε_t and the structural innovations η_t can be expressed by the linear combination

$$A\varepsilon_t = \eta_t,$$

where A is a nonsingular matrix. We adopt a recursive identification strategy by which all variables are included in the information set of the monetary authority and react to a monetary policy shock with a one-period lag. This implies that A is lower triangular.

The empirical ($n \times 1$) vector of IRFs of the variables to a monetary policy shock j periods ago, denoted by Φ_j , are

$$\Phi_j = \frac{\partial x_{t+j}}{\partial \eta_t^R},$$

¹See Appendix 1 for details.

²Their dynamics are not reported here since they are not included in the model's estimation process.

where η_t^R is the structural innovation corresponding to the line associated with the Federal Funds rate and Φ is defined as

$$\Phi = \text{vec}(\Phi_0, \dots, \Phi_h),$$

where the $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ operator transforms an $(n \times m)$ matrix into an $(nm \times 1)$ vector by stacking the columns of the original matrix and h is the final horizon set to $h = 20$ quarters.³ Let $\hat{\Phi}_T$ denote the empirical estimate of Φ , resulting from the estimated VAR model where T is the sample size.

[insert Figure 1 here]

Figure 1 exhibits the estimated IRFs to a contractionary one-standard-deviation monetary policy shock. The observed dynamics of most variables are well-known. After an initial hike, the interest rate declines gradually, reaching steady state after about two years. Wage and price inflation are characterised by a negative hump-shaped response, reaching their lowest point only after the interest rate is back to its pre-shock level. Capital investment, consumption and output also fall gradually before returning to steady state in a hump-shaped fashion, though displaying less persistence than wage and price inflation. Capital investment decreases more than output, which in turn falls more than consumption. Regarding the extensive margin, we observe that the response of net firm entry is similar in shape and magnitude to that of capital investment. This is in line with Bergin and Corsetti (2008), Uusküla (2008) and Lewis (2009). Real profits also feature a downward hump-shaped pattern that is significant over two years. The response of markups, despite not being very accurately estimated, appears to be procyclical on impact and countercyclical over medium horizons. In the following, we develop a DSGE model with the goal of accounting quantitatively for the observed dynamics.

3 Model

Our starting point is the model of Bilbiie et al (2007), BGM hereafter, which features endogenous entry of firms subject to a fixed labour requirement, a constant firm exit rate, and sticky prices à la Rotemberg (1982).

In our model, firm entry affects inflation in two ways. First, an increase in the number of differentiated products lowers the welfare-based price index through the so-called variety effect. When preferences display love of variety, a more diverse consumption bundle gives rise to higher utility

³The lines corresponding to predetermined variables for the monetary shock are zero in vector Φ_0 . Thus, they are removed from vector Φ before estimation.

and therefore it costs less to attain a given welfare level. Holding nominal product prices constant, markups rise. Since markups and inflation are negatively related under price stickiness, the variety effect implies that entry dampens inflation. Second, as in Floetotto and Jaimovich (2008), we allow for strategic interactions between firms, resulting in a goods price markup that depends negatively on the number of competitors.⁴ This so-called competition effect, combined with pro-cyclical entry, makes markups countercyclical, which could help to capture the medium-run markup movement observed in Figure 1. In the industrial organisation literature, there is evidence of such a relationship, see Campbell and Hopenhayn (2005). Higher competitive pressure and lower desired markups due to entry reduce inflation. Cecioni (2010) finds evidence for such an effect in US data. The estimation procedure will help us to test the relevance of these two effects in the transmission of monetary policy shocks.

We add several empirically motivated frictions to make the model estimable, in line with Christiano et al (2005). These are external habit persistence in consumption, monopolistic competition in labour markets and sticky wages, price and wage indexation, physical capital to produce firms and intermediate goods, adjustment costs in intensive and extensive margin investment, variable capital utilisation and working capital.

The equilibrium is symmetric such that all households and all firms are identical. In addition, the timing of events is consistent with the recursive identification scheme adopted in the previous section. This means that all the optimisation decisions of households and firms are made before the realisation of the monetary policy shock, except household decisions concerning assets. This specification implies that production, investment, consumption, prices, wages and firm entry decisions are predetermined with respect to the shock.⁵

Below, we lay out the model in linearised form.⁶ A hat above a variable denotes its deviation from the deterministic steady state. A variable without a hat or a time subscript denotes its steady state level.

⁴We do not adopt a translog preference specification as in BGM (2007), but note that such a model is observationally equivalent to ours.

⁵To be precise, all variables in t (except the interest rate) are chosen on the basis of information in period $t - 1$, including forward variables $E_t \{x_{t+1}\}$, where $E_t \{\cdot\}$ is the expectation operator conditional on information available at t .

⁶For a full derivation, see the model appendix available at <http://sites.google.com/site/vivienjlewis>.

3.1 Firms

There is a fixed range of industries of measure 1, indexed by $i \in [0, 1]$. Within each industry, there is a mass N_t of firms, each producing one differentiated intermediate good, indexed by $f \in [0, N_t]$. The firms' intermediate goods are bundled into an industry good according to a constant elasticity of substitution (CES) aggregator, with elasticity θ_f . The final good is a CES composite of the industry goods which have an elasticity of substitution θ_i .

Suppose for now that nominal rigidities are absent. We assume that each industry is an oligopolistic market. The number of firms is small, such that each firm takes into account the effect of its pricing decision on the industry price. The type- (i, f) firm takes as given the prices of other firms in the industry and the price levels of other industries. Strategic interactions between firms imply that the price elasticity of demand (multiplied by -1) is given by ⁷

$$\varepsilon_t^{yp} = \theta_f - (\theta_f - \theta_i) \frac{1}{N_t}. \quad (1)$$

Equation (1) shows that for $\theta_f > \theta_i$, the firms' price setting power is eroded by the arrival of new entrants, such that their desired markup falls. Recall that the desired markup is the markup that firms charge optimally when there are no price setting frictions. In a standard New Keynesian model, it is constant over time. Broda and Weinstein (2006) present evidence that empirically, goods are less substitutable across industries than within an industry, such that $\theta_f > \theta_i$ is a reasonable assumption. Consider the steady state markup,

$$\mu = \frac{\varepsilon^{yp}(N)}{\varepsilon^{yp}(N) - 1}.$$

For future reference, we define the elasticity of the steady state markup to the number of firms (multiplied by -1),

$$\eta = \frac{\partial \mu / \mu}{\partial N / N}.$$

The parameter η measures the competition effect of entry. If $\eta > 0$, more firms imply a lower markup in steady state. The competition effect vanishes if $\eta = 0$. As we shall see below, the competition effect has an impact on the model's short-run inflation dynamics.

Intermediate firms set prices as a markup $\hat{\mu}_t$ over marginal costs,

$$\hat{\rho}_t = \hat{\mu}_t + \hat{m}c_t, \quad (2)$$

⁷This expression is obtained by differentiating the demand for firm (i, f) 's goods with respect to its price and assuming symmetry across firms. See model appendix for details.

where \widehat{mc}_t denotes the real marginal cost and $\widehat{\rho}_t$ is the product price relative to the welfare-based price index, i.e. $\rho_t = p_t/P_t$. In a model with endogenous firm entry, the relative product price of an intermediate good, denoted by p_t , differs from the welfare-based consumer price index P_t when the latter incorporates the variety effect. More precisely, the real product price is related to the number of firms through

$$\widehat{\rho}_t = (\nu_v - 1) \widehat{N}_t, \quad (3)$$

where $\nu_v \geq 1$ captures the degree of ‘love of variety’ defined as the increase in consumption utility from spreading a certain amount of consumption over a greater number of differentiated products (see Bénassy, 1996; and the working paper version of Dixit and Stiglitz, 1977). This means that a rise in the range of available goods raises consumption utility more than proportionately. For example, $\nu_v = \frac{\theta_f}{\theta_f - 1}$ as in Dixit and Stiglitz (1977) implies a particular calibration for the love of variety. Then the relative product price is positively related to the number of firms; in this particular case, $\widehat{\rho}_t = \frac{1}{\theta_f - 1} \widehat{N}_t$. An autonomous increase in product diversity (driven, for example, by a country opening up to trade) results in a fall in the price index but does not change product prices. Instead, setting $\nu_v = 1$ as in Floetotto and Jaimovich (2008), eliminates the variety effect. This implies an aggregate production function that is linear in the number of intermediate goods. Then the nominal product price and the price index are equal, and thus $\widehat{\rho}_t = 0$.

Let us turn to the pricing decision of intermediate goods producers. As in Rotemberg (1982), we assume that a firm that wishes to change its price incurs an adjustment cost proportional to its real revenues. Price adjustment costs are higher, the higher is the parameter κ_p and the more the change in the firms’ nominal price diverges from the term $\lambda_p \widehat{\pi}_{p,t-1}^C + (1 - \lambda_p)$, where $\widehat{\pi}_{p,t}^C$ is the change in the welfare-based price index. Perfectly flexible prices are given by $\kappa_p = 0$. We introduce indexation as in Ravn et al (2010). When λ_p is equal to zero, there is no indexation to past inflation and we have the case of a purely forward-looking New Keynesian Phillips Curve. When $\lambda_p > 0$, the price adjustment cost is a function of the difference between the firms’ price change and a weighted average of past inflation (with weight λ_p) and steady state inflation, where the latter is equal to 1. For simplicity, we assume that entrants, too, face this price adjustment cost.⁸ Under these assumptions, the change in nominal product prices, denoted by $\widehat{\pi}_{p,t}$, is a positive function of its expected future value and a negative function of the markup $\widehat{\mu}_t$. With indexation, $\widehat{\pi}_{p,t}$ also depends on current and lagged welfare-based inflation.

⁸ Bilbiie et al (2007) show that the impulse responses to shocks change negligibly under the alternative assumption that entrants can change their price costlessly.

The New Keynesian Phillips Curve (NKPC) is therefore,

$$\widehat{\pi}_{p,t} - \lambda_p \widehat{\pi}_{p,t-1}^C = -\phi_p \left(\eta \widehat{N}_t + \widehat{\mu}_t \right) + \beta (1 - \delta_N) \text{E}_t \{ \widehat{\pi}_{p,t+1} - \lambda_p \widehat{\pi}_{p,t}^C \}, \quad (4)$$

where $\phi_p = (\varepsilon^{yp} - 1)/\kappa_p$ is its slope and the discount factor $\beta(1 - \delta_N)$ is the product of the households' subjective discount factor β and the firms' exogenous survival rate $(1 - \delta_N)$. The term $-\phi_p \eta \widehat{N}_t$ captures the competition effect, i.e. the negative effect of the number of firms on inflation through desired markups. Substituting the price setting equation (2) and price index (3) into the NKPC (4) to replace $\widehat{\mu}_t$, we have an alternative inflation equation,

$$\widehat{\pi}_{p,t} - \lambda_p \widehat{\pi}_{p,t-1}^C = -\phi_p \left([\eta + (\nu_v - 1)] \widehat{N}_t - \widehat{m}c_t \right) + \beta (1 - \delta_N) \text{E}_t \{ \widehat{\pi}_{p,t+1} - \lambda_p \widehat{\pi}_{p,t}^C \}. \quad (5)$$

Through the variety effect, the markup is no longer the inverse of real marginal costs, but also depends positively on the number of firms, see (2). This version of the NKPC shows that in the presence of love of variety ($\nu_v > 1$) or the competition effect ($\eta > 0$), inflation fluctuates inversely with the number of goods and firms. We test below whether these two effects are important in the transmission of monetary policy shocks.

Firm profits \widehat{d}_t depend positively on the markup, on the real product price and on intermediate firm output \widehat{y}_t ,

$$\widehat{d}_t = (\varepsilon^{yp} - 1) \widehat{\mu}_t + \widehat{\rho}_t + \widehat{y}_t, \quad (6)$$

where the latter varies negatively with the real product price and positively with final output \widehat{Y}_t^C ,

$$\widehat{y}_t = -\theta_f \widehat{\rho}_t + \widehat{Y}_t^C + [(\theta_f - 1) \nu_v - \theta_f] \widehat{N}_t. \quad (7)$$

Final output, $\widehat{Y}_t^C = \widehat{\rho}_t + \widehat{y}_t + \widehat{N}_t$, is a weighted average of private consumption \widehat{C}_t and exogenous government consumption, which we assume is constant,

$$\widehat{Y}_t^C = (1 - \Gamma) \widehat{C}_t.$$

The parameter Γ denotes the steady state share of government consumption in final output.

We now describe the production function and cost minimisation by firms. The model features two sectors denoted by j , where $j = C, E$. The subscript C refers to the sector producing goods, the subscript E refers to the sector producing firms. Differentiated intermediate goods and new firms are produced using labour and physical capital according to a Cobb-Douglas technology with α denoting the (common) capital share. $K_{j,t}^s$ are capital services and $L_{j,t}$ is the labour input into production in sector j . The aggregate production function for goods is given by

$$\widehat{y}_t + \widehat{N}_t = \alpha \widehat{K}_{C,t}^s + (1 - \alpha) \widehat{L}_{C,t}.$$

Similarly, the aggregate production function for new firms is

$$\widehat{N}_{E,t} = \alpha \widehat{K}_{E,t}^s + (1 - \alpha) \widehat{L}_{E,t},$$

where $\widehat{N}_{E,t}$ is the number of entrants. Factors are rented in competitive markets; their prices are equal to their marginal revenue products. It follows that the ratio of the wage bill to the rental bill is constant,

$$\widehat{r}_t^k + \widehat{K}_{C,t}^s = \widehat{w}_t + \widehat{R}_t^w + \widehat{L}_{C,t},$$

where \widehat{r}_t^k is the real rental rate on capital and \widehat{w}_t is the real wage. Because a fraction ν_w of the wage costs must be paid ahead of production, the wage bill includes the interest rate \widehat{R}_t^w given by

$$\widehat{R}_t^w = \frac{\nu_w R}{\nu_w R + (1 - \nu_w)} \widehat{R}_t,$$

where \widehat{R}_t is the gross rate of return on riskfree nominal bonds. This specification follows Christiano et al (2010) and allows us to estimate the strength of the working capital channel. Real marginal costs are given by the expression

$$\widehat{mc}_t = \alpha \widehat{r}_t^k + (1 - \alpha) (\widehat{w}_t + \widehat{R}_t^w).$$

Due to perfect cross-sectoral factor mobility, factor prices are equalised across sectors and so is the capital-labour ratio,

$$\widehat{K}_{C,t}^s - \widehat{L}_{C,t} = \widehat{K}_{E,t}^s - \widehat{L}_{E,t}.$$

3.2 Households

Households maximise expected lifetime utility. Period t utility is increasing in consumption with σ_C denoting the degree of risk aversion. Furthermore, consumption displays external habit persistence of degree b , such that marginal consumption utility is given by

$$\widehat{U}_{C,t} = -\frac{\sigma_C}{1-b} (\widehat{C}_t - b\widehat{C}_{t-1}).$$

Utility depends negatively on hours worked \widehat{L}_t , such that marginal labour disutility is

$$\widehat{U}_{L,t} = -\sigma_L \widehat{L}_t,$$

where σ_L is the inverse elasticity of labour supply to the real wage. Households have access to three assets. First, they buy riskfree nominal one-period bonds at the price of one currency unit

per bond, which pay a gross return \widehat{R}_t in the next period. The first order condition for bonds is the familiar Euler equation

$$\widehat{U}_{C,t} = \widehat{R}_t - \text{E}_t\{\widehat{\pi}_{p,t+1}^C - \widehat{U}_{C,t+1}\}.$$

Second, households buy shares at price \widehat{v}_t and sell them one period later. The return on shares is given by firm profits, paid out as dividends, and the capital gain realised in the next period, discounted appropriately, such that the optimality condition on shares is

$$\widehat{v}_t = \text{E}_t\{\widehat{U}_{C,t+1} - \widehat{U}_{C,t} + [1 - \beta(1 - \delta_N)]\widehat{d}_{t+1} + \beta(1 - \delta_N)\widehat{v}_{t+1}\}.$$

Firm entry is subject to a flow adjustment cost measured by the parameter φ_N . This specification allows us to capture the gradual response of entry to shocks, which is consistent with empirical evidence on the diffusion of production innovations documented in the industrial organisation literature, see Gort and Klepper (1982). The parameter $0 < \varphi_N^{-1} < 1$ can be also interpreted as the fraction of entrants that are unsuccessful. In Beaudry et al's (2006) gold rush model for instance, an exogenous expansion of product varieties can lead to an inefficient scramble of startups to produce these new varieties. In the process, resources are wasted as some of these startups fail. Here, we also assume a non-zero failure rate of startups. We model the failure rate as a positive function of the change in entry. Therefore, whenever a shock opens up profitable opportunities that stimulate firm entry, the failure rate is high initially, but declines as entry rates decelerate. Under these assumptions, the number of entrants has a forward-looking and a backward-looking component and depends positively on firm value less the entry cost,

$$\widehat{N}_{E,t} - \widehat{N}_{E,t-1} = \varphi_N(\widehat{v}_t - \widehat{m}c_t) + \beta \text{E}_t\{\widehat{N}_{E,t+1} - \widehat{N}_{E,t}\}. \quad (8)$$

It takes one period for a successful entrant to turn into a producer. Each period, a fraction δ_N of active firms and new entrants exit the market, such that the stock of firms evolves according to the law of motion

$$\widehat{N}_t = (1 - \delta_N)\widehat{N}_{t-1} + \delta_N\widehat{N}_{E,t-1}. \quad (9)$$

The third asset is physical capital, which agents rent out to firms and entrants. Capital is bought at price \widehat{q}_t today and is sold tomorrow at a return given by the rental rate \widehat{r}_{t+1}^k , in addition to the capital gain \widehat{q}_{t+1} , discounted appropriately. The first order condition for capital purchases is

$$\widehat{q}_t = \text{E}_t\{\widehat{U}_{C,t+1} - \widehat{U}_{C,t} + [1 - \beta(1 - \delta_K)]\widehat{r}_{t+1}^k + \beta(1 - \delta_K)\widehat{q}_{t+1}\}.$$

Capital services depend on the stock of capital \widehat{K}_t and its utilisation rate \widehat{u}_t ,

$$\widehat{K}_t^s = \widehat{u}_t + \widehat{K}_t.$$

Households choose how intensively capital is utilised. As in Christiano et al (2005), changes in the utilisation rate are costly. At the optimum, utilisation is adjusted with elasticity σ_a^{-1} to changes in the rental rate of capital,

$$\widehat{u}_t = \sigma_a^{-1} \widehat{r}_t^k.$$

Allowing for variable capital utilisation dampens the response of the rental rate of capital to a shock, which in turn dampens the response of real marginal costs. Investment adjustment costs are captured by φ_K . Current investment \widehat{I}_t depends on lagged investment, expected future investment and the real cost of capital,

$$\widehat{I}_t - \widehat{I}_{t-1} = \varphi_K \widehat{q}_t + \beta \mathbf{E}_t \{ \widehat{I}_{t+1} - \widehat{I}_t \}.$$

The parameter φ_K measures the elasticity of investment with respect to current price of installed capital. Physical capital depreciates at rate δ_K , such that capital accumulation is given by

$$\widehat{K}_t = (1 - \delta_K) \widehat{K}_{t-1} + \delta_K \widehat{I}_{t-1}.$$

Finally, we introduce differentiated labour types into the model following Erceg et al (2000). Labour types are bundled according to a CES aggregator with elasticity θ_w . Quadratic wage adjustment costs (captured by κ_w) and indexation (captured by λ_w) are introduced, such that wage setting frictions are analogous to price setting frictions. Wage inflation in period t , $\widehat{\pi}_{w,t}$, depends positively on its expected future value and negatively on the difference between the real wage \widehat{w}_t and the marginal rate of substitution between labour and consumption $\widehat{U}_{L,t} - \widehat{U}_{C,t}$. In the presence of wage indexation, wage inflation also depends on current and lagged welfare-based inflation,

$$\widehat{\pi}_{w,t} - \lambda_w \widehat{\pi}_{p,t-1}^C = -\phi_w [\widehat{w}_t - (\widehat{U}_{L,t} - \widehat{U}_{C,t})] + \beta \mathbf{E}_t \{ \widehat{\pi}_{w,t+1} - \lambda_w \widehat{\pi}_{p,t}^C \}, \quad (10)$$

where $\phi_w = (\theta_w - 1)/\kappa_w$ is the slope of the wage inflation equation.

3.3 Market Clearing

In equilibrium, total labour supply equals the sum of labour used in the production of goods and labour used in the production of new firms, weighted by their respective steady state shares,

$$\widehat{L}_t = \frac{L_C}{L} \widehat{L}_{C,t} + \frac{L_E}{L} \widehat{L}_{E,t}.$$

Similarly, total capital is a weighted average of capital used in the production of goods and capital used in the production of new firms,

$$\widehat{K}_t = \frac{K_C}{K} \widehat{K}_{C,t} + \frac{K_E}{K} \widehat{K}_{E,t}.$$

The aggregate accounting identity is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{Y^C}{Y} \widehat{Y}_t^C + \frac{vN_E}{Y} (\widehat{m}c_t + \widehat{N}_{E,t}) + \frac{I}{Y} \widehat{I}_t + \frac{r^k K}{Y} \widehat{u}_t, \\ = & \frac{dN}{Y} (\widehat{d}_t + \widehat{N}_{t-1}) + \frac{wL}{Y} (\widehat{w}_t + \widehat{L}_t) + \frac{r^k K}{Y} (\widehat{r}_t^k + \widehat{K}_{t-1} + \widehat{u}_t), \end{aligned}$$

where Y is steady state GDP. Total expenditure comprises aggregate consumption, investment in new firms and new capital, and utilisation adjustment costs. Total income is the sum of dividend income, labour income and rental income.

3.4 Monetary Policy

Monetary policy is described by a Taylor rule with interest rate smoothing. The monetary authority adjusts the interest rate in response to changes in product price inflation, GDP, and last period's interest rate.⁹ The feedback coefficients are, respectively, τ_π , τ_Y and τ_R , such that

$$\widehat{R}_t = \tau_R \widehat{R}_{t-1} + (1 - \tau_R) \tau_\pi \widehat{\pi}_{p,t} + (1 - \tau_R) \tau_Y \widehat{Y}_t + \eta_t^R,$$

where η_t^R is an exogenous monetary policy shock with autocorrelation coefficient ρ_η and standard error σ_η .

4 Estimation Method

4.1 Calibration

The model parameters are partitioned into two groups. The first collects the parameters which are calibrated. These include parameters given by first order moments in the data, as well as parameters that cannot be separately identified. Let

$$\psi^c = (\beta, \sigma_L, \alpha, \delta_K, \delta_N, \lambda_p, \lambda_w, \Gamma)'$$

denote the vector of calibrated parameters whose values are reported in Table 3.

[insert Table 3 here]

⁹BGM (2007) and Bergin and Corsetti (2008) show that in the presence of appropriate corrective fiscal policies, the optimal monetary policy stabilises product prices rather than the welfare-based price index that varies with the number of differentiated goods. The latter is typically not observed by the central bank.

The subjective discount factor is set to $\beta = 0.99$, implying a steady-state annualised real interest rate of 4%. Following Christiano et al (2005), we assume a quadratic labour disutility function, implying $\sigma_L = 1$. As is conventional in the literature, the elasticity of output to capital is set to $\alpha = 0.33$. In addition, the value $\delta_K = 0.025$ implies an annual capital depreciation rate of 10%. Following BGM (2007), the firm exit rate δ_N is set to 0.025, so as to fit the job destruction rate of 10% per year observed in US data. That value is also close to the estimate of Cecioni (2010), who documents an annual firm exit rate of about 12% implying that $\delta_N = 0.03$. This parameter plays a key role for the model's persistence: a higher value of δ_N implies less persistent dynamics. We assume full indexation of prices and wages as in Christiano et al (2005) and set $\lambda_p = \lambda_w = 1$. When we estimated these parameters they were driven to their upper bound of unity. The parameters θ_w and κ_w cannot be separately identified since they appear only jointly in (10). Consequently, we estimate only ϕ_w , the slope of the wage inflation equation. The steady state government spending share in output Γ is set to 21%.

4.2 Minimum Distance Estimation

The second set of model parameters is estimated by minimum distance estimation. Let ψ denote the vector of estimated parameters

$$\psi = (\sigma_\eta, \rho_\eta, \sigma_C, b, \sigma_a^{-1}, \phi_p, \phi_w, \varphi_K, \varphi_N, \varepsilon^{yp}, \eta, \nu_w, \nu_v, \tau_R, \tau_\pi, \tau_Y)'$$

In a first step, a VAR is estimated as outlined in Section 2. Since the welfare-based price index, which includes the variety effect, is unobserved, we posit that measured inflation corresponds to the variable $\hat{\pi}_{p,t}$ in the model. We use the change in the GDP deflator to measure inflation; our conclusions are robust if we instead use consumer price inflation.

In a second step, the theoretical counterparts of vector Φ , denoted by $\Phi^m(\psi^c, \psi)$, are obtained from the theoretical system which has been solved with the AIM algorithm (Anderson and Moore, 1985). In the model, real variables are deflated by the welfare-based price index, which is not observed. To obtain data-consistent model variables, we divide each real variable by the real product price ρ_t . See BGM (2007) for details. Note that this transformation leaves the variety effect on welfare intact. Estimated values of ψ , denoted by $\hat{\psi}_T$, fulfil¹⁰

$$\hat{\psi}_T = \arg \min_{\psi \in \Psi} [\Phi^m(\psi^c, \psi) - \hat{\Phi}_T]' W_T [\Phi^m(\psi^c, \psi) - \hat{\Phi}_T], \quad (11)$$

¹⁰Since commodity prices CRB_t have no counterpart in the DSGE model, the response of this variable is removed from Φ_T for the MDE procedure.

where W_T is a diagonal matrix with the inverse of the asymptotic variances of each element of $\hat{\Phi}_T$ along the diagonal. Following Christiano et al (2005), the standard errors of the estimated parameters are computed using the asymptotic delta function method applied to the first order condition associated with (11).

The goodness-of-fit of the model is quantified by resorting to bootstrap techniques so as to reveal the distribution of the minimum distance. Recall that since the weighting matrix W_T is not optimal, this statistic is not distributed as a χ^2 with $\dim(\hat{\Phi}_T) - \dim(\hat{\psi}_T)$ degrees of freedom. Bootstrapping the minimum distance allows us to circumvent this difficulty. For each model, 200 bootstrap replications of the VAR model are generated. For each replication, the parameters of the DSGE models are re-estimated and the value of the minimum distance is computed. Then, the bootstrapped distribution of this distance allows us to deduce a p -value for the overidentification test. This methodology enables us to check whether the DSGE model passes the overidentification test implied by the choice of moments.

5 Results

The discussion of our estimation results is in four parts. We first assess the overall performance of our model at reproducing the dynamic responses to a monetary policy shock. Second, we compare the estimation results of the benchmark model with those obtained from a model without firm entry, a summary of which is provided in Appendix 2. Third, we evaluate the two hypotheses of how entry affects inflation: love of variety and the competition effect. Finally, we carry out several counterfactual exercises where we vary one parameter at a time.

5.1 Overall Model Performance

Figure 2 compares the SVAR-based and model-based IRFs of the variables to a monetary policy shock in the model without firm entry. The variable net business formation has no counterpart in the model and is therefore removed from the SVAR prior to estimation.

[insert Figure 2 here]

As can be seen from Figure 2, the standard model, while being silent on firm dynamics, is rich enough to capture the other responses to a monetary policy shock very well. It reproduces the hump-shaped pattern of output, investment and consumption and it does a good job at matching the persistence of inflation. The magnitude of the response of profits is quite well replicated, while

the model fails to reproduce the countercyclical response of markups over the medium run. The performance of the no-entry model is satisfactory, with a p -value of the overidentification test equal to 36% (see Table 5).

Figure 1 above compares the empirical and theoretical responses of the variables in the benchmark model with endogenous firm entry. The goodness-of-fit of the model is satisfactory; the model-based impulse responses stay within the 95% confidence bands of the empirical responses. With a p -value of 26%, the J -test for overidentification confirms that the data do not reject the model. The model does a very good job at replicating price and wage inflation, investment, consumption, output, and net entry. It is worth noticing that the benchmark model generates less persistence in the response of profits, in comparison with the no-entry model. It does better at replicating the response of markups, especially over the short run. However, the theoretical responses of profits and markups are smaller than their empirical counterparts. This confirms the volatility puzzle emphasised in Colciago and Etro (2010).

5.2 Parameter Estimates

We discuss the estimates of the benchmark model parameters, contrasting them with the parameters of the no-entry model whenever there is a notable difference. Tables 4 and 5 report the two sets of estimates.

[insert Tables 4 and 5 here]

Most of the parameter estimates are significantly different from zero, which implies that the corresponding friction in the model is needed to match the data impulse responses. One notable exception is the elasticity of capital utilisation with respect to the rental rate of capital (σ_a^{-1}) that is not significant. As explained in Christiano et al (2005), this friction is important to generate a rise in labour productivity in response to a monetary loosening. Intuitively, variable capital utilisation allows firms to expand production with only a small increase in hours. Since we do not include productivity in our VAR, this may explain our result.

Consider the estimates of the shock process and the coefficients of the interest rate rule. The standard error and autocorrelation of the shock are estimated at $\sigma_\eta = 0.15$ and $\rho_\eta = 0.86$, respectively. Interest rate smoothing by the central bank, τ_R equals 0.14 and it is insignificant. Thus, monetary policy shocks are persistent over the sample, while monetary policy exhibits a negligible degree of inertia. This is consistent with the finding in Carrillo et al (2007), who argue that the dynamics of

price and wage inflation are useful for discriminating between policy inertia and persistent shocks. The point estimate of the interest rate rule coefficient on inflation τ_π is above unity ($\tau_\pi = 1.42$), suggesting that monetary policy is active. In the no-entry model, the corresponding parameter estimate is 1.23 and it is not significant. Finally, the estimated interest rate rule coefficient on output τ_Y is driven to its lower bound of zero.

We now turn to the parameters relating to tastes and technology. Consistent with much of the literature, including Christiano et al (2005) and Smets and Wouters (2007), our estimate of the degree of habit persistence, b , is 0.71. It is slightly lower in the no-entry model ($b = 0.66$) that roughly corresponds to the estimates by Christiano et al (2005). This friction helps to reproduce the sluggishness of consumption. The inverse of the elasticity of intertemporal substitution is estimated at $\sigma_C = 3.22$. By assuming a log utility function, Christiano et al (2005) implicitly calibrate $\sigma_C = 1$. Our fairly high estimate may reflect the fact that the consumption series in our VAR does not include durables. The greater smoothness in consumption calls for a lower intertemporal substitution elasticity in the model.

Capital investment adjustment cost are somewhat higher in the benchmark model ($\varphi_K = 7.18$) than in the no-entry model ($\varphi_K = 5.76$). These values are higher than Christiano et al (2005) but consistent with the result in Poilly (2010). At the extensive investment margin, adjustment costs are estimated at $\varphi_N = 8.22$, which is thus comparable to adjustment costs in physical capital investment. This can be explained by the fact that the empirical responses of investment and net entry have a similar magnitude. To our knowledge, this is the first attempt to quantify adjustment costs in firm entry. Our estimate therefore implies that around 14% of startups are unsuccessful. Note that this parameter is distinct from the exit shock that hits a fraction δ_N of entrants as well as established firms.

The working capital channel is parameterised by ν_w , the fraction of the wage bill that must be financed ahead of production. This parameter is driven to its upper bound of unity in the benchmark model. Interestingly, in the no-entry model, the estimate of ν_w is smaller ($\nu_w = 0.59$), suggesting that the working capital channel is weaker. The intuition behind this result is the following. A procyclical impact response of the markup is needed for the model to replicate the observed markup dynamics over the short run, in addition to the price puzzle and the size of the reduction in profits. This requires an increase in marginal costs in response to a monetary contraction, which is delivered through the working capital channel as marginal costs rise along with borrowing costs. Therefore,

the good fit of the short-run markup response in the benchmark model is explained by the larger estimated strength of the working capital channel. For a discussion on how the working capital channel helps to reproduce the price puzzle, see Rabanal (2007) and Henzel et al (2009).

The price elasticity of demand ε^{yp} shows up in conjunction with the price stickiness parameter κ_p in the slope of the NKPC, but it also appears in the profit equation. Consequently, this parameter can be identified using profit data. Our estimate of ε^{yp} is 2.48 in the benchmark model and 5.10 in the no-entry model. A higher elasticity in the no-entry model reinforces the link between profits and markups, see (6). This explains the higher impact response of profits in the no-entry model, in comparison with the benchmark model. Two further comments are in order. First, a steady state markup as high as 60% is not unreasonable in a model with entry costs. This is because firms price at average cost (including entry costs), such that profits in excess of the entry costs are zero in the free-entry equilibrium. In Smets and Wouters' (2007) model with fixed costs, the steady state markup is estimated at 60%, consistent with our result. Second, evidence based on microeconomic data suggests that the empirically relevant range of average markups across sectors is rather wide and includes the values reported here. For instance, Christopoulou and Vermeulen (2008) report 7% for Textiles and 79% for Public Administration and Defence. The same holds true for estimates of substitution elasticities across goods ranging from 1.2 for Footwear to 17 for Crude oil (see Broda and Weinstein, 2006).¹¹ Our estimate of ε^{yp} is, however, inconsistent with one of the great ratios in the model itself. As we show in a separate model appendix, the inverse of the demand elasticity equals the steady state profit share in consumption output, $\frac{dN}{YC} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{yp}}$. For the US, the average profit share in post-WWII data is consistent with $\varepsilon^{yp} \approx 9$ rather than 2.5. We leave the resolution of this puzzle to future research.

Regarding the nominal frictions, we report the slopes of the wage and price inflation curves in Table 5. The New Keynesian Phillips Curve is slightly flatter in the benchmark model than in the no-entry model; the estimated slope ϕ_p is 0.07 and 0.12, respectively. Given our estimates of ε^{yp} , this implies a Rotemberg price stickiness parameter κ_p of 22 and 35, respectively. These figures are low in comparison with the maximum likelihood estimates in Ireland (2001).¹² Interestingly, this suggests that prices are less sticky in a model with endogenous entry, as suggested by BGM (2007).

¹¹Notice that the within-industry substitution elasticity θ_f is equal to the price elasticity of demand ε^{yp} in the absence of the competition effect, i.e. if $\eta = 0$, which is what we find empirically.

¹²We cannot compare this figure with the numerous estimates of price stickiness that use the Calvo price setting restriction, because the latter relies on a constant population of price setters.

The slope of the wage inflation curve ϕ_w , is significantly estimated at 0.01 in the benchmark model (0.03 in the no-entry model).¹³ We confirm Lewis' (2009) result that wage stickiness is key for an endogenous-entry model to generate a negative, and hence empirically plausible, response of firm entry to monetary contractions. The reason is the following. The labour requirement for firm startups makes entry costs depend on real wages. Potential entrants compare entry costs with the present value of profits (i.e., firm value). Firm value decreases through a no-arbitrage condition across assets: the return on shares needs to increase to match the interest rate rise. This happens through a drop in today's share price relative to tomorrow's. Entry decreases only if entry costs fall by less than firm value. Wage stickiness suitably dampens the reaction of real wages and, in turn, of entry costs, resulting in the required drop in entry. While Christiano et al (2005) stress the importance of wage rigidities to dampen marginal production costs, it is the same friction that produces realistic entry dynamics through its attenuating effect on entry costs.

We note that most of the individual parameter estimates are not significantly different across the two models. For all parameters, except the slope of the NKPC, the 95% confidence intervals of the two models overlap. We now investigate the two potential mechanisms through which entry affects inflation.

5.3 Love of Variety and Competition Effect

We estimate ν_v and η in addition to the usual model parameters. These two parameters measure the variety effect and the competition effect, respectively, and thus govern the elasticity of inflation to the number of firms, see (5). They can be separately identified using data on markups and entry. Indeed, ν_v corresponds to the elasticity of markups to net entry, see the price setting equation (2) and the price index equation (3). We can infer ε^{yp} from the elasticity of profits to the markup, see (6). The within-industry substitution elasticity θ_f is determined residually; it is related to the competition effect parameter η and the steady-state demand elasticity ε^{yp} as follows,

$$\theta_f = [\eta(\varepsilon^{yp} - 1) + 1]\varepsilon^{yp}.$$

Our estimation results indicate that η is not significantly different from zero. This suggests that strategic interactions and the competition effect do not help to reproduce the impulse responses to a monetary policy shock. We offer two explanations for this result. First, Figure 1 shows that on

¹³In the wage setting case, it is valid to compute the Calvo stickiness probability from the estimated slope of the wage inflation curve. Using the relation $\frac{\theta_w - 1}{\kappa_w} = \frac{(1 - \beta\alpha_w)(1 - \alpha_w)}{\alpha_w(1 + \theta_w/\sigma_L)}$, and assuming a wage mark-up of 10% (i.e. $\theta_w = 11$), the corresponding Calvo wage stickiness parameter α_w equals 0.75 in the benchmark model.

impact, the markup reacts pro-cyclically to a monetary policy shock in the data. Therefore, the model with a competition effect fits the data less well at short horizons since it produces a (more) countercyclical markup. Second, a monetary policy shock leads to a procyclical response of net business formation. In the model, however, a high value of η implies a strong negative elasticity of inflation to entry, through the NKPC. The negative co-movement between these two variables is at odds with the empirical dynamics resulting from interest rate shocks. Cecioni (2010) estimates the NKPC (4) and reports $\eta = 1.10$. Her estimates suggest that a 1% increase in the number of firms lowers annual inflation significantly by 0.14 percentage points. This finding is not necessarily inconsistent with our results if the competition effect is more important in the presence of other types of shocks, e.g. technology shocks.

Our estimate of the degree of love for variety is $\nu_v = 1.48$. This is slightly lower than the Dixit-Stiglitz (1977) value $\nu_v = \theta_f / (\theta_f - 1)$ used in BGM (2007), which in our estimation is 1.67. However, our estimate is significantly higher than the calibration in Floetotto and Jaimovich (2008), who implicitly assume $\nu_v = 1$. Consequently, our finding suggests that the variety effect is supported by the data. We are not aware of any other study that estimates the degree of love of variety.

5.4 Counterfactual Exercises

To build intuition for the functioning of our model, we conduct several counterfactual exercises. We use the benchmark parameter estimates and vary one parameter at a time to derive the model-based impulse response functions (i.e., without re-estimation). Figures 3 and 4 show the IRFs of profits, net entry, inflation and the markup for different specifications of the working capital channel (ν_w), nominal rigidities (ϕ_p and ϕ_w), the competition effect (η) and the love of variety (ν_v). Each specification is analysed in detail in the next subsections.

[insert Figure 3 here]

Working Capital

We have seen that the working capital channel is much stronger in the endogenous-entry model than in the no-entry model. Here we show that it is a key assumption to replicate the sign of the markup response on impact. This is because the interest rate influences the markup through its effect on real marginal costs; an increase in R_t implies a negative response of markups. In the left panel of Figure 3, we set the parameter ν_w to 1, 0.5 and 0.

From the figure, it is clear that a stronger working capital channel makes the markup more procyclical while making profits more volatile. In particular, profits are only slightly responsive to monetary policy shocks for $\nu_w = 0$. Interestingly, the larger the value of ν_w , the stronger the net entry response. Again, the increase in the interest rate has a positive impact on real marginal costs that reduces net entry. Equation (8) shows that this effect is dampened when the adjustment cost, φ_N , is high.

Nominal Rigidities

In the following, we investigate how price and wage rigidities affects the model's dynamics. We consider the model IRFs under the assumption of sticky wages and flexible prices (setting $\phi_p = 0$), as well as under sticky prices and flexible wages (setting $\phi_w = 0$). See the left panel of Figure 3.

In the sticky-wage model, markups and profits hardly respond to a monetary policy shock, while the response of net entry is larger in comparison with the benchmark model. We notice a counterfactual pattern of inflation, which rises on impact. This can be explained by the presence of the working capital channel that drives up real marginal costs. Setting price stickiness κ_p to a small value makes inflation very responsive to the pattern of real marginal costs.

The sticky-price model produces counterfactual increases in markups and profits. This happens because wages are flexible, such that real wages fall, reducing in turn real marginal costs. Through the NKPC, inflation mirrors the markup response. The rise in profits dampens the drop in entry. These findings underline the importance of wage stickiness in the endogenous-entry model.

[insert Figure 4 here]

Competition Effect

We now analyse how the competition effect modifies the transmission of monetary policy shocks by setting η to 1.1. As expected, a higher value of η makes markups more countercyclical over the medium run, and more persistent. The fall in net entry also becomes more persistent. In addition, the output drop is stronger (not shown), amplifying the fall in inflation, even if the elasticity of inflation to the number of firms is higher. These results confirm that the competition effect is a key model element to generate countercyclical movements of markups.

Variety Effect

How does love of variety change the propagation mechanism of the model? Our benchmark estimate of parameter ν_v is 1.48. The right panel of Figure 4 shows the IRFs of our variables in the benchmark estimation and when love of variety is absent, corresponding to $\nu_v = 1$. Recall that, since the number of firms is predetermined, the variety effect is zero on impact and small in the short run. Net entry falls by less and returns to steady state faster when the love of variety is higher. Without the variety effect, the responses of entry and profits remain persistently negative. In other words, the variety effect reduces persistence. This is because by lowering the welfare-based price index, entry raises the stochastic discount factor (the growth rate of the marginal utility of one currency unit). The dampening effect on inflation is visible here in that inflation declines less when the variety effect is present. The response of markups is not strongly affected by the love of variety parameter. This explains why our model with endogenous entry does not improve by much the fit of the markup response as compared with the no-entry model.

6 Conclusion

The growing literature on endogenous entry and the extensive margin in business cycles has been mainly theoretical up to now. We estimate a medium-scale DSGE model which includes endogenous firm entry as in Bilbiie et al (2007) in addition to many other frictions. More specifically, we minimise the distance between the model impulse responses to a monetary policy shock and their empirical counterparts in an identified vector autoregression. The exercise is comparable to Christiano et al (2005), who abstract from firm dynamics. Our VAR includes profits, markups and net business formation along with other standard macroeconomic variables. The model is successful at matching the empirical impulse responses, especially that of firm entry. However, the predicted responses of markups and profits are smaller than in the data, confirming the volatility puzzle noted in Colciago and Etro (2010). Our parameter estimates are largely unaffected by the introduction of firm entry. There is no evidence of a competition effect by which a rise in the number of firms reduces desired markups and hence dampens inflation in an expansion. Indeed this effect does not help to capture the countercyclical movement of markups observed in the data. Instead, our results support the love of variety effect: increased product diversity through firm entry lowers the welfare-based price index. Thus, markups rise and under sticky prices, inflation declines.

References

- [1] ANDERSON, GARY S. AND GEORGE R. MOORE (1985), A Linear Algebraic Procedure for Solving Linear Perfect Foresight Models, *Economics Letters* 17, 247-252.
- [2] BEAUDRY, PAUL; FABRICE COLLARD AND FRANCK PORTIER (2006), Gold Rush Fever in Business Cycles, NBER Working Paper N° 12710.
- [3] BENASSY, JEAN-PASCAL (1996), Taste for Variety and Optimum Production Patterns in Monopolistic Competition, *Economics Letters* 52, 41-47.
- [4] BERGIN, PAUL AND GIANCARLO CORSETTI (2008), The Extensive Margin and Monetary Policy, *Journal of Monetary Economics* 55(7), 1222-1237.
- [5] BILBIIE, FLORIN; FABIO GHIRONI AND MARC MELITZ (2007), Monetary Policy and Business Cycles with Endogenous Entry and Product Variety. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual* 22, 299-353.
- [6] BRODA, CHRISTIAN AND DAVID WEINSTEIN (2010), Product Creation and Destruction: Evidence and Price Implications, *American Economic Review* 100(3), 691-723.
- [7] BRODA, CHRISTIAN AND DAVID E. WEINSTEIN (2006), Globalization and the Gains from Variety, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121(2), 541-585.
- [8] CAMPBELL, JEFFREY R. AND HUGO A. HOPENHAYN (2005), Market Size Matters, *Journal of Industrial Economics* 53(1), 1-25.
- [9] CARRILLO, JULIO; PATRICK FEVE AND JULIEN MATHERON (2007), Monetary Policy Inertia or Persistent Shocks: A DSGE Analysis, *International Journal of Central Banking* 3(2), 1-38.
- [10] CECIONI, MARTINA (2010), Firm Entry, Competitive Pressures and the U.S. Inflation Dynamics, Temi di discussione (Economic working papers) 773, Bank of Italy, Economic Research Department.
- [11] CHRISTIANO, LAWRENCE J.; MARTIN EICHENBAUM AND CHARLES L. EVANS (2005), Nominal Rigidities and the Dynamic Effects of a Shock to Monetary Policy, *Journal of Political Economy* 113(1), 1-45.

- [12] CHRISTIANO, LAWRENCE J.; MATHIAS TRABANDT AND KARL VALENTIN (2010), DSGE Models for Monetary Policy Analysis, manuscript prepared for Handbook on Monetary Economics, edited by B.M. Friedman and M. Woodford.
- [13] CHRISTOPOULOU, REBEKKA AND PHILIP VERMEULEN (2008), Markups in the Euro Area and the US over the period 1981-2004. A Comparison of 50 Sectors, European Central Bank Working Paper N° 856.
- [14] COLCIAGO, ANDREA AND FEDERICO ETRO (2010), Endogenous Market Structures and the Business Cycle, *Economic Journal* 120, 1201-1233.
- [15] DIXIT, AVINASH K. AND JOSEPH E. STIGLITZ (1977), Monopolistic Competition and Optimum Product Diversity, *American Economic Review* 67(3), 297-308.
- [16] ERCEG, CHRISTOPHER J.; DALE W. HENDERSON AND ANDREW T. LEVIN (2000), Optimal Monetary Policy with Staggered Wage and Price Contracts, *Journal of Monetary Economics* 46(2), 281-313.
- [17] FLOETOTTO, MAX AND NIR JAIMOVICH (2008), Firm Dynamics, Markup Variations, and the Business Cycle, *Journal of Monetary Economics* 55(7), 1238-1252.
- [18] GORT, MICHAEL AND STEVEN KLEPPER (1982), Time Paths in the Diffusion of Product Innovations, *Economic Journal* 92, 630-653.
- [19] HENZEL, STEFFEN; OLIVER HULSEWIG; ERIC MAYER AND TIMO WOLLMERSHAUSER (2009), The Price Puzzle Revisited: Can the Cost Channel Explain a Rise in Inflation after a Monetary Policy Shock? *Journal of Macroeconomics* 31(2), 268-289.
- [20] IRELAND, PETER N. (2001), Sticky-Price Models of the Business Cycle: Specification and Stability, *Journal of Monetary Economics* 47(1), 3-18.
- [21] LEWIS, VIVIEN (2009), Business Cycle Evidence on Firm Entry, *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 13(5), 605-624.
- [22] POILLY, CELINE (2010), Does Money Matter for the Identification of Monetary Policy Shocks: A DSGE Perspective, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 34, 2159-2178.

- [23] RABANAL, PAU (2007), Does Inflation Increase after a Monetary Policy Tightening? Answers Based on an Estimated DSGE Model, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 31(3), 906-937.
- [24] RAVN, MORTEN O.; STEPHANIE SCHMITT-GROHE, MARTIN URIBE AND LENNO UUSKULA (2010), Deep Habits and the Dynamic Effects of Monetary Policy Shocks, *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 24(2), 236-258.
- [25] ROTEMBERG, JULIO J. (1982), Sticky prices in the United States, *Journal of Political Economy* 90, 1187-1211.
- [26] ROTEMBERG, JULIO J. AND MICHAEL WOODFORD (1991), Markups and the Business Cycle, *NBER Macroeconomics Annual* 6, 63-140.
- [27] SMETS, FRANK AND RAF WOUTERS (2007), Shocks and Frictions in US Business Cycles: A Bayesian DSGE Approach, *American Economic Review* 97(3), 586-606.
- [28] UUSKULA, LENNO (2008), Limited Participation or Sticky Prices? New Evidence from Firm Entry and Failures, manuscript, European University Institute.

Appendix 1: Markup Measure

In this section, we show how to compute an empirical measure of the goods price markup derived from our model.¹⁴ Our markup proxy, denoted by $\tilde{\mu}_t$, is based on the inverse labour share. It is close to the concept proposed by Rotemberg and Woodford (1991) that corrects for overhead labour, i.e. labour used to set up new production lines. This measure has been used in many studies, including BGM (2007) and Colciago and Etro (2010) in the endogenous-entry literature. The first order condition for labour demand can be manipulated to produce a relation between the markup and the inverse labour share,

$$\tilde{\mu}_t = \frac{(1 - \alpha) \frac{L_t}{L_{C,t}}}{s_t^L R_t^w},$$

where $s_t^L = \frac{w_t L_t}{Y_t^C}$ denotes the ratio of the wage bill to consumption output. Following Colciago and Etro (2010), we assume that the share of workers employed in startup activities $\frac{L_{E,t}}{L_t}$ is constant at 0.2, such that $\frac{L_t}{L_{C,t}} = 1.25$. The parameter α is set to 0.33, as before. The interest rate R_t^w is not

¹⁴In a model without firm entry, the markup is simply expressed as the inverse labor share.

observed. Recall that this variable reflects the borrowing costs to firms that have to pay a fraction ν_w of the wage bill in advance. Given our estimate $\nu_w = 1$, we set this borrowing cost equal to the Federal Funds Rate.

Appendix 2: DSGE Model without Entry

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{Y}_t^C &= \alpha \widehat{K}_t^s + (1 - \alpha) \widehat{L}_t \\
\widehat{R}_t^w &= \frac{\nu_w R}{\nu_w R + (1 - \nu_w)} \widehat{R}_t \\
\widehat{r}_t^k + \widehat{K}_t^s &= \widehat{w}_t + \widehat{R}_t^w + \widehat{L}_t \\
\widehat{m}c_t &= \alpha \widehat{r}_t^k + (1 - \alpha) (\widehat{w}_t + \widehat{R}_t^w) \\
\widehat{Y}_t^C &= (1 - \Gamma) \widehat{C}_t \\
0 &= \widehat{\mu}_t + \widehat{m}c_t \\
\widehat{d}_t &= (\theta_f - 1) \widehat{\mu}_t + \widehat{y}_t \\
\widehat{\pi}_{p,t} - \lambda_p \widehat{\pi}_{p,t-1} &= -\phi_p \widehat{\mu}_t + \beta \mathbf{E}_t \{ \widehat{\pi}_{p,t+1} - \lambda_p \widehat{\pi}_{p,t} \} \\
\widehat{U}_{C,t} &= -\frac{\sigma_C}{1-b} (\widehat{C}_t - b \widehat{C}_{t-1}) \\
\widehat{U}_{L,t} &= -\sigma_L \widehat{L}_t \\
\widehat{K}_t^s &= \widehat{u}_t + \widehat{K}_t \\
\widehat{u}_t &= \sigma_a^{-1} \widehat{r}_t^k \\
\widehat{U}_{C,t} &= \widehat{R}_t - \mathbf{E}_t \{ \widehat{\pi}_{p,t+1} - \widehat{U}_{C,t+1} \} \\
\widehat{q}_t &= \mathbf{E}_t \left\{ \widehat{U}_{C,t+1} - \widehat{U}_{C,t} + [1 - \beta(1 - \delta_K)] \widehat{r}_{t+1}^k + \beta(1 - \delta_K) \widehat{q}_{t+1} \right\} \\
\widehat{I}_t - \widehat{I}_{t-1} &= \varphi_K \widehat{q}_t + \beta \mathbf{E}_t \{ \widehat{I}_{t+1} - \widehat{I}_t \} \\
\widehat{\pi}_{w,t} - \lambda_w \widehat{\pi}_{p,t-1} &= -\phi_w [\widehat{w}_t - (\widehat{U}_{L,t} - \widehat{U}_{C,t})] + \beta \mathbf{E}_t \{ \widehat{\pi}_{w,t+1} - \lambda_w \widehat{\pi}_{p,t} \} \\
\frac{wL}{Y} (\widehat{w}_t + \widehat{L}_t) + \frac{r^k K}{Y} (\widehat{r}_t^k + \widehat{K}_t + \widehat{u}_t) &= \frac{Y^C}{Y} \widehat{Y}_t^C + \frac{I}{Y} \widehat{I}_t + \frac{r^k K}{Y} \widehat{u}_t \\
\widehat{K}_t &= (1 - \delta_K) \widehat{K}_{t-1} + \delta_K \widehat{I}_{t-1} \\
\widehat{R}_t &= \tau_R \widehat{R}_{t-1} + (1 - \tau_R) \tau_\pi \widehat{\pi}_{p,t} + (1 - \tau_R) \tau_Y \widehat{Y}_t + \eta_t^R \\
\widehat{\pi}_{p,t} &= \widehat{\pi}_{w,t} - (\widehat{w}_t - \widehat{w}_{t-1})
\end{aligned}$$

Table 1. Data Series

| Series ID | Variable | Description | Construction |
|---|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Variables used in Vector Autoregression | | | |
| $RGDP_t$ | Real GDP | real gross domestic product | $\frac{GDP_t}{GDPDEF_t}$ |
| $RFPI_t$ | Real Investment | real fixed private investment | $\frac{FPI_t}{GDPDEF_t}$ |
| $RPCEt$ | Real Consumption | real personal consumption expenditures on services and non-durable goods | $\frac{PCESV_t+PCND_t}{GDPDEF_t}$ |
| $WINFL_t$ | Wage Inflation | growth rate of hourly compensation | $\Delta \log (COMP NFB_t)$ |
| $PINFL_t$ | Price Inflation | growth rate of GDP deflator | $\Delta \log (GDPDEF_t)$ |
| NBF_t | Net Entry | net business formation index | average of monthly figures |
| $RPROFITS_t$ | Real Profits | real corporate profits | $\frac{CPRFIT_t}{GDPDEF_t}$ |
| $MARKUP_t$ | Markup | model-consistent markup measure | $\tilde{\mu}_t$ |
| CRB_t | Commodity Prices | commodity price index | CRB_t |
| $FEDFUNDS_t$ | Interest Rate | Effective Federal Funds Rate | avg of monthly figures |
| Variables used in Markup Measure | | | |
| s_t^L | Labour Share | labour share in consumption output | $\frac{COE_t}{PCE_t+GCE_t}$ |

For details on how the markup is constructed, see Appendix 1.

Table 2. Data Sources

| Series Titel | Units, Frequency, Seasonal Adjustment | FRED Series ID | Source |
|--|--|----------------|------------|
| Gross Domestic Product | Billions of \$, Q, SAAR | GDP | BEA |
| Fixed Private Investment | Billions of \$, Q, SAAR | FPI | BEA |
| Personal Consumption Expenditures: Services | Billions of \$, Q, SAAR | PCESV | BEA |
| Personal Consumption Expenditures: Nondurable Goods | Billions of \$, Q, SAAR | PCND | BEA |
| Gross Domestic Product: Implicit Price Deflator | Index, Q, SA | GDPDEF | BEA |
| Effective Federal Funds Rate | Percent, M, n.a. | FEDFUNDS | Board |
| Compensation Per Hour (Nonfarm Business Sector) | Index, Q, SA | COMPNFB | BLS |
| Net Business Formation | Index, M, none | n.a. | BEA |
| Corporate Profits with IVA and CCAAdj. | Billions of \$, Q, SAAR | CPROFIT | BEA |
| CRB Raw Industrials Sub-index | Index, M, none | n.a. | Bridge CRB |
| National Income: Compensation of Employees, Paid | Billions of \$, Q, SAAR | COE | BEA |
| Personal Consumption Expenditures | Billions of \$, Q, SAAR | PCEC | BEA |
| Government Consumption Expenditures & Gross Investment | Billions of \$, Q, SAAR | GCE | BEA |

Notes: FRED = Federal Reserve Economic Data. BEA = U.S. Department of Commerce; Bureau of Economic Analysis. BLS = U.S. Department of Labor; Bureau of Labor Statistics. Board: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Bridge CRB = Bridge Commodity Research Bureau. Data on Net Business Formation are from the BEA Survey of Current Business. Q = quarterly, M = monthly, SA = seasonally adjusted, SAAR = seasonally adjusted annual rate.

Table 3. Calibrated Parameters

| | | |
|-------------|--|-------|
| β | Discount factor | 0.99 |
| σ_L | Inverse elasticity of labour supply to real wage | 1 |
| α | Capital share in production | 0.33 |
| δ_K | Depreciation rate of capital | 0.025 |
| δ_N | Firm exit rate | 0.025 |
| λ_p | Price indexation | 1 |
| λ_w | Wage indexation | 1 |
| Γ | Steady-state government spending share in output | 0.21 |

Table 4. Results of Minimum Distance Estimation (1954Q4-1995Q2)

| | | Entry Model | No-Entry Model |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Monetary Policy Shock | | | |
| σ_η | Standard error | 0.154 (0.012) [0.13,0.18] | 0.152 (0.013) [0.13,0.18] |
| ρ_η | Autocorrelation | 0.856 (0.043) [0.77,0.94] | 0.824 (0.190) [0.45,0.99] |
| Monetary Policy Rule | | | |
| τ_R | Interest rate smoothing | 0.145 (0.088) [0.00,0.32] | 0.177 (0.234) [0.00,0.64] |
| τ_π | Interest rate rule coefficient on inflation | 1.417 (0.518) [0.40,2.43] | 1.228 (1.186) [0.00,3.55] |
| τ_Y | Interest rate rule coefficient on output | 0.000 (*) | 0.000 (*) |


The numbers in parentheses are the standard errors of the parameter estimates. A star (*) refers to a constraint imposed during the estimation stage to avoid convergence problems. The numbers in square brackets are the 95% confidence intervals around each point estimate.

Table 5. Results of Minimum Distance Estimation (1954Q4-1995Q2)

| | | Entry Model | No-Entry Model |
|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Nominal and Real Frictions | | | |
| σ_C | Inverse elast. of intertemporal substitution | 3.221 (0.762) [1.73,4.71] | 3.319 (0.649) [2.05,4.59] |
| b | Habit persistence | 0.714 (0.090) [0.54,0.89] | 0.664 (0.087) [0.49,0.83] |
| σ_a^{-1} | Elasticity of utilisation w.r.t. rental rate | 1.444 (0.956) [0.00,3.32] | 0.087 (0.184) [0.00,0.45] |
| κ_p | Rotemberg price stickiness | 21.749 (10.210) [1.74,41.76] | 34.750 (24.022) [0,81.83] |
| ϕ_p | Elasticity of price inflation w.r.t. markup | 0.068 (0.001) [0.07,0.07] | 0.118 (0.003) [0.11,0.12] |
| ϕ_w | Elast. of wage inflation w.r.t. labour wedge | 0.007 (0.004) [0.00,0.01] | 0.030 (0.014) [0.00,0.06] |
| φ_K | Investment adjustment cost | 7.183 (1.730) [3.79,10.57] | 5.763 (0.962) [3.88,7.65] |
| φ_N | Entry adjustment cost | 8.223 (1.796) [4.70,11.74] | n.a. |
| ε^{yp} | Price elasticity of demand | 2.478 (0.638) [1.23,3.73] | 5.098 (2.419) [0.36,9.84] |
| ν_w | Fraction of wage bill paid in advance | 1.000 (*) | 0.589 (0.190) [0.22,0.96] |
| ν_v | Love of variety | 1.485 (0.205) [1.15,1.82] | n.a. |
| η | Competition effect | 0.000 (*) | n.a. |
| $\mathcal{J}-stat$ | | 65.871 (0.257) | 49.671 (0.365) |


The numbers in parentheses are the standard errors of the parameter estimates and the p -values of the J -statistics, respectively. A star (*) refers to a constraint imposed during the estimation stage to avoid convergence problems. The numbers in square brackets are the 95% confidence intervals around each point estimate.

Figure 1: **Entry Model** : Impulse Response Functions to a Monetary Policy Shock.




Entry Model: SVAR-based IRFs (solid lines) and model-based IRFs (lines with circles) (multiplied by 100). Grey areas correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 2: **No-Entry Model**: Impulse Response Functions to a Monetary Policy Shock.




No-entry Model: SVAR-based IRFs (solid lines) and model-based IRFs (lines with circles) (multiplied by 100). Grey areas correspond to 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 3: Counterfactual Exercises.



Counterfactual Exercises: Left panel: change in working capital channel (ν_w). Right panel: change in price stickiness (ϕ_p) and in wage stickiness (ϕ_w).

Figure 4: Counterfactual Exercises.



Counterfactual Exercises: Left panel: change in competition effect (η). Right panel: change in love of variety (ν_v).

NATIONAL BANK OF BELGIUM - WORKING PAPERS SERIES

1. "Model-based inflation forecasts and monetary policy rules", by M. Dombrecht and R. Wouters, *Research Series*, February 2000.
2. "The use of robust estimators as measures of core inflation", by L. Aucremanne, *Research Series*, February 2000.
3. "Performances économiques des Etats-Unis dans les années nonante", by A. Nyssens, P. Butzen and P. Bisciari, *Document Series*, March 2000.
4. "A model with explicit expectations for Belgium", by P. Jeanfils, *Research Series*, March 2000.
5. "Growth in an open economy: Some recent developments", by S. Turnovsky, *Research Series*, May 2000.
6. "Knowledge, technology and economic growth: An OECD perspective", by I. Visco, A. Bassanini and S. Scarpetta, *Research Series*, May 2000.
7. "Fiscal policy and growth in the context of European integration", by P. Masson, *Research Series*, May 2000.
8. "Economic growth and the labour market: Europe's challenge", by C. Wyplosz, *Research Series*, May 2000.
9. "The role of the exchange rate in economic growth: A euro-zone perspective", by R. MacDonald, *Research Series*, May 2000.
10. "Monetary union and economic growth", by J. Vickers, *Research Series*, May 2000.
11. "Politique monétaire et prix des actifs: le cas des États-Unis", by Q. Wibaut, *Document Series*, August 2000.
12. "The Belgian industrial confidence indicator: Leading indicator of economic activity in the euro area?", by J.-J. Vanhaelen, L. Dresse and J. De Mulder, *Document Series*, November 2000.
13. "Le financement des entreprises par capital-risque", by C. Rigo, *Document Series*, February 2001.
14. "La nouvelle économie" by P. Bisciari, *Document Series*, March 2001.
15. "De kostprijs van bankkredieten", by A. Bruggeman and R. Wouters, *Document Series*, April 2001.
16. "A guided tour of the world of rational expectations models and optimal policies", by Ph. Jeanfils, *Research Series*, May 2001.
17. "Attractive prices and euro - Rounding effects on inflation", by L. Aucremanne and D. Cornille, *Documents Series*, November 2001.
18. "The interest rate and credit channels in Belgium: An investigation with micro-level firm data", by P. Butzen, C. Fuss and Ph. Vermeulen, *Research series*, December 2001.
19. "Openness, imperfect exchange rate pass-through and monetary policy", by F. Smets and R. Wouters, *Research series*, March 2002.
20. "Inflation, relative prices and nominal rigidities", by L. Aucremanne, G. Brys, M. Hubert, P. J. Rousseeuw and A. Struyf, *Research series*, April 2002.
21. "Lifting the burden: Fundamental tax reform and economic growth", by D. Jorgenson, *Research series*, May 2002.
22. "What do we know about investment under uncertainty?", by L. Trigeorgis, *Research series*, May 2002.
23. "Investment, uncertainty and irreversibility: Evidence from Belgian accounting data" by D. Cassimon, P.-J. Engelen, H. Meersman and M. Van Wouwe, *Research series*, May 2002.
24. "The impact of uncertainty on investment plans", by P. Butzen, C. Fuss and Ph. Vermeulen, *Research series*, May 2002.
25. "Investment, protection, ownership, and the cost of capital", by Ch. P. Himmelberg, R. G. Hubbard and I. Love, *Research series*, May 2002.
26. "Finance, uncertainty and investment: Assessing the gains and losses of a generalised non-linear structural approach using Belgian panel data", by M. Gérard and F. Verschueren, *Research series*, May 2002.
27. "Capital structure, firm liquidity and growth", by R. Anderson, *Research series*, May 2002.
28. "Structural modelling of investment and financial constraints: Where do we stand?", by J.-B. Chatelain, *Research series*, May 2002.
29. "Financing and investment interdependencies in unquoted Belgian companies: The role of venture capital", by S. Manigart, K. Baeyens, I. Verschueren, *Research series*, May 2002.
30. "Development path and capital structure of Belgian biotechnology firms", by V. Bastin, A. Corhay, G. Hübner and P.-A. Michel, *Research series*, May 2002.
31. "Governance as a source of managerial discipline", by J. Franks, *Research series*, May 2002.
32. "Financing constraints, fixed capital and R&D investment decisions of Belgian firms", by M. Cincera, *Research series*, May 2002.

33. "Investment, R&D and liquidity constraints: A corporate governance approach to the Belgian evidence", by P. Van Cayseele, *Research series*, May 2002.
34. "On the origins of the Franco-German EMU controversies", by I. Maes, *Research series*, July 2002.
35. "An estimated dynamic stochastic general equilibrium model of the euro area", by F. Smets and R. Wouters, *Research series*, October 2002.
36. "The labour market and fiscal impact of labour tax reductions: The case of reduction of employers' social security contributions under a wage norm regime with automatic price indexing of wages", by K. Burggraeve and Ph. Du Caju, *Research series*, March 2003.
37. "Scope of asymmetries in the euro area", by S. Ide and Ph. Moës, *Document series*, March 2003.
38. "De autonijverheid in België: Het belang van het toeleveringsnetwerk rond de assemblage van personenauto's", by F. Coppens and G. van Gastel, *Document series*, June 2003.
39. "La consommation privée en Belgique", by B. Eugène, Ph. Jeanfils and B. Robert, *Document series*, June 2003.
40. "The process of European monetary integration: A comparison of the Belgian and Italian approaches", by I. Maes and L. Quaglia, *Research series*, August 2003.
41. "Stock market valuation in the United States", by P. Bisciari, A. Durré and A. Nyssens, *Document series*, November 2003.
42. "Modeling the term structure of interest rates: Where do we stand?", by K. Maes, *Research series*, February 2004.
43. "Interbank exposures: An empirical examination of system risk in the Belgian banking system", by H. Degryse and G. Nguyen, *Research series*, March 2004.
44. "How frequently do prices change? Evidence based on the micro data underlying the Belgian CPI", by L. Aucremanne and E. Dhyne, *Research series*, April 2004.
45. "Firms' investment decisions in response to demand and price uncertainty", by C. Fuss and Ph. Vermeulen, *Research series*, April 2004.
46. "SMEs and bank lending relationships: The impact of mergers", by H. Degryse, N. Masschelein and J. Mitchell, *Research series*, May 2004.
47. "The determinants of pass-through of market conditions to bank retail interest rates in Belgium", by F. De Graeve, O. De Jonghe and R. Vander Vennet, *Research series*, May 2004.
48. "Sectoral vs. country diversification benefits and downside risk", by M. Emir, *Research series*, May 2004.
49. "How does liquidity react to stress periods in a limit order market?", by H. Beltran, A. Durré and P. Giot, *Research series*, May 2004.
50. "Financial consolidation and liquidity: Prudential regulation and/or competition policy?", by P. Van Cayseele, *Research series*, May 2004.
51. "Basel II and operational risk: Implications for risk measurement and management in the financial sector", by A. Chapelle, Y. Crama, G. Hübner and J.-P. Peters, *Research series*, May 2004.
52. "The efficiency and stability of banks and markets", by F. Allen, *Research series*, May 2004.
53. "Does financial liberalization spur growth?", by G. Bekaert, C.R. Harvey and C. Lundblad, *Research series*, May 2004.
54. "Regulating financial conglomerates", by X. Freixas, G. Lóránth, A.D. Morrison and H.S. Shin, *Research series*, May 2004.
55. "Liquidity and financial market stability", by M. O'Hara, *Research series*, May 2004.
56. "Economisch belang van de Vlaamse zeehavens: Verslag 2002", by F. Lagneaux, *Document series*, June 2004.
57. "Determinants of euro term structure of credit spreads", by A. Van Landschoot, *Research series*, July 2004.
58. "Macroeconomic and monetary policy-making at the European Commission, from the Rome Treaties to the Hague Summit", by I. Maes, *Research series*, July 2004.
59. "Liberalisation of network industries: Is electricity an exception to the rule?", by F. Coppens and D. Vivet, *Document series*, September 2004.
60. "Forecasting with a Bayesian DSGE model: An application to the euro area", by F. Smets and R. Wouters, *Research series*, September 2004.
61. "Comparing shocks and frictions in US and euro area business cycle: A Bayesian DSGE approach", by F. Smets and R. Wouters, *Research series*, October 2004.
62. "Voting on pensions: A survey", by G. de Walque, *Research series*, October 2004.
63. "Asymmetric growth and inflation developments in the acceding countries: A new assessment", by S. Ide and P. Moës, *Research series*, October 2004.
64. "Importance économique du Port Autonome de Liège: rapport 2002", by F. Lagneaux, *Document series*, November 2004.

65. "Price-setting behaviour in Belgium: What can be learned from an ad hoc survey", by L. Aucremanne and M. Druant, *Research series*, March 2005.
66. "Time-dependent versus state-dependent pricing: A panel data approach to the determinants of Belgian consumer price changes", by L. Aucremanne and E. Dhyne, *Research series*, April 2005.
67. "Indirect effects – A formal definition and degrees of dependency as an alternative to technical coefficients", by F. Coppens, *Research series*, May 2005.
68. "Noname – A new quarterly model for Belgium", by Ph. Jeanfils and K. Burggraeve, *Research series*, May 2005.
69. "Economic importance of the Flemish maritime ports: Report 2003", by F. Lagneaux, *Document series*, May 2005.
70. "Measuring inflation persistence: A structural time series approach", by M. Dossche and G. Everaert, *Research series*, June 2005.
71. "Financial intermediation theory and implications for the sources of value in structured finance markets", by J. Mitchell, *Document series*, July 2005.
72. "Liquidity risk in securities settlement", by J. Devriese and J. Mitchell, *Research series*, July 2005.
73. "An international analysis of earnings, stock prices and bond yields", by A. Durré and P. Giot, *Research series*, September 2005.
74. "Price setting in the euro area: Some stylized facts from Individual Consumer Price Data", by E. Dhyne, L. J. Álvarez, H. Le Bihan, G. Veronese, D. Dias, J. Hoffmann, N. Jonker, P. Lünemann, F. Rumlér and J. Vilmunen, *Research series*, September 2005.
75. "Importance économique du Port Autonome de Liège: rapport 2003", by F. Lagneaux, *Document series*, October 2005.
76. "The pricing behaviour of firms in the euro area: New survey evidence", by S. Fabiani, M. Druant, I. Hernando, C. Kwapil, B. Landau, C. Loupias, F. Martins, T. Mathä, R. Sabbatini, H. Stahl and A. Stokman, *Research series*, November 2005.
77. "Income uncertainty and aggregate consumption", by L. Pozzi, *Research series*, November 2005.
78. "Crédits aux particuliers - Analyse des données de la Centrale des Crédits aux Particuliers", by H. De Doncker, *Document series*, January 2006.
79. "Is there a difference between solicited and unsolicited bank ratings and, if so, why?", by P. Van Roy, *Research series*, February 2006.
80. "A generalised dynamic factor model for the Belgian economy - Useful business cycle indicators and GDP growth forecasts", by Ch. Van Nieuwenhuyze, *Research series*, February 2006.
81. "Réduction linéaire de cotisations patronales à la sécurité sociale et financement alternatif", by Ph. Jeanfils, L. Van Meensel, Ph. Du Caju, Y. Saks, K. Buysse and K. Van Cauter, *Document series*, March 2006.
82. "The patterns and determinants of price setting in the Belgian industry", by D. Cornille and M. Dossche, *Research series*, May 2006.
83. "A multi-factor model for the valuation and risk management of demand deposits", by H. Dewachter, M. Lyrio and K. Maes, *Research series*, May 2006.
84. "The single European electricity market: A long road to convergence", by F. Coppens and D. Vivet, *Document series*, May 2006.
85. "Firm-specific production factors in a DSGE model with Taylor price setting", by G. de Walque, F. Smets and R. Wouters, *Research series*, June 2006.
86. "Economic importance of the Belgian ports: Flemish maritime ports and Liège port complex - Report 2004", by F. Lagneaux, *Document series*, June 2006.
87. "The response of firms' investment and financing to adverse cash flow shocks: The role of bank relationships", by C. Fuss and Ph. Vermeulen, *Research series*, July 2006.
88. "The term structure of interest rates in a DSGE model", by M. Emiris, *Research series*, July 2006.
89. "The production function approach to the Belgian output gap, estimation of a multivariate structural time series model", by Ph. Moës, *Research series*, September 2006.
90. "Industry wage differentials, unobserved ability, and rent-sharing: Evidence from matched worker-firm data, 1995-2002", by R. Plasman, F. Rycx and I. Tojerow, *Research series*, October 2006.
91. "The dynamics of trade and competition", by N. Chen, J. Imbs and A. Scott, *Research series*, October 2006.
92. "A New Keynesian model with unemployment", by O. Blanchard and J. Gali, *Research series*, October 2006.
93. "Price and wage setting in an integrating Europe: Firm level evidence", by F. Abraham, J. Konings and S. Vanormelingen, *Research series*, October 2006.
94. "Simulation, estimation and welfare implications of monetary policies in a 3-country NOEM model", by J. Plasmans, T. Michalak and J. Fornero, *Research series*, October 2006.

95. "Inflation persistence and price-setting behaviour in the euro area: A summary of the Inflation Persistence Network evidence ", by F. Altissimo, M. Ehrmann and F. Smets, *Research series*, October 2006.
96. "How wages change: Micro evidence from the International Wage Flexibility Project", by W.T. Dickens, L. Goette, E.L. Goshen, S. Holden, J. Messina, M.E. Schweitzer, J. Turunen and M. Ward, *Research series*, October 2006.
97. "Nominal wage rigidities in a new Keynesian model with frictional unemployment", by V. Bodart, G. de Walque, O. Pierrard, H.R. Sneessens and R. Wouters, *Research series*, October 2006.
98. "Dynamics on monetary policy in a fair wage model of the business cycle", by D. De la Croix, G. de Walque and R. Wouters, *Research series*, October 2006.
99. "The kinked demand curve and price rigidity: Evidence from scanner data", by M. Dossche, F. Heylen and D. Van den Poel, *Research series*, October 2006.
100. "Lumpy price adjustments: A microeconomic analysis", by E. Dhyne, C. Fuss, H. Peseran and P. Sevestre, *Research series*, October 2006.
101. "Reasons for wage rigidity in Germany", by W. Franz and F. Pfeiffer, *Research series*, October 2006.
102. "Fiscal sustainability indicators and policy design in the face of ageing", by G. Langenus, *Research series*, October 2006.
103. "Macroeconomic fluctuations and firm entry: Theory and evidence", by V. Lewis, *Research series*, October 2006.
104. "Exploring the CDS-bond basis", by J. De Wit, *Research series*, November 2006.
105. "Sector concentration in loan portfolios and economic capital", by K. Düllmann and N. Masschelein, *Research series*, November 2006.
106. "R&D in the Belgian pharmaceutical sector", by H. De Doncker, *Document series*, December 2006.
107. "Importance et évolution des investissements directs en Belgique", by Ch. Piette, *Document series*, January 2007.
108. "Investment-specific technology shocks and labor market frictions", by R. De Bock, *Research series*, February 2007.
109. "Shocks and frictions in US business cycles: A Bayesian DSGE approach", by F. Smets and R. Wouters, *Research series*, February 2007.
110. "Economic impact of port activity: A disaggregate analysis. The case of Antwerp", by F. Coppens, F. Lagneaux, H. Meersman, N. Sellekaerts, E. Van de Voorde, G. van Gastel, Th. Vanellander, A. Verhetsel, *Document series*, February 2007.
111. "Price setting in the euro area: Some stylised facts from individual producer price data", by Ph. Vermeulen, D. Dias, M. Dossche, E. Gautier, I. Hernando, R. Sabbatini, H. Stahl, *Research series*, March 2007.
112. "Assessing the gap between observed and perceived inflation in the euro area: Is the credibility of the HICP at stake?", by L. Aucremanne, M. Collin and Th. Stragier, *Research series*, April 2007.
113. "The spread of Keynesian economics: A comparison of the Belgian and Italian experiences", by I. Maes, *Research series*, April 2007.
114. "Imports and exports at the level of the firm: Evidence from Belgium", by M. Muûls and M. Pisu, *Research series*, May 2007.
115. "Economic importance of the Belgian ports: Flemish maritime ports and Liège port complex - Report 2005", by F. Lagneaux, *Document series*, May 2007.
116. "Temporal distribution of price changes: Staggering in the large and synchronization in the small", by E. Dhyne and J. Konieczny, *Research series*, June 2007.
117. "Can excess liquidity signal an asset price boom?", by A. Bruggeman, *Research series*, August 2007.
118. "The performance of credit rating systems in the assessment of collateral used in Eurosystem monetary policy operations", by F. Coppens, F. González and G. Winkler, *Research series*, September 2007.
119. "The determinants of stock and bond return comovements", by L. Baele, G. Bekaert and K. Inghelbrecht, *Research series*, October 2007.
120. "Monitoring pro-cyclicality under the capital requirements directive: Preliminary concepts for developing a framework", by N. Masschelein, *Document series*, October 2007.
121. "Dynamic order submission strategies with competition between a dealer market and a crossing network", by H. Degryse, M. Van Achter and G. Wuyts, *Research series*, November 2007.
122. "The gas chain: Influence of its specificities on the liberalisation process", by C. Swartenbroekx, *Document series*, November 2007.
123. "Failure prediction models: Performance, disagreements, and internal rating systems", by J. Mitchell and P. Van Roy, *Research series*, December 2007.
124. "Downward wage rigidity for different workers and firms: An evaluation for Belgium using the IWFP procedure", by Ph. Du Caju, C. Fuss and L. Wintr, *Research series*, December 2007.

125. "Economic importance of Belgian transport logistics", by F. Lagneaux, *Document series*, January 2008.
126. "Some evidence on late bidding in eBay auctions", by L. Wintr, *Research series*, January 2008.
127. "How do firms adjust their wage bill in Belgium? A decomposition along the intensive and extensive margins", by C. Fuss, *Research series*, January 2008.
128. "Exports and productivity – Comparable evidence for 14 countries", by The International Study Group on Exports and Productivity, *Research series*, February 2008.
129. "Estimation of monetary policy preferences in a forward-looking model: A Bayesian approach", by P. Ilbas, *Research series*, March 2008.
130. "Job creation, job destruction and firms' international trade involvement", by M. Pisu, *Research series*, March 2008.
131. "Do survey indicators let us see the business cycle? A frequency decomposition", by L. Dresse and Ch. Van Nieuwenhuyze, *Research series*, March 2008.
132. "Searching for additional sources of inflation persistence: The micro-price panel data approach", by R. Raciborski, *Research series*, April 2008.
133. "Short-term forecasting of GDP using large monthly datasets - A pseudo real-time forecast evaluation exercise", by K. Barhoumi, S. Benk, R. Cristadoro, A. Den Reijer, A. Jakaitiene, P. Jelonek, A. Rua, G. Rünstler, K. Ruth and Ch. Van Nieuwenhuyze, *Research series*, June 2008.
134. "Economic importance of the Belgian ports: Flemish maritime ports, Liège port complex and the port of Brussels - Report 2006", by S. Vennix, *Document series*, June 2008.
135. "Imperfect exchange rate pass-through: The role of distribution services and variable demand elasticity", by Ph. Jeanfils, *Research series*, August 2008.
136. "Multivariate structural time series models with dual cycles: Implications for measurement of output gap and potential growth", by Ph. Moës, *Research series*, August 2008.
137. "Agency problems in structured finance - A case study of European CLOs", by J. Keller, *Document series*, August 2008.
138. "The efficiency frontier as a method for gauging the performance of public expenditure: A Belgian case study", by B. Eugène, *Research series*, September 2008.
139. "Exporters and credit constraints. A firm-level approach", by M. Muûls, *Research series*, September 2008.
140. "Export destinations and learning-by-exporting: Evidence from Belgium", by M. Pisu, *Research series*, September 2008.
141. "Monetary aggregates and liquidity in a neo-Wicksellian framework", by M. Canzoneri, R. Cumby, B. Diba and D. López-Salido, *Research series*, October 2008.
142. "Liquidity, inflation and asset prices in a time-varying framework for the euro area", by Ch. Baumeister, E. Durinck and G. Peersman, *Research series*, October 2008.
143. "The bond premium in a DSGE model with long-run real and nominal risks", by G. D. Rudebusch and E. T. Swanson, *Research series*, October 2008.
144. "Imperfect information, macroeconomic dynamics and the yield curve: An encompassing macro-finance model", by H. Dewachter, *Research series*, October 2008.
145. "Housing market spillovers: Evidence from an estimated DSGE model", by M. Iacoviello and S. Neri, *Research series*, October 2008.
146. "Credit frictions and optimal monetary policy", by V. Cúrdia and M. Woodford, *Research series*, October 2008.
147. "Central Bank misperceptions and the role of money in interest rate rules", by G. Beck and V. Wieland, *Research series*, October 2008.
148. "Financial (in)stability, supervision and liquidity injections: A dynamic general equilibrium approach", by G. de Walque, O. Pierrard and A. Rouabah, *Research series*, October 2008.
149. "Monetary policy, asset prices and macroeconomic conditions: A panel-VAR study", by K. Assenmacher-Wesche and S. Gerlach, *Research series*, October 2008.
150. "Risk premiums and macroeconomic dynamics in a heterogeneous agent model", by F. De Graeve, M. Dossche, M. Emiris, H. Sneessens and R. Wouters, *Research series*, October 2008.
151. "Financial factors in economic fluctuations", by L. J. Christiano, R. Motto and M. Rotagno, *Research series*, to be published.
152. "Rent-sharing under different bargaining regimes: Evidence from linked employer-employee data", by M. Rusinek and F. Rycx, *Research series*, December 2008.
153. "Forecast with judgment and models", by F. Monti, *Research series*, December 2008.
154. "Institutional features of wage bargaining in 23 European countries, the US and Japan", by Ph. Du Caju, E. Gautier, D. Momferatou and M. Ward-Warmedinger, *Research series*, December 2008.
155. "Fiscal sustainability and policy implications for the euro area", by F. Balassone, J. Cunha, G. Langenus, B. Manzke, J. Pavot, D. Prammer and P. Tommasino, *Research series*, January 2009.

156. "Understanding sectoral differences in downward real wage rigidity: Workforce composition, institutions, technology and competition", by Ph. Du Caju, C. Fuss and L. Wintr, *Research series*, February 2009.
157. "Sequential bargaining in a New Keynesian model with frictional unemployment and staggered wage negotiation", by G. de Walque, O. Pierrard, H. Sneessens and R. Wouters, *Research series*, February 2009.
158. "Economic importance of air transport and airport activities in Belgium", by F. Kupfer and F. Lagneaux, *Document series*, March 2009.
159. "Rigid labour compensation and flexible employment? Firm-Level evidence with regard to productivity for Belgium", by C. Fuss and L. Wintr, *Research series*, March 2009.
160. "The Belgian iron and steel industry in the international context", by F. Lagneaux and D. Vivet, *Document series*, March 2009.
161. "Trade, wages and productivity", by K. Behrens, G. Mion, Y. Murata and J. Südekum, *Research series*, March 2009.
162. "Labour flows in Belgium", by P. Heuse and Y. Saks, *Research series*, April 2009.
163. "The young Lamfalussy: An empirical and policy-oriented growth theorist", by I. Maes, *Research series*, April 2009.
164. "Inflation dynamics with labour market matching: Assessing alternative specifications", by K. Christoffel, J. Costain, G. de Walque, K. Kuester, T. Linzert, S. Millard and O. Pierrard, *Research series*, May 2009.
165. "Understanding inflation dynamics: Where do we stand?", by M. Dossche, *Research series*, June 2009.
166. "Input-output connections between sectors and optimal monetary policy", by E. Kara, *Research series*, June 2009.
167. "Back to the basics in banking? A micro-analysis of banking system stability", by O. De Jonghe, *Research series*, June 2009.
168. "Model misspecification, learning and the exchange rate disconnect puzzle", by V. Lewis and A. Markiewicz, *Research series*, July 2009.
169. "The use of fixed-term contracts and the labour adjustment in Belgium", by E. Dhyne and B. Mahy, *Research series*, July 2009.
170. "Analysis of business demography using markov chains – An application to Belgian data", by F. Coppens and F. Verduyn, *Research series*, July 2009.
171. "A global assessment of the degree of price stickiness - Results from the NBB business survey", by E. Dhyne, *Research series*, July 2009.
172. "Economic importance of the Belgian ports: Flemish maritime ports, Liège port complex and the port of Brussels - Report 2007", by C. Mathys, *Document series*, July 2009.
173. "Evaluating a monetary business cycle model with unemployment for the euro area", by N. Groshenny, *Research series*, July 2009.
174. "How are firms' wages and prices linked: Survey evidence in Europe", by M. Druant, S. Fabiani and G. Kezdi, A. Lamo, F. Martins and R. Sabbatini, *Research series*, August 2009.
175. "Micro-data on nominal rigidity, inflation persistence and optimal monetary policy", by E. Kara, *Research series*, September 2009.
176. "On the origins of the BIS macro-prudential approach to financial stability: Alexandre Lamfalussy and financial fragility", by I. Maes, *Research series*, October 2009.
177. "Incentives and tranche retention in securitisation: A screening model", by I. Fender and J. Mitchell, *Research series*, October 2009.
178. "Optimal monetary policy and firm entry", by V. Lewis, *Research series*, October 2009.
179. "Staying, dropping, or switching: The impacts of bank mergers on small firms", by H. Degryse, N. Masschelein and J. Mitchell, *Research series*, October 2009.
180. "Inter-industry wage differentials: How much does rent sharing matter?", by Ph. Du Caju, F. Rycx and I. Tojerow, *Research series*, October 2009.
181. "Empirical evidence on the aggregate effects of anticipated and unanticipated US tax policy shocks", by K. Mertens and M. O. Ravn, *Research series*, November 2009.
182. "Downward nominal and real wage rigidity: Survey evidence from European firms", by J. Babecký, Ph. Du Caju, T. Kosma, M. Lawless, J. Messina and T. Rõõm, *Research series*, November 2009.
183. "The margins of labour cost adjustment: Survey evidence from European firms", by J. Babecký, Ph. Du Caju, T. Kosma, M. Lawless, J. Messina and T. Rõõm, *Research series*, November 2009.
184. "Discriminatory fees, coordination and investment in shared ATM networks" by S. Ferrari, *Research series*, January 2010.
185. "Self-fulfilling liquidity dry-ups", by F. Malherbe, *Research series*, March 2010.
186. "The development of monetary policy in the 20th century - some reflections", by O. Issing, *Research series*, April 2010.

187. "Getting rid of Keynes? A survey of the history of macroeconomics from Keynes to Lucas and beyond", by M. De Vroey, *Research series*, April 2010.
188. "A century of macroeconomic and monetary thought at the National Bank of Belgium", by I. Maes, *Research series*, April 2010.
189. "Inter-industry wage differentials in EU countries: What do cross-country time-varying data add to the picture?", by Ph. Du Caju, G. Kátay, A. Lamo, D. Nicolitsas and S. Poelhekke, *Research series*, April 2010.
190. "What determines euro area bank CDS spreads?", by J. Annaert, M. De Ceuster, P. Van Roy and C. Vespro, *Research series*, May 2010.
191. "The incidence of nominal and real wage rigidity: An individual-based sectoral approach", by J. Messina, Ph. Du Caju, C. F. Duarte, N. L. Hansen, M. Izquierdo, *Research series*, June 2010.
192. "Economic importance of the Belgian ports: Flemish maritime ports, Liège port complex and the port of Brussels - Report 2008", by C. Mathys, *Document series*, July 2010.
193. "Wages, labor or prices: how do firms react to shocks?", by E. Dhyne and M. Druant, *Research series*, July 2010.
194. "Trade with China and skill upgrading: Evidence from Belgian firm level data", by G. Mion, H. Vandebussche, and L. Zhu, *Research series*, September 2010.
195. "Trade crisis? What trade crisis?", by K. Behrens, G. Corcos and G. Mion, *Research series*, September 2010.
196. "Trade and the global recession", by J. Eaton, S. Kortum, B. Neiman and J. Romalis, *Research series*, October 2010.
197. "Internationalization strategy and performance of small and medium sized enterprises", by J. Onkelinx and L. Sleuwaegen, *Research series*, October 2010.
198. "The internationalization process of firms: From exports to FDI?", by P. Conconi, A. Sapir and M. Zanardi, *Research series*, October 2010.
199. "Intermediaries in international trade: Direct versus indirect modes of export", by A. B. Bernard, M. Grazzi and C. Tomasi, *Research series*, October 2010.
200. "Trade in services: IT and task content", by A. Ariu and G. Mion, *Research series*, October 2010.
201. "The productivity and export spillovers of the internationalisation behaviour of Belgian firms", by M. Dumont, B. Merlevede, C. Piette and G. Rayp, *Research series*, October 2010.
202. "Market size, competition, and the product mix of exporters", by T. Mayer, M. J. Melitz and G. I. P. Ottaviano, *Research series*, October 2010.
203. "Multi-product exporters, carry-along trade and the margins of trade", by A. B. Bernard, I. Van Beveren and H. Vandebussche, *Research series*, October 2010.
204. "Can Belgian firms cope with the Chinese dragon and the Asian tigers? The export performance of multi-product firms on foreign markets" by F. Abraham and J. Van Hove, *Research series*, October 2010.
205. "Immigration, offshoring and American jobs", by G. I. P. Ottaviano, G. Peri and G. C. Wright, *Research series*, October 2010.
206. "The effects of internationalisation on domestic labour demand by skills: Firm-level evidence for Belgium", by L. Cuyvers, E. Dhyne, and R. Soeng, *Research series*, October 2010.
207. "Labour demand adjustment: Does foreign ownership matter?", by E. Dhyne, C. Fuss and C. Mathieu, *Research series*, October 2010.
208. "The Taylor principle and (in-)determinacy in a New Keynesian model with hiring frictions and skill loss", by A. Rannenberg, *Research series*, November 2010.
209. "Wage and employment effects of a wage norm: The Polish transition experience" by A. de Crombrughe and G. de Walque, *Research series*, February 2011.
210. "Estimating monetary policy reaction functions: A discrete choice approach" by J. Boeckx, *Research series*, February 2011.
211. "Firm entry, inflation and the monetary transmission mechanism" by V. Lewis and C. Poilly, *Research series*, February 2011.

National Bank of Belgium
Limited liability company
RLP Brussels – Company's number: 0203.201.340
Registered office: boulevard de Berlaimont 14 – BE-1000 Brussels
www.nbb.be

Editor

Jan Smets

Member of the board of Directors of the National Bank of Belgium

© Illustrations: National Bank of Belgium

Layout: Analysis and Research Group
Cover: NBB TS – Prepress & Image

Published in February 2011