

# Explaining International Business Synchronization: Recursive Preferences and the Terms of Trade Channel

(Forthcoming in: *Open Economies Review*, 2019)

**Robert Kollmann**, Université Libre de Bruxelles & CEPR

Contact: [robert\\_kollmann@yahoo.com](mailto:robert_kollmann@yahoo.com), [www.robertkollmann.com](http://www.robertkollmann.com)

## Abstract

- **Business cycles of advanced economies are synchronized. Standard models cannot explain this.**
- **This paper: simple two-country model with high endogenous business cycle correlation**
- **Key ingredients: recursive intertemporal preferences (Epstein-Zin-Weil) and muted wealth effect on labor supply (GHH preferences and demand-determined employment under rigid wages)**
- **Key mechanism: recursive preferences magnify terms-of-trade response to country-specific shocks**
- ⇒ **A productivity increase in a given country triggers a strong improvement on foreign terms of trade**
- ⇒ **Increase in foreign labor demand**
- ⇒ **With muted labor wealth effect, foreign hours & GDP ↑**
- ⇒ **domestic and foreign GDP are synchronized in model!**

## Endogenous international shock transmission

Not plausible that world business cycle is solely driven by common (world-wide) shocks: demand & supply shocks are LESS correlated across countries than GDP. E.g., GDP is more correlated internationally than GDP!

Corr. across US & aggreg. of 13 other OECD countries: TFP: 0.13. GDP: 0.45 (quarterly growth rates)

⇒ **INTERNAT. BIZ CYCLE SYNCHRONIZATION MUST PARTLY BE ENDOGENOUS: SYNCHRONIZED DOMESTIC & FOREIGN RESPONSES TO COUNTRY-SPECIFIC SHOCKS**

- **Problem: existing models do NOT generate strong endogenous international shock transmission.**
- **MODEL HERE GENERATES STRONG INTERNATIONAL TRANSMISSION OF TFP SHOCKS, DUE TO STRONG TERMS-OF-TRADE CHANNEL**

## The model

**Simple two-country (Home, Foreign) structure:**

- **2 traded goods, local spending bias**
- **Each country produces 1 traded good (from K & L)**
- **Complete financial markets**
- **Exogenous persistent TFP shocks**

### • Period utility

$$u_{i,t}(C_{i,t}, L_{i,t}) = \frac{1}{1-\sigma} [\psi_{i,t}(C_{i,t}, L_{i,t})]^{1-\sigma} \quad \sigma > 0, \sigma \neq 0$$

- **Recursive EZW intertemporal preferences:**

$$U_{i,t} = \left\{ (1-\beta) [\psi_{i,t}(C_{i,t}, L_{i,t})]^{1-\sigma} + \beta [E_t U_{i,t+1}]^{1-\sigma} \right\}^{1/(1-\sigma)}$$

$\sigma$ : 1/IES intertemporal elasticity of substitution (IES)

$\gamma$ : coefficient of risk aversion (CRA)

**NB** When  $\gamma = \sigma$ : time-separable utility

Intertemporal marginal rate of substitution (IMRS) depends on future life-time utility

$$\rho_{i,t+1} \equiv \beta \frac{\partial u_{i,t+1} / \partial C_{i,t+1}}{\partial u_{i,t} / \partial C_{i,t}} \left( \frac{U_{i,t+1}}{(E_t U_{i,t+1})^{1-\gamma}} \right)^{\sigma-\gamma}$$

### ► Efficient risk sharing

$$\rho_{H,t+1} / \rho_{F,t+1} = RER_{t+1} / RER_t$$

Standard assumption:  $\gamma > \sigma \equiv 1/IES$  (preference for early resolution of uncertainty)

• Unexpected **RISE** in future life-time utility **LOWERS** IMRS: **Consumption & life-time utility are 'substitutes'**

► **Positive TFP shock in country H:**

- **Relative consumption of country H ↑**
- **Relative life-time utility of country H ↑**
- **RER of country H depreciates strongly**

⇒ **Relative price of good H ↓**

**Terms of trade of country H worsen,**  
**Terms of trade of country F improve**

Foreign terms of trade **improvement** **RAISES** foreign marginal product of capital & labor, in final good units

⇒ **Foreign Investment and labor demand ↑**

## Quantitative results

### Predicted moments: Flexible wage vs. Rigid wage

Role of: KPR/GHH utility; risk aversion ( $\gamma$ )

	Flexible wage				Predeterm. wage		Data
	KPR		GHH		KPR	GHH	
	$\gamma=1/IES$	$\gamma=50$	$\gamma=1/IES$	$\gamma=50$	$\gamma=50$	$\gamma=50$	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
<b>Standard deviations (%)</b>							
GDP	0.82	0.85	0.90	0.84	1.36	1.36	0.81
<b>Standard deviations relative to GDP</b>							
C	0.22	0.25	0.48	0.39	0.48	0.72	0.66
Labor	0.61	0.63	0.67	0.61	1.07	1.03	0.89
RER	<b>0.37</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>1.53</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.95</b>	3.03
<b>Cross-country correlations</b>							
GDP	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.47</b>	0.45
C	<b>0.13</b>	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.69</b>	0.35
I	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.54</b>	0.34
Labor	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.61</b>	0.43
<b>Hansen-Jagannathan bound</b>							
	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.257</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.225</b>	<b>0.257</b>	<b>0.225</b>	

HJ bound = std(IMRS)/E(IMRS); Sharpe ratio = E(Rx)/std(Rx); SR ≤ HJ. Rx: excess return; historical SR equity: 0.22

## Conclusion

• Paper has developed simple DSGE model that solves the 'international correlation puzzle':

► **Country-specific productivity shocks generate sizable cross-country correlations of GDP, investment, Labor.**

► **Real exchange rate is volatile**

• **Key ingredients (BOTH are needed!)**

► **recursive intertemporal preferences (⇒ volatile RER)**

► **weak wealth effect on labor supply (⇒ positive international shock transmission, via t.o.t. channel)**