BOK Working Paper

A Structural Change in the
Trend and Cycle in Korea

Nam Gang Lee, Byoung Hoon Seok

2019. 11

BANK OF KOREA

Economic Research Institute
Bank of Korea

Publisher
Juyeol Lee
(Governor of Bank of Korea)

Editor
Woon Shin
(Director General of the Institute)

BOK Working Paper is occasionally published by the Economic Research Institute, Bank of Korea. This is circulated in order to stimulate discussion and comments. Articles include research achievement by the staff and visiting scholars, and selected works sponsored by the Institute.

The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of Bank of Korea or the Economic Research Institute.

Requests for copies of publications, or for addition/changes to the mailing list, should be sent to:

Economic Research Institute
Bank of Korea
39 Namdaemunno Jung-Gu
Seoul, 110-794, Korea

E-mail: eso@bok.or.kr

Fax: 82-2-759-5410

This publication available on the BOK
Economic Research Institute website
(<http://imer.bok.or.kr>)

© Bank of Korea, 2019
All rights reserved.

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

A Structural Change in the Trend and Cycle in Korea

Nam Gang Lee*, Byoung Hoon Seok**

The views expressed herein are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the official views of Bank of Korea. When reporting or citing this paper, the authors' names should always be explicitly stated.

* First Author, Economic Research Institute, Bank of Korea, Tel: +82-2-759-5473, Email: nglee@bok.or.kr

** Corresponding Author, Department of Economics, Ewha Womans University, Tel: +82-2-3277-2733, Email: bhseok@ewha.ac.kr

We are grateful to the seminar participants at the Western Economic Association International 94th Annual Conference, 2019 Korea's Allied Economic Associations Annual Meeting, 2018 Korea International Economic Association Annual Meeting, and Bank of Korea for their valuable comments. All errors remain ours.

Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. Korean Business Cycles	5
III. Trend and Cycle in Productivity	12
IV. Conclusion	20
References	21
Appendix	23

A Structural Change in the Trend and Cycle in Korea

We develop a new identification approach based on the regression of consumption on output to identify a structural break in business cycles. Using this method, we find that a structural change in the trend and cycle in Korea occurred in 1993. To explain these, we estimate the parameters of the productivity process in Korea, using data on Solow residuals. Our estimates show that the relative importance of trend growth shocks in the post-break period increased by a factor of 2.56 compared to that in the pre-break period.

Keywords: Structural change, Consumption volatility, Trend growth shocks

JEL Classification: E32, F44

I . Introduction

At the beginning of the 21st century, economists began to pay close attention to the differences in business cycle regularities observed between emerging markets and developed countries (see Neumeyer and Perri, 2005; Aguiar and Gopinath, 2007). Emerging market business cycles have two key features: consumption being more volatile than output and strongly countercyclical net exports. Specifically, Aguiar and Gopinath (2007) report that business cycles in Korea showed these features over the period 1980–2003.

Figure 1. Real GDP and Consumption (1980–2016)

The less well-known fact regarding Korea is that business cycle regularities observed in emerging markets have stood out in Korea since the early 1990s. Figure 1 depicts this experience by showing consumption volatility relative to output volatility. Fluctuations in consumption have become greater than or equal to those in output since the early 1990s. The actual historical experience is also revealed in Figure 2, which shows Hodrick-Prescott (HP)-filtered real GDP and net exports over GDP from the first quarter of 1980 to the last quarter of 2016. During this period, net exports were countercyclical; however, net exports have become strongly countercyclical since the early 1990s. Korea became a developed country in the middle of the 1990s in that the World Bank classified Korea as a high-income country in 1995 and Korea became a member of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1996. Given this, it is puzzling that business cycles in Korea started to show key features of those in developing countries over the same period. The goals of this paper are to detect exactly when the business cycle regularities of emerging markets began to appear in Korea and to explain the reason for this change in business cycle patterns.

Figure 2. HP-filtered Real GDP and Net Exports Over GDP

The first contribution of this paper is to develop a regression-based approach to identify a structural break using changing patterns of the relative consumption volatility to output. As consumption becomes more volatile than output, net exports tend to be more countercyclical, because consumption is pro-cyclical, and net exports are equal to output minus consumption, investment, and government spending. Since these two key features of emerging market business cycles are connected, we can identify a structural break using a sudden change in the relative volatility of consumption to output. We consider a simple regression of HP-filtered consumption on HP-filtered output, which helps us express the relative volatility of consumption to output as the ratio of the regression coefficient to the square root of the coefficient of determination, R-squared. If this ratio becomes greater than unity, it means that the consumption is more volatile than output. Since the coefficient of determination is between zero and one, we can capture a structural break using an abrupt increase in the regression coefficient. This is indeed what happened in Korea in the early 1990s. We then use Bai (1997)'s method to find a structural break date in the sample period 1980–2016. Our finding suggests that HP-filtered consumption started to be more volatile than output in 1993.

The second contribution of the paper is to show that this structural break in 1993 was caused by the rising importance of shocks to the trend growth of the total factor productivity (TFP) in Korea. Following Aguiar and Gopinath (2007), we propose that the increase in the relative consumption volatility of Korea since 1993 was driven by a rising volatility in trend growth. To confirm this, we estimate the parameters of the productivity process in Korea, using data on Solow residuals. We find that variations in trend growth explain roughly 70% of the fluctuations in TFP growth after 1993, which is more than double that before 1993.

Our research first relates to the strand of the literature that explains the difference in business cycle regularities between developed and developing countries. Aguiar and Gopinath (2007) show that the greater importance of trend growth shocks to productivity in developing countries causes

consumption to be more volatile than output. Neumeyer and Perri (2005) find that the countercyclical borrowing premium shocks and financial frictions in developing economies raise the volatilities of consumption and output. Alvarez-Parra et al. (2013) claim that countercyclical borrowing premium shocks raise the volatility of durable goods consumption, which increases the relative consumption volatility in emerging markets. Restrepo-Echavarria (2014) and Chen et al. (2018) focus on the greater importance of the informal economy or home production in developing countries relative to developed economies. In emerging markets, consumers can substitute goods produced in the informal economy or at home for commodities produced in the formal economy or markets, raising the relative volatility of consumption to output. Our paper focuses on business cycles in Korea, which experienced a rapid transition from a developing country to a developed one. In this paper, we first develop a new method to identify a structural break in business cycles. Using this method, we find that there was a structural change in the trend and cycle in Korea in 1993. Then, we show that the importance of trend growth shocks to productivity increased since 1993 and that this raised the relative volatility of consumption to output in Korea.

This study also contributes to the literature on business cycles in Korea. Using data prior to the middle of the 1990s, Kim and Choi (1997), and Kim and Ahn (2005) find that business cycles in Korea resemble those in developed countries. On the other hand, using data from 1987 to 2013, Rhee (2017) shows that the business cycles in Korea are similar to those in developing countries. Unlike the previous studies, we find that Korean business cycles have featured the business cycle regularities observed in developing countries since 1993 and that there was a structural change in the trend and cycle in Korea in 1993.

The paper is organized as follows: in the next section, we describe the data sources and variable construction and then present some stylized facts about business cycles in Korea. Section 3 presents our main results on the structural break in the trend and cycle of productivity in Korea, while Section 4 concludes.

II. Korean Business Cycles

This section begins our analysis by documenting the Korean business cycle from the first quarter of 1980 to the last quarter of 2016 and by introducing a new method to identify the timing of a structural break in the relative consumption volatility. With this method, we show how the economic fluctuations of the two neighboring regimes surrounding the break differ.

To document the stylized facts of Korean business cycles, we obtain data from the OECD. Each series of interest is quarterly and spans the period from the first quarter of 1980 to the fourth quarter of 2016. After implementing the Census Bureau's X-12 ARIMA program to deseasonalize the series, we use both the HP-filtered series with a smoothing parameter value of 1,600 and the first difference of the unfiltered series (growth rates) to compute business cycle moments.

Table 1. Korean Business Cycle Moments

	Full sample 1980Q1–2016Q4	Pre-break 1980Q1–1993Q1	Post-break 1993Q2–2016Q4
Volatility of GDP			
$\sigma(\tilde{y})$	1.99	1.70	2.14
$\sigma(\Delta y)$	1.50	1.60	1.31
Relative volatility of consumption, investment, and net exports			
$\sigma(\tilde{c})/\sigma(\tilde{y})$	1.36	0.51	1.55
$\sigma(\Delta c)/\sigma(\Delta y)$	1.12	0.42	1.47
$\sigma(\tilde{i})/\sigma(\tilde{y})$	2.48	2.77	2.37
$\sigma(\Delta i)/\sigma(\Delta y)$	2.12	2.19	2.14
$\sigma(NX/Y)$	5.94	2.59	6.26
Correlation of net exports with GDP			
$\rho(NX/Y, \tilde{y})$	−0.26	−0.03	−0.36
$\rho(NX/Y, \Delta y)$	−0.35	0.19	−0.38

Note: Data taken from the OECD. Lowercase letters denote logarithms of variables. Tildes denote HP-filtered series using smoothing parameter of 1,600. Δ denotes difference operator; that is, $\Delta y_t = y_t - y_{t-1}$.

The three features of business cycle regularities in emerging market economies are consumption being more volatile than output, strongly countercyclical net exports, and sudden stops (see Aguiar and Gopinath, 2007;

Neumeyer and Perri, 2005). Table 1 and Figure 2 illustrate that Korean business cycles have these features during the period from the first quarter of 1980 to the fourth quarter of 2016.

The first column of Table 1 reports business cycle moments in the full sample period (1980–2016), and two of the features are noticeable. First, in the data, consumption volatility exceeds output volatility at business cycle frequencies (1.36). Second, the data suggest that Korea has experienced a negative contemporaneous correlation of net exports and output; however, the correlation is moderate, with correlations of -0.26 in filtered log output and of -0.35 in the growth rate of output.

The sudden stop phenomenon is associated with a dramatic and large reversal in net capital inflows. Figure 2 plots the ratio of net exports to output and filtered log output. The most striking feature is the abrupt and large increases in the ratio in 1997 and 2008. This reflects the Asian financial crisis and the global financial crisis, respectively.

1. A Structural Change in Relative Consumption Volatility

We start with looking at patterns in relative consumption volatility over time. The top panel of Figure 1 plots HP-filtered log consumption and log output. A brief glance at the figure suggests that consumption is more volatile than output in the period after the early 1990s.

Before we develop an approach to capture the structural break in relative consumption volatility, let's step back and ask a fundamental question: Why was consumption more volatile than output over the period of the past two decades? The permanent income hypothesis (PIH) provides an answer to this question. According to the PIH, changes in consumption depend primarily on changes in permanent income. If a large fraction of fluctuations in income came from changes in permanent income, consumption would respond strongly to changes in income. On the other hand, if income fluctuations came from changes in transitory income, consumers would spread out these income changes over time by adjusting savings to smooth consumption. This logic can

explain the small consumption volatility relative to output volatility before the early 1990s.

Motivated by the prediction of the PIH, we consider the following regression to detect more precisely when the pattern in volatility of consumption relative to output changes:

$$\tilde{c}_t = \alpha + \beta \tilde{y}_t + e_t, \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{c}_t$ and $\tilde{y}_t$ denote HP-filtered log consumption and log output, respectively. If this structure is not a bad approximation, relative consumption volatility can be represented by the regression coefficient β and the square root of R-squared as follows:¹⁾

$$\frac{\sigma(\tilde{c}_t)}{\sigma(\tilde{y}_t)} = \frac{\beta}{R}. \quad (2)$$

Equation (2) gives us an idea about how to detect a structural break in relative consumption volatility. Values of β , greater (less) than those of R , imply consumption volatility being greater (less) than output volatility. When β is greater than unity, it is a special case. If this is the case, consumption is always more volatile than output because R is limited to an upper bound of unity and changes in the same direction as β .

The special case is useful to identify a structural break in relative consumption volatility in our case. It is generally difficult to detect an abrupt change in the ratio of β to R ; however, Table 2 shows that it would be enough to see whether there was an abrupt shift in β to determine a structural break at an unknown point in the early 1990s. The estimated β over R is 0.45 in

1) Equation (2) is directly derived from the regression considered. Taking the variance on both sides of the regression equation (1), $\sigma^2(\tilde{c}_t) = \beta^2 \sigma^2(\tilde{y}_t) + \sigma^2(e_t)$. Since $R^2 = 1 - \sigma^2(e_t)/\sigma^2(\tilde{c}_t)$, $\sigma^2(\tilde{c}_t)(1 - \sigma^2(e_t)/\sigma^2(\tilde{c}_t)) = \beta^2 \sigma^2(\tilde{y}_t)$ becomes $\sigma^2(\tilde{c}_t)R^2 = \beta^2 \sigma^2(\tilde{y}_t)$. Dividing both sides by $\sigma^2(\tilde{y}_t)R^2$ and taking the square root, we have $\sigma(\tilde{c}_t)/\sigma(\tilde{y}_t) = \beta/R$.

the 1980s with a regression coefficient of 0.21; it rises to 1.50 in the 1990s with a sharp rise in the estimated regression coefficient (1.45).

Table 2. OLS Regressions of Filtered Consumption on Filtered Output

Period	α	β	R^2	β/R	$\hat{\sigma}(\tilde{c}_t)/\hat{\sigma}(\tilde{y}_t)$
1980–1989	−0.14 (0.18)	0.21 (0.13)	0.21	0.45	0.45
1990–1999	0.09 (0.23)	1.45 (0.06)	0.94	1.50	1.50
2000–2009	0.17 (0.42)	1.21 (0.24)	0.55	1.62	1.62
2010–2016	−0.01 (0.11)	0.55 (0.19)	0.27	1.06	1.06

Note: Newey–West (1987) standard errors are in parentheses. β/R denotes implied relative consumption volatility.

To utilize this idea, we adopt Bai (1997)’s method²⁾ to identify a structural break at an unknown point in the sample period 1980–2016 based on the following model:

$$\tilde{c}_t = (\alpha_1 + \beta_1 \tilde{y}_t)1(t \leq m) + (\alpha_2 + \beta_2 \tilde{y}_t)1(t > m) + e_t, \quad (3)$$

where $1(t \leq m)$ and $1(t > m)$ are the dummy variables that take values equal to one for dates until and after a specific date m , respectively. We first trim the top and bottom 10% of the sample. For each possible break date, we split the sample in line with the break date, estimate the regression coefficients, and compute the sum of squared residuals. The procedure is terminated by finding the break date that minimizes the sum of squared residuals. The break

2) One of the modern approaches to find a break date is to carry out Sup tests (Andrews, 1993). Andrews (1993)’s idea is to find the break date at which the Wald statistics are maximized. The problem is that the asymptotic critical values are computed under the assumption that regressors are strictly stationary, which excludes structural changes in the regressors. Hansen (2000) overcomes the problem by proposing the fixed regressor bootstrap, yet this method is relevant only when errors are serially uncorrelated. We, therefore, follow Bai (1997)’s method for estimating a structural break because it provides the asymptotic distribution for the estimated break date even when regressors are not strictly stationary and errors are serially correlated.

date is defined as follows:

$$\hat{m} = \arg \min_{t_1 \leq m \leq t_2} S(m),$$

where t_1 and t_2 are trimmed dates and $S(m) = (1/T) \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{e}_t(m)^2$. Bai (1997) provides two kinds of asymptotic distributions of the estimated break date: when regressors and errors are homogeneous for the whole sample and when their distributions change at the estimated break date.³⁾ We consider both cases in this study.

We report results for equation (3) (labeled “HP-filtered series”) for the full sample period 1980–2016 and for growth rates (labeled “Growth rates”) over the same period. Table 3 presents parameter estimates, R-squared, and implied relative consumption volatility (β/R) for these two models. For each parameter estimate, we also report two types 90% confidence intervals using the Newey-West (1987) covariance estimators: symmetric and skewed confidence intervals. The symmetric confidence interval comes from the assumption that regressors and errors have homogenous distributions for the whole sample, while the skewed confidence interval is derived from the assumption that regressors and errors have non-homogenous distributions.

For the HP-filtered series, we identify the first quarter of 1993 as the most likely date for the structural break associated with relative consumption volatility. Assuming non-homogenous data, the lower boundary of the skewed confidence interval is found to be the first quarter of 1992, and the upper boundary is the third quarter of 1994. The estimated break date straddles the lower and upper boundaries of the skewed confidence interval for the estimated break date in the “Growth rates” regression model (the fourth quarter of 1990 and the second quarter of 1995, respectively). On the other hand, the break date in the “Growth rates” model that we estimate is the fourth quarter of 1994, which is outside the 90% confidence interval for the break date in the “HP-filtered series” model. Hence, we choose the first

3) The confidence intervals for the estimated break dates are described in detail in the Appendix.

Table 3. Estimated Parameters and Confidence Intervals

	HP-filtered series		Growth rates	
	Estimate	90% C.I.	Estimate	90% C.I.
m	1993Q1	[1992Q1, 1994Q3] ^a [1992Q1, 1993Q4] ^b	1994Q4	[1990Q4, 1995Q2] ^a [1992Q3, 1997Q1] ^b
	1980Q1–1993Q1		1980Q1–1994Q4	
α_1	−0.06	[−0.34, 0.23]	0.61	[0.38, 0.83]
β_1	0.26	[0.06, 0.45]	0.09	[−0.02, 0.20]
R_1^2		0.26		0.05
β_1/R_1		0.51		0.43
	1993Q2–2016Q4		1995Q1–2016Q4	
α_2	0.02	[−0.31, 0.35]	0.13	[−0.07, 0.33]
β_2	1.44	[1.33, 1.56]	1.28	[0.90, 1.66]
R_2^2		0.87		0.71
β_2/R_2		1.55		1.52

Note: “HP-filtered series” column reports parameter estimates of following model:

$\tilde{c}_t = (\alpha_1 + \beta_1 \tilde{y}_t)1(t \leq m) + (\alpha_2 + \beta_2 \tilde{y}_t)1(t > m) + e_t$. “Growth rates” column is based on $(\Delta c_t - \hat{\mu}_c) = [\alpha_1 + \beta_1 (\Delta y_t - \hat{\mu}_y)]1(t \leq m) + [\alpha_2 + \beta_2 (\Delta y_t - \hat{\mu}_y)]1(t > m) + e_t$. Confidence intervals for break date estimates are constructed according to Bai (1997)’s method. We trim the top and bottom 10% from the data and employ Newey-West (1987) covariance estimators allowing for a lag of up to 4 (Bartlett kernel with bandwidth of 5).

^a The skewed confidence interval is calculated on the assumption that distributions of $(\tilde{y}_t, \Delta y_t, e_t)$ change at the estimated break date.

^b The symmetric confidence interval is based on the assumption that $(\tilde{y}_t, \Delta y_t, e_t)$ have homogeneous distributions for the whole sample.

quarter of 1993 as the structural break date at which the full sample is split into two sub-samples in this study.

We find evidence for non-homogenous responses of consumption to income. In the pre-break period from the first quarter of 1980 to the first quarter of 1993, the 90% confidence interval for the estimated slope coefficient lies far below unity, with a point estimate of 0.26. The number sharply rises to 1.44, with the 90% confidence interval lying well above unity, in the post-break period from the second quarter of 1993 to the last quarter of 2016. This result implies that consumption responded more strongly to changes in income in the post-break period than in the pre-break period; hence, consumption became more volatile than income after the break

date. Our finding of non-homogenous responses of consumption still holds when we use growth rates instead of the HP-filtered series. The estimate of the slope coefficient is 0.09, and zero is inside the 90% confidence interval in the first sub-sample period. The estimate, on the other hand, is large—around 1.28 in the second sub-sample period.

2. Changes in Business Cycles

This subsection presents changes in Korean business cycle moments. In order to look into changes in the business cycle moments in Korea, we divide the dataset into two sub-periods based on the structural break date obtained from the previous subsection. The first sub-sample ranges from the first quarter of 1980 to the first quarter of 1993. The period of the crisis and its aftermath is captured through the second sub-sample period spanning from the second quarter of 1993 to the fourth quarter of 2016.

The second column of Table 1 reports results for the first sub-sample. We find that business cycles in Korea show the empirical regularities of those in developed economies in the pre-break period. The data suggest that consumption is less volatile than output (0.51) and that net exports are acyclical, with a correlation of -0.03. These features stand in contrast with the well-documented regularities of business cycles in emerging market countries.

The third column of Table 1 presents that the Korean economy experiences relatively volatile consumption at business cycle frequencies as compared to output (1.55). It also shows that the Korean economy exhibits strongly countercyclical trade balances in the post-break period (-0.36). These features do not change when we compute the same moments using growth rates.

These distinct patterns of business cycles between the two sub-samples indicate that a structural change may exist in the trend and cycle in Korea. Aguiar and Gopinath (2007) highlight the role of trend growth shocks to

productivity in explaining the characteristics of emerging market business cycles. In line with the literature, we focus on a change in the importance of trend growth shocks to productivity over time as a source of the different patterns of economic fluctuations in Korea.

III. Trend and Cycle in Productivity

This section begins by describing the data sources used for the construction of Solow residuals. We then present empirical findings on how the importance of trend growth shocks to productivity has changed over time.

1. Construction of Solow Residuals

In order to calculate the Solow residuals, we measure labor input as the total number of employed workers (employed population aged 15 and over), reported in the OECD Main Economic Indicator (MEI) database. The available labor series start from the first quarter of 1983.

The log of Solow residuals at time t is constructed as follows:

$$a_t = \log Y_t - \alpha \log L_t - (1 - \alpha) \log K_t,$$

where Y_t denotes output, K_t is capital input, and L_t is labor input. The labor share α is set at 0.68, which is a standard value from the literature. To construct the capital stock series, we use the perpetual inventory method. The capital stock series are obtained according to the following recursion:

$$K_{t+1} = (1 - \delta)K_t + i_t,$$

where the depreciation rate of capital stock, $\delta = 0.05$. The initial capital stock for the first quarter of 1980 is calculated as $I_{1980Q1}(\delta + \mu_I)$, where μ_I is the quarterly average growth rate of investment for 1980–2016. For the labor input

series, we remove a seasonal component using X-12 ARMA. The resulting Solow residuals are the quarterly series spanning the period from the first quarter of 1983 to the last quarter of 2016.

2. Empirical Model and Estimation

Following Aguiar and Gopinath (2007), we assume that the log of Solow residuals has two independent stochastic components: cycle z_t and trend x_t components,

$$a_t = x_t + z_t \quad (4)$$

The persistence of the effect of a transitory shock on the cycle component is governed by an AR(1) process

$$z_t = \rho_z z_{t-1} + \epsilon_{z,t},$$

where $|\rho_z| < 1$.

The stochastic trend component is non-stationary, and its growth evolves according to an AR(1) process. In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} x_t &= \mu + x_{t-1} + s_t, \\ s_t &= \rho_s s_{t-1} + \epsilon_{s,t}, \end{aligned}$$

where μ is its unconditional mean and $|\rho_s| < 1$. If $\rho_s = 0$, a trend growth shock has a one-time effect on productivity growth, while it has a persistent effect on productivity growth if $\rho_s > 0$.

We assume the following distributions for the transitory and permanent shocks:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{z,t} \\ \epsilon_{s,t} \end{bmatrix} \sim i.i.d.N \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_z^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_s^2 \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

where $\sigma_z > 0$ and $\sigma_s > 0$ for all t .

In order to estimate the structural parameters, μ , ρ_s , ρ_z , σ_s , and σ_z , we first take the first differences on both sides of equation (4) and then cast the model in state-space form. The state-space representation is given by

$$\Delta a_t = \mu + [1 \ 1 \ 1] \begin{bmatrix} z_t \\ z_{t-1} \\ s_t \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} z_t \\ z_{t-1} \\ s_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_z & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_s \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z_{t-1} \\ z_{t-2} \\ s_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{z,t} \\ \epsilon_{s,t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since the state vector $[z_t \ z_{t-1} \ s_t]'$ is stationary, the Kalman filter is initiated by setting the initial mean squared error matrix of the state vector equal to its unconditional covariance matrix. We then evaluate the log-likelihood function based on the prediction error decomposition. To find the parameters that maximize the log-likelihood function, the Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (BFGS) algorithm is conducted.

3. Empirical Results

We document how trend and cycle dynamics have changed since 1983. Motivated by the PIH, we propose that trend growth shocks have grown in importance. More specifically, our argument is that relative consumption volatility being greater than unity after 1993 is due to substantially large importance of trend growth shocks.

Table 4 presents parameter estimates and a measure of the relative importance of trend growth shocks for the pre-and post-break periods alongside the full sample period. As in Aguiar and Gopinath (2007), we determine the relative importance of the random walk component of the Solow residuals according to the following expression:⁴⁾

$$\frac{\sigma_{\Delta x}^2}{\sigma_{\Delta a}^2} = \frac{\sigma_s^2/(1-\rho_s^2)}{\sigma_s^2/(1-\rho_s^2) + 2\sigma_z^2/(1+\rho_z)}.$$

We find evidence for the distinct importance of trend growth shocks between the two sub-samples. Based on the estimates, the above ratio is 0.27 in the pre-break period whereas it is 0.69 in the post-break period, which is more than doubled.

Table 4. Estimated Parameters

	Full sample 1983Q1–2016Q4	Pre-break 1983Q1–1993Q1	Post-break 1993Q2–2016Q4
Parameter estimates			
μ	0.67 (0.11)	0.93 (0.25)	0.55 (0.12)
ρ_s	0.33 (0.24)	0.62 (0.28)	0.36 (0.20)
ρ_z	−0.33 (0.38)	−0.09 (0.29)	0.80 (0.30)
σ_s	0.89 (0.23)	0.61 (0.25)	0.75 (0.27)
σ_z	0.48 (0.23)	0.85 (0.18)	0.52 (0.32)
Log likelihood			
LL	409.22	112.38	303.28
Relative importance of trend			
$\sigma_{\Delta x}^2/\sigma_{\Delta a}^2$	0.65	0.27	0.69

Note: Estimates of mean and standard deviations are reported in percentage terms. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

In order to illustrate the change in the importance of trend growth shocks, we plot our estimates of the evolution of the trend growth and cycle process from each sample (Figure 3). The first feature of the figure is that cycle served an important role in explaining fluctuations in productivity in the first sub-sample; however, its importance declined after 1993, and trend growth

4) $var(\Delta a_t) = var(\Delta x_t) + var(\Delta z_t)$, where $var(\Delta x_t) = var(s_t)$ and $var(\Delta z_t) = (\rho_z - 1)^2 var(\Delta z_{t-1}) + \sigma_z^2$. As $var(s_t) = \sigma_s^2/(1-\rho_s^2)$ and $var(z_{t-1}) = \sigma_z^2/(1-\rho_z^2)$, $var(\Delta x_t) = \sigma_s^2/(1-\rho_s^2)$ and $var(\Delta z_t) = 2\sigma_z^2/(1+\rho_z)$. Hence, $var(\Delta a_t) = \sigma_s^2/(1-\rho_s^2) + 2\sigma_z^2/(1+\rho_z)$.

dominated its counterpart. Second, trend growth on average remained high in the first sub-sample (0.93% per quarter) but then declined to 0.55% in the second sub-sample. Our estimates attribute much of the declined trend growth to large drops in trend during the Asian financial crisis of 1997 and the global financial crisis of 2008 and to the sluggish economy since 2010.

Figure 3. Smoothed Trend Growth and Cycle

Both trend and cycle show different time-series patterns for the two sub-samples. In the pre-break period, we identify large but purely transitory variation in cycle and small variation in trend growth, which is consistent with the estimates of cycle and trend growth shocks in Table 4. In the case of cycle, its persistence is estimated at almost zero, which means productivity reverts to trend following a transitory shock in a quarter. Such a positive, purely transitory shock acts as an incentive for households to increase savings to smooth consumption over time, whereas households consume more following a positive trend shock. The contribution of cycle to variation in productivity growth was larger by a factor of 2.70 than that of trend in the pre-break period, which explains why relative consumption volatility is less than unity.

Table 5. Variance Ratio Test

	Full sample 1983Q1–2016Q4	Pre-break 1983Q1–1993Q1	Post-break 1993Q2–2016Q4
VR(2)	1.05 (0.12)	0.82 (0.22)	1.27 (0.12)
VR(4)	1.16 (0.21)	0.90 (0.36)	1.45 (0.23)
VR(8)	0.98 (0.33)	0.75 (0.54)	1.23 (0.41)
VR(12)	0.94 (0.40)	0.90 (0.64)	1.04 (0.51)
VR(24)	0.84 (0.52)	0.71 (0.83)	1.14 (0.67)

Note: Heteroskedasticity robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

The dominant role of the cycle component in explaining variation in productivity growth would also imply the negative autocorrelation of productivity growth in the pre-break period. This is because positive shifts in productivity caused by purely transitory shocks should be followed by negative shifts in productivity growth.⁵⁾ Table 5, which illustrates the variance ratio for productivity growth, confirms this assumption. The variance ratio is a simple way to quantify the persistence of time-series of interest. Cochrane (1998) defines it as the ratio of the variance of k -period productivity growth to one-period productivity growth divided by k :

$$VR_k = \frac{1}{k} \frac{\text{var}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \Delta a_{t-j}\right)}{\text{var}(\Delta a_t)}.$$

The second column of the table reports variance ratios for the pre-break period. The variance ratio for productivity growth for 24 quarters is 0.71,

5) This assumption comes directly from the Wold representation of the empirical model considered:

$\Delta a_t = \mu + (\epsilon_{s,t} + \rho_s \epsilon_{s,t-1} + \rho_s^2 \epsilon_{s,t-2} + \dots) + (\epsilon_{z,t} + (\rho_z - 1)\epsilon_{z,t-1} + (\rho_z - 1)\rho_z \epsilon_{z,t-2} + \dots)$. For simplicity, ignore trend growth shocks and assume $\rho_z = 0$ and $\mu = 0$. Then $\Delta a_t = \epsilon_{z,t} - \epsilon_{z,t-1}$, which implies that a positive, transitory shock at time $t-1$ ($\epsilon_{z,t-1} > 0$) results in a negative value of expected productivity growth at time t ($E_{t-1}(\Delta a_t) < 0$).

below one, which indicates evidence for the negative autocorrelation of productivity growth.

We next examine the properties of trend and cycle in the post-break period. Trend growth is more volatile than cycle; however, cycle is more persistent than its counterpart. The fact that variation in trend growth explains roughly two-thirds of the movement of productivity growth is associated with the positive autocorrelation of productivity growth in the post-break period. The third column of Table 5 shows that the variance ratio for productivity growth for 24 quarters is 1.14, above one. If we choose a small lag length (e.g., 2 quarters) to obtain a good approximation, the ratio is statistically significant and substantially above unity (1.27). These properties of productivity growth provide a key explanation as to why households make a considerable consumption change in response to output.

4. Remarks

In this subsection, we provide a possible explanation as to why permanent shocks to productivity have grown in prominence since 1993. For this purpose, we first focus on the openness of the economy. Figure 4 depicts trade openness and reported cases of foreign investment. Trade openness is measured as the sum of exports and imports as a share of GDP. Figure 4a shows that the trade-to-GDP ratio has been on a sharp rise since 1993. In addition, the Korean government launched a series of campaigns to open the capital market to foreign investors in 1992 and 1993, which facilitated foreign investment thereafter. This is illustrated in Figure 4b, which plots the reported cases of foreign investment from the U.S. and European countries. In 1993, there were 127 (108) reported cases of foreign investment from the U.S. (European countries). However, after 1993, investment from U.S. and European investors began to grow rapidly, and those figures reached 263 (183) in 1995, roughly double those in 1993.

Figure 4. Openness of Korea

Increasing openness seems to have contributed to the increasing importance of the trend growth shocks in Korea. The trade-to-GDP ratio, which has been on an upward trend since 1993, appears to have permanent impacts on productivity in Korea. Lileeva and Trefler (2010) show that high openness stimulates persistent competition and facilitates effective access to production inputs, which leads to productivity growth. On the other hand,

higher openness seems to make the Korean economy more vulnerable to external shocks. Two major examples are the 1997 Asian financial crisis and the global financial crisis of 2008, which led to a massive outflow of foreign capital. The negative shocks had permanent impacts on the income level in Korea. We, therefore, attribute a structural change in the trend, more precisely the increasing importance of the trend growth shocks, to the consequence of increasing the openness of the Korean economy.

IV. Conclusion

We developed a regression identification approach to estimate the structural break in the relative consumption volatility in Korea, and the first quarter of 1993 was identified as the break point. Empirical evidence suggested that Korean business cycles featured the business cycle regularities observed in emerging markets in the post-break period. Motivated by Aguiar and Gopinath (2007), we quantified the importance of the trend component in productivity in both the pre- and post-break periods. Our finding was that time-series patterns of trend and cycle behaviors changed at the break point. Specifically, the cycle component played a dominant role in explaining fluctuations in productivity in the pre-break period, whereas the variations in productivity were largely attributed to the trend component in the post-break period.

We looked at a possible explanation for the finding, the openness of the Korean economy, but did not perform an in-depth analysis of them. It would be interesting to uncover the underlying reasons for the break in the trend and cycle. We leave this as a future research topic.

References

- Aguiar, M., and G. Gopinath (2007), “Emerging Market Business Cycles: The Cycle is the Trend,” *Journal of political Economy*, Vol. 115(1), pp. 69-102.
- Alvarez-Parra, F., L. Brandao-Marques, and M. Toledo (2013), “Durable Goods, Financial Frictions, and Business Cycles in Emerging Economies,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 60(6), pp. 720-736.
- Andrews, D. W. (1993), “Tests for Parameter Instability and Structural Change with Unknown Change Point,” *Econometrica*, Vol. 61(4), pp. 821-856.
- Azzimonti, M., and M. Talbert (2014), “Polarized Business Cycles,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 67, pp. 47-61.
- Bai, J. (1997), “Estimation of a Change Point in Multiple Regression Models,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 79(4), pp. 551-563.
- Chen, K. J., A. C. Chu, and C. C. Lai (2018), “Home Production and Small Open Economy Business Cycles,” *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, Vol. 95, pp. 110-135.
- Cochrane, J. H. (1998), “How Big is the Random Walk in GNP?” *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 96(5), pp. 893-920.
- Hansen, B. E. (2000), “Testing for Structural Change in Conditional Models,” *Journal of Econometrics*, Vol. 97(1), pp. 93-115.
- Kim, K., and Y. Y. Choi (1997), “Business Cycles in Korea: Is there Any Stylized Feature?” *Journal of Economic Studies*, Vol. 24(5), pp. 275-293.
- Kim, S. H., and H. Ahn (2005), “Dynamics of Business Cycles in Korea: The Role of External Shocks,” *KDI Journal of Economic Policy*, Vol. 27(1), pp. 157-183.
- Lileeva, A., and D. Trefler (2010), “Improved Access to Foreign Markets Raises Plant-level Productivity... for some Plants,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*,

Vol. 125(3), pp. 1051–1099.

Neumeyer, P. A., and F. Perri (2005), “Business Cycles in Emerging Economies: the Role of Interest Rates,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 52(2), pp. 345–380.

Newey, W. K., and K. D. West (1987), “Hypothesis Testing with Efficient Method of Moments Estimation,” *International Economic Review*, Vol. 28(3), pp. 777–787.

Restrepo-Echavarria, P. (2014), “Macroeconomic Volatility: The Role of the Informal Economy,” *European Economic Review*, Vol. 70, pp. 454-469.

Rhee, W. (2017), “Can RBC Models Explain Business Cycles in Korea?” *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, Vol. 21(3), pp. 599-623.

Appendix A: Confidence Intervals for Bai (1997) Estimator

We start with the regression model as follows:

$$y_t = \beta_1' x_t 1(t \leq m) + \beta_2' x_t 1(t > m) + e_t.$$

Bai (1997) proposes *two cases of asymptotic distribution* of the break date. In the first case, x_t and e_t are second-order stationary for the whole sample.

Define $L = \frac{(\delta' Q \delta)^2}{\delta' \Omega \delta}$, where $\delta = \beta_2 - \beta_1$, $Q = E(x_t x_t')$, and $\Omega = E(x_t x_t' e_t^2)$. If

$\delta \rightarrow 0$, then $L(\hat{m} - m) \xrightarrow{d} z$, where the distribution of z is

$$G(z) = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{z}{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{z}{8}\right) - \frac{1}{2}(z+5)\Phi\left(-\frac{\sqrt{z}}{2}\right) + \frac{3}{2} \exp(z)\Phi\left(-\frac{3\sqrt{z}}{2}\right)$$

for $z \geq 0$ and $G(z) = 1 - G(-z)$.

Define $\hat{L} = \frac{(\hat{\delta}' \hat{Q} \hat{\delta})^2}{\hat{\delta}' \hat{\Omega} \hat{\delta}}$, where $\hat{\delta} = \hat{\beta}_2 - \hat{\beta}_1$, $\hat{Q} = (1/T) \sum_{t=1}^T x_t x_t'$, and $\hat{\Omega}$ is the

Newey-West (1987) covariance estimator. Then $(\hat{L} - L)(\hat{m} - m) \xrightarrow{p} 0$. A 100 $(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence interval for $\hat{m}$ is given by $[\hat{m} - [c/\hat{L}] - 1, \hat{m} + [c/\hat{L} + 1]]$, where c is the $(1 - \alpha/2)^{\text{th}}$ quantile of $G(z)$ and $[c/\hat{L}]$ is the integer part of $c/\hat{L}$.

In the second case, x_t and e_t are stationary within each subsample. Define

$$\xi = \frac{\delta' Q_2 \delta}{\delta' Q_1 \delta}, \quad \phi = \frac{\delta' \Omega_2 \delta}{\delta' \Omega_1 \delta}, \quad \text{and} \quad L = \frac{(\delta' \Omega_1 \delta)^2}{\delta' \Omega_1 \delta} \quad \text{where} \quad Q_1 = E(x_t x_t') \quad \text{and}$$

$\Omega_1 = E(x_t x_t' e_t^2)$ for $t \leq m$ and $Q_2 = E(x_t x_t')$ and $\Omega_2 = E(x_t x_t' e_t^2)$ for $t > m$.

If $\delta \rightarrow 0$, then $L(\hat{m} - m) \xrightarrow{d} z$. The distribution of z for $z \geq 0$ is

$$G(z) = 1 + \beta \sqrt{\frac{z}{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta^2 z}{8}\right) - \frac{1}{2}(\beta^2 z + 2d - 4)\Phi\left(-\frac{\beta \sqrt{z}}{2}\right) + c \exp(az)\Phi(-b\sqrt{z})$$

where $\beta = \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{\phi}}$, $a = \frac{\xi + \phi}{2}$, $b = \frac{\xi + 2\phi}{2\sqrt{\phi}}$, $c = \frac{\xi(\xi + 2\phi)}{\phi(\xi + \phi)}$, and $d = \frac{(\xi + 2\phi)^2}{\phi(\xi + \phi)}$. For $z < 0$,

$$G(z) = -\sqrt{\frac{|z|}{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{|z|}{8}\right) + \frac{1}{2}(|z| + 2d - 4)\Phi\left(-\frac{\sqrt{|z|}}{2}\right) + c \exp(az)\Phi(-b\sqrt{|z|})$$

where $a = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\xi}{\phi} (1 + \frac{\xi}{\phi})$, $b = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\xi}{\phi}$, $c = \frac{\phi(2\xi + \phi)}{\xi(\xi + \phi)}$, and $d = \frac{(2\xi + \phi)^2}{\xi(\xi + \phi)}$. Let $\hat{L}$ be an estimate of L . Then a $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence interval for $\hat{m}$ is given by $[\hat{m} - [c_1/\hat{L}] - 1, \hat{m} + [c_2/\hat{L}] + 1]$, where c_1 is the $\alpha/2^{\text{th}}$ quantile, c_2 is the $(1 - \alpha/2)^{\text{th}}$ quantile, and $[c_j/\hat{L}]$ is the integer part of $c_j/\hat{L}$ for $j = 1, 2$.

<Abstract in Korean>

상대적 소비변동성을 이용한 추세와 순환의 구조변화

이남강*, 석병훈**

본고는 회귀분석을 통해 상대적 소비변동성의 구조변화를 식별할 수 있는 방법을 제안한다. 우리나라의 구조변화 시점은 1993년으로 추정되었으며, 동 시점 이후 상대적 소비변동성이 증가하였다. 항상소득가설 기반으로 이러한 이유를 설명하기 위하여 솔로우 잔차로 측정한 생산성에서 영구적 충격이 차지하는 비중을 조사한다. 그 결과, 영구적 충격의 상대적 중요성은 구조변화 시점 이전 대비 이후에 2.56배 증가하였음을 확인하였다.

핵심 주제어: 구조변화, 상대적 소비변동성, 추세성장충격

JEL Classification: E32, F44

* 한국은행 경제연구원 거시경제연구실 부연구위원(전화: 02-759-5473, E-mail: nglee@bok.or.kr)

** 이화여자대학교 경제학과 조교수(전화: 02-3277-2773, E-mail: bhseok@ewha.ac.kr)

논고 작성에 많은 도움을 주신 KDI 국제정책 대학원 손욱 교수, 한국은행 신은 경제연구원장, 안병권 본부장, 배병호 거시경제연구실장께 감사를 표합니다. 또한 유익한 논평을 주신 국제경제연구실 엄지현 부연구위원, 한국조세재정연구원 한종석 박사, 익명의 심사위원, 그리고 세미나 참석자분들께 감사의 말씀을 전합니다.

이 연구내용은 집필자의 개인의견이며 한국은행의 공식견해와 무관합니다. 따라서 본 논문의 내용을 보도하거나 인용할 경우에는 집필자명을 반드시 명시하여주시기 바랍니다.

BOK 경제연구 발간목록

한국은행 경제연구원에서는 Working Paper인 『BOK 경제연구』를 수시로 발간하고 있습니다. 『BOK 경제연구』는 주요 경제 현상 및 정책 효과에 대한 직관적 설명 뿐 아니라 깊이 있는 이론 또는 실증 분석을 제공함으로써 엄밀한 논증에 초점을 두는 학술논문 형태의 연구이며 한국은행 직원 및 한국은행 연구용역사업의 연구 결과물이 수록되고 있습니다. 『BOK 경제연구』는 한국은행 경제연구원 홈페이지(<http://imer.bok.or.kr>)에서 다운로드하여 보실 수 있습니다.

제2016-1	The Spillover Effects of U.S. Monetary Policy on Emerging Market Economies: Breaks, Asymmetries and Fundamentals	Geun-Young Kim · Hail Park · Peter Tillmann
2	Pass-Through of Imported Input Prices to Domestic Producer Prices: Evidence from Sector-Level Data	JaeBin Ahn · Chang-Gui Park · Chanho Park
3	Stock Returns and Mutual Fund Flows in the Korean Financial Market: A System Approach	Jaebeom Kim · Jung-Min Kim
4	Spillovers from U.S. Unconventional Monetary Policy and Its Normalization to Emerging Markets: A Capital Flow Perspective	Sangwon Suh · Byung-Soo Koo
5	정책금리 변동이 성별·세대별 고용률에 미치는 영향	정성엽
6	From Firm-level Imports to Aggregate Productivity: Evidence from Korean Manufacturing Firms Data	JaeBin Ahn · Moon Jung Choi
7	자유무역협정(FTA)이 한국 기업의 기업내 무역에 미친 효과	전봉걸 · 김은숙 · 이주용
8	The Relation Between Monetary and Macroprudential Policy	Jong Ku Kang
9	조세피난처 투자자가 투자 기업 및 주식시장에 미치는 영향	정호성 · 김순호
10	주택실거래 자료를 이용한 주택부문 거시건전성 정책 효과 분석	정호성 · 이지은
11	Does Intra-Regional Trade Matter in Regional Stock Markets?: New Evidence from Asia-Pacific Region	Sei-Wan Kim · Moon Jung Choi
12	Liability, Information, and Anti-fraud Investment in a Layered Retail Payment Structure	Kyoung-Soo Yoon · Jooyong Jun
13	Testing the Labor Market Dualism in Korea	Sungyup Chung · Sunyoung Jung
14	북한 이중경제 사회계정행렬 추정을 통한 비공식부문 분석	최지영

제2016-15	Divergent EME Responses to Global and Domestic Monetary Policy Shocks	Woon Gyu Choi · Byongju Lee · Taesu Kang · Geun-Young Kim
16	Loan Rate Differences across Financial Sectors: A Mechanism Design Approach	Byoung-Ki Kim · Jun Gyu Min
17	근로자의 고용형태가 임금 및 소득 분포에 미치는 영향	최충 · 정성엽
18	Endogeneity of Inflation Target	Soyoung Kim · Geunhyung Yim
19	Who Are the First Users of a Newly-Emerging International Currency? A Demand-Side Study of Chinese Renminbi Internationalization	Hyoung-kyu Chey · Geun-Young Kim · Dong Hyun Lee
20	기업 취약성 지수 개발 및 기업 부실화에 대한 영향 분석	최영준
21	US Interest Rate Policy Spillover and International Capital Flow: Evidence from Korea	Jieun Lee · Jung-Min Kim · Jong Kook Shin
제2017-1	가계부채가 소비와 경제성장에 미치는 영향 - 유량효과와 저장효과 분석 -	강종구
2	Which Monetary Shocks Matter in Small Open Economies? Evidence from SVARs	Jongrim Ha · Inhwan So
3	FTA의 물가 안정화 효과 분석	곽노선 · 임호성
4	The Effect of Labor Market Polarization on the College Students' Employment	Sungyup Chung
5	국내 자영업의 폐업을 결정요인 분석	남윤미
6	차주별 패널자료를 이용한 주택담보대출의 연체요인에 대한 연구	정호성
7	국면전환 확산과정모형을 이용한 콜금리행태 분석	최승문 · 김병국

제2017-8	Behavioral Aspects of Household Portfolio Choice: Effects of Loss Aversion on Life Insurance Uptake and Savings	In Do Hwang
9	신용공급 충격이 재화별 소비에 미치는 영향	김광환 · 최석기
10	유가가 손익분기인플레이션에 미치는 영향	김진용 · 김준철 · 임형준
11	인구구조변화가 인플레이션의 장기 추세에 미치는 영향	강환구
12	종합적 상환여건을 반영한 과다부채 가계의 리스크 요인 분석	이동진 · 한진현
13	Crowding out in a Dual Currency Regime? Digital versus Fiat Currency	KiHoon Hong · Kyoungheon Park · Jongmin Yu
14	Improving Forecast Accuracy of Financial Vulnerability: Partial Least Squares Factor Model Approach	Hyeongwoo Kim · Kyunghwan Ko
15	Which Type of Trust Matters?: Interpersonal vs. Institutional vs. Political Trust	In Do Hwang
16	기업특성에 따른 연령별 고용행태 분석	이상욱 · 권철우 · 남윤미
17	Equity Market Globalization and Portfolio Rebalancing	Kyungkeun Kim · Dongwon Lee
18	The Effect of Market Volatility on Liquidity and Stock Returns in the Korean Stock Market	Jieun Lee · KeeH.Chung
19	Using Cheap Talk to Polarize or Unify a Group of Decision Makers	Daeyoung Jeong
20	패스트트랙 기업회생절차가 법정관리 기업의 이자보상비율에 미친 영향	최영준
21	인구고령화가 경제성장에 미치는 영향	안병권 · 김기호 · 육승환
22	고령화에 대응한 인구대책: OECD사례를 중심으로	김진일 · 박경훈

제2017-23	인구구조변화와 경상수지	김경근 · 김소영
24	통일과 고령화	최지영
25	인구고령화가 주택시장에 미치는 영향	오강현 · 김솔 · 윤재준 · 안상기 · 권동휘
26	고령화가 대외투자에 미치는 영향	임진수 · 김영래
27	인구고령화가 가계의 자산 및 부채에 미치는 영향	조세형 · 이용민 · 김정훈
28	인구고령화에 따른 우리나라 산업구조 변화	강종구
29	인구구조 변화와 재정	송호신 · 허준영
30	인구고령화가 노동수급에 미치는 영향	이철희 · 이지은
31	인구 고령화가 금융산업에 미치는 영향	윤경수 · 차재훈 · 박소희 · 강선영
32	금리와 은행 수익성 간의 관계 분석	한재준 · 소인환
33	Bank Globalization and Monetary Policy Transmission in Small Open Economies	Inhwan So
34	기존 경영자 관리인(DIP) 제도의 회생기업 경영성과에 대한 영향	최영준
35	Transmission of Monetary Policy in Times of High Household Debt	Youngju Kim · Hyunjoon Lim
제2018 -1	4차 산업혁명과 한국의 혁신역량: 특허자료를 이용한 국가기술별 비교 분석, 1976-2015	이지홍 · 임현경 · 정대영
2	What Drives the Stock Market Comovements between Korea and China, Japan and the US?	Jinsoo Lee · Bok-Keun Yu
3	Who Improves or Worsens Liquidity in the Korean Treasury Bond Market?	Jieun Lee

제2018-4	Establishment Size and Wage Inequality: The Roles of Performance Pay and Rent Sharing	Sang-yoon Song
5	가계대출 부도요인 및 금융업권별 금융취약성: 자영업 차주를 중심으로	정호성
6	직업훈련이 청년취업률 제고에 미치는 영향	최충 · 김남주 · 최광성
7	재고투자와 경기변동에 대한 동학적 분석	서병선 · 장근호
8	Rare Disasters and Exchange Rates: An Empirical Investigation of Korean Exchange Rates under Tension between the Two Koreas	Cheolbeom Park · Suyeon Park
9	통화정책과 기업 설비투자 - 자산가격경로와 대차대조표경로 분석 -	박상준 · 육승환
10	Upgrading Product Quality: The Impact of Tariffs and Standards	Jihyun Eum
11	북한이탈주민의 신용행태에 관한 연구	정승호 · 민병기 · 김주원
12	Uncertainty Shocks and Asymmetric Dynamics in Korea: A Nonlinear Approach	Kevin Larcher · Jaebeom Kim · Youngju Kim
13	북한경제의 대외개방에 따른 경제적 후생 변화 분석	정혁 · 최창용 · 최지영
14	Central Bank Reputation and Inflation-Unemployment Performance: Empirical Evidence from an Executive Survey of 62 Countries	In Do Hwang
15	Reserve Accumulation and Bank Lending: Evidence from Korea	Youngjin Yun
16	The Banks' Swansong: Banking and the Financial Markets under Asymmetric Information	Jungu Yang

제2018 –17	E-money: Legal Restrictions Theory and Monetary Policy	Ohik Kwon · Jaevin Park
18	글로벌 금융위기 전·후 외국인의 채권투자 결정요인 변화 분석: 한국의 사례	유복근
19	설비자본재 기술진보가 근로유형별 임금 및 고용에 미치는 영향	김남주
20	Fixed-Rate Loans and the Effectiveness of Monetary Policy	Sung Ho Park
21	Leverage, Hand-to-Mouth Households, and MPC Heterogeneity: Evidence from Korea	Sang-yoon Song
22	선진국 수입수요가 우리나라 수출에 미치는 영향	최문정 · 김경근
23	Cross-Border Bank Flows through Foreign Branches: Evidence from Korea	Youngjin Yun
24	Accounting for the Sources of the Recent Decline in Korea's Exports to China	Moon Jung Choi · Kei-Mu Yi
25	The Effects of Export Diversification on Macroeconomic Stabilization: Evidence from Korea	Jinsoo Lee · Bok-Keun Yu
26	Identifying Uncertainty Shocks due to Geopolitical Swings in Korea	Seohyun Lee · Inhwan So · Jongrim Ha
27	Monetary Policy and Income Inequality in Korea	Jongwook Park
28	How the Financial Market Can Dampen the Effects of Commodity Price Shocks	Myunghyun Kim
29	Which External Shock Matters in Small Open Economies? US Economic Policy Uncertainty vs. Global Risk Aversion	Youngju Kim · Hyunjoon Lim
30	Do Korean Exports Have Different Patterns over Different Regimes?: New Evidence from STAR-VECM	Sei-Wan Kim · Moon Jung Choi
31	기술진보와 청년고용	심명규 · 양희승 · 이서현

제2018-32	북한지역 장기주택수요 및 연관 주택건설투자 추정	이주영
33	기업규모간 임금격차 원인 분석	송상윤
34	우리나라 고용구조의 특징과 과제	장근호
35	창업의 장기 고용효과: 시군구 자료 분석	조성철 · 김기호
36	수출입과 기업의 노동수요	음지현 · 박진호 · 최문정
37	청년실업의 이력현상 분석	김남주
38	노동시장 이중구조와 노동생산성: OECD 국가를 중심으로	최충 · 최광성 · 이지은
39	한국과 일본의 청년실업 비교분석 및 시사점	박상준 · 김남주 · 장근호
40	노동시장의 이중구조와 정책대응: 해외사례 및 시사점	전병유 · 황인도 · 박광용
41	최저임금이 고용구조에 미치는 영향	송헌재 · 임현준 · 신우리
42	최저임금과 생산성: 우리나라 제조업의 사례	김규일 · 육승환
43	Transmission of U.S. Monetary Policy to Commodity Exporters and Importers	Myunghyun Kim
44	Determinants of Capital Flows in the Korean Bond Market	Soohyon Kim
45	Central Bank Credibility and Monetary Policy	Kwangyong Park
46	통화정책이 자본유출입에 미치는 영향: 행태방정식 분석	이명수 · 송승주

제2018-47	Commodities and International Business Cycles	Myunghyun Kim
제2019-1	Deciphering Monetary Policy Board Minutes through Text Mining Approach: The Case of Korea	Ki Young Park · Youngjoon Lee · Soohyon Kim
2	The Impacts of Macroeconomic News Announcements on Intraday Implied Volatility	Jieun Lee · Doojin Ryu
3	Taking a Bigger Slice of the Global Value Chain Pie: An Industry-level Analysis	Chong-Sup Kim · Seungho Lee · Jihyun Eum
4	Trend Growth Shocks and Asset Prices	Nam Gang Lee
5	Uncertainty, Attention Allocation and Monetary Policy Asymmetry	Kwangyong Park
6	Central Bank Digital Currency and Financial Stability	Young Sik Kim · Ohik Kwon
7	은행의 수익 및 자산구조를 반영한 통화정책 위험선호경로	김의진 · 정호성
8	혁신기업에 대한 산업금융 지원: 이론모형 분석	강경훈 · 양준구
9	가계부채 제약하의 통화정책: 2주체 거시모형(TANK)에서의 정량적 분석	정용승 · 송승주
10	Alchemy of Financial Innovation: Securitization, Liquidity and Optimal Monetary Policy	Jungu Yang
11	Measuring Monetary Policy Surprises Using Text Mining: The Case of Korea	Youngjoon Lee · Soohyon Kim · Ki Young Park
12	Tracking Uncertainty through the Relative Sentiment Shift Series	Seohyun Lee · Rickard Nyman
13	Intra-firm and Arm's Length Trade during the Global Financial Crisis: Evidence from Korean Manufacturing Firms	Moon Jung Choi · Ji Hyun Eum

제2019-14	특허자료를 이용한 우리나라 지식전파의 지역화 분석	이지홍 · 남윤미
15	Overhead Labour and Skill-Biased Technological Change: The Role of Product Diversification	Choong Hyun Nam
16	Does the Number of Countries in an International Business Cycle Model Matter?	Myunghyun Kim
17	High-Frequency Credit Spread Information and Macroeconomic Forecast Revision	Bruno Deschamps · Christos Ioannidis · Kook Ka
18	경제 분석을 위한 텍스트 마이닝	김수현 · 이영준 · 신진영 · 박기영
19	Takeover, Distress, and Equity Issuance: Evidence from Korea	Euna Cho
20	The Cash-Flow Channel of Monetary Policy: Evidence from Mortgage Borrowers	Sang-yoon Song
21	부의 효과의 분위 추정: 분위 정준 공적분회귀를 중심으로	김기호
22	Identifying Government Spending Shocks and Multipliers in Korea	Kwangyong Park · Eun Kyung Lee
23	Systemic Risk of the Consumer Credit Network across Financial Institutions	Hyun Hak Kim · Hosung Jung
24	Impact of Chinese Renminbi on Korean Exports: Does Quality Matter?	Jihyun Eum
25	Uncertainty, Credit and Investment: Evidence from Firm-Bank Matched Data	Youngju Kim · Seohyun Lee · Hyunjoon Lim
26	A Structural Change in the Trend and Cycle in Korea	Nam Gang Lee · Byoung Hoon Seok