

# ***A discusión***

## **ENDOGENOUS GROWTH AND ENDOGENOUS BUSINESS CYCLES\***

**Lilia Maliar and Serguei Maliar\*\***

WP-AD 2003-14

Correspondence to: Universidad de Alicante, Departamento de Fundamentos del Análisis Económico, Campus San Vicente del Raspeig, Ap. Correos, 99, 03080 Alicante (Spain). E-mails: maliarl@merlin.fae.ua.es, maliars@merlin.fae.ua.es.

Editor: Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Económicas, S.A.  
Primera Edición Abril 2003  
Depósito Legal: V-1909-2003

*IVIE working papers offer in advance the results of economic research under way in order to encourage a discussion process before sending them to scientific journals for their final publication.*

---

\* We wish to express our sincere gratitude to the editor, an associate editor, and two anonymous referees for many valuable comments and suggestions. All errors are ours. This research was partially supported by the Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Económicas and the Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología de España, BEC 2001-0535.

\*\* Universidad de Alicante.

# **ENDOGENOUS GROWTH AND ENDOGENOUS BUSINESS CYCLES**

**Lilia Maliar and Serguei Maliar**

## **ABSTRACT**

This paper presents a computable general equilibrium model of endogenous (stochastic) growth and cycles that can account for two key features of the aggregate data: balanced growth in the long-run and business cycles in the short-run. The model is built on Schumpeter's idea that economic development is the consequence of the periodic arrival of innovations. There is growth because each subsequent innovation leads to a permanent improvement in the production technology. Cycles arise because innovations trigger a re-allocation of resources between production and R&D. The quantitative implications of the calibrated version of our model are very similar to those of Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model. Moreover, our model can correct two serious shortcomings of RBC models: it can account for the persistence in output growth and the asymmetry of growth within the business cycle.

**Keywords:** Endogenous growth, Endogenous business cycles, Innovation, R&D, Technological progress, RBC

**JEL classification:** E13, E22, O41

# 1 Introduction

This paper presents a computable general equilibrium model of endogenous (stochastic) growth and cycles that can account for two key features of the aggregate data: balanced growth in the long-run and business cycles in the short-run. The model is built on Schumpeter's idea that economic development is the consequence of the periodic arrival of innovations. There is growth because each subsequent innovation leads to a permanent improvement in the production technology. Cycles arise because innovations trigger a re-allocation of resources, between production and R&D.

It is generally accepted in the literature that innovations play an important role in long-run economic growth.<sup>1</sup> Empirical evidence also suggests that there is a link between R&D and business cycles. Kleinknecht (1987) reports that the number of patents vary significantly over time. At the level of firms, Lach and Schankerman (1989) find that R&D Granger-cause investment in physical capital after a short lag. Lach and Rob (1996) report that a similar tendency is observed at the level of industry. Geroski and Walters (1995) document a pro-cyclical behavior of innovations in the U.K. In particular, Geroski and Walters (1995, p.927) conclude: "... the pro-cyclical variations in innovation which we observe are, no doubt, an important contributor to the pro-cyclical variation in productivity growth which has been widely observed."

The idea that both growth and cycles are an outcome of innovative activity has been advocated in previous literature. The origins of growth and cycles have been related to an extensive search for new technology and further refinement of old technology (Jovanovic and Rob, 1990), to the discovery of new technology and its subsequent diffusion (Andolfatto and MacDonald, 1998), and to the discovery of new technology and a subsequent shift of resources from R&D to production (Bental and Peled, 1996, Freeman, Hong and Peled, 1999).

The literature, however, explains long waves in economic activity but not short waves. In particular, two models that are related to ours, presented by Andolfatto and MacDonald (1998), and by Freeman et al. (1999), do not produce fluctuations in business cycle frequencies in their construction. High-frequency fluctuations are missing in Andolfatto and MacDonald

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, this idea lies in the basis of the models developed in Aghion and Howitt (1992), Grossman and Helpman (1991), Romer (1990), Segerstrom (1991).

(1998), because technology improvements are large and rare, so that imitation is the main source of the economy's dynamics. To be more specific, their model is parameterized to account for six major technology innovations in the U.S., during 1946-1994, e.g., the chemicals revolution, and the electronics revolution. Freeman et al. (1999) interpret innovations as infra-structural projects that require large amounts of investments and long periods of development, e.g., railroads or telegraph systems. The model generates cycles of a constant shape and a constant (presumably long) duration, which are not comparable to cycles in the data.

Our approach to modelling innovations differs from those presented in the literature in several aspects. First, in our model, the aggregate level of production technology is determined by three factors: intensity of research effort, the current level of technology and a random element that can be interpreted as "luck". Due to the presence of aggregate uncertainty, our model is capable of producing stochastic cycles that are similar to those generated by a typical Real Business Cycle (RBC) model. In contrast, the previous literature has no uncertainty at the aggregate level, so that cycles are deterministic.<sup>2</sup> Concerning our assumption of the randomness of innovations, research projects clearly differ. Certain projects, such as the construction of railroads or telegraph systems, can generally be planned from the out-set. Other projects may have highly uncertain outcomes, e.g., the development of a treatment for cancer. Furthermore, research in new directions is typically preceded by trial and error, and many discoveries are purely accidental.<sup>3</sup>

Secondly, in our economy, technology increases in discrete increments of a fixed size, so that the economy experiences switches in regime, between positive growth and no growth at all.<sup>4</sup> Unlike the previous literature, we consider technological improvements to be relatively small and frequent. In our view, the development of a railroad system is not merely one great project, but rather, a series of small projects: productivity does not increase very much

---

<sup>2</sup>In Andolfatto and MacDonald (1998), there is idiosyncratic uncertainty but not aggregate uncertainty; this is because a continuum of agents is assumed and, thus, the law of large numbers applies. In Freeman et al. (1999), uncertainty is absent: innovation occurs with the probability one as soon as the required amounts of R&D resources have been collected.

<sup>3</sup>Jovanovic and Rob (1990) provide many examples of research projects that have had random outcomes.

<sup>4</sup>There is evidence that supports the two-regime process assumption. Hamilton (1989) finds that the periodic shifts between positive and negative growth in output concur remarkably with the dates of expansions and recessions in the U. S. economy.

after the entire railroad has been constructed, but rather, productivity increases step-by-step as each phase of the railroad is completed and put into operation. Likewise, we do not think that either development or diffusion of the IBM PC-XT has led to an information revolution. Rather, we believe that productivity has been increasing, step-by-step, after the introduction of IBM's PC-286, -386, -486, etc.<sup>5</sup> As the consequence of frequent innovation, we obtain short waves of economic activity.

Finally, we differ from the literature in our methodology for the numerical study. To be specific, we do not try to distinguish from the data particular technology shocks to parameterize the model, but calibrate the model to reproduce the selected first moments of the aggregate series, as is typically done in RBC models. We subsequently test the validity of the model's predictions by looking at the second moments of the simulated series.

The main implications of our analysis are as follows: By construction, the model produces a balanced growth path, such that all the model's variables (except that of working hours) grow at the same constant rate in the long-run. In the short-run, the model generates random cycles that resemble business cycle fluctuations in actual economies. The quantitative implications of the calibrated version of our model are very similar to those of Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model. Moreover, our model can correct two serious shortcomings of RBC models: it can account for the persistence in output growth and the asymmetry of growth within the business cycle.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the model, derives the optimality conditions and discusses some of the model's implications for growth and cycles. Section 3 outlines the calibration procedure and analyzes the quantitative implications of the model. Section 4 concludes.

## 2 The model

In this section, we formulate the model and discuss some of its implications. We restrict our attention to a socially optimal economy. A competitive equilibrium version is discussed in Appendix A.

---

<sup>5</sup>A related idea appears in Jovanovic and Lach (1997, p.7) in a context of a product-innovation model: "...more important products are the embodiment of a larger number of innovations, so that, for example, the computer embodies a large "bunch" of smaller innovations".

## 2.1 The growing economy

Time is discrete and the horizon is infinite,  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ . Output is produced according to the Cobb-Douglas production technology,  $K_{t-1}^\alpha N_t^{1-\alpha}$ ,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , where the two inputs  $K_{t-1}$  and  $N_t$  are physical capital and efficiency labor, respectively. The amount of efficiency labor is given by the product of the current labor productivity,  $A_t$ , and the aggregate physical hours worked,  $n_t$ , i.e.,  $N_t = A_t \cdot n_t$ .

There is endogenous labor augmenting technological progress. In each period  $t$ , depending on a random draw, labor productivity either increases by a factor  $\bar{\gamma} > 1$ , i.e.,  $A_t = A_{t-1} \cdot \bar{\gamma}$ , or remains unchanged,  $A_t = A_{t-1}$ . The probability of innovation,  $\varphi_t$ , is endogenous: it depends on the human capital stock,  $H_{t-1}$ , and productivity,  $A_{t-1}$ .<sup>6</sup> We assume that the probability function is homogeneous of degree zero and, thus, can be written as  $\varphi_t = \varphi(H_{t-1}/A_{t-1})$ . Moreover, we assume that  $\varphi(x)$  is strictly increasing and strictly concave for all  $x \geq 0$  and satisfies  $\varphi(0) = 0$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x) = 1$ . The assumption of strict concavity of the probability function implies that there is a decreasing rate of return on human capital (in terms of the probability of innovation) in a given period. Furthermore, since the probability function is strictly decreasing in  $A_{t-1}$ , the rate of return on human capital also decreases across periods, as the economy develops. Therefore, to achieve continuous technological progress, human capital stock must grow at an average rate that is not lower than that of technology. As we will show, under the assumption of a homogeneity of degree zero of the probability function, the economy follows a balanced growth path such that not only human capital but also output, consumption and physical capital all grow at the same average rate as technology does.<sup>7</sup>

Note that, in our economy, human capital,  $H_t$ , is used exclusively for mak-

---

<sup>6</sup>Thus, production technology follows a random-walk-type of process  $\ln A_t = \ln A_{t-1} + \ln \gamma_t$ ,  $\gamma_t \in \{\bar{\gamma}, 1\}$ , where the probabilities of the two states,  $\varphi_t$  and  $(1 - \varphi_t)$ , change over time. The assumption of a random-walk process for innovations is in agreement with the data (see Geroski and Walters, 1995).

<sup>7</sup>Consequently, our model reproduces empirical evidence that indicates that real economies constantly increase their spending on R&D, although their growth rates change relatively little. This evidence is documented by Coe and Helpman (1995), Griliches (1988), Grossman and Helpman (1991, table 1.1), Jones (1995), Kortum (1997) among others. Jones (1995) argues that such evidence cannot be replicated under the assumption of constant returns to R&D activity that is standard for R&D-based models, e.g., Aghion and Howitt (1992), Grossman and Helpman (1991), Romer (1990).

ing innovations, i.e., for R&D activity. We interpret human capital stock as a collection of all non-human and human resources that encourage innovation, i.e., computers and other lab equipment in the R&D sector, a stock of knowledge of researchers and all or a part of resources employed in the educational sector. Furthermore, we assume that human capital is one of the uses of output, i.e., that it is produced by using the same technology as that used for producing consumption and physical capital.

The planner maximizes the expected discounted lifetime utility of the representative consumer

$$\max_{\{C_t, l_t, K_t, H_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t \{\ln C_t + B \ln l_t\} \quad (1)$$

subject to

$$C_t + K_t + H_t = (1 - d_k) K_{t-1} + (1 - d_h) H_{t-1} + K_{t-1}^{\alpha} (1 - l_t)^{1-\alpha} A_t^{1-\alpha}, \quad (2)$$

$$A_t = A_{t-1} \cdot \gamma_t \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(\gamma_t = \bar{\gamma}) &= \varphi(H_{t-1}/A_{t-1}), \\ \text{Prob}(\gamma_t = 1) &= 1 - \varphi(H_{t-1}/A_{t-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with initial condition  $(K_{-1}, H_{-1}, A_{-1})$  given. Here,  $E_0$  denotes the expectation, conditional on the information set in the initial period;  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  is the discount factor;  $B$  is a positive constant;  $C_t$  and  $l_t$  denote consumption and leisure, respectively; the agent's total time endowment is normalized to one, i.e.,  $n_t = 1 - l_t$ ; and finally,  $d_k \in (0, 1]$  and  $d_h \in (0, 1]$  are the depreciation rates of physical and human capital, respectively.

An equilibrium is defined as a sequence of contingency plans for an allocation  $\{C_t, l_t, K_t, H_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$  that solves the utility maximization problem (1)–(3). All equilibrium quantities are restricted to being non-negative and, in addition, leisure is assumed to satisfy  $l_t \leq 1$  for all  $t$ .

## 2.2 Relation to Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model

By appropriately re-defining the process for innovations, we can cast the model (1) – (3) into the standard neoclassical setup with exogenous growth and cycles. Specifically, assume that instead of (3), the technology is described by

$$A_t = \theta_t \cdot X_t, \quad (4)$$

where  $\theta_t$  is an exogenous technology shock following a first-order Markov process  $\ln \theta_t = \rho \ln \theta_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$  with  $\rho \in [0, 1)$  and  $\varepsilon_t \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ , and  $X_t$  is exogenous labor augmenting technological progress,  $X_t = X_0 \gamma_x^t$  with  $X_0 \in R_+$  and  $\gamma_x \geq 1$ . Since, under the assumption of exogenous technology, human capital is useless, the optimal choice of the planner is  $H_t = 0$  for all  $t$ , which takes us back to the familiar Kydland and Prescott (1982) model.

### 2.3 The stationary economy

Although the model formulated in Section 2.1. is non-stationary, it can be converted into a stationary model by using the appropriate change of variables. Let us introduce  $c_t \equiv C_t/A_{t-1}$ ,  $k_{t-1} \equiv K_{t-1}/A_{t-1}$ ,  $h_{t-1} \equiv H_{t-1}/A_{t-1}$ . In terms of these variables, the problem (1)–(3) can be re-written as follows:

$$\max_{\{c_t, l_t, k_t, h_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t \{ \ln c_t + B \ln l_t + \ln A_{t-1} \} \quad (5)$$

subject to

$$c_t = (1 - d_k) k_{t-1} + (1 - d_h) h_{t-1} + \gamma_t^{1-\alpha} k_{t-1}^{\alpha} (1 - l_t)^{1-\alpha} - \gamma_t (k_t + h_t), \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}(\gamma_t = \bar{\gamma}) &= \varphi(h_{t-1}), \\ \text{Prob}(\gamma_t = 1) &= 1 - \varphi(h_{t-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $A_t = A_{t-1} \cdot \gamma_t$ , and initial condition  $(k_{-1}, h_{-1}, A_{-1})$  is given.

The above transformation does not remove the growth completely: the growing-over-time endogenous technology  $A_{t-1}$  is still present in the objective function (5).<sup>8</sup> It turns out, however, that a Markov (recursive) equilibrium exists, such that the corresponding optimal decision rules depend only on a current realization of  $\gamma_t \in \{1, \bar{\gamma}\}$ , but not on the growing term  $A_{t-1}$ . Moreover, such an equilibrium is unique. These results are formally established in the proposition below.

---

<sup>8</sup>The standard transformation for removing the growth in Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model is  $c_t \equiv C_t/X_t$  and  $k_t \equiv K_t/X_t$ . The objective function obtained after this transformation contains the growing term  $X_t$ . However, in contrast to our model, the growing term in this case is exogenous and does not affect the equilibrium allocation.



**Proposition 1** *a). The optimal value function  $V$  for the problem (5) – (7) is a solution to the Bellman equation*

$$V(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t) = \quad (8)$$

$$\max_{l_t, k_t, h_t} \left\{ \ln c_t + B \ln l_t + \frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \ln \gamma_t + \delta [\varphi(h_t) V(k_t, h_t, \bar{\gamma}) + (1 - \varphi(h_t)) V(k_t, h_t, 1)] \right\}$$

*subject to (6), (7).*

*b) The Bellman operator is a contraction mapping.*

**Proof.** See Appendix B. ■

With interior equilibrium, a solution to the problem (8) satisfies First-Order Conditions (FOCs)

$$(l_t) : \quad c_t = \frac{(1-\alpha) \cdot l_t}{B} \gamma_t^{1-\alpha} k_{t-1}^\alpha (1-l_t)^{-\alpha}, \quad (9)$$

$$(k_t) : \quad \frac{\gamma_t}{\delta c_t} = \frac{\varphi(h_t)}{c_{t+1}^g} \cdot \left( 1 - d_k + \alpha \bar{\gamma}^{1-\alpha} k_t^{\alpha-1} (1 - l_{t+1}^g)^{1-\alpha} \right) + \frac{[1 - \varphi(h_t)]}{c_{t+1}^b} \cdot \left( 1 - d_k + \alpha k_t^{\alpha-1} (1 - l_{t+1}^b)^{1-\alpha} \right), \quad (10)$$

$$(h_t) : \quad \frac{\gamma_t}{\delta c_t} = (1 - d_h) \left( \frac{\varphi(h_t)}{c_{t+1}^g} + \frac{1 - \varphi(h_t)}{c_{t+1}^b} \right) + \varphi'(h_t) [V(k_t, h_t, \bar{\gamma}) - V(k_t, h_t, 1)], \quad (11)$$

where the super-scripts  $\{g, b\}$  correspond to the states  $\gamma_t = \bar{\gamma}$  and  $\gamma_t = 1$ , referred to as "good" and "bad" states, respectively.

In our model, the FOCs regarding leisure and physical capital are similar to the corresponding optimality conditions in the model by Kydland and Prescott (1982). However, in Kydland and Prescott's (1982) setup, the probabilities of states are determined exogenously by the assumed process for shocks, whereas, in our case, they are determined endogenously by the FOC with respect to human capital. When human capital is chosen in our economy, the planner takes into account that each additional unit of  $h_t$  increases the probability of technological advancement, which, if it occurs, increases the lifetime utility by the amount  $V(k_t, h_t, \bar{\gamma}) - V(k_t, h_t, 1)$ .

## 2.4 Endogenous growth and cycles

We have shown that, under the recursive formulation, a solution to the model with growth,  $\{C_t, K_t, H_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ , can be sub-divided into two components: a growing-over-time stochastic trend,  $\{A_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ , and a solution to the stationary model,  $\{c_t, k_t, h_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ ; these two components can be interpreted as long-term growth and the short-term cyclical fluctuations, respectively. In our model, growth and cycles are endogenous in the sense that they depend not only on "luck" but also on the actions of the planner (i.e., on the choice of human capital).<sup>9</sup>

Fluctuations in our model take the form of cycles of a random length and shape, which occur because technology's progress is stochastic. The cyclical nature of fluctuations is a consequence of the existing trade-off between production, on the one hand, and technological progress on the other. Specifically, a technological advance increases the rate of return on physical capital relative to that on human capital. This leads to a re-allocation of resources from R&D to production and, as a result, lowers the probability of technological advance during the next period. In subsequent periods, the resources are gradually shifted back to R&D until the next technological advance occurs and so on. In section 3, we plot cycles produced by a calibrated version of the model.

The long-run growth is also due to technological progress. The model predicts that the economy follows a balanced growth path such that consumption and both capital stocks,  $\{C_t, K_t, H_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ , grow at the same stochastic rate  $\gamma_t$  while labor,  $\{n_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ , and leisure,  $\{l_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ , exhibit no long-run growth. The fact that the process for  $\{h_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$  is stationary implies that the processes for the probability of innovation and the growth rate are also stationary. The expected growth rate in our economy is

$$\gamma = E \left[ \frac{A_{t+1}}{A_t} \right] = E [\gamma_t] = E [\bar{\gamma} \cdot \varphi(h_t) + 1 \cdot (1 - \varphi(h_t))], \quad (12)$$

where  $E$  is the unconditional expectation. Note that if parameters are chosen so that the average growth rate  $\gamma$  in our model is equal to the deterministic growth rate  $\gamma_x$  in Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model, both models imply

---

<sup>9</sup>The "exogenous growth and cycles" variant of our model can be obtained by considering a stationary stochastic equilibrium of the problem (8) in which human capital stock is fixed to some level,  $h_t = \bar{h}$  for all  $t$ . In such a case, the probability of innovation is also fixed, so that growth and cycles depend entirely on "luck".

a similar balanced growth path. However, in our model, the time trend is stochastic, while, in Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model, it is deterministic.

### 3 Quantitative analysis

In this section, we outline the calibration procedure and discuss simulation results. More details on the calibration procedure and the solution algorithm are provided in Appendix C and Appendix D, respectively.

#### 3.1 Calibration

A distinctive feature of our endogenous growth model is that it can be calibrated in the standard way employed in the RBC literature. Specifically, we choose the values of the parameters so that, in the steady state, the model reproduces the following statistics for the U.S. economy: the capital share in production  $\alpha$ , physical capital to output ratio  $\pi_k$ , consumption to output ratio  $\pi_c$ , average working time  $n$ , and average growth rate  $\gamma$ .<sup>10</sup> We take the model's period as one quarter. We choose the values of  $\alpha$ ,  $\pi_k$  and  $\gamma$  in line with the estimates presented in Christiano and Eichenbaum (1992). We take the value of  $\pi_c$  which is somewhat higher than it was in their paper because our model does not contain the government. We borrow the value of  $n$  from the micro-study presented in Juster and Stafford (1991). The above parameters are fixed for all simulations; they also identify the parameter  $B$  in the utility function. *Table 1* summarizes the parameter choice.

We assume that the probability function is of the Poisson type

$$\varphi(h_t) = 1 - \exp(-vh_t), \quad v > 0.$$

Furthermore, we assume that the depreciation rates of physical and human capital are equal. Under the above assumptions, we can uniquely determine the rest of the model's parameters,  $\{\delta, d_k, d_h, \bar{\gamma}, v\}$ , by fixing a human capital to the output ratio,  $\pi_h$ . The empirical value of this ratio depends significantly on whether the variable  $h_t$  is interpreted only as a stock of R&D expenditure or as a stock of both R&D and educational expenditure. During the period 1985-1995, the expenditure on R&D in the U.S., amounted to 2.5% of GDP, whereas the expenditure on education was 6.7% and 5.4% of GDP in 1980

---

<sup>10</sup>Here, and further on in the text,  $z$  denotes the steady state value of a variable  $z_t$ .

and 1996, respectively.<sup>11</sup> We consider four alternative values of the parameter  $\pi_h$ , such that  $\pi_h/\pi_k \equiv h/k \in \{0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6\}$ . As is seen from *Table 2*, these values imply the steady state shares of human capital investment to output,  $i_h/y$ , ranging from 6.34% to 9.83%, which is grossly consistent with the amount of expenditure on R&D and education in the U.S. economy.<sup>12</sup>

In *Table 2*, we provide the values of the parameters  $\{\delta, d_k, d_h, \bar{\gamma}, v\}$  computed by our calibration procedure for each considered value of  $h/k$ . The parameters  $\delta$ ,  $d_h$  and  $d_k$  decrease with  $\pi_h$ , which can be seen from formulas (20), (21) in Appendix C. The regularities that  $\bar{\gamma}$  increases with  $\pi_h$  and that  $v$  decreases with  $\pi_h$  are more difficult to understand, as the calibration of the parameters  $\bar{\gamma}$  and  $v$  requires finding a numerical solution to a non-linear equation (23) and combining several conditions, such as (22), (24) and (25) (see Appendix C). However, one can gain a simple intuition about the implied inverse relation between the frequency and size of the innovations by looking at formula (12). In each of the cases considered, the model is calibrated to reproduce the average growth rate of output in the U.S. economy,  $\gamma$ . The result is that if technology improvements are small (large), they occur often (rarely). The quantitative expression of this effect is very significant: as the value of  $h/k$  rises from 0.3 to 0.6, the size of innovation,  $\bar{\gamma}$ , increases from 1.0046 to 1.0676, while the steady state probability of innovation,  $\varphi(h)$ , decreases from 0.8707 to 0.0591, respectively.

## 3.2 Results

*Figure 1* plots the simulated series produced by the model under  $h/k = 0.5$ . The first column shows the series generated by the stationary model. The second column plots the series after introducing the growth. In the last column, we show the growing series that are logged and de-trended by using the Hodrick-Prescott filter with a smoothing parameter of 1600. The most important point here is that the series produced by the model resemble those observed in real economies, i.e., they grow over time and exhibit cycles of random durations.

To illustrate how the properties of the simulated series depend on the

---

<sup>11</sup>Source: the World Bank's website, Tables 5.15 and 2.9, respectively.

<sup>12</sup>The estimates of McGrattan and Prescott (2000) offer an alternative justification for the assumed range of  $h/k$ . This paper reports a ratio of approximately 0.6 between what they call unmeasured and measured corporate capital, with the former kind of capital being defined as brand names, patents and firm-specific human capital.

Table 1. The parameters common for all artificial model economies.

<i>Parameter</i>	$\pi_k$	$\pi_c$	$n$	$\gamma$	$\alpha$	$B$
<i>Value</i>	10.62	0.67	0.31	1.004	0.339	2.196

Table 2. The model-specific parameters and selected steady state values.

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Model</i> <i>h /k=0.3</i>	<i>Model</i> <i>h /k=0.4</i>	<i>Model</i> <i>h /k=0.5</i>	<i>Model</i> <i>h /k=0.6</i>
$\delta$	0.9921	0.9904	0.9890	0.9877
$d_k, d_h$	0.0199	0.0182	0.0167	0.0154
$\bar{\gamma}$	1.0046	1.0055	1.0083	1.0676
$v$	0.6141	0.2894	0.1176	0.0091
$i_h / y$	0.0634	0.0773	0.0888	0.0983
$\varphi(h)$	0.8707	0.7234	0.4795	0.0591




Figure 1. Time series solution to the model with  $h/k = 0.5$ .

value of  $h/k$ , in *Figure 2*, we plot output series under  $h/k \in \{0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6\}$ . The introspection of the third column in *Figure 2* allows us to appreciate pronounced asymmetries of output growth within the business cycle under our extreme parametrizations  $h/k \in \{0.3, 0.6\}$ . Asymmetries of output growth are a well-known feature of the data. Various empirical studies find that output grows sharply during expansions and declines slowly during recessions (see Freeman et al., 1999, for a review of these studies). Our model of endogenous growth and cycles reproduces this pattern under  $h/k = 0.6$ .<sup>13</sup> This implication of our model is of particular interest, given that asymmetries of output growth are difficult to obtain within RBC models that rely on the assumption of exogenous shocks (see, e.g., Balke and Wynne, 1995).

*Figure 3* presents impulse responses to the discovery of new technology in the growing economy under  $h/k = 0.5$ . Prior to the shock, the economy has had no technology improvements during a long period of time (100 periods) so that the model's variables have converged to constant values. As we can see, all or the model's variables, with the exception of those related to R&D activity, increase after technology advances. In other words, just as in Kydland and Prescott's (1982) setup, our model predicts a pro-cyclical behavior in consumption, working hours, wage, interest rates, etc. This finding is not surprising since an innovation plays the same role in our model as a positive exogenous shock to technology does in RBC settings.

As is apparent from *Figure 3*, the R&D variables, such as human capital investment, human capital stock and the probability of innovation move counter-cyclically. To capture the intuition behind this result, we should note that a discovery of new technology affects the level of production positively, but it affects the following period's probability of innovation negatively (recall that  $A_t$  appears in the denominator in the probability function,  $\varphi(H_t/A_t)$ ). To restore the probability after the technological advance, the human capital stock must be increased proportionally. Doing it in just one period, however, is simply too costly. Thus, the alternative strategy is used: the resources are first switched from R&D to production to take advantage of the new technology and, only then are they gradually shifted back to R&D with the aim of increasing the probability of future innovation. The re-allocation of resources between innovative and productive activities is precisely what accounts for the cyclical nature of the fluctuations in our model.

---

<sup>13</sup>The model by Freeman et al. (1999) can also generate the appropriate asymmetric pattern of output growth within the cycle.




Figure 2. Comparison of output series across models with different  $h / k$  ratios.






Figure 3. Impulse response functions for the model with  $h / k = 0.5$ .

The model's implications for R&D and innovations are in agreement with the findings presented in the empirical literature. First, in our model, a positive relationship between the level of output and the discovery of new technology is consistent with evidence that innovations move pro-cyclically, as documented by Geroski and Walters (1995). Secondly, the counter-cyclical pattern of the R&D activity produced by the model agrees with the findings of Lach and Schankerman (1989), and Lach and Rob (1996), which show that an increase in R&D investment precedes an expansion in physical capital investment.

In *Tables 3* and *4*, we provide selected second moments generated by our model. To facilitate comparison, we also include the moments produced by Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model and the corresponding statistics for the U.S. economy.<sup>14</sup> Before computing the second moments, we remove the growth in a way that is standard in the RBC literature: we log all the variables for the U.S and artificial economies and detrend them by using the Hodrick-Prescott filter with a penalty parameter of 1600.<sup>15</sup>

The main findings in *Table 3* are as follows: Overall, the relative volatilities and contemporaneous correlations in our model are close to the respective statistics in Kydland and Prescott's (1982) setup. The volatility of output in our model is determined by the size of technological advance and increases from 0.18 to 1.62 as the value of  $h/k$  rises from 0.3 to 0.6 (note that the volatility of output in the latter case is comparable to the one in the data, 1.64). The correlation between the current output and the next period's probability of innovation,  $\varphi_{t+1} \equiv \varphi(H_t/A_t)$ , is negative and close to perfect (recall that a counter-cyclical movement of R&D activity accounts for the cycles in our model).

As is seen from *Table 4*, our model is capable of delivering fluctuations in the business cycle frequency. Indeed, the auto-correlation coefficients of output at short lags, in our model, are close to those of the U.S. economy and practically identical to those presented in Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model. A realistic persistence of output in a RBC model is a consequence of assuming an exogenous  $AR(1)$  technological shock with the required degree of serial correlation. In contrast, our endogenous growth model can

---

<sup>14</sup>See Maliar and Maliar (2002) for a description of the U.S. time series data that was used to generate the empirical statistics in *Tables 3* and *4*.

<sup>15</sup>We focus exclusively on the second moments properties of the original non-stationary models. The first moments (levels) generated by the supplementary stationary models are not reported as such models have no clear economic interpretation.

Table 3. Selected second moments for the U.S. and artificial economies.

Statistic	Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model	Endogenous growth models				U.S. economy
		Model $h/k=0.3$	Model $h/k=0.4$	Model $H/k=0.5$	Model $h/k=0.6$	
$\sigma_A/\sigma_y$	-	1.139 (0.009)	1.099 (0.008)	1.030 (0.014)	0.982 (0.018)	-
$\sigma_\phi/\sigma_y$	-	0.290 (0.023)	0.717 (0.024)	1.660 (0.030)	2.457 (0.066)	-
$\sigma_c/\sigma_y$	0.302 (0.014)	0.444 (0.009)	0.462 (0.007)	0.534 (0.007)	0.559 (0.007)	0.511
$\sigma_i/\sigma_y$	2.507 (0.032)	2.205 (0.015)	2.206 (0.020)	2.165 (0.034)	2.129 (0.032)	2.864
$\sigma_n/\sigma_y$	0.513 (0.005)	0.402 (0.005)	0.387 (0.005)	0.343 (0.007)	0.331 (0.005)	0.769
$\sigma_w/\sigma_y$	0.505 (0.008)	0.610 (0.006)	0.622 (0.005)	0.668 (0.005)	0.685 (0.004)	0.611
$\sigma_y$	1.636 (0.170)	0.184 (0.023)	0.301 (0.030)	0.492 (0.053)	1.619 (0.321)	1.676
$corr(A_t, y_t)$	0.999 (0.000)	0.999 (0.004)	0.998 (0.005)	0.984 (0.006)	0.971 (0.007)	-
$corr(\phi_{t+1}, y_t)$	-	-0.983 (0.018)	-0.980 (0.013)	-0.959 (0.009)	-0.943 (0.009)	-
$corr(c_t, y_t)$	0.892 (0.018)	0.969 (0.007)	0.980 (0.007)	0.983 (0.007)	0.977 (0.005)	0.846
$corr(i_t, y_t)$	0.993 (0.002)	0.995 (0.001)	0.996 (0.001)	0.994 (0.003)	0.991 (0.003)	0.914
$corr(n_t, y_t)$	0.983 (0.004)	0.982 (0.004)	0.986 (0.004)	0.980 (0.005)	0.968 (0.007)	0.899
$corr(w_t, y_t)$	0.982 (0.004)	0.992 (0.002)	0.995 (0.002)	0.995 (0.002)	0.993 (0.002)	0.464
$corr(w_t, n_t)$	0.931 (0.016)	0.951 (0.011)	0.963 (0.011)	0.953 (0.014)	0.930 (0.015)	0.219

Note: Statistics  $\sigma_x$  and  $corr(x, z)$  are the volatility of a variable  $x$  and the correlation coefficient between variables  $x$  and  $z$ , respectively. The volatilities and the correlation coefficients of the models' variables are sample averages across 500 simulations. Each simulation consists of 157 periods, as do the U.S. time series. Numbers in parentheses are the sample standard deviations of the corresponding statistics. Before calculating any statistic, we log all the variables for the U.S and artificial economies and detrend them by using the Hodrick-Prescott filter with a penalty parameter of 1600.

*Table 4.* The auto-correlation coefficients for output and output growth for the U.S. and artificial economies.

<i>Statistic</i>	<i>Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model</i>	<i>Endogenous growth models</i>				<i>U.S. economy</i>
		<i>Model <math>h/k=0.3</math></i>	<i>Model <math>h/k=0.4</math></i>	<i>Model <math>h/k=0.5</math></i>	<i>Model <math>h/k=0.6</math></i>	
$corr(y_t, y_{t-1})$	0.696 (0.056)	0.682 (0.063)	0.723 (0.055)	0.787 (0.043)	0.810 (0.032)	0.867
$corr(y_t, y_{t-2})$	0.446 (0.088)	0.441 (0.094)	0.464 (0.091)	0.499 (0.088)	0.513 (0.074)	0.681
$corr(y_t, y_{t-3})$	0.245 (0.103)	0.242 (0.105)	0.257 (0.108)	0.271 (0.107)	0.275 (0.096)	0.470
$corr(y_t, y_{t-4})$	0.082 (0.113)	0.083 (0.110)	0.092 (0.111)	0.091 (0.115)	0.090 (0.107)	0.258
$corr(y_t, y_{t-5})$	-0.044 (0.111)	-0.040 (0.106)	-0.033 (0.109)	-0.045 (0.115)	-0.049 (0.111)	0.042
$corr(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t-1})$	-0.020 (0.077)	-0.044 (0.078)	0.049 (0.082)	0.261 (0.072)	0.356 (0.060)	0.290
$corr(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t-2})$	-0.018 (0.074)	-0.001 (0.080)	-0.011 (0.079)	-0.019 (0.090)	-0.029 (0.087)	0.189
$corr(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t-3})$	-0.017 (0.078)	-0.003 (0.081)	-0.003 (0.089)	-0.015 (0.090)	-0.020 (0.083)	0.084
$corr(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t-4})$	-0.017 (0.079)	-0.004 (0.081)	-0.009 (0.082)	-0.014 (0.088)	-0.016 (0.091)	0.053
$corr(\gamma_t, \gamma_{t-5})$	-0.019 (0.078)	-0.010 (0.086)	-0.008 (0.083)	-0.018 (0.087)	-0.016 (0.090)	-0.108

*Note:* Statistic  $corr(x, z)$  is the correlation coefficient between variables  $x$  and  $z$ . The correlation coefficients of the models' variables are sample averages across 500 simulations. Each simulation consists of 157 periods, as do the U.S. time series. Numbers in parentheses are the sample standard deviations of the corresponding statistics. Before calculating any statistic, we log all the variables for the U.S and artificial economies and detrend them by using the Hodrick-Prescott filter with a penalty parameter of 1600.

produce an appropriate cyclical pattern of output without having any exogenous source of technological persistence. This finding is interesting, since the existing models for endogenous cycles do not produce business cycle fluctuations (see Andolfatto and MacDonald, 1998, and Freeman et al., 1999).

We finally discuss the implications our model has for persistence in output growth. It is a stylized fact that U.S. output growth displays significant positive auto-correlations over short horizons and weak negative auto-correlations over long horizons (see Cogley and Nason, 1995, for a detailed discussion). To illustrate the quantitative expression of this tendency in our data set, in the last column of *Table 4*, we provide the auto-correlations for output growth,  $\gamma_t \equiv y_t/y_{t-1}$ , at the first five lags. Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model cannot account for the above stylized fact: it generates weak negative auto-correlations at the five lags considered (see the first column of *Table 4*).<sup>16</sup> The failure of Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model in this dimension is explained by a weakness of the embodied propagation mechanisms, which are capital accumulation and intertemporal substitution. In our model, the presence of human capital gives rise to an additional propagation mechanism: a discovery of new technology triggers the re-allocation of resources from R&D activities to production, which increases the future output. As can be seen from *Table 4*, under high values of  $h/k \in \{0.5, 0.6\}$ , this mechanism is so strong that our model is able to generate the first-order auto-correlation of output growth, which is close to the one observed in the U.S. data. Thus, our model of endogenous growth and cycles generates more realistic output dynamics than does the standard RBC model.

## 4 Conclusion

Models with endogenous innovations have been previously applied in an attempt to explain long waves in economic activity. The theoretical and empirical results of this paper provide support for the hypothesis that innovations also play an important role in business cycles. We construct an R&D-based general equilibrium model in which both the long-run growth and the short-run cyclical fluctuations arise endogenously, because of continuous techno-

---

<sup>16</sup>Cogley and Nason (1995) show that other standard RBC models (e.g., Hansen's, 1985, model with indivisible labor, Christiano and Eichenbaum's, 1992, model with government spending shocks) also have difficulties in generating the appropriate dynamics of output growth.

logical progress. In our economy, three factors that affect the outcome of R&D activity are research efforts, the existing stock of knowledge and a random component. The calibrated version of our endogenous growth and cycle model has proved to be as good in reproducing the business cycle facts as the benchmark RBC setup by Kydland and Prescott (1982). Furthermore, our model can account for two stylized facts which cannot be reconciled within the typical RBC model, such as the asymmetry in the shape of business cycles and the persistence in output growth.

## References

- [1] Aghion, P. and P. Howitt (1992) A model of growth through creative destruction. *Econometrica* 60, 323-351.
- [2] Andolfatto, D. and G. MacDonald (1998) Technology diffusion and aggregate dynamics. *Review of Economic Dynamics* 1, 338-370.
- [3] Balke, N. and M. Wynne (1995) Recessions and recoveries in real business cycle models. *Economic Inquiry* 33, 640-663.
- [4] Bental, B. and D. Peled (1996) The accumulation of wealth and the cyclical generation of new technologies: a search theoretic approach. *International Economic Review* 37, 687-718.
- [5] Christiano, L. and M. Eichenbaum (1992) Current real-business-cycle theories and aggregate labor-market fluctuations. *American Economic Review* 82, 430-450.
- [6] Coe, D. and E. Helpman (1995) International R&D spillovers. *European Economic Review* 39, 859-887.
- [7] Cogley, T. and J. Nason (1995) Output dynamics in Real-Business-Cycle models. *American Economic Review* 85, 492-511.
- [8] Freeman, S., D.-P. Hong, and D. Peled (1999) Endogenous cycles and growth with indivisible technological developments. *Review of Economic Dynamics* 2, 403-433.
- [9] Geroski, P. and C. Walters (1995) Innovative activity over the business cycle. *Economic Journal* 1005, 916-928.

- [10] Grililishes, Z. (1988) Productivity puzzles and R&D: another nonexplanation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 2, 9-21.
- [11] Grossmann, G. and E. Helpman (1991) *Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- [12] Hamilton, J. (1989) A new approach to the economic analysis of non-stationary time series and the business cycle. *Econometrica* 57, 357-384.
- [13] Hansen, G. (1985) Indivisible labor and the business cycle. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 16, 309-328.
- [14] Jones, C. (1995) Time series tests of endogenous growth models. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 110, 495-525.
- [15] Jovanovic, B. and S. Lach (1997) Product innovation and the business cycle. *International Economic Review* 1, 3-22.
- [16] Jovanovic, B. and R. Rob (1990) Long waves and short waves: growth through intensive and extensive search. *Econometrica* 58, 1391-1409.
- [17] Juster, F. and F. Stafford (1991) The allocation of time: empirical findings, behavioral models, and problems of measurement. *Journal of Economic Literature* 29, 471-522.
- [18] Kleinknecht, A. (1987) *Innovation Patterns in Crisis and Prosperity: Schumpeter's Long Cycle Reconsidered*. London: MacMillan.
- [19] Kortum, S. (1997) Research, patenting, and technological change. *Econometrica* 6, 1389-1419.
- [20] Kydland, F. and E. Prescott (1982) Time to build and aggregate fluctuations. *Econometrica* 50, 1345-1370.
- [21] Lach, S. and R. Rob (1996) R&D, investment and industry dynamics. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy* 2, 217-249.
- [22] Lach, S. and M. Schankerman (1989) Dynamics of R&D and investment in the scientific sector. *Journal of Political Economy* 4, 880-904.
- [23] Maliar, L. and S. Maliar (in press) The representative consumer in the neoclassical growth model with idiosyncratic shocks. *Review of Economic Dynamics*.

- [24] Marcet, A. (1988) Solving nonlinear stochastic models by parameterizing expectations. Working paper, Carnegie Mellon University.
- [25] Marcet, A. and G. Lorenzoni (1999) The parameterized expectations approach: some practical issues. In R. Marimon and A. Scott (ed.), *Computational Methods for the Study of Dynamic Economies*, pp. 143-172. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [26] McGrattan, E. and E. Prescott (2000) Is the stock market overvalued? *Quarterly Review* 24(4). Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank.
- [27] Romer, P. (1990) Endogenous technical change. *Journal of Political Economy* 98, S71-S103.
- [28] Segerstrom, P. (1991) Innovation, imitation, and economic growth. *Journal of Political Economy* 99, 807-827.

## 5 Appendices

This section exposes supplementary results. Appendix A decentralizes the planner's economy. Appendix B proves Proposition 1. Appendices C and D elaborate the calibration and solution procedures, respectively.

### 5.1 Appendix A

A market economy consists of one production firm, one research firm and a continuum of homogeneous agents with the names on the unit interval  $[0, 1]$ .

A research firm rents the human capital stock, accumulated by the agents. In exchange for the supplied human capital,  $H_{t-1}$ , an agent receives a new technology with the probability  $\varphi_t = \varphi(H_{t-1}/A_{t-1})$ . As all agents are identical, in the equilibrium, the individual human capital stock coincides with the aggregate one. Thus, when the new technology,  $A_t$ , is discovered, the research firm delivers it to all agents in the economy.

Except for human capital, an agent accumulates physical capital and rents it to the production firm at the interest rate,  $r_t$ . Also, the agent supplies efficiency labor in exchange for the wage,  $w_t$ . The problem of the agent is

$$\max_{\{C_t, l_t, K_t, H_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t \{\ln C_t + B \ln l_t\}$$



subject to

$$C_t + K_t + H_t = (1 - d_k + r_t) K_{t-1} + (1 - d_h) H_{t-1} + w_t A_t (1 - l_t),$$

where  $A_t$  represents the efficiency of one hour worked, i.e., the current level of technology.

The production firm maximizes period-by-period profit by choosing the demand for physical capital and efficiency labor. In the equilibrium, the marginal product of each input is equal to its rental price

$$r_t = \alpha K_{t-1}^{\alpha-1} (A_t (1 - l_t))^{1-\alpha} = \alpha \gamma_t^{1-\alpha} k_{t-1}^{\alpha-1} (1 - l_t)^{1-\alpha},$$

$$w_t = (1 - \alpha) K_{t-1}^{\alpha} (A_t (1 - l_t))^{-\alpha} = (1 - \alpha) \gamma_t^{1-\alpha} k_{t-1}^{\alpha} (1 - l_t)^{-\alpha}.$$

The fact that the planner's economy and the market economy have an identical optimal allocation follows from the equivalence of the optimality conditions.

## 5.2 Appendix B

### Proof of Proposition 1.

a). Let  $W_t$  be the value of lifetime utility in period  $t$ . From (5), we have

$$W_t = \ln c_t + B \ln l_t + \ln A_{t-1} + \delta E_t \left[ \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s (\ln c_{t+1+s} + B \ln l_{t+1+s} + \ln A_{t+s}) \right].$$

The value function  $W_t$  varies with time as it depends on the growing-over-time technology  $A_{t-1}$ . We guess that the function  $W_t$  can be represented as  $W_t = V(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t) + \mu \ln A_{t-1}$ , where  $V$  is a time-invariant value function, which depends on the endogenous state variables  $k_{t-1}$ ,  $h_{t-1}$  and the exogenous state variable  $\gamma_t$ . Then, we obtain

$$V(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t) = W_t - \mu \ln A_{t-1} = \ln c_t + B \ln l_t + \ln A_{t-1} - \mu \ln A_{t-1} +$$

$$\delta E_t \left[ \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s (\ln c_{t+1+s} + B \ln l_{t+1+s} + \ln A_{t+s}) \right] = \ln c_t + B \ln l_t + \delta \mu \ln A_t -$$

$$\delta \mu \ln A_t + (1 - \mu) \ln A_{t-1} + \delta E_t \left[ \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s (\ln c_{t+1+s} + B \ln l_{t+1+s} + \ln A_{t+s}) \right].$$

By using the fact that  $\ln A_t = \ln A_{t-1} + \ln \gamma_t$ , we get

$$V(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t) = \ln c_t + B \ln l_t + (1 - \mu + \delta\mu) \ln A_{t-1} + \delta\mu \ln \gamma_t +$$

$$\delta E_t \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} [\delta^s (\ln c_{t+1+s} + B \ln l_{t+1+s} + \ln A_{t+s}) - \mu \ln A_t] =$$

$$\ln c_t + B \ln l_t + (1 - \mu + \delta\mu) \ln A_{t-1} + \delta\mu \ln \gamma_t + \delta E_t [(W_{t+1} - \mu \ln A_t)] =$$

$$\ln c_t + B \ln l_t + (1 - \mu + \delta\mu) \ln A_{t-1} + \delta\mu \ln \gamma_t + \delta E_t [V(k_t, h_t, \gamma_{t+1})].$$

In order  $V(k_t, h_t, \gamma_{t+1})$  is time-invariant, the term  $\ln A_{t-1}$  should disappear from the last equation. This implies that  $(1 - \mu + \delta\mu) = 0$ . Consequently, we have

$$V(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t) = \ln c_t + B \ln l_t + \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} \ln \gamma_t + \delta E_t [V(k_t, h_t, \gamma_{t+1})].$$

This functional equation is equivalent to the Bellman equation (8).

b). We define the operator

$$TV = \max_{l_t, k_t, h_t} \{u_t + \delta \varphi(h_t) V(k_t, h_t, \bar{\gamma}) + \delta [1 - \varphi(h_t)] V(k_t, h_t, 1)\},$$

where  $u_t = u(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t, k_t, h_t, l_t)$  represents the momentary utility of period  $t$  after substituting consumption from budget constraint (6).

To show that  $T$  is a contraction, we verify that it satisfies the Blackwell's sufficiency conditions.

First, suppose  $k_{t-1} \in \mathcal{K} \equiv [k_{\min}, k_{\max}]$ ,  $h_{t-1} \in \mathcal{H} \equiv [h_{\min}, h_{\max}]$  and  $l_t \in [0, 1]$ . Consider any two functions  $f$  and  $\phi$ , defined on  $\mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{H} \times \{\bar{\gamma}, 1\}$ . Assume that  $f(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t) \geq \phi(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t)$  for all  $k_{t-1} \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $h_{t-1} \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\gamma_t \in \{\bar{\gamma}, 1\}$ . Let  $(k_t^f, h_t^f, l_t^f)$  and  $(k_t^\phi, h_t^\phi, l_t^\phi)$  attain  $Tf$  and  $T\phi$ , respectively, for any  $k_{t-1} \in \mathcal{K}$ ,  $h_{t-1} \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\gamma_t \in \{\bar{\gamma}, 1\}$ . After denoting  $u_t^f =$

$u(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t, k_t^f, h_t^f, l_t^f)$  and  $u_t^\phi = u(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t, k_t^\phi, h_t^\phi, l_t^\phi)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Tf &= u_t^f + \delta \varphi(h_t^f) f(k_t^f, h_t^f, \bar{\gamma}) + \delta [1 - \varphi(h_t^f)] f(k_t^f, h_t^f, 1) \\ &\geq u_t^\phi + \delta \varphi(h_t^\phi) f(k_t^\phi, h_t^\phi, \bar{\gamma}) + \delta [1 - \varphi(h_t^\phi)] f(k_t^\phi, h_t^\phi, 1) \\ &\geq u_t^\phi + \delta \varphi(h_t^\phi) \phi(k_t^\phi, h_t^\phi, \bar{\gamma}) + \delta [1 - \varphi(h_t^\phi)] \phi(k_t^\phi, h_t^\phi, 1) = T\phi. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $T$  is monotone.

Second, for any positive constant  $m \geq 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(V + m) &= \max_{l_t, k_t, h_t} \{u_t + \delta \varphi(h_t) [V(k_t, h_t, \bar{\gamma}) + m] + \delta [1 - \varphi(h_t)] \cdot [V(k_t, h_t, 1) + m]\} \\ &= TV + \delta m. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $T$  discounts.  $\parallel$

### 5.3 Appendix C

We calibrate the parameters of the model in the steady state. We define a steady state as a situation in which all variables of the stationary economy (5) – (7) take constant values. In the steady state, instead of switching between two different growth rates,  $\gamma_t \in \{\bar{\gamma}, 1\}$ , and, consequently, two levels of labor productivity,  $\gamma_t^{1-\alpha} \in \{\bar{\gamma}^{1-\alpha}, 1\}$ , the economy faces a constant growth rate,  $\gamma$ , and a constant level of labor productivity,  $a$ , given by

$$\gamma = \bar{\gamma} \varphi(h) + 1 - \varphi(h), \quad (13)$$

$$a = \bar{\gamma}^{1-\alpha} \varphi(h) + 1 - \varphi(h). \quad (14)$$

By evaluating FOCs (9) – (11) and constraint (6) in the steady state, we obtain, respectively,

$$c = \frac{(1-\alpha)l}{B} a k^\alpha n^{-\alpha}, \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{\gamma}{\delta} = 1 - d_k + \alpha a k^{\alpha-1} n^{1-\alpha}, \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{\gamma}{\delta} = 1 - d_h + \frac{v \exp(-vh) c \delta \ln \bar{\gamma}}{1 - \delta}, \quad (17)$$

$$c + \gamma(k + h) = (1 - d_k)k + (1 - d_h)h + a k^\alpha n^{1-\alpha}, \quad (18)$$

where  $n = 1 - l$ . In terms of the ratios  $\pi_c$ ,  $\pi_k$  and  $\pi_h$ , conditions (15), (16), (18) can be re-written as

$$B = \frac{\pi_c n}{(1 - n)(1 - \alpha)}, \quad (19)$$

$$\delta = \frac{\gamma}{1 - d_k + \alpha/\pi_k}, \quad (20)$$

$$d_k = d_h = 1 - \gamma + \frac{1 - \pi_c}{\pi_h + \pi_k}. \quad (21)$$

Equations (19) – (21) provide a basis for calibrating the parameters  $B$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $d_k$  and  $d_h$ .

We now calibrate the parameter  $\bar{\gamma}$ . From (13) we have that  $\exp(-vh) = 1 - \varphi(h) = \frac{\bar{\gamma} - \gamma}{\bar{\gamma} - 1}$  and, consequently,

$$v = -\frac{1}{h} \ln \left( \frac{\bar{\gamma} - \gamma}{\bar{\gamma} - 1} \right). \quad (22)$$

The last result allows us to re-write condition (17) as follows:

$$\frac{\gamma}{\delta} = 1 - d_h - \frac{\pi_c}{\pi_h} \left( \frac{\bar{\gamma} - \gamma}{\bar{\gamma} - 1} \right) \ln \left( \frac{\bar{\gamma} - \gamma}{\bar{\gamma} - 1} \right) \cdot \frac{\delta \ln \bar{\gamma}}{1 - \delta}. \quad (23)$$

By solving this equation numerically, we obtain the value of the parameter  $\bar{\gamma}$ . Next, we restore the technology by using (14)

$$a = \bar{\gamma}^{1-\alpha} \left( \frac{\gamma - 1}{\bar{\gamma} - 1} \right) + \left( \frac{\bar{\gamma} - \gamma}{\bar{\gamma} - 1} \right). \quad (24)$$

Given the technology level, we compute the capital to labor ratio,

$$\frac{k}{n} = \left[ \frac{\gamma/\delta - 1 + d_k}{\alpha a} \right]^{1/(\alpha-1)}, \quad (25)$$

and find the steady state level of output,  $y = an(k/n)^\alpha$ . Subsequently, we compute the steady state human capital stock,  $h = \pi_h y$ , and calibrate the parameter  $v$  by using equation (22).

In sum, our calibration procedure identifies uniquely the model's parameters  $\{B, \delta, d_k, d_h, \bar{\gamma}, v\}$  so that the model reproduces  $\{\pi_c, \pi_k, \pi_h, n, \gamma\}$ .

For consistency, we calibrate Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model to reproduce the same values of  $\{\pi_c, \pi_k, n, \gamma\}$  as our model does. The steady state expression of the FOCs of Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model coincides with (19) – (21) under  $\pi_h = 0$ . These conditions identify the values of  $B$ ,  $\delta$  and  $d_k$ . The process for the technology shock  $\theta_t$  is calibrated in the standard manner,  $\rho = 0.95$  and  $\sigma = 0.0085$ , (see, e.g., Hansen, 1985).

## 5.4 Appendix D

To solve for equilibrium in the model, we employ a variant of the Parameterized Expectation Algorithm (PEA) by Marcet (1988). A description of the PEA and its applications can be found in Marcet and Lorenzoni (1999).

Since there are two intertemporal FOCs, we must parameterize two conditional expectations. We parameterize the right hand side of FOC (10) as follows:<sup>17</sup>

$$\frac{\gamma_t c_t}{\delta} = \exp(\beta_1 + \beta_2 \ln k_{t-1} + \beta_3 \ln h_{t-1} + \beta_4 \ln \gamma_t). \quad (26)$$

The second intertemporal FOC may not be parameterized in this manner as there would be two equations identifying consumption and no condition identifying physical and human capital. To deal with this complication, we premultiply both sides of FOC (11) by  $h_t$  and parameterize the right hand side of the resulting condition as follows:

$$\frac{\gamma_t c_t}{\delta} \cdot h_t = \exp(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \ln k_{t-1} + \lambda_3 \ln h_{t-1} + \lambda_4 \ln \gamma_t). \quad (27)$$

We approximate the optimal value function  $V(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t)$  by a second

---

<sup>17</sup>We find that using a more accurate second-order polynomial approximation for the decision rules instead of the first-order one affects the solution very little, however, raises the computational expenses significantly.

order polynomial

$$V(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t) = \eta_1 + \eta_2 \ln k_{t-1} + \eta_3 \ln h_{t-1} + \eta_4 \ln \gamma_t + \eta_5 \ln k_{t-1} \ln h_{t-1} + \eta_6 \ln k_{t-1} \ln \gamma_t + \eta_7 \ln h_{t-1} \ln \gamma_t + \eta_8 (\ln k_{t-1})^2 + \eta_9 (\ln h_{t-1})^2 + \eta_{10} (\ln \gamma_t)^2. \quad (28)$$

We use the following iterative procedure:

- *Step 1.* Fix the initial coefficients  $\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^4$ ,  $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^4$  and  $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^{10}$ . Fix initial condition  $(k_{-1}, h_{-1})$ . Draw a random series of numbers  $\{u_t\}_{t=0}^T$  from a uniform distribution,  $[0, 1]$ , and fix it.
- *Step 2.* Given  $\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^4$  and  $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^4$ , use (6), (9), (26) and (27) to calculate recursively  $\{c_{t+1}^g, c_{t+1}^b, l_{t+1}^g, l_{t+1}^b, k_t, h_t, \gamma_t\}_{t=0}^T$ . To determine a sequence of the economy's states, use the series  $\{u_t\}_{t=0}^T$ . Specifically, for each  $t$ , compute the probability  $\varphi(h_t)$  and compare it with the random number  $u_t$ . If  $\varphi(h_t) \geq u_t$ , then assume  $\gamma_t = \bar{\gamma}$ ; otherwise, take  $\gamma_t = 1$ .
- *Step 3.* Given  $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^{10}$  and  $\{c_{t+1}^g, c_{t+1}^b, l_{t+1}^g, l_{t+1}^b, k_t, h_t, \gamma_t\}_{t=0}^T$ , from the Bellman equation (8), compute the series of values of the value function in the two states,  $\{V(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, \gamma_t), V(k_{t-1}, h_{t-1}, 1)\}_{t=0}^T$ . Restore the variables in the right hand sides of FOCs (10) and (11). Run the non-linear least square regressions of the corresponding variables on the functional forms (26), (27) and (28). Use the re-estimated coefficients  $\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^4$ ,  $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^4$  and  $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^{10}$  as input for next iteration.

Iterate on the coefficients  $\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^4$ ,  $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^4$  and  $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^{10}$  until a fixed-point is found. To solve for a fixed-point, we use a built-in MATLAB's gradient-descent procedure "fsolve". The length of simulations was  $T = 5000$ .

We also apply the PEA for calculating a solution to Kydland and Prescott's (1982) model. We parameterize the intertemporal condition of the stationary version of the model as follows:

$$\frac{\gamma c_t}{\delta} = \exp(e_1 + e_2 \ln k_{t-1} + e_3 \ln \theta_t).$$

We fix initial condition  $(k_{-1}, \theta_{-1})$  and the initial coefficients  $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^3$ . We draw a series of technology shocks,  $\{\theta_t\}_{t=1}^T$ , and fix it. As above, we iterate on the coefficients  $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^3$  until we find a fixed point.