

Changing dynamics at the zero lower bound

Gregor Bäurle, Daniel Kaufmann, Sylvia Kaufmann and Rodney W. Strachan

SNB Working Papers

16/2016



Legal Issues

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the Swiss National Bank. Working Papers describe research in progress. Their aim is to elicit comments and to further debate.

COPYRIGHT©

The Swiss National Bank (SNB) respects all third-party rights, in particular rights relating to works protected by copyright (information or data, wordings and depictions, to the extent that these are of an individual character).

SNB publications containing a reference to a copyright (© Swiss National Bank/SNB, Zurich/year, or similar) may, under copyright law, only be used (reproduced, used via the internet, etc.) for non-commercial purposes and provided that the source is mentioned. Their use for commercial purposes is only permitted with the prior express consent of the SNB.

General information and data published without reference to a copyright may be used without mentioning the source. To the extent that the information and data clearly derive from outside sources, the users of such information and data are obliged to respect any existing copyrights and to obtain the right of use from the relevant outside source themselves.

LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

The SNB accepts no responsibility for any information it provides. Under no circumstances will it accept any liability for losses or damage which may result from the use of such information. This limitation of liability applies, in particular, to the topicality, accuracy, validity and availability of the information.

ISSN 1660-7716 (printed version)
ISSN 1660-7724 (online version)

© 2016 by Swiss National Bank, Börsenstrasse 15,
P.O. Box, CH-8022 Zurich

Changing dynamics at the zero lower bound

Gregor Bäurle*, Daniel Kaufmann[†]
Sylvia Kaufmann[‡] and Rodney W. Strachan^{§¶}

November 2016

Abstract

The interaction of macroeconomic variables may change as the nominal short-term interest rates approach zero. In this paper, we propose an empirical model that captures these changing dynamics with a time-varying parameter vector autoregressive process. State-dependent parameters are determined by a latent state indicator. This state indicator follows a distribution with time-varying probabilities affected by the lagged interest rate. As the interest rate enters the critical zero lower bound (ZLB) region, the dynamics between the variables and the effect of shocks change. We estimate the model with Bayesian methods and explicitly consider that the interest rate may be constrained in the ZLB region. We provide an estimate of the latent rate, i.e., a lower interest rate than the observed level, which is state- and model-consistent. The endogenous specification of the state indicator permits dynamic forecasts of the state and system variables. In the application of the model to the Swiss data, we evaluate state-dependent impulse responses to a risk premium shock that is identified with sign restrictions. Additionally, we discuss scenario-based forecasts and evaluate the probability of the system exiting the ZLB region that is only based on the inherent dynamics.

JEL classification: C3, E3

Key words: Regime switching, time-varying probability, constrained variables.

*Swiss National Bank, Börsenstrasse 15, CH-8022 Zurich, gregor.baeurle@snb.ch

[†]KOF ETH Zurich, Leonhardstrasse 21, 8091 Zurich kaufmann@kof.ethz.ch

[‡]Study Center Gerzensee, Dorfstrasse 2, P.O. Box 21, CH-3115 Gerzensee, sylvia.kaufmann@szgerzensee.ch

[§]The University of Queensland, Level 6, Colin Clark Building, St Lucia, Brisbane Qld 4072, Australia r.strachan@uq.edu.au

[¶]The paper contains the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Swiss National Bank. We thank for the comments of an anonymous referee.

1 Introduction

The monetary policy instrument of leading central banks is the nominal short-term interest rate. Until recently, the use of this instrument was perceived as having one problem: because moderate amounts of money can be stored at a relatively low cost, the effective nominal interest rate cannot fall below or not far below zero. Some discussion on the zero lower bound (ZLB) lower bound took place at the beginning of the century (Woodford 2003, Eggertsson and Woodford 2003; Eggertsson and Woodford 2004, Benhabib et al. 2002 and Auerbach and Obstfeld 2004), and it was recognized that the ZLB may fundamentally change the functioning of an economy. Nevertheless, at the time, the ZLB was not perceived as constituting a major problem (Reifschneider and Williams 2000). However, since the outbreak of the financial crisis and the subsequent euro area sovereign debt crisis, the policy rate has remained at the ZLB for a considerably long period of time, particularly in the US but also in Switzerland. To circumvent the constraint of the ZLB on the policy rate, the US resorted to unconventional monetary policy measures to accommodate the negative effects of the financial crash on the real economy. In Switzerland, the Swiss National Bank (SNB) responded to sharp appreciation pressures by intervening in the foreign exchange market in 2009/2010 and introducing a minimum exchange rate against the euro in September 2011. In December 2014, the SNB lowered the range for its operational target, i.e., for the three-month Libor, into negative territory to between -0.75% and 0.25%. In January 2015, it discontinued the euro-Swiss franc exchange rate floor and moved the target range further into negative territory to between -1.25% and -0.25%.

Still, even if negative policy rates are now being implemented, they are still constrained. As long as cash currency is available, there will be a lower bound at which it will pay to substitute a deposit account by storage. Moreover, if the economic dynamics are changing near this effective ZLB, it is also an open issue as to whether the shocks or interest rate changes have the same effect on, e.g., prices, exchange rates and GDP, compared to when interest rates are out of the ZLB region. One reason for this is that usually and obviously the ZLB region is reached because of strongly deteriorating economic and financial conditions. In these periods, uncertainty increases, which may change the interest rate sensitivity of economic agents. Moreover, adverse shocks may have different effects if agents expect that the central bank has a limited ability to counteract those shocks with further interest rate cuts.

In this paper, we analyze the data with a vector autoregression (VAR) with parameters that are allowed to change when the ZLB becomes binding. A latent state indicator determines the state-specific parameters and error covariances of the VAR system. The probability distribution of the state indicator itself depends on a covariate that is perceived to be informative with regard to the prevailing state. A natural candidate is the interest rate; we work with this variable currently. Furthermore, we take into account that the interest rate may be constrained. We are able to provide an estimate of the latent interest rate, i.e., the rate below the observed rate, which would be state- and model-consistent. The method can be adapted to situations in which several variables are constrained permanently or temporarily. This becomes important in situations in which an unconventional monetary policy directly targets prices in specific asset markets, e.g.,

government bonds, mortgages or currency markets.

Our research relates to the growing empirical literature that studies macroeconomic dynamics at the ZLB using structural VARs.¹ Studies relying on a constant parameter VAR include Miyao (2002) and Schenkelberg and Watzka (2013). More similar to our approach is Iwata and Wu (2006), who examine the Japanese experience with a constant-parameter structural VAR but take into account that the interest rate is a constrained variable. A few papers allow for changing parameters at the ZLB. Baumeister and Benati (2013) explore how a compression in the bond spreads impacts the economy during the Great Recession using a time-varying parameter VAR that is estimated for the US, the Euro area, Japan and the UK. Wu and Xia (2016) assess how parameters of a VAR changed when the interest reached the ZLB in the US by relying on a latent interest rate derived from a term-structure model. Similarly, Baurle and Kaufmann (2014) study how the response of Swiss macroeconomic aggregates to risk premium shocks is affected by the ZLB. None of these contributions, however, models the endogenous change of parameters when the interest rates approach the ZLB.

We apply our method to analyze the dynamics of Swiss data: the consumer price index (CPI), GDP, and the effective exchange rate in relation to the nominal interest rate. Taking up the idea of Baurle and Kaufmann (2014), we analyze how risk premium shocks affect the exchange rate transmission to prices. We find that risk premium shocks have more persistent effects on prices if the policy rate is constrained but have only temporary effects otherwise. The endogenous specification of the state indicator allows for the computation of the dynamic state and variable forecasts. We provide scenario-based forecasts for the third quarter of 2014 to the third quarter of 2020. We find that the system is unlikely to exit the ZLB region as long as appreciation pressures are present.

The next section presents the econometric model and discusses various aspects of the endogenous state probability distribution. Section 3 briefly presents the estimation procedure and describes the computation of the unconditional and scenario-based forecasts. The results are discussed in section 4, and section 5 concludes. Technical details can be found in the appendix.

2 Econometric model

2.1 Specification

Let y_t be a $N \times 1$ vector of observed variables, which follow a vector autoregressive process

¹Additionally, there are a number of contributions focusing on the behavior of the yield curve at the ZLB (Wright (2012), Swanson and Williams (2014a), Swanson and Williams (2014b))

$$\begin{aligned}
y_t^* &= \mu_t + B_{1t}y_{t-1} + \dots + B_{pt}y_{t-p} + \varepsilon_t, \quad \varepsilon_t \sim N(0, \Sigma_t) \\
y_{1t} &= \max\{y_{1t}^*, b\} \\
y_{2t} &= y_{2t}^*
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the variables that are potentially constrained at a certain bound b are gathered in y_{1t} and the unconstrained variables are collected in y_{2t} . In a standard censored Tobit model (Chib 1992), a positive probability is attached to the constraint b , $P(y_{1t} = b) = P(y_{1t}^* \leq b) > 0$. While y_{1t} is the nominal interest rate in our application, the model is written in general terms such that y_{1t} may be a sub-*vector* of y_t and hence b may represent a vector of bounds to take into account that other variables may be constrained as well. For example, in the Swiss case, in addition to the interest rate constraint, this could be the 1.20 floor introduced for the euro-Swiss franc exchange rate.

The following two considerations render the modeling approach different from a standard Tobit analysis. The Tobit framework usually applies to a regression relationship with exogenous regressors, in which the dependent variable is censored at a known threshold b . However, in (1), we encounter an endogenous dynamic relationship, where the current-period variables y_t , including the potentially censored variables y_{1t} , depend on lagged values, particularly on the lagged values of y_{1t} . Second, censored data usually contain the information about which observations are censored, i.e., some observations are constrained to the minimum value b . Our data do not contain this information. For example, the interest rate is always observed, although at a very low value near zero, or even slightly negative, in recent periods. Thus, setting the lower bound equal to $b = 0$ would mean that no observations have actually been constrained. However, this goes against the view that central banks were constrained in recent times, forcing them to implement unconventional policy measures. Thus, the relevant threshold b may be at a value above but close to zero. However, the data do not tell us the periods in which central banks were constrained in setting the interest rate.

In light of these two aspects, we may also envisage using a model in which the interest rate has truncated support with a moving lower truncation threshold given, e.g., by the lower bound of the Libor target in the SNB's case. We do not pursue this avenue because we also want to evaluate the extent to which monetary policy is constrained, conditional on all available observed values. For periods in which we assume the central bank has been constrained, the Tobit framework allows us to form a model-based estimate of the so-called latent interest rate y_{1t}^* , i.e., the interest rate level that is lower than the threshold, which would be consistent with the model and currently observed data.

To address the first issue, we will interpret model (1) as a regression relationship:

$$\begin{aligned}
y_t^* &= X_t \beta_t + \varepsilon_t \\
y_{1t} &= \max\{y_{1t}^*, b\}
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $X_t = I_N \otimes [1, y'_{t-1}, \dots, y'_{t-p}]$ and $\beta_t = \text{vec}([\mu_t, B_{1t}, \dots, B_{pt}]')$. This notation makes explicit that we condition parameter estimation on past *observed* values, i.e., X_t contains all lagged observed values of y_t and the observed values of very low interest rates.

To determine the periods in which the interest rate is constrained, we use $b = 0.25$. This assumption defines the interest rate since 2010 and two observations at the end of the 1970s as being constrained (see figure 3).²

To model the time-varying process of the parameters, we rely on a mixture approach

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_t &= \beta_0(1 - I_t) + \beta_1 I_t \\ \Sigma_t &= \Sigma_0(1 - I_t) + \Sigma_1 I_t\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

where β_0 and Σ_0 represent, respectively, the effects and the error variance structure when the interest rate is out of what we call the critical ZLB region, and β_1 and Σ_1 are the parameters that prevail when the interest rate is within the ZLB critical region. The same indicator I_t drives the effects and the error covariance of the system, given that the volatility of the constrained variables obviously changes, as do the covariances with other variables when the interest rate enters the critical ZLB region. The indicator I_t , which takes a value of 0 or 1, $I_t \in \{0, 1\}$, may be specified ad hoc by defining a priori the periods of very low interest rates. The disadvantage of this procedure is that the relevant threshold for the interest rate at which dynamics change is unknown to the investigator.

Therefore, we assume the indicator I_t to be a latent variable that is to be estimated from the data. A natural indicator of whether I_t is 0 or 1 is the departure of the interest rate from the ZLB in the lagged period. We formulate a probabilistic model for I_t that depends on the lagged interest rate r_{t-1} . To be consistent with model 1, we base the condition again on past observed values:

$$P(I_t = 1 | r_{t-1}, \gamma, \gamma^r) = \frac{\exp(\gamma^r r_{t-1} + \gamma)}{1 + \exp(\gamma^r r_{t-1} + \gamma)}\tag{4}$$

Alternative specifications may use the inflation rate and the output gap as Taylor rate indicators:

$$\hat{r}_{t-1} = \hat{r} + \hat{\alpha}_\pi (\pi_{t-1} - \pi^*) + \hat{\alpha}_y \hat{y}_{t-1}$$

where the hats indicate estimates and \hat{r} , $(\pi_t - \pi^*)$ and \hat{y}_t represent, respectively, the long-run average interest rate, the deviation of the inflation rate from target and the output gap. This specification has advantages when the interest rate reaches the zero lower bound. An increasing inflation rate and an increasingly positive output gap indicate rising interest rates that are again away from the zero lower bound towards regime $I_t = 0$.

2.2 Some considerations on the probability function

To obtain state identification in (4), we restrict $\gamma^r < 0$. This ensures that $I_t = 1$ indicates periods in which the interest rate is in the critical ZLB region.

Moreover, we call the parametrization (4) the *implicit threshold parametrization* because an estimate allows for the recovery of the threshold after having estimated the model. The threshold is defined as the level of r_t , at which the state probability equals 0.5.

²Bäurle and Kaufmann (2014) take into account another brief episode with interest rates as low as 0.5% in 2003 and 2004.

For example, if the interest rate were expressed in percentage terms if $\gamma^r = -1$ and $\gamma = 0.5$ the threshold level would lie at $-\gamma/\gamma^r = 0.5\%$. To estimate the model, we will use parametrization (4); by additionally implementing a two-layer data augmentation step, the non-linear model in γ^r and γ becomes linear. This allows us to draw from full conditional distributions. However, the drawback of parametrization (4) is a high correlation between γ^r and γ , as we will see below.

The usual probability parametrization, which we call the *explicit threshold parametrization*, explicitly includes the threshold $\tilde{\gamma}$ (Teräsvirta and Anderson 1992):


$$P(I_t = 1|r_{t-1}, \gamma, \gamma^r) = \frac{\exp(\gamma^r (r_{t-1} - \tilde{\gamma}))}{1 + \exp(\gamma^r (r_{t-1} - \tilde{\gamma}))} \quad (5)$$

Note that from an estimate of (4), in case $\gamma^r \neq 0$, we can also retrieve the threshold level $\tilde{\gamma}$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\gamma^r \tilde{\gamma} &= \gamma \\ \tilde{\gamma} &= -\gamma/\gamma^r \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Relation (6) shows that the threshold $\tilde{\gamma}$ and γ are mutually highly dependent. Conditional on γ^r , the threshold determines γ and vice versa. For a given threshold, γ is increasing in γ^r . Figure 1 illustrates this point. The figure plots values for the short-term interest rate against the state probability obtained for various γ^r , assuming a threshold level of 0.8%. As $-\gamma^r$ increases, the probability function approaches a step function. To keep the threshold unchanged, γ increases by the same factor as γ^r .

Figure 1: State probability $P(I_t = 1|r_t, \gamma^r, \gamma)$ for various sensitivities γ^r , where γ is adjusted to keep the threshold level at 0.8%.



The relationship between both parameterizations can be used to include information in the prior distribution for the parameters of the state probabilities. We may have some idea of an upper and lower bound for $\tilde{\gamma}$. For example, $\tilde{\gamma}$ is certainly well below 10%, is

probably below 1%, and may be between 0.5% and 1.5%. Therefore, let the upper and lower bound on $\tilde{\gamma}$ be $\bar{\gamma}$ and $\underline{\gamma}$, respectively, such that $\underline{\gamma} < \tilde{\gamma} \leq \bar{\gamma}$.

This implies $0 \leq \underline{\gamma} \leq -\frac{\underline{\gamma}}{\gamma^r} \leq \bar{\gamma}$, or

$$-\gamma^r \underline{\gamma} \leq \gamma \leq -\gamma^r \bar{\gamma} \quad (7)$$

This places an upper and a lower bound on γ since $\gamma^r < 0$. The prior for (γ, γ^r) is expressed with these inequalities in place:

$$\pi(\gamma, \gamma^r) = N(g_0, G_0) 1(\gamma^r < 0) 1(-\gamma^r \underline{\gamma} \leq \gamma \leq -\gamma^r \bar{\gamma}) \quad (8)$$

We may also work with parametrization (5). Various priors have been suggested in the literature; see Lopes and Salazar (2005) for an overview. Using this parametrization, a truncated normal prior distribution may also incorporate prior information for the threshold.

3 Estimation and forecasting

3.1 Estimation

To describe the estimation of model (2)-(4) in a concise way, we introduce additional notation. While the vector y_t represents the vector of observed variables (see specification (2)), the vector y_t^* represents the augmented data vector, which contains all uncensored variables, $y_t^* = (y_{2t}', y_{1t}^*)'$. The bold-faced objects gather all observations of a data vector or a latent variable, e.g., $\mathbf{y} = \{y_t | t = 1, \dots, T\}$, similarly for \mathbf{y}^* and \mathbf{I} . We gather all latent values of the censored variables in $\mathbf{y}_1^* = \{y_{1t}^* | t \in \mathbf{t}^*\}$, $\mathbf{t}^* = \{\tau | y_{1\tau} \leq b, \tau = 1, \dots, T\}$. The parameters are included in $\theta = \{\beta_k, \Sigma_k, \gamma | k = 0, 1, \gamma = (\gamma^r, \gamma)\}$, and the augmented parameter vector adds the latent variables to θ , $\vartheta = \{\theta, \mathbf{y}_1^*, \mathbf{I}\}$.

We apply Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods to estimate the model. By combining the likelihood with the prior distribution, we obtain the conditional posterior

$$\pi(\vartheta | \mathbf{y}) \propto f(\mathbf{y}^* | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{I}, \theta) \pi(\mathbf{I} | \mathbf{r}, \theta) \pi(\mathbf{y}_1^*) \pi(\theta) \quad (9)$$

To obtain a sample from (9), we draw from the posterior of

- (i) \mathbf{I} , $\pi(\mathbf{I} | \mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{r}, \theta)$
- (ii) \mathbf{y}_1^* , $\pi(\mathbf{y}_1^* | \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{I}, \theta) 1(\mathbf{y}_1^* \leq b)$
- (iii) γ , $\pi(\gamma | \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{I}) 1(\gamma^r < 0) 1(-\gamma^r \underline{\gamma} \leq \gamma \leq -\gamma^r \bar{\gamma})$
- (iv) the rest of the parameters, $\theta_{-\gamma}$, $\pi(\theta_{-\gamma} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{I})$

All posterior distributions are standard distributions. Given that there is no state persistence, in step (i), we can sample \mathbf{I} in one draw from a discrete distribution. Conditional on observed values \mathbf{y}_2 , \mathbf{I} and the model parameters, we draw \mathbf{y}_1^* from a truncated normal distribution. To derive the posterior of the parameters governing the state distribution, we condition on two layers of data augmentation (see Frühwirth-Schnatter and Frühwirth 2010 and Kaufmann 2015). In the first layer, we obtain a linear model with non-normal

error terms, which relates the difference in latent state utilities to the interest rate effect on the state probability. In the second layer, we approximate the exponential error distribution with a mixture of M normals. Conditional on the differences in latent utilities and the components of the mixtures, the posterior of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is normal. We draw from the normal posterior that is truncated to the region where the parameters restrictions derived in (8) are fulfilled. The posterior distribution of the remaining parameters in (iv) are normal and inverse Wishart, respectively, for β_k and Σ_k , $k = 0, 1$. A detailed derivation of the likelihood and the prior and posterior distributions can be found in the appendix C.

3.2 Forecasting

The model can be used to obtain forecasts over the forecast horizon H , $h = 1, \dots, H$. To obtain draws from the unconditional posterior predictive distribution at each horizon h :

$$\pi(y_{T+h}|y_T) \propto \prod_{j=1}^h \pi(y_{T+j}|y_{T+j-1}, I_{T+j}) \pi(I_{T+j}|y_{T+j-1}) \quad (10)$$

We produce dynamic forecasts and simulate for $j = 1, \dots, h$

1. $I_{T+j}^{(l)}$ from $\pi\left(I_{T+j}^{(l)}|r_{T+j-1}^{(l)}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(l)}\right)$, with $r_T^{(l)} = r_T$.
2. $y_{T+j}^{(l)}$ from $\pi\left(y_{T+j}^{(l)}|y_{T+j-1}^{(l)}, I_{T+j}^{(l)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(l)}\right) \sim N\left(m_{T+j}^{(l)}, \Sigma_{I_{T+j}^{(l)}}\right)$
with $m_{T+j}^{(l)} = X_{T+j}^{(l)}\beta_{I_{T+j}^{(l)}}$, $y_T^{(l)} = y_T$ and $X_{T+1}^{(l)} = X_{T+1}$.

for each draw (l) out of the posterior $\pi(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}|\mathbf{y})$.

We may also produce so-called conditional forecasts, which would reflect specific scenarios. In all examples, step 2 above is adjusted appropriately. For example,

2. (i) keeps the mean forecast of the interest rate at or above the last rate, i.e., restricts the predictive distribution to:

$$\pi(y_{T+h}|y_T, (m_{1,T+1}, \dots, m_{1,T+h}) = y_{1T}) \text{ or } \pi(y_{T+h}|y_T, (m_{1,T+1}, \dots, m_{1,T+h}) \geq y_{1T})$$

The second conditional forecast is implemented as follows. At each step j , $j = 1, \dots, h$, we set $m_{1,T+j}^{(l)} = \max\left\{X_{1,T+j}^{(l)}\beta_{1,I_{T+j}^{(l)}}, y_{1T}\right\}$.

2. (ii) implements a (mean) path for a variable i over a certain period of time, for example, $h = 1, \dots, 4$, (e.g., lower the interest rate to -1% for one year):

Simulate the first variable i , $y_{i,T+h}^{(l)}$ from $N\left(m_{i,T+h}, \Sigma_{i,I_{T+h}^{(l)}}\right)$, where $m_{i,T+h}$ is pre-specified.

Then, conditional on $y_{i,T+h}^{(l)}$, simulate all other variables, $y_{-i,T+h}^{(l)}|y_{i,T+h}^{(l)}$, from $N\left(m_{-i,T+h}, \Sigma_{-i|i,I_{T+h}^{(l)}}\right)$, the moments of which are given by the moments of the implied normal conditional predictive distribution.

2. (iii) a combination of the two. Here we apply 2.(ii), except that $y_{i,T+h}^{(l)}$ refers to sub-vector i of y_{T+h} , which is generated from the joint predictive distribution with restricted means.

4 Results

4.1 Specification

To illustrate the method, we estimate a level VAR for four Swiss variables: the consumer price index (CPI), GDP, the 3-month Libor and the trade-weighted effective exchange rate. We use quarterly data covering the first quarter of 1974 to the third quarter of 2014. As already mentioned, the state-identifying restriction $\gamma^r < 0$ defines $I_t = 1$ as indicating the periods in which the interest rate enters the ZLB critical region. We additionally induce the threshold, i.e., the level of the interest rate at which $P(I_t = 1) = 0.5$, to lie in the interval $[\underline{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}] = [0.5, 1.5]$. Hence, the prior mean for the threshold is 1.0. In the critical ZLB region, we define the interest rate levels at or below 0.25 as being constrained, i.e., $b = 0.25$.

The specification of the prior hyperparameters, $\pi(\vartheta)$, completes the Bayesian setup in (9); see Appendix B.2 for details about the hyperparameters.


1. We assume an independent Minnesota-type prior for the VAR parameters β_k , $k = 0, 1$, $\pi(\beta_k) = N(\underline{\nu}, \underline{V})$ (Doan et al. 1984; Bańbura et al. 2010).
2. For Σ_k , we assume inverse Wishart prior distributions $\pi(\Sigma_k) \sim IW(\underline{s}, \underline{S}_k)$, where the scale \underline{S}_k is proportional to the variance of the residuals of state-specific univariate autoregressions, $\underline{S}_{k,ii} \propto \sigma_{ki}^2$, with pre-defined states $\underline{I}_t = 1$ if the Libor $\leq 1\%$.
3. A relatively informative prior on γ^r is used to obtain the steep shape of the transition function (see figure 1). This is also necessary due to the relatively low number of observations near the ZLB.

$$\begin{pmatrix} \gamma^r \\ \gamma \end{pmatrix} \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} -10 \\ 10 \end{bmatrix}, \text{diag}(0.01, 6.25) \right) 1(\gamma^r < 0) 1(-0.5\gamma^r \leq \gamma \leq -1.5\gamma^r) \quad (11)$$

The left panel of Figure 2 plots the prior distribution of γ^r and γ . Although the prior distributions are quite informative, they are considerably updated (shift to the left and increased variance) conditional on the data. The right panel shows what this implies for the transition function. The 95% highest posterior interval is also quite dense for the posterior. We see that, conditional on the data, the parameter implies a considerable shift to the right.

4. For \mathbf{y}_1^* , we work with a diffuse prior, $\pi(\mathbf{y}_1^*) \propto 1(\mathbf{y}_1^* \leq b)$.

Figure 2: Left plot: Prior (left) and posterior (right) distributions of γ^r and γ . Right plot: prior (left) and posterior (right) 95% highest density interval for the transition function conditional on γ^r and γ ; the black line corresponds to the median transition function.



4.2 Model inference

To estimate the model, we iterate $M = 10,000$ times over the sampling steps (i)-(iv) listed in section 3.1 and retain the last 8,000 to compute the posterior moments. Figure 3 plots the interest rate and the inflation rate along with the mean posterior probabilities of state 2 in yellow. The estimate is able to discriminate clearly between the two states. State 2 is also estimated to prevail at the end of the 1970s, a period where the Swiss franc was also subject to appreciation against the German mark and where, therefore, interest rates were also decreased to a then all-time low. The horizontal line indicates the threshold level at 1.5%, which is inferred from the parameter estimates of the transition function.

The shaded area below $b = 0.25$ indicates the periods in which the interest rate is thought to be constrained. On the left-hand side in Figure 4, the observed interest rate is plotted along with the median estimate of the latent observations. Compared with the end of the 1970s, the ZLB on the interest rate appears to bind more strongly. Up to the end of the sample, the median of the latent interest rate decreases to nearly -0.6%. The right-hand histograms in figure 4 additionally show that over 90% of the sampled period-specific latent interest rates, $y_{1t}^* < b$, were lower than the all-time minimum observed value for the interest rate, $\min_t \{y_{1t}\}$.

To document that dynamics change when the interest rate enters the critical ZLB region, we plot impulse responses to a structural shock that is identified as a risk-premium shock. Monetary policy can counter-act the effects of a risk-premium shock, which effects an appreciation for a small open economy, by lowering the interest rate. Obviously, this reaction will be constrained if the interest rate is already very low. As a consequence, the short-term and long-term pass-through effects on prices will also differ in the two situations (see also Baurle and Kaufmann 2014). To obtain structural identification, we

Figure 3: Annual inflation rate (red) and interest rate (blue). Mean posterior probability (yellow) of state 1. The periods during which the interest rate is defined to be constrained are those in which the interest rate lies in the shaded area ($b \leq 0.25$). The horizontal line indicates the inferred threshold level 1.5% at which $P(I_t = 1) = 0.5$.




Table 1: Sign restrictions on the impact and next period responses of the variables.

Shock to	Reaction in			
	GDP	CPI	Short rate	exchange rate
Risk-premium	—	↓	↓	↑

impose sign restrictions on the impact and next period responses of the variables, as shown in Table 1 (Arias et al. 2014). A risk-premium shock is expected to appreciate the currency. In a small open economy, the pass-through should lead to a decrease in prices. Monetary policy can counteract the effects by lowering the interest rate. The response of GDP is not restricted. All responses are left unrestricted after the first two periods. This allows to infer whether the medium-term and the long-term effects differ between the two states.

The state-specific impulse responses to a risk-premium shock are plotted in Figure 5. The responses are normalized to correspond to 1% appreciation in the exchange rate. Although the density intervals are quite large, the tendencies are recognizable. In the short-term, we observe that there is obviously more leeway for the interest rate to decrease transitorily in state 1 ($I_t = 0$). The response of GDP is not restricted and is broadly insignificant. Nevertheless, the median shows a positive transitory effect that is likely initiated by the decrease in the interest rate. The negative pass-through to prices is transitory, and after two years, a level reversion takes place. In particular, the long-run effects on prices are very different in state 2 ($I_t = 1$). Given that the interest rate cannot react as strongly to the risk-premium shock in the ZLB region, the initial negative pass-through to prices remains permanent. In other words, a transitory risk-premium shock translates to a permanent

Figure 4: Left: Observed interest rate and model-based estimate of $y_1^* < b$ (red). Mean posterior probability of state 1 (yellow). Right: histogram of $y_{1t}^* < b$.





Figure 5: Impulse responses to a risk premium shock identified by sign restrictions and normalized to a corresponding 1% appreciation shock. The black line is the median response, the areas decreasing in shades correspond to the 25%, the 50% and the 80% interval of the highest posterior density.



effect on the price level. Although long-run cross-country relationships are not modelled explicitly, we know that for a given real exchange rate, the permanent negative effects on the price level induce further long-run nominal appreciation of the currency. Overall, these results are consistent with those presented in Bäumle and Kaufmann (2014).

4.3 Forecasts

The model estimate is used to answer the following questions: Where does the system drift to if the mean interest is observed as falling to -1% in the first quarter of the forecast horizon and remains at this level for one year but is left unconstrained afterwards? What is the probability of exiting the critical ZLB region, and under what economic conditions does this happen in this scenario? These questions may be relevant against the backdrop of the SNB's recent decision to introduce negative interest rates. However, it is important to recognize that our scenario does not implement a *policy experiment*, i.e., it does not provide an estimate of the *causal* impact of a decrease in interest rates to -1%. It merely describes the economic conditions *consistent with* an average interest rate at -1% for one year. Furthermore, to obtain a policy-relevant scenario, we would have to condition on e.g. foreign monetary policy and/or foreign demand. This is, however, beyond the scope of this exercise.

The forecast horizon is 6 years, $H = 24$. The sample from the forecasting density (10) is obtained by producing dynamic forecasts using all posterior parameter draws. Figure 6 displays the forecasts we obtain if the mean interest rate stays at a level of -1% for one year from Q4 2014 onwards. This corresponds to the second setting in 2 (ii) in section 3.2. Over the entire forecasting period, the mean interest rate remains quite stable in this scenario. However, the model is able to produce a relevant chance (12%) for the system to exit the ZLB region. GDP growth and inflation are low on average but are still positive (0.7% and 0.2%, respectively). This overall stable development is accompanied by further appreciation pressures.

Figure 7 plots the forecasts of the 12% paths that finally exit the ZLB region again. On average, GDP growth and inflation reach 1.4% and 1.1%, respectively, and we observe that they are accelerating over the forecast period. At the end of the forecast horizon, annual GDP growth reaches 3% and inflation reaches 2.3%. At the same time, the appreciation trend is broken. On average, depreciation amounts to 0.1%, while towards the end of the forecast horizon, it increases to 3.1%. Thus, the results indicate that economic conditions must improve substantially to make an exit from the ZLB regime happening endogenously. In contrast to the previous results, an exit from the ZLB region would be accompanied by a depreciation of the Swiss franc. Of course, exiting the ZLB also depends on (exogenous) foreign conditions, which are not included in this VAR model for domestic variables. Taking into account a specific view on the evolution of foreign conditions would influence our results. However, the results illustrate that our proposed model is able to endogenously produce a transition from one regime to the other, without the need of exogenous variables causing the shift.

Figure 6: Left: Forecast distribution that is conditional on a mean interest rate lowered to -1% for 1 year. The black line is the median forecast, and the areas decreasing in shade correspond to the 25%, the 50% and the 80% interval of the highest forecast density. The vertical line denotes the end of the sample, Q3 2014. Right: Mean forecast probability of $I_{T+h} = 1$.





Figure 7: Conditional forecast distribution for paths that exit the ZLB region (mean 12% probability), $I_{T+H} = 0$. The black line is the median forecast, and the areas decreasing in shade correspond to the 20%, the 50% and the 80% interval of the highest forecast density. The vertical line denotes the end of the sample, 2014Q3.



5 Conclusion

In the present paper, we propose to capture the changing dynamics between variables near the ZLB with the use of a nonlinear model. A latent state indicator determines the changes in the parameters and error covariances of a VAR model. The logit model for the state probability itself depends on a covariate, which is perceived to significantly indicate whether the system is out of or in the so-called critical ZLB region. Currently, we work with the lagged interest rate level as a covariate in the probability function. It is obvious that other variables determining the policy stance, such as GDP growth or the inflation rate, could also be used as covariates. For a small open economy, another alternative could be to include a monetary condition index, which determines the monetary stance by a weighted average of the interest rate and the exchange rate. The specification of the VAR model takes into account that in the ZLB region, the interest rate may be a constrained variable. The estimation of the model then provides us with an inference on the latent rate, i.e., the lower-than-observed level of the interest rate, which would be state- and model-consistent.

We set up a model for four Swiss variables: GDP, CPI, the Libor and a trade-weighted effective exchange rate. We estimate the model within a Bayesian framework, which allows for situations with few observations near the ZLB. Additionally, we can input subjective information into the specification of the prior distributions. For example, a notion for an upper and lower bound of the interest rate at which we think that dynamics may change, a prior notion on the threshold value, can be included in the prior of the parameters of the state probability distribution. The results show that dynamics indeed change when the interest rate enters the ZLB region. The impulse response analysis shows evidence that transitory risk-premium shocks, which correspond to a 1% appreciation in the exchange rate, translate to a permanent negative price level effect when the interest rate is in the ZLB region. This differs from the normal situation, in which the negative price level effect is also transitory.

The endogenous specification of the state probability distribution allows for a dynamic forecast of the state and the VAR system in the future. In particular, we can evaluate the probability with which the system can exit the ZLB region based on its own dynamics. We find that the model is able to produce a relevant chance of exiting the ZLB. However, in our illustrative model with only four domestic variables, this is unlikely to happen as long as the Swiss franc is under appreciation pressure.

The model used in the present paper can be extended in various ways. The model for a small open economy would be completed by including a set of foreign, exogenous variables. Additional scenarios could then be evaluated, such as the reaction to a further increase or decrease in the foreign policy rate or a protracted recovery abroad. Another avenue would be to explicitly model long-run common trending behavior among the variables. An issue that is not addressed in this paper is how to identify a monetary policy shock in the ZLB region. Further research will address these extensions.

References

- Arias, J. E., J. F. Rubio-Ramrez, and D. F. Waggoner (2014). Inference based on SVARs identified with sign and zero restrictions: Theory and applications. Dynare Working Papers 30, CEPREMAP.
- Auerbach, A. J. and M. Obstfeld (2004). The case for open-market purchases in a liquidity trap. Center for international and development economics research, working paper series, Center for International and Development Economics Research, Institute for Business and Economic Research, UC Berkeley.
- Bañbura, M., D. Giannone, and L. Reichlin (2010). Large Bayesian vector auto regressions. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 25, 71–92.
- Baumeister, C. and L. Benati (2013, June). Unconventional Monetary Policy and the Great Recession: Estimating the Macroeconomic Effects of a Spread Compression at the Zero Lower Bound. *International Journal of Central Banking* 9(2), 165–212.
- Bäurle, G. and D. Kaufmann (2014). Exchange rate and price dynamics in a small open economy – The role of the zero lower bound and monetary policy regimes. Working Paper 10, Swiss National Bank.
- Benhabib, J., S. Schmitt-Grohe, and M. Uribe (2002). Avoiding liquidity traps. *Journal of Political Economy* 110(3), 535–563.
- Botev, Z. (2016). The normal law under linear restrictions: simulation and estimation via minimax tilting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* forthcoming.
- Chib, S. (1992). Bayesian analysis in the Tobit censored regression model. *Journal of Econometrics* 51, 79–99.
- Doan, T., R. Litterman, and C. A. Sims (1984). Forecasting and conditional projection using realistic prior distributions. *Econometric Reviews* 3, 1–100.
- Eggertsson, G. B. and M. Woodford (2003). The zero bound on interest rates and optimal monetary policy. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 34(1), 139–235.
- Eggertsson, G. B. and M. Woodford (2004, October). Optimal monetary and fiscal policy in a liquidity trap. NBER Working Papers 10840, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. and R. Frühwirth (2010). Data augmentation and MCMC for binary and multinomial logit models. In T. Kneib and G. Tutz (Eds.), *Statistical Modelling and Regression Structures – Festschrift in Honour of Ludwig Fahrmeir*, pp. 111–132. Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- Iwata, S. and S. Wu (2006, October). Estimating Monetary Policy Effects when Interest Rates are Close to Zero. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 53(7), 1395–1408.
- Kaufmann, S. (2015). K -state switching models with time-varying transition distributions – does loan growth signal stronger effects of variables on inflation? *Journal of Econometrics* 187, 82–94.
- Lopes, H. F. and E. Salazar (2005). Bayesian model uncertainty in smooth transition autoregressions. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 27, 99–117.

- Miyao, R. (2002). The effects of monetary policy in japan. *Journal of Money Credit and Banking* 34, 376–392.
- Reifschneider, D. and J. C. Williams (2000, November). Three lessons for monetary policy in a low-inflation era. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 32(4), 936–66.
- Robert, C. P. (2009). Simulation of truncated normal variables. arxiv:0907.4010v1 [stat.co], LSTA, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris.
- Schenkelberg, H. and S. Watzka (2013). Real Effects of Quantitative Easing at the Zero Lower Bound: Structural VAR-Based Evidence from Japan. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 33(C), 327–357.
- Swanson, E. T. and J. C. Williams (2014a). Measuring the effect of the zero lower bound on medium- and longer-term interest rates. *The American Economic Review* 104, 315485.
- Swanson, E. T. and J. C. Williams (2014b). Measuring the effect of the zero lower bound on yields and exchange rates in the u.k. and germany. *Journal of International Economics* 92, S2–S21.
- Teräsvirta, T. and H. M. Anderson (1992). Characterizing nonlinearities in business cycles using smooth transition autoregressive models. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 7, S119–S136.
- Wright, J. H. (2012). What does monetary policy do to long-term interest rates at the zero lower bound? *The Economic Journal* 122, F447–F466.
- Wu, J. S. and F. D. Xia (2016). Measuring the macroeconomic impact of monetary policy at the zero lower bound. *Journal of Money Credit and Banking* 48, 253–291.

A Distributional properties of censored and uncensored variables

Given the normality assumption for ε_t , model (2) defines a joint normal distribution for the variables $y_t^* = [y_{1t}^*, y_{2t}^*]'$, where y_{2t} gathers the uncensored variables.

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_{1t}^* \\ y_{2t} \end{bmatrix} | X_t, I_t, \theta \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} m_{1I_t} \\ m_{2I_t} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{11,I_t} & \Sigma_{12,I_t} \\ \Sigma_{21,I_t} & \Sigma_{22,I_t} \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (12)$$

where $\theta = \{\beta_k, \Sigma_k, \gamma^r, \gamma | k = 0, 1\}$ represents the model parameters and $m_{iI_t} = X_{it}\beta_{i,I_t}$ and Σ_{ij,I_t} are obtained by gathering the corresponding rows in (2) and by accordingly partitioning the moment matrices. This allows for the expression of the joint observation density $f(y_t^*)$ as the product of a marginal and a conditional density, $f(y_t^*|\cdot) = f(y_{1t}^*|y_{2t}, \cdot)f(y_{2t}|\cdot)$, where:

$$f(y_{2t}|\cdot) = N(m_{2I_t}, \Sigma_{22,I_t}) = N(X_{2t}\beta_{2I_t}, \Sigma_{22,I_t}) \quad (13)$$

$$f(y_{1t}^*|\cdot) = f(y_{1t}^*|y_{2t}, \cdot) = N(m_{1I_t|2}, M_{1I_t|2}) \quad (14)$$

with

$$m_{1I_t|2} = m_{1I_t} + \Sigma_{12,I_t}\Sigma_{22,I_t}^{-1}(y_{2t} - m_{2I_t}) \quad (15)$$

$$M_{1I_t|2} = \Sigma_{11,I_t} - \Sigma_{12,I_t}\Sigma_{22,I_t}^{-1}\Sigma_{21,I_t} \quad (16)$$

The factoring of $f(y_t^*|\cdot)$ partitions the joint distribution into two parts and allows for the implementation of a normal regression model for the unconstrained variables and a conditional censored normal regression model for the constrained variables:

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_{1t|2} \\ y_{2t} \end{bmatrix} | X_t, I_t, \theta \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} m_{1I_t|2} \\ m_{2I_t} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{1I_t|2} & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_{22,I_t} \end{bmatrix} \right) 1(y_{1t} \geq b) \quad (17)$$

B Bayesian framework

B.1 Likelihood

Define the number N_j , $j = 1, 2$, which indicates the number of censored and uncensored variables, respectively.

Conditional on \mathbf{I} and using (17), the data likelihood can be factorized

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{I}, \theta) &= \prod_{t=p+1}^T f(y_t | X_t, \beta_{I_t}, \Sigma_{I_t}) 1(y_{1t} \geq b) \\ &= \prod_{t=p+1}^T f(y_{1t} | y_{2t}, X_{1t}, \beta_{1I_t}, \Sigma_{11,I_t}) 1(y_{1t} \geq b) f(y_{2t} | X_{2t}, \beta_{2I_t}, \Sigma_{22,I_t}) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

From (13), the period t density contribution is multivariate normal

$$f(y_{2t} | X_{2t}, \beta_{2I_t}, \Sigma_{22,I_t}) = (2\pi)^{-N_2/2} |\Sigma_{22,I_t}|^{-1/2} \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (y_{2t} - X_{2t}\beta_{2I_t})' \Sigma_{22,I_t}^{-1} (y_{2t} - X_{2t}\beta_{2I_t}) \right\} \quad (20)$$

and the period t contribution of censored variables is

$$f(y_{1t} | y_{2t}, X_{1t}, \beta_{1I_t}, \Sigma_{11,I_t}) 1(y_{1t} \geq b) = \Phi \left(M_{1I_t|2}^{-1/2} (b - m_{1I_t|2}) \right)^{1(y_{1t}=b)} \times |M_{1I_t|2}|^{-1/2} \phi \left(M_{1I_t|2}^{-1/2} (y_{1t} - m_{1I_t|2}) \right)^{1(y_{1t}>b)} \quad (21)$$

where $\Phi(z)$ for the $N_1 \times 1$ vector z ,

$$\Phi(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{z_1} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{z_{N_1}} |M_{1I_t|2}|^{-1/2} \phi(z) dz_1 \dots dz_{N_1},$$

denotes the cdf and ϕ the pdf (see (20)) of the standard (multivariate) normal distribution.

The likelihood of the complete data factorizes

$$f(\mathbf{y}^*|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{I}, \theta) = \prod_{t=p+1}^T f(y_{1t}^* | y_{2t}, X_{1t}, \beta_{1I_t}, \Sigma_{11,I_t}) f(y_{2t} | X_{2t}, \beta_{2I_t}, \Sigma_{22,I_t}) \quad (22)$$

where the moments of the conditional and marginal normal observation densities are given in, respectively, (14)-(16) and (13).

B.2 Prior distributions

To complete the Bayesian setup, we specify the prior density of the state indicator \mathbf{I} :

$$\pi(\mathbf{I}|\mathbf{r}, \gamma, \gamma^r) = \prod_{t=p+1}^T \pi(I_t|r_{t-1}, \gamma, \gamma^r) \quad (23)$$

The prior for the censored variables is assumed to be diffuse, $\pi(\mathbf{y}_1^*) \propto 1(\mathbf{y}_1^* \leq b)$. We may also work with a proper prior distribution that is restricted to the latent area, $\pi(\mathbf{y}_1^*) \sim N(0, \kappa I) 1(\mathbf{y}_1^* \leq b)$ with κ some real number.

Finally, the prior specification for the model parameters completes the Bayesian setup. We assume independent priors:

$$\pi(\theta) = \pi(\gamma, \gamma^r) \prod_{k=0}^1 \pi(\beta_k) \pi(\Sigma_k) \quad (24)$$

The prior for (γ^r, γ) includes a state-identifying restriction and additional information on the threshold level; see (11).

The priors on β_k are independent normal, with a variance structure implied by Minnesota priors, $\pi(\beta_k) = N(\underline{\nu}, \underline{V}_k)$. The vector $\underline{\nu}$ is of dimension $N(Np+1)$; see (2). Given that we estimate a VAR in levels, we center the first own autoregressive lag at 1 and all other coefficients at zero, $\underline{\nu} = \{\underline{\nu}_l | l = 1, \dots, N(Np+1)\}$, with

$$(\underline{\nu}_l, \underline{V}_{k, ll}) = \begin{cases} 1 & l = (j-1)(Np+1) + (j+1), j = 1, \dots, N \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We specify the corresponding elements in \underline{V}_k , such that

$$\text{Var}(B_{kl, ij}) = \begin{cases} 0.01/l^2 & i = j \\ 0.25(0.01/l^2)(\sigma_{ki}^2/\sigma_{kj}^2) & i \neq j \end{cases}, i, j = 1, \dots, N$$

for $k = 0, 1$ and $l = 1, \dots, p$. The state-specific variances in the scale factor $(\sigma_{ki}^2/\sigma_{kj}^2)$ are equal to the variance of the residuals of univariate state-specific autoregressions, in which the states are predefined as $\underline{I}_t = 1$ if the Libor $\leq 1\%$. For the intercepts, we work with diffuse priors, $\text{Var}(\mu_{ki}) = 5$.

For Σ_k , we assume an inverse Wishart prior distribution $IW(\underline{s}, \underline{S}_k)$ with degrees of freedom $\underline{s} = N+2$ and scale \underline{S}_k with diagonal elements $\underline{S}_{k, ii} = \sigma_{ki}^2$; see above.

C Posterior distributions

To obtain draws from the posterior

$$\pi(\vartheta|\mathbf{y}) \propto f(\mathbf{y}^*|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{I}, \theta) \pi(\mathbf{I}|\mathbf{r}, \theta) \pi(\mathbf{y}_1^*) \pi(\theta)$$

we sample iteratively from the posterior of

1. the state indicator, $\pi(\mathbf{I}|\mathbf{y}_1^*, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{r}, \theta)$. Given that there is no state dependence in the state probabilities, we are able to sample the states simultaneously. We update the period t prior odds $P(I_t = 1)/P(I_t = 0) = \exp(\gamma^r r_{t-1} + \gamma)$ to obtain the posterior odds

$$P(I_t = 1|\cdot)/P(I_t = 0|\cdot) = \frac{f(\mathbf{y}_t^*|X_t, \beta_1, \Sigma_1) \exp(\gamma^r r_{t-1} + \gamma)}{f(\mathbf{y}_t^*|X_t, \beta_0, \Sigma_0)}, \quad t = p+1, \dots, T$$

We sample $T - p$ uniform random variables U_t and set $I_t = 1$ if

$$P(I_t = 1|\cdot)/(P(I_t = 0|\cdot) + P(I_t = 1|\cdot)) \geq U$$

2. the censored variables, $\pi(\mathbf{y}_1^*|\mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{I}, \theta) 1(\mathbf{y}_1^* \leq b)$. Conditional on \mathbf{I} and the observed variables, and given a diffuse prior, the moments of the posterior normal distribution $\pi(\mathbf{y}_1^*|\cdot)$ are given by (14)-(16). We sample from this distribution truncated to the region $\mathbf{y}_1^* \leq b$.
3. the parameters of the state distribution, $\pi(\boldsymbol{\gamma}|\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{I}) 1(\gamma^r < 0) 1(-\gamma^r \underline{\gamma} \leq \gamma \leq -\gamma^r \bar{\gamma})$. First, we introduce two layers of data augmentation, which render the non-linear, non-normal model into a linear-normal model for the parameters (Frühwirth-Schnatter and Frühwirth 2010):

- We express the state distribution in relative terms as the difference between the latent state utilities

$$\begin{aligned} \varpi_t &= I_{1t}^u - I_{0t}^u \\ &= \gamma^r r_{t-1} + \gamma + \epsilon_t, \quad \epsilon_t \sim \text{Logistic} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1t}^u &= \gamma^r r_{t-1} + \gamma + \nu_{1t}, \quad \text{and } I_{0t}^u = \nu_{0t} \\ &\text{with } \nu_{kt} \text{ i.i.d. Type I EV} \end{aligned}$$

- We approximate the logistic distribution by a mixture of normals with M components, $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, \dots, R_T)$. Conditional on the latent relative state utilities $\boldsymbol{\varpi}$ and the components, we obtain a normal posterior distribution, $N(g, G)$, with moments:

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \left(G_0^{-1} + \sum_{t=p+1}^T Z_t' Z_t / s_{m_t}^2 \right)^{-1} \\ g &= G \left(G_0^{-1} g_0 + \sum_{t=p+1}^T Z_t' \varpi_t / s_{m_t}^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_t = [r_{t-1}, 1]'$ and $s_{m_t}^2 = s_m^2$ is the variance of the mixture components R_t , see Table 2 in Frühwirth-Schnatter and Frühwirth (2010).

To implement the restrictions on $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ according to (7), we partition the posterior appropriately:

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^r, \boldsymbol{\gamma}|\cdot) \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ g_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} G_{11} & G_{12} \\ G_{21} & G_{22} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

We then first sample $\gamma^{r,(mc)}$ from $N(g_1, G_{11})1(\gamma^r < 0)$ and then sample γ from the truncated conditional posterior (Robert 2009 or Botev 2016):

$$\gamma|\gamma^r = \gamma^{r,(mc)} \sim N(g_2^c, G_2^c)1(-\gamma^r \underline{\gamma} \leq \gamma \leq -\gamma^r \bar{\gamma})$$


with moments

$$\begin{aligned} g_2^c &= g_2 - G_{21}G_{11}^{-1}(\gamma^{r,(mc)} - g_2) \\ G_2^c &= G_{22} - G_{21}G_{11}^{-1}G_{12} \end{aligned}$$

4. the rest of the parameters, $\pi(\theta_{-\gamma}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}_1^*, \mathbf{I})$. Conditional on \mathbf{I} and the augmented data \mathbf{y}^* , the model in (2) becomes linear normal. The posterior distribution of the regression parameters and the error variances are then, respectively, normal and inverse Wishart, the moments of which can be derived in the usual way.

Recent SNB Working Papers

- | | | | |
|---------|--|---------|--|
| 2016-16 | Gregor Bäurle, Daniel Kaufmann, Sylvia Kaufmann and Rodney W. Strachan: Changing dynamics at the zero lower bound. | 2016-6 | Pascal Towbin and Sebastian Weber: Price expectations and the US housing boom. |
| 2016-15 | Adrian Jäggi, Martin Schlegel and Attilio Zanetti: Macroeconomic surprises, market environment and safe-haven currencies. | 2016-5 | Raphael A. Auer and Cédric Tille: The banking sector and the Swiss financial account during the financial and European debt crises. |
| 2016-14 | Alain Galli: Sticky consumption and wealth effects in Switzerland. | 2016-4 | Christian Hepenstrick and Massimiliano Marcellino: Forecasting with Large Unbalanced Datasets: The Mixed-Frequency Three-Pass Regression Filter. |
| 2016-13 | Gregor Bäurle and Rolf Scheufele: Credit cycles and real activity – the Swiss case. | 2016-3 | Alain Galli: How reliable are cointegration-based estimates for wealth effects on consumption? Evidence from Switzerland. |
| 2016-12 | Silvio Schumacher: Networks and lending conditions: Empirical evidence from the Swiss franc money markets. | 2016-2 | Pinar Yeşin: Exchange Rate Predictability and State-of-the-Art Models. |
| 2016-11 | Lucas Marc Fuhrer, Benjamin Müller and Luzian Steiner: The Liquidity Coverage Ratio and Security Prices. | 2016-1 | Sandra Hanslin and Rolf Scheufele: Foreign PMIs: A reliable indicator for exports? |
| 2016-10 | Nikola Mirkov, Igor Pozdeev and Paul Söderlind: Toward Removal of the Swiss Franc Cap: Market Expectations and Verbal Interventions. | 2015-13 | Thomas Nellen: Collateralised liquidity, two-part tariff and settlement coordination. |
| 2016-9 | Severin Bernhard and Till Ebner: Cross-border Spill over Effects of Unconventional Monetary Policies on Swiss Asset Prices. | 2015-12 | Jacob Gyntelberg, Mico Loretan and Tientip Subhanij: Private information, capital flows, and exchange rates. |
| 2016-8 | Pinar Yeşin: Capital Flows and the Swiss Franc. | 2015-11 | Philip Sauré: Time-intensive R&D and unbalanced trade. |
| 2016-7 | Signe Krogstrup and Cédric Tille: On the roles of different foreign currencies in European bank lending. | 2015-10 | Nikola Mirkov and Andreas Steinhauer: Ben Bernanke vs. Janet Yellen: Exploring the (a)symmetry of individual and aggregate inflation expectations. |



SCHWEIZERISCHE NATIONALBANK
BANQUE NATIONALE SUISSE
BANCA NAZIONALE SVIZZERA
BANCA NAZIUNALA SVIZRA
SWISS NATIONAL BANK

