Commodity Booms and Busts in Emerging Economies*

Thomas Drechsel
LSE, CFM

Silvana Tenreyro
LSE, CFM, CEPR

June 10, 2017

Abstract

Emerging economies, in particular those that are dependent on commodity exports, are prone to highly disruptive economic cycles. This paper proposes a small open economy (SOE) model to study the triggers of these cycles, highlighting the role of commodity prices. The economy consists of two main sectors, one of which produces commodities whose prices are subject to exogenous international fluctuations. The model nests various candidate sources of shocks proposed in previous work on emerging economy business cycles and additionally allows for a double-role of commodity prices. International changes in commodity prices improve both the competitiveness of the economy, as we consider a net commodity exporter, and its borrowing terms, as higher commodity prices are associated with lower spreads between the country's borrowing rate and world interest rates. Both effects jointly result in strongly positive effects of commodity price increases on GDP, consumption and investment, and a negative effect on the total trade balance. They also generate excess volatility of consumption over output and a large volatility of investment. We estimate the model using data on Argentina from 1900 to 2015 to provide a quantitative evaluation of the various sources of shocks and their effect on macroeconomic aggregates over a long time horizon. Our estimate of the contribution of commodity price shocks to fluctuations in output growth of Argentina is in the order of 17%. In addition, commodity prices account for around 21% and 50% of the variation in consumption and investment growth, respectively. These estimates are even higher in the post-1950 period. Furthermore, we find transitory productivity shocks to be an important driver of output fluctuations, exceeding the contribution of shocks to the trend, which are smaller, although not negligible.

Keywords: Business cycles, Small open economy, Emerging markets, Commodity prices, Argentina's economy.

JEL Classification: E13, E32, F43, O11, O16.

*We would like to thank Neele Balke, Gianluca Benigno, Francesco Caselli, Wouter Den Haan, Martin Ellison, Andrea Fererro and seminar participants at the LSE and the Workshop in International Economics at Oxford University for useful comments and conversations. Author details: Department of Economics and Centre for Macroeconomics, London School of Economics. Houghton Street, London, WC2A 2AE, United Kingdom; E-Mail: s.tenreyro@lse.ac.uk and t.a.drechsel@lse.ac.uk.

1 Introduction

Emerging economies, in particular those that are dependent on commodity exports, have a long history of volatile and disruptive economic cycles. This paper proposes a model of booms and busts in emerging economies with the aim of quantitatively assessing their triggers. The model builds on the small open economy model of Aguiar and Gopinath (2007) and García-Cicco et al. (2010) by adding two elements absent from their analysis. First, it allows for a second sector to capture the separate role of commodities in the economy. Specifically, the analysis focuses on the case of a net commodity exporting country, facing exogenous international price changes. Second, the model embeds a negative relation between the interest rate premium and commodity prices, which we show is consistent with the empirical evidence. In addition to this novel double-role of commodity prices, the model nests the various sources of shocks identified in previous work on emerging economy business cycles. To study the predictions of our model we resort both to a calibration exercise and to estimation of the model with Bayesian methods.

The quantitative analysis throughout the paper focuses on Argentina, a quintessential example of commodity exporting emerging economy. To set the stage, we begin by documenting a number of empirical regularities. In common with other emerging economies, Argentina displays large and persistent cyclical fluctuations, excess volatility of consumption over output, high volatility of investment, and a negative correlation between output growth and the trade balance. In addition, the Argentine data reveal large positive effects of world commodity price shocks on output, consumption and investment, as well as negative effects on the trade balance. We identify these shocks using a structural vector autoregression (SVAR) model with a standard Cholesky decomposition, relying on the assumption that world commodity prices are not contemporaneously affected by Argentina's economic activity.[1] Furthermore, the data display a strong negative association between interest rate spreads in Argentina and world commodity prices. Maintaining the assumption that international commodity prices

[1]We use the updated commodity price index of Grilli and Yang (1988). In order to obtain a real measure, we deflate this index with Argentine import prices.

are exogenous to developments in Argentina's economy, we estimate this relation with a set of regressions of measures of Argentine real rates (net of world interest rates) on the international commodity price index and various controls. The strongly negative relation is robust across a number of regression specifications, with different interest rate spread measures and different sets of controls, including output growth, the trade balance and the debt-to-GDP ratio. The lower bound of our estimates suggests that a 10 percent deviation of commodity prices from their long-run mean can move Argentina's real interest spread by almost 2 percentage points. This finding also confirms some of the existing evidence from the literature on interest rate spread of commodity exporting economies (see for example Fernández et al., 2015 and Bastourre et al., 2012). It is also highlighted in recent work by Shousha (2016).

In the model calibration exercise we analyze the response of the economy to commodity price shocks of a sensibly calibrated size, which we can directly compare to the impulse response functions obtained from the SVAR. We find that the model impulse response functions and theoretical moments of the model line up well with the empirical evidence. The two effects stemming from commodity prices (that is, the competitiveness effect and the borrowing cost effect) *jointly* produce impulse response functions to a commodity price shock that mimic the empirical responses not only qualitatively but also quantitatively. They generate a strongly positive effects on GDP, consumption and investment, and a negative effect on the total trade balance. They also give rise to excess volatility of consumption over output and a large volatility of investment. The first effect alone (akin to a productivity increase) cannot generate a countercyclical trade balance. The second effect alone (which is isomorphic to a simple negative interest rate shock) does not give a contemporaneous response in output, while consumption and investment do increase on impact.

The aim of the structural estimation of the model is to gauge the quantitative importance of commodity price shocks (relative to other shocks) in driving the business cycle. Using Bayesian methods, we estimate the stochastic processes of various exogenous disturbances, as well as the parameter governing the sensitivity of the interest rate spreads to commodity prices, using data on output, consumption, investment and the trade balance of Argentina.

Our results suggest a sizable contribution of commodity price shocks to Argentine business cycle fluctuations. The posterior forecast error variance decomposition attributes 17% of the observed variation in output growth to commodity price shocks. Furthermore, 21% of consumption growth and 50% of investment growth can be explained by commodity price shocks according to our estimation. Reassuringly, the model-implied process for the commodity price shares important features with empirically observed world commodity prices. Since it resembles the data well after 1950, we also repeat the estimation on the post-1950 subsample and find that the contribution of commodity shocks to output, consumption and investment growth rises to around 29%, 35% and 72% respectively.[2]

Our assessment of the remaining variation in macroeconomic aggregates sheds additional light on the debate around candidate drivers of emerging economy business cycles previously proposed in the literature, in particular by Aguiar and Gopinath (2007) and García-Cicco et al. (2010). We find that in general, stationary technology shocks remain the most important source of fluctuations, explaining around half of the variation in output growth, and are quantitatively more important than non-stationary technology shocks. While this echoes the conclusion of García-Cicco et al. (2010) who refute the notion that the "cycle is the trend" in emerging economies, the contribution of nonstationary shocks remains non-negligible, as these shocks are able to explain 28% of the variation in output growth.[3] We also find a significant role for preference shocks and interest rate shocks, in particular for explaining important shares of the variation in consumption, investment and the trade balance.

Taken together, our results suggest that commodity prices should feature prominently in the analysis of business cycles in emerging economies that are dependent on commodity exports. In terms of quantitative contribution, they are among the three most important shocks in driving output growth in Argentina. Importantly, shocks to international commodity prices, in contrast to inherently unobservable concepts such as domestic TFP shocks, are

[2]It should be pointed out that our model does not feature a role for sovereign default/distress. While sovereign default episodes have been important for Argentina, we think there is a lot of merit in understanding the triggers of the cycles and how they are affected by external factors such as commodity prices in a relatively simple setting, which more realistically would end with a technical default. A better understanding of these regularities may actually help in avoiding default episodes by guiding policy.

[3]Our conclusion with respect to this aspect is quite similar to recent findings of Akinci (2017).

factors that are easier to detect and measure, and eventually act upon, by policy makers.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a number of empirical regularities characterizing Argentine business cycles. As said, many of these regularities are shared with other emerging commodity exporting countries, though for the sake of accuracy in the mapping from data to the model economy, we think it is preferable to focus on a single country. Section 3 introduces the model. Section 4 performs the calibration exercise and studies the role of commodity prices in the model. Section 5 estimates the model and carries out quantitative analysis of the various sources of shocks. Section 6 contains concluding remarks.

2 Emerging Market Cycles: Empirical Regularities


In this section we present the main empirical regularities that will guide the development of the model.

2.1 Data and Sample

We start this section by presentingt the main empirical features that characterize the business cycle of Argentina's economy from 1900 to 2015. Though there are strong commonalities across emerging countries, we think it is important to work with a straight mapping from a single country to the model, rather that using averages across different countries that might confound effects due to aggregation. The focus on a long time period is both insightful and befitting for a number of reasons. First, Argentina's large and persistent economic cycles call for a lengthy time span in order to capture a reasonable number of completed cycles in the analysis. Second, unlike advanced economies, Argentina's cyclical properties have shown virtually no changes over this long period. This is apparent in Figure 1 Panel (a), which plots the logarithm of Argentine real GDP per capita from 1900 to 2015. Argentina's output volatility in the first half of the 20th century (measured as the standard deviation of real GDP growth rates) is practically the same as the volatility in the post 1950 period, despite the higher levels of development in the latter. In the corresponding

plot for the United States, shown in Panel (b) using the same log scale, marked changes in the volatility of output are visible. This typically leads researchers to separately analyze data before and after the World War II, or before and after the 1980s, which was when the Great Moderation occurred in the United States. Such changes in volatility are not present in Argentina, which makes a case for analyzing fluctuations jointly over the entire period.[4] Third, Argentina's trend growth rate has been remarkably stable since 1900, at 1.2 percent per year, a constancy that can be fully appreciated by taking a long-term perspective in analyzing its business cycles.

Figure 1: Output per capita 1900-2015 - Argentina vs. US




In addition to output data, we will focus on typical macroeconomic variables of interest in small open economies, by studying the fluctuations of consumption, investment, and the trade balance. This data is provided by Ferreres (2005).[5] Furthermore, to assess the role of commodity price fluctuations for Argentina's economy, we use the commodity price index of Grilli and Yang (1988), which we update following Pfaffenzeller et al. (2007) and deflate to

[4] A similar argument is made by García-Cicco et al. (2010), who emphasize the importance of a long horizon to disentangle transitory shocks from shocks to trend growth in business cycles of emerging economies, which are the focus of Aguiar and Gopinath (2007).

[5] Our data is similar to García-Cicco et al. (2010). Details on the sources and construction of the data are available upon request.

be a relative ("real") price using Argentine import prices.[6] Figure 2 plots this time series in deviations from its sample mean. We generally focus on mean deviations, since we want persistent movements over longer time spans, sometimes referred to as "supercycles" in commodity prices, to remain present.

Figure 2: Real commodity prices 1900-2015



Notes: Commodity price index of Grilli and Yang (1988), deflated with the Argentine import price index. Unit is log-deviation from sample mean.

We begin our characterization of the empirical regularities by documenting business cycle moments in the next subsection. We then turn to estimating an SVAR in order to gauge the effects of exogenous commodity price developments on Argentina's economy. Furthermore, we present evidence on the relation of commodity prices and Argentina's real interest rate spread. Finally, we summarize the insights of this section into a set of stylized facts.

[6] We have tried alternative ways of deflating this series, for example using manufacturing prices, or the US consumer price index. This did not have a noteworthy impact on the results presented. We prefer the deflation using import prices, since this brings the observed price index closest to the corresponding concept in our model, which is a relative price between commodities and a final tradable consumption good.

2.2 Business Cycle Moments

Table 1 summarizes key business cycle moments of Argentina's economy. We report mean, standard deviation, persistence, and contemporaneous cross-correlation of GDP growth, consumption growth, investment growth (all per capita), as well as the trade balance, defined as exports minus imports scaled by GDP. As the table shows, many properties of the Argentine business cycle are in line with what is typically observed in advanced economies. Output, consumption and investment are strongly correlated and investment is much more volatile than output. On the other hand, there are features that are typically distinctive of fluctuations in emerging markets. In particular, it is worth highlighting that consumption growth is more volatile than output growth.[7] Furthermore, as often observed in emerging markets, the trade balance is countercyclical. In the case of Argentina the contemporaneous correlation of -0.07 with output growth is not large, but the size of the negative correlation is more pronounced with consumption and investment.

Table 1: Business Cycle Moments 1900-2015

	GDP growth	**Cons. growth**	**Inv. growth**	**Trade balance**
Mean	1.17%	1.12%	1.40%	-0.04%
Standard deviation	5.27%	5.84%	19.16%	4.76%
Persistence	0.14	0.05	0.34	0.72
Correlation with GDP growth	1	0.86	0.76	-0.07
Correlation with Cons. growth	0.86	1	0.49	-0.11
Correlation with Inv. growth	0.76	0.49	1	-0.20
Correlation with trade balance	-0.07	-0.11	-0.20	1

Notes: GDP, consumption and investment growth are real and in per capita terms. The trade balance is defined as total exports minus total imports, scaled by GDP. Persistence is the coefficient from an estimated AR(1) process. The frequency of the data is annual.

[7] Interestingly, the excess volatility of of consumption is smaller in our sample than in the shorter one in García-Cicco et al. (2010), suggesting that this phenomenon has fallen in recent years.

2.3 Commodity Price Shocks and Emerging Economy Business Cycles

In order to gauge the effect of international commodity prices on merging market business cycles, consider the following structural vector autoregression (SVAR):

$$A_0 Z_t = at + A_1 Z_{t-1} + \ldots + A_p Z_{t-p} + u_t, \tag{1}$$

where Z_t is vector containing the commodity price index in deviations from mean, as plotted in Figure 2, together with the log-levels of the business cycle variables of interest - output, consumption, investment and the trade balance. u_t is a vector of normally distributed structural shocks with covariance matrix $\mathbb{E}(u_t u_t') = I_5$ and t is a linear time trend.


The exercise we carry out is straightforward. We estimate the reduced form version of equation (1) using OLS on Argentine data, obtain the residuals $\hat{\epsilon}_t = \hat{A}_0^{-1}\hat{u}_t$ and then recover commodity price shocks, i.e. the element of $\hat{u}_t$ corresponding to commodity prices using restrictions on A_0. This is done using a standard Cholesky ordering in which the commodity price is ordered first.[8] Our underlying identifying assumption is that international commodity prices are not contemporaneously affected by any other variable in the system. Given that Argentina is a relatively small country which should not be a driver of world-wide commodity prices, we believe this assumption is reasonable. We set the order $p = 2$.[9]

The impulse response functions to a one standard deviation shock to commodity prices are plotted in Figure 3. The results show that there is a statistically and economically significant positive response of output, consumption and investment following a commodity price shock. The trade balance response is negative, i.e. net exports fall in response to a commodity price shocks. All responses are hump-shaped with a peak after two years, and quite persistent. Measured at peak, a one standard deviation shock in international commodity prices, which corresponds to an increase of 22% above mean, increases the level of real GDP per capita by more than one percent.

[8] We leave the remaining shocks to the system unidentified, so that the ordering of the remaining variables is irrelevant.

[9] This lag length is selected over $p = 1$ using various lag length selection criteria, e.g. the Akaike information criterion (AIC).

Figure 3: Impulse responses to 1 S.D. Commodity Price Shock



Note: The structural shock is identified using Cholesky ordering. 80% confidence bands are plotted, as suggested by Sims and Zha (1999). GDP, consumption and investment are real, in per-capita terms and in log-levels. The trade balance is defined as exports net of imports divided by GDP.


2.4 Commodity Prices and Interest Rate Spreads

What are possible channels behind the influence of commodity prices on emerging market business cycles? One key observation that has been highlighted in previous research on commodity exporting economies is the strong negative comovement of interest rate spreads and commodity prices. Fernández et al. (2015) highlight the strong negative effect of commodity price increases on country risk premia in sovereign bond spreads. Bastourre et al. (2012) estimate the correlation between a common factor of emerging economy bond returns and a common factor of commodity prices to be -0.81. Shousha (2016) emphasizes that the negative correlation is a major difference between emerging and advanced commodity exporters. We think that incorporating this effect into our analysis is important, since (strongly

countercyclical) interest rate movement in general have been found to be very important for emerging markets business cycles, see for example Uribe and Yue (2006) and Neumeyer and Perri (2005).

Figure 4 plots one available measure of Argentina's real interest rate, provided by the World Bank for the period from 1994, together with the commodity price index for the same period. To have a spread/premium measure we subtract the UK real interest rate from the Argentine rate. As is visible in the figure, the two series show a striking negative comovement, with a simple correlation coefficient of -0.78. We once again emphasize that the commodity price measure captures international commodity price developments which are arguably exogenous to economic activity in Argentina.

Figure 4: Commodity prices vs. Argentina's real interest rate spread



Note: The spread measure, displayed by the black dashed line, is computed using the Argentine real interest measure provided by the World Bank and subtracting the UK real interest rate. The blue solid line repeats the commodity price for Figure 2 for the corresponding time period.

To shed further light on the link between the real spread and commodity prices in the case of Argentina, we run a set of regressions of the Argentine real interest rate spread on the real commodity price index (in log deviations from its mean). The regressions are specified

as follows:

$$r_t - r_t^* = \alpha + \xi(ln\tilde{p}_t - ln\bar{\tilde{p}}) + \beta X_t + v_t, \tag{2}$$

where r_t is the real interest rate of Argentina, r_t^* is a measure of the world interest rate, $\tilde{p}_t$ is the commodity price (with $(ln\tilde{p}_t - ln\bar{\tilde{p}})$ being the deviation from mean which we generally plot), and X_t is a vector of control variables including output growth, the debt-to-GDP ratio and the trade balance. The key parameter of interest is ξ which denotes the sensitivity of the real interest rate spreads with respect to changes in world commodity prices. Note that this sensitivity parameter will also feature in our model, and we will calibrate it based on the results presented in this section. Since interest rate data is not available over our baseline 1900-2015 sample, we stick to a smaller time period and try a collection of different interest rate series available for Argentina. Specifically, we use the World Bank measure from 1994 shown in Figure 4 as well as a domestic deposit rate, savings rate and a moment market rate. The latter measures are provided by the IMF International Financial Statistics. For the world interest rate we generally use a measure of the UK real interest rate provided by the Bank of England.

One set of regression results, based on the World Bank measure, is presented in Table 2. We show several other results using different interest rate measures in Appendix A. Our findings across all regressions, including those in the appendix, are that across a big range of specifications, our estimates of ξ are typically highly statistically and economically significant, with point estimates ranging from -0.13 to -0.31. If we consider the lowest estimate (in absolute value) that is statistically significant, which is -0.199, the interpretation is that a 10 percent deviation of commodity prices from their long-run mean can move Argentina's real interest spread by almost 2 percentage points. We view this as strong evidence in support of a channel by which exogenous international commodity price put downward pressure on interest rate premia faced by commodity exporting emerging economies. This evidence will guide our modeling choices below, where we also provide further theoretical discussion of this economic relation.

Table 2: Regression Results

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
LHS variable	Real spread (based on World Bank measure)				
Commodity price	-0.278***	-0.233***	-0.307***	-0.313***	-0.260***
	(0.073)	(0.065)	(0.080)	(0.077)	(0.070)
Output growth		-0.668**			-0.664**
		(0.236)			(0.235)
Trade balance			-0.273		0.231
			(0.306)		(0.508)
Debt-to-GDP ratio				-0.058	-0.087
				(0.046)	(0.079)
Constant	0.049**	0.054***	0.055***	0.086**	0.105**
	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.019)	(0.034)	(0.044)
Observations	22	22	22	22	22
R-squared	0.423	0.594	0.446	0.468	0.640

Standard errors in parentheses
*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

2.5 Summary of Stylized Facts

Based on the empirical analysis above, we summarize the following stylized facts around aggregate fluctuations in Argentina 1900-2015:

1. A relatively constant growth rate of GDP per capita of around 1.2%
2. Excess volatility of consumption
3. A negative correlation between the output growth the trade balance
4. Large of effects of commodity price shocks on all key business cycle variables
5. A negative relation between interest spreads and commodity prices

3 An RBC Model With A Commodity Sector

We build on the small open economy model real business cycle model formulated by García-Cicco et al. (2010).[10] Our model adds two elements absent in their analysis. First

[10]We abstract from nominal frictions and the important question of fixed versus nominal exchange rate choice. We refer readers to Gali and Monacelli (2005) and the literature that built on their seminal contribution.

it allows for a second sector to capture the distinctive role of commodities in the Argentine economy. Second, the model embeds a negative relation between the interest rate premium and commodity prices, consistent with the empirical evidence presented above. The model nests the various sources of shocks identified in previous work (see García-Cicco et al., 2010 and Aguiar and Gopinath, 2007) and allows for a novel double-role of commodity prices. Increases in commodity prices improve both the competitiveness of the economy (as Argentina is a net commodity exporter) and the economy's borrowing terms, as higher prices are associated with lower spreads between Argentina's borrowing rates and the world's interest rates.

We begin by describing the technology. There are two sectors in the economy: a final-good sector and a commodity-producing sector. The final good is produced by combining capital K_t^1, commodity inputs $\tilde{M}_t$ and labor N_t^1. It can be consumed, invested and exported or imported. The production function in the final good sector is

$$Y_t = a_t(K_t^1)^{\alpha_K}(\tilde{M}_t)^{\alpha_M}(X_t N_t^1)^{1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M}. \tag{3}$$

Commodities can be produced domestically using capital K_t^2 and labor N_t^2, and can be used as an intermediate input in final goods production or be traded on international markets. The production function in the commodity sector is

$$\tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{a}_t(K_t^2)^{\tilde{\alpha_K}}(X_t N_t^2)^{1-\tilde{\alpha_K}}. \tag{4}$$

In the production functions, a_t and $\tilde{a}_t$ capture total factor productivities (TFP), which are assumed to be stationary. X_t is the nonstationary level of labor-augmenting technology common to both sectors. We denote the gross growth rate of the nonstationary technology as $g_t = X_t/X_{t-1}$. X_t is introduced to capture shocks to the trend, which has been a key focus in the literature on emerging market business cycles.[11] The price of the final good is

[11] See in particular Aguiar and Gopinath (2007). The fact that in our model the nonstationary technology is common to both sectors ensures that the model admits a non-stochastic balanced growth path (BGP). See details in Appendix B.

normalized to 1, and the price of commodities $\tilde{p}_t$ is exogenously given on world markets and subject to shocks. We assume that a_t, $\tilde{a}_t$, g_t and $\tilde{p}_t$ follow stochastic processes which will be specified further below.

Firms in both sectors rent capital and hire labor on competitive input markets. The total stock of capital in the economy K_t is measured in final goods and is divided between the two production technologies, so that

$$K_t = K_t^1 + K_t^2. \tag{5}$$

It depreciates at rate δ and is accumulated through investment I_t which gives

$$K_{t+1} = (1-\delta)K_t + I_t. \tag{6}$$

The economy is populated by a representative household who supplies the two types labor, owns and rents out the capital stock and borrows from abroad. The budget constraint is given by

$$C_t+K_{t+1}+D_t+S_t+\frac{\phi}{2}\left(\frac{K_{t+1}}{K_t}-g\right)^2 = r_t^{k1}K_t^1+r_t^{k2}K_t^2+w_t^1N_t^1+w_t^2N_t^2+(1-\delta)K_t+\frac{D_{t+1}}{1+r_t}, \tag{7}$$

where C_t is final good consumption, D_t denotes the level of (real) debt and $\frac{D_{t+1}}{1+r_t}$ is newly issued debt at net interest rate r_t. S_t is exogenous government spending, where $s_t = S_t/X_{t-1}$ will follow a stochastic process to be specified further below. r_t^{kj} and w_t^j, $j = 1, 2$, are the returns from renting out capital and supplying labor to the two sectors, respectively. Note that in equilibrium the expected return on capital will equalize across the two sectors. The presence of $\phi > 0$ captures investment adjustment costs face by the household.

The household's objective is to maximize

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \nu_t \beta^t \frac{[C_t - \theta\omega^{-1}X_{t-1}(N_t^1)^{\omega} - \theta\tilde{\omega}^{-1}X_{t-1}(N_t^2)^{\tilde{\omega}}]^{1-\gamma} - 1}{1-\gamma} \tag{8}$$

with $\gamma > 0$. In the household's objective functions β is the discount factor and ν_t captures shocks to preferences. The utility function features Greenwood et al. (1988) preferences, which eliminate the wealth effect on labor supply. Note that the presence of X_{t-1} ensures a constant labor supply along the non-stochastic BGP. The Frisch elasticity of labor supply will be determined by ω and $\tilde{\omega}$, and θ governs the weight on relative disutility of labor.

Based on the small open economy assumption, the steady state interest rate is exogenously given. In particular, r_t is determined by the world interest rate r^*, and a spread term which is further composed into three additive terms so that

$$r_t = r^* + \psi\left(e^{D^*_{t+1}/X_t - d^*} - 1\right) + \xi\left(ln(\tilde{p}_t) - ln(\tilde{p})\right) + \left(e^{\mu_t - 1} - 1\right). \tag{9}$$

The first term of the spread in (9) is standard in the literature. Following Schmitt-Grohe and Uribe (2003), it is assumed that the premium is increasing in the (detrended) level of debt. The presence of D^*_{t+1} is taken as exogenous by the household but $D_{t+1} = D^*_{t+1}$ holds in equilibrium. This debt-elastic interest rate ensures a stationary solution of the model after detrending.[12] The second term captures the empirical observation, discussed in detail in Section 2.4, that commodity prices strongly affect interest rate premia of commodity exporting economies. The parameter ξ represents the sensitivity of the interest rate with respect to commodity price deviations from steady state, and can be calibrated to the reduced-form parameter we estimated in Section 2.4. The assumption of an interest rate that responds to commodity prices will be important for our main results concerning the effect of commodity price fluctuations for the economy.[13] The third term in (9) allows for a simple interest rate premium shock, similar to the one specified in García-Cicco et al. (2010). Since it is central to our objective to trace out the effects of commodity price movements for the economy, we also allow for the presence of μ_t in order to capture possible exogenously driven movements in the interest premium that are unrelated to commodity prices.

[12] See also Lubik (2007) for further discussion.

[13] This modeling choice is similar to Shousha (2016), who also further discusses some of the underlying empirical evidence.

Equations (3) to (9) feature a set of exogenous disturbances to technology, preferences and prices, $\{a_t, \tilde{a}_t, g_t, \tilde{p}_t, s_t, \nu_t, \mu_t\}$, which we specify to follow autoregressive processes of order one in logs that are subject to stochastic shocks $\{\epsilon_t^a, \epsilon_t^{\tilde{a}}, \epsilon_t^g, \epsilon_t^{\tilde{p}}, \epsilon_t^s, \epsilon_t^\nu, \epsilon_t^\mu\}$. The shocks are normally distributed with mean zero and standard deviations $\{\sigma_a, \sigma_{\tilde{a}}, \sigma_g, \sigma_{\tilde{p}}, \sigma_s, \sigma_\nu, \sigma_\mu\}$. The processes for g_t, s_t and $\tilde{p}_t$ have deterministic means different from 1 that are parametrized as g, s and $\tilde{p}$, and which will be either estimated or calibrated to match business cycle moments of the steady state model. The processes are

$$
\begin{aligned}
ln(a_t) &= \rho_a ln(a_{t-1}) + \epsilon_t^a && (10)\\
ln(\tilde{a}_t) &= \rho_{\tilde{a}} ln(\tilde{a}_{t-1}) + \epsilon_t^{\tilde{a}} && (11)\\
ln\left(\frac{g_t}{g}\right) &= \rho_g ln\left(\frac{g_{t-1}}{g}\right) + \epsilon_t^g && (12)\\
ln\left(\frac{s_t}{s}\right) &= \rho_s ln\left(\frac{s_{t-1}}{s}\right) + \epsilon_t^s && (13)\\
ln(\nu_t) &= \rho_\nu ln(\nu_{t-1}) + \epsilon_t^\nu && (14)\\
ln(\mu_t) &= \rho_\mu ln(\mu_{t-1}) + \epsilon_t^\mu && (15)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
ln\left(\frac{\tilde{p}_t}{\tilde{p}}\right) = \rho_{\tilde{p}}^1 log\left(\frac{\tilde{p}_{t-1}}{\tilde{p}}\right) + \rho_{\tilde{p}}^2 log\left(\frac{\tilde{p}_{t-2}}{\tilde{p}}\right) + \epsilon_t^{\tilde{p}}. \quad (16)
$$

Note that we specify the log of the commodity price $\tilde{p}_t$ to follow an AR(2) process. This allows us to calibrate the parameters to the ones obtained in the from the SVAR analysis in Section 2.3.

The model features the following resource constraints. In the final goods sector the resource constraint is given by

$$
Y_t = C_t + I_t + S_t + \frac{\phi}{2}\left(\frac{K_{t+1}}{K_t} - g\right)^2 + TB_t \quad (17)
$$

where TB_t denotes the trade balance in final goods. The commodity market resource constraint reads as

$$\tilde{p}_t \tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{p}_t \tilde{M}_t + \tilde{TB}_t \tag{18}$$

where $\tilde{TB}_t$ measure the real commodity trade balance, that is, net exports of commodities measured in terms of final goods. Carrying out some further national accounting, we compute the GDP and the total trade balance of the economy, both measured in terms of final goods, as

$$Y_t^{GDP} = Y_t + \tilde{p}_t \tilde{Y}_t - \tilde{p}_t \tilde{M}_t \tag{19}$$

$$TB_t^{Total} = TB_t + \tilde{TB}_t \tag{20}$$

The complete list of optimality conditions derived in this model is provided in Appendix B. The Appendix also contains the derivation of a normalized version of the model that is stationary, that is, where all nonstationary equilibrium variables are normalized by X_{t-1}. This results in a system of normalized variables, which we denote with lower case letters and which we solve numerically with standard perturbation techniques. We carry out both a calibration exercise and a structural estimation of this model, in order to asses the quantitative contribution of different shocks to fluctuations, with particular emphasis on commodity price shocks.

4 Calibration and Business Cycle Characteristics

The goal of this section is to study the business cycle characteristics of the model that are induced by shocks to the commodity price. To do so, we calibrate all structural parameters of the model, including the parameters governing the stochastic process of $ln(\tilde{p}_t)$. We then generate impulse response functions and theoretical business cycle moments of the model,

focusing exclusively on commodity price shocks.

4.1 Calibration

Table 3 summarizes our baseline calibration. Many of the parameter values are standard in business cycle research, but several are worth highlighting. Both the mean of the commodity sector productivity $\tilde{a}_t$ as well as the steady state relative price of commodities $\tilde{p}$ determine the relative size of the two sectors in the economy. We have normalized the mean technology in both sectors to 1 - as can be seen in equations (10) and (11) - and find the value of $\tilde{p}$ that matches the ratio net exports of commodities to GDP observed in Argentine data (8.60%).[14] This successfully pins down a relative size of the commodity price sector that is in line with Argentine data. The parameter d^* in equation (9) is calibrated to match the average trade balance to output ratio in the data (-0.041%, consistent with Table 1). We calibrate the mean of the government spending process to induce the average government spending to GDP ratio observed in the data (9.38%). The parameter ξ, which governs the sensitivity of the interest rate spread to commodity prices, is calibrated based on the coefficient we estimated in Section 2.4. To be conservative we take the lower bound of -0.199 among the statistically significant estimates we have obtained across a broad range of regression specifications. The average technology growth rate of the economy g is set directly to 1.0117 in order to generate the observed mean output growth in the data. We impose equal capital shares in both sectors ($\alpha_k = \tilde{\alpha}_k$) and set the commodity share in the final goods production to $\alpha_m = 0.05$ following Shousha (2016). ψ is set to a small value which is standard in the small open economy literature (see e.g. Schmitt-Grohe and Uribe, 2003). The stochastic process of $ln(\tilde{p}_t)$ is calibrated to be in line with the estimated SVAR coefficients in Section 2.3, which gives $\rho^1_{\tilde{p}} = 0.95$, $\rho^2_{\tilde{p}} = -0.13$ and $\sigma_{\tilde{p}} = 0.1064$.

[14] To compute this target ratio we use a broad measure of commodity exports which includes manufactures of commodities. Due to data availability we use an annual sample starting in 1980.

Table 3: Model Calibration


Parameter	Value	Calibration target/source
$\tilde{p}$	0.5244	Target commodity net exports to GDP in the data (8.60%)
d^*	-0.001	Target trade balance to GDP in the data (-0.041%)
s	0.0189	Target gov't spending to GDP in the data (9.38%)
ξ	-0.199	Estimated coefficient in Section 2.4
g	1.0117	Average GDP growth in the data
ψ	0.001	Aguiar and Gopinath (2007), García-Cicco et al. (2010)
α_k	0.32	García-Cicco et al. (2010)
α_m	0.05	Shousha (2016)
$\tilde{\alpha_k}$	0.32	Impose same capital share in both sectors
δ	0.1255	García-Cicco et al. (2010)
ϕ	4	Aguiar and Gopinath (2007)
β	0.93	Steady state interest rate $\approx 10\%$
γ	2	Standard value in business cycle analysis
θ	1.6	$N^1 + N^2 \approx 1/3$
ω,$\tilde{\omega}$	1.6	Standard in SOE literature
$\rho^1_{\tilde{p}}$	0.95	Estimated VAR coefficient (Section 2.3)
$\rho^2_{\tilde{p}}$	-0.13	Estimated VAR coefficient (Section 2.3)
$\sigma_{\tilde{p}}$	0.1064	Estimated VAR coefficient (Section 2.3)

4.2 Impulse Response Functions to Commodity Price Shocks

Figure 5 displays the impulse response functions to a one standard deviation commodity price shocks $\epsilon^{\tilde{p}}_t$ based on the calibration described above. The figure shows that the responses on impact are in line with the stylized facts of the business cycle of Argentina highlighted in Section 2. Positive commodity price shocks boost the economy by increasing total output, consumption and investment. The investment growth response is the strongest, and the consumption response is larger in magnitude than the output response. The total trade balance response is negative, rendering total net exports countercyclical.

To understand the mechanism behind the dynamics visible in Figure 5, note that commodity prices in the model give rise to two effects. The first effect goes through commodity trade revenues. The economy needs to trade off the cost more expensive commodity inputs

Figure 5: Impulse response functions to commodity price shock




in the production of final goods with the benefits of being able to produce and export commodities at more attractive prices and thus generating trade revenues. The second effect is governed by the negative sensitivity of the interest spread $r_t - r^*$ to commodity price shocks present in equation (9) and based on the empirical evidence in Section 2.4. Both of these effects are necessary to generate the responses in Figure 5. To highlight this, Figures 6 and 7 open up the double role of commodity prices in our model by plotting impulse response function for the two effects separately and inspecting them across the two sectors of the economy. In both cases, the responses of consumption and investment growth are omitted.

Figure 6 studies the first effect of commodity price shocks, which we dub "competitiveness effect". The figure plots the responses of GDP and the total trade balance to a commodity price shock when setting $\xi = 0$, i.e. shutting of the channel through the interest rate, which we will analyze separately below. It also breaks down these responses into the dynamics in both sectors, i.e. the final goods sector and the commodity sector, separately. What the left panels of the figure reveal is that after a commodity prices increase, the commodity

sector GDP increases massively, as higher international prices make it attractive to increase production. The final goods sector actually suffers, as intermediate commodity inputs necessary to produce final goods become more expensive. However this effect is dwarfed by the boom in the commodity sector and total production in the economy increases. The trade balances in the two sectors, shown in the right panels of the figure, go into different directions. The economy starts exporting more commodities and importing final goods as the former are very attractive to sell abroad and the letter less attractive to produce domestically. Taken together, the *total* trade balance increases with the commodity price boom. This highlights that the first effect alone does generate a countercylical *total* which is a salient feature in emerging economy business cycle data.

Figure 6: Impulse response functions to commodity price shock: Breakdown



Let us turn to Figure 7, in which the dynamics arising from the second effect, which we call "borrowing cost effect" are presented. The figure plots the IRFs of total GDP and the total trade balance to a simple interest rate shock. This shock is (qualitatively) isomorphic

to an increase in commodity prices that only goes through the presence of $\tilde{p}_t$ in equation (9) but that does not *directly* affect production in either sector. It thus completely shuts off the competitiveness effect described above and only shows the effect that commodity price increases have through their indirect effect on bringing down the spread between the economies borrowing rate and the world interest rate. Again, the figure breaks down these responses into the dynamics in both sectors, i.e. the final goods sector and the commodity sector, separately.[15] The figure shows that the exogenous fall in borrowing rates allows representative agent to afford to bring resources to the present by borrowing funds and decreasing the final goods trade balance, i.e. importing final goods. Some of these resources will be consumed (consumption goes up on impact, not shown in the figure), and some will be invested into capital (investment goes up on impact, not shown in the figure) in order to produce final goods and maintain a smooth path of consumption. Some of the capital will also be used to produce commodities, which are a required intermediary input to final goods production. This gives a slow and hump shaped increase in the GDP of both sectors and the total economy. Hence, the effect that the interest shock has through borrowing rates is that the total trade balance falls and that output increases, but not on impact.


In conclusion, the two double-role of commodity effects in our model, through the *joint* presence of competitiveness and the borrowing cost effect, gives rise to dynamics that very well in line with the empirical facts in Argentina (and other commodity export dependent emerging economies by extension), as shown by comparing the SVAR results from Figure 3 with the model responses presented in Figure 5.

4.3 Theoretical Moments

Maintaining the thought experiment that there are only commodity price shocks, what are the implied theoretical business cycle moments of our model? Table 4 reports the standard deviation, persistence and cross correlation of the growth rate of GDP,

[15]The interest rate shock in this figure is calibrated to have the same maximum output response as the total response in Figure 5.

Figure 7: Impulse response functions to interest rate shock: Breakdown



consumption and investment, as well as the total trade balance to GDP. These are the theoretical concepts in the model that are the analogues of the empirical time series that we analyzed in Table 1.[16] As the table shows, and in line with the impulse response functions analyzed above, commodity price shocks alone are successful at generating some of the distinctive features of the Argentine business cycle: Excess volatility of consumption, volatile investment, and a countercylical trade balance. Quantitatively, a considerable fraction of the standard deviation of the variables appears to be accounted for by commodity price shocks. In the case of GDP growth, for example, this is 1.94% compared to 5.27% in the data. This already hints that a potentially significant fraction of output fluctuations in reality could be captures by international commodity price shocks. The model hit by commodity price shocks only overstates the size of the countercylcality of the trade balance and its standard deviation. It also misses the persistence in investment. However, recall

[16]Note that the system is solved in the normalized variables, as described in Appendix B. the growth rates of the original non-normalized variables can be recovered from those of the normalized variables by adding g_t.

that a variety other disturbances in the model have been held constant when computing these moments. We emphasize again that the focus of the calibration exercise in this section lies on explaining the dynamics that arise from commodity shocks alone. This is done to highlight our mechanism in light of the facts present in the data. In Appendix C we report the IRFs to all of the other shocks we have defined in the model. In order to systematically gauge what precise fraction of aggregate fluctuations in Argentina that can be explained by commodity price shocks, we move on to estimating the model in the next section.

Table 4: Model Moments Generated From Commodity Price Shocks

	ΔlnY_t^{GDP}	ΔlnC_t	ΔlnI_t	$\frac{TB_t^{Total}}{Y_t^{GDP}}$
Standard deviation	1.94%	3.13%	11.71%	6.14%
Persistence	0.54	0.08	-0.05	0.87
Correlation with ΔlnY_t^{GDP}	1	0.85	0.73	-0.68
Correlation with ΔlnC_t	0.85	1	0.98	-0.53
Correlation with ΔlnI_t	0.73	0.98	1	-0.42
Correlation with $\frac{TB_t^{Total}}{Y_t^{GDP}}$	-0.68	-0.53	-0.42	1

Notes: Theoretical moments implied by the model calibration. The variables correspond directly to the model concepts we define in Section 3.

5 Estimation: Assessing the Quantitative Contribution of Different Sources of Shocks in Emerging Economies

In this section, our goal is to carefully assess the quantitative contribution of different shocks to aggregate fluctuations in emerging economies for which commodity exports are potentially important. The idea is to take the model to Argentine data and structurally estimate it with the goal of running a "horse race" between the various shocks that possibly drive the business cycle. To this end, we maintain the calibration of most of the parameters (see Table 3), and estimate the stochastic processes of the exogenous disturbances defined

by equations (10) to (16). In addition, we also estimate one key parameter that is at the heart of our mechanism: ξ, which governs the sensitivity of the real interest rate spread to commodity prices. This allows the data to speak about the strength of this mechanism in our model structure. In carrying out the exercise, we give equal footing to all different shocks in the model, which represent the typical candidates that have previously been proposed in the literature.

5.1 Estimation Specification

Our methods are Bayesian. In particular, we define standard priors on the estimated parameters and run a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm to obtain draws from the marginal posterior distributions of the parameters.[17] We then recompute business cycle moments and carry out forecast error variance decomposition as well as historical variance decompositions of the observables at the estimated posterior modes. To estimate the model we add the following measurement equations

$$\Delta lnY_t^{GDP,obs} = lnY_t^{GDP} - lnY_{t-1}^{GDP} \quad (21)$$

$$\Delta lnC_t^{obs} = lnC_t - lnC_{t-1} \quad (22)$$

$$\Delta lnI_t^{obs} = lnI_t - lnI_{t-1} \quad (23)$$

$$TB^{Total,obs}/Y_t^{GDP,obs} = TB_t^{Total}/Y_t^{GDP}, \quad (24)$$

where $\Delta lnY_t^{GDP,obs}, \Delta lnC_t^{obs}, \Delta lnI_t^{obs} and \Delta TB^{Total,obs}$ correspond to the empirically observed time series which we analyzed in Section 2.[18] The variables on the right hands side of equations (21) to (24) are model concepts defined in Section 3.[19] As explained above, we keep the calibration for most of the parameters and estimate only the parameters governing

[17] We take 1 million draws. We discard the first 500,000 and keep the remaining ones for inference.

[18] Note that in principle we could add the commodity price series, which we have also used for parts of the calibration of the model, as an observable. However, since the Grilli and Yang (1988) index is not Argentina-specific, our preferred specification is to estimate the model without this observable and then compare the model-implied commodity price process with the empirically observed index. See the discussion further below.

[19] Note that while we solve the (linearized) model in variables that are normalized by X_{t-1} (see Appendix B), we here use growth rates in the original non-normalized variables. This is possible, as the implied nonstationary variables can be recomputed from the model solution.

the stochastic processes of all shocks as well as ξ. Table 5 summarizes the priors imposed on the parameters. As is standard for the estimation of DSGE models, we use beta priors on the persistence parameters and inverse-gamma priors on the standard deviations. The values parameters of the priors are the same as in Smets and Wouters (2007) and a number of related papers, except for the commodity price process. Since the latter is specified as an AR(2), we use priors that at the mode impose the same maximum root as for the other disturbances.[20] We set identical scale parameters on the standard deviation of the shocks to be remain relatively agnostic about the relative importance of the different shocks. Finally, we put a normal prior on ξ, which is centered around the smallest statistically significant regression estimate from Section 2.4, with the standard deviation equal to the standard error obtained from the regression.

Table 5: Estimated parameters

Parameter	**Prior**	**Mean**	**Std. dev.**
ξ	Normal	-0.199	0.045
$\rho_{\tilde{p}}^1$	Beta	0.8	0.2
$-\rho_{\tilde{p}}^2$	Beta	0.15	0.1
$\sigma_{\tilde{p}}$	Inverse-Gamma	0.05	2
ρ_i	Beta	0.5	0.2
σ_i	Inverse-Gamma	0.05	2
$i = a, \tilde{a}, g, s, \nu, \mu$			

5.2 Estimation Results

How large is the contribution of different structural shocks to the variation in output, consumption, investment and the trade balance in emerging economies? Table 6, Panel (a)

[20] $\rho_{\tilde{p}}^1 = 0.8$ and $\rho_{\tilde{p}}^2 = -0.15$ imply that the larger root of the process 0.5, which is the same for an AR(1) processes with $\rho = 0.5$.

shows the results of an (infinite horizon) forecast error variance decomposition based on the posterior estimates obtained from estimating our model on Argentine data 1900-2015.[21] For each of the variables used as observables, this gives the share of variation that can be explained by a particular shock. We begin by focusing on the commodity price shock, as this is the novelty we are aiming to bring in with respect to work that is in similar spirit to our analysis. As the table reveals, a sizable fraction of output (16.73%), consumption (21.08%) and investment growth (50.44%) can be explained by commodity prices. This confirms same of the intuition we derived from the calibration exercise and from the quantitatively large responses that were present in our SVAR analysis.

Table 6: Variance decomposition for baseline estimation

	Stationary technology	Nonstat. technology	Interest rate	Comm. price	Spending shock	Pref. Shock
			(a) Baseline sample from 1900-2015			
Output growth	51.66%	27.63%	3.97%	**16.73%**	0.00%	0.00%
Consumption growth	26.61%	16.02%	5.15%	**21.08%**	0.48%	30.67%
Investment growth	6.47%	5.89%	37.16%	**50.44%**	0.00%	0.00%
Trade balance	22.34%	7.19%	4.25%	**0.18%**	2.6%	63.26%
			(b) Shorter sample from 1950-2015			
Output growth	42.6%	28.14%	0.39%	**28.87%**	0.00%	0.00%
Consumption growth	27.67%	19.87%	0.74%	**35.29%**	0.37%	16.05%
Investment growth	7.77%	8.55%	10.91%	**72.77%**	0.00%	0.00%
Trade balance	53.41%	21.04%	0.13%	**0.88%**	3.91%	20.63%


Notes: Posterior forecast error variance decomposition of the observables used for estimation (at infinite horizon). Stationary technology is the sum of the contribution of a_t and $\tilde{a}_t$. These estimates are obtained from the baseline estimation specification explained in the text.

Turning to the other shocks, the table shows that our estimation attributes most of the variation in output growth (51.66%) to transitory technology shocks (the table reports the joint contribution of a_t and $\tilde{a}_t$). This finding is in line with García-Cicco et al. (2010). We do not, however, confirm their conclusion with respect to a very small contribution of shock to nonstationary technology à la Aguiar and Gopinath (2007). We find the

[21] Table 10 in the appendix reports the mean of the posterior estimates of the individual parameters.

contribution of these shocks to still be very sizable, explaining 27.63% of the variation in output growth in Argentina.[22] Preference shocks and interest shocks also play an important in understanding the business cycle. The former, affecting directly the intertemporal choices of the representative household, explains in particular consumption growth and the trade balance variation, while the later contributes substantially to variance in investment growth. The government spending (endowment) shock is generally found to be unimportant, which is also in line with the previous literature.

Figure 8: Estimated and actual process for commodity prices



Note: The blue solid line repeats the commodity price series from Figure 2. The dashed black line is the commodity price process $\tilde{p}_t$ that is implied by the posterior estimates of the parameters and shocks of the estimated model.

To shed further light on our findings with respect to commodity prices, in Figure 8 we plot two series. First, as the dashed black line, the model-implied commodity price process i.e. the time series of $\tilde{p}_t$ that is obtained from feeding the estimated shocks $\epsilon_t^{\tilde{p}}$ into equation (16),

[22] Interestingly, Akinci (2017) also finds both types of technology shocks to be important in the context of a model which features financial frictions and time-varying risk premia but does not have a role for commodity prices.


setting the parameters $\rho_{\tilde{p}}^1$ and $\rho_{\tilde{p}}^2$ to their estimated posterior mode. Second, as a solid blue line, the real commodity price index we have used for calibrating parts of the model above. Glancing at the figure, it can be seen that reassuringly the two time series broadly share common features, such as a similar volatility and often reasonably synchronized movements. While this is quite visible in the post-1950 period, it is less the case for the war and interwar period, where large level differences between the two price series are visible. We speculate that this may be due to different limitations of our analysis. For example, the wars may have been special periods which have produced swings in trade and commodity prices that were not connected in the way our theory would prescribe. Furthermore, we point out that the commodity price index by Grilli and Yang (1988) captures world commodity prices and not necessarily those commodity prices faced by Argentina. With financial integration, the global cross section of commodity prices has become more correlated over time and thus may render the index a concept that is more closely related to the actual commodity prices faced by Argentina in the later parts of the estimation sample. Given these concerns, we also re-estimated the model using the same data, but based on a shorter sample from 1950 to 2015. The results of the forecast error variance decomposition are shown in Table 6, Panel (b). In this sample, the quantitative contribution of commodity price shocks is estimated to be even larger. Commodity price shocks explain 28.87% of the variance in output growth, 35.9% in consumption growth and 72.77% in investment growth. The relative importance between the other shocks remains broadly similar in this sample.

In addition to the decomposition given in Table 6, which is a theoretical object computed at the posterior modes, it is also possible to construct a *historical* variance decomposition which breaks down the movements of a variable *at a given point in the actual data sample* into the contribution of the different shocks. Figure 9 presents such a historical decomposition for Argentine output growth from 1900 to 2015. The black line displays the actual time series of growth in real GDP per capita, which is used as one of the observables in the estimation. The colored bars represent the contribution of different shocks to the movements in the output time series at given points in time. Overall, the figure mirrors the insights from Table 6,

given that the orange and (dark) blue bars, i.e. commodity and technology shocks, capture most of the variation in output growth. Figure 9 in addition enables us to inspect particular episodes in the economic history of Argentina and interpret them through the lens of our model.

Taken together, our results suggest that commodity prices should feature prominently in the analysis of business cycles in emerging economies that are dependent on commodity exports. In terms of quantitative contribution they are among the three most important shocks in driving output growth in Argentina. Importantly, we believe that shocks to international commodity prices, in contrast to inherently very different concepts such as domestic TFP shocks, are something that may be easier to detect, and eventually act upon, by policy makers.

Figure 9: Historical Decomposition of Argentine Output Growth



Note: The black line displays the actual time series of growth in real GDP per capita, which is used as one of the observables in the estimation. The colored bars represent the contribution of different shocks to the movements in the output time series at this point. The estimates are obtained using the baseline estimation specification explained in the text. The contribution of initial values at the beginning of the sample is due to the fact that the data is not at the model-implied steady state values at the beginning of the sample.

6 Conclusion

This paper has sought to answer a classical question in international macroeconomics: what causes the large swings in economic activity in emerging markets? The literature is split on the answers. Aguiar and Gopinath (2007) have argued that the main source of fluctuations is nonstationary productivity shocks - the cycle is the trend. García-Cicco et al. (2010) refuted the argument, showing that these shocks only explain a negligible fraction

of fluctuations. They contended that the main drivers of shocks are stationary TFP shocks and exogenous shocks to the interest rate premium. The latter result is in line with earlier work by Guimaraes (2011) and Neumeyer and Perri (2005). The role of commodity prices and, more generally, terms of trade, however, has remained elusive in this debate. Empirical work by 2012 raised questions on the ability of commodity prices to account for critical features of business cycles in emerging economies.[23] We study the question anew, using a model that nests previous sources of shocks advanced in the literature. The model adds two elements absent from the previous analysis. First, it allows for a second sector to capture the separate role of commodities in the economy. Specifically, the analysis focuses on the case of a net commodity exporting country, facing exogenous price changes. Second, the model embeds a negative relation between the interest rate premium and commodity prices, which we show is consistent with the empirical evidence. Exogenous increases in commodity prices improve both the competitiveness of the economy and the economy's borrowing terms through the negative effect of higher prices on the spread between the country's borrowing rates and the world's interest rates. Both effects jointly result in strongly positive effects of commodity price movements on GDP, consumption and investment, and a negative effect on the total trade balance. They also generate excess volatility of consumption over output and a large volatility of investment. We estimate the model using data on Argentina from 1900 to 2015 to provide a quantitative evaluation of the various sources of shocks and their effect on macroeconomic aggregates over a long time horizon. Our estimate of the contribution of commodity price shocks to fluctuations in output growth of Argentina is in the order of 17%. Furthermore, commodity prices account for 21% and and 50% of the variation in consumption and investment growth, respectively. The contribution of these shocks is even bigger on a post-1950 data sample, accounting for 29% of the variance of output growth, 35%

[23]Schmitt-Grohe and Uribe (2012) and (2015) empirically estimate the impulse response function of GDP and consumption to commodity price shocks. They find that consumption responds negatively to commodity price increases, in sharp contrast to the positive response of GDP. Given the overall positive comovement between consumption and GDP in the data, their work bode negative prospects for commodity prices as main drivers of the cycle. Empirical results in Fernandez, Uribe and Schmidt-Grohe (2017), however, suggest that commodity prices could potentially account for a significant fraction of output finance, though their paper does not provide impulse response functions for the macroeconomic aggregates to shed light on the mechanisms or the comovements across variables.

of consumption and 72% of investment. We also find a role for non-stationary productivity shocks - much smaller than Aguiar and Gopinath (2007), though bigger than García-Cicco et al. (2010) - and a role for stationary productivity shocks, consistent with previous findings.

Though in this paper we do not address normative issues, to the extent that agents do not internalize the effect of their own borrowing on interest rate premia, the model naturally leads to over-borrowing, which exacerbates the rise and fall of the economy. The results offer hope. Insofar as part of the cycle can be accounted for observable variables (world commodity prices) that cannot be manipulated for political goals, contingent macroeconomic policies can be implemented to help mitigate the cycle. Given the nature of the driver, sovereign wealth funds offer a promising avenue for tackling volatility in commodity producing countries like Argentina.

References

Aguiar, M. and Gopinath, G. (2007). Emerging Market Business Cycles: The Cycle Is the Trend. *Journal of Political Economy*, 115:69–102.

Akinci, O. (2017). Financial frictions and macroeconomic fluctuations in emerging economies.

Bastourre, D., Carrera, J., Ibarlucia, J., and Sardi, M. (2012). Common drivers in emerging market spreads and commodity prices. Technical report, Working Paper, Central Bank of Argentina (BCRA).

Fernández, A., González, A., and Rodriguez, D. (2015). *Sharing a Ride on the Commodities Roller Coaster*. IDB Working Papers.

Ferreres, O. (2005). Dos siglos de economía argentina. *Fundación Norte y Sur*.

García-Cicco, J., Pancrazi, R., and Uribe, M. (2010). Real business cycles in emerging countries? *American Economic Review*, 100(5):2510–31.

Greenwood, J., Hercowitz, Z., and Huffman, G. (1988). Investment, capacity utilization, and the real business cycle. *American Economic Review*, 78(3):402–17.

Grilli, E. R. and Yang, M. C. (1988). Primary commodity prices, manufactured goods prices, and the terms of trade of developing countries: what the long run shows. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 2(1):1–47.

Guimaraes, B. (2011). Sovereign default: Which shocks matter? *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 14(4):553 – 576.

Lubik, T. A. (2007). Non-stationarity and instability in small open-economy models even when they are closed. *Economic Quarterly*, (Fall):393–412.

Neumeyer, P. A. and Perri, F. (2005). Business cycles in emerging economies: the role of interest rates. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 52(2):345–380.

Pfaffenzeller, S., Newbold, P., and Rayner, A. (2007). A short note on updating the grilli and yang commodity price index. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 21(1):151–163.

Schmitt-Grohe, S. and Uribe, M. (2003). Closing small open economy models. *Journal of International Economics*, 61(1):163 – 185.

Schmitt-Grohe, S. and Uribe, M. (2012). Open economy macroeconomics. *Manuscript, Columbia University*.

Schmitt-Grohe, S. and Uribe, M. (2015). How important are terms of trade shocks? Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Shousha, S. (2016). Macroeconomic effects of commodity booms and busts: The role of financial frictions. *Unpublished Manuscript*.

Sims, C. A. and Zha, T. (1999). Error bands for impulse responses. *Econometrica*, 67(5):1113–1155.

Smets, F. and Wouters, R. (2007). Shocks and frictions in us business cycles: A bayesian dsge approach. *American Economic Review*, 97(3):586–606.

Uribe, M. and Yue, V. (2006). Country spreads and emerging countries: Who drives whom? *Journal of International Economics*, 69(1):6–36.

A Additional Regression Results

Table 7: Additional Regression Results: Using the Lending Rate

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
LHS variable	Real spread (based on lending rate)				
Commodity price	-0.200***	-0.199***	-0.214***	-0.210***	-0.203***
	(0.049)	(0.045)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.050)
Output growth		-0.434**			-0.406
		(0.206)			(0.241)
Trade balance			-0.252		-0.164
			(0.224)		(0.385)
Debt-to-GDP ratio				-0.033	0.015
				(0.036)	(0.062)
Constant	0.023*	0.034**	0.024*	0.041*	0.026
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.024)	(0.034)
Observations	21	21	21	21	21
R-squared	0.462	0.568	0.497	0.485	0.573
Standard errors in parentheses					
*** p¡0.01, ** p¡0.05, * p¡0.1					

Table 8: Additional Regression Results: Using the Sending Rate

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
LHS variable	Real spread (based on savings rate)				
Commodity price	-0.131	-0.123	-0.174	-0.138	-0.188
	(0.111)	(0.113)	(0.117)	(0.116)	(0.119)
Output growth		-0.317			-0.259
		(0.426)			(0.427)
Trade balance			-0.526		-1.398
			(0.478)		(0.906)
Debt-to-GDP ratio				-0.020	0.154
				(0.075)	(0.139)
Constant	-0.113***	-0.107***	-0.106***	-0.102*	-0.176**
	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.050)	(0.075)
Observations	25	25	25	25	25
R-squared	0.057	0.080	0.106	0.060	0.183
Standard errors in parentheses					
*** p¡0.01, ** p¡0.05, * p¡0.1					

Table 9: Additional Regression Results: Using the Money Market Rate

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
LHS variable	Real spread (based on money market rate)				
Commodity price	-0.183	-0.165	-0.175	-0.162	-0.178
	(0.187)	(0.184)	(0.206)	(0.196)	(0.207)
Output growth		-0.941			-0.931
		(0.641)			(0.661)
Trade balance			0.088		-0.579
			(0.829)		(1.377)
Debt-to-GDP ratio				0.052	0.107
				(0.122)	(0.203)
Constant	0.031	0.044	0.030	0.003	-0.004
	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.042)	(0.078)	(0.102)
Observations	34	34	34	34	34
R-squared	0.029	0.092	0.029	0.035	0.101
Standard errors in parentheses					
*** p¡0.01, ** p¡0.05, * p¡0.1					

B Model Details

B.1 Optimality conditions

B.1.1 Firms

The first-order conditions for final goods producers with respect to K_t^1, N_t^1 and $\tilde{M}_t$ are

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_t^{k1} &= \alpha_K a_t (K_t^1)^{\alpha_K - 1} (\tilde{M}_t)^{\alpha_M} (X_t N_t^1)^{1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M} && (25)\\
w_t^1 &= (1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M) a_t (K_t^1)^{\alpha_K} (\tilde{M}_t)^{\alpha_M} (X_t N_t^1)^{-\alpha_K-\alpha_M} X_t && (26)\\
\tilde{p}_t &= \alpha_M a_t (K_t^1)^{\alpha_K} (\tilde{M}_t)^{\alpha_M - 1} (X_t N_t^1)^{1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M}. && (27)
\end{aligned}
$$

The first-order conditions for commodity producers with respect to K_t^1 and N_t^1 are

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_t^{k2} &= \tilde{\alpha_K} \tilde{p}_t \tilde{a}_t (K_t^2)^{\tilde{\alpha_K} - 1} (X_t N_t^2)^{1-\tilde{\alpha_K}} && (28)\\
w_t^2 &= (1-\tilde{\alpha_K}) \tilde{p}_t \tilde{a}_t (K_t^2)^{\tilde{\alpha_K}} (X_t N_t^2)^{-\tilde{\alpha_K}} X_t && (29)
\end{aligned}
$$

B.1.2 Representative Household

Setting up the dynamic Lagrangian

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \nu_t \beta^t \Bigg\{ & \frac{[C_t - \theta\omega^{-1} X_{t-1} (N_t^1)^{\omega} - \theta\tilde{\omega}^{-1} X_{t-1} (N_t^2)^{\tilde{\omega}}]^{1-\gamma} - 1}{1-\gamma} \\
& - X_{t-1}^{-\gamma} \lambda_t \Bigg[C_t + K_{t+1}^1 + K_{t+1}^2 + D_t + S_t + \frac{\phi}{2} \left(\frac{K_{t+1}}{K_t} - g \right)^2 \\
& - r_t^{k1}(K_t^1) - r_t^{k2}(K_t^2) - w_t^1 N_t^1 - w_t^2 N_t^2 - (1-\delta) K_t^1 - (1-\delta) K_t^2 - \frac{D_{t+1}}{1+r_t} \Bigg] \Bigg\},
\end{aligned} \tag{30}
$$

the first-order conditions with respect to C_t, N_t^1, N_t^2, D_{t+1}, K_{t+1}^1, and K_{t+1}^2 are derived as follows:

$$
[C_t - \theta\omega^{-1} X_{t-1} (N_t^1)^{\omega} - \theta\tilde{\omega}^{-1} X_{t-1} (N_t^2)^{\tilde{\omega}}]^{-\gamma} = \lambda_t X_{t-1}^{-\gamma} \tag{31}
$$

$$[C_t - \theta\omega^{-1}X_{t-1}(N_t^1)^{\omega} - \theta\tilde{\omega}^{-1}X_{t-1}(N_t^2)^{\tilde{\omega}}]^{-\gamma}\theta X_{t-1}(N_t^1)^{\omega-1} = \lambda_t X_{t-1}^{-\gamma} w_t^1 \tag{32}$$

$$[C_t - \theta\omega^{-1}X_{t-1}(N_t^1)^{\omega} - \theta\tilde{\omega}^{-1}X_{t-1}(N_t^2)^{\tilde{\omega}}]^{-\gamma}\theta X_{t-1}(N_t^2)^{\tilde{\omega}-1} = \lambda_t X_{t-1}^{-\gamma} w_t^2 \tag{33}$$

$$\nu_t\lambda_t X_{t-1}^{-\gamma} = \beta(1+r_t)X_t^{-\gamma}\mathbb{E}_t(\nu_{t+1}\lambda_{t+1}) \tag{34}$$

$$\begin{gathered}\nu_t\lambda_t X_{t-1}^{-\gamma}\left[1+\phi\left(\frac{K_{t+1}}{K_t}-g\right)\right] = \\ \beta X_t^{-\gamma}\mathbb{E}_t\left\{\nu_{t+1}\lambda_{t+1}\left[r_{t+1}^{k1}+1-\delta+\phi\left(\frac{K_{t+2}}{K_{t+1}}-g\right)\frac{K_{t+2}}{K_{t+1}}-\frac{\phi}{2}\left(\frac{K_{t+2}}{K_{t+1}}-g\right)^2\right]\right\}\end{gathered} \tag{35}$$

$$\begin{gathered}\nu_t\lambda_t X_{t-1}^{-\gamma}\left[1+\phi\left(\frac{K_{t+1}}{K_t}-g\right)\right] = \\ \beta X_t^{-\gamma}\mathbb{E}_t\left\{\nu_{t+1}\lambda_{t+1}\left[r_{t+1}^{k2}+1-\delta+\phi\left(\frac{K_{t+2}}{K_{t+1}}-g\right)\frac{K_{t+2}}{K_{t+1}}-\frac{\phi}{2}\left(\frac{K_{t+2}}{K_{t+1}}-g\right)^2\right]\right\}\end{gathered} \tag{36}$$

Note that equations (35) and (36) imply that the expected return on capital is equalized across the two sectors in the economy.

B.2 Stationary version of equilibrium

Imposing market clearing and denoting $c_t = \frac{C_t}{X_{t-1}}$, $k_t^1 = \frac{K_t^1}{X_{t-1}}$, $k_t^2 = \frac{K_t^2}{X_{t-1}}$ etc., and using the fact that $g_t = X_t/X_{t-1}$, the first-order conditions (31) to (36) can be rewritten in stationary form as:

$$[c_t - \theta\omega^{-1}(N_t^1)^{\omega} - \theta\tilde{\omega}^{-1}(N_t^2)^{\tilde{\omega}}]^{-\gamma} = \lambda_t \tag{37}$$

$$\begin{gathered}[c_t - \theta\omega^{-1}(N_t^1)^{\omega} - \theta\tilde{\omega}^{-1}(N_t^2)^{\tilde{\omega}}]^{-\gamma}\theta(N_t^1)^{\omega-1} \\ = \lambda_t g_t^{(1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M)}(1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M)a_t(k_t^1)^{\alpha_K}(\tilde{m}_t)^{\alpha_M}(N_t^1)^{-\alpha_K-\alpha_M}\end{gathered} \tag{38}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[C_t - \theta\omega^{-1}(N_t^1)^{\omega} - \theta\tilde{\omega}^{-1}(N_t^2)^{\tilde{\omega}}]^{-\gamma}\theta(N_t^2)^{\tilde{\omega}-1} \\
&\quad = \lambda_t g_t^{(1-\alpha\tilde{}_K)}(1-\alpha\tilde{}_K)\tilde{p}_t\tilde{a}_t(k_t^2)^{\alpha\tilde{}_K}(N_t^2)^{-\alpha\tilde{}_K}
\end{aligned} \tag{39}
$$

$$
\lambda_t = \beta(1+r_t)g_t^{-\gamma}\mathbb{E}_t\left(\frac{\nu_{t+1}}{\nu_t}\lambda_{t+1}\right) \tag{40}
$$

$$
\tilde{p}_t = \alpha_M g_t^{(1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M)} a_t (k_t^1)^{\alpha_K}(\tilde{m}_t)^{\alpha_M-1}(N_t^1)^{1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M} \tag{41}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\nu_t\lambda_t\left[1+\phi\left(\frac{k_{t+1}}{k_t}g_t - g\right)\right] = \\
&\beta g_t^{-\gamma}\mathbb{E}_t\Bigg\{\nu_{t+1}\lambda_{t+1}\Bigg[g_t^{1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M}\alpha_K a_{t+1}(k_{t+1}^1)^{\alpha_K-1}(\tilde{m}_{t+1})^{\alpha_M}(N_{t+1}^1)^{1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M} \\
&\qquad +1-\delta+\phi\left(\frac{k_{t+2}}{k_{t+1}}g_{t+1}-g\right)\frac{k_{t+2}}{k_{t+1}} - \frac{\phi}{2}\left(\frac{k_{t+2}}{k_{t+1}}g_{t+1}-g\right)^2\Bigg]\Bigg\}
\end{aligned} \tag{42}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\nu_t\lambda_t\left[1+\phi\left(\frac{k_{t+1}}{k_t}g_t - g\right)\right] = \\
&\beta g_t^{-\gamma}\mathbb{E}_t\Bigg\{\nu_{t+1}\lambda_{t+1}\Bigg[g_t^{1-\alpha\tilde{}_K}\alpha\tilde{}_K\tilde{p}_{t+1}\tilde{a}_{t+1}(k_{t+1}^2)^{\alpha\tilde{}_K-1}(N_{t+1}^2)^{1-\alpha\tilde{}_K} \\
&\qquad +1-\delta+\phi\left(\frac{k_{t+2}}{k_{t+1}}g_{t+1}-g\right)\frac{k_{t+2}}{k_{t+1}} - \frac{\phi}{2}\left(\frac{k_{t+2}}{k_{t+1}}g_{t+1}-g\right)^2\Bigg]\Bigg\}
\end{aligned} \tag{43}
$$

The remaining equations of the system that define the stationary equilibrium are given by the budget constraint (with factor prices eliminated), the production functions and the interest rate equation, all normalized in the same way, i.e. by

$$
c_t + k_{t+1}g_t + \tilde{p}_t\tilde{m}_t + d_t + s_t + \frac{\phi}{2}\left(\frac{k_{t+1}}{k_t}g_t - g\right)^2 = y_t + \tilde{p}_t\tilde{y}_t + (1-\delta)k_t + \frac{d_{t+1}}{1+r_t}g_t \tag{44}
$$

$$y_t = a_t(k_t^1)^{\alpha_K}(\tilde{m}_t)^{\alpha_M}(N_t^1)^{1-\alpha_K-\alpha_M} \tag{45}$$

$$\tilde{y}_t = \tilde{a}_t(k_t^2)^{\tilde{\alpha_K}}(N_t^2)^{1-\tilde{\alpha_K}} \tag{46}$$

$$r_t = r^* + \psi\left(e^{d_{t+1}-d^*} - 1\right) - \xi\left(log(\tilde{p}_t) - log(\tilde{p})\right) + \left(e^{\mu_t - 1} - 1\right) \tag{47}$$

and by the stochastic processes (10) to (16) in the body of the paper. The total trade balance and GDP of the economy can be calculated accordingly.

B.3 Steady state


To compute the steady state, we can proceed as follows:

1. Drop all time subscripts.
2. Steady state must fulfill $r = r^* = \frac{1}{\beta}g^{-\gamma} - 1$ and $d = d^*$ from (40) and (47).
3. Solve (43) for the steady state capital-labor ratio in the commodity sector as a function of primitives
4. Combine (37) and (38) through λ. Plug in the capital-labor ratio. It is possible to solve analytically for N^2 as a function of primitives. Using the capital-labor ratio, can solve for k^2.
5. Combine (37), (39), (41), and (42) to eliminate λ, k^1, $\tilde{m}$. Obtain an equation for N^1 as an implicit function of primitives. Solve this equation for N^1 *numerically*.
6. Use the equations combined in the previous step to solve for k^1 and $\tilde{m}$ given the solution for N^1.
7. Use the budget constraint to solve for c.


C Additional Model Results

Figure 10: Impulse response functions to different shocks


(a) Final goods sector productivity shock ϵ_t^a




(b) Commodity sector productivity shock $\epsilon_t^{\tilde{a}}$




(c) Growth shock ϵ_t^g




(d) Commodity price shock $\epsilon_t^{\tilde{p}}$




(e) Interest rate shock ϵ_t^{μ}



(f) Spending shock ϵ_t^s



(g) Preference shock ϵ_t^{ν}



Note: All shocks have been re-scaled to give the same maximum GDP growth response as the commodity price shock in the body of the paper.

Table 10: Posterior estimates of parameters

Parameter	Prior mean	Posterior mean	90% HPD interval	
ξ	0.199	0.2045	0.1405	0.2659
ρ_a	0.5	0.8744	0.8134	0.9376
$\rho_{\tilde{a}}$	0.5	0.5968	0.2932	0.9186
ρ_g	0.5	0.4796	0.3149	0.6426
ρ_ν	0.5	0.8549	0.7984	0.9142
ρ_s	0.5	0.7178	0.5968	0.8496
ρ_μ	0.5	0.7574	0.6667	0.8639
$\rho_{\tilde{p}}^1$	0.8	0.8116	0.6943	0.9336
$-\rho_{\tilde{p}}^2$	0.15	0.0967	0.01	0.1744
σ_a	0.1	0.0283	0.0229	0.0339
$\sigma_{\tilde{a}}$	0.1	0.0489	0.0239	0.0739
σ_g	0.1	0.0299	0.0216	0.0385
σ_ν	0.1	0.346	0.2797	0.4133
σ_s	0.1	0.189	0.1672	0.2103
σ_μ	0.1	0.0302	0.0223	0.0383
$\sigma_{\tilde{p}}$	0.1	0.1522	0.0837	0.2237