



Monetary Policy and Stock Market

Kian Tehranian

Department of Economics and Finance, Queen Mary University of London, UK

August 2020

Abstract

This paper assesses the link between central bank's policy rate, inflation rate and output gap through Taylor rule equation in both United States and United Kingdom from 1990 to 2020. Also, it analyses the relationship between monetary policy and asset price volatility using an augmented Taylor rule. According to the literature, there has been a discussion about the utility of using asset prices to evaluate central bank monetary policy decisions.

First, I derive the equation coefficients and examine the stability of the relationship over the shocking period. Test the model with actual data to see its robustness. I add asset price to the equation in the next step, and then test the relationship by Normality, Newey-West, and GMM estimator tests.

Lastly, I conduct comparison between USA and UK results to find out which country's policy decisions can be explained better through Taylor rule.

Keywords: Monetary Policy, Stock Market, Asset Price, Interest Rate, Output Gap, Inflation, Taylor Rule

Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 (424)-407-6624

E-mail address: tehraniank@g.ucla.edu

I would like to thank Professor Konstantinos Theodoridis for his most valuable comments and suggestions on this paper.



Introduction

There are two most commonly used tools for controlling economic activity, monetary and fiscal policy. Fiscal policy is determined by government and the aim is to control economic growth and inflation by adjusting the government tax rate and the government spending level. It does, however, affect the government budget and debt level. On the other hand, central bank is known as an independent national authority regulates banking, monetary policy, and financial services such as economic research. The central bank is owned by the government but independent from government finance department or ministry, and functions as a banker, advisor, and agent to the government. Throughout the economy, it plays a crucial role which directly and indirectly affects everyone in financial transactions. Its main objective is to stabilize the currency of the country, low unemployment rate and control inflation. The road between monetary policy and the stabilization operates in a number of ways. The six primary sources are Interest rate, exchange rate, equity, bank lending, wealth and balance sheet.

Some channels aim to have a greater economic influence. The channels will eventually work together, though. Monetary policy triggers changes in the interest rate, the exchange rate and the value of the financial assets, which then influence consumption expenditure, investment expenditure and net export, all resulting in changes in the gross domestic product (GDP) and other macroeconomic factors. Changes in GDP lead in changes in unemployment rates, price levels and inflation. A rise in GDP, for instance, lowers unemployment but raises inflation. A reduction in GDP is causing unemployment to increase and inflation to decrease. The most commonly used tool is the interest rate, which operates by increasing both consumption and investment expenditure. Lower interest rates usually contribute to higher investment and consumption expenditure.

In this paper I analyze the effectiveness of the Taylor rule, which is known as a tool to link the Central Bank's instrument (short-term nominal interest rate) to the inflation rate, output gap and asset price volatility in both the United States and the United Kingdom. From 1993 Taylor introduced the theory as a framework for evaluating monetary policy and behavior of central bank system. Ever since economists used the rule to analyze the decisions of policy makers. The popularity of the rule resets on some features.

First, it is straightforward as it ties the interest rate directly to economic conditions, as captured by inflation and output gap. There is, however, an implicit link in targeted rules where central banks seek to reduce deviations from a target. Plus, in comparison with inflation forecast targeting, it does not need a prediction model. Setting current inflation and output gap is sufficient.



In addition, the Taylor rule has defined the monetary policy actions with precision. For example, Gelach and Schnabel (1998) found that the Taylor rule in the 1990s defines average nominal short-term interest rates in the euro area with a coefficient of 0.5 on output gap and 1.5 on inflation. Ultimately, simplicity and performance in tracking nominal short-term interest rates and evaluating monetary policy decisions illustrate the major usage of Taylor rule by economists and private-sector analysts.

Taylor rule, on the other hand, has two key disadvantages from the prospective monetary authorities. There is small number of variables in the feedback list, so it is too limiting. Generally speaking, it is irrational for central banks not to use other information such as the exchange rate, other asset prices, credit aggregates, etc. in support of price stability. In addition, the methods may not be resilient to systemic shifts in the economy. The efficient coefficients would be complicated functions of the economic model's structural parameters and the desires of the policy maker. For example, changes in the structure of the economy generally lead to changes in the efficient coefficient. Central banks aren't willing to implement such a simple rule, according to the above reasons. Central banks need to be able to flexibly adjust policy in response to new data and economic structural changes.

But for three purposes, Simple Taylor rule, government guidance, may be helpful. Firstly, it can be used internally as a benchmark to test the decisions taken by policy makers based on different information presented. The existence of Taylor rule as a benchmark gives consistency to the workers at the central bank to justify their research deviates from the one indicated by benchmark. And policymakers use the Taylor rule to determine a potential interest rate range, but they are pragmatic in exercising their discretion and allowing the interest rate to deviate from the amount indicated by the rule. Secondly, the rule should be used as a simple mechanism to justify policy decisions for the general population, and the rule understood to the population should help to minimize confusion regarding future monetary policy and deter macroeconomic volatility.

As described above, the advantages of using the Taylor rule will depend on how effective the rule's ability to control inflation and output gap is in modifying the economy structure. Of example, if the policy deviates regularly and continuously from the benchmark and so the rule has to be updated frequently, thus the benefit of using benchmark would vanish.

Historical policy assessment has been seen as an attempt to clarify the relationship between policy decisions and economic outcomes, and thus to assess whether policy action was appropriate in terms of timing, magnitude and direction. Although the Taylor rule serves as a useful tool for interpreting past policy decisions and errors, adoption of the Taylor rule is not enough to avoid further policy errors.



The monetary policy aim of the central bank is both market stability and sustainable economic development. Recently, policymakers and academic economists have been attempting to resolve the issue of whether, in addition to price stabilization, central bank should still recognize asset price stability (Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan 1996). So, some are of the opinion that in their decisions central banks should consider volatility of asset prices, especially the stock market. One explanation for this is that solvency and liquidity issues may be triggered by significant and market-wide shifts in asset prices. For an example, the distribution of resources can be disordered if financial markets are reversely influenced by unpredictable price fluctuations. Another explanation may be that the high volatility in stock prices leaves investors unsure about potential profits, and therefore may induce an economic slump or even initiate one by itself. Because of the reverse trend in acquisitions and transactions (Hu (1995); Choudhry (2003)), companies and businesses may delay their ongoing consumer buying until the future seems to be more certain. Therefore, instability in the stock market will contribute to greater macroeconomic uncertainty in terms of output and volatility in inflation. Another purpose of this paper is to determine the impact of financial market uncertainty on central bank policy decisions by changing interest rates. Therefore, it is important to find acceptable participants of the stock market in the United States and the United Kingdom. Since the S&P500 and FTSE100 comprise the 500 and 100 biggest market capitalization companies in the US and UK respectively, they can be a fair indicator of asset price volatility.

Literature Review

Capistran (2008) reports that policymakers are more interested in high than low inflation. Branch (2014) indicates that higher inflation and output forecasts make policymakers more cautious, as well as demonstrating that uncertainty affects policy decisions, higher uncertainty leads to more passive monetary policy.

There is no consensus among economists on whether monetary policy and asset price are related or not. Economists give two replies. One party argues, Bernanke and Gertler (1999, 2001), the right monetary strategy is that it sets inflation rates regardless of whether or not asset prices are perceived. In other words, asset price volatility does not affect target inflation for the central bank. Yet another group, Cecchetti (1998), believes that information about asset prices can improve economic performance.

Bernanke and Gertler (1999) suggest that central bank would pay no heed to asset price inflation, because reasonable interest rates will stabilize asset prices. They also note (1999, 18) that stabilizing asset prices is troublesome because it is unclear whether a shift in asset values is triggered by fundamental factors, non-fundamental factors or both.

Bullard and Schaling (2002), use the macroeconomic model to evaluate the inflation, output and asset price targeting. They believe that a strategy that responds to asset prices can be detrimental because it can conflict with inflation minimization and fluctuations in output. It also claims that a strategy of managing asset prices will lead to more unpredictable fluctuations



than they happen, if asset prices were not taken into account. Targeting asset prices is weakening monetary policy efficiency and undoubtedly doing significant harm. Goodfriend (2003) had the same idea that the direction and size of the correlation between the volatility of asset prices and the short-term interest rate is not stable. Consequently, the correct course and scale of the interest rate relative to asset values is in fact challenging. Finally, Filardo (2000, 2001) concluded that if asset prices are high, monetary policy would respond to asset prices, otherwise it would be better to stay neutral. Filardo and Fair (2000) states that there is no evidence that by paying attention to asset prices through the macroeconomic model, Fed can boost economic stability. They demonstrate the adverse impacts of capital loss following a stock market collapse overshadow the Fed's positive consequences by reducing the interest rate after the crisis.

By comparison, Cecchetti (1998) says monetary policy should consider asset prices, as stated earlier. The explanation for this is that policy makers tend to trade off output variability for price volatility because it is difficult to keep them steady. Also, Cecchetti and Krause (2000) assess the relationship between considerable movement in financial structure of many regions and conclude the movements have caused the stability of economic development and low inflation. In 2003, he argues the policy reactions to stock price changes should be different according to its reason, for example growth in earnings and profits. Bernance and Gertler (2001 p. 257) believe that the shock cycle for non-fundamental asset markets is entirely different, although the equations are almost the same. As a result, policymakers know that the observable fluctuations are not due to underlying factors and can thus boost economic efficiency by reacting to shifts in market markets. Besides, Rigobon and Sack (2003) use the methodology of heteroscedasticity to analyze the response of monetary policy to stock markets. They claim that there is a clear response to changes in the stock market, with swings of 5 per cent in the S&P500 Index raising the possibility of 25 basis point tightening or easing by around half. They break down all daily and weekly fluctuations in interest rates and stock market values, thereby concluding that short-term stock market moves push interest rates in the same direction as stock price changes.

Data Set

The variables that need to be assessed in Taylor rule are real Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Consumer Price Index (CPI), Nominal Short-term Interest Rate and Stock Market Index.

Short term nominal interest rate is the expense of borrowing funds, usually calculated as the loan's annual amount. It's the premium banks spend for their short-term deposits. It is the principal instrument of the central bank to control the economy. Therefore, policy makers use various approaches to determine optimal interest levels according to the target level of the economy indicators. Basically, as the interest rate increases, so does the inflation and stock market.



Law leaders and analysts use Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to calculate the value of all domestically produced goods and services. GDP is essential, since it shows an economy's size and well-being. The rise in GDP should be seen as a good indicator of overall economic health. There are three main methods of calculating a country's GDP. They are both winding up with the same number of results.

This is the form of spending, which measures all the various forms of spending such as: consumption, investment, government expenditure and net exports.

Second method is Earnings. In this method all factors of payment should be added together. The factor contributions are made up of profits, labor returns and capital returns.

Lastly, the system of production, which measures the overall value of all manufactured products minus the value of intermediate goods.

The authorities mostly use CPI as an indicator of inflation rates. It essentially tests shift in the average market basket price index for households. Therefore, all the goods and services that people purchase will be in the market basket including food, accommodation, transportation, medical treatment, education, etc. The CPI Index is calculated by dividing market basket costs in a given year by market basket costs in the base year, and multiplying by 100. Therefore, inflation rate can be driven by the percentage change in CPI Index from base year to the given year.

The stock index is a stock market tracking index which is developed by individual stocks and allows investors to compare current prices with past values and quantify performance. There are plenty methods to calculate stock index.

Full form of market capitalization is the line up of the market capitalization of the company. In the United States the S&P500 index uses this method.

Another method is free float market capitalization, it excludes restricted shares by government, companies or employee stock options. The companies in the index are free floats based on their percentage of floats. Modified weighted capitalization also reduces the influence of large market capitalization companies. This method sets a limit on the weight of large stocks. NASDAQ 100 uses this method.

My evaluation period in this assessment is 1990: Q1 to 2020: Q1. The data sets are quarterly based (data tables are placed in the appendix).

However, I need to modify the simple data in order to use in Taylor rule equation.

Output Gap: The output gap estimation approach is to distinguish between the actual output and the pattern in which the output difference continues to revert. However, due to lack of availability of real-time data, I 'm following Linear Time Trend process.



I take the Real GDP Log and then regress it on a constant and linear time trend term with OLS estimator. Thus, the regression residuals multiplied by 100 percent, considered as output gap.

$$LGDP = \log(GDP)$$

$$Output_Gap = 100 * (lgdp - hptrend)$$

Inflation: The Consumer Price Index (CPI) was among the most widely used inflation indicators. CPI measures mainly the weighted average market basket of changes to consumer products. It can also be a relatively good indicator of inflation, since there is real time limit for inflation.

To normalize CPI, I take CPI Log, then subtract from previous year to derive year-to-year change amounts. In addition, each country has its own inflation target according to its policies, but the inflation target is assumed to be 2% in developed countries, especially the United States and the United Kingdom. Finally, I calculate the CPI change by 100 and deduct (2 per cent) from the inflation target.

$$LCPI = \log(CPI)$$

$$Inflation_Gap = 100 * (LCPI - LCPI(-4)) - 2\%$$

Stock market: There can be many stock market indicators to add in Taylor rule equation so as to examine the relationship between variables, such as Close price, P/E, P/B, EV/EBITDA, etc.

I considered Close Price on both FTSE100 and S&P500, which contains 100 and 500 large UK and US companies respectively. I assume closing price can be good indicator of the day and both Indexes are well diversified to consider as benchmark in the assessment.

So, after getting Log of each index, I subtract each period closing price from previous year, multiply by 100, to derive the % changed amount.

$$Asset = \log(s\&p500)$$

$$S = 100 * (Asset - Asset(-4))$$



Model

The original monetary policy rule of Taylor (1993) suggests that the central banks set a nominal short-term interest rate based on inflation rate adjustments and output gap. Therefore, forward-looking monetary policy guidelines linking the nominal interest rate to inflation and the output gap were more effective than the original backward-looking specification from Taylor (Orphanides 2003). A Taylor rule encompassing either current or forward-looking policy making is written as follows:

$$i(t) = \alpha + \beta(\pi(t) - \pi(t)^*) + \gamma(y(t) - y(t)^*) \quad (1)$$

In this equation, i is the Short-Term Nominal interest rate, π is the year-over-year inflation Rate, π^* is the Target Level of inflation (usually treated as a 2% constant in developed countries), y^* is the percentage Deviation of output from its long-run trend (the output gap), α is the error term. Based on Clarida, Gali, and Gertler (1998), I believe that the central bank gradually adjusts the actual interest rate.

This strategy raises several challenges. First, real-time realized inflation values are not available to policymakers, so policymakers are pressured to be reluctant to change real-time interest rates. In addition, the realized inflation values are the "effect" of the Fed 's policy, not the "cause". Hence, they may not be suitable in the reaction to interest rates. For example, assume that both output gap and inflation are close to target rates, but the Greenbook forecast shows that the current policy situation is that I expect inflation to rise up to 4% next year, while the policy goal is to sustain it at 2%. *Ceteris paribus* said that rising inflation expectations will lead the Central Bank (Federal Reserve, Bank of England) to raise interest rates now, leading to actual inflation nearly 2 per cent next year. The value of price stabilization for Fed has risen since 1980 based on Figure La, as well as Greenbook 's inflation forecast has generally been above realized inflation when the inflation rate is above its target. This example illustrates the possible factor of bias when the Taylor rule calculation uses realized inflation of 2 per cent.

In the past couple of decades, the dramatic rise of share prices in the United States and United Kingdom has drawn people to stock markets as an economic proxy, especially through recession and economic shocks. It has contributed to a discussion about the potential association between equity prices and the form of policy rule implied by Taylor's rule. Some claim that fluctuations in asset markets may add more details to the Taylor rule. The probability of the relationship between asset price volatility and the actions of policy makers can be tested by adding new terms to the equation of Simple Taylor rule:



$$i(t) = \alpha + \beta(\pi(t) - \pi(t)^*) + \gamma(y(t) - y(t)^*) + \sum_{k=1}^n \delta(k)S(t - k) + \varepsilon(t) \quad (2)$$


Large and well diversified Stock Market indexes can be considered as Benchmark in both USA and UK, S&P500 and FTSE100 respectively. In the new term $S(t-k)$ is year to year index change for stock market volatility, plus an error term, ε .

Result

USA Data Assessment

After explaining Taylor rule model, now I use data sets and apply Taylor rule equation (1) to assess the relationship between dependent variable (interest rate) and independent variables (inflation gap, output gap), then in the next stage add asset price volatility to the equation and examine the relationship.

Firstly, I plot the variables for USA data set as group to see any obvious relation:





The graph illustrates that inflation gap and output gap have similar behavior in the U.S., as well as experiencing a significant decline in 1991, 2001, 2008, which can be explained by the presence of economic shocks such as recession in 1991 and 2001, and the financial crisis in 2008. Such shocks ultimately lead to a sharp decline in the inflation gap and output gap that prompted policymakers (FED) intervention to dramatically lower interest rates. The interest rate (IT) however decreased dramatically in 1991, 2001, 2008 and then stabilized.

Then I estimate the Taylor series equation without considering stock market index to find out the relationship between dependent and independent variables (Table 1):

Dependent Variable: IT, Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1			
Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Prob
Inflation_Gap	0.9063	5.4191	0
OutPut_Gap	0.454512	2.5263	0.0129
C	2.451161	13.6914	0
R-squared	0.3098	Durbin-Watson stat	0.1478
Adjusted R-squared	0.2977		

The inflation coefficient is positive and significantly strong as expected which can explain the close association between inflation and interest rate.

An price rise of 1 percent corresponds to an interest rate rise of 0.91 per cent. In comparison, a unitary rise in the output gap increases the rate of interest by 0.45%.

In addition, I used R-squared to check the model, which calculates how close the data is to the fitted regression line, also known as the determination coefficient. I may note that the R2 shows that the model can explain about 31 per cent of the dependent variable variability. In fact, the F-statistic claims the difference between the mean of two population and is in favor of the model 's correctness, as its corresponding likelihood is smaller than 0.05. Lastly, the statistics for Durbin-Watson are around 0.05. This indicates that the specification can suffer from serial association, repetitive patterns.


Taylor (1993) suggest that the monetary policy should set both coefficients equal weight to 0.5. In order to test constraints on statistical parameters, I set a Wald test (Table 2):



Wald Test		
Null hypothesis: Coefficients are equally weighted		
Test Statistic	Value	Probability
F-statistic	3.1426	0.0469
Chi-square	6.2853	0.0432

In the Wald test the null hypothesis is equally weighted coefficients. Given that Chi-square's probability is smaller than 0.05, the Wald test is significant. So, in shaping monetary policy, I can reject the null hypothesis, and inflation and output gap weight differently.

Regarding the impression of the model, I want to see how it performs in predicting dependent variable variability. So, together with designed ones, I plot the actual values:





The model is the fitted value (green line). Fitted line underestimates the actual data (red line) from the beginning of 2003 and precisely matched the actual value from 2003 to 2009, while overestimating from 2006 onwards.

It may be perceived that the Taylor rule predicted lower interest rates before the break point and higher interest rates after the break.

I want to test the consistency of the link under investigation at the next point. More specifically it may be affected by the presence of certain shocks.

For instance, the recession at the beginning of 2003 and 2006 may had some consequences on the way in which the monetary authority shaped monetary policy. In order to disclose the presence of a structural break, I set up a Chow-Break test (Table 3):

Chow Breakpoint Test: 2006Q1, Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1			
Null Hypothesis: No break at specified breakpoint			
F-statistic	56.8077	Prob. F(3.111)	0.0000
Wald Statistic	170.4231	Prob. Chi-Square(3)	0.0000

or for 2006 (Table 4):

Chow Breakpoint Test: 2006Q1, Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1			
Null Hypothesis: No break at specified breakpoint			
F-statistic	30.3655	Prob. F(3.111)	0.0000
Wald Statistic	91.0965	Prob. Chi-Square(3)	0.0000

The null hypothesis for this test is No Break.

The null should be rejected, since the values are strongly significant. I would also assume that, in that period, some particular factors played a role in the way monetary policy was set.

According to the literature, by adding more information to the monetary authority, it is likely that asset price instability influences the monetary policy. In order to extract theory, stock market and interest-rate relationship can be investigated by adding additional term to the basic Taylor rule. To test the possibility, it is necessary to revisit equation to:



$$i(t) = \alpha + \beta(\pi(t) - \pi(t)^*) + \gamma(y(t) - y(t)^*) + \sum_{k=1}^n \delta(k)S(t - k) + \varepsilon(t)$$

In order to examine, I adopt a specific to general approach. I include lags, which particularly means delay, until they are not significant. So, start with one lag (Table 5):

Dependent Variable: IT, Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1			
Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Prob
C	2.3675	11.8876	0.0000
Inflation_Gap	0.8427	4.7943	0.0000
OtPut_Gap	0.4051	2.0023	0.0477
S(-1)	0.0117	0.9736	0.3323
R-squared	0.3035	Durbin-Watson stat	0.1417
Adjusted R-squared	0.2848		


I look at the adjusted R2 instead of focusing on the R2, since the latter is sensitive only to the inclusion of meaningful regressors. I may note that this marginally decreased from 0.30 to 0.28, indicating that the model may not help describe the volatility of the dependent variable.

With respect to the coefficient associated with S(-1), I may mention that the t-statistic associate is equal to 0.97, with a p-value of 0.33. That means I do not have any credible evidence that there is a strong relationship between asset price and interest rate. It is also sufficient to argue that uncertainty in asset prices (S&P500) is not adding more knowledge into the model.

Given the result, I do not re-estimate my model by including the second lag of S. Therefore, I can conclude that no lag should be included in the model.

A source of misspecification may come from the fact that the model does not satisfy the main assumptions of classical regression model. Specifically, it may suffer from heteroskedasticity and serial correlation of the residuals and at a small extent from normality of the residuals. So, I carry out some tests to check the model.

The first test is normality test:



In normality test Jararque Bera test the goodness of fit test through matching skewness and kurtosis with a normal distribution, and also it has the null of normally distribution in the residuals.

Jarque bera test reject the hypothesis of normality in the distribution of the residuals. Actually, I could reach the same result by looking at the graph reported along with statistic.

The second test is White test for heteroskedasticity (Table 6):

Heteroskedasticity Test: White			
Null hypothesis: Homoskedasticity			
Fstatistic	4.1786	Prob. F(9,107)	0.0001
Obs R-squared	30.4280	Prob Chi-Square(9)	0.0004

Homoskedasticity is where the variance of errors is constant. Homoskedasticity is the null hypothesis, and I can clearly reject the null hypothesis and thus the residuals are heteroskedastic. The volatility level cannot therefore be predicted for any period.

The third test is LM test for serial correlation (Table 7):



As I did not include any lags, I should put 0 to the number of lags.

Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test:			
Null hypothesis: No serial correlation at up to 1 lag			
F-statistic	650.9373	Prob. F(1,112)	0.0000
Obs*R-squared	99.8242	Prob Chi-square(1)	0.0000

I can strongly say I have enough evidence to refute the null hypothesis, No Serial Correlation. So, serial correlation problem exist which means the variables are not independent from one another.

I may conclude that the model suffers from both serial correlation and heteroskedasticity, mean the future observations are affected by past values and the volatility cannot be predicted!

I may overcome this problem by re-estimating the model using the Newey-West option to obtain robust standard errors by estimating covariance matrix of variables (Table 8):

Dependent variable: IT ,Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1			
HAC standard errors & covariance (Bartlett kernel, Newey-West fixed bandwidth=5.0000)			
Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Prob
C	2.3638	7.6767	0.0000
Inflation_Gap	0.8911	2.9363	0.0040
OutPut_Gap	0.3979	1.2832	0.2020
S	0.0120	0.5879	0.5577

I may conclude that after re-estimating the model by using robust standard errors, just inflation gap variable enters the model significantly.

Asset price volatility affects output gap. Therefore, there exists a problem of endogeneity, explanatory variable is correlated with the error term, that I need to address. I achieve so by



using a GMM estimator to apply an IV method, which blends independent variables with population-time information to determine dependent parameters (Table 9):

Dependent variable: IT ,Sample: 1991Q3 2020Q1			
Estimation Weighting Matrix: HAC (Bartlett Kernel, New-West fixed bandwidth=5.0000)			
Instrument Specification: Inflation_Gap(-1) Inflation_Gap(-2) OutPut_Gap(-1) OutPut_Gap(-2)			
Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Prob
C	2.8076	6.2563	0.0000
Inflation_Gap	0.8071	1.8996	0.0601
OutPut_Gap	0.9315	2.3857	0.0187
S	-0.0526	-1.7846	0.0770
J-statistic	3.6830	Prob (J-statistic)	0.055


The value associated with J-statistic is the value of the GMM objective function evaluated using an efficient GMM estimator, and so it supports the choice of the instruments, as the probability is higher than 0.05.

The S-related coefficient is therefore negative, and not statistically significant. It may be evidence that the volatility of asset prices is not influencing the interest rate.

Therefore, the key result is that adding equity prices to Taylor's rule equation does not strengthen the model to help justify the Fed Fund's rate decision, and by generating indeterminacy in reasonable assumptions it would hurt economic efficiency.

UK Data Assessment

In this stage I implement the same procedure for the UK data sets. after calculating each variable (output gap, inflation gap) for Taylor series equation, I plot the variables of interest between 1990Q1 and 2020Q1:



Inflation gap and output gap display similar behavior to that of the USA, and they have suffered a substantial downturn in 2008, which can be explained by the existence of a financial crisis. In fact, the financial downturn has led to a dramatic fall in inflation and has culminated in policymakers taking steps to dramatically lower the interest rate. Nevertheless, the interest rate (IT) plummeted sharply in 2008 and stabilized afterwards.

Then estimating the Taylor Series equation without considering Stock Market Index can reveal the relationship between dependent and independent variables (Table 10):



Dependent Variable: IT, Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1			
Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Prob
Inflation_Gap (%)	1.2564	6.7208	0
OutPut_Gap (%)	0.514578	2.270698	0.025
C	3.4587	14.123	0
R-squared (%)	0.2927	Durbin-Watson stat	0.0489
Adjusted R-squared (%)	0.2804		

As expected, the coefficient to inflation is positive and significantly strong which can explain the strong relationship between inflation and interest rate.

An inflation increase of 1%, results in an interest rate increase of 1.26%. In fact, a unitary rise in the output gap increases the interest rate by 0.51%.

Additionally, I used R-squared to test the formula, which calculates how close the data is to the fitted regression line, also known as the determination coefficient. R² shows that the model will describe the volatility of the dependent variable marginally lower (29 per cent) relative to the USA model (31 per cent).

In general, the F-statistic, the differential between mean of two population, is in favor of model validity, as the likelihood is smaller than 0.05. Eventually the figures for Durbin-Watson are about 0.05. This may be a sign of serial correlation, repeated patterns.


According to the simple Taylor (1993), monetary policy should set both coefficients equal weight to 0.5. In order to test constraints on statistical parameters a Wald test can be set (Table 11):

Wald Test		
Null hypothesis: Coefficients are equally weighted		
Test Statistic	Value	Probability
F-statistic	97.68412	0
Chi-square	195.3682	0



In the Wald test the null hypothesis is equally weighted coefficients. Given that Chi-square's probability is smaller than 0.05, the Wald test is significant. I can therefore reject the null hypothesis, coefficients are weighted equally, and thus inflation and output gap weight differently in monetary policy shaping.

Regarding the model impression, I want to see how it performs in predicting the variability of the interest rate. So, I plot the actual values along with fitted ones:



The model is the fitted value (green line). Unlike the USA model that fit the actual data closely, Fitted line is underestimated the actual data (red line) from the beginning, while it overestimates from 2006 onwards in UK.

It can be assumed, Taylor rule predicted lower interest rate before break point and higher interest rate after break point.

As I did for USA, I want to check the stability of the relationship under investigation. Particularly, the presence of some shocks may affect the way that policy makers set the interest rate.



For instance, the financial crisis at the beginning of 2006 may have had some consequences on the way in which the monetary authority shaped monetary policy. Chow-Break test can disclose the presence of structural break (Table 12):

Chow Breakpoint Test: 2006Q1, Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1			
Null Hypothesis: No break at specified breakpoint			
F-statistic	164.4359	Prob. F(3.111)	0.0000
Wald Statistic	493.3077	Prob. Chi-Square(3)	0.0000

The null hypothesis for this test is No Break.

The null is rejected due to significant values. I may also assume that, in that period, certain particular factors played a part in the way monetary policy was set.

Again, by adding more information to the monetary authority, it is possible that uncertainty in asset prices impacts monetary policy. I revise the equation to check the possibility:

$$i(t) = \alpha + \beta(\pi(t) - \pi(t)^*) + \gamma(y(t) - y(t)^*) + \sum_{k=1}^n \delta(k)S(t - k) + \varepsilon(t)$$

Specific to general approach indicates to include lags, until they are not significant. So, start with one lag (Table 13):



Dependent Variable: IT, Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1			
Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Prob
C	3.3671	13.3325	0.0000
Inflation_Gap	1.1247	5.3573	0.0000
OtPut_Gap	0.3883	1.6216	0.1077
S(-1)	0.0254	1.4373	0.1534
R-squared	0.2491	Durbin-Watson stat	0.0509
Adjusted R-squared	0.2290		

Like in the USA section, I look the adjusted R^2 . I may note that it decreased from 0.28 to 0.23, thus suggesting that the model is not explaining better the variability of the dependent variable through adding lags.


Since the coefficient associated to S(-1) is concerned, the associate t-statistic is equal to 1.44, with a p-value of 0.15. That means I do not have any meaningful evidence that there is a strong relationship between asset price and interest rate. This is also adequate to assert that the uncertainty of the asset price (FTSE100) does not carry further knowledge into the model, such as the USA test.

Given the result, I do not re-estimate the model by including the second lag of S. Hence, I may conclude that no lag should be included in the model.

This may be concluded that a cause of mis-specification arises from the fact that the model does not follow the core assumptions of the concept of classical regression. Specifically, it may suffer from residual heteroskedasticity and serial correlation, and to a small extent from residual normality. So, I do some testing again to check the model.



Normality test:



As Jarque Bera test is explained in USA section, Jarque bera test reject the hypothesis of normality in the distribution of the residuals because of 0.016 probability. Obviously, the result could be seen by the graph reported along with statistic.

The second test is White test for heteroskedasticity (Table 14):

Heteroskedasticity Test: White			
Null hypothesis: Homoskedasticity			
Fstatistic	4.2235	Prob. F(9,107)	0.0001
Obs R-squared	30.6689	Prob Chi-Square(9)	0.0003

The null hypothesis is Homoskedasticity, variance of errors is constant, so I can clearly reject the null hypothesis (0.00 Probability), and so the residuals are heteroskedastic. Thus, the level of volatility cannot be predicted over any period.

The last test is LM test for serial correlation (Table 15):

As I did not include any lags, I should put 0 to the number of lags like USA model:



Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test:			
Null hypothesis: No serial correlation at up to 1 lag			
F-statistic	1702.7310	Prob. F(1,112)	0.0000
Obs*R-squared	109.7791	Prob Chi-square(1)	0.0000

I may firmly state that I have ample proof to refute the null hypothesis, No Serial Correlation. There is also an issue with serial correlation which implies that the variables are not independent from each other.

I may infer that the model suffers from both serial correlation and heteroskedasticity, indicating that past values influence future findings and the volatility cannot be anticipated!

I may resolve this issue by re-estimating the model using the Newey-West option to get robust standard errors by estimating the covariance matrix of variables (Table 16):

Dependent variable: IT, Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1			
HAC standard errors & covariance (Bartlett kernel, Newey-West fixed bandwidth=5.0000)			
Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Prob
C	3.3837	6.8462	0.0000
Inflation_Gap	1.2281	3.9292	0.0002
OutPut_Gap	0.4645	1.7165	0.0888
S	0.0198	0.7831	0.4352

I may conclude that, after re-estimating the model with the use of robust standard errors, inflation gap and output gap variables significantly join the formula, unlike the USA, where only inflation gap substantially joins.

Volatility of asset prices influences output gap. And so, there is an endogeneity issue that needs to be discussed. I do so by using a GMM estimator to execute an IV method, which blends independent variables with data in population moment conditions to determine dependent parameters (Table 17):



Dependent variable: IT ,Sample: 1991Q3 2020Q1			
Estimation Weighting Matrix: HAC (Bartlett Kernel, New-West fixed bandwidth=5.0000)			
Instrument Specification: Inflation_Gap(-1) Inflation_Gap(-2) OutPut_Gap(-1) OutPut_Gap(-2)			
Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Prob
C	3.6271	6.6122	0.0000
Inflation_Gap	1.1325	2.4125	0.0175
OutPut_Gap	0.5798	1.5437	0.1255
S	-0.0165	-0.2898	0.7725
J-statistic	2.3971	Prob (J-statistic)	0.1216

The value associated with J-statistic is the value of the GMM objective function evaluated using an efficient GMM estimator, and so it supports the choice of the instruments (probability higher than 0.05) like USA.

Besides, asset price volatility does not affect the interest rate because the coefficient associated with S is negative and not significant.

Therefore, I achieve the same result that adding equity prices to the Taylor rule equation will not boost the model to better explain the policy rate decision, and even causing indeterminacy of rational expectations could harm economic performance.

Conclusion

The Taylor rule is a descriptive model of monetary policy on the central bank. Simplicity and transparency are the Taylor rule's most important feature. Also, it can be used not only to test the decisions made by monetary authorities, but also to minimize general population policy decisions confusion because of its simplicity. While interpretation of monetary policy has become a helpful method, it should not blindly obey simple policy rule. The number of variables in Taylor rule is limited and it does not prevent further policy errors. In addition, additional macroeconomic indicators could provide more information to optimize the model. For example, solvency and liquidity problem may arise by considerable changes in asset prices. So, considering asset price volatility can optimize the model.



This paper looks at the relationship between Taylor rule equation variables and asset price fluctuations in the USA and UK from Q1:1990 to Q1:2020. Economic uncertainty provides policy-makers with challenges. Given the statement, I begin with driving output gap, inflation, and stock market volatility, then calculate the equation of Taylor's rule to find out the coefficients and the robustness of the model. Since both output gap and inflation coefficients are significant, there is a strong relationship between dependent and independent variables such that independent variables with high precision can describe the interest rate adjustments (R-squared 30% USA, 28% UK). Then I check the stability of model in critical points, shocking period, through Chow-Break test. In the next stage, I add additional term to Taylor rule equation in order to assess the relationship between asset price, stock market index is used as diversified benchmark, and interest rate. First, I check the robustness of the model. As the asset price does not improve the model (R-squared 28% USA, 23% UK), different tests and procedures use to find the source of misspecification, such as Normality test, White test, re-estimation the model by Newey-West, and using GMM estimator. Ultimately, I come up with the conclusion that asset price volatility does not affect the interest rate and so including asset price would not optimize the model in both countries.

According to the literature analysis, there is no definitive response as to whether the central bank should or should not take on account assets. Some economists believe central bank should not pay attention to asset price, because the interest rate would stabilize the asset prices itself, also, the reason behind shift in asset prices is not clear, so stabilizing asset prices may lead to unpredictable volatility. The rest, however, are of the opinion that shock cycle is different for non-fundamental reasons. So, considering asset prices can boost the efficiency. Lastly, the economic data suggests that the policy rate is set primarily in reaction to difference in inflation and output gap.



Reference

Peersman, G. and Smets, F. (1999). The Taylor Rule: Useful Monetary Policy Benchmark for the Euro Area?. *International Finance*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd. pp 85-116.

Gerlach, S. and Schnabel, G. (1999). The Taylor Rule and Interest Rates in the EMU Area. *centre for Economic Policy Research*.

Schaling, E and Bullard. (2002). Why the Fed Should Ignore the Stock Market. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis*. pp 35-42

Jovanovic, M. and Zimmermann, T. (2008). Stock Market Uncertainty and Monetary Policy Reaction Functions of the Federal Reserve Bank. *Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft Leibniz Information Centre for Economics*.

Orphanides, A. (2002). Historical Monetary Policy Analysis and the Taylor Rule. *Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System*.

Woodford, M. (2001). The Taylor Rule and Optimal Monetary Policy. *The American economic review*. Vol 91, pp 232-237

Hayford, M. and Malliaris, A. (2004). Monetary Policy and the U.S. Stock Market. *Economic Inquiry*. Vol 42, pp 387-401

Kontonikas, A. Ioannidis, Ch. (2005). Should Monetary Policy Respond to Asset Price Misalignments?. *Department of Economics and Finance, Brunel University*.

Roskelley, K. (2016). Augmenting the Taylor rule: Monetary Policy and the Bond Market. *Economic Letters*.

Nikolsko-Rzhevskyy, A. (2011). Monetary Policy Estimation in Real Time: Forward-Looking Taylor Rules without Forward-Looking Data. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*. Vol 43. pp 871-897.

Levin, A., V. Wieland and J. Williams (1999), 'Robustness of Simple Monetary Policy Rules under Model Uncertainty', in J. Taylor, ed., *Monetary Policy Rules*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, forthcoming.

Borio, C., and Lowe, P. (2002). "Asset prices, Financial and Monetary Stability: Exploring the Nexus", BIS Working Paper, No. 114.



Bordo, M, and Jeanne, O. (2002). "Boom-Busts in Asset Prices, Economic Instability, and Monetary Policy", NBER Working Paper, No. 8966.

Adams, Ch. (2002). Financial Market Stability and Monetary Policy: Remarks on Stiglitz's Speech. *Blackwell Publishers Ltd: Pacific Economic Review*. pp 31-36

Monetary Policy Channels, AmosWEB Encyclonomic WEB*pedia, <http://www.AmosWEB.com>, AmosWEB LLC, 2000-2020. [Accessed: August 9, 2020]



Appendix

Data Table (1)

Variable Definition and Sample Statistics, USA

Federal Reserve Economic Data, Link: <https://fred.stlouisfed.org>

Frequency: Quarterly

Observation Data: 1990 Q1- 2020 Q1

Real GDP: Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars Quarterly, Seasonally Adjusted Annual Rate

CPI Index: CPI Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items in U.S. City Average, Index 1982-1984=100, Seasonally Adjusted

Interest Rate (IT): Effective Federal Funds Rate, Percent, Not Seasonally Adjusted

S&P500: Close price, 500 large US corporations, Quarterly adjusted

Observation Date	Real GDP	CPI Index	Interest Rate (IT)	S&P500 Index
1/1/90	9358.289	128.033	8.248	353.400
4/1/90	9392.251	129.300	8.239	339.940
7/1/90	9398.499	131.533	8.160	358.020
10/1/90	9312.937	133.767	7.743	306.050
1/1/91	9269.367	134.767	6.430	330.220
4/1/91	9341.642	135.567	5.864	375.220
7/1/91	9388.845	136.600	5.645	371.160
10/1/91	9421.565	137.733	4.818	387.860
1/1/92	9534.346	138.667	4.024	417.090
4/1/92	9637.732	139.733	3.774	403.690
7/1/92	9732.979	140.800	3.259	408.140
10/1/92	9834.510	142.033	3.035	417.800
1/1/93	9850.973	143.067	3.042	435.710
4/1/93	9908.347	144.100	2.997	451.670
7/1/93	9955.641	144.767	3.058	450.530
10/1/93	10091.049	145.967	2.988	458.930
1/1/94	10188.954	146.700	3.209	466.450



4/1/94	10327.019	147.533	3.938	445.770
7/1/94	10387.382	148.900	4.485	444.270
10/1/94	10506.372	149.767	5.168	462.690
1/1/95	10543.644	150.867	5.803	459.270
4/1/95	10575.100	152.100	6.019	500.710
7/1/95	10665.060	152.867	5.797	544.750
10/1/95	10737.478	153.700	5.719	584.410
1/1/96	10817.896	155.067	5.371	615.930
4/1/96	10998.322	156.400	5.244	645.500
7/1/96	11096.976	157.300	5.306	670.630
10/1/96	11212.205	158.667	5.281	687.310
1/1/97	11284.587	159.633	5.278	740.740
4/1/97	11472.137	160.000	5.522	757.120
7/1/97	11615.636	160.800	5.535	885.140
10/1/97	11715.393	161.667	5.507	947.280
1/1/98	11832.486	162.000	5.519	970.430
4/1/98	11942.032	162.533	5.497	1101.750
7/1/98	12091.614	163.367	5.532	1133.840
10/1/98	12287.000	164.133	4.861	1017.010
1/1/99	12403.293	164.733	4.735	1229.230
4/1/99	12498.694	165.967	4.748	1286.370
7/1/99	12662.385	167.200	5.096	1372.710
10/1/99	12877.593	168.433	5.304	1282.710
1/1/00	12924.179	170.100	5.678	1469.250
4/1/00	13160.842	171.433	6.272	1498.580
7/1/00	13178.419	173.000	6.519	1454.600
10/1/00	13260.506	174.233	6.475	1436.510
1/1/01	13222.690	175.900	5.597	1320.280
4/1/01	13299.984	177.133	4.327	1160.330
7/1/01	13244.784	177.633	3.502	1224.420



10/1/01	13280.859	177.500	2.130	1040.940
1/1/02	13397.002	178.067	1.733	1148.080
4/1/02	13478.152	179.467	1.752	1147.390
7/1/02	13538.072	180.433	1.741	989.810
10/1/02	13559.032	181.500	1.444	815.280
1/1/03	13634.253	183.367	1.250	879.820
4/1/03	13751.543	183.067	1.247	848.180
7/1/03	13985.073	184.433	1.017	974.500
10/1/03	14145.645	185.133	0.997	995.970
1/1/04	14221.147	186.700	1.002	1111.920
4/1/04	14329.523	188.167	1.011	1126.210
7/1/04	14464.984	189.367	1.431	1140.840
10/1/04	14609.876	191.400	1.950	1114.580
1/1/05	14771.602	192.367	2.469	1211.920
4/1/05	14839.782	193.667	2.942	1180.590
7/1/05	14972.054	196.600	3.460	1191.330
10/1/05	15066.597	198.433	3.978	1228.810
1/1/06	15267.026	199.467	4.454	1248.290
4/1/06	15302.705	201.267	4.908	1294.830
7/1/06	15326.368	203.167	5.245	1270.200
10/1/06	15456.928	202.333	5.243	1335.850
1/1/07	15493.328	204.317	5.255	1418.300
4/1/07	15582.085	206.631	5.252	1420.860
7/1/07	15666.738	207.939	5.074	1503.350
10/1/07	15761.967	210.490	4.496	1526.750
1/1/08	15671.383	212.770	3.181	1468.360
4/1/08	15752.308	215.538	2.085	1322.700
7/1/08	15667.032	218.861	1.941	1280.000
10/1/08	15328.027	213.849	0.505	1166.360
1/1/09	15155.940	212.378	0.184	903.250



4/1/09	15134.117	213.507	0.178	797.870
7/1/09	15189.222	215.344	0.154	919.320
10/1/09	15356.058	217.030	0.118	1057.080
1/1/10	15415.145	217.374	0.134	1115.100
4/1/10	15557.277	217.297	0.192	1169.430
7/1/10	15671.967	217.934	0.189	1030.710
10/1/10	15750.625	219.699	0.190	1141.200
1/1/11	15712.754	222.044	0.155	1257.640
4/1/11	15825.096	224.568	0.095	1325.830
7/1/11	15820.700	226.033	0.084	1320.640
10/1/11	16004.107	227.047	0.074	1131.420
1/1/12	16129.418	228.326	0.104	1257.610
4/1/12	16198.807	228.808	0.152	1408.470
7/1/12	16220.667	229.841	0.144	1362.160
10/1/12	16239.138	231.369	0.161	1440.670
1/1/13	16382.964	232.299	0.144	1426.190
4/1/13	16403.180	232.045	0.116	1569.190
7/1/13	16531.685	233.300	0.085	1606.280
10/1/13	16663.649	234.163	0.086	1681.550
1/1/14	16616.540	235.621	0.072	1848.360
4/1/14	16841.475	236.872	0.091	1872.340
7/1/14	17047.098	237.478	0.089	1960.230
10/1/14	17143.038	236.888	0.101	1972.290
1/1/15	17277.580	235.355	0.113	2058.900
4/1/15	17405.669	236.960	0.126	2067.890
7/1/15	17463.222	237.855	0.135	2063.110
10/1/15	17468.902	237.837	0.161	1920.030
1/1/16	17556.839	237.777	0.360	2043.940
4/1/16	17639.417	239.473	0.369	2059.740
7/1/16	17735.074	240.591	0.395	2098.860



10/1/16	17824.231	242.115	0.448	2168.270
1/1/17	17925.256	243.822	0.699	2238.830
4/1/17	18021.048	244.054	0.947	2362.720
7/1/17	18163.558	245.359	1.154	2423.410
10/1/17	18322.464	247.250	1.205	2519.360
1/1/18	18438.254	249.235	1.447	2673.610
4/1/18	18598.135	250.591	1.737	2640.870
7/1/18	18732.720	251.883	1.926	2718.370
10/1/18	18783.548	252.697	2.220	2913.980
1/1/19	18927.281	253.275	2.402	2506.850
4/1/19	19021.860	255.171	2.397	2834.400
7/1/19	19121.112	256.325	2.192	2941.760
10/1/19	19221.970	257.832	1.646	2976.740
1/1/20	18974.702	258.608	1.255	3230.780

Reference: Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Link: <https://fred.stlouisfed.org>



Data Table (2)

Variable Definition and Statistics, UK

Federal Reserve Economic Data, Link: <https://fred.stlouisfed.org>

Frequency: Quarterly

Observation Data: 1990 Q1- 2020 Q1

Real GDP: Millions of Chained 2010 National Currency, Seasonally Adjusted

CPI Index: CPI Index, Index 2015=100, Not Seasonally Adjusted

Interest Rate (IT): Bank of England Policy Rate in the United Kingdom, Percent per Annum, Not Seasonally Adjusted

FTSE100: Close price, 100 large UK corporations, Quarterly adjusted

Observation Date	Real GDP	CPI Index	Interest rate (IT)	FTSE100 Index
1990-01-01	266386.8	52.8000	14.88	2422.7
1990-04-01	267755.2	54.8667	14.88	2247.9
1990-07-01	264959.8	55.7000	14.88	2374.7
1990-10-01	264048.2	56.8667	13.88	1990.3
1991-01-01	263277.6	57.2333	13.05	2143.4
1991-04-01	262945.7	59.1333	11.55	2456.6
1991-07-01	262371.5	59.7667	10.71	2414.7
1991-10-01	262827.3	60.5333	10.38	2621.7
1992-01-01	262846.3	60.8000	10.38	2493.1
1992-04-01	262536.1	62.0667	10.05	2440.1
1992-07-01	264208.2	62.1333	9.55	2521.2
1992-10-01	266048.6	62.5333	7.21	2553
1993-01-01	267973.1	62.7000	5.88	2846.5
1993-04-01	269301.6	63.5333	5.88	2878.7
1993-07-01	271423.3	63.7000	5.88	2900
1993-10-01	273224.8	63.9333	5.55	3037.5
1994-01-01	276437.1	64.2000	5.21	3418.4
1994-04-01	279663.0	65.0333	5.13	3086.4



1994-07-01	282859.0	65.0000	5.30	2919.2
1994-10-01	284574.6	65.2667	5.80	3026.3
1995-01-01	285782.8	65.7333	6.46	3065.5
1995-04-01	286839.1	66.6333	6.63	3137.9
1995-07-01	289489.8	66.9000	6.63	3314.6
1995-10-01	289862.4	67.2333	6.55	3508.2
1996-01-01	292524.0	67.6667	6.07	3689.3
1996-04-01	293565.8	68.5333	5.86	3699.7
1996-07-01	296152.3	68.6667	5.69	3711
1996-10-01	298434.0	69.2333	5.94	3953.7
1997-01-01	302554.3	69.3000	5.94	4118.5
1997-04-01	305166.1	69.9333	6.23	4312.9
1997-07-01	307409.0	70.2667	6.92	4604.6
1997-10-01	311059.9	70.6333	7.17	5244.2
1998-01-01	313759.4	70.6000	7.25	5135.5
1998-04-01	316527.7	71.3667	7.33	5932.2
1998-07-01	318689.1	71.4333	7.50	5832.5
1998-10-01	321906.0	71.8333	6.75	5064.4
1999-01-01	323936.3	72.0000	5.67	5882.6
1999-04-01	324604.6	72.7000	5.17	6295.3
1999-07-01	330573.4	72.6000	5.08	6318.5
1999-10-01	335336.7	72.9333	5.42	6029.8
2000-01-01	337891.6	72.8000	5.92	6930.2
2000-04-01	339782.6	73.4667	6.00	6540.2
2000-07-01	340711.4	73.4667	6.00	6312.7
2000-10-01	341247.7	73.9333	6.00	6294.2
2001-01-01	346129.4	73.7000	5.83	6222.5
2001-04-01	349025.2	74.7667	5.33	5633.7
2001-07-01	351806.2	74.7667	5.00	5642.5
2001-10-01	353112.1	74.9333	4.17	4903.4



2002-01-01	354675.7	75.0000	4.00	5217.4
2002-04-01	356471.8	75.7333	4.00	5271.8
2002-07-01	359192.1	75.8000	4.00	4656.4
2002-10-01	362277.8	76.1667	4.00	3721.8
2003-01-01	364682.5	76.1333	3.83	3940.4
2003-04-01	368096.5	76.7667	3.75	3613.3
2003-07-01	371889.4	76.8000	3.50	4031.2
2003-10-01	375029.4	77.1667	3.67	4091.3
2004-01-01	377068.8	77.1667	3.92	4476.9
2004-04-01	378418.1	77.8000	4.25	4385.7
2004-07-01	379045.7	77.8333	4.67	4464.1
2004-10-01	380292.8	78.3333	4.75	4570.8
2005-01-01	383488.9	78.5333	4.75	4814.3
2005-04-01	388256.7	79.3000	4.75	4894.4
2005-07-01	392679.0	79.7000	4.58	5113.2
2005-10-01	398569.2	80.1000	4.50	5477.7
2006-01-01	400160.9	80.2000	4.50	5618.8
2006-04-01	401167.4	81.2333	4.50	5964.6
2006-07-01	401579.8	81.7333	4.67	5833.4
2006-10-01	403666.2	82.2667	4.92	5960.8
2007-01-01	407433.8	82.4333	5.25	6220.8
2007-04-01	409959.7	83.3000	5.42	6308
2007-07-01	413142.2	83.3333	5.75	6607.9
2007-10-01	415088.4	84.1333	5.67	6466.8
2008-01-01	417340.2	84.5333	5.33	6456.9
2008-04-01	415025.1	86.1000	5.00	5702.1
2008-07-01	408535.3	87.0667	5.00	5625.9
2008-10-01	400097.6	87.2333	3.17	4902.45
2009-01-01	393106.8	87.0333	1.00	4434.17
2009-04-01	392150.0	87.8333	0.50	3926.14



2009-07-01	392428.5	88.2000	0.50	4249.21
2009-10-01	393606.0	88.6333	0.50	5133.9
2010-01-01	396113.8	89.0667	0.50	5412.88
2010-04-01	400083.1	90.0667	0.50	5679.64
2010-07-01	402736.5	90.2667	0.50	4916.87
2010-10-01	402991.5	91.0667	0.50	5548.62
2011-01-01	405528.3	92.2333	0.50	5899.94
2011-04-01	405931.6	93.4333	0.50	5908.76
2011-07-01	407190.5	93.9667	0.50	5945.71
2011-10-01	407947.5	94.7333	0.50	5128.48
2012-01-01	410572.9	95.1000	0.50	5572.28
2012-04-01	410249.1	95.8000	0.50	5768.45
2012-07-01	415235.8	96.0667	0.50	5571.15
2012-10-01	414597.3	97.0333	0.50	5742.07
2013-01-01	417269.7	97.4333	0.50	5897.81
2013-04-01	419506.2	98.0667	0.50	6411.74
2013-07-01	423473.7	98.3667	0.50	6215.47
2013-10-01	425721.9	98.9333	0.50	6462.22
2014-01-01	428527.3	99.0333	0.50	6749.09
2014-04-01	431337.1	99.6667	0.50	6598.37
2014-07-01	433821.4	99.8333	0.50	6743.94
2014-10-01	436247.9	99.9667	0.50	6622.72
2015-01-01	438545.8	99.4333	0.50	6566.09
2015-04-01	441673.2	100.0333	0.50	6773.04
2015-07-01	443572.3	100.1667	0.50	6520.98
2015-10-01	446887.7	100.3333	0.50	6061.61
2016-01-01	447631.1	100.1333	0.50	6242.32
2016-04-01	450006.9	100.8000	0.50	6174.9
2016-07-01	452035.4	101.2000	0.33	6504.33
2016-10-01	454971.9	101.8667	0.25	6899.33



2017-01-01	457594.5	102.3000	0.25	7142.83
2017-04-01	458744.9	103.4000	0.25	7322.92
2017-07-01	460306.7	103.9333	0.25	7312.72
2017-10-01	462144.4	104.7000	0.5	7372.76
2018-01-01	462419.3	104.8333	0.5	7687.77
2018-04-01	464854.8	105.7667	0.5	7056.61
2018-07-01	467584.2	106.3333	0.5	7636.93
2018-10-01	468585.3	106.9000	0.75	7510.2
2019-01-01	471727.1	106.7333	0.75	6728.13
2019-04-01	470975.6	107.8000	0.75	7279.19
2019-07-01	473448.1	108.2333	0.75	7425.63
2019-10-01	473542.2	108.4333	0.75	7408.21
2020-01-01	464187.4	108.5000	0.25	7542.44

Reference: Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Link: <https://fred.stlouisfed.org>



The original E-views software tables are placed below:

Table 1:

Equation: UNTITLED Workfile: US DATA::Untitled\									
View	Proc	Object	Print	Name	Freeze	Estimate	Forecast	Stats	Resids
Dependent Variable: IT									
Method: Least Squares									
Date: 06/27/20 Time: 23:54									
Sample (adjusted): 1991Q1 2020Q1									
Included observations: 117 after adjustments									
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.					
INFLATION_GAP	0.906309	0.167241	5.419167	0.0000					
OUTPUT_GAP	0.454512	0.179912	2.526311	0.0129					
C	2.451161	0.179028	13.69148	0.0000					
R-squared	0.309850	Mean dependent var	2.712802						
Adjusted R-squared	0.297742	S.D. dependent var	2.195087						
S.E. of regression	1.839501	Akaike info criterion	4.082172						
Sum squared resid	385.7490	Schwarz criterion	4.152997						
Log likelihood	-235.8071	Hannan-Quinn criter.	4.110926						
F-statistic	25.59074	Durbin-Watson stat	0.147860						
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000								

Table 2:

Wald Test:
Equation: Untitled

Test Statistic	Value	df	Probability
F-statistic	3.142641	(2, 114)	0.0469
Chi-square	6.285282	2	0.0432

Null Hypothesis: C(1)=0.5, C(2)=0.5
Null Hypothesis Summary:

Normalized Restriction (= 0)	Value	Std. Err.
-0.5 + C(1)	0.406309	0.167241
-0.5 + C(2)	-0.045488	0.179912

Restrictions are linear in coefficients.



Table 3:

Chow Breakpoint Test: 2003Q1
Null Hypothesis: No breaks at specified breakpoints
Varying regressors: All equation variables
Equation Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1

F-statistic	56.80770	Prob. F(3,111)	0.0000
Log likelihood ratio	108.8485	Prob. Chi-Square(3)	0.0000
Wald Statistic	170.4231	Prob. Chi-Square(3)	0.0000

Table 4:

Chow Breakpoint Test: 2006Q1
Null Hypothesis: No breaks at specified breakpoints
Varying regressors: All equation variables
Equation Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1

F-statistic	30.36553	Prob. F(3,111)	0.0000
Log likelihood ratio	70.10822	Prob. Chi-Square(3)	0.0000
Wald Statistic	91.09659	Prob. Chi-Square(3)	0.0000

Table 5:

Dependent Variable: IT
Method: Least Squares
Date: 06/27/20 Time: 23:59
Sample (adjusted): 1991Q2 2020Q1
Included observations: 116 after adjustments

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	2.367577	0.199163	11.88765	0.0000
INFLATION_GAP	0.842709	0.175769	4.794399	0.0000
OUTPUT_GAP	0.405135	0.202327	2.002372	0.0477
S(-1)	0.011777	0.012095	0.973657	0.3323
R-squared	0.303549	Mean dependent var		2.680753
Adjusted R-squared	0.284894	S.D. dependent var		2.176944
S.E. of regression	1.840910	Akaike info criterion		4.092271
Sum squared resid	379.5623	Schwarz criterion		4.187223
Log likelihood	-233.3517	Hannan-Quinn criter.		4.130816
F-statistic	16.27178	Durbin-Watson stat		0.141748
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			



Table 6:

Heteroskedasticity Test: White
Null hypothesis: Homoskedasticity

F-statistic	4.178675	Prob. F(9,107)	0.0001
Obs*R-squared	30.42807	Prob. Chi-Square(9)	0.0004
Scaled explained SS	12.92883	Prob. Chi-Square(9)	0.1659

Test Equation:
Dependent Variable: RESID^2
Method: Least Squares
Date: 06/28/20 Time: 00:01
Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1
Included observations: 117

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	1.753718	0.468123	3.746273	0.0003
INFLATION_GAP^2	0.374279	0.154020	2.430060	0.0168
INFLATION_GAP*OUTPUT_G	0.424007	0.302290	1.402651	0.1636
INFLATION_GAP*S	-0.018188	0.020669	-0.880009	0.3808
INFLATION_GAP	0.421128	0.308246	1.366206	0.1747
OUTPUT_GAP^2	-0.487184	0.304197	-1.601540	0.1122
OUTPUT_GAP*S	-0.012456	0.026531	-0.469492	0.6397
OUTPUT_GAP	-0.097270	0.496563	-0.195886	0.8451
S^2	0.003006	0.001030	2.916840	0.0043
S	0.061139	0.032539	1.878931	0.0630

R-squared	0.260069	Mean dependent var	3.263773
Adjusted R-squared	0.197832	S.D. dependent var	3.128591
S.E. of regression	2.802086	Akaike info criterion	4.980201
Sum squared resid	840.1305	Schwarz criterion	5.216284
Log likelihood	-281.3417	Hannan-Quinn criter.	5.076047
F-statistic	4.178675	Durbin-Watson stat	0.629901
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000121		

Table 7:

Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test:
Null hypothesis: No serial correlation at up to 1 lag

F-statistic	650.9373	Prob. F(1,112)	0.0000
Obs*R-squared	99.82428	Prob. Chi-Square(1)	0.0000



Table 8:

Dependent Variable: IT
Method: Least Squares
Date: 06/28/20 Time: 00:02
Sample (adjusted): 1991Q1 2020Q1
Included observations: 117 after adjustments
HAC standard errors & covariance (Bartlett kernel, Newey-West fixed bandwidth = 5.0000)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
INFLATION_GAP	0.891138	0.303483	2.936369	0.0040
OUTPUT_GAP	0.397858	0.310041	1.283241	0.2020
S	0.011997	0.020404	0.587946	0.5577
C	2.363806	0.307917	7.676756	0.0000

R-squared	0.316805	Mean dependent var	2.712802
Adjusted R-squared	0.298667	S.D. dependent var	2.195087
S.E. of regression	1.838289	Akaike info criterion	4.089137
Sum squared resid	381.8614	Schwarz criterion	4.183570
Log likelihood	-235.2145	Hannan-Quinn criter.	4.127476
F-statistic	17.46647	Durbin-Watson stat	0.153153
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000	Wald F-statistic	6.804897
Prob(Wald F-statistic)	0.000294		

Table 9:

Dependent Variable: IT
Method: Generalized Method of Moments
Date: 06/28/20 Time: 00:04
Sample (adjusted): 1991Q3 2020Q1
Included observations: 115 after adjustments
Linear estimation with 1 weight update
Estimation weighting matrix: HAC (Bartlett kernel, Newey-West fixed bandwidth = 5.0000)
Standard errors & covariance computed using HAC weighting matrix (Bartlett kernel, Newey-West fixed bandwidth = 5.0000)
Instrument specification: INFLATION_GAP(-1) INFLATION_GAP(-2)
OUTPUT_GAP(-1) OUTPUT_GAP(-2)
Constant added to instrument list

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	2.807578	0.448755	6.256373	0.0000
INFLATION_GAP	0.807066	0.424851	1.899645	0.0601
OUTPUT_GAP	0.931545	0.390469	2.385709	0.0187
S	-0.052630	0.029490	-1.784675	0.0770

R-squared	0.075589	Mean dependent var	2.653072
Adjusted R-squared	0.050605	S.D. dependent var	2.165870
S.E. of regression	2.110358	Sum squared resid	494.3506
Durbin-Watson stat	0.193156	J-statistic	3.683003
Instrument rank	5	Prob(J-statistic)	0.054970



Table 10:

Equation: UNTITLED Workfile: UK DATA::Untitled\									
View	Proc	Object	Print	Name	Freeze	Estimate	Forecast	Stats	Resids
Dependent Variable: IT									
Method: Least Squares									
Date: 06/27/20 Time: 22:57									
Sample (adjusted): 1991Q1 2020Q1									
Included observations: 117 after adjustments									
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.					
C	3.458729	0.244900	14.12302	0.0000					
INFLATION_GAP	1.256408	0.186942	6.720847	0.0000					
OUTPUT_GAP	0.514578	0.226617	2.270698	0.0250					
R-squared	0.292768	Mean dependent var		3.819715					
Adjusted R-squared	0.280361	S.D. dependent var		3.033076					
S.E. of regression	2.573006	Akaike info criterion		4.753333					
Sum squared resid	754.7208	Schwarz criterion		4.824158					
Log likelihood	-275.0700	Hannan-Quinn criter.		4.782087					
F-statistic	23.59592	Durbin-Watson stat		0.048907					
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000								

Table 11:

Equation: UNTITLED Workfile: UK DATA::Untitled\									
View	Proc	Object	Print	Name	Freeze	Estimate	Forecast	Stats	Resids
Wald Test:				Equation: Untitled					
Test Statistic	Value	df	Probability						
F-statistic	97.68412	(2, 114)	0.0000						
Chi-square	195.3682	2	0.0000						
Null Hypothesis: C(1)=0.5, C(2)=0.5				Null Hypothesis Summary:					
Normalized Restriction (= 0)	Value	Std. Err.							
-0.5 + C(1)	2.958729	0.244900							
-0.5 + C(2)	0.756408	0.186942							
Restrictions are linear in coefficients.									



Table 12:

Equation: UNTITLED Workfile: UK DATA:Untitled\			
View	Proc	Object	Print Name Freeze Estimate Forecast Stats Resids
Chow Breakpoint Test: 2006Q1			
Null Hypothesis: No breaks at specified breakpoints			
Varying regressors: All equation variables			
Equation Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1			
F-statistic	164.4359	Prob. F(3,111)	0.0000
Log likelihood ratio	198.2627	Prob. Chi-Square(3)	0.0000
Wald Statistic	493.3077	Prob. Chi-Square(3)	0.0000

Table 13:

Equation: UNTITLED Workfile: UK DATA:Untitled\				
View	Proc	Object	Print Name Freeze Estimate Forecast Stats Resids	
Dependent Variable: IT				
Method: Least Squares				
Date: 06/27/20 Time: 23:11				
Sample (adjusted): 1991Q2 2020Q1				
Included observations: 116 after adjustments				
Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	3.367140	0.252551	13.33250	0.0000
INFLATION_GAP	1.124711	0.209939	5.357315	0.0000
OUTPUT_GAP	0.388349	0.239484	1.621609	0.1077
S(-1)	0.025447	0.017705	1.437320	0.1534
R-squared	0.249156	Mean dependent var	3.740172	
Adjusted R-squared	0.229044	S.D. dependent var	2.921103	
S.E. of regression	2.564849	Akaike info criterion	4.755550	
Sum squared resid	736.7863	Schwarz criterion	4.850502	
Log likelihood	-271.8219	Hannan-Quinn criter.	4.794095	
F-statistic	12.38848	Durbin-Watson stat	0.050940	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000			



Table 14:

Heteroskedasticity Test: White
Null hypothesis: Homoskedasticity

F-statistic	4.223505	Prob. F(9,107)	0.0001
Obs*R-squared	30.66894	Prob. Chi-Square(9)	0.0003
Scaled explained SS	12.41353	Prob. Chi-Square(9)	0.1910

Test Equation:
Dependent Variable: RESID^2
Method: Least Squares
Date: 06/19/20 Time: 16:14
Sample: 1991Q1 2020Q1
Included observations: 117

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	7.531529	0.734899	10.24839	0.0000
INFLATION_GAP^2	-0.632160	0.165757	-3.813766	0.0002
INFLATION_GAP*OUTPUT_G	-97.39981	58.53852	-1.663858	0.0991
INFLATION_GAP*S	-0.040076	0.032041	-1.250785	0.2137
INFLATION_GAP	2.570281	0.701180	3.665652	0.0004
OUTPUT_GAP^2	-6222.799	2512.197	-2.477034	0.0148
OUTPUT_GAP*S	-2.273958	3.471984	-0.654945	0.5139
OUTPUT_GAP	-67.23506	56.31372	-1.193937	0.2351
S^2	-0.001182	0.001990	-0.594193	0.5536
S	0.013412	0.042030	0.319107	0.7503

R-squared	0.262128	Mean dependent var	6.373442
Adjusted R-squared	0.200064	S.D. dependent var	5.962916
S.E. of regression	5.333182	Akaike info criterion	6.267368
Sum squared resid	3043.382	Schwarz criterion	6.503451
Log likelihood	-356.6410	Hannan-Quinn criter.	6.363215
F-statistic	4.223505	Durbin-Watson stat	0.464714
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000107		

Table 15:

Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test:
Null hypothesis: No serial correlation at up to 1 lag

F-statistic	1702.731	Prob. F(1,112)	0.0000
Obs*R-squared	109.7791	Prob. Chi-Square(1)	0.0000



Table 16:

Dependent Variable: IT
Method: Least Squares
Date: 06/27/20 Time: 23:20
Sample (adjusted): 1991Q1 2020Q1
Included observations: 117 after adjustments
HAC standard errors & covariance (Bartlett kernel, Newey-West fixed bandwidth = 5.0000)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
INFLATION_GAP	1.228155	0.313283	3.920280	0.0002
OUTPUT_GAP	0.464534	0.270615	1.716588	0.0888
S	0.019845	0.025339	0.783168	0.4352
C	3.383682	0.494236	6.846295	0.0000
R-squared	0.301228	Mean dependent var	3.819715	
Adjusted R-squared	0.282677	S.D. dependent var	3.033076	
S.E. of regression	2.568862	Akaike info criterion	4.758393	
Sum squared resid	745.6927	Schwarz criterion	4.852826	
Log likelihood	-274.3660	Hannan-Quinn criter.	4.796732	
F-statistic	16.23744	Durbin-Watson stat	0.057072	
Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000	Wald F-statistic	10.28791	
Prob(Wald F-statistic)	0.000005			

Table 17:

Dependent Variable: IT
Method: Generalized Method of Moments
Date: 06/27/20 Time: 23:24
Sample (adjusted): 1991Q3 2020Q1
Included observations: 115 after adjustments
Linear estimation with 1 weight update
Estimation weighting matrix: HAC (Bartlett kernel, Newey-West fixed bandwidth = 5.0000)
Standard errors & covariance computed using HAC weighting matrix (Bartlett kernel, Newey-West fixed bandwidth = 5.0000)
Instrument specification: INFLATION_GAP(-1) INFLATION_GAP(-2) OUTPUT_GAP(-1) OUTPUT_GAP(-2)
Constant added to instrument list

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	3.627182	0.548552	6.612279	0.0000
INFLATION_GAP	1.132567	0.469443	2.412578	0.0175
OUTPUT_GAP	0.579766	0.375568	1.543707	0.1255
S	-0.016528	0.057025	-0.289837	0.7725
R-squared	0.160891	Mean dependent var	3.672290	
Adjusted R-squared	0.138213	S.D. dependent var	2.840506	
S.E. of regression	2.636913	Sum squared resid	771.8172	
Durbin-Watson stat	0.046020	J-statistic	2.397154	
Instrument rank	5	Prob(J-statistic)	0.121556	