Capital Controls as an Alternative to Credit Policy in a Small Open Economy[*]

Shigeto Kitano[†]   Kenya Takaku[‡]

Abstract

We develop a sticky price, small open economy model with financial frictions à la Gertler and Karadi (2011), in combination with liability dollarization. An agency problem between domestic financial intermediaries and foreign investors of emerging economies introduces financial frictions in the form of time-varying endogenous balance sheet constraints on the domestic financial intermediaries. We consider a shock that tightens the balance sheet constraint and show that capital controls, the possibility of which is rigorously examined as a policy tool for the emerging economies, can be an alternative to credit policy employed by advanced economy central banks in mitigating the negative shock.

Keywords: capital control; credit policy; balance sheets; small open economy; nominal rigidities; New Keynesian; DSGE; financial intermediaries; financial frictions; crisis.
JEL Classification: E44, E58, F32, F38, F41.

1 Introduction

The low interest rates in developed countries after the recent financial crisis caused a surge in capital inflows into emerging economies. The ensuing normalization of US monetary policy now causes a serious concern for capital outflows from emerging economies. Recent volatile international capital movements in emerging economies have been the subject of rigorous discussion among concerned policymakers and economists (e.g., G20 summit in February in 2016). An increasing number of policymakers think that capital controls can be an effective instrument to stabilize economies against volatile capital flows. In fact, some emerging countries (Brazil, Taiwan, South Korea, and Thailand) have recently responded to instability by imposing capital controls. Even the IMF, a former critic of capital controls, reconsiders such measures as a possible suitable policy response to volatile capital flows under certain circumstances.[1]

Against this background, a rapidly growing body of literature related to capital controls has emerged.[2] A strand of the literature focuses on pecuniary externalities associated with financial crises and provides a rationale for prudential capital controls to prevent excessive borrowing (e.g., Jeanne and Korinek (2010), Bianchi (2011), Jeanne et al. (2012), and Brunnermeier and Sannikov (2015)). Another strand studies the possibilities of capital controls in the presence of nominal rigidities. Developing a disequilibrium model featuring a downward rigid wage and an

---

[1]For details, see Ostry et al. (2010) and Ostry et al. (2012).

[2]Capital controls are not a new policy instrument. Already before the recent financial crisis, capital controls have been widely discussed both theoretically and empirically. Theoretical analyses on capital controls have been mainly related to the issue of currency crises. Empirical analyses of capital controls have been conducted mainly to test if the presence of capital account liberalization (or capital controls) is correlated with higher economic growth. For the earlier literature on capital controls, see Kitano (2011).

exchange rate peg, Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2016) show that capital controls reduce unemployment and can be an effective instrument for macroeconomic stabilization. Farhi and Werning (2012) show that under the peg, capital controls are effective for addressing some shocks, particularly, country-specific risk-premium shocks. They also show that even if the exchange rate is not fixed, capital controls may be optimal if wages and prices are sticky.

More possibilities of capital controls as a policy tool have been rigorously examined from a broader perspective. Among many studies, De Paoli and Lipinska (2013) examine capital controls as a tool to manage terms of trade. They show that although capital controls limit international risk sharing, individual countries can benefit from using them to manage exchange rate fluctuations. Their findings suggest a possibility of welfare gains from international policy coordination. Davis and Presno (2014) examine welfare gains from capital controls as an additional tool for macroeconomic stabilization under flexible exchange rates. They show that the benefits of capital controls are present even when an optimal monetary policy is employed. Chang et al. (2015) and Liu and Spiegel (2015) examine the effectiveness and welfare implications of capital controls and sterilization in a small open economy with imperfect international asset substitutability. They show that capital controls and sterilization are complementary policies. Agénor and Jia (2015) focus on the relationship between countercyclical capital controls and reserve requirement rules on cross-border bank borrowing.[3]

As is well known, advanced economies have employed credit policy in response

---

[3]Kitano and Takaku (2015) compare the welfare implications of an optimal monetary policy under flexible exchange rates and an optimal capital control policy under fixed exchange rates. They show that in an economy without the financial accelerator, an optimal monetary policy under flexible exchange rates is superior to an optimal capital control policy under fixed exchange rates and vice versa in an economy with the financial accelerator.

to the recent crisis. Against this background, there has emerged a rapidly growing body of literature related to credit policy (e.g., Gertler and Karadi (2011), Gertler and Kiyotaki (2010), and Gertler et al. (2012)). However, with a few exceptions, credit policy in emerging economies have not been examined as extensively as those in advanced economies.[4] This is probably expected because the use of credit policy in emerging economies has been rare. According to Ishi et al. (2009), only one country employed the credit policy during the crisis period (from September 2008 to June 2009).[5] As for the reason why emerging economies barely used the credit policy, Ishi et al. (2009) argue as follows: "The unpleasant history of emerging economies with quasi-fiscal activities may also help explain their limited use of unconventional, especially credit easing, measures. During the 1970s and 1980s, central banks, in particular those of emerging economies, undertook a variety of quasi-fiscal roles, including implementing direct credit policies.... These roles were seen as compromising central bank independence and monetary policy objectives (page 15)." Another reason why emerging economies barely used the credit policy may come from their economic structures as argued by Aoki (2011): "...those countries tend to have less-developed domestic financial markets. Markets for securities and corporate bonds are much smaller. Then there may be no scope for credit easing (page 119)."

Our paper belongs to a growing literature that examines a greater possibility of capital controls as a policy tool. We examine whether capital controls, which are getting more prevalent among policy makers, can mitigate a crisis shock and

---

[4]Notable exceptions are Garcia-Cicco (2011) and Chang and Velasco (2016).

[5]The bank of Korea purchased corporate debt and commercial paper. In November 2008, the central bank announced that it would provide up to $ 3.3 billion to a bond fund to purchase commercial papers.

play the same role as credit policy which is employed in advanced economies but unpopular in emerging economies as documented above. To this aim, we develop a sticky price, small open economy model with financial frictions à la Gertler and Karadi (2011), in combination with liability dollarization. Financial intermediaries transfer funds collected from foreign investors to non-financial firms. Owing to an agency problem between intermediaries and foreign investors that limits the ability of intermediaries to raise funds from foreign investors, financial intermediaries are subject to endogenously determined constraints on their leverage ratios. Further, financial intermediaries face the "liability dollarization" problem, and all the economy's liabilities are denominated in foreign currency. When the intermediaries' liabilities are "dollarized," exchange rate behavior may exacerbate the effect of financial frictions through their balance sheet. We then consider a shock that tightens the balance sheet constraint and show that capital controls may alleviate the negative effect due to the balance sheet shock as much as credit policy does. In other words, our paper shows that capital controls, the possibility of which is rigorously examined as a policy tool for emerging economies, can be an alternative to credit policy employed by advanced economy central banks in mitigating crisis shocks.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present a sticky price, small open economy model with financial frictions à la Gertler and Karadi (2011) in combination with liability dollarization. In Section 3, we perform a comparative analysis for credit policy and capital control policy. The conclusions are presented in Section 4.

2 Model

We develop a small open economy model accompanied with financial frictions. The core framework is a standard small open economy model such as Galí and Monacelli (2005) and Faia and Monacelli (2008). We incorporate financial frictions à la Gertler and Karadi (2011) into the standard small open economy model.

The small open economy consists of households, financial intermediaries, intermediate goods firms, capital producing firms, retail firms, and the government. In addition to the traditional monetary policy, the government has two policy options: the credit policy that expands government credit intermediation and the capital control policy that regulates financial intermediary's foreign borrowing.

2.1 Households

Following Gertler and Kiyotaki (2010) and Gertler and Karadi (2011), we assume that there are two types of members: a fraction $1 - f$ of workers and a fraction f of bankers within a representative household with a continuum of members of measure unity. Workers supply labor and return their wages to the household. Each banker manages a financial intermediary and returns dividends to the household. There is a perfect consumption insurance within the household. For each period, a banker remains a banker in the next period with probability θ. $(1 - \theta)f$ bankers exit and become workers, and the same number of workers randomly become bankers. The fraction of each type of members remains constant over time. Bankers who exit transfer their retained earnings to the household, whereas new bankers receive some start-up funds from the household.

The household maximizes the following expected lifetime utility:

$$E_t \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \beta^i \left[\ln \left(C_{t+i} - h C_{t+i-1} \right) - \frac{\chi}{1+\varphi} L_{t+i}^{1+\varphi} \right],$$

(1)

where E_t denotes the mathematical expectations operator conditional on information available at time t, $\beta \in (0,1)$ is the discount factor, C_t signifies a composite consumption index, $h \in (0,1)$ is the habit parameter, L_t represents labor effort, $\chi > 0$ is the relative weight of labor in the utility function, and $\varphi > 0$ is the inverse of Frisch elasticity of labor supply. The composite consumption index C_t is given by

$$C_t \equiv \left[(1-\varpi)^{\frac{1}{\iota}} C_{H,t}^{\frac{\iota-1}{\iota}} + \varpi^{\frac{1}{\iota}} C_{F,t}^{\frac{\iota-1}{\iota}} \right]^{\frac{\iota}{\iota-1}}.$$

(2)

where $\iota(>0)$ is the elasticity of substitution between domestic and imported goods, and $\varpi \in (0,1)$ represents the measure of openness. Households consume domestic goods $(C_{H,t})$ and foreign goods $(C_{F,t})$. The optimal expenditure allocation between domestic and imported goods gives

$$C_{H,t} = (1-\varpi) \left(\frac{P_{H,t}}{P_t} \right)^{-\iota} C_t \, ; \qquad C_{F,t} = \varpi \left(\frac{P_{F,t}}{P_t} \right)^{-\iota} C_t,$$

(3)

where $P_{H,t}$ is the domestic price, and $P_{F,t}$ is the import price. P_t represents the consumer price index (CPI):

$$P_t \equiv \left[(1-\varpi) P_{H,t}^{1-\iota} + \varpi P_{F,t}^{1-\iota} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\iota}}.$$

(4)

From Eqs. (3) and (4), we obtain

$$P_{H,t}\, C_{H,t} + P_{F,t}\, C_{F,t} = P_t\, C_t. \tag{5}$$

Households have access to domestic and foreign asset markets. A household's budget constraint in period t is given as

$$P_t\, C_t + (1 + i_t)A_t + (1 + i_t^*)\mathcal{E}_t D_{h,t} + P_t \frac{\psi_D}{2}(D_{h,t+1} - D_h)^2 + T_{h,t}$$
$$= A_{t+1} + \mathcal{E}_t D_{h,t+1} + W_t L_t + \Pi_t^{fb}, \tag{6}$$

where i_t is the nominal interest rate of domestic currency assets, A_{t+1} is the domestic currency debt position, i_t^* is the exogenous nominal interest rate of foreign currency assets, $\mathcal{E}_t$ represents the nominal exchange rate (in terms of the domestic currency), $D_{h,t+1}$ is the households' foreign currency debt position, $T_{h,t}$ is lump-sum taxes, W_t is the nominal wage, and Π_t^{fb} denotes dividends from financial and non-financial firms. $P_t\psi_D(D_{h,t+1} - D_h)^2/2$ denotes the portfolio adjustment costs, which yield the stationarity of the equilibrium dynamics in a small open economy.

The optimality conditions associated with the household maximization problem are given by

$$\varrho_t = \frac{1}{C_t - hC_{t-1}} - \beta h E_t\left(\frac{1}{C_{t+1} - hC_t}\right), \tag{7}$$

$$\varrho_t w_t = \chi L_t^\varphi, \tag{8}$$

$$1 = E_t \beta \Lambda_{t,t+1} R_{t+1}, \tag{9}$$

and

$$1 = E_t \beta \Lambda_{t,t+1} R_{h,t+1}^*, \tag{10}$$

where $w_t \equiv \frac{W_t}{P_t}$,

$$\Lambda_{t,t+1} \equiv \frac{\varrho_{t+1}}{\varrho_t}, \tag{11}$$

$$R_{t+1} \equiv (1 + i_{t+1})\frac{P_t}{P_{t+1}}, \tag{12}$$

and

$$R^*_{h,t+1} \equiv (1 + i^*_{t+1})\frac{\mathcal{E}_{t+1}}{\mathcal{E}_t}\frac{P_t}{P_{t+1}}\Big[1 - \psi_D(D_{h,t+1} - D_h)\frac{P_t}{\mathcal{E}_t}\Big]^{-1}. \tag{13}$$

Combining (9) and (10), we obtain the interest parity condition:

$$E_t\Lambda_{t,t+1}R_{t+1} = E_t\Lambda_{t,t+1}R^*_{h,t+1}. \tag{14}$$

We assume that the law of one price holds for individual goods. The terms of trade are therefore given as

$$s_t \equiv \frac{P_{F,t}}{P_{H,t}} = \frac{\mathcal{E}_t P^*_t}{P_{H,t}}, \tag{15}$$

where P^*_t denotes the CPI in the foreign country (in terms of foreign currency).[6] From (15), we obtain

$$\frac{s_t}{s_{t-1}} = \frac{\Delta\mathcal{E}_t}{\Pi_{H,t}}, \tag{16}$$

where $\Pi_{H,t}\left(\equiv \frac{P_{H,t}}{P_{H,t-1}}\right)$ and $\Delta\mathcal{E}_t\left(\equiv \frac{\mathcal{E}_t}{\mathcal{E}_{t-1}}\right)$ represent the rate of domestic inflation and the depreciation rate of the nominal exchange rate, respectively. From CPI

---

[6]Without loss of generality, we assume that P^*_t is exogenous and constant $(= 1)$ for all t.

(4) and (15), we obtain

$$\frac{P_t}{P_{H,t}} = [(1 - \varpi) + \varpi s_t^{1-\iota}]^{\frac{1}{1-\iota}} \equiv g(s_t).$$
(17)

From (17), CPI inflation $\Pi_t \left(\equiv \frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}} \right)$ is given by

$$\Pi_t = \Pi_{H,t} \frac{g(s_t)}{g(s_{t-1})}.$$
(18)

From (15) and (17), the real exchange rate is given by

$$e_t \equiv \frac{\mathcal{E}_t P_t^*}{P_t} = \frac{s_t}{g(s_t)}.$$
(19)

2.2 Financial intermediaries

Financial intermediaries raise funds in international financial markets, and lend them to domestic non-financial firms. The balance sheet of a financial intermediary j is given by

$$P_t Q_t S_{j,t} = P_t N_{j,t} + \mathcal{E}_t D_{b,j,t+1},$$
(20)

where $S_{j,t}$ is the quantity of financial claims on non-financial firms, Q_t is the relative price of each claim, $N_{j,t}$ is the net worth of financial intermediaries, and $D_{b,j,t+1}$ is the financial intermediary's foreign debt position. Dividing both sides of Eq.(20) by P_t yields

$$Q_t S_{j,t} = N_{j,t} + e_t D_{b,j,t+1}.$$
(21)

The net worth of the financial intermediary is the difference between earnings on assets and interest payments on foreign debts. Under capital controls, a tax is

imposed on the financial intermediary's foreign borrowing. The evolution of the financial intermediary's net worth is then given as

$$P_{t+1}N_{j,t+1} = R_{k,t+1}P_{t+1}Q_tS_{j,t} - (1+\tau^*_{t+1})(1+i^*_{t+1})\mathcal{E}_{t+1}D_{b,j,t+1} + P_{t+1}\Omega_{j,t+1}, \quad (22)$$

where $R_{k,t+1}$ denotes the real gross return on assets, τ^*_{t+1} is the tax rate on the intermediary's foreign currency debt, and $\Omega_{j,t}$ is a lump-sum transfer. Dividing both sides of Eq.(22) by P_{t+1} yields

$$N_{j,t+1} = R_{k,t+1}Q_tS_{j,t} - (1+\tau^*_{t+1})R^*_{b,t+1}e_tD_{b,j,t+1} + \Omega_{j,t+1}, \quad (23)$$

where $R^*_{b,t+1} \equiv (1+i^*_{t+1})\frac{P_t}{P_{t+1}}\frac{\mathcal{E}_{t+1}}{\mathcal{E}_t}$. Substituting (21) into (23) yields the evolution of net worth as follows:

$$N_{j,t+1} = [R_{k,t+1} - (1+\tau^*_{t+1})R^*_{b,t+1}]Q_tS_{j,t} + (1+\tau^*_{t+1})R^*_{b,t+1}N_{j,t} + \Omega_{j,t+1}. \quad (24)$$

For financial intermediaries to operate in period t, the discounted risk adjusted premium needs to be positive:

$$E_t\beta^i\Lambda_{t,t+1+i}[R_{k,t+1+i} - (1+\tau^*_{t+1+i})R^*_{b,t+1+i}] \geq 0, \quad i \geq 0 \quad (25)$$

where $\beta^i\Lambda_{t,t+1+i}$ is the stochastic discount rate.

The objective of financial intermediaries is to maximize the terminal wealth that would be transferred to households when they exit. Financial intermediaries

maximize the following expected terminal wealth:

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{j,t} &= \max \ E_t \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (1-\theta)\theta^i \beta^{i+1} \Lambda_{t,t+1+i} N_{j,t+1+i}, \\
&= \max \ E_t \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (1-\theta)\theta^i \beta^{i+1} \Lambda_{t,t+1+i} \{ [R_{k,t+1+i} - (1+\tau^*_{t+1+i})R^*_{b,t+1+i}]Q_{t+i}S_{j,t+i} \cdot \\
&\quad + (1+\tau^*_{t+1+i})R^*_{b,t+1+i}N_{j,t+i} + \Omega_{j,t+1+i} \}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{26}
$$

As long as $\beta^i \Lambda_{t,t+1+i}[R_{k,t+1+i} - (1+\tau^*_{t+1+i})R^*_{b,t+1+i}]$ is positive, financial intermediaries borrow from foreign investors and expand assets infinitely. To motivate an endogenous constraint on the financial intermediaries' ability to obtain funds, we introduce an agency problem à la Gertler and Karadi (2011) but between financial intermediaries and foreign investors. We assume that there is a possibility for bankers to divert a fraction λ of assets and transfer them to the household to which the banker belongs. If a banker diverts the fund, foreign investors can only recover the remaining fraction $1-\lambda$ of assets. Since foreign investors recognize the banker's incentive to divert funds, they restrict the amount they lend, which motivates an endogenous constraint on bankers. To ensure that financial intermediaries do not divert funds and lenders are willing to supply funds, the following constraint must hold:

$$
V_{j,t} \geq \lambda Q_t S_{j,t}.
\tag{27}
$$

The financial intermediary's expected terminal wealth can be expressed as

$$
V_{j,t} = \nu_t Q_t S_{j,t} + \eta_t N_{j,t},
\tag{28}
$$

with

$$\nu_t = E_t\{(1-\theta)\beta\Lambda_{t,t+1}[R_{k,t+1} - (1+\tau_{t+1}^*)R_{b,t+1}^*] + \beta\Lambda_{t,t+1}\theta x_{t,t+1}\nu_{t+1}\}, \qquad (29)$$

and

$$\eta_t = E_t\{(1-\theta)\beta\Lambda_{t,t+1}(1+\tau_{t+1}^*)R_{b,t+1}^* + \beta\Lambda_{t,t+1}\theta z_{t,t+1}\eta_{t+1}\}, \qquad (30)$$

where $x_{t,t+i} \equiv \frac{Q_{t+i}S_{j,t+i}}{Q_t S_{j,t}}$ is the gross growth rate of assets, and $z_{t,t+i} \equiv \frac{N_{j,t+i}}{N_{j,t}}$ is the gross growth rate of net worth. Substituting (28) into (27) yields

$$\nu_t Q_t S_{j,t} + \eta_t N_{j,t} \geq \lambda Q_t S_{j,t}. \qquad (31)$$

Since this constraint binds in equilibrium, we obtain

$$Q_t S_{j,t} = \phi_t N_{j,t}, \qquad (32)$$

where

$$\phi_t \equiv \frac{\eta_t}{\lambda - \nu_t}. \qquad (33)$$

ϕ_t is the (private) leverage ratio.

As we argue in Section 2.6, the government returns the collected tax from capital controls as a transfer to a financial intermediary (i.e., $\Omega_{j,t+1} = \tau_{t+1}^* R_{b,t+1}^* e_t D_{b,j,t+1}$). Substituting (32) into (24), we can thus express the evolution of the financial intermediary's net worth as

$$N_{j,t+1} = [(R_{k,t+1} - R_{b,t+1}^*)\phi_t + R_{b,t+1}^*]N_{j,t}. \qquad (34)$$

13

From Eqs.(32) and (34), we obtain the gross growth rate of net worth $z_{t,t+i}(\equiv \frac{N_{j,t+i}}{N_{j,t}})$ and the gross growth rate of assets $x_{t,t+i}$ $(\equiv \frac{Q_{t+i}S_{j,t+i}}{Q_t S_{j,t}})$ as follows:

$$z_{t,t+1} = (R_{k,t+1} - R^*_{b,t+1})\phi_t + R^*_{b,t+1}, \tag{35}$$

and

$$x_{t,t+1} = \frac{\phi_{t+1}}{\phi_t} z_{t,t+1}. \tag{36}$$

Since the leverage ratio $\phi_t(\equiv \frac{\eta_t}{\lambda - \nu_t})$ does not depend on bank-specific factors, we can sum up Eq.(32) across j and obtain the relation of the aggregate financial intermediary's assets S_t to the aggregate financial intermediary's net worth N_t as follows:

$$Q_t S_t = \phi_t N_t. \tag{37}$$

Further, we can sum up Eq. (21) across j to obtain

$$Q_t S_t = N_t + e_t D_{b,t+1}. \tag{38}$$

Aggregate net worth is the sum of the net worth of existing bankers $N_{e,t}$ and the net worth of new bankers $N_{n,t}$:

$$N_t = N_{e,t} + N_{n,t}. \tag{39}$$

Since in each period, the fraction θ of bankers continues to operate in the next period, the existing banker's net worth $N_{e,t}$ is given by

$$N_{e,t} = \theta[(R_{k,t} - R^*_{b,t})\phi_{t-1} + R^*_{b,t}]\xi_{t-1}N_{t-1}, \tag{40}$$

14

where ξ_{t-1} denotes an exogenous shock to the net worth.

The aggregate assets of exiting bankers at period t are denoted by $(1-\theta)Q_tS_{t-1}$. It is assumed that households transfer the fraction $\omega/(1-\theta)$ of the assets to new bankers. Thus, the new banker's net worth is given by

$$N_{n,t} = \omega Q_t S_{t-1}. \tag{41}$$

Substituting (40) and (41) into (39), we obtain the evolution of the aggregate net worth:

$$N_t = \theta[(R_{k,t} - R^*_{b,t})\phi_{t-1} + R^*_{b,t}]\xi_{t-1}N_{t-1} + \omega Q_t S_{t-1}. \tag{42}$$

2.3 Intermediate-good firms

Competitive firms produce intermediate goods by using capital and labor and sell their products to retail firms. The firms finance their capital acquisition by obtaining funds from financial intermediaries. The firms issue S_t claims, which equal K_{t+1} at the price of a unit of capital Q_t:

$$Q_t K_{t+1} = Q_t S_t. \tag{43}$$

The firms sell capital after production on the open market. The production function is given by

$$Y^m_{H,t} = Z_t(U_t K_t)^\alpha L_t^{1-\alpha}, \tag{44}$$

where $Y^m_{H,t}$ is the domestic output of intermediate goods, Z_t is total factor productivity, and U_t is the utilization rate of capital. From the first-order conditions

associated with the firm's optimization, we have

$$P_{H,t}^m \alpha \frac{Y_{H,t}^m}{U_t} = \delta'(U_t) K_t, \tag{45}$$

and

$$P_{H,t}^m (1 - \alpha) \frac{Y_{H,t}^m}{L_t} = w_t, \tag{46}$$

where

$$\delta(U_t) = \delta_c + \frac{b}{1 + \zeta} U_t^{1+\zeta}. \tag{47}$$

Here, $\delta(U_t)$ is the depreciation rate of capital, and $P_{H,t}^m$ is the domestic price of intermediate goods.[7]

Since competitive firms earn zero profits, the expected gross return to holding a unit of capital from t to $t+1$ is given by

$$R_{k,t+1} = \frac{P_{H,t+1}^m \alpha \frac{Y_{H,t+1}^m}{K_{t+1}} + Q_{t+1} - \delta(U_{t+1})}{Q_t}. \tag{48}$$

2.4 Capital producing firms

Competitive capital producing firms buy capital from intermediate-good firms. They repair depreciated capital and produce new capital. The value of a unit of new capital is Q_t and net investment is subject to adjustment costs. Since capital producing firms are owned by households, the firm's optimization problem is

$$\max_{I_{n,t}} E_t \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \beta^i \Lambda_{t,t+i} \left[(Q_{t+i} - 1) I_{n,t+i} - \frac{\eta_I}{2} \left(\frac{I_{n,t+i} + I}{I_{n,t+i-1} + I} - 1 \right)^2 (I_{n,t+i} + I) \right], \tag{49}$$

---

[7]The cost of replacing depreciated capital is assumed unity.

subject to

$$I_{n,t} = I_t - \delta(U_t)K_t, \tag{50}$$

where I_t is gross investment and $I_{n,t}$ is net investment. The first-order condition for $I_{n,t}$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_t &= 1 + \frac{\eta_I}{2}\left(\frac{I_{n,t}+I}{I_{n,t-1}+I}-1\right)^2 + \eta_I\left(\frac{I_{n,t}+I}{I_{n,t-1}+I}-1\right)\left(\frac{I_{n,t}+I}{I_{n,t-1}+I}\right) \\
&\quad - E_t\beta\Lambda_{t,t+1}\eta_I\left(\frac{I_{n,t+1}+I}{I_{n,t}+I}-1\right)\left(\frac{I_{n,t+1}+I}{I_{n,t}+I}\right)^2
\end{aligned} \tag{51}
$$

We assume that the production of capital needs domestic and imported final goods. I_t is composed of domestic and imported final goods as follows:

$$I_t \equiv \left[(1-\varpi)^{\frac{1}{\iota}}I_{H,t}^{\frac{\iota-1}{\iota}} + \varpi^{\frac{1}{\iota}}I_{F,t}^{\frac{\iota-1}{\iota}}\right]^{\frac{\iota}{\iota-1}}. \tag{52}$$

The optimal allocation of expenditures between domestic and imported goods gives

$$I_{H,t} = (1-\varpi)\left(\frac{P_{H,t}}{P_t}\right)^{-\iota}I_t; \qquad I_{F,t} = \varpi\left(\frac{P_{F,t}}{P_t}\right)^{-\iota}I_t. \tag{53}$$

From Eqs. (4) and (53), we have

$$P_{H,t}\,I_{H,t} + P_{F,t}\,I_{F,t} = P_t\,I_t. \tag{54}$$

2.5   Retail firms

Using domestic intermediate goods as the sole input, retail firms produce differentiated goods. The final output is expressed by the CES form of differentiated

goods:

$$Y_{H,t} \equiv \left[\int_0^1 (Y_{H,t}^f)^{\frac{\varepsilon-1}{\varepsilon}} \, df \right]^{\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon-1}}, \tag{55}$$

where $Y_{H,t}$ is the domestic final output, and $Y_{H,t}^f$ denotes the domestic differentiated good. An optimal expenditure allocation for the domestic final output implies that

$$Y_{H,t}^f = \left(\frac{P_{H,t}^f}{P_{H,t}} \right)^{-\varepsilon} Y_{H,t}, \tag{56}$$

where $P_{H,t}^f$ is the domestic differentiated good price. $P_{H,t}$ denotes the domestic price index:

$$P_{H,t} \equiv \left[\int_0^1 (P_{H,t}^f)^{1-\varepsilon} \, df \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}}. \tag{57}$$

Following Calvo (1983), we assume that in each period, a fraction $1 - \gamma$ of retail firms reset their prices, while a fraction γ keep their prices unchanged. This implies that the domestic price index can be expressed as

$$P_{H,t} \equiv \left[\gamma (P_{H,t-1})^{1-\varepsilon} + (1-\gamma)(\bar{P}_{H,t})^{1-\varepsilon} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}}, \tag{58}$$

where $\bar{P}_{H,t}$ represents the price reset in period t. Transforming (58) yields

$$1 = \gamma (\Pi_{H,t})^{-1+\varepsilon} + (1-\gamma)(\tilde{P}_{H,t})^{1-\varepsilon}, \tag{59}$$

where $\tilde{P}_{H,t} \equiv \frac{\bar{P}_{H,t}}{P_{H,t}}$.

Each retail firm chooses its price to maximize the present discounted value of its profit stream:

$$\max_{\bar{P}_{H,t}} \quad E_t \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \gamma^i \beta^i \Lambda_{t,t+i} \left[\frac{\bar{P}_{H,t}}{P_{H,t+i}} - P_{H,t+i}^m \right] Y_{H,t+i}^f, \tag{60}$$

18

subject to

$$Y_{H,t+i}^f = \left(\frac{\bar{P}_{H,t}}{P_{H,t+i}}\right)^{-\varepsilon} Y_{H,t+i}. \tag{61}$$

From the first-order condition associated with the above problem, the optimal price is determined as

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{H,t} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon - 1}\Pi_{H,t}\frac{X_t^1}{X_t^2}, \tag{62}$$

where $\tilde{\Pi}_{H,t} \equiv \frac{\bar{P}_{H,t}}{P_{H,t-1}}$. X_t^1 and X_t^2 are given by

$$X_t^1 = P_{H,t}^m Y_{H,t} + E_t \gamma\beta\Lambda_{t,t+1}(\Pi_{H,t+1})^\varepsilon X_{t+1}^1, \tag{63}$$

and

$$X_t^2 = Y_{H,t} + E_t \gamma\beta\Lambda_{t,t+1}(\Pi_{H,t+1})^{\varepsilon-1} X_{t+1}^2. \tag{64}$$

2.6 Government

In this subsection, we describe the government's policies. Irrespective of whether credit policy or capital control policy is employed, we assume that monetary policy follows a simple Taylor rule:

$$i_t = i_{t-1}^{\rho_i} \left[\frac{1}{\beta}(\Pi_{H,t})^{\kappa_\pi}\left(\frac{Y_t}{Y_{H,t}^m}\right)^{\kappa_y}\right]^{1-\rho_i}, \tag{65}$$

where $Y_{H,t}^m$ corresponds to the flexible price equilibrium level of final output.

2.6.1 Credit policy

We assume that the government adopts exactly the same type of credit policy described in Gertler and Karadi (2011). The government directly lends funds to

non-financial firms. The aggregate assets are expressed by the sum of the aggregate assets of privately intermediated assets $Q_t S_{p,t}$ and the publicly intermediated assets $Q_t S_{g,t}$:

$$Q_t S_t = Q_t S_{p,t} + Q_t S_{g,t}. \tag{66}$$

The publicly intermediated assets are the fraction ψ_t of the aggregate assets:

$$Q_t S_{g,t} = \psi_t Q_t S_t. \tag{67}$$

Substituting (37) and (67) into (66), we obtain

$$Q_t S_t = \phi_t N_t + \psi_t Q_t S_t. \tag{68}$$

Rearranging (68), we have

$$Q_t S_t = \phi_{c,t} N_t, \tag{69}$$

where $\phi_{c,t} \equiv \frac{1}{1-\psi_t} \phi_t$ is the leverage ratio for total (private and public) intermediated funds.

To conduct credit policy, the government obtains funds by issuing the government bond $B_{g,t}$, which equals $\psi_t Q_t S_t$, to domestic households.[8] The government intermediation involves an efficiency cost of τ per unit. Since the government borrows at R_{t+1} from households, the government's net earnings are given by $(R_{k,t+1} - R_{t+1})B_{g,t}$. In a case where the government performs credit policy, its

---

[8]Following Gertler and Karadi (2011), we assume that there is no agency problem between the government and households.

20

budget constraint in period t is given by

$$G_t + \tau \psi_t Q_t K_{t+1} = (R_{k,t} - R_t) B_{g,t-1} + T_{h,t}, \tag{70}$$

where G_t is the exogenous government spending.[9] It is assumed that the government injects credit in response to movements in credit spreads (or risk premium). The credit policy rule is given by

$$\psi_t = \kappa E_t[(\ln R_{k,t+1} - \ln R_{b,t+1}^*) - (\ln R_k - \ln R_b^*)], \tag{72}$$

where κ is the (positive) coefficient for the credit policy rule.

2.6.2 Capital controls

As we argued in Section 2.2, the government imposes a tax on the financial intermediary's foreign borrowing and transfers the tax revenue to financial intermediaries in each period. Therefore, in a case where the government conducts capital controls, its budget constraint in period t is given by

$$G_t + \Omega_{t+1} = \tau_{t+1}^* R_{b,t+1}^* e_t D_{b,t+1} + T_{h,t}, \tag{73}$$

---

[9]The aggregate government spending G_t is composed of domestic and imported goods:

$$G_t \equiv \left[(1-\varpi)^{\frac{1}{\iota}} G_{H,t}^{\frac{\iota-1}{\iota}} + \varpi^{\frac{1}{\iota}} G_{F,t}^{\frac{\iota-1}{\iota}} \right]^{\frac{\iota}{\iota-1}}.$$

Similar to C_t and I_t, it holds that

$$G_{H,t} = (1-\varpi) \left(\frac{P_{H,t}}{P_t} \right)^{-\iota} G_t; \qquad G_{F,t} = \varpi \left(\frac{P_{F,t}}{P_t} \right)^{-\iota} G_t.$$

It follows from Eq. (4) that

$$P_{H,t} G_{H,t} + P_{F,t} G_{F,t} = P_t G_t. \tag{71}$$

where $\Omega_{t+1} = \int_0^1 \Omega_{j,t+1} dj = \tau_{t+1}^* R_{b,t+1}^* e_t D_{b,t+1}$.

We consider four alternative policy rules for capital controls as follows. The first is a feedback rule that changes the tax rate τ_t^* in response to movements in the real exchange rate:

$$\tau_t^* = \kappa_e(e_t - e), \tag{74}$$

where κ_e denotes the positive coefficient for the the real exchange rate (RER) rule, and e denotes the steady state level of the real exchange rate. The second is a feedback rule that changes the tax rate τ_t^* in response to movements in the current account level to output ratio:

$$\tau_t^* = -\kappa_{ca}\left(\frac{g(s_t)CA_t}{Y_t} - \frac{g(s)CA}{Y}\right), \tag{75}$$

where κ_{ca} denotes the positive coefficient for the current account (CAY) rule, and $\frac{g(s)CA}{Y}$ denotes the steady state level of the current account level to output ratio. The third is a feedback rule that changes thze tax rate τ_t^* in response to movements in the debt level to output ratio:

$$\tau_t^* = \kappa_d\left(\frac{s_t D_t}{Y_t} - \frac{sD}{Y}\right), \tag{76}$$

where κ_d denotes the positive coefficient for the debt level to output ratio (DY) rule, and $\frac{SD}{Y}$ denotes the steady state level of the debt level to output ratio. The fourth is a feedback rule that changes the tax rate τ_t^* in response to movements in the risk premium level:

$$\tau_t^* = -\kappa_r E_t[(\ln R_{k,t+1} - \ln R_{b,t+1}^*) - (\ln R_k - \ln R_b^*)], \tag{77}$$

where κ_r denotes the positive coefficient for the risk premium (RP) rule, and $\ln R_k - \ln R_b^*$ denotes the steady state level of the risk premium.

2.7 Equilibrium

In each period, the domestic goods market must clear. Thus, we have

$$Y_{H,t} = (1 - \varpi)g(s_t)^{\iota}(C_t + I_t + G_t + \Gamma_t^D + \Gamma_t^f + \Gamma_t^{\psi}) + s_t EX_t, \tag{78}$$

where $\Gamma_t^D \equiv \frac{\psi_D}{2}(D_{h,t} - D_h)^2$, $\Gamma_t^f \equiv f\left(\frac{I_{n,t}+I_{ss}}{I_{n,t-1}-I_{ss}}\right)(I_{n,t} + I_{ss})$, $\Gamma_t^{\psi} \equiv \tau\psi_t Q_t K_{t+1}$, and EX_t is the exogenous demand for export. Eq. (78) indicates that demand for domestic goods comes from consumption, investment, government expenditure, and export. In addition, since the portfolio adjustment costs Γ_t^D, the adjustment costs for investment Γ_t^f, and the efficiency costs Γ_t^{ψ} are represented in terms of composite final good, part of these costs must be incurred in terms of domestic goods.

Since differentiated domestic retail goods are produced by using domestic intermediate goods as the sole input, the aggregation of differentiated domestic retail goods is expressed as

$$\int_0^1 Y_{H,t}^f df = Y_{H,t}^m = Z_t(U_t K_t)^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha}. \tag{79}$$

From the demand function for differentiated retail goods (56), it follows that

$$\int_0^1 \left(\frac{P_{H,t}^f}{P_{H,t}}\right)^{-\varepsilon} Y_{H,t} df = Z_t(U_t K_t)^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha}. \tag{80}$$

23

We define $\theta_t \equiv \int_0^1 \left(\frac{P_{H,t}^f}{P_{H,t}} \right)^{-\varepsilon} df$, which indicates a measure of price dispersion across firms. Here, θ_t can also be expressed as[10]

$$\theta_t = (1 - \gamma)\tilde{P}_{H,t}^{-\varepsilon} + \gamma \Pi_{H,t}^{\varepsilon} \theta_{t-1}, \tag{81}$$

where $\tilde{P}_{H,t} \equiv \frac{\bar{P}_{H,t}}{P_{H,t}}$. Using θ_t, we can rewrite Eq.(80) as

$$Y_{H,t} = \theta_t^{-1} Z_t (U_t K_t)^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha}, \tag{82}$$

In Eq.(82), a larger value of θ_t indicates the larger resource cost due to the price dispersion.

Dividing the nominal trade balance $P_{H,t} Y_{H,t} - P_t(C_t + I_t + G_t + \Gamma_t^D + \Gamma_t^f + \Gamma_t^{\psi})$ by P_t, we define the real trade balance as

$$TB_t \equiv \frac{Y_{H,t}}{g(s_t)} - C_t - I_t - G_t - \Gamma_t^D - \Gamma_t^f - \Gamma_t^{\psi}. \tag{83}$$

Using the trade balance (83), we define the current account as

$$CA_t \quad \equiv \quad -e_t(D_{t+1} - D_t) \tag{84}$$
$$= \quad TB_t - i_t^* e_t D_t, \tag{85}$$

where $D_t \equiv D_{h,t} + D_{b,t}$. From this definition, we have

$$D_{h,t} = D_t - D_{b,t}. \tag{86}$$

---

[10]For the derivation of (81), see Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2006).

The equilibrium of this economy is a set of stationary stochastic processes $\{ C_t,$ $C_{H,t},$ $C_{F,t},$ $A_t,$ $\varrho_t,$ $\frac{W_t}{P_t},$ $R_{t+1},$ $R^*_{h,t+1},$ $\Pi_t,$ $\mathcal{E}_t,$ $s_t,$ $\Pi_{H,t},$ $e_t,$ $\nu_t,$ $\eta_t,$ $\phi_t,$ $z_{t,t+1},$ $x_{t,t+1},$ $S_t,$ $D_{b,t},$ $N_{e,t},$ $N_{n,t},$ $N_t,$ $K_{t+1},$ $Y^m_{H,t},$ $U_t,$ $L_t,$ $\delta(U_t),$ $R_{k,t+1},$ $I_t,$ $Q_t,$ $I_{H,t},$ $I_{F,t},$ $Y^f_{H,t},$ $\tilde{P}_{H,t},$ $X^1_t,$ $X^2_t,$ $i_t,$ $S_{p,t},$ $S_{g,t},$ $T_{h,t},$ $\psi_t,$ $Y_{H,t},$ $\theta_t,$ $TB_t,$ $CA_t,$ $D_t,$ $D_{h,t}$ $\}^\infty_{t=0}$ satisfying Eqs. (1), (2), (5)-(10), (12), (13), (15), (16), (19), (29), (30), (33), (35)-(38), (40)-(48), (50)-(52), (54), (56), (59), (63)-(67), (70 or 73), (72), (81)-(86) (combined with the equations for other variables), given initial values for A_{-1}, D_{-1}, $D_{b,-1}$, $D_{h,-1}$, K_0, N_{-1}, and S_{-1}, and exogenous stochastic processes ξ_t, Z_t, EX_t, G_t, and i^*_t.

2.8 Calibration

We choose standard parameter values in the related literature for calibration, which are summarized in Table 1.

Since we consider credit policy in Gertler and Karadi (2011) as our benchmark, we choose the same parameter values except for the parameters related to the open economy. For the parameters for households, and financial intermediaries, we set the discount factor β, the habit parameter h, the relative utility weight of labor χ, the inverse of the Frisch elasticity of labor supply φ, and the survival rate of the bankers θ to 0.99, 0.815, 3.409, 0.276, and 0.972, respectively. For the parameters for intermediate-good firms, capital producing firms, and retail firms, we set the effective capital share α, the elasticity of marginal depreciation with respect to utilization rate ζ, the inverse elasticity of net investment to the price of capital η_i, the elasticity of substitution among differentiated goods ϵ, and the price rigidity parameter γ to 0.33, 7.2, 1.728, 4.167, and 0.779, respectively. We set the steady state values of the capital utilization rate U, the depreciation rate δ, and the ratio

of government expenditure to GDP $\frac{G}{Y}$ to 1, 0.025, and 0.2, respectively.

For parameters related to the open economy, we choose standard values in the related literature. Following Ravenna and Natalucci (2008), we set the elasticity of substitution between domestic and imported goods ι to 1.5. With respect to the degree of openness ϖ, we follow Cook (2004) and set it to 0.28. The parameter for bond adjustment cost ψ_{Dh} and steady state debt ratio to GDP $\frac{D}{Y}$ are set to 0.0007 and 0.4, respectively, as in Devereux et al. (2006).

In the credit policy rule (72), we set the coefficient κ to 10, which equals that in the base line case in Gertler and Karadi (2011).

In the capital control rules (74)-(77), we set the respective coefficients so that each rule yields the equal level of welfare to the credit policy rule (72). Formally, we measure conditional welfare levels by writing the household utility in a recursive form:

$$V_t = U(C_t, C_{t-1}, L_t) + \beta V_{t+1}, \tag{87}$$

and using the second-order perturbation methods as described in Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2004) and Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2007).[11] The coefficients κ_e, κ_{ca}, κ_d, and κ_r are set to 7.1, 11.8, 0.7, and 45, respectively.

3   Results

This section presents the main results of our analysis. Following Gertler and Karadi (2011), we consider a shock that tightens the balance sheet constraint of

---

[11]Kim and Kim (2003) show that second-order solutions are necessary because conventional linearization may generate spurious welfare reversals.

Table 1: Calibration.

Parameters	Value	
β	0.99	Discount factor
h	0.815	Habit parameter
χ	3.409	Relative utility weight of labor
φ	0.276	Inverse Frisch elasticity of labor supply
θ	0.972	Survival rate of the bankers
α	0.33	Effective capital share
U	1	Steady state capital utilization rate
δ	0.025	Steady state depreciation rate
ζ	7.2	Elasticity of marginal depreciation with respect to utilization rate
η_i	1.728	Inverse elasticity of net investment to the price of capital
ϵ	4.167	Elasticity of substitution among differentiated goods
γ	0.779	Fraction of firms that do not reset their prices
ι	1.5	Elasticity of substitution between domestic and imported goods
ϖ	0.28	Degree of openness
ψ_{Dh}	0.0007	Parameter for bond adjustment cost
$\frac{D}{Y}$	0.4	Steady state ratio of debt to GDP
$\frac{G}{Y}$	0.2	Steady state ratio of government expenditure to GDP
κ	10	Coefficient for the credit policy rule
κ_e	7.1	Coefficient for the RER rule
κ_{ca}	11.8	Coefficient for the CAY rule
κ_d	0.7	Coefficient for the DY rule
κ_r	45	Coefficient for the RP rule

financial intermediaries. We consider a a direct disturbance to the net worth that causes about 50% decline in the net worth of financial intermediaries on impact.[12]

Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 show the response of the model economy to the net worth shock. In each figure, the thickest solid line ("No policy") and the thick solid line ("Credit policy") depict the impulse response for the case without policy interventions and that with the credit policy rule, respectively. As for the capital controls, the capital control rule targeting real exchange rate ("RER policy"), the rule targeting the current account level to output ratio ("CAY policy"), the rule targeting the debt level to output ratio ("DY policy"), and the rule targeting the risk premium level ("RP policy") are depicted by the solid line, the dashed dotted line, the dotted line, and the dashed line, respectively.

As we argue in Section 2.8, we set the coefficients in capital control rules (κ_e, κ_{ca}, κ_d, and κ_r) so that the conditional welfare level under each of the capital control rules equals that under the baseline credit policy rule in Gertler and Karadi (2011). That is, except for the no policy case, the credit policy rule and all the capital control rules yield the same welfare level in Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4.

As in Gertler and Karadi (2011), the credit policy significantly reduces the contraction. This is mainly because the central bank reduces the rise in the spread, which in turn moderates the drop in investment. Some of the capital control rules ("CAY policy" and "RP policy") reduce the rise in the spread ($E[R_K] - R_b$) as much as (or more than) the credit policy does. The other capital control rules ("RER policy" and "DY policy") reduce the rise in the spread compared to the no policy case but do not reduce it as much as the credit policy does. However,

---

[12]Gertler and Karadi (2011) consider a disturbance to capital quality that generates a decline in the net worth of financial intermediaries as large as 62.4% on impact in the economy without policy interventions.

it should be noted that "RER policy" and "DY policy" reduce the fluctuations in the real exchange rate more compared to the credit policy, which in turn stabilize output and consumption in a small open economy in general. That is, in addition to the risk premium channel, there is another channel through the real exchange rate in stabilizing the small open economy.

Another notable point is that the capital control rules have different trajectories in their tax rates. The "RER policy" yields a rise in the tax rate on impact, whereas the "CAY policy" and "RP policy" yield a fall in the tax rates on impact. A fall in the tax rates due to the "CAY policy" and "RP policy" implies that these policies play a role of dampening the initial rise in the spread as the credit policy does.

As for consumption (C), capital (K) and real exchange rate (RER), the "CAY policy" causes a larger size of fluctuation compared to the other capital control rules and the credit policy. However, over all, we can say that the capital control rules cause a basically equivalent role to the credit policy rule in moderating the contraction. In fact, the capital control rules achieve the same welfare level as the credit policy rule does.

The intuition behind the results of our analysis is as follows. In Eq. (25), we can interpret that ν_t is the expected marginal gain of having another unit of $Q_t S_{j,t}$ holding $N_{j,t}$ constant, and that η_t is the expected marginal gain of having another unit of $N_{j,t}$ holding $Q_t S_{j,t}$ constant. Eq. (25) implies that a decrease in τ_{t+1}^* reduces η_t but increases ν_t. In other words, we can say that a decrease in the tax rate raises the expected marginal gain of having another unit of the financial intermediary's assets but reduces the expected marginal gain of having another unit of the financial intermediary's net worth. Therefore, we can know that the tax reduction restores the financial intermediary's leverage ratio $\frac{Q_t S_{j,t}}{N_{j,t}}$.

This implies that capital controls play the same role as the credit policy of restoring the financial intermediary's leverage ratio and dampening the negative shock that tightens the financial intermediary's balance sheet constraint.

Figure 1: Responses to Net Worth Shock (Y,R,RP,C).

Figure 2: Responses to Net Worth Shock (I,K,L,Q).

Figure 3: Responses to Net Worth Shock (N,Infl,int,RER).

Figure 4: Responses to Net Worth Shock (CAY,DY,tax).

4　Conclusion

In this paper, we developed a sticky price, small open economy model with financial frictions featuring emerging economies. In combination with liability dollarization, domestic financial intermediaries face financial frictions in the form of time varying endogenous balance sheet constraints due to the agency problem with foreign investors. This paper falls in a strand of studies that examine the possibility of capital controls as a policy tool for emerging economies. We examined the alternative rules of capital controls and compared them with the credit policy. Our findings suggest that capital controls can play an alternative role to the credit policy in mitigating the contract after a crisis.

While credit policy was employed by advanced economy central banks and proved useful and important, there was almost no case for credit policy in emerging economies. Although we mentioned the several related arguments about it in Introduction, the reason why emerging economies do not adopt the credit policy is beyond the scope of our study. We leave this as a subject for future research.

References

Agénor, Pierre-Richard and Pengfei Jia (2015) "Capital Controls and Welfare with Cross-Border Bank Capital Flows," Centre for Growth and Business Cycle Research Discussion Paper Series 212, Economics, The University of Manchester.

Aoki, Kosuke (2011) "Discussion of 'On the Quantitative Effects of Unconventional Monetary Policies in Small Open Economies'," *International Journal of Central Banking*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 117-120.

Bianchi, Javier (2011) "Overborrowing and Systemic Externalities in the Business Cycle," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 101, No. 7, pp. 3400-3426.

Brunnermeier, Markus K. and Yuliy Sannikov (2015) "International Credit Flows and Pecuniary Externalities," *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 297-338.

Calvo, Guillermo A. (1983) "Staggered Prices in a Utility-Maximizing Framework," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 383-398.

Chang, Chun, Zheng Liu, and Mark M. Spiegel (2015) "Capital Controls and Optimal Chinese Monetary Policy," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 74, pp. 1-15.

Chang, Roberto and Andrés Velasco (2016) "Financial Frictions and Unconventional Monetary Policy in Emerging Economies," Working Paper 21955, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Cook, David (2004) "Monetary Policy in Emerging Markets: Can Liability Dollarization Explain Contractionary Devaluations?" *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 51, No. 6, pp. 1155-1181.

Davis, Scott and Ignacio Presno (2014) "Capital Controls as an Instrument of Monetary Policy," Working Paper 171, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Globalization and Monetary Policy Institute.

De Paoli, Bianca and Anna Lipinska (2013) "Capital Controls: a Normative Analysis," staff reports, Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Devereux, Michael B., Philip R. Lane, and Juanyi Xu (2006) "Exchange Rates and Monetary Policy in Emerging Market Economies," *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 116, No. 511, pp. 478-506.

Faia, Ester and Tommaso Monacelli (2008) "Optimal Monetary Policy in a Small Open Economy with Home Bias," *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, Vol. 40, No. 4, pp. 721–750.

Farhi, Emmanuel and Ivan Werning (2012) "Dealing with the Trilemma: Optimal Capital Controls with Fixed Exchange Rates," Working Paper 18199, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Galí, Jordi and Tommaso Monacelli (2005) "Monetary Policy and Exchange Rate Volatility in a Small Open Economy," *The Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 72, No. 3, pp. 707-734.

Garcia-Cicco, Javier (2011) "On the Quantitative Effects of Unconventional Monetry Policies in Small Open Economies," *International Journal of Central Banking*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 53-115.

Gertler, Mark, Nobuhiro Kiyotaki, and Albert Queralto (2012) "Financial crises, bank risk exposure and government financial policy," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 59, Supplement, pp. S17 - S34.

Gertler, Mark and Peter Karadi (2011) "A Model of Unconventional Monetary Policy," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 17 - 34.

Gertler, Mark and Nobuhiro Kiyotaki (2010) "Chapter 11 - Financial Interme-

diation and Credit Policy in Business Cycle Analysis," Vol. 3 of Handbook of Monetary Economics: Elsevier, pp. 547-599.

Ishi, Kotaro, Mark R. Stone, and Etienne B. Yehoue (2009) "Unconventional Central Bank Measures for Emerging Economies," *IMF working papers*, pp. 1–42.

Jeanne, Olivier, Arvind Subramanian, and John Williamson (2012) *Who Needs to Open the Capital Account?*: Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Jeanne, Olivier and Anton Korinek (2010) "Excessive Volatility in Capital Flows: A Pigouvian Taxation Approach," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 100, No. 2, pp. 403-07.

Kim, Jinill and Sunghyun Henry Kim (2003) "Spurious Welfare Reversals in International Business Cycle Models," *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 60, No. 2, pp. 471-500.

Kitano, Shigeto (2011) "Capital Controls and Welfare," *Journal of Macroeconomics*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 700 - 710.

Kitano, Shigeto and Kenya Takaku (2015) "Capital Controls, Monetary Policy, and Balance Sheets in a Small Open Economy," Discussion Paper Series DP2015-10, Research Institute for Economics & Business Administration, Kobe University.

Liu, Zheng. and Mark M. Spiegel (2015) "Optimal Monetary Policy and Capital Account Restrictions in a Small Open Economy," *IMF Economic Review*, Vol. 63, No. 2, pp. 298-324.

Ostry, Jonathan David, Mahvash Saeed Qureshi, Karl Habermeier, Dennis Bernhard Sebastian Reinhardt, Marcos Chamon, and Atish Ghosh (2010) "Capital

Inflows: The Role of Controls," IMF Staff Position Notes 2010/04, International Monetary Fund.

Ostry, Jonathan, Atish Ghosh, and Anton Korinek (2012) "Multilateral Aspects of Managing the Capital Account," IMF Staff Discussion Notes 12/10, International Monetary Fund.

Ravenna, Federico and Fabio M. Natalucci (2008) "Monetary Policy Choices in Emerging Market Economies: The Case of High Productivity Growth," *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, Vol. 40, No. 2-3, pp. 243-271.

Schmitt-Grohé, Stephanie and Martín Uribe (2004) "Solving Dynamic General Equilibrium Models Using a Second-Order Approximation to the Policy Function," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 755-775.

Schmitt-Grohé, Stephanie and Martin Uribe (2006) "Optimal Simple and Implementable Monetary and Fiscal Rules: Expanded Version," Working Paper 12402, National Bureau of Economic Research.

——— (2007) "Optimal Simple and Implementable Monetary and Fiscal Rules," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 54, No. 6, pp. 1702 - 1725.

Schmitt-Grohé, Stephanie and Martín Uribe (2016) "Downward Nominal Wage Rigidity, Currency Pegs, and Involuntary Unemployment," *Journal of Political Economy*, forthcoming.