

THE MACROECONOMIC LOSS FUNCTION: A CRITICAL NOTE

THOMAS MAYER

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 771
CATEGORY 6: MONETARY POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCE
SEPTEMBER 2002

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- *from the SSRN website:* www.SSRN.com
- *from the CESifo website:* www.CESifo.de

THE MACROECONOMIC LOSS FUNCTION: A CRITICAL NOTE

Abstract

The standard loss function counts both positive and negative deviations from the output and inflation targets as losses. But if the sample period is long enough, then output growth in excess of the target, and often also inflation rates that are below target, should be counted as gains instead of losses.

JEL Classification: E61, E50, E37.

Keywords: loss functions, policy evaluation.

*Thomas Mayer (emeritus
University of California Berkeley)
3054 Buena Vista Way
Berkeley, Ca, 94708
U.S.A.
Tommayer@bayarea.net*

The objective function usually employed in evaluating macroeconomic policies is a loss function described in the MIT Dictionary of Modern Economics (Pearce, 1986, p. 255) as a disutility function of policymakers that: "usually contains the squared difference between the actual and desired value of each target variable multiplied by a weight associated with that variable." It cites as an example $L = a_1(u-u^*)^2 + a_2(p-p^*)^2$, where L is the loss, the u's are the unemployment rates, the p's the inflation rates, the stars designate the desired rates, and the a's the weights of the two variables. Although such a loss function may not be applicable to a new classical model in which a rise in unemployment can represent the appropriate response of agents to a fall in productivity, Cecchetti (2000, p. 51) has called this type of loss function (though, written with an output measure in place of unemployment) "the simplest and most commonly used objective function."¹

The use of such loss functions to evaluate monetary or fiscal policies raise several questions. One is the omission of the higher moments of the variances of output and inflation (see Cecchetti, 2000). A second is its assumption of symmetry, that is the attachment of equal weights to deviations above and below the target. A third is the

use of a quadratic function, which is usually justified only by its tractability, and sometimes by its innocuousness. (See for instance Waud, 1976, Kunstman, 1984, Horowitz, 1987, Mitchell, 1990). The fourth - the subject of this Note - is the treatment of above-target output and below-target inflation as instances of losses.

1. Output

Suppose output exceeds its target so that the output gap is negative. Why should this be considered a loss? This depends on why the particular output target was chosen. One possibility is it represents the output level that maximizes the utility function of agents. At a higher output level some agents would be required to work involuntary overtime, and shortages would develop in some markets. Another possibility - one much more likely to influence the decisions of policymakers - is that this output target represents the highest level of output consistent with nonaccelerating inflation. I will assume that this second possibility is the way the output target was chosen. This accords with New Keynesian efficiency wage models in which agents generally want to supply more labor than is demanded. But in this case the standard loss function is problematic because the loss from inflation is already included in it. Hence, if the period over which policy is evaluated is long enough for the full inflationary effect of overshooting the output target to show up, then penalizing an overshooting of the output target because it is inflationary, amount to

counting the loss from inflation twice; once directly when the inflation rate exceeds its target, and once indirectly when the groundwork for this inflation rate is laid.

This does not mean that the inflationary consequence of overshooting the output target should always be ignored, because if the overshooting occurs toward the end of the period covered, the resulting loss from the rise in the inflation rate will not be counted. The solution to this problem is to terminate the period over which policy is evaluated at a point when sufficient time has passed for excess demand to have had all its inflationary effect. However, when evaluating the actual policy followed during a particular period, rather than the effects of a simulated policy this may create a serious problem because by the time the inflationary effect of one episode of excess demand has occurred a new episode of excess demand may have begun.

That the loss function should not include a negative output gap does not mean that policymakers are wrong if they adopt a more restrictive policy when output exceeds its target. Given the limited reliability of the inflation forecasts provided by other indicators, information on current or predicted output may provide a useful signal for when a switch to a more restrictive policy is warranted. But an economist fitting a loss function does not need such a signal since he or she, unlike the real-time policymaker, already knows the inflation rate.

2.. Inflation

Whether a moderate shortfall of inflation below its target should be counted as a loss depends on why the particular inflation target was chosen. One possibility is that it was chosen because at that time it seemed the lowest inflation rate that was achievable. If so, the loss function should not treat a shortfall of the inflation rate from its target as involving a loss. For example, the Fed's policy in recent years is probably explained much better by assuming that it gave a zero weight to deviations of inflation below its target than by assuming that it gave them the same weight as deviations above the inflation target. Should the loss function used to evaluate monetary policy penalize such an opportunistic policy? Or, suppose that policymakers had set the inflation target as high as they did because they believed that, due to nominal wage inflexibility, as shifts in demand occur a lower inflation rate could generate excessive frictional unemployment, or because they believed that with a lower inflation target the zero bound to nominal interest rates would inhibit stabilization policy. Here, too, if the period used to evaluate the policy is long enough, treating a below-target inflation rate as a loss results in double counting: the undershooting of the inflation rate is counted as a loss when it occurs, and then again when it manifests itself in a fall in output ² Another possibility is that the inflation target was set at a certain level to avoid falsifying the public's expectation

of inflation. Here treating the shortfall of the inflation rate as a loss is appropriate. Even giving it the same weight as an overshooting of the inflation rate seems plausible.

3. Some Potential Solutions

One possible solution is to use an asymmetric loss function (see Kunstman, 1984) in which deviations above the output target and deviations below the inflation target have a weight of zero. Another is to replace the actual target levels by pseudo target levels set at the highest observed value of output growth and the lowest observed rate of inflation, so that all deviations from the target will automatically have the same sign. This, however, may make the use of a quadratic function questionable because it increases the relative weight of large deviations.

4. Conclusion

The standard loss function should not be treated as an off-the-shelf default option that can be added mechanically to an econometric model. Instead, if the period over which the model is run is long enough for the inflationary effect of excess output to have occurred, then above-target output should be treated as a gain, not as a loss, and in many cases undershooting of the inflation target should also be counted as a gain. Since instances of output exceeding its target or inflation falling below its target are not uncommon, the symmetry assumption's implication that all deviations

from the inflation and output targets should be treated as losses is not just a harmless assumption that provided tractability at some small loss in accuracy. Instead, it can easily produce wrong results.

ENDNOTES

1. However, other loss functions are also used. See for instance the ones employed in Rudenbusch (2002).
- 2.. This assumes that policymakers are correct in their beliefs

REFERENCES

- Cecchetti, Stephen (2000) "Making Monetary Policy: Objectives and Rules," Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 16, 43-59.
- Horowitz, Ann (1987) "Loss Functions and Public Policy," Journal of Macroeconomics, 9, 489-504.
- Kunstman, A. (1984) "Controlling a Linear Dynamic System According to Asymmetric Preferences." Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 7, 261-81
- Mitchell, Douglas (1990) "The Efficient Policy Frontier under Conditions of Parameter Uncertainty and Multiple Tools," Journal of Macroeconomics, 12, 137-45
- Pearce, David (1986) The MIT Dictionary of Modern Economics, Cambridge, MA., MIT Press,
- Rudenbusch (2002) "Assessing Nominal Income Rules for Monetary Policy with Model and Data Uncertainty," Economic Journal, 112, 402-432
- Waud, Roger (1976) "Asymmetric Policymaker Utility Functions and Optimal Policy under Uncertainty," Econometrica, 44, 53-66.

CESifo Working Paper Series

(for full list see www.cesifo.de)

- 702 Ralph Chami and Gregory D. Hess, For Better or For Worse? State-Level Marital Formation and Risk Sharing, April 2002
- 703 Fredrik Andersson and Kai A. Konrad, Human Capital Investment and Globalization in Extortionary States, April 2002
- 704 Antonis Adam and Thomas Moutos, The Political Economy of EU Enlargement: Or, Why Japan is not a Candidate Country?, April 2002
- 705 Daniel Gros and Carsten Hefeker, Common Monetary Policy with Asymmetric Shocks, April 2002
- 706 Dirk Kiesewetter and Rainer Niemann, Neutral and Equitable Taxation of Pensions as Capital Income, April 2002
- 707 Robert S. Chirinko, Corporate Taxation, Capital Formation, and the Substitution Elasticity between Labor and Capital, April 2002
- 708 Frode Meland and Gaute Torsvik, Structural Adjustment and Endogenous Worker Recall Probabilities, April 2002
- 709 Rainer Niemann and Caren Sureth, Taxation under Uncertainty – Problems of Dynamic Programming and Contingent Claims Analysis in Real Option Theory, April 2002
- 710 Thomas Moutos and William Scarth, Technical Change and Unemployment: Policy Responses and Distributional Considerations, April 2002
- 711 Günther Rehme, (Re-)Distribution of Personal Incomes, Education and Economic Performance Across Countries, April 2002
- 712 Thorvaldur Gylfason and Gylfi Zoega, Inequality and Economic Growth: Do Natural Resources Matter?, April 2002
- 713 Wolfgang Leininger, Contests over Public Goods: Evolutionary Stability and the Free-Rider Problem, April 2002
- 714 Ernst Fehr and Armin Falk, Psychological Foundations of Incentives, April 2002
- 715 Giorgio Brunello, Maria Laura Parisi, and Daniela Sonedda, Labor Taxes and Wages: Evidence from Italy, May 2002
- 716 Marta Aloi and Huw Dixon, Entry Dynamics, Capacity Utilisation and Productivity in a Dynamic Open Economy, May 2002

- 717 Paolo M. Panteghini, Asymmetric Taxation under Incremental and Sequential Investment, May 2002
- 718 Ben J. Heijdra, Christian Keuschnigg, and Wilhelm Kohler, Eastern Enlargement of the EU: Jobs, Investment and Welfare in Present Member Countries, May 2002
- 719 Tapio Palokangas, The Political Economy of Collective Bargaining, May 2002
- 720 Gilles Saint-Paul, Some Evolutionary Foundations for Price Level Rigidity, May 2002
- 721 Giorgio Brunello and Daniela Sonedda, Labor Tax Progressivity, Wage Determination, and the Relative Wage Effect, May 2002
- 722 Eric van Damme, The Dutch UMTS-Auction, May 2002
- 723 Paolo M. Panteghini, Endogenous Timing and the Taxation of Discrete Investment Choices, May 2002
- 724 Achim Wambach, Collusion in Beauty Contests, May 2002
- 725 Dominique Demougin and Claude Fluet, Preponderance of Evidence, May 2002
- 726 Gilles Saint-Paul, Growth Effects of Non Proprietary Innovation, May 2002
- 727 Subir Bose, Gerhard O. Orosel, and Lise Vesterlund, Optimal Pricing and Endogenous Herding, May 2002
- 728 Erik Leertouwer and Jakob de Haan, How to Use Indicators for ‘Corporatism’ in Empirical Applications, May 2002
- 729 Matthias Wrede, Small States, Large Unitary States and Federations, May 2002
- 730 Christian Schultz, Transparency and Tacit Collusion in a Differentiated Market, May 2002
- 731 Volker Grossmann, Income Inequality, Voting Over the Size of Public Consumption, and Growth, May 2002
- 732 Yu-Fu Chen and Michael Funke, Working Time and Employment under Uncertainty, May 2002
- 733 Kjell Erik Lommerud, Odd Rune Straume, and Lars Sørgaard, Downstream Merger with Oligopolistic Input Suppliers, May 2002
- 734 Saku Aura, Does the Balance of Power Within a Family Matter? The Case of the Retirement Equity Act, May 2002
- 735 Sandro Brusco and Fausto Panunzi, Reallocation of Corporate Resources and Managerial Incentives in Internal Capital Markets, May 2002

- 736 Stefan Napel and Mika Widgrén, Strategic Power Revisited, May 2002
- 737 Martin W. Cripps, Godfrey Keller, and Sven Rady, Strategic Experimentation: The Case of Poisson Bandits, May 2002
- 738 Pierre André Chiappori and Bernard Salanié, Testing Contract Theory: A Survey of Some Recent Work, June 2002
- 739 Robert J. Gary-Bobo and Sophie Larribeau, A Structural Econometric Model of Price Discrimination in the Mortgage Lending Industry, June 2002
- 740 Laurent Linnemer, When Backward Integration by a Dominant Firm Improves Welfare, June 2002
- 741 Gebhard Kirchgässner and Friedrich Schneider, On the Political Economy of Environmental Policy, June 2002
- 742 Christian Keuschnigg and Soren Bo Nielsen, Start-ups, Venture Capitalists, and the Capital Gains Tax, June 2002
- 743 Robert Fenge, Silke Uebelmesser, and Martin Werding, Second-best Properties of Implicit Social Security Taxes: Theory and Evidence, June 2002
- 744 Wendell Fleming and Jerome Stein, Stochastic Optimal Control, International Finance and Debt, June 2002
- 745 Gene M. Grossman, The Distribution of Talent and the Pattern and Consequences of International Trade, June 2002
- 746 Oleksiy Ivaschenko, Growth and Inequality: Evidence from Transitional Economies, June 2002
- 747 Burkhard Heer, Should Unemployment Benefits be Related to Previous Earnings?, July 2002
- 748 Bas van Aarle, Giovanni Di Bartolomeo, Jacob Engwerda, and Joseph Plasman, Staying Together or Breaking Apart: Policy-makers' Endogenous Coalitions Formation in the European Economic and Monetary Union, July 2002
- 749 Hans Gersbach, Democratic Mechanisms: Double Majority Rules and Flexible Agenda Costs, July 2002
- 750 Bruno S. Frey and Stephan Meier, Pro-Social Behavior, Reciprocity or Both?, July 2002
- 751 Jonas Agell and Helge Benmarker, Wage Policy and Endogenous Wage Rigidity: A Representative View From the Inside, July 2002
- 752 Edward Castronova, On Virtual Economies, July 2002
- 753 Rebecca M. Blank, U.S. Welfare Reform: What's Relevant for Europe?, July 2002
- 754 Ruslan Lukach and Joseph Plasman, Measuring Knowledge Spillovers Using Patent Citations: Evidence from the Belgian Firm's Data, July 2002

- 755 Aaron Tornell and Frank Westermann, Boom-Bust Cycles in Middle Income Countries: Facts and Explanation, July 2002
- 756 Jan K. Brueckner, Internalization of Airport Congestion: A Network Analysis, July 2002
- 757 Lawrence M. Kahn, The Impact of Wage-Setting Institutions on the Incidence of Public Employment in the OECD: 1960-98, July 2002
- 758 Sijbren Cnossen, Tax Policy in the European Union, August 2002
- 759 Chandima Mendis, External Shocks and Banking Crises in Developing Countries: Does the Exchange Rate Regime Matter?, August 2002
- 760 Bruno S. Frey and Lars P. Feld, Deterrence and Morale in Taxation: An Empirical Analysis, August 2002
- 761 Lars Calmfors and Åsa Johansson, Nominal Wage Flexibility, Wage Indexation and Monetary Union, August 2002
- 762 Alexander R. W. Robson and Stergios Skaperdas, Costly Enforcement of Property Rights and the Coase Theorem, August 2002
- 763 Horst Raff, Preferential Trade Agreements and Tax Competition for Foreign Direct Investment, August 2002
- 764 Alex Cukierman and V. Anton Muscatelli, Do Central Banks have Precautionary Demands for Expansions and for Price Stability? – Theory and Evidence, August 2002
- 765 Giovanni Peri, Knowledge Flows and Knowledge Externalities, August 2002
- 766 Daniel Friedman and Nirvikar Singh, Equilibrium Vengeance, August 2002
- 767 Sam Bucovetsky and Michael Smart, The Efficiency Consequences of Local Revenue Equalization: Tax Competition and Tax Distortions, August 2002
- 768 Tapio Palokangas, International Labour Market Regulation and Economic Growth with Creative Destruction, August 2002
- 769 Rudi Dornbusch, The New International Architecture, September 2002
- 770 Hans-Werner Sinn, Weber's Law and the Biological Evolution of Risk Preferences: The Selective Dominance of the Logarithmic Utility Function, September 2002
- 771 Thomas Mayer, The Macroeconomic Loss Function: A Critical Note, September 2002