



22nd EBES Conference - Rome

May 24-26, 2017

Rome, Italy



Jointly organized with the Faculty of Economics, Sapienza University of Rome

Certificate of Participation

This is to certify that:

Ozlen Hic

(Istanbul University, Turkey)

has participated in the *22nd EBES Conference - Rome* held in Rome, Italy on May 24-26, 2017 and orally presented a paper entitled "*New Keynesian Economics*".

President

Jonathan Batten

Jonathan Batten, Ph.D.



EBES

(Eurasia Business and Economics Society)

www.ebesweb.org

Conference Coordinator

Ender Demir

Ender Demir, Ph.D.



22nd EBES CONFERENCE - ROME
PROGRAM AND ABSTRACT BOOK

MAY 24-26, 2017
ROME, ITALY

JOINTLY ORGANIZED WITH



SAPIENZA
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

The Faculty of Economics
Sapienza University of Rome

SPONSORED BY



ebes@ebesweb.org
www.ebesweb.org

Copyright © EBES Publications
22nd EBES Conference - Rome Program and Abstract Book
ISBN: 978-605-84468-9-2
Publisher: EBES
Istanbul - Turkey
May 2017

22nd EBES Conference - Rome Program and Abstract Book
(ISBN: 978-605-84468-9-2)

EBES Publications / EBES Yayınları

Mailing Address / Yönetim Yeri Adresi: Akşemsettin Mah. Kocasinan Cad.
Erenoğlu İş Merkezi No:8/4 34080 Fatih - İstanbul, Türkiye

Publisher / Baskı: EBES

Akşemsettin Mah. Kocasinan Cad. Erenoğlu İş Merkezi No:8/4
34080 Fatih - İstanbul, Türkiye

Tel: 0212 2205451 **Fax:** 0212 2205452

Publication Type / Yayın Türü: Conference Book / Konferans Kitabı

Types of Material / Materyal Türü: *Electronic Book / Elektronik Kitap*

Istanbul - Turkey / İstanbul - Türkiye

May 2017 / Mayıs 2017

Contents

Contents	i
About EBES	ii
Executive Board & Officers	iii
Advisory Board.....	iv
Welcome - from the Conference Coordinator	v
Scientific Committee.....	vi
Keynote Speakers.....	vii
Publication Opportunities.....	viii
General Information.....	ix
Conference Program - Day 1.....	1-8
Conference Program - Day 2.....	9-16
Conference Program - Day 3.....	17-22
Abstract Book - Day 1	23-81
Abstract Book - Day 2	82-143
Abstract Book - Day 3	144-189
List of Countries Represented	190-191
List of Institutions Represented.....	192-197
List of Conference Participants	198-207

The Impact of Tax Burden on the Success Indicators of Small and Medium-Sized Businesses in Russia

Viktor Barhatov, Chelyabinsk State University, Russia; Irina Belova, Chelyabinsk State University, Russia; and Dmitri Pletnev, Chelyabinsk State University, Russia

LUNCH: 12:45-13:30

DAY 2 - SESSION III: 13:30-15:30

MANAGEMENT IV

Room: Aula 6a

Chair: Kenji Klein

Supporting Enterprise Innovation by Business Environment Institutions in Poland and Belarus

Andrzej Daniluk, Bialystok University of Technology, Poland

Structural Analysis of Turkish Hospital Industry Using Porter's Diamond Framework: A Case from an Emerging Market

Pinar Ozbilen, Bogazici University, Turkey

Performance Management in the Public Sector: The Case of Turkey

Hasan Engin Sener, Ankara Yildirim Beyazit University, Turkey

Modeling the Antecedents of Knowledge Sharing Behavior in Healthcare Services

Carlos Peixeira Marques, University of Tras-os-Montes and Alto Douro, Portugal; Carmem Teresa Leal, University of Tras-os-Montes and Alto Douro, Portugal; and Carla Susana Marques, University of Tras-os-Montes and Alto Douro, Portugal

Trust and Cooperation between Companies and Public Administration Institutions in Poland

Urszula Kobylinska, Bialystok University of Technology, Poland

Evaluation of Self-Esteem Levels of Faculty of Communication Students: A Comparison between Public and Private Universities

Emel Karayel Bilbil, Marmara University, Turkey and R. Fulya Akin, Marmara University, Turkey

MONETARY ECONOMICS & EXCHANGE RATES

Room: Aula 6b

Chair: Maritta Paloviita

Toward a Quality of Monetary Policy in Less Developing Countries: Case of Tunisia

El Mehdi Ali Griguiche, IHEC - Carthage / Carthage University, Tunisia

New Keynesian Economics

Ozlen Hic, Istanbul University, Turkey

Chinese Optimal Exchange Rate Policy Analysis Based on a Semi-Open 2-Country Economy Model

Fang Liu, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

The Closer We Get the Better We Are?

Ben-Zion Zilberfarb, Netanya Academic College and Bar-Ilan University, Israel and Natan Goldstein, Bar-Ilan University, Israel

Heterogeneous Autoregressive Realized Volatility Model versus Seasonal Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average Model

Sanja Slobodan Dudukovic, Franklin University Switzerland, Switzerland

Insulating Property of the Exchange Rate Regime in Central and Eastern European Countries

Marek A. Dabrowski, Cracow University of Economics, Poland and Justyna Wroblewska, Cracow University of Economics, Poland

in 2015-2016 education year. The self-esteem levels of students were determined by using Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. The study was conducted by face to face interview technique. The data collected for the study were analyzed by using IBM SPSS 21 package program. During the process of data analysis, independent samples t test, one way analysis of variance, regression analysis and correlation analysis were utilized. According to the findings obtained in the study, it was concluded that self-esteem level of students enrolled to communication faculties were found to be high, having a moderate level of trust to other people, high level of sensitivity to criticism, feeling of low level of thread during interpersonal relationships and moderate level of ability to joining to discussions. Monthly income, age and maternal education level variables were found to have no effect on self-esteem. On the other hand, in terms of the type of residence and the type of university variables, it was found to have a significant effect. It is found that there is a significant relationship between self-esteem and trusting to other people, sensitivity to criticism, feeling of thread for interpersonal relationships and ability to join discussions. These findings were discussed in the light of relevant literature.

Keywords: Self-Esteem, Sensitivity to Criticism, Trusting to Others, Being Able to Join Discussions

MONETARY ECONOMICS & EXCHANGE RATES

Room: Aula 6b

Chair: Maritta Paloviita

Toward a Quality of Monetary Policy in Less Developing Countries: Case of Tunisia

El Mehdi Ali Griguiche

IHEC - Carthage / Carthage University, Tunisia

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to study major changes in Tunisian monetary policy implementation conditions, and their effects. It focuses on the role of the central bank as a strategic participant in the finance of the economy, and the recycle of saving into investment. It aims to analyze new conditions of the efficiency of the settlement system through central bank balance sheet and its impact, not only through autonomous and discretionary factors, but also through liquidity factors of operators other than banks.

Keywords: Monetary policy, Transparency, Original sin, Currency mismatch, Fiscal dominance, Debt intolerance

New Keynesian Economics

Ozlen Hic

Istanbul University, Turkey

Abstract

During the stagflation of '70s, the Keynesian System fell from favor in the academic circles while Monetarism and, in particular, New Classical Economics became widely spread. The years '80s witnessed implementation of economic policies in line with Monetarism and the New Classical School, but unemployment, far from being removed automatically, increased and recession deepened. Hence during this decade these two schools fell from favor in the academic circles and in the US academic circles a new school, New Keynesian economics

began to take hold. The new Classicals had criticized the Keynesian System severely because its macro analysis had no micro foundations and its result, i.e. unemployment due to lack of demand was inconsistent with the result of full employment reached in the traditional microeconomics which was based on perfect competition. To meet this criticism of methodology, the New Keynesians went into microeconomics foundations of Keynesian macro analysis but they rejected the relevance of traditional microeconomics and instead accepted imperfectly competitive markets and lack of coordination between markets. These conditions would lead to Keynesian unemployment in the short run, if not in the long run. This would be cured by the implementation of Keynesian monetary and fiscal policies. In their analysis and models, New Keynesians also accepted the Rational Expectations Hypothesis of the New Classicals, which meant that all decision makers, including workers, could estimate future price increases and other future conditions correctly. The model of Efficiency Wages, as in the Keynesian System, recognizes that economy is in NANRUE due to the excess supply of labor on labor market. This model analyses several options of profits of companies under REH when economy is in NANRUE. It employs macroeconomic analysis and shows that how this analysis is benefited. It is a reasonable model.

Keywords: New Keynesian Economics, New Keynesian Models, Efficiency Wage Models, Fair Wages, Shirking Models, Adverse Selection Models

Chinese Optimal Exchange Rate Policy Analysis Based on a Semi-Open 2-Country Economy Model

Fang Liu

University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Abstract

The myth of China's currency "manipulation" is a controversial debate. In this paper, an alternative perspective is considered. I structure a 2-country model, containing a semi-open economy country and a industry country, to test the optimal exchange rate. A semi-open economy applies to Chinese financial market structure: the central bank has full access to international capital market, but the private sector does not. Moreover, Chinese financial market is identified by a large demand for saving instrument generated by limited financial development. Additionally, a central bank is modeled as a Ramsey planner to optimize the social welfare. My main result is consistent with Chinese experience: the optimal real exchange rate has an initial depreciation, which is followed by an appreciation in the long term. It means that Chinese real exchange rate moving is optimal after joining WTO in 2001 applying this model, regardless of the "manipulation". I also show that a coordination of two countries will improve the total welfare, especially for the developing country, but the magnitude is relatively small.

Keywords: Semi-Open Economy, Exchange Rate, Emerging Market, Ramsey Planner

Nayha Mansoor	University of St Andrews	United Kingdom
Nebojsa Savic	FEFA	Serbia
Nela Vlahinic Lenz	University of Rijeka	Croatia
Nerma Colakovic-Prguda	University of Mostar	Bosnia and Herzegovina
Nevber Zeynep Eroglu	Marmara University	Turkey
Nexhmie Berisha Vokshi	University of Prishtina	Kosovo
Nicki-Maria Destouni	University of Crete	Greece
Nihal Bayraktar	Penn State University	U.S.A.
Nikolay Hristov	Ifo Institute for Economic Research	Germany
Nikoloz Abuashvili	Georgian Institute of Public Affairs	Georgia
Nis Hoyrup Christensen	Copenhagen Business School	Denmark
Norbert Sipos	University of Pecs	Hungary
Norman Peng	University of Westminster	United Kingdom
Nurcan Hakan Ciraklar	Dokuz Eylul University	Turkey
Nurhastuty Kesumo Wardhani	Trisakti University	Indonesia
Olena Nikolsko-Rzhevskaja	Lehigh University	U.S.A.
Oliver Hulsewig	University of Applied Sciences Munich	Germany
Onur Tosun	University of Warwick	United Kingdom
Osmis Areda Habte	Lund University	Sweden
Ozlem Inanc Tuncer	Isik University	Turkey
Ozlen Hic	Istanbul University	Turkey
Pasi Sajasalo	Jyvaskyla University	Finland
Paul Windrum	The University of Nottingham	United Kingdom
Pawel Stepien	University of Szczecin	Poland
Pedro Miguel Amakasu Raposo de Medeiros Carvalho	Lisbon School of Economics & Management	Portugal
Peeter Maripuu	Tallinn University of Technology	Estonia
Pekka Tuominen	University of Tampere	Finland
Peter Michael Sheldon	University of New South Wales	Australia
Phouphet Kyophilavong	National University of Laos	Laos
Pinar Ozbilen	Bogazici University	Turkey
R. Fulya Akin	Marmara University	Turkey
Radmila Jablan Stefanovic	University of Belgrade	Serbia
Radoslaw Kaluzny	Poznan University of Economics	Poland
Radovan Kovacevic	University of Belgrade	Serbia
Rajeev Sharma	University of Petroleum and Energy Studies	India
Raquel Ch Meneses	FEP	Portugal
Razvan Mihai Dobrescu	University of Bucharest	Romania
Riste Temjanovski	University "Goce Delcev" - Shtip	Republic of Macedonia
Rozita Susniene	Kaunas University of Technology	Lithuania
Ruchi Tyagi	UPES	India
Rui Jorge Cavaco	DREAMS - Universidade Lusofona de Humanidades e Tecnologias	Portugal
Safak Aksoy	Akdeniz University	Turkey
Saina Kohli	UPES	India
Samah Horchani Chemli	Tunis El-Manar University, FSEGT	Tunisia



22nd EBES CONFERENCE - ROME PROCEEDINGS - VOLUME 3

**MAY 24-26, 2017
ROME, ITALY**

JOINTLY ORGANIZED WITH



SAPIENZA
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA

**The Faculty of Economics
Sapienza University of Rome**

SPONSORED BY



**ebes@ebesweb.org
www.ebesweb.org**

The authors of individual papers are responsible for technical, content, and linguistic correctness.

Published by EBES
Copyright © 2017

85	<i>The Interaction between Social Capital, Creativity and Efficiency an Organizational Perspective: An Empirical Study</i> Fikret Sozbulir, Artvin Coruh University, Turkey	1514-1525
86	<i>The Facility Service Industry in Europe</i> Alexander Redlein, TU Wien, Austria and Eva Stopajnik, TU Wien, Austria	1526-1535
87	<i>Unexpected Loan Losses and Bank Capital in an Estimated DSGE Model of the Euro Area</i> Nikolay Hristov, Ifo Institute for Economic Research, Germany and Oliver Hulsewig, University of Applied Sciences Munich, Germany	1536-1586
88	<i>Competition Makes Inspectors More Lenient: Evidence from the Motor Vehicle Inspection Market</i> Osmis Arede Habte, Lund University, Sweden and Hakan J. Holm, Lund University, Sweden	1587-1622
89	<i>New Keynesian Economics</i> Ozlen Hic, Istanbul University, Turkey	1623-1633
90	<i>Management Education for Sustainability and Innovation: Strategic and Administrative Frameworks for Effective Curricula Integrations</i> Marco Tavanti, University of San Francisco, U.S.A.	1634-1653
91	<i>Situation on the Global Market of Energy Resources and Development Perspectives by 2030</i> Ireneusz Maciej Miciula, University of Szczecin, Poland and Pawel Stepien, University of Szczecin, Poland	1654-1665
92	<i>Predicting Asset Dynamics with the Use of Bivariate Kernel Density Estimate</i> Mantas Landauskas, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania and Eimutis Valakevicius, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania	1666-1674
93	<i>Instant Articles (Facebook) - The Impact of Trust and the Relations among the Partners Pursuing the Strategy of Cooperation</i> Jan Kreft, Jagiellonian University, Poland	1675-1687
94	<i>From Entrepreneurial Orientation to Innovation: The Mediating Role of Information System Case of Tunisian SMEs</i> Samah Horchani Chemli, Tunis El-Manar University, FSEGT, Tunisia and Mahmoud Zouaoui, Business School of Tunis, Compus La Manouba, Tunisia	1688-1698
95	<i>Ethical Accounting - The Driver in Recovering Markets</i> Sandeep Goel, Management Development Institute, India	1699-1714
96	<i>Re-Examining the Determinants of Islamic vs. Conventional Banks Performance, Static OLS vs. Dynamic GMM Models: New Classification QISMUT Plus Three Countries</i> Alimshan Faizulayev, Eastern Mediterranean University, Cyprus; Eralp Bektas, Eastern Mediterranean University, Cyprus; and Ayodeji Samson Fatigun, Eastern Mediterranean University, Cyprus	1715-1739
97	<i>IPO as a VC Funds Type of Exit</i> Dorota Podedworna-Tarnowska, Warsaw School of Economics, Poland	1740-1768
98	<i>Private Sector' Emiratization: Job Satisfaction and Sociocultural Influences</i> Emilie J. Rutledge, United Arab Emirates University, U.A.E. and Khaled Alkaabi, United Arab Emirates University, U.A.E.	1769-1800
99	<i>History of the European Accounting Directives Review: An Analysis of the Different Views Emerging from the Public Consultation and Their Acceptance Level in the Current EU Directive</i> Gabriele D'Alauro, University of Genoa, Italy	1801-1844
100	<i>Branch Purchasing Groups vs. Sales Profitability of Commercial Companies</i> Grzegorz Zimon, Rzeszow University of Technology, Poland	1845-1852

NEW KEYNESIAN EFFICIENCY MODELS

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özlen HİÇ
Istanbul University, ozlen.h.birrol @ gmail.com

Abstract

During the stagflation of '70s, the Keynesian System fell from favor in the academic circles while Monetarism and, in particular, New Classical Economics became widely spread. The years '80s witnessed implementation of economic policies in line with Monetarism and the New Classical School, but unemployment, far from being removed automatically, increased and recession deepened. Hence during this decade these two schools fell from favor in the academic circles and in the US academic circles a new school, New Keynesian economics began to take hold.

The new Classicals had criticized the Keynesian System severely because its macro analysis had no micro foundations and its result, i.e. unemployment due to lack of demand was inconsistent with the result of full employment reached in the traditional microeconomics which was based on perfect competition.

To meet this criticism of methodology, the New Keynesians went into microeconomics foundations of Keynesian macro analysis but they rejected the relevance of traditional microeconomics and instead accepted imperfectly competitive markets and lack of coordination between markets. These conditions would lead to Keynesian unemployment in the short run, if not in the long run. This would be cured by the implementation of Keynesian monetary and fiscal policies. In their analysis and models, New Keynesians also accepted the Rational Expectations Hypothesis of the New Classicals, which meant that all decision makers, including workers, could estimate future price increases and other future conditions correctly.

The model of Efficiency Wages, as in the Keynesian System, recognizes that economy is in NANRUE due to the excess supply of labor on labor market. This model analyses several options of profits of companies under REH when economy is in NANRUE. It employs macroeconomic analysis and shows that how this analysis is benefited. It is a reasonable model.

Keywords-New Keynesian Economics, New Keynesian Models, Efficiency Wage Models, Fair Wages, Shirking Models, Adverse Selection Models

1. THE INSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL FACTORS LEADING TO THE BIRTH OF NEW KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS

Since the '80s, Monetarism and New Classical School have fallen from favor in the academic circles and two opposing views have begun to be widely accepted, namely, New Keynesian Economics based upon the Keynesian System (in USA) and Post- Keynesian Economics based upon the Keynesian system (in Britain).

The main factors leading to the birth or rather spread of New Keynesian Economics, are institutional and political. These reasons can be recalled as below:

A. The Validity of the Phillips Curve

In the '70s, the prices constantly were rising because of OPEC, leading to a rise also in the Phillips Curve (PE) as the New Keynesian econometricians (Gordon) proved; hence Phillips Curve (PC), again, has become valid for the short-run (SR) and the long-run (LR) and

was included in the analyses. According to this new finding, the New Classicals claim, “The Great Fallacy of Keynesian System” by Lucas and Sargent, has been refuted. Later on, Blinder who is one of the most important representatives of the New Keynesian Economics considered this misinterpretation of PC by the New Classicals as “The Greatest Fallacy of New Classical Economists”.

B. The High Rates of Unemployment in USA and Britain

Until the ‘80s, despite the high level of unemployment in USA and in Britain, strict monetary policy was being implemented and the government intervention was at the minimum as in accordance with Monetarist and New Classical policy recommendations; however, neither inflation nor unemployment decreased. Yet, during Thatcher’s government in Britain, the number of unemployed rose from 1.1 million to 3 million. This consolidated the belief in the academic circles that the results of New Classical and Monetarist “automatic-full-employment equilibrium (AFNE)” assumption and their policy recommendations were wrong; whereas the Keynesian “less-than-full-employment equilibrium (or unemployment equilibrium, UNE)” assumption and Keynesian policies were realistic.

C. The Consistency of Macroeconomics with the Microeconomics

New Keynesian economists accepted the “inconsistency” of the Keynesian macroeconomic analysis with the micro analysis, which was considered as a fallacy of the Keynesian System by the New Classical economists, hence they concentrated on this issue and filled this gap within the Keynesian System.

However, New Keynesian economists accepted “Imperfect Competition (IC) conditions” in their microeconomic analysis which seems to be more valid for today’s markets and therefore refuted the assumptions of “full flexibility of Prices (P) and Wages (W)”, “Perfect Competition (PC)” and the “Walrasian Auctioneer”. The inflexibility of P and W due to IC will lead the economy to the Keynesian lack of effective demand and UNE. In addition, even if the PC conditions are valid in all the markets, this time, “the lack of coordination between markets” might occur that means, even if the P and W may not necessarily be inflexible, they not change immediately and/or at the desired rate hence leading to “involuntary unemployment” due to the lack of effective demand, particularly in the short-run. In this case, the government should intervene through Keynesian fiscal policies.

For many younger generation academics, the New Keynesian Economics is as interesting as the New Classical School because the New Keynesian Economics extensively includes mathematical analysis, particularly in the microeconomic analyses.

D. The Conservative View in ‘80s and the Keynesian Fiscal Policies

Despite the “conservative view” that was dominant especially in USA, Keynesian policies suggested by New Keynesians did not receive considerable reaction because the New Keynesian economists could show the logic behind the necessity of government intervention that was particularly needed for the SR. Similarly, New Keynesian economists, with respect to the “the distribution of income”, have more rightist tendencies on the political spectrum and locate themselves between the Central Left and Centre compared to the Keynesian System in general and the Post-Keynesian Economists in particular.

E. The Invalidity of the Rational Expectations Hypothesis and the Flexibility of Prices and Wages

Even though the “rational expectations hypothesis (REH)” which is one of the two major assumptions of the New Classical School, was accepted by most of the New Keynesian

economists - to eliminate the discussion topics-, econometric analyses have not yet confirmed the validity of REH; instead they showed that more probably REH is an “invalid”.

The second major assumption of the New Classical School is the assumption of full flexibility of P and W but this assumption has been refuted as IC was identified more spread in all the markets. New Keynesian economists showed that P and W are not inflexible but they do not change enough which is the main reason for Keynesian UNE in the SR.

F. The Pro-Cyclical Pattern of the Real Wages

The progress of real wages in time is also far from the assumptions of the New Classical economists based on the Traditional Classical analysis because, according to these systems, when there is unemployment (N) in the economy, the reason is the high wages. Accordingly, the wages were expected to be contra-cyclical. However, in reality, the wages seemed to be “pro-cyclical” with relatively soft fluctuations. This de facto progress of the real wages can easily be explained within the context of the Keynesian System; for example, the aggregate demand (AD) may increase due to the technological developments and due to the increases in investments and therefore, labor unions can increase the real and nominal wages to some extent with respect to the increase in N. Then again, this wage-increase may partially compensate the increase in the labor costs due to their high marginal consumption propensity. On the other hand, during low levels of income, labor unions will prevent the wages to decrease too much.

2. THE RISE OF NEW KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS

Because of all the reasons mentioned above, the New Keynesian Economics has become widespread in the academic circles in USA during the '80 when Monetarist and New Classical policies did not produce any positive results.

The term “New Keynesian” was firstly used by Michael Parkin (1982). The use of “New” instead of “Neo” had a definite purpose; the New Keynesian economists would like to distinguish themselves clearly from “Neo-Keynesian economists” (Samuelson, Tobin, Modigliani, Solow etc.) because New Keynesian economists generally – with a few exception who adopted the hysteresis and efficiency wage models later- accepted the conclusions of the Neo-Classical Synthesis, in other words, the economy would automatically come to “natural-rate-of-unemployment equilibrium (ANRUE) in the LR. Nevertheless, contrary to the Synthesist Keynesians or Neo-Keynesians (hydraulic Keynesians) who followed Keynes and left their analyses on a macroeconomic level, the New Keynesian economists, just like the New Classical economists, included the microeconomic analysis within their macroeconomic system as a whole. They tried to establish microeconomic basis for their macroeconomic analysis. For this reason, New Keynesian economists differ from Neo-Keynesians in terms of “methodology”. However, through their analyses (IC instead of PC, P and W-inflexibility instead of P and W-flexibility, and the lack of coordination between markets instead of Walrasian Auctioneer), they reached again the Keynesian result NANRUE as opposed to the New Classical economists who reached the Classical result, ANRUE.

Thereby, the New Keynesian economists called themselves as “New” Keynesians in order to demonstrate their differences from the “New” Classicals whom they saw as their opponents and adversaries. Accordingly, this term also distinguishes them from the former generation of “Neo-Keynesians” who left their analysis only on macroeconomic level.

3. FOUNDATIONS OF NEW KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS: NANRUE

The foundations of the New Keynesian Economics are based upon the following assumptions:

- In all markets in the economy, IC conditions prevail. Even if the P and W are not fully inflexible, they are not flexible in the SR to provide ANRUE.
- There is lack of coordination between markets. Walrasian Auctioneer is not valid.

According to these assumptions, the New Keynesian economists claim that the economy will settle at NANRUE due to the lack of AD and there will be involuntary unemployment, particularly in the SR.

For the LR, New Keynesian economists are divided into two groups:

- In the early '80s, the majority of New Keynesian economists accepted the fact that economy in the LR would tend towards ANRUE. The first groups of New Keynesian economists' thoughts were in line with the Neo-Classical Synthesist Keynesians (or Neo-Keynesians).
- However, the other group of New Keynesian economists, who accepted the "hysteresis" and "efficiency wage" models stated that the economy, in the LR, does not automatically reach ANRUE but settle at UNE. The models of the second group of New Keynesian economists are totally compatible with Keynes's original ideas; therefore, these models are also called "Super-Keynesian models".

The New Keynesian economists essentially accept that in the SR, there will be involuntary unemployment due to lack of effective demand and this can be prevented or at least reduced by Keynesian monetary and/or fiscal policies. Most of the New Keynesian economists, however, accept that in the LR, the economy will tend towards ANRUE, however, most of the time the economy will face involuntary unemployment due to lack of effective demand. In this case, waiting without intervention until the economy tends towards ANRUE in the LR would cause even bigger problems than the unemployment problem itself as unemployment continues in the long run. For this reason, the government should continuously intervene to economy with Keynesian policies.

4. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF NEW KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS

A. Rational Expectations Hypothesis: REH

All of the New Keynesian economists followed New Classical economists and accepted REH. There are two strategic reasons lying behind this recognition of some New Keynesian economists that actually do not believe in REH:

First, New Keynesian economists desire to reduce points of discussion with New Classical economists because New Classical economists consider that models that do not recognize REH as "non-scientific" and passionately exclude them from discussions.

In addition, according to New Keynesian economists, the basic reason for NANRUE is not Keynesian effective demand insufficiency but inflexibility of P and W. Stanley Fischer and Taylor proved this on their models. This is the second strategic reason for New Keynesian economists to recognize REH.

Even in the case of REH's recognition, as long as inflexibility of P and W exists, unemployment due to Keynesian effective demand insufficiency occurs. Therefore, there is a need for state intervention to economy in the context of Keynesian policies and intervention brings positive outcomes.

With the acceptance of REH, New Keynesian economists methodologically prefer "atomistic analysis", in other words they put macroeconomic analyses on the bases of microeconomic analyses. In addition to rationality of units or the purpose of profit and/or

utility maximization, they assume that such units have full information or acquire necessary information easily and without expenses to make decisions. Both laborers and entrepreneurs are not wrong about their future expectations concerning prices. Entrepreneurs, while they are making decision for investment and production, they can accurately predict the future as “Bayesian probability set”.

However, New Keynesian economists know that REH does not accurately reflects reality and econometric studies have not yet proved the existence of REH. In some cases, they suggest models consisting of near-rational behaviors.

B. Inflexibility of Prices and Wages: NANRUE

NRU, instead of full employment, was first claimed by M. Friedman. It was accepted by New Classic economists. According to M. Friedman, let the state increases money supply, the economy would tend towards to ANRUE in the long run (following period) due to “the assumption of adapted expectations”. For New Classical economists would tend towards to ANRUE with perfect competition and full flexibility of P and W in line with the Walrasian assumptions of auction.

Most New Keynesian economists recognize the concept of NRU instead of full employment. Despite REH, the main factor that economy does not fully come to the balance on the point of NRU, is the spread of “IC” on markets, flexibility of P and W and at the same time “lack of coordination between markets”.

In New Keynesian economics, in the footsteps of Traditional Classical System, perfect competition conditions, flexibility P and W and Walrasian assumptions of auction, which are recognized by the New Classical School, are not considered. According to New Keynesian economists, these assumptions would lead to Keynesian effective demand insufficiency in the SR and Keynesian involuntary unemployment. In New Keynesian economics, the tendency of economy in the LR to ANRUE is mentioned above.

C. Significance Level of Assumptions

Almost all New Keynesian economists accepted REH for strategic reasons although it is not in the Keynesian System and not verified by econometric studies. Taylor and Fischer recognized REH in their models but at the same time, considering the assumption that P and W are inflexible, they proved Keynesian effective demand insufficiency oriented involuntary unemployment despite the existence of REH and the effectiveness of Keynesian policies in this situation.

Therefore, New Keynesian economists started with the assumptions of REH and P and W’s flexibility, which was theoretically considered equally important by the New Classical School and showed that the assumption of P and W’s inflexibility is more important and REH’s validity is not a matter of question.

5. METHODOLOGY OF NEW KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS

In models of New Keynesian Economics, macroeconomic assumptions and microeconomic analyses are of primary importance because New Keynesian economists attempt to locate the Keynesian System and emergence of UNE within this system due to demand insufficiency on solid macroeconomic bases. This common result, in other words emergence of UNE that is caused by demand insufficiency, might remain unnoticed during microeconomic analyses. However, “the main theme” of New Keynesian economists- through following the Keynesian system- is UNE that was caused by effective demand insufficiency

in the SR and involuntary unemployment. The definition and bases of New Keynesian Economics, as mentioned above, were best explained by Blinder.

New Keynesian economists, while locating macroeconomic analysis on microeconomic basis, they left the assumptions of perfect competition conditions, P and W's full flexibility, Walrasian general balance and Walrasian auction. Therefore in fact by adaptation of microeconomic analysis to the conditions of the Keynesian System, they made a breakthrough in microeconomic analyses. Theories, which were first raised by Robinson (*Theory of Monopolistic Competition, 1933*) and Chamberlain (*Theory of Imperfect Competition, 1933*) were incorporated with theory of oligopoly and Game Theory and advanced more. Further analyses confirmed that IC refers to more common market conditions and there can be a lack of coordination between markets.

Nevertheless, studies of New Keynesian economists are not a single model depending on "microeconomic basis" but with many models. All these models, although they lead us to Keynesian results, are not consistent with each other. "Acceptance of a model requires rejection of another", in other words, they are mutually exclusive. For example, hysteresis and efficiency wages models contradict other models that presume economy in UD would provide ONRUD. On the other hand, many models can be mutually inclusive. For example, a model can explain economic developments in a particular country or in a particular period; another model might do the same. New Keynesian economists' research on microeconomic analyses causes them to be called as "microns".

6. A BRIEF CLASSIFICATION OF NEW KEYNESIAN MODELS

New Keynesian economists put macroeconomics and UNE that is caused by demand inefficiency on the microeconomic basis against the criticism of New Classicals. In doing so, they reject New Classical theory of microeconomics (Perfect Competition, Walrasian general equilibrium, Walrasian assumption of auction, assumption of the full flexibility of P and W) and basically start from IC.

According to New Keynesian economists, inflexibility of P and W are observed due to IC on markets and this creates UNE. New Keynesian economists, while doing these investigations, identified several reasons for inflexibility in various sectors. For this reason they developed several "models". As each of these models finds a reason for inflexibility of P and W, they actually emerge in some sectors and due to some certain reasons. Accordingly, a certain New Keynesian model can be valid however another one can be valid for another reason. Most of the reasons and models are not contradictive and acceptance of one does not necessarily require rejection of the other. In other words they are not mutually exclusive, instead they can be considered mutually inclusive. However in some cases, acceptance of a model requires rejection of other models logically. For example, the ones who accept "hysteresis and efficiency wage models" cannot simultaneously accept the fact that economy in the LR tend towards to ANRUE. Several models based upon microeconomic assumptions, although contradictory ones are eliminated, are not able to form an integrated single "New Keynesian Model" or "New Keynesian System". In fact econometric studies investigating the validity of many models have not yet been done as there is not enough time.

However, macroeconomic results and macroeconomic policy suggestions of these models do not change: UNE in the SR or periods (or both in SR and LR for hysteresis and wage efficiency models) and solving this problem through Keynesian policies. IC causes several inflexibilities in P and W and this lead to Keynesian effective demand inefficiency.

Following Blinder, Gordon, Mankiw and Romer, we can classify major New Keynesian models into the following groups.

A. “Price and Wage Inflexibilities on Markets Based on IC”

The models in this group can be classified under 3 sub-titles.

6.A.1. “Menu (Catalogue) Costs”

When there is status of decrease in demand, due to “constant costs of change of prices” companies sacrifice their profits for a while, hold their prices constant and increase production to some extent. This creates stickiness of prices, which might result in large scale of fluctuations in economy: Mankiw, Akerlof and Yellen, Blanchard and Kiyotaki etc.

6.A.2. “Staggering of Prices and Wages”

When there is status of decrease in demand and there is a need for changing wages and/or prices, due to “contracts based upon nominal prices and wages”, it is unable to reduce “all wages and prices at the same time”. In brief, delays or staggering of prices and wages, instead of “synchronization of prices and wages”. These delays, even under REH, cause UNE and the possibilities to overcome these issues through Keynesian monetary policy: Fischer, Phelps and Taylor, Taylor etc.

6.A.3. “Wrong Pricing”

Under IC, some companies, producers or consumers on market are “leaders” (large); some are “followers” (small). This causes wrong pricing and wrong pricing leads to UNE: Hart, Hall, Mankiw etc.

B. “Inertia”

The main idea in menu costs model depends on stabilization of prices instead of reducing them when there is a status of decrease in demand or increase in production costs. Inertia is a large scale implementation of this idea. Due to “constant costs of the decision concerning product purchases”, no changes are made for purchase decisions and “inertia” of prices becomes valid in all fields: For example, inventory purchase decisions of companies, customers’ demand for durable consumer goods, investments’ demand for portfolio and consequently demand inefficiency and ANRUE: Blinder, Blanchard, Blinder and Gordon, Azaiadis and Stiglitz.

C. “Coordination Failures or Lack of Coordination between Markets”

Lack of coordination between markets causes to inflexibility of P and W and this results in ANRUE. Axel Leijonhufvud’s avant garde work on this issue and New Keynesian models that follow this work: Cooper and John, Diamond, Schleifer etc.

D. “Efficiency Wages”

According to these models, which accept that all units in economy are rational and maximize their profits and eventually accept REH, “high wages” increase MPPL and decrease labor turnover costs. For this reason, this model deals with maximization of company profits on a higher wage level that brings economy to ANRUE, which is called “efficiency wages”. Consequently UNE occurs. These models investigate permanency of UNE in the LR and probability of eliminating it through Keynesian policies. An extensive review of these models is done by Akerlof and Yellen.

E. “Hysteresis”

According to these models, when economy comes to UNE once, due to several factors it cannot restore to ANRUE. In brief, as most of New Classicals agree, these models do not accept automatic NRU balance in the LR. They are also called as “Super-Keynesian” models.

As is seen, there are several New Keynesian models determining and explaining inflexibilities that stem from IC in prices and wages, lack of coordination etc. For example, even Mankiw and Romer's selection among these models consists of 2 volumes (880 pages in total).

7. EFFICIENCY WAGE MODELS AND ITS CRITICISM

The model of efficiency wages, as in the Keynesian System, recognizes that economy is in NANRUE due to the excess supply of labor on labor market. This model analyses several options of profits of companies under REH when economy is in NANRUE. It employs macroeconomic analysis and shows that how this analysis is benefited. It is a reasonable model.

In traditional microanalysis, MPPL depends on technical knowledge level and quantity of other factors of production used (particularly the capital) and how much (or how many hours) labor is employed. If we increase constant capital and quantity of labor employed, MPPL decreases from a certain point. According to the principle of profit maximization, entrepreneurs employ labor in line with the fact that real wage is equal MPPL under PC. In this analysis, MPPL is independent from wage level, in other words;

Short Term Production Function:

$$y = f(L, K, T, R) \quad \text{and } K, T, R \quad \text{briefly}$$

$$y = f(L)$$

$$y' \equiv \text{MPPL}$$

The Condition of Balance and Profit Maximization for D_L and N:

$$\text{It will be } \text{MPPL} = w$$

In the model of efficiency wages, as a completely new assumption, it is acknowledged that real wage level effects MPPL and high wages cause an increase in MPPL. Laborers, who are satisfied with high real wages, would increase their effectiveness (The demand impacts of Keynesian macro consumption tendency increase, which is caused by high wages, are the same). We can explain this in the following:

Production function:

$$y = y(eL, K, T, R) \quad \text{and } K, T, R \quad \text{briefly}$$

$$y = f(eL)$$

$$e = e(w), \quad e' > 0$$

$$y = f[e(w)L]$$

The Condition of Balance for D_L and N::

$$\text{It is accepted that } \text{MPPL} = f(w)$$

y: Production

L: Labor that is employed

e: Effectiveness Criteria referring laborers' effort

w: Real Wage Level

In this case,

wL: Total wages paid for labor

Company's profit:

$\Pi = \text{Production} - \text{Cost}$

$\Pi = f[e(w)L] - wL$

Π : Total Profit

e is w's (real wage) increasing function. For this reason, the more wages are, the more effective labor is and its MPPL would rise. The reasons for this are psychological. When a person gets higher wage, this motivates him or her to work more, to adopt his or her company and to sacrifice more.

Conditions for Profit Maximization:

1- Marginal physical productivity of labor should be equal to wage per unit of effectiveness, that is to say:

$$\text{MPPL} = w/e(w)$$

2- The function's elasticity should be 1 on the point where the profit is maximum (if it is not 1 then the profit would decrease or increase), that is to say:

$$- ee(w) = 1$$

We can verify it like this:

For w, the primary condition of profit maximization

$$f'(eL)e'(w) = 1$$

For L, the primary condition of profit maximization

$$f'(eL) = w/e(w)$$

When we combine these two equations

$$we'(w)/e = 1$$

If efficiency wage is shown w*, the primary condition of profit maximization (with the condition of labor supply is at least L*) optimal employment quantity gives us L*.

w*: quantity of w that maximizes profit

L^* : quantity of L that maximizes profit

Then we find such a point that (w, L) , on this point this equation is valid:

$$f'[e(w^*)L^*] = w^*/e(w^*)$$

If L^* is more than total labor supply on w^* , that is to say if $\Sigma L^* < S_L(w^*)$, involuntary unemployment will occur on the equilibrium point where profit is maximized due to “highness of real wages”. This balance is permanent because entrepreneurs would not desire to reduce real wages; in other words W is rigid. This is an important point because “the efficiency wages model”, both explains NANRUE that is caused by Keynesian “highness of wages” and starting from the analysis of profit maximization- that is to say macroeconomic analysis- shows that NANRUE can be reached as an optimum balance and this balance cannot be removed. In fact, Keynes began with the rigidity of nominal wages. In this model, it is connected to the rigidity of real or relative wages (W/P_{good}). Nevertheless, we can accept this rigidity as rigidity of nominal wages by adding a simple assumption: We can assume rigidity of real wages as Keynesian rigidity of nominal wages by taking constant costs of wage changes into consideration.

Apart from the psychological factors mentioned above, there are more reasons behind the fact that the company pays real wages to labor more than MPPL:

Psychological Factors:

The company attempts to increase workers' experience within the company by reducing labor turnover ratio. This might cause factors of long term productivity and profitability.

Factors concerning employees' conception of “fair wages”:

Employees, particularly doing the same job in different sectors, desire to get same and/or more wages than others; so they make a comparison between wages. This factor explains “ e ”.

In order to prevent employees from shirking, they are given high real wages. According to this model, the company, instead of controlling their shirking, it pays more real wages and makes them to work without shirking (*Shirking Models*).

If wages are low, then the least productive employees will rush to that sector and this negatively affects the company (*Adverse Selection Models*). The productivity of laborers can be measured with the help of several “tests”.

8. CONCLUSION

Today, we witness that at present New Keynesian School is more widespread and influential compared to Post-Keynesian. One possible reason is that the former school sprang up in the USA while the latter basically in the UK; and USA today is much more influential worldwide compared say to the times when Keynes lived. But this should not be the sole or even the major reason why Post-Keynesianism is less popular. The reason which would likely explain the difference in popularity is that in their normative value judgments Post-Keynesian economists assign a heavy weight to improving income distribution while New Keynesian economists, on the whole, are less concerned with this goal.

References

- [1] Akerlof, “Gift Exchange and Efficiency Wage Theory: Four Views,” AER, No. 74, May 1984, pp. 79-83. Yellen, “Efficiency Wage Models of Unemployment,” AER, No. 74, May 1984, ss. 200-205.

- [2] Akerlof, Yellen, "A Near-Rational Model of the Business Cycles with Wage and Price Inertia," QJE, No.100 supplement, 1985, pp. 823-838.
- [3] Akerlof, Yellen, *Efficiency Wage Models of the Labour Market*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- [4] Azariadis, Stiglitz, "Implicit Contracts and Fixed Price Equilibria," QJE, No. 98 supplement, Oct. 1983, pp. 1-22.
- [5] Blanchard, "Price Asynchronization and Price-Level Inertia," *Inflation, Debt, and Indexation*, Rudiger Dornbush, in Mario Henrique Simonsen ed., Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1983, pp. 3-24.
- [6] Blanchard, Kiyotaki, "Monopolistic Competition and the Effects of Aggregate Demand," AER, Vol. 77, No. 4, Sept. 1987, pp. 647-666.
- [7] Blinder, "Retail Inventory Behaviour and Business Fluctuations," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, No. 2, 1981, pp. 443-505.
- [8] Blinder, "The Fall and Rise of Keynesian Economics".
- [9] Carlin, Soskice, "Medium-Run Keynesianism: Hysteresis and Capital Scrapping," in P. Davidson, J.A. Kregel ed., *Macroeconomic Problems and Policies*, Aldershot, Hants: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd., 1989.
- [10] Cooper, John, "Coordinating Coordination Failures in Keynesian Models," QJE, Vol. 100, No. 3, Aug. 1988, pp. 441-463.
- [11] Diamond, "Aggregate Demand Management in Search Equilibrium," JPE, Vol. 90, No. 5, Oct. 1982, pp. 881-894.
- [12] Fischer, "Long-term Contracts, Rational Expectations and the Optimal Money Supply Rule".
- [13] Gordon, "Can Inflation of the 1970s Be Explained?"; "Understanding Inflation in the 1980s".
- [14] Gordon, "What is New Keynesian Economics," and Blinder, "The Fall and Rise of Keynesian Economics".
- [15] Greenwald, Stiglitz, "Keynesian, New Keynesian and New Classical Economics," *Oxford Economics Papers*, No. 39, 1987, pp. 119-132.
- [16] Hall, "Market Structure and Macroeconomic Fluctuations," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, No. 2, 1986, pp. 285-322.
- [17] Hart, "A Model of Imperfect Competition with Keynesian Features," QJE, No. 97, Feb. 1982, pp. 109-138.
- [18] Katz, "Efficiency Wage Theories: A Partial Evaluation," *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 1986, pp. 235-276.
- [19] Leijonhufvud, *On Keynesian Economics and the Economics of Keynes: A Study in Monetary Policy*, 4th. ed., New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 1973.
- [20] Lindbeck, Snower, "Wage Setting, Unemployment and Insider-Outsider Relations," AER, No. 76, May 1987, pp. 235-239.
- [21] Mankiw, "Imperfect Competition and the Keynesian Cross," *Economics Letters*, No. 26, 1988, pp. 7-14.
- [22] Mankiw, "Small Menu Costs and Large Business Cycles: A Macroeconomic Model of Monopoly," QJE, Vol. 100, No. 2, May 1985, pp. 529-539.
- [23] Mankiw, Romer, *New Keynesian Economics, Volume 1; New Keynesian Economics, Volume 2*, 5th. ed., Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1995.
- [24] Parkin, "The Output-Inflation Trade-off When Prices Are Costly to Change," JPE, No. 94, Feb. 1986, pp. 200-224.
- [25] Phelps, Taylor, "Stabilizing Powers of Monetary Policy with Rational Expectations," JPE, Vol. 85, No.1, Feb. 1977, pp. 163-190.
- [26] Roberts, Stocton, Struckmeyer, "An Evaluation of the Sources of Aggregate Price Rigidity," *Federal Reserve System, Division of Research and Statistics, Paper No. 99*, May 1989.
- [27] Romer, Ball, "Are Prices Too Sticky," QJE, No. 104, Aug. 1989, pp. 507-524.
- [28] Romer, Ball, "Real Rigidities and the Non-Neutrality of Money", *Review of Economic Studies*, No. 57, April 1990, pp. 183-302.
- [29] Sargent, "Estimation of Dynamic Labor Schedules under Rational Expectations".
- [30] Schleifer, "Implementation Cycles," JPE, No. 94, Dec. 1986, ss. 1163-1190.
- [31] Summers, "Relative Wages, Efficiency Wages and Keynesian Unemployment," AER, Vol. 78, No. 2, May 1988, pp. 383-388.
- [32] Taylor, "Staggered Wage Setting in a Macro Model," AER, No. 69, May 1979, ss. 108-113.
- [33] Weiss, *Efficiency Wages: Model of Unemployment, Layoffs and Wage Dispersion*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.