

# Temporal Aggregation and SVAR Identification, with an Application to Fiscal Policy\*

Roel Beetsma,<sup>†</sup> Massimo Giuliadori<sup>‡</sup> and Franc Klaassen<sup>§</sup>

Revised, August 2009

## Abstract

We show how to assess identifying assumptions for a low-frequency SVAR using estimates from a higher-frequency model. In our application quarterly data support identifying annual SVARs in government spending and output by assuming zero within-year impact of output on spending.

**Keywords:** Structural vector autoregression (SVAR), identification, high-frequency, low-frequency, fiscal and monetary policy.

**JEL Codes:** E60, H60, C10

---

\*We thank, without implicating, Peter Boswijk for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

<sup>†</sup>Amsterdam School of Economics, University of Amsterdam, Roetersstraat 11, 1018 WB Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Phone: +31.20.5255280, Fax: +31.5254254, E-mail: R.M.W.J.Beetsma@uva.nl; CEPR and CESifo.

<sup>‡</sup>Amsterdam School of Economics, University of Amsterdam.

<sup>§</sup>Amsterdam School of Economics, University of Amsterdam.

# 1 Introduction

Structural vector autoregressions (SVARs) are often used to estimate the effects of economic impulses, such as fiscal and monetary policy shocks. High-frequency data can help identify the shocks. For instance, to study the impact of fiscal shocks many contributions (e.g., Blanchard and Perotti, 2002; Ravn et al., 2007) use a quarterly analysis, where implementation lags and other restrictions motivated by institutional features provide natural identifying assumptions. However, data of a sufficiently high frequency are sometimes only available for a small number of countries and often over a shorter period. Thus, to examine a large cross-section of countries over a sufficiently long period, one needs to have low-frequency data (for fiscal SVARs see e.g., Beetsma et al., 2006, and Ardagna et al., 2007). However, temporal aggregation can invalidate the absence of a contemporaneous impact used to identify the high-frequency model (see Granger, 1988, among others), hampering identification in the low-frequency model.

This letter describes a way to examine how serious this is. More specifically, we exploit high-frequency identification restrictions and transform the estimates of a high-frequency model into (approximate) estimates for a low-frequency SVAR specification. This allows one to assess the plausibility of the identifying assumptions in the low-frequency specification. Hence, this way one can combine the advantages of using low- and high-frequency observations. We believe that this approach may be useful not only for fiscal but also for monetary policy, where researchers often use SVARs at different frequencies.

The next section lays out the identification problem and is followed by, respectively, a section that describes the temporal aggregation, an implementation section and a section that applies our method to the estimation of the within-year impact of output on government purchases from quarterly data. A brief conclusion ends this letter.

## 2 The identification problem

Let  $x_t$  be a  $K$ -vector of flow variables in the *low* (for instance, annual) frequency period  $t$ . We assume that  $x_t$  follows an SVAR (though the procedure also works for SVARMA):

$$A_0 x_t = A(L) x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t,$$

where  $A_0$  is a  $K \times K$  matrix with 1's on the diagonal. The problem is how to obtain an estimate of the  $(K - 1)K$  unknown parameters in  $A_0$ . Without additional restrictions these parameters are not identified. The idea of our approach is to exploit high-frequency restrictions (e.g. a triangular ordering) to identify and estimate a high-frequency model and then derive estimates for  $A_0$  of the low-frequency SVAR.

### 3 The Temporal Aggregation Procedure

From the SVAR specification we know that feeding a shock of size  $\varepsilon_t$  instead of 0 into the system leads to a change  $dx_t$  in  $x_t$  that fulfils

$$A_0 \cdot dx_t = \varepsilon_t.$$

Note that  $dx_t$  is the *within-period* change  $x_t - x_t^0$ , where  $x_t^0$  is defined as the value of  $x_t$  when  $\varepsilon_t = 0$ . Suppose that we know the shock comes from variable  $k$  only ( $k = 1, \dots, K$ ). Let  $\varepsilon_t^k$  denote the  $K$ -vector with the shock as  $k$ -th element (and  $K - 1$  zeros) and denote the resulting change in  $x_t$  by  $dx_t^k$ . Then subtracting  $dx_t^k$  and stacking for all  $k$  gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} (A_0 - I_K) dx_t^1 \\ \vdots \\ (A_0 - I_K) dx_t^K \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_t^1 - dx_t^1 \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_t^K - dx_t^K \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $I_K$  is the  $K$ -dimensional identity matrix, so that the diagonal of  $(A_0 - I_K)$  is zero. Let  $vec$  denote the columnwise vectorization of a matrix. Then, we can rewrite the system in block-diagonal format (see Section 5 for a concrete example)

$$\left( I_K \otimes \begin{bmatrix} dx_t^{1'} \\ \vdots \\ dx_t^{K'} \end{bmatrix} \right) vec(A_0' - I_K) = vec \left( \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_t^{1'} - dx_t^{1'} \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_t^{K'} - dx_t^{K'} \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (1)$$

Suppose we have an observation of  $dx_t^k$ . We know that it originates from a shock to variable  $k$  only, but we do not observe the size of that shock. Consider the  $k$ -th block of equations in (1). The  $k$ -th equation of that block contains the same set of  $A_0$  parameters as the other  $K - 1$  equations, but in contrast to those equations the  $k$ -th one also includes the unknown  $k$ -th element of  $\varepsilon_t^k$ . Hence, the  $k$ -th equation embodies no information on  $A_0$  and we remove it. We do this for all  $K$  blocks (so all  $\varepsilon_t^k$  disappear from (1), because precisely the nonzero elements of all  $\varepsilon_t^k$  are deleted). Next, we remove the  $K$  columns in the Kronecker matrix and  $K$  zero elements in  $vec(A_0' - I_K)$  that correspond to the diagonal of  $(A_0' - I_K)$ . This gives a square block-diagonal system of  $(K - 1)K$  equations in the  $(K - 1)K$  unknown elements of  $A_0$ ; we can solve this for  $A_0$ , provided there are no singularities.

To operationalize our method we need values of  $dx_t^k$  that come from shocks to variable  $k$  in period  $t$ . We generate such shocks from an identified model (not necessarily an SVAR) for the vector  $x_{t,q}$  of high-frequency values corresponding to the low-frequency  $x_t$ , where  $q = 1, \dots, Q$ . Then, we compute the low-frequency changes  $dx_t^k$  by combining the  $Q$  high-frequency changes.

More precisely, suppose  $x_{t,q}$  has an infinite moving average representation, so that for

the  $x_{t,q}$  in the low-frequency period  $t$  we have

$$\begin{cases} x_{t,1} = & \Psi_0 \varepsilon_{t,1} + \Psi_1 \varepsilon_{t-1,Q} + \dots \\ x_{t,2} = & \Psi_0 \varepsilon_{t,2} + \Psi_1 \varepsilon_{t,1} + \Psi_2 \varepsilon_{t-1,Q} + \dots \\ \vdots & \\ x_{t,Q} = & \Psi_0 \varepsilon_{t,Q} + \dots + \Psi_{Q-1} \varepsilon_{t,1} + \Psi_Q \varepsilon_{t-1,Q} + \dots \end{cases},$$

where the  $\Psi$  are  $K \times K$  matrices and the  $\varepsilon_{t,q}$  are  $K$ -vectors of structural disturbances of the high-frequency model. Assuming  $x_t$  and  $x_{t,q}$  are in logarithms, one cannot simply add  $x_{t,1}, \dots, x_{t,Q}$  to obtain  $x_t$ . In fact,

$$x_t = \log [\exp(x_{t,1}) + \dots + \exp(x_{t,Q})],$$

where the log and exp functions of vectors are defined element by element. We now linearize around the value of  $x_{t,q}$  that results from  $\varepsilon_{t,1} = \dots = \varepsilon_{t,Q} = 0$ , denoted by  $x_{t,q}^0$ , so that

$$dx_t \approx \text{diag} \left( \sum_{q=1}^Q \exp(x_{t,q}^0) \right)^{-1} [\text{diag}(\exp(x_{t,1}^0)) dx_{t,1} + \dots + \text{diag}(\exp(x_{t,Q}^0)) dx_{t,Q}],$$

where, for some generic  $K$ -vector  $z$ ,  $\text{diag}(z)$  is the diagonal matrix with the elements of  $z$  on its diagonal, and  $dx_{t,q} \equiv x_{t,q} - x_{t,q}^0$ . We approximate

$$\text{diag} \left( \sum_{q=1}^Q \exp(x_{t,q}^0) \right)^{-1} \text{diag}(\exp(x_{t,q}^0)) \approx \frac{1}{Q} I_K,$$

for all  $q$ . As we want to know the effect of shocks in period  $t$  only, we have

$$\begin{cases} dx_{t,1} = & \Psi_0 \varepsilon_{t,1} \\ dx_{t,2} = & \Psi_0 \varepsilon_{t,2} + \Psi_1 \varepsilon_{t,1} \\ \vdots & \\ dx_{t,Q} = & \Psi_0 \varepsilon_{t,Q} + \dots + \Psi_{Q-1} \varepsilon_{t,1} \end{cases}.$$

This yields

$$dx_t \approx \frac{1}{Q} [\Psi_0 \varepsilon_{t,Q} + (\Psi_0 + \Psi_1) \varepsilon_{t,Q-1} + \dots + (\Psi_0 + \dots + \Psi_{Q-1}) \varepsilon_{t,1}]. \quad (2)$$

Hence, for each  $k$ , if we have high-frequency shock vectors  $\varepsilon_{t,1}^k, \dots, \varepsilon_{t,Q}^k$ , we can use (2) to compute (an approximate value of) the low-frequency change  $dx_t^k$ , which can then be used in (1) to derive the corresponding low-frequency contemporaneous correlations in  $A_0$ .

## 4 Implementation

To obtain the actual estimates of the low-frequency contemporaneous correlations, we first estimate the high-frequency model; this yields an estimate of the  $K \times K$  diagonal

covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  of the structural innovations  $\varepsilon_{t,q}$ , while a standard Monte Carlo method generates  $S$  sets of relevant impulse response matrices  $(\Psi_0, \dots, \Psi_{Q-1})$ . Second, for each  $k$  we draw  $R$  sets of uncorrelated shock vectors  $(\varepsilon_{t,1}^k, \dots, \varepsilon_{t,Q}^k)$ , where the  $k$ -th element of each vector is a draw from the estimated error distribution  $N(0, \widehat{\Sigma}_{kk})$ . This gives  $R$  sets of shock vectors  $\{(\varepsilon_{t,1}^1, \dots, \varepsilon_{t,Q}^1), \dots, (\varepsilon_{t,1}^K, \dots, \varepsilon_{t,Q}^K)\}$ . Third, we combine one set  $(\Psi_0, \dots, \Psi_{Q-1})$  with one collection  $\{(\varepsilon_{t,1}^1, \dots, \varepsilon_{t,Q}^1), \dots, (\varepsilon_{t,1}^K, \dots, \varepsilon_{t,Q}^K)\}$  to compute  $dx_t^k$  for all  $k$  using (2) and then derive the unknown elements in  $A_0$  from (1); repeating this for all combinations yields  $SR$  draws for  $A_0$  (the variation in the  $\Psi$  sets ensures that these  $A_0$  draws capture the uncertainty of the high-frequency estimation step). We use the 5% and 95% quantiles to summarize the range of the  $A_0$  draws.

## 5 Application

We apply our method to a 7-country panel SVAR in public spending  $g$  and output  $y$  (both in logarithms of their real values and seasonally adjusted) over the period 1970-2004. The country sample is Finland, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK, for which quarterly public spending data are available (source: OECD Economic Outlook). Moreover, these are all EU countries, which guarantees a certain degree of homogeneity. Nevertheless, we control for country and time fixed effects, as well as country-specific time trends. After these corrections, the *annual-frequency* panel SVAR reads:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\alpha_{12} \\ -\alpha_{21} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} g_{it} \\ y_{it} \end{bmatrix} = A(L) \begin{bmatrix} g_{i,t-1} \\ y_{i,t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{it}^g \\ \varepsilon_{it}^y \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $i$  indexes the country and  $t$  the year. We assume that the shock distribution is the same for all countries. System (1) becomes:

$$\begin{bmatrix} dg_{it}^1 & dy_{it}^1 & 0 & 0 \\ dg_{it}^2 & dy_{it}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & dg_{it}^1 & dy_{it}^1 \\ 0 & 0 & dg_{it}^2 & dy_{it}^2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\alpha_{12} \\ -\alpha_{21} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{it}^{g,1} - dg_{it}^1 \\ 0 - dg_{it}^2 \\ 0 - dy_{it}^1 \\ \varepsilon_{it}^{y,2} - dy_{it}^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Removing the redundant rows and columns yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} dy_{it}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & dg_{it}^1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{12} \\ \alpha_{21} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} dg_{it}^2 \\ dy_{it}^1 \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow \alpha_{12} = \frac{dg_{it}^2}{dy_{it}^2} \text{ and } \alpha_{21} = \frac{dy_{it}^1}{dg_{it}^1},$$

provided  $dy_{it}^2 \neq 0$  and  $dg_{it}^1 \neq 0$ . With  $Q = 4$ , the changes follow from (2) as:

$$\begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} dg_{it}^1 \\ dy_{it}^1 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{4} [\Psi_0 \varepsilon_{t,4}^1 + (\Psi_0 + \Psi_1) \varepsilon_{t,3}^1 + \dots + (\Psi_0 + \dots + \Psi_3) \varepsilon_{t,1}^1] \\ \begin{bmatrix} dg_{it}^2 \\ dy_{it}^2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{4} [\Psi_0 \varepsilon_{t,4}^2 + (\Psi_0 + \Psi_1) \varepsilon_{t,3}^2 + \dots + (\Psi_0 + \dots + \Psi_3) \varepsilon_{t,1}^2] \end{cases}.$$

To obtain the  $\Psi$  and  $\varepsilon$  we estimate a *quarterly* panel SVAR in  $g$  and  $y$ . We thus consider the annual model as an approximation to the SVARMA implied by the temporally

aggregated quarterly model; see Christiano and Eichenbaum (1987). We take six lags and impose the commonly-used identifying assumption that  $g$  within the quarter does not react to  $y$  (i.e. the coefficient that corresponds to the annual  $\alpha_{12}$  is imposed to be zero). Application of the above procedure (with  $S = R = 1000$ ) yields a 90% confidence interval  $(-0.082, 0.168)$  on the annual, within-year response coefficient  $\alpha_{12}$  of  $g$  to  $y$ . This suggests that imposing a zero within-year response of  $g$  to  $y$  to identify an annual SVAR is a reasonable identifying restriction for the data set at hand. Moreover, the confidence interval can be used to examine the sensitivity of the annual SVAR results to realistic non-zero impacts.

## 6 Conclusion

We have shown how one may assess the sensibility of identifying assumptions in a low-frequency SVAR using estimates of a high-frequency model. We have applied our procedure to an annual SVAR in government purchases and output for a sample of EU countries using quarterly estimates. Imposing a zero effect of output on government spending at annual frequency appeared quite reasonable for our application. This finding is in line with fact that the government budget is usually set once a year, while within-year revisions tend to be relatively small and implemented with substantial delay.

## References

- [1] Ardagna, S., Caselli, F. and T. Lane (2007). Fiscal Discipline and the Cost of Public Debt Service: Some Estimates for OECD Countries, *The B.E. Journals of Macroeconomics* 7, 1 (Topics), Article 28. Available at: <http://www.bepress.com/bejm/vol7/iss1/art28>.
- [2] Beetsma, R., Giuliodori, M. and F. Klaassen (2006). Fiscal Policy and Trade Spillovers in the EU, *Economic Policy* 21, 48, 639-687.
- [3] Blanchard, O.J. and R. Perotti (2002). An Empirical Characterization of the Dynamic Effects of Changes in Government Spending and Taxes on Output, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 117, 4, 1329-68.
- [4] Granger, C.W.J. (1988). Some Recent Developments in a Concept of Causality, *Journal of Econometrics* 39, 199-211.
- [5] Christiano, L.J. and M. Eichenbaum (1987). Temporal Aggregation and Structural Inference in Macroeconomics, *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy* 26, 63-130.

- [6] Ravn, M., Schmitt-Grohé, S. and M. Uribe (2007). Explaining the Effects of Government Spending Shocks on Consumption and the Real Exchange rate, *Mimeo*, European University Institute and Duke University.