Fiscal Spillover in Emerging Economies: Real vs. Financial Channels

Abhishek Kumar ^a Sushanta K. Mallick ^b Apra Sinha ^c

^a University of Southampton, UK

^b Queen Mary University London, UK

^c University of Delhi, India

ADB+PIER Conference, May 2024

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

Motivation

- Fiscal policy is an important tool for business cycle stabilization and has significant spillover due to real and financial channels.
- Fiscal spillover has been researched extensively in recent years for advanced economies.
- Most of the existing studies suggest that fiscal expansion in the US leads to depreciation of the real exchange rate for the US (see Kim and Roubini 2008; Corsetti and Muller 2006; Monacelli and Perotti 2010; Ravn et al. 2012; and Enders et al. 2011)

Motivation

- Facinni et al. (2016) suggest that spillover of US fiscal policy works mainly through the financial channel (real rate channel).
- There is not enough literature on US fiscal spillover in emerging economies.
- Real rate channel may not be operative in emerging economies
- Policy rate disconnect in emerging economies due to countercyclical risk (De Leo et al. 2022; Kalemli- Ozcan 2019).

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

This Paper

- We estimate the spillover of US government expenditure shock in emerging economies.
- We estimate the US government expenditure shock using two methods; Cholesky factorization (Blanchard and Perotti, 2002) and max share identification (Kumar and Mallick, 2024)
- With both these methods, we estimate three types of government expenditure shocks.
 - First: using real government expenditure, real GDP, and real tax.
 - Second: using normalized variables following Gordon and Krenn (2010).
 - Third: using real defense expenditure instead of real government expenditure following Ramey (2011) and Ramey (2016).

Summary of Findings

- Both policy and real policy rate decline in the emerging economies due to the US government expenditure shock.
- Most of these declines in policy rate and real policy rates are direct effect of US fiscal shock.
- The US government expenditure shock leads to the steepening of the yield curve in the emerging economies whereas it has negligible effect in the US economy.
- The US government expenditure shock leads to a prolonged depreciation (appreciation) of real effective exchange rates in the US (emerging economies)

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

Methodology

Cholesky Decomposition

A general SVAR model is given by:

$$A_0 y_t = a + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A_j y_{t-j} + \epsilon_t$$

The reduced form model is given by

$$y_t = b + \sum_{j=1}^{p} B_j y_{t-j} + u_t$$

The reduced form model can be estimated by OLS and reduced form residuals can be obtained. The covariance matrix of the reduced form shocks $E(u_t, u'_t) = \sum$ is known. One can do Cholesky decomposition of \sum as

$$\sum = PP'$$

and can write the impulse response matrix at horizon h as:

$$IR^h = C(h)A_0^{-1}$$

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

Max Share Identification I

The forecast error variance of the i^{th} variable due to a shock associated with j^{th} variable at horizon h is given by

$$\sum_{h=0}^{h=h} IR^{h}(i,j)IR^{h}(i,j)' = \sum_{h=0}^{h=h} q'_{j}c_{ih}c'_{ih}q_{j} = q'_{j}\left(\sum_{h=0}^{h=h} c_{ih}c'_{ih}\right)q_{j}$$

The forecast error variance of the i^{th} variable due to all shocks is given by $\sum_{h=0}^{h=h} c'_{ih} c_{ih}$. The share of j^{th} variable in the forecast error variance of i^{th} variable is given by

$$FEV(i, j, h) = rac{q_{j}'\left(\sum_{h=0}^{h=h}c_{ih}c_{ih}'
ight)q_{j}}{\sum_{h=0}^{h=h}c_{ih}'c_{ih}}$$

We define

$$FEV(i,h) = \frac{\left(\sum_{h=0}^{h=h} c_{ih}c'_{ih}\right)}{\sum_{h=0}^{h=h} c'_{ih}c_{ih}}$$

Max Share Identification II

The matrix P obtained by Cholesky decomposition is not the only matrix that satisfies the $\sum = PP'$ as we can always write:

$$\sum = PQQ'P'$$

For any orthonormal matrix Q (QQ' = I). This gives us $A_0^{-1} = PQ$ and hence the structural impulse response can be written as

$$IR^h = C(h)PQ$$

We identify multiple columns (all columns as well) of Q using the following optimization problem

$$Q_{1,k}^* = rg\max_{Q_{1:k}}\sum_{i=1}^k q_i' FEV(i,h)q_i$$

Subject to

$$q_j' FEV(j,h)q_j \ge q_j' FEV(i,h)q_j$$
 for $j=1,...,k, \forall i \in I_{-j}$
 $Q_{1:k}' Q_{1:k} = I_n$

Responses to the Identified Shocks: Direct Effect

We estimate the response for the US using the local projection regression based on Cloyne et al. (2023) and Jorda (2005). We estimate the equation given by:

$$Y_{t+h} - Y_{t-1} = \mu^h + f_t \beta^h + \sum_{t=-2}^{t=0} (x_t - \bar{x})\gamma^h + e_{t+h}$$

where Y is one of the variables of interest, f_t is one of the six US government expenditure shocks identified above and x includes the GDP growth and inflation. β^h is the coefficient of interest which gives the effect of US government expenditure shock at t = 0 on Y at time t = h. We estimate a similar regression in a panel framework for emerging economies

$$Y_{i,t+h} - Y_{i,t-1} = \mu_i^h + f_t \beta^h + \sum_{t=-2}^{t=0} (x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_i) \gamma_i^h + e_{i,t+h}$$

・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・
 ・

Responses to the Identified Shocks: Direct & Indirect Effect

To control for indirect effects, we include the interaction of the US government expenditure shock with GDP growth and inflation and the extended model is given by:

$$Y_{i,t+h} - Y_{i,t-1} = \mu_i^h + f_t \beta^h + f_t (x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_i) \theta_x^h + \sum_{t=-2}^{t=0} (x_{i,t} - \bar{x}_i) \gamma_i^h + e_{i,t+h}$$

 β^h is the coefficient of interest which gives the direct effect of US government expenditure shock at t = 0 on Y at time t = h after teasing out the indirect effect being captured by γ_i^h . We compare the β^h from these two regression models to evaluate the relative role of real and financial channels.

Data

- Quarterly data for the US is obtained from the Federal Reserve Bank of Saint Louis.
- For emerging economies, we use IMF classification and obtain quarterly data from 1990 from IFS-IMF
- We have an unbalanced panel of countries
- The US government expenditure shocks are identified using a longer sample based on data availability.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

Identified Shocks

Identified Shocks





(a) Cholesky and Max Share Identification

(b) Cholesky Decomposition



(c) Max Share Identification Figure: Identified Shocks

Correlation Among Shocks

Table: Correlation Among Shocks

		Cholesky			Max Share		
Cholesky	Blanchard Perotti	1.00					
	Gordon and Krenn	0.95	1.00				
	Defense Expenditure	0.65	0.61	1.00			
Max Share	Blanchard Perotti	0.98	0.92	0.64	1.00		
	Gordon and Krenn	0.94	0.99	0.61	0.94	1.00	
	Defense Expenditure	0.65	0.61	1.00	0.65	0.62	1.00

Responses to Identified Shocks

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Response of monetary policy rate



(c) Shock: US defense expenditure Figure: Response of monetary policy rate

Confidence Band

Model: Baseline US

Quarte

Model: Base Line

Confidence Band: US

--- Model: Indirect Effect

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲国▶ ▲国▶ - 国 - のへで

Response of real monetary policy rate





(c) Shock: US defense expenditure Figure: Response of real monetary policy rate

Response of the slope of the yield curve



Figure: Response of the slope of the yield curve

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへで

Response of real effective exchange rate



(c) Shock: US defense expenditure Figure: Response of real effective exchange rate

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへで

Response of GDP growth in emerging economies



(c) Shock: US defense expenditure Figure: Response of GDP growth in emerging economies

・ロト ・ 国 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

э

Concluding Remarks

- We find that the US government expenditure shock leads to a lowering of monetary policy and real policy rates in emerging economies unlike in the US.
- Results suggest a disconnect between long-term and policy rates that leads to the steepening of the yield curve in emerging economies due to the shock.
- Similar to the findings in the existing literature, we find that the US government expenditure shock leads to the depreciation of the real effective exchange rate in the US but causes appreciation of real effective exchange rates in emerging economies and hurts their external competitiveness.