

SAM 31 2018

ISSN: 0804-6824

December 2018

Discussion paper

Spillovers from US monetary policy: Evidence from a time-varying parameter GVAR model

BY

Jesús Crespo Cuaresma, Gernot Doppelhofer, Martin Feldkircher AND Florian Huber

This series consists of papers with limited circulation, intended to stimulate discussion

Spillovers from US monetary policy: Evidence from a time-varying parameter GVAR model*

Jesús Crespo Cuaresma^{1,5,6,7,8}, Gernot Doppelhofer², Martin Feldkircher³, and Florian Huber⁴

¹Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU)

²Norwegian School of Economics (NHH)

³Oesterreichische Nationalbank (OeNB)

⁴Salzburg Centre of European Union Studies (SCEUS), University of Salzburg

⁵International Institute of Applied System Analysis (IIASA)

⁶Wittgenstein Center for Demography and Global Human Capital (IIASA,VID/OEAW,WU)

⁷Austrian Institute of Economic Research (WIFO)

⁸Vilnius University (VU)

Abstract

This paper develops a global vector autoregressive (GVAR) model with time-varying parameters and stochastic volatility to analyze whether international spillovers of US monetary policy have changed over time. The proposed model allows assessing whether coefficients evolve gradually over time or are better characterized by infrequent, but large breaks. Our findings point towards pronounced changes in the international transmission of US monetary policy throughout the sample period, especially so for the reaction of international output, equity prices, and exchange rates against the US dollar. In general, the strength of spillovers has weakened in the aftermath of the global financial crisis. Using simple panel regressions, we link the variation in international responses to measures of trade and financial globalization. We find that a broad trade base and a high degree of financial integration with the world economy tend to cushion risks stemming from a foreign shock such as a US monetary policy tightening, whereas a reduction in trade barriers and/or a liberalization of the capital account increase these risks.

Keywords: Spillovers, zero lower bound, globalization, mixture innovation models

JEL Codes: C30, E52, F41

*Corresponding author: Martin Feldkircher, email: martin.feldkircher@oenb.at. The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official viewpoint of the Oesterreichische Nationalbank or the Eurosystem.

1 Introduction

Economists and policy makers have extensively argued about the implications of globalization for the design and conduct of monetary policy. Globalization has rendered monetary policy more complex. As former Fed chairman Ben Bernanke noted, "... *effective monetary policy making now requires taking into account a diverse set of global influences, many of which are not fully understood*".¹ Globalization has also laid the ground for the propagation of spillovers from one country to the rest of the world. Recently, international spillovers from monetary policy actions of one country to other economies have been dubbed *a corollary of globalization* by ECB vice president Vítor Constâncio.²

With both trade and financial globalization on the rise, the main objective of this paper is to assess whether spillovers are currently different from those in the past and whether such differences can be linked to changes in globalization. These questions received relatively little attention in the empirical literature on spillovers (for an exception, see [Kamin, 2013](#)). This is due to two reasons. First, the necessity to model several countries simultaneously gives rise to additional challenges involved in estimation and model specification. Second, a potentially large model of the world economy which accounts for changing spillovers needs to be able to accommodate movements in its coefficients. This, however, turns out to be computationally challenging using standard econometric tools.

We propose a new econometric model that extends the global vector autoregressive (GVAR) model put forth in [Pesaran et al. \(2004\)](#) to allow for movements in regression coefficients and error variances. To infer whether parameters change gradually or feature sudden breaks, we adapt recent techniques proposed in [Huber et al. \(2018\)](#) to the GVAR context. The resulting time-varying parameter GVAR model with mixture innovations is a flexible framework that allows to estimate global spillovers from a US monetary policy shock that potentially differ for each point in time in our observation sample.

The existence of significant spillovers from US monetary policy has been demonstrated in a range of empirical studies (see, among others, [Kim, 2001](#); [Canova, 2005](#); [Dees et al., 2007](#); [Feldkircher and Huber, 2016](#)). A consensus has also emerged concerning the fact that monetary policy and its transmission in the US have changed over the last decades ([Sims and Zha, 2006](#); [Boivin et al., 2010](#); [Boivin, 2006](#); [Baumeister and Benati, 2013](#)). As pointed out in [Boivin et al. \(2010\)](#), this could be driven by several factors, including regulatory changes as

¹Globalization and Monetary Policy, speech at the Fourth Economic Summit, Stanford, 2007.

²"Divergent monetary policies and the world economy", Keynote address by Vítor Constâncio, Vice-President of the ECB, at the conference organized by FED/ECB/FED Dallas/HKMA in Hong Kong, 15 October 2015.

well as shifts in domestic macroeconomic and financial market conditions.³ In addition, there could be global drivers that determine effects of monetary policy, such as a global financial cycle proposed by [Rey \(2015\)](#) or more generally the degree of trade and financial globalization. [Georgiadis and Mehl \(2016\)](#) examine the relationship between monetary policy effectiveness – measured as the reaction of output to an unexpected change in the policy rate – and financial globalization. They find that a fall in a country’s net foreign asset position in response to a monetary tightening strengthens *domestic* monetary policy effectiveness and that this “valuation effect” offsets a dampening effect caused by the existence of a US led global financial cycle - as argued in [Bekaert et al. \(2013\)](#) and [Rey \(2015\)](#). Considering this argument in the context of spillovers from US monetary policy, financial globalization would be expected to dampen spillovers from a US rate hike since the accompanying appreciation of the US dollar strengthens other countries’ (dollar held) asset positions. [Rey \(2015\)](#) and [Miranda-Agrippino and Rey \(2015\)](#), by contrast, stress the importance of a global financial cycle and financial variables in general for the international propagation of macroeconomic shocks.

In this paper we ask two questions. First, do spillovers of US monetary policy shocks vary over time? And second, what is the contribution of trade and financial globalization in determining the size of the international effects? As stated above, the model we propose is capable of answering the first question by allowing for movements in the coefficients that can be gradual or abrupt. This is of ample importance given the research question and sample period under study which features a rapid decrease of interest rates followed by a prolonged period of no interest rate changes (zero lower bound) and a gradual increase thereafter.

Our results can be summarized as follows. First, a contractionary shock to US monetary policy tends to imply a persistent global contraction in real activity and a drop in international consumer and equity prices. Also, currencies tend to depreciate against the US dollar. Second, for several variables, we find evidence for considerable time variation: Spillovers to international output, exchange rates and equity prices have been stronger in the period prior to the global financial crisis. Last, we find that both trade and financial globalization can explain variation in the strength of spillovers. A broad trade base and a high degree of financial integration with the world economy cushion spillovers stemming from a US monetary policy tightening, whereas a reduction of trade barriers and/or a liberalization of the capital account increase them.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the econometric framework, including a detailed discussion on the novel mixture innovation specification adopted. Section 3 presents the data, while Section 4 discusses the results. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper

³Our paper thus contributes to the literature on asymmetric effects of US monetary policy depending on domestic economic conditions. There is also a related literature that examines asymmetry depending on whether monetary policy is tightened or loosened. Focusing on asset prices, this possibility has been examined among others in [Kuttner \(2001\)](#) and [Rogers et al. \(2014\)](#), who both find little evidence of asymmetry using US data.

and a technical appendix provides information on the Bayesian estimation strategy and the prior specifications which makes estimation of the model feasible.

2 Econometric framework

To assess the dynamic transmission mechanism between US monetary policy and the global economy, we develop a global vector-autoregressive model featuring time-varying parameters and stochastic volatility (TVP-SV-GVAR model). The TVP-SV-GVAR model is estimated using a broad panel of countries and macroeconomic aggregates, thus providing a truly global and flexible representation of the world economy. In general, the structure of a GVAR model implies two distinct stages in the estimation process. In the first stage, $N + 1$ country-specific multivariate time series models are specified, each of them including exogenous regressors that aim to capture cross-country linkages. In the second stage, these models are combined using country weights to form a global model that is used to carry out impulse response analysis or forecasting.

2.1 A dynamic global macroeconomic model

Let the endogenous variables $y_{ij,t}$ ($j = 1, \dots, k_i$) for country $i = 0, \dots, N$ be contained in a $k_i \times 1$ vector $\mathbf{y}_{it} = (y_{i1,t}, \dots, y_{ik_i,t})'$. In addition, all country-specific models feature a set of k_i^* weakly exogenous regressors $\mathbf{y}_{it}^* = (y_{i1,t}^*, \dots, y_{ik_i,t}^*)'$, constructed as weighted averages of the endogenous variables in other economies,

$$y_{ij,t}^* = \sum_{c=0}^N w_{ic} y_{cj,t} \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k_i^*. \quad (2.1)$$

Here, w_{ic} is the weight corresponding to the j th variable of country c in country i 's specification. These weights are typically assumed to be related to bilateral trade exposure, sum up to unity, and $w_{ii} = 0$ for all i . In line with the bulk of the literature on GVAR modeling, we assume that all variables and countries are linked by the same set of weights which is fixed over time (Dees et al., 2007). It could be argued that considering time-varying weights would be an alternative way to model time-variation within the GVAR framework. However, whereas this strategy would affect only the set of weakly exogenous variables, the proposed TVP-SV-GVAR model allows for time variation in all coefficients as well as changes in residual variances and is thus capable to model a much richer set of dynamics at the international level.⁴

⁴Moreover, note that in the empirical application we are not interested in interpreting particular coefficients; rather we are interested in whether spillovers change over time leaving it open whether these changes are driven

We deviate from existing GVAR modeling efforts by specifying country-specific VAR models that feature exogenous regressors, time-varying parameters, and stochastic volatility, so that

$$\mathbf{y}_{it} = \sum_{p=1}^P \mathbf{B}_{ip,t} \mathbf{y}_{it-p} + \sum_{q=0}^Q \mathbf{\Lambda}_{iq,t} \mathbf{y}_{it-q}^* + \mathbf{u}_{it}, \quad (2.2)$$

where

- $\mathbf{B}_{ip,t}$ ($p = 1, \dots, P$) is a $k_i \times k_i$ matrix of coefficients associated with the lagged endogenous variables;
- $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{iq,t}$ ($q = 0, \dots, Q$) denotes a $k_i \times k_i^*$ dimensional coefficient matrix corresponding to the k_i^* weakly exogenous variables in \mathbf{y}_{it}^* ;
- $\mathbf{u}_{it} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{it})$ is a heteroskedastic vector error term with

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_{it} = \mathbf{A}_{i0,t}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_{it} (\mathbf{A}_{i0,t}^{-1})'. \quad (2.3)$$

We let $\mathbf{D}_{it} = \text{diag}(\lambda_{i0,t}, \dots, \lambda_{ik_i,t})$ be a diagonal matrix and $\mathbf{A}_{i0,t}^{-1}$ denotes a $k_i \times k_i$ lower uni-triangular matrix of covariance parameters that establishes contemporaneous relations between the shocks in \mathbf{u}_{it} . Notice that $\mathbf{u}_{it} = \mathbf{A}_{i0,t}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{it}$, where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{it}$ is a Gaussian vector white noise process with zero mean and variance-covariance matrix \mathbf{D}_{it} ;

- the variances $\lambda_{il,t}$ are assumed to follow a stationary autoregressive process,

$$\log(\lambda_{il,t}) = \mu_{il} + \rho_{il}(\log(\lambda_{il,t-1}) - \mu_{il}) + v_{il,t}, \quad v_{il,t} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \varsigma_{il}^2), \quad (2.4)$$

where μ_{il} denotes the unconditional expectation of the log-volatility, ρ_{il} the corresponding persistence parameter and ς_{il}^2 is the innovation variance of the process.

The set of $N + 1$ country specific models can be linked together to yield a global VAR model (Pesaran et al., 2004). Collecting all contemporaneous terms of Eq. (2.2) and defining a $(k_i + k_i^*)$ -dimensional vector $\mathbf{z}_{it} = (\mathbf{y}'_{it}, \mathbf{y}'_{it}^*)'$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{C}_{it} \mathbf{z}_{it} = \sum_{s=1}^{\mathfrak{S}} \mathbf{L}_{is,t} \mathbf{z}_{it-s} + \mathbf{u}_{it}, \quad (2.5)$$

with $\mathbf{C}_{it} = (\mathbf{I}_{k_i}, -\mathbf{\Lambda}_{i0,t})$, $\mathbf{L}_{is,t} = (\mathbf{B}_{is,t}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{is,t})$ and $\mathfrak{S} = \max(P, Q)$. A global vector $\mathbf{y}_t = (\mathbf{y}'_{0t}, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_{Nt})'$ of dimension $k = \sum_{i=0}^N k_i$ and a corresponding country-specific link matrix

by changes in the economic relationship between countries or by changes how these countries react to foreign factors.

\mathbf{W}_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$) of dimension $(k_i + k_i^*) \times k$ can be defined such that Eq. (2.5) can be rewritten exclusively in terms of the global vector,

$$\mathbf{C}_{it} \mathbf{W}_i \mathbf{y}_t = \sum_{s=1}^{\mathfrak{S}} \mathbf{L}_{is,t} \mathbf{W}_i \mathbf{y}_{t-s} + \mathbf{u}_{it}. \quad (2.6)$$

Stacking the equations $N + 1$ times yields

$$\mathbf{G}_t \mathbf{y}_t = \sum_{s=1}^{\mathfrak{S}} \mathbf{F}_{st} \mathbf{y}_{t-s} + \mathbf{u}_t, \quad (2.7)$$

where $\mathbf{G}_t = \{(\mathbf{C}_{0t} \mathbf{W}_0)', \dots, (\mathbf{C}_{Nt} \mathbf{W}_N)'\}'$ and $\mathbf{F}_{st} = \{(\mathbf{L}_{0s,t} \mathbf{W}_0)', \dots, (\mathbf{L}_{N_s,t} \mathbf{W}_N)'\}'$ denote stacked coefficient matrices. The error term $\mathbf{u}_t = (\mathbf{u}'_{0t}, \dots, \mathbf{u}'_{Nt})'$ is normally distributed with mean zero and block diagonal variance-covariance matrix $\mathbf{H}_t = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{0t}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{Nt})$. Eq. (2.7) resembles a (very) large VAR model with drifting coefficients which, notwithstanding the problems associated with the high dimensionality of the parameter vector, can be estimated using Bayesian techniques developed to deal with multivariate linear models with time-varying parameters.

2.2 Modeling time variation in the regression coefficients

Up to this point, we remained silent on the specific law of motion for the coefficients in the model. Since the number of parameters is typically large relative to the length of the sample T , a parsimonious way of modeling time-variation is necessary in order to obtain precise estimates and avoid overfitting.

Stacking the lagged endogenous and weakly exogenous variables in an m_i -dimensional vector, with $m_i = k_i P + k_i^*(Q + 1)$,

$$\mathbf{x}_{it} = \{\mathbf{y}'_{it-1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_{it-P}, (\mathbf{y}_{it}^*)', \dots, (\mathbf{y}_{it-Q}^*)'\}' \quad (2.8)$$

and collecting all regression coefficients in a $k_i \times (m_i k_i)$ matrix,

$$\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{it} = (\mathbf{B}_{i1,t}, \dots, \mathbf{B}_{iP,t}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{i0,t}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{iQ,t})', \quad (2.9)$$

allows us to rewrite Eq. (2.2) as

$$\mathbf{y}_{it} = (\mathbf{I}_{k_i} \otimes \mathbf{x}'_{it}) \boldsymbol{\psi}_{it} + \mathbf{u}_{it}. \quad (2.10)$$

For convenience, define $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{it} = \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{it})$ and collect the free covariance parameters in $\mathbf{A}_{i0,t}$ in an $l_i = k_i(k_i - 1)/2$ -dimensional vector $\mathbf{a}_{i0,t}$. For each individual coefficient in $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{it} =$

$(\mathbf{a}'_{i0,t}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{it})'$, we assume a random walk law of motion,

$$\xi_{ij,t} = \xi_{ij,t-1} + \eta_{ij,t}, \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, s_i, \quad (2.11)$$

where $s_i = l_i + k_i(m_i k_i)$ and $\eta_{ij,t}$ denotes a white noise shock with time-varying variance $\vartheta_{ij,t}$.

In principle, allowing all coefficients of the model to move freely yields a highly parameterized model that is prone to overfitting. This issue is intensified in the context of a multi-country GVAR model, calling for some form of regularization of the variation in the parameters over time. To achieve this, we follow [Huber et al. \(2018\)](#) and assume that $\vartheta_{ij,t}$ evolves according to

$$\vartheta_{ij,t} = (1 - d_{ij,t})\vartheta_{ij,0} + d_{ij,t}\vartheta_{ij,1}, \quad (2.12)$$

whereby $\vartheta_{ij,1} \gg \vartheta_{ij,0}$ and $\vartheta_{ij,0}$ is set close to zero.⁵ Moreover, let $d_{ij,t}$ denote a binary random variable that follows an independent Bernoulli distribution with,

$$d_{ij,t} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } p_{ij} \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - p_{ij}. \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

This specification is commonly referred to as a mixture innovation model ([Giordani and Kohn, 2008](#); [Koop et al., 2009](#)) and nests a wide variety of competing models. For instance, if $d_{ij,t} = 1$ for all t , we obtain a standard time-varying parameter specification whereas in the case of $d_{ij,t} = 0$ for all t , we end up having a nearly constant parameter specification (as the variance of $\eta_{ij,t}$ will be relatively small). Cases in between are also possible, implying that our framework flexibly accommodates situations where parameters might be time-varying during certain intervals of time, while being effectively constant during other periods. Especially in the context of GVAR models, selecting appropriate model features *a priori* is a daunting task given the high dimensionality of the parameter space. Our approach avoids this by effectively selecting data-based restrictions on the law of motion of each coefficient separately.

Estimation of such a mixture innovation model would be unfeasible given the high dimensionality of the parameter space of the GVAR model. Hence, following [Huber et al. \(2018\)](#), we approximate the latent indicators, $d_{ij,t}$, by proposing a simple thresholding rule during Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling. More specifically, the l th draw of $d_{ij,t}$ is approximated through

$$d_{ij,t}^{(l)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\Delta \xi_{ij,t}^{(l)}| > c_{ij}^{(l-1)}, \\ 0 & \text{if } |\Delta \xi_{ij,t}^{(l)}| \leq c_{ij}^{(l-1)}, \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

⁵In this paper we follow [Huber et al. \(2018\)](#) and set $\vartheta_{ij,0} = 10^{-5} \hat{\sigma}_{ij}$, with $\hat{\sigma}_{ij}$ denoting the OLS standard deviation of a time-invariant VAR model.

with $|\Delta \xi_{ij,t}^{(l)}|$ and $c_{ij}^{(l-1)}$ denoting draws of the (time-varying) coefficients and of a latent threshold, c_{ij} , respectively. This approximation captures the notion that if the period-on-period change in the respective parameter is large, the unconditional probability (after integrating $\xi_{ij,t}$ out) that $d_{ij,t}$ equals one is also large. The key advantage of this approach is its computational simplicity. Compared to standard TVP-VAR models in the spirit of [Cogley et al. \(2005\)](#); [Primiceri \(2005\)](#), the computational burden is increased only slightly, while the model is much more flexible. Relative to standard mixture innovation models, our approach avoids Kalman-filter based algorithms to infer the full history of the indicators altogether.

This coefficient-specific law of motion for the regression parameters enables us to rigorously investigate changes in the domestic and international transmission mechanisms. Moreover, we account for heteroskedasticity by making the country-specific variance-covariance matrix of u_{it} time-varying. This is to ensure that changes in the parameters reflect changes in the underlying macroeconomic relationships and are not confounded by a wrongly assumed constant error variance. Our model captures a range of properties that are essential to assess changes in domestic and international transmission mechanisms of monetary policy shocks and can accommodate important features which are commonly observed in macroeconomic and financial time series.

We use Bayesian methods to carry out inference in the model proposed above. Given the risk of overparameterization that is inherent to the specification used, we rely on Bayesian shrinkage methods to achieve a simpler representation of the data. The time-varying nature of the parameters in the model and the presence of the weakly exogenous variables in [Eq. \(2.2\)](#) present further complications that are tackled in the estimation procedure. More details on the exact prior specification, the proposed MCMC algorithm as well as convergence criteria are detailed in [Appendix A](#).⁶

3 Data and model specification

This section introduces the data and provides details on the specification of the model. We use quarterly data for 35 countries spanning the period from 1990:Q1 to 2016:Q4. The countries covered in our sample are shown in [Table 1](#).

The country-specific models include real GDP growth (Δgdp), inflation (Δcp) measured by the log-difference of the consumer price level, and the log-difference of the nominal exchange rate (Δer) vis-à-vis the US dollar, with an increase denoting an appreciation of the dollar. We include (3-months) short-term nominal interest rates (ir) in all economies, except for euro area countries, Great Britain, Japan and the US. For these countries, we use shadow

⁶Here, it suffices to note that we repeat the algorithm outlined in [Appendix A](#) 40,000 times, where the first 30,000 draws are discarded. From the retained draws, we single out unstable draws, which gives us a final sample of 500 posterior draws upon which inference is based.

Table 1: Country coverage of GVAR model.

Europe	Other developed economies	Emerging Asia	Latin America	Mid-East and Africa
Austria (AT)	Australia (AU)	China (CN)	Argentina (AR)	Turkey (TR)
Belgium (BE)	Canada (CA)	India (IN)	Brazil (BR)	Saudi Arabia (SA)
Germany (DE)	Japan (JP)	Indonesia (ID)	Chile (CL)	South Africa (ZA)
Spain (ES)	United States (US)	Malaysia (MY)	Mexico (MX)	
Finland (FI)		Korea (KR)	Peru (PE)	
France (FR)		Philippines (PH)		
Greece (GR)		Singapore (SG)		
Italy (IT)		Thailand (TH)		
Netherlands (NL)				
Portugal (PT)				
Denmark (DK)				
Great Britain (GB)				
Switzerland (CH)				
Norway (NO)				
Sweden (SE)				

Notes: ISO-2 country codes in parentheses. Empirical results shown for countries in bold.

interest rates instead,⁷ since in these economies and over the time period covered, interest rates stayed at the zero lower bound for considerable time. These standard macroeconomic data are augmented by financial variables to take into account their potential role as shock propagators (Rey, 2015; Miranda-Agrippino and Rey, 2015). Specifically, we include the term spread (sp), constructed as the difference between 10-year government bond yields and short-term interest rates, and changes in stock market prices (Δeq). Note that not all variables are available for each of the countries we consider in this study. This concerns mostly long-term interest rates (that are used to calculate the term-spread) and equity prices.

The vector of *domestic* variables for a typical country i is given by

$$\mathbf{y}_{it} = (\Delta gdp_{it}, \Delta cp_{it}, ir_{it}, sp_{it}, \Delta er_{it}, \Delta eq_{it})'. \quad (3.1)$$

We follow the bulk of the literature on GVAR modeling by including changes in oil prices ($\Delta poil$) as a global control variable. With the exception of exchange rates, we construct foreign counterparts for all domestic variables. The weights to calculate foreign variables are based on average bilateral annual trade flows in the period from 2000 to 2014.⁸ For a typical country i the set of *weakly exogenous* and global control variables comprises

⁷We use the shadow rates of Krippner (2013), which are publicly available from <https://www.rbnz.govt.nz/research-and-publications/research-programme/additional-research/measures-of-the-stance-of-united-states-monetary-policy/comparison-of-international-monetary-policy-measures>.

⁸Note that recent contributions (Eickmeier and Ng, 2015; Dovern and van Roye, 2014) suggest using financial data to compute foreign variables related to the financial side of the economy (e.g., interest rates or credit volumes). However, reliable data on financial flows – such as portfolio flows or foreign direct investment – are not available for the country coverage we consider in this study. See the appendix of Feldkircher and Huber (2016)

$$\mathbf{y}_{it}^* = (\Delta gdp_{it}^*, \Delta cp_{it}^*, ir_{it}^*, sp_{it}^*, \Delta poil)' \quad (3.2)$$

The US model, which we normalize to correspond to $i = 0$, deviates from the other country specifications in that oil price inflation is determined within that country model, and the change in the trade weighted exchange rate (Δer^*) is included as an additional control variable, so that the vector of endogenous and weakly exogenous variables for the US is given by

$$\mathbf{y}_{0t} = (\Delta gdp_{0t}, \Delta cp_{0t}, ir_{0t}, sp_{0t}, \Delta eq_{0t}, \Delta poil_t)' \quad (3.3)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_{0t}^* = (\Delta gdp_{0t}^*, \Delta cp_{0t}^*, \Delta er_{0t}^*, i_{0t}^*, sp_{0t}^*, \Delta eq_{0t}^*)' \quad (3.4)$$

Finally, for all countries considered, we set the lag length of endogenous and weakly exogenous variables equal to one. Despite the parsimonious lag structure, the model adequately captures the serial correlation of the underlying data. ⁹

3.1 Structural identification

In this paper, we consider structural generalized impulse responses (SGIRFs, see [Koop et al., 1996](#); [Pesaran and Shin, 1998](#)) to trace the global effects of a US monetary policy shock. In the GVAR framework, using SGIRFs proves to be a standard choice since identifying all k shocks is usually unfeasible. Moreover, since we are only interested in the causal effects of a US-based monetary policy shock, identifying the remaining shocks in the system is not necessary.

To identify the monetary policy shock, we follow [Dees et al. \(2007\)](#), [Eickmeier and Ng \(2015\)](#), and [Feldkircher and Huber \(2016\)](#) and adopt sign restrictions imposed on the contemporaneous responses of the US macroeconomic quantities. This implies that the reactions of \mathbf{y}_t to the US monetary policy shock coincide with the structural impulse responses, while responses of \mathbf{y}_t to shocks outside the US country model are generalized impulse responses (for a detailed discussion, see [Dees et al., 2007](#)).

For simplicity, we assume that the US model is indexed by $i = 0$. Introducing a $k_0 \times k_0$ matrix \mathbf{R}_{0t} (with $\mathbf{R}_{0t}\mathbf{R}'_{0t} = \mathbf{I}_{k_0}$) and multiplying [Eq. \(2.2\)](#) from the left with $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00,t} = \mathbf{R}_{0t}\mathbf{A}_{00,t}$

for the results of a sensitivity analysis with respect to the choice of weights in Bayesian GVAR specifications in the framework of models with fixed parameters.

⁹[Figure A.1](#) in the appendix provides evidence on the lack of serial dependence of the residuals. In the same figure, we further show evidence of convergence of the MCMC algorithm, the distribution of trade weights and evidence of weak cross-country correlation of the residuals.

yields,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{00,t}\mathbf{y}_{it} = \sum_{p=1}^P \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{0p,t}\mathbf{y}_{it-p} + \sum_{q=0}^Q \tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{iq,t}\mathbf{y}_{it-q}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_{i0,t}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{it}, \quad (3.5)$$

with $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{0p,t} = \mathbf{R}_{0t}\mathbf{A}_{00,t}\mathbf{B}_{0p,t}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{\Lambda}}_{iq,t} = \mathbf{R}_{0t}\mathbf{A}_{00,t}\mathbf{\Lambda}_{iq,t}$. Notice that the introduction of the rotation matrix \mathbf{R}_{0t} leaves the likelihood function untouched.

Traditional sign restrictions are implemented by simulating rotation matrices $\mathbf{R}_{i0,t}$, computing the corresponding structural impulse responses, and if a set of restrictions is fulfilled the associated rotation matrix is kept. We implement this approach using the algorithm outlined in [Rubio-Ramírez et al. \(2010\)](#). For each rotation, we construct a $k \times k$ dimensional matrix \mathbf{R}_t that features \mathbf{R}_{0t} in the first $k_0 \times k_0$ block and equals an identity matrix elsewhere. More specifically, \mathbf{R}_t is given by

$$\mathbf{R}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{0t} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{I}_{k_1} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \mathbf{I}_{k_N} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.6)$$

This matrix is then used to recover the structural form of the global VAR model.

Before proceeding to the actual sign restrictions included, a few words on the specific choice of the rotation matrices are in order. First, consistent with the literature that deals with sign restrictions in GVAR models, the shock is only *locally* identified in the US model. This implies that the structure of the rotation matrix in [Eq. \(3.6\)](#) is sufficient to identify the impact vector with respect to the US monetary policy shock. In principle, we could also simulate a full $k \times k$ rotation matrix or introduce a separate rotation matrix \mathbf{R}_{it} for each country. However, doing so would increase the computational burden as well as potentially lead to higher estimation uncertainty. Second, since we are exclusively interested in identifying a US-based monetary policy shock, we do not identify additional shocks outside the US country model. Such a modelling strategy would increase the number of restrictions significantly, leading to a situation where finding suitable rotation matrices becomes almost impossible. Third, notice that \mathbf{R}_t is time-specific. This is a consequence of the fact that the full variance-covariance matrix is time-varying, implying that the contemporaneous relations across shocks are subject to change. Thus, a rotation matrix that fulfills the sign restrictions at time t might not satisfy the restrictions at time $t + 1$. To circumvent this issue, we follow the literature and simulate a rotation matrix for each point in our sample (for a recent example, see [Gambetti and Musso, 2017](#)). We then assess whether the sign restrictions are fulfilled, in which case we keep the rotation matrix.

We elicit the restrictions based on [Feldkircher and Huber \(2016\)](#) and [Peersman \(2005\)](#). These are imposed on the US country model and are provided in [Table 2](#) below.

Table 2: Sign restrictions.

Shock	Δy	Δp	i_s	Δeq
Monetary policy	↓	↓	↑	↓
Aggregate demand	↑	↑	↑	–
Aggregate supply	↑	↓	↓	–

Notes: The restrictions are imposed as \geq / \leq and on impact only.

The constraints above are based on a typical aggregate demand and supply diagram and are consistent with most dynamic stochastic general equilibrium models. The unexpected rate increase in the US is assumed to decrease output, consumer price and equity price growth. The latter assumption is based on empirical evidence for the reaction of stock markets to monetary policy-induced interest rate changes ([Thorbecke, 1997](#); [Rigobon and Sack, 2004](#); [Bernanke and Kuttner, 2005](#); [Li et al., 2010](#); [Rogers et al., 2014](#)).

The identification of monetary policy shocks in a zero lower bound environment deserves some further discussion. As noted above, we use shadow rates instead of actual short-term interest rates as the policy instrument. These are estimated from a term structure model and reflect what short-term rates would have been in the absence of the zero lower bound (see e.g., [Krippner, 2013](#)). Hence, shadow rates constitute an overall measure of the monetary policy stance that is equally valid during both normal periods and times where the zero lower bound is binding. It could be argued that our results thus blend effects of conventional monetary policy (i.e., interest rate changes) and unconventional monetary policy tools such as quantitative easing, which have been launched in the wake of the global financial crisis. However, since we use a time-varying parameter framework (with stochastic volatility), our analysis allows to attribute macroeconomic effects of the monetary policy shock to conventional monetary policy during normal times and to unconventional monetary policy during the zero lower bound period (in which the shadow rate becomes negative).

Hence, our econometric framework coupled with a generally valid policy instrument yields a consistent analysis of monetary policy with no need to change the policy instrument or the identification of the shock over different sub-samples. To facilitate pinning down the shock of interest, we further identify an aggregate demand and supply shock based on standard macroeconomic reasoning (see [Feldkircher and Huber, 2016](#); [Peersman, 2005](#)). Note that our assumptions are minimalistic in a sense that they apply to growth rates, are imposed on

impact only and are introduced exclusively to the US economy. This is to ensure that our results are not driven by the identifying assumptions.¹⁰


4 The international dimension of US monetary policy

We start showcasing our model framework by presenting the time variation of two exemplary coefficients with the aim to provide some intuition of the proposed mixture innovation mechanism. In the next step, we briefly investigate how US monetary policy affects international macroeconomic variables. We then move on to assess whether the effects have strengthened or weakened over time. Finally, we relate country characteristics to the extent the monetary policy shock affects international output.

4.1 Illustrating our modeling approach

In this section, we provide additional intuition by considering two examples of time-varying parameters in the framework of our application.

Figure 1: Illustrative marginal posterior distribution of reduced form coefficients.



Notes: The plots show the marginal posterior distribution of the dynamic regression coefficients alongside the probability that a given coefficient is time-varying at a certain point in time (in gray, left hand scale). Blue solid lines refer to the posterior median along with 68% credible intervals (blue dotted lines).

¹⁰The early literature on US monetary policy shocks relied heavily on recursive identification, such as in [Christiano et al. \(2005\)](#). More recently, a number of authors propose the use of external instruments, based on either the narrative approach ([Romer and Romer, 2004](#)) or high frequency information ([Gertler and Karadi, 2015](#); [Rogers et al., 2014](#); [2018](#)). [Miranda-Agrippino and Ricco \(2015\)](#), however, show that using these measures often leads to output and/or price puzzles.

Figure 1 shows the marginal posterior distribution of the dynamic regression coefficients as well as the probability that a certain coefficient is time-varying for a given point in time (gray shaded area, left hand scale). The blue dotted lines refer to the 16th (84th) percentiles of the respective posterior distribution while the solid blue line is the posterior median.

Panel (a) in Figure 1 shows the evolution of the coefficient associated with weakly exogenous term spreads in the output equation for Greece. This plot serves as a means to demonstrate that our flexible specification of the error variance in the state equation enables us to detect situations where coefficients remained approximately constant over a certain time frame (i.e., the period up to the global financial crisis) and then exhibit sudden shifts (during the crisis period). After the shift, the figure suggests that the corresponding coefficient remained approximately constant. The posterior moving probability (gray shaded area) suggests that during the crisis, strong evidence in favor of time variation is present whereas in the remaining periods the moving probability is approximately zero.


As a second illustrating example, panel (b) of Figure 1 displays the path of the coefficient on the intercept term of the output equation for Brazil. In contrast to panel (a), we find that the moving probability is around 0.2 during the estimation period. The corresponding posterior tends to display a rather strong degree of time-variation. At first glance, this may seem counterintuitive, since the state innovation variances are pushed to zero in 80 percent of the posterior draws. However, it is worth noting that the figure refers to the marginal distribution of the coefficients. These are obtained after integrating out the indicators that control the amount of time-variation, effectively leading to a situation where the unconditional variance of the shocks to the regression parameters is non-zero (and potentially moderate).

4.2 Does the global economy respond to US monetary policy shocks?

First, we investigate the international responses to an unexpected US monetary policy tightening normalized to a 25 basis point (bp) increase in US short-term interest rates (measured by the Krippner shadow rate) throughout the sample period. While the shock on impact is fixed to 25 bp for the US, spillovers generated by the shock are allowed to vary if macroeconomic relationships change over time. The results are summarized in Figure 2, which shows posterior medians of time averaged responses for the largest three countries from each region as defined in Table 1. To provide some information on the behavior of the whole region, we moreover show credible sets that correspond to regional (time-averaged) responses. These reflect the variation of responses within each country group. All results except those for the short-term rates and the term spread are shown in cumulative terms.

[INCLUDE Figure 2 HERE]

Figure 2: Responses to a +25 basis point (bp) US monetary policy shock.



Notes: The figure shows the posterior median of time averaged responses for selected countries. The shaded areas correspond to the 68% (light grey) and 50% (dark grey) credible sets of the regional time averaged responses. Regions defined as in Table 1 and all responses in cumulative terms except those of short-rates.

Figure 2, top panel, shows that US output declines by approximately 0.5% in response to the rate increase. In quantitative terms, this result lies between estimates of linear models surveyed in Coibion (2012) and those of Baumeister and Benati (2013) and Feldkircher and Huber (2018), who use a time-varying parameter VAR model with stochastic volatility. Looking at the other countries, output contracts and responses tend to be rather persistent, corroborating the findings by Feldkircher and Huber (2016). Also note that credible sets mostly lie below zero, indicating that responses are (on average viewed over the sample span) statistically significantly different from zero. Considering the different world regions, most responses are very homogeneous and fall inside the credible sets spanned by the respective cross-country means. An exception is Argentina which shows a much more pronounced reaction to the monetary tightening in the US than its regional peers.

The second panel shows responses of consumer prices. With the exception of Latin America, all responses and regional credible sets lie below zero. Contractions in consumer prices range between 0.05% to 0.4% in other developed and Western European economies. They tend to be more pronounced in emerging Asia and especially so in China. In Latin America, Mexico shows a (modest) positive price response.

The third panel of Figure 2 depicts the (non-cumulative) response of interest rates to the monetary policy shock. Here, the responses tend to differ markedly across regional aggregates. For example, Western European countries lower interest rates in order to provide stimulus and offset output losses. These responses are tightly estimated and homogeneous within the region. By contrast, short-rates in Asian economies (including Japan) appear to display little reactions to the US monetary policy tightening. This could be driven by the comparably low degree of capital account openness.¹¹

The fourth panel of Figure 2 shows the cumulative responses of the exchange rate vis-à-vis the US dollar. As expected, responses for countries with a flexible exchange rate regime tend to be positive, indicating a weakening of the respective local currency against the dollar. Advanced economies and Latin American countries respond most strongly to the rate increase, whereas Asian currencies tend to be more insulated – a result which is paralleled in their interest rates responses. Again, this could be driven by the comparably low degree of financial openness since this renders exchange rates less sensitive to foreign rate changes (Kamin, 2013). More specifically, in Western Europe, exchange rates depreciate as the interest rate differential widens.

Last, the bottom panel of Figure 2 shows time-averaged responses of global equity prices. The 25 bp increase in US rates triggers a 4% decline in US equity prices (on average over the

¹¹In general, Shambaugh (2004) finds that domestic interest rates in countries with a low degree of capital account openness respond less strongly to foreign interest rate changes. By contrast and looking at US monetary policy shocks, Miniane and Rogers (2007) do not find evidence that domestic rates in countries with high capital account openness respond more swiftly compared to those financially more open economies.

sample period), roughly in line with the findings reported in [Li et al. \(2010\)](#). As monetary policy is tightened in the US, equity prices contract worldwide. This finding is consistent with [Hausman and Wongswan \(2011\)](#) and [Ehrmann and Fratzscher \(2009\)](#). Responses in other developed economies, Western Europe, and Asia are very homogeneous, while those in Latin America show more variation. For completeness, we show results for term spreads in [Figure A.2](#) in the appendix. International term spreads show a homogeneous negative response. They also adjust quickly after the initial decrease. That term spreads behave in a similar fashion could be explained by the high cross-country correlation of short-term rates and bond yields for advanced economies ([Kamin, 2013](#)).

Summing up, we find that a US monetary tightening decreases international output, consumer prices and equity prices. International interest rates also respond to the US monetary policy shock, but to a varying degree. The same holds true for exchange rates vis-à-vis the dollar. These observations hold on average, viewed over the whole sample period. The estimated effects for the domestic economy are in line with the rich literature on US monetary policy shock. Moreover, it is worth emphasizing that average reactions across real and financial quantities exhibit considerable differences in their shapes, pointing towards heterogeneous timing patterns in the international transmission of US monetary policy shocks. While real quantities generally display a weak immediate reaction, financial quantities such as equity prices tend to display a strong impact response. These results provide confidence in our econometric framework and identification strategy.

4.3 Have spillovers changed over time?

In this section we examine whether spillovers have changed over time. For that purpose, we first construct a simple measure of time variation, namely the robust version of the coefficient of variation, given by


$$CV_{ij}(\mathfrak{h}) = \frac{\varpi_{ij}(\mathfrak{h})^{75} - \varpi_{ij}(\mathfrak{h})^{25}}{\varpi_{ij}(\mathfrak{h})^{50}}. \quad (4.1)$$

Here, $\varpi_{ij}(\mathfrak{h}) = [\varpi_{ij,1}(\mathfrak{h}), \dots, \varpi_{ij,T}(\mathfrak{h})]'$ denotes the impulse responses of the i th variable at impulse forecast horizon \mathfrak{h} with respect to the j th structural shock in the system (i.e, the US monetary policy shock) over time. The superscript indicates the 25th, 50th and 75th quantiles of $\varpi_{ij}(\mathfrak{h})$. We compute the marginal posterior distribution of the CV statistic using Monte Carlo integration. In what follows we present the posterior median CV and 68% credible set for impact responses ($\mathfrak{h} = 0$) with red bars denoting coefficient of variations that are statistically different from zero.


[INCLUDE [Figure 3](#) HERE]

Figure 3: Coefficient of variation of impact responses.


(a) Output




(b) Consumer prices




(c) Short-rates




(d) Term spread



(e) Exchange rate



(f) Equity prices



Notes: The plots show the posterior median of the coefficient of variation of impact responses over time. The whiskers denote 68% credible intervals. Red bars denote coefficient of variations that are statistically different from zero.

The plot demonstrates that there is pronounced time variation of impact responses for most variables and countries considered in this study. Examining cross-country differences reveals that no systematic pattern emerges with respect to which countries exhibit time-variation in their respective impulse response functions. Both advanced as well as emerging countries display strong time-variation in their impact responses.

Turning to variable-specific results reveals most time variation for equity prices, output and exchange rates. This is mirrored in the largest number of countries with coefficients of variation significantly different from zero. Responses of term spreads also show a lot of variation but are available only for a small set of countries. Especially equity impact responses vary considerably. That there is comparably less time variation concerning short term interest rates implies that central banks adjusted their policy rates in response to the US monetary policy induced output loss in a consistent fashion over the sample period.

Looking at time variation of impact responses provides only an indication of the amount of time variation in international spillovers. Spillovers could also change at longer horizons or, more generally, the shapes of spillover responses could change over time. Hence, we show the full set of output responses in [Figure 4](#) for selected countries and the regional average over time. Light yellow responses correspond to the beginning of the sample (i.e., 1990Q2) and dark red responses to the end of the sample (i.e., 2016Q4). To preserve space, we focus on the three variables for which most country responses show time variation, namely equity prices, output and exchange rates. Results for the remaining variables are provided in the appendix. We also show the posterior median of the time averaged response along with 68% credible bounds. Responses that fall outside these bounds can be regarded as significantly different from their time average.


[INCLUDE [Figure 4](#) HERE]

Looking at the figure yields further insights on the amount of time variation in international output responses. In general, we find considerable time variation not only on impact dynamics but up to a time horizon of ten to 15 quarters. In the longer term (up to 20 quarters), however, responses tend to be covered by the credible sets. This might indicate that long-run responses are shaped by fundamental relationships that do not vary that much over time. Taking a regional angle, we see that Western European countries that adopted the euro over the sample period show considerable variation in their responses. This carries over to other developed economies, including the US and Latin American economies. By contrast, responses in Asia are generally more time invariant.

[INCLUDE [Figure 5](#) HERE]


Next, we investigate time variation of exchange rate responses provided in [Figure 5](#). Here we observe that responses vary considerably for Western European economies but mainly so

Figure 4: Output responses over time for selected countries



Notes: The plot shows posterior median responses over the sample period. Light yellow responses correspond to the beginning of the sample (i.e., 1990Q2), dark red responses to the end (i.e., 2016Q4). The black line corresponds to the posterior median of the time averaged response along with 68% credible bounds.

Figure 5: Exchange rate responses over time for selected countries



Notes: The plot shows posterior median responses over the sample period. Light yellow responses correspond to the beginning of the sample (i.e., 1990Q2), dark red responses to the end (i.e., 2016Q4). The black line corresponds to the posterior median of the time averaged response along with 68% credible bounds. An increase implies an appreciation of the US dollar against the respective local currency.

in the medium to long term, which is in contrast to output responses. Consistent with our previous assessment, currencies in emerging Asia show smaller reactions to the US monetary policy shock. The plot reveals that this finding holds true throughout the sample period. Latin American currencies, by contrast, show again strong reactions and impulse responses vary throughout the impulse response horizon.

Next, [Figure 6](#) shows the responses of equity prices. Inspecting the shape of equity price responses yields a very homogeneous picture. Throughout all regions, we observe substantial variation of responses up to ten quarters. The strongest (i.e., most negative) responses are obtained for the beginning of the sample period. Also the variation of responses over the sample period for a given country is much larger compared to output responses, which indicates a considerable degree of time variation.

Last, we aim to answer the question whether international spillovers have strengthened or weakened over time. For that matter we assess time profiles of international trough output and equity price effects and the peak effect (i.e., maximum depreciation against the US dollar) of international exchange rates. Simple cross-country averages are depicted in [Figure 7](#) below.


[INCLUDE [Figure 7](#) HERE]

Note that exchange rates are in inverted scale to ease visual comparison with the other variables. All three variables show a very similar pattern of trough responses over time. Roughly, these results indicate stronger international effects in the period from 1990Q2 to 2008Q4 compared to the post-crisis period. From a domestic perspective, this finding could be related to diminishing effectiveness of asset purchases in the US, which we capture with the shadow rate during the zero lower bound period which lasted until 2015Q4. In fact, there is ample empirical evidence for abating effects of US asset purchase programs on the US macroeconomy either due to diminishing effects on US investment growth ([Stein, 2012](#); [Feldkircher and Huber, 2018](#)) or via signaling effects that have the strongest impact when financial markets are strained ([Engen et al., 2015](#)). Weaker effects on the US economy could trigger weaker international effects.¹² Besides that, changes in the global macroeconomic environment such as declines in trade and financial globalization could also account for this finding – a more systematic analysis will be carried out in the next section. Last, note that there is no steady decline in the strength of the effects, rather they appear to evolve in cycles.

Summing up, we find evidence for time variation in US domestic responses as well as for international reactions of selected quantities. Specifically, output, exchange rates, and, most notably, equity price responses vary considerably throughout all regions. To be precise, variation in international output and equity price effects mostly regards short to medium-term

¹²That this is not necessarily the case is demonstrated in [Fratzscher et al. \(2018\)](#) who show that the last two US asset purchase programs had a particularly strong effect on foreign markets.


Figure 6: Equity price responses over time for selected countries




Notes: The plot shows posterior median responses over the sample period. Light yellow responses correspond to the beginning of the sample (i.e., 1990Q2), dark red responses to the end (i.e., 2016Q4). The black line corresponds to the posterior median of the time averaged response along with 68% credible bounds.

Figure 7: Trough / peak responses over time.


(a) Output



(b) Exchange rates



(c) Equity prices



Notes: The plots show simple cross-country averages of trough responses of output and equity prices over time, as well as peak responses of exchange rates (i.e., maximum depreciations against the US dollar) in inverted scale.

dynamics (up to ten quarters), whereas exchange rate responses vary also in the longer-term (up to 20 quarters). Focusing on trough/peak responses, we find no evidence for a steady increase or decline in the strength of spillover effects in the data – rather these evolve in cycles. Roughly, we find weaker international effects in the aftermath of the global financial crisis compared to the rest of the sample period. This could be either explained domestically by noting diminishing effects of large scale asset purchase programs on the US economy or by global trends such as changes in trade and financial globalization, which we will analyze in more detail in the next section.

4.4 The influence of financial and trade globalization on spillovers

So far we have established that spillovers from US monetary policy are significant, different across countries and time-varying. In this section, we assess whether the size of these international effects can be related to two phenomena that have shaped the global economy over the last decades: the increase in trade and financial globalization.

In a survey, [Kamin \(2013\)](#) reviews the channels through which globalization can shape international responses. In a nutshell, and as pointed out in [Mishkin \(2009\)](#), the effect of more globalization can either enhance or decrease spillovers. As countries become more integrated with the global economy, their macroeconomic variables generally become more exposed to external shocks. By the same token, countries with a broad trade base and a high degree of financial market integration reduce the risk to suffer from an adverse shock that originates from a single country. A second observation made in [Kamin \(2013\)](#) is that globalization may alter the transmission channels of monetary policy. As trade becomes more important, monetary policy could work more through exchange rates and net exports and less through its effects on domestic demand by steering long-term interest rates. Also, as government bond yields tend to be increasingly determined on global financial markets, their sensitivity to domestic changes in short-term rates might have abated ([Kamin, 2013](#)).

We measure trade and financial globalization using the new version of the KOF globalization indexes described in [Gyglia et al. \(2018\)](#). This updated database allows to distinguish between *de-facto* (activities) and *de-jure* measures (policies). That these can differ substantially has been pointed out in [Kose et al. \(2009\)](#) and corroborated empirically in the context of economic growth by [Quinn et al. \(2011\)](#). De-facto trade globalization is captured by variables that measure the exchange of goods and services over long distances and de jure globalization by measures that reflect the degree of trade regulation and tariff barriers. Financial globalization is measured by capital flows and stocks of foreign assets and liabilities, as well as de jure measures such as the foreign exchange rate regime and capital account and current account restrictions.

The indices, aggregated for the global economy, are depicted in Figure 8. Looking first at de-facto globalization measures, the picture shows that both trade and financial globalization have steadily increased up until 2008. With the onset of the global financial crisis, a sharp drop in world trade is reflected in a pronounced decline in trade globalization and a slow down in financial globalization. Considering de-jure measures yields a more diverse picture. While trade de-jure globalization follows closely its de-facto counterpart, financial de-jure globalization evolves differently. Capital account openness increased only up until 1995 and then moved in cycles. Consistent with the other measures, de-jure financial openness has declined from 2008 onward.

Figure 8: KOF Globalization indices (world)



Notes: The plots shows the evolution of world trade de-facto (red, solid) and de-jure (red, dashed) and financial de-facto (blue, solid) and de-jure (blue, dashed) globalization indexes. Data retrieved from <https://www.kof.ethz.ch/en/forecasts-and-indicators/indicators/kof-globalisation-index.html>.

To assess the impact of globalization measures on spillovers from the US monetary policy shock, we collect cumulative trough effects on output, consumer and equity prices, as well as peak effects (i.e., maximum appreciations of the US dollar) for the exchange rate. We focus on these variables since time variation of spillovers in interest rates and term spreads are comparably low. Similar exercises to explain cross-country differences in spillovers have been carried out recently in Georgiadis and Mehl (2016) and Dedola et al. (2017).¹³ Note, however, that the time-varying approach yields trough / peak responses for each point over the

¹³Using a large cross-country data set with both monthly and quarterly macroeconomic time series, Dedola et al. (2017) do not find a systematic relationship between a country’s response and country characteristics. By contrast, Georgiadis (2016) finds a range of potential determinants that can account for differences in the extent of spillovers. These include, among other characteristics, the receiving country’s degree of trade and financial openness and the exchange rate regime. The importance of these determinants differs, however, across advanced and emerging countries and there exist also non-linear relationships among the determinants.

sample period, which allows us to estimate a panel, as opposed to cross-country regressions previously employed in the literature, and perform more reliable inference, as pointed out in [Dedola et al. \(2017\)](#). We convert the annual globalization indices to quarterly frequency by simply repeating the annual observations over the quarterly frequency domain. The results of a simple panel regression using country fixed effects are depicted in [Table 3](#).

Table 3: Effects of globalization on strength of spillovers.

	<i>Dependent variable:</i>		
	y	eq	er
Trade (de-facto)	0.002*** (0.001)	0.059*** (0.008)	-0.040*** (0.005)
Financial (de-facto)	0.001** (0.0004)	0.031*** (0.006)	-0.037*** (0.004)
Trade (de-jure)	-0.001*** (0.0003)	-0.024*** (0.006)	0.035*** (0.003)
Financial (de-jure)	-0.003*** (0.0003)	-0.045*** (0.005)	0.025*** (0.003)
Observations	3,605	2,781	3,502
R ²	0.039	0.130	0.144
Adjusted R ²	0.029	0.121	0.135
F Statistic	36.464***	102.771***	145.970***

Notes: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01. Output (y) and equity prices (eq) refer to trough values of the cumulative impulse response, exchange rates (er) to peak values (i.e., maximum appreciations of the US dollar against the respective local currency). Country fixed effects employed.

First, we see that de-facto measures of both trade and financial globalization reduce trough output and equity price responses as well as maximum depreciations against the dollar. This implies that economies with a broad trade base that are well integrated with the global financial economy are less exposed to spillover effects of a US monetary policy shock. Regarding financial globalization and output effects, this finding implicitly corroborates the results of [Georgiadis and Mehl \(2016\)](#), who postulate that the appreciation of the US dollar strengthens other countries' (dollar held) asset positions, which mitigate negative effects on international GDP. Moreover, as argued in [Mishkin \(2006\)](#), financial globalization can help promote institutional reforms and, in turn, financial stability, thereby contributing to more output stability. By contrast, policies that reduce trade barriers and open the capital account can amplify

spillovers to output, equity markets, and the exchange rate. Since the uncovered interest rate parity condition that links interest rate differentials to expected exchange rate movements assumes substitutability of assets and capital account openness, a high degree of the latter implies that interest rate differentials have a stronger impact on exchange rates. As a robustness check, we have regressed the yearly average of trough / peak responses on the measures of globalization to investigate whether our results are driven by our frequency conversion of the annual indexes to the quarterly domain. The results do not change qualitatively and are available upon request from the authors.


Up to this point, we have shown that the international effects of a US monetary policy shock vary over time and that the degree of trade and financial globalization explains cross-country variation of these spillovers. A natural further question is to ask whether the relationship between spillovers and globalization has also changed over time. In other words, whether for example de-facto trade globalization has always acted as a cushion to the monetary policy shock. We do this by running the same panel regression as before but using an extending window for the observations. We start using only the first four observations and then go forward until the end of the sample period. The estimated coefficients along with one-standard error bounds are depicted in [Figure 9](#), with the first panel showing results on international output effects, the middle panel those on exchange rates and the bottom panel the ones on global equity prices.

[INCLUDE [Figure 9](#) HERE]

A striking observation that emerges from these regressions is the changing correlation of the globalization indexes and the trough / peak effects in the very early part of the sample up until 1992. This holds equally true for output, exchange rate and equity price effects and for all measures of globalization. The reason for this is the changing dynamics of the globalization indices, also evident in [Figure 8](#). They fall in the beginning of the sample and then start to rise during 1992. The effect of de-jure trade measures changes more strongly and frequently compared to the other globalization indicators. All estimated coefficients converge at the end of the sample period to the results shown in [Table 3](#).

Summing up, we find that both trade and financial globalization can account for differences in international responses of output, equity prices and exchange rates. The distinction between de-facto measures (i.e., outcomes) and de-jure measures (i.e., policies) is crucial: Loosening de-jure measures amplifies spillovers to output and equity prices. It also triggers a greater sensitivity of the exchange rate to monetary policy tightening in the US. By contrast, a diverse trade base and a high degree of financial integration cushions the international effects of the US rate hike. The distinction between trade and financial globalization is less important since both measures have the same mitigating / amplifying effect on spillovers. These results

Figure 9: Estimated coefficients of a rolling panel regression.



Notes: The figure shows coefficient estimates of rolling panel regressions using the same specification as in Table 3.

hold true over most of the sample period, which indicates a stable relationship between international spillovers and globalization. An exception to this is the early part of our sample, a period that showed different dynamics in globalization than the rest of the observation period.

5 Closing remarks

This paper analyzes the international effects of a US monetary tightening taking explicitly into account that the extent of spillovers might have changed over time. For that purpose, we develop a time-varying parameter global vector autoregression with stochastic volatility and use shadow interest rates with sign restrictions to identify the monetary policy shock. Our econometric model yields a consistent framework for the analysis of monetary policy during normal times, as well as during the zero lower bound period. We further assess the global drivers of these spillovers focusing on new measures of trade and financial globalization.

Our results indicate significant international effects caused by an unexpected tightening of US policy rates. In general, a US monetary policy contraction tends to decrease global output and this response appears to be quite persistent, a result which is in line with [Feldkircher and Huber \(2016\)](#). Global consumer prices tend to fall, and most currencies strengthen against the dollar. International short-term interest rates show a more diverse picture: they decrease in Western Europe in order to compensate short-falls in output, they follow the rate hike in Latin America. Taking a regional angle, these effects are rather modest in emerging Asia compared to the rest of the world. We also find evidence for a significant and negative effect on global equity prices. These results relate to average effects over the sample period, 1990Q2 to 2016Q4 and are consistent with the bulk of the literature on international effects of US monetary policy shocks.

More importantly, our results yield significant evidence for a changing international transmission of monetary policy shocks over time. This holds true for effects on output, exchange rates and especially so on equity prices. More precisely, for output and equity prices short-run dynamics tend to vary considerably, while long-run responses are less time sensitive. This implies that a (hypothetical) monetary policy shock has similar long-run consequences in 1990 as in 2016, but their immediate effects might differ. By contrast, the effect on exchange rates varies also over the longer term. These results hint at complex dynamics of the international transmission mechanism and heterogeneity across countries. Considering the strength of international effects, our findings suggest that these rather evolve in cycles than following a continuous trend. Roughly speaking, our results point at weaker international effects in the period after the global financial crisis compared to the earlier part of the sample period. Partially, this could be explained by domestic factors, such as diminishing effects of quantitative easing on the US economy (see, e.g., [Engen et al., 2015](#); [Stein, 2012](#)).

Other potential driving forces of the strength of international spillovers are related to global developments in trade and financial globalization. Over our sample period, both forms of globalization have steadily increased up until the outbreak of the global financial crisis which triggered a relaunch of prohibitive policies. This pattern is mostly consistent with trough/peak values that we observe for the variables with considerable time variation. A more systematic analysis that draws on the newly available KOF globalization indices shows distinct effects of globalization outcomes / de-facto measures and policies / de-jure measures. An increase in de-facto measures of both trade and financial globalization mitigates international spillovers. This implies that a broad trade base and a high degree of financial integration with the world economy cushions risks stemming from a foreign shock such as a rate increase in the US. By contrast, an increase in de-jure measures (i.e., a reduction of trade barriers and / or a liberalization of the capital account) is associated with stronger international responses to the US shock. In this sense, our analysis yields a more precise assessment of the theoretically ambiguous effects of globalization on the macroeconomy as pointed out in [Mishkin \(2009\)](#). Except for the early part of our sample, these relationships between globalization and spillovers are stable over time. The distinction between trade and financial globalization as a determinant of the strength of spillovers is less important.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Roger Bivand, Markus Brunnermeier, Michele Dell’Era, Sylvia Frühwirth-Schnatter, Georgios Georgiadis, Gregor Kastner, Dubravko Mihajek, Philipp Piribauer, Pierre Siklos and Mike West as well as participants at research seminars at the Bank for International Settlements, the Norwegian School of Economics, the OeNB, the NBER-NSF 2015 time series workshop, the 9th International Conference on Computational and Financial Econometrics (CFE 2015), ECB’s workshop on global spillovers (2016), the CESifo MMIF 2016 conference and the Zeuthen 2018 workshop for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Support by funds of the Jubiläumsfonds of the Oesterreichische Nationalbank (project number 16244), the Crisis, Restructuring and Growth project at NHH and the European Social Fund (project *Reassessment of the Optimum Currency Area in the persistently heterogeneous European Union, Euro4Europe*) is gratefully acknowledged.

References

Baumeister, Christiane and Luca Benati, “Unconventional Monetary Policy and the Great

- Recession: Estimating the Macroeconomic Effects of a Spread Compression at the Zero Lower Bound,” *International Journal of Central Banking*, June 2013, 9 (2), 165–212.
- Bekaert, Geert, Marie Hoerova, and Marco Lo Duca**, “Risk, Uncertainty and Monetary Policy,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2013, 60 (7), 771–788.
- Bernanke, Ben S. and Kenneth N. Kuttner**, “What Explains the Stock Market’s Reaction to Federal Reserve Policy?,” *Journal of Finance*, 2005, 60 (3), 1221–1257.
- Boivin, Jean**, “Has U.S. Monetary Policy Changed? Evidence from Drifting Coefficients and Real-Time Data,” *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, August 2006, 38 (5), 1149–1173.
- , **Michael T. Kiley, and Frederic S. Mishkin**, “How Has the Monetary Transmission Mechanism Evolved Over Time?,” in Benjamin M. Friedman and Michael Woodford, eds., *Handbook of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 3 of *Handbook of Monetary Economics*, Elsevier, January 2010, chapter 8, pp. 369–422.
- Burriel, Pablo and Alessandro Galesi**, “Uncovering the Heterogeneous Effects of ECB Unconventional Monetary Policies Across euro Area Countries,” *European Economic Review*, 2018, 101 (C), 201–229.
- Canova, Fabio**, “The Transmission of US Shocks to Latin America,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 2005, 20 (2), 229–251.
- Carter, Chris K. and Robert Kohn**, “On Gibbs Sampling for State Space Models,” *Biometrika*, 1994, 81 (3), 541–553.
- Christiano, Lawrence J, Martin Eichenbaum, and Charles L Evans**, “Nominal Rigidities and the Dynamic Effects of a Shock to Monetary Policy,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2005, 113 (1), 1–45.
- Cogley, Timothy, Sergei Morozov, and Thomas J. Sargent**, “Bayesian Fan Charts for UK Inflation: Forecasting and Sources of Uncertainty in an Evolving Monetary System,” *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 2005, 29 (11), 1893–1925.
- Coibion, Olivier**, “Are the Effects of Monetary Policy Shocks Big or Small?,” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, April 2012, 4 (2), 1–32.
- Crespo Cuaresma, Jesús, Martin Feldkircher, and Florian Huber**, “Forecasting with Global Vector Autoregressive Models: a Bayesian Approach,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 2016, 31 (7), 1371–1391.
- Dedola, Luca, Giulia Rivolta, and Livio Stracca**, “If the Fed Sneezes, Who Catches a Cold?,” *Journal of International Economics*, 2017, 108 (Supplement 1), S23–S41.
- Dees, Stephane, Filippo di Mauro, M. Hashem Pesaran, and L. Vanessa Smith**, “Exploring the International Linkages of the euro Area: a Global VAR Analysis,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 2007, 22 (1), 1–38.
- Dovern, Jonas and Björn van Roye**, “International Transmission and Business-Cycle Effects of Financial Stress,” *Journal of Financial Stability*, 2014, 13 (0), 1–17.
- Ehrmann, Michael and Marcel Fratzscher**, “Global Financial Transmission of Monetary Policy Shocks,” *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, December 2009, 71 (6), 739–759.
- Eickmeier, Sandra and Tim Ng**, “How Do US Credit Supply Shocks Propagate Internationally? A GVAR Approach,” *European Economic Review*, 2015, 74, 128–145.
- Engen, Eric M., Thomas T. Laubach, and David Reifschneider**, “The Macroeconomic Effects of the Federal Reserves Unconventional Monetary Policies,” Finance and Economic Discussion Series 2015-005, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (U.S.) 2015.

- Feldkircher, Martin and Florian Huber**, “The International Transmission of US Shocks – Evidence from Bayesian Global Vector autoregressions,” *European Economic Review*, 2016, 81 (C), 167–188.
- and —, “Unconventional U.S. Monetary Policy: New Tools, Same Channels?,” *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 2018, 11 (4).
- Fratzscher, Marcel, M. Lo Duca, and Roland Straub**, “On the International Spillovers of US Quantitative Easing,” *The Economic Journal*, 2018, 128, 330–337.
- Frühwirth-Schnatter, Sylvia**, “Data Augmentation and Dynamic Linear Models,” *Journal of time series analysis*, 1994, 15 (2), 183–202.
- Gambetti, Luca and Alberto Musso**, “Loan supply shocks and the business cycle,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 2017, 32 (4), 764–782.
- George, Edward I, Dongchu Sun, and Shawn Ni**, “Bayesian stochastic search for VAR model restrictions,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 2008, 142 (1), 553–580.
- Georgiadis, Georgios**, “Determinants of global spillovers from US monetary policy,” *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 2016, 67 (C), 41–61.
- and **Arnaud Mehl**, “Financial globalisation and monetary policy effectiveness,” *Journal of International Economics*, 2016, 103, 200–212.
- Gertler, Mark and Peter Karadi**, “Monetary policy surprises, credit costs, and economic activity,” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, Jan. 2015, 7 (1), 44–76.
- Geweke, John**, “Evaluating the Accuracy of Sampling-Based Approaches to the Calculation of Posterior Moments,” in J. M. Bernardo, J. O. Berger, A. P. Dawid, and A. F. M. Smith, eds., *Bayesian Statistics 4*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1992, pp. 169–193.
- Giordani, Paolo and Robert Kohn**, “Efficient Bayesian inference for multiple change-point and mixture innovation models,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 2008, 26 (1), 66–77.
- Griffin, Jim E and Philip J Brown**, “Inference with normal-gamma prior distributions in regression problems,” *Bayesian Analysis*, 2010, 5 (1), 171–188.
- Gyglia, Savina, Florian Haelgb, and Jan-Egbert Sturm**, “The KOF Globalisation Index – Revisited,” KOF Working Papers 439, ETH Zürich February 2018.
- Hausman, Joshua and Jon Wongswan**, “Global asset prices and FOMC announcements,” *Journal of International Money and Finance*, April 2011, 30 (3), 547–571.
- Huber, F., G. Kastner, and M. Feldkircher**, “Should I stay or should I go? A latent threshold approach to large-scale mixture innovation models,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 2018, *forthcoming*.
- Huber, Florian**, “Density forecasting using Bayesian global vector autoregressions with stochastic volatility,” *International Journal of Forecasting*, 2016, 32 (3), 818–837.
- and **Martin Feldkircher**, “Adaptive Shrinkage in Bayesian Vector Autoregressive Models,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 2017, 0 (0), 1–13.
- Kamin, Steven B.**, “Financial Globalization and Monetary Policy,” in “Handbooks in Financial Globalization,” Vol. 3, Elsevier UK: Academic Press, 2013, pp. 391–415.
- Kastner, Gregor and Sylvia Frühwirth-Schnatter**, “Ancillarity-Sufficiency Interweaving Strategy (ASIS) for Boosting MCMC Estimation of Stochastic Volatility Models,” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 2013, 76.
- Kim, Soyoung**, “International Transmission of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks: Evidence from VAR’s,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, October 2001, 48 (2), 339–372.

- Koop, Gary, Dimitris Korobilis, and Davide Pettenuzzo**, “Bayesian Compressed Vector Autoregressions,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 2018, *forthcoming*.
- , **M Hashem Pesaran, and Simon M Potter**, “Impulse Response Analysis in Nonlinear Multivariate Models,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 1996, 74 (1), 119–147.
- , **Roberto Leon-Gonzalez, and Rodney W. Strachan**, “On the Evolution of the Monetary Policy Transmission Mechanism,” *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, April 2009, 33 (4), 997–1017.
- Kose, M. Ayabn, Eswar Prasad, Kenneth S. Rogoff, and Shang-Jin Wei**, “Financial Globalization: A Reappraisal,” *IMF Staff Papers*, 2009, 56 (1), 8–62.
- Krippner, Leo**, “Measuring the Stance of Monetary Policy in Zero Lower Bound Environment,” *Economics Letters*, 2013, 118 (1), 135–138.
- Kuttner, Kenneth N.**, “Monetary Policy Surprises and Interest Rates: Evidence from the Fed Funds Futures Market,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, June 2001, 47 (3), 523–544.
- Leydold, Josef and Wolfgang Hörmann**, *GIGrv: Random variate generator for the GIG distribution* 2015. R package version 0.4.
- Li, Yun Daisy, Talan B. Iscan, and Kuan Xu**, “The Impact of Monetary Policy Shocks on Stock Prices: Evidence from Canada and the United States,” *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 2010, 29 (5), 876–896.
- Miniane, Jacques and John H. Rogers**, “Capital Controls and the International Transmission of U.S. Money Shocks,” *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 2007, 39 (5), 1003–1035.
- Miranda-Agrippino, Silvia and Giovanni Ricco**, “The Transmission of Monetary Policy Shocks,” Discussion Papers 1711, Centre for Macroeconomics (CFM) September 2015.
- **and Helene Rey**, “World Asset Markets and the Global Financial Cycle,” NBER Working Paper 21722, NBER Nov 2015.
- Mishkin, Frederic S.**, *The Next Great Globalization: How Disadvantaged Nations Can Harness Their Financial Systems to Get Rich*, Princeton University Press, 2006.
- , “Globalization, Macroeconomic Performance, and Monetary Policy,” *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 2009, 41 (s1), 187–196.
- Peersman, Gert**, “What caused the early millennium slowdown? Evidence based on vector autoregressions,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 2005, 20 (2), 185–207.
- Pesaran, H Hashem and Yongcheol Shin**, “Generalized Impulse Response Analysis in Linear Multivariate Models,” *Economics Letters*, 1998, 58 (1), 17–29.
- Pesaran, M. Hashem, Til Schuermann, and Scott M. Weiner**, “Modeling Regional Interdependencies Using a Global Error-Correcting Macroeconometric Model,” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics, American Statistical Association*, 2004, 22 (2), 129–162.
- Primiceri, Giorgio E.**, “Time Varying Structural Vector Autoregressions and Monetary Policy,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2005, 72 (3), 821–852.
- Quinn, Dennis, Martin Schindler, and A. Maria Toyoda**, “Assessing Measures of Financial Openness and Integration,” *IMF Economic Review*, 2011, 59 (3), 488–522.
- Rey, Helene**, “Dilemma Not Trilemma: the Global Cycle and Monetary Policy Independence,” NBER Working Paper, NBER May 2015.
- Rigobon, Roberto and Brian Sack**, “The Impact of Monetary Policy on Asset Prices,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2004, 51 (8), 1553–1575.
- Ritter, Christian and Martin A. Tanner**, “Facilitating the Gibbs sampler: the Gibbs stopper and the griddy-Gibbs sampler,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1992, 87

- (419), 861–868.
- Rogers, John H., Chiara Scotti, and Jonathan H. Wright**, “Evaluating Asset-Market Effects of Unconventional Monetary Policy: A Multi-Country Review,” *Economic Policy*, 2014, 29 (80), 3–50.
- , —, and —, “Unconventional Monetary Policy and International Risk Premia,” *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 2018, *forthcoming*.
- Romer, Christina D. and David H. Romer**, “A New Measure of Monetary Shocks: Derivation and Implications,” *American Economic Review*, September 2004, 94 (4), 1055–1084.
- Rubio-Ramírez, Juan F., Daniel F. Waggoner, and Tao Zha**, “Structural Vector Autoregressions: Theory of Identification and Algorithms for Inference,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 2010, 77 (2), 665–696.
- Shambaugh, J. C.**, “The Effect of Fixed Exchange Rates on Monetary Policy,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2004, 119 (1), 301–352.
- Sims, Christopher A. and Tao Zha**, “Were There Regime Switches in U.S. Monetary Policy?,” *American Economic Review*, 2006, 96 (1), 54–81.
- Stein, Jeremy C.**, “Evaluating Large-Scale Asset Purchases,” Speech at the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C. October 2012.
- Thorbecke, Willem**, “On Stock Market Returns and Monetary Policy,” *Journal of Finance*, 1997, 52 (2), 635–654.

Appendix A Technical appendix

A.1 Prior specification

In a Bayesian framework, we need to elicit priors on the coefficients in Eq. (2.10). Crespo Cuaresma et al. (2016) show that prior elicitation at the individual country level translates into a specific prior structure at the global level, providing additional shrinkage through the trade weights used. We impose a normal-gamma (NG) prior (Griffin and Brown, 2010) on ξ_{i0} , the initial state of ξ_{it} ,¹⁴

$$\xi_{i0} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{s_i}, \mathbf{V}_{\xi_i}), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

with $\mathbf{0}_{s_i}$ being a s_i -dimensional vector of zeros and \mathbf{V}_{ξ_i} is a $s_i \times s_i$ diagonal prior variance-covariance matrix. We assume that each diagonal element of \mathbf{V}_{ξ_i} , labeled $v_{\xi_{ij}}$, features a Gamma prior with

$$v_{\xi_{ij}} \sim \mathcal{G}(\theta_i, \theta_i \kappa_i / 2). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We let θ_i denote a scalar hyperparameter specific to each country that serves to control the tail behavior of the prior. It allows for non-zero regression coefficients in the presence of a large global shrinkage parameter $\kappa_i \sim \mathcal{G}(q_0, q_1)$ that pushes all elements in ξ_i to zero. Again, q_0 and q_1 are prior hyperparameters that are typically set to small values. In the empirical application we set $\theta_i = 0.1$ and $q_0 = q_1 = 0.01$. These choices are based on VAR evidence provided in Huber and Feldkircher (2017).

One can think of this prior specification as an approximation to spike and slab priors (George et al., 2008), that fail to perform well if s_i is large. The main goal of this specification is to select whether a given regressor should be included or excluded at time $t = 0$. Notice that the question whether some covariate should enter the model over time does not only depend on whether $v_{\xi_{ij}}$ is close to zero but also whether that parameter is time-varying. Since we introduce a flexible law of motion for ξ_i , our model selects important regressors and allows for a stochastic model specification search over time.

For the parameter governing time-variation of coefficients $\vartheta_{ij,1}^{-1}$, we use a Gamma prior with

$$\vartheta_{ij,1}^{-1} \sim \mathcal{G}(n_0, n_1), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $n_0 = 3$ and $n_1 = 0.03$ are hyperparameters. Moreover, on the thresholds we introduce a prior that is uniformly distributed and depends on $\vartheta_{ij,1}$,

$$c_{ij} | \vartheta_{ij,1} \sim \mathcal{U}(\pi_{ij,0} \sqrt{\vartheta_{ij,1}}, \pi_{ij,1} \sqrt{\vartheta_{ij,1}}). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

We set $\pi_{ij,0} = 0.1$ and $\pi_{ij,1} = 3$, effectively bounding the thresholds away from zero. This implies that high frequency noise in the latent states is always set equal to zero, effectively reducing uncertainty stemming from this source without seriously distorting inference.

Moreover, we use the prior setup proposed in Kastner and Frühwirth-Schnatter (2013) and subsequently used in Huber (2016) on the coefficients of the log-volatility process in Eq. (2.4). A normal prior is imposed on μ_{il} ($l = 1, \dots, k_i$) with mean $\underline{\mu}_i$ and variance \underline{V}_{μ_i}

$$\mu_{il} \sim \mathcal{N}(\underline{\mu}_i, \underline{V}_{\mu_i}). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

¹⁴For a recent applications of this prior to the VAR case, see Huber and Feldkircher (2017).

For the persistence parameter ρ_{il} , we elicit a Beta-distributed prior

$$\frac{\rho_{il} + 1}{2} \sim \text{Beta}(a_0, b_0), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

For typical data sets arising in macroeconomics, the exact choice of the hyperparameters $a_0 = 25$ and $b_0 = 5$ in Eq. (A.6) is quite influential, since data do not tend to be very informative about the degree of persistence of log-volatilities. Our proposed choice translates into a quite persistent log-volatility process and appears to be in concordance with earlier literature (see [Primiceri, 2005](#)).

Finally, we impose a non-conjugate gamma prior for ς_{ij}^2 , ($j = 1, \dots, k_i$),

$$\varsigma_{ij}^2 \sim \mathcal{G}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2B_\varsigma}\right). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

This choice does not bound ς_{ij}^2 away from zero, thus providing more shrinkage than standard typical conjugate inverted gamma priors do. Here, we follow the recommendations provided in [Kastner and Frühwirth-Schnatter \(2013\)](#) and set $B_\varsigma = 1$.

A.2 Posterior inference

Using the prior setting described in Section 2, a MCMC algorithm to draw samples from the (country-specific) parameter posterior distribution can be designed. Let us denote the full history of the time-varying elements in Eq. (2.5) up to time T as

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T &= \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{i1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}'_{iT})', \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}_i^T &= (\lambda_{i1}, \dots, \lambda_{iT})'. \end{aligned}$$

The MCMC algorithm consists of the following blocks

- $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T$ is sampled through the well known algorithm provided in [Carter and Kohn \(1994\)](#) and [Frühwirth-Schnatter \(1994\)](#).
- Conditional on $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T$, the hierarchy of the model implies that the posterior of $\vartheta_{ij,1}^{-1}$ ($j = 1, \dots, s_i$) is independent of the data and follows a Gamma distribution,

$$\vartheta_{ij,1} | \bullet \sim \mathcal{G}^{-1}\left(\frac{T_1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + n_0, n_1 + \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T d_{ij,t} (\xi_{ij,t} - \xi_{ij,t-1})^2}{2}\right), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

with $T_1 = \sum_{t=1}^T d_{ij,t}$ denoting the number of observations that display time-variation in the j th parameter of country i , and \bullet is a generic notation that indicates conditioning on all remaining model parameters and the data.

- The posterior of v_{ij}^2 follows a Generalized Inverted Gaussian (GIG) distribution,

$$v_{\xi_{ij}} | \bullet \sim \text{GIG}\left(\theta_i - \frac{1}{2}, \xi_{ij,0}^2, \theta_i \kappa_i^2\right). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

We sample from the GIG by using the R package GIGrvg ([Leydold and Hörmann, 2015](#)).

- The global shrinkage parameter κ_i is sampled from a Gamma distribution given by

$$\kappa_i | \bullet \sim \mathcal{G} \left(q_0 + \theta_i s_i, q_1 + \frac{\theta_i}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{s_i} v_{\xi_{i,j}} \right). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

- We use a Griddy Gibbs algorithm (Ritter and Tanner, 1992) to obtain draws from the posterior distribution of the thresholds c_j . Due to the hierarchical structure of the model, the likelihood is given by

$$p(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T | \bullet) \propto \prod_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sqrt{\vartheta_{ij,t}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(\xi_{ij,t} - \xi_{ij,t-1})^2}{2\vartheta_{ij,t}} \right\}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

We combine Eq. (A.11) with the uniform prior in Eq. (A.4) and evaluate the conditional posterior of c_{ij} over a fine grid of potential values to approximate the inverse cumulative distribution function of the posterior. This approximation is then consequently utilized to perform inverse transform sampling.

- The history of log volatilities is sampled using the algorithm outlined in Kastner and Frühwirth-Schnatter (2013).


To speed up computation and to permit equation-by-equation estimation, we exploit a Cholesky ordering for estimating the model (Koop et al., 2018). This implies that, for each equation j within a given country model, we include the endogenous variables of the preceding $(j - 1)$ equations to jointly draw the covariance parameters and the VAR coefficients. This technique, in principle, is not order-invariant with respect to random permutations in \mathbf{y}_{it} . However, we found in limited experiments, that randomly assigning the order of the variables in \mathbf{y}_{it} yields only minor differences in the estimated impulse responses. Notice that this is a short-cut that allows to fully exploit parallel computing.

A.3 Convergence properties of the MCMC algorithm and residual diagnostics


In Figure A.1 we show several diagnostic checks based on the residuals of the country models. These are based on 10,000 posterior draws after a burn-in phase of 30,000 draws. From the upper left panel we see that the residuals are generally not serially autocorrelated. In the top right panel we show box plots of Z-scores of Geweke's convergence diagnostic (Geweke, 1992) per country. These indicate that the MCMC algorithm has converged to its target distribution since most (absolute) values of the statistic are below the 1.96 threshold. The bottom left panel illustrates the distribution of the trade weights. One assumption underlying the GVAR framework is that the weights are relatively small (see Pesaran et al., 2004). We see that most countries are well integrated with the rest of the world and weights tend to be small (i.e., equally distributed). Germany for Austria, and the US (for Canada and Malaysia) are notable exceptions. Last, we show in the bottom panel of Figure A.1, right-hand side that cross-sectional dependence of the country residuals is generally weak. The cumulative density function of the pairwise correlations across the country residuals show that 90% of the mass lies below 30% indicating weak cross-sectional dependence (Burriel and Galesi, 2018).

Figure A.1: Diagnostics of the estimated GVAR.


(a) Residual serial dependence




(b) Geweke's convergence diagnostic



(c) Trade-based weight matrix




(d) Residual cross-sectional dependence



Notes: The top left panel shows the autocorrelation function (ACF) of the cross-country residuals, the right panel boxplots of Z-scores of Geweke's convergence diagnostic ([Geweke, 1992](#)). The bottom panel, left-hand side shows the distribution of trade weights, the right-hand side panel the empirical cumulative density function of average pairwise cross-country residual correlations (in absolute values).


A.4 Additional results

Figure A.2: Term spread responses to a +25 basis point (bp) US monetary policy shock.




Notes: The figure shows the posterior median of time averaged responses for selected countries. The shaded areas correspond to the 68% (light grey) and 50% (dark grey) credible sets of the regional time averaged responses. Regions defined as in [Table 1](#) and all responses in cumulative terms.

Figure A.3: Price responses over time for selected countries.




Notes: The plot shows posterior median responses over the sample period. Light yellow responses correspond to the beginning of the sample (i.e., 1990Q2), dark red responses to the end (i.e., 2016Q4). The black line corresponds to the posterior median of the time averaged response along with 68% credible bounds.

Figure A.4: Short-rate responses over time for selected countries.



Notes: The plot shows posterior median responses over the sample period. Light yellow responses correspond to the beginning of the sample (i.e., 1990Q2), dark red responses to the end (i.e., 2016Q4). The black line corresponds to the posterior median of the time averaged response along with 68% credible bounds.

Figure A.5: Term spread responses over time for selected countries.



Notes: The plot shows posterior median responses over the sample period. Light yellow responses correspond to the beginning of the sample (i.e., 1990Q2), dark red responses to the end (i.e., 2016Q4). The black line corresponds to the posterior median of the time averaged response along with 68% credible bounds.

Issued in the series Discussion Papers 2017

2017

- 01/17** January, **Agnar Sandmo**, "Should the marginal tax rate be negative? Ragnar Frisch on the socially optimal amount of work"
- 02/17** February, **Luca Picariello**, "Organizational Design with Portable Skills"
- 03/17** March, **Kurt R. Brekke**, Tor Helge Holmås, Karin Monstad og Odd Rune Straume, "Competition and physician behaviour: Does the competitive environment affect the propensity to issue sickness certificates?"
- 04/17** March, **Mathias Ekström**, "Seasonal Social Preferences".
- 05/17** April, Orazio Attanasio, Agnes Kovacs, and **Krisztina Molnar**: "Euler Equations, Subjective Expectations and Income Shocks"
- 06/17** April, **Alexander W. Cappelen**, Karl Ove Moene, Siv-Elisabeth Skjelbred, and **Bertil Tungodden**, "The merit primacy effect"
- 07/17** May, **Jan Tore Klovland**, "Navigating through torpedo attacks and enemy raiders: Merchant shipping and freight rates during World War I"
- 08/17** May, **Alexander W. Cappelen**, Gary Charness, **Mathias Ekström**, Uri Gneezy, and **Bertil Tungodden**: "Exercise Improves Academic Performance"
- 09/17** June, **Astrid Kunze**, "The gender wage gap in developed countries"
- 10/17** June, **Kristina M. Bott**, **Alexander W. Cappelen**, **Erik Ø. Sørensen** and **Bertil Tungodden**, "You've got mail: A randomized field experiment on tax evasion"
- 11/17** August, Marco Pagano and **Luca Picariello**, "Talent Discovery, Layoff Risk and Unemployment Insurance"
- 12/17** August, Ingrid Kristine Folgerø, **Torfinn Harding** and Benjamin S. Westby, «Going fast or going green? Evidence from environmental speed limits in Norway"
- 13/17** August, **Chang-Koo Chi**, Pauli Murto, and Juuso Välimäki, "All-pay auctions with affiliated values"

- 14/17 August, **Helge Sandvig Thorsen**, "The effect of school consolidation on student achievement".
- 15/17 September, Arild Sæther, "Samuel Pufendorf and Ludvig Holberg on Political Economy".
- 16/17 September, **Chang-Koo Chi**, Pauli Murto, and Juuso Välimäki, "War of attrition with affiliated values".
- 17/17 September, **Aline Bütikofer** and Giovanni Peri, "The Effects of Cognitive and Noncognitive Skills on Migration Decisions"
- 18/17 October, **Øivind Schøyen**, "What limits the powerful in imposing the morality of their authority?"
- 19/17 October, **Charlotte Ringdal** and **Ingrid Hoem Sjursen**, "Household bargaining and spending on children: Experimental evidence from Tanzania"
- 20/17 December, **Fred Schroyen** and Karl Ove Aarbu, "Attitudes towards large income risk in welfare states: an international comparison"
- 21/17 December, **Alexander W. Cappelen**, **Ranveig Falch**, and **Bertil Tungodden**, "The Boy Crisis: Experimental Evidence on the Acceptance of Males Falling Behind"

2018

- 01/18 January, Øystein Fosros, Mai Nguyen-Ones, and **Frode Steen**, "Evidence on consumer behavior and firm performance in gasoline retailing"
- 02/18 January, **Agnar Sandmo**, "A fundamental externality in the Labour Market? Ragnar Frisch on the socially optimal amount of work"
- 03/18 February, Pierre Dubois and **Morten Sæthre**, "On the Effect of Parallel Trade on Manufacturers' and Retailers' Profits in the Pharmaceutical Sector"
- 04/18 March, **Aline Bütikofer**, Julie Riise, and Meghan Skira, "The Impact of Paid Maternity Leave on Maternal Health"
- 05/18 March, **Kjetil Bjorvatn** and **Bertil Tungodden**, "Empowering the disabled through savings groups: Experimental evidence from Uganda"

- 06/18 April, Mai Nguyen-Ones and **Frode Steen**, "Measuring Market Power in Gasoline Retailing: A Market- or Station Phenomenon?"
- 07/18 April, **Chang Koo Chi** and Trond Olsen, "Relational incentive contracts and performance"
- 08/18 April, **Björn Bartling**, **Alexander W. Cappelen**, **Mathias Ekström**, **Erik Ø. Sørensen**, and **Bertil Tungodden**, «Fairness in Winner-Take-All Markets»
- 09/18 April, **Aline Bütikofer**, **Sissel Jensen**, and **Kjell G. Salvanes**, «The Role of Parenthood on the Gender Gap among Top Earners»
- 10/18 May, **Mathias Ekström**, "The (un)compromise effect"
- 11/18 May, Yilong Xu, **Xiaogeng Xu**, and Steven Tucker, «Ambiguity Attitudes in the Loss Domain: Decisions for Self versus Others»
- 12/18 June, **Øivind A. Nilsen**, Per Marius Pettersen, and Joakim Bratlie, "Time-Dependency in producers' price adjustments: Evidence from micro panel data"
- 13/18 June, **Øivind A. Nilsen**, Arvid Raknerud, and Diana-Cristina Iancu, "Public R&D support and firms' performance. A Panel Data Study"
- 14/18 June, Manudeep Bhuller, Gordon B. Dahl, **Katrine V. Løken**, and Magne Mogstad: «Incarceration, Recidivism, and Employment"
- 15/18 August, Manudeep Bhuller, Gordon B. Dahl, **Katrine V. Løken**, and Magne Mogstad: «Incarceration Spillovers in Criminal and Family Networks"
- 16/18 August, Pedro Carneiro, Kai Liu, and **Kjell G. Salvanes**: "The Supply of Skill and Endogenous Technical Change: Evidence From a College Expansion Reform"
- 17/18 August, **Chang Koo Chi**, "An analysis of the two-bidder all-pay auction with common values"
- 18/18 August, **Alexander W. Cappelen**, Cornelius Cappelen, and **Bertil Tungodden**, "Second-best fairness under limited information: The trade-off between false positives and false negatives"
- 19/18 September, **Aline Bütikofer**, **Antonio Dalla Zuanna**, and **Kjell G. Salvanes**: "Breaking the Links: Natural Resource Booms and Intergenerational Mobility"

- 20/18 September, Juan Pablo Atal, José Ignacio Cuesta, and **Morten Sæthre**, “Quality regulation and competition: Evidence from Pharmaceutical Markets”
- 21/18 October, Orazio Attanasio, Agnes Kovacs, and **Krisztina Molnar**, “Euler Equations, Subjective Expectations and Income Shocks”
- 22/18 October, Antonio Mele, **Krisztina Molnár**, and Sergio Santoro, “On the perils of stabilizing prices when agents are learning”
- 23/18 November, Bjørn-Atle Reme, Helene Lie Røhr, and **Morten Sæthre**, “The Poking Effect: Price Changes, Information, and Inertia in the Market for Mobile Subscriptions”
- 24/18 November, **Ingrid Hoem Sjursen**, “Accountability and taxation: Experimental evidence”
- 25/18 November, **Liam Brunt** and Antonio Fidalgo, “Why 1990 international Geary-Khamis dollars cannot be a foundation for reliable long run comparisons of GDP”
- 26/18 November, **Ola Honningdal Grytten**, “A continuous consumer price index for Norway 1492-2017”
- 27/18 December, **Liam Brunt** and Antonio Fidalgo, “Feeding the people: grain yields and agricultural expansion in Qing China”
- 28/18 December, **Kurt R. Brekke**, Chiara Canta, Luigi Siciliani and Odd Rune Straume, “Hospital Competition in the National Health Service: Evidence from a Patient Choice Reform”
- 29/18 December, Richard Friberg, **Frode Steen** and **Simen A. Ulsaker**, “Hump-shaped cross-price effects and the extensive margin in cross-border shopping”
- 30/18 December, David Jaume and **Alexander Willén**, “Oh Mother: The Neglected Impact of School Disruptions”
- 31/18 December, Jesús Crespo Cuaresma, **Gernot Doppelhofer**, Martin Feldkircher and Florian Huber, “Spillovers from US monetary policy: Evidence from a time-varying parameter GVAR model”



**Norges
Handelshøyskole**

Norwegian School of Economics

NHH
Helleveien 30
NO-5045 Bergen
Norway

Tlf/Tel: +47 55 95 90 00
Faks/Fax: +47 55 95 91 00
nhh.postmottak@nhh.no
www.nhh.no