Government Spending Multipliers in Good Times and in Bad: Evidence from U.S. Historical Data

Valerie A. Ramey
UC San Diego & NBER

Sarah Zubairy
Texas A&M University

Discussion by

Yuriy Gorodnichenko
UC Berkeley & NBER

MOTIVATION

Key policy questions

- What is the size of the government spending multiplier?
  - Previous work: multiplier ≈ 1 (wide “confidence” bands)

MOTIVATION

Key policy questions

- What is the size of the government spending multiplier?
    - Previous work: multiplier ≈ 1 (wide “confidence” bands)

- What is the size of the government spending multiplier **IN RECESSIONS**?

MOTIVATION

Key policy questions

- What is the size of the government spending multiplier?
    - Previous work: multiplier ≈ 1 (wide "confidence" bands)

- What is the size of the government spending multiplier **IN RECESSIONS**?

Challenges of estimating state-dependent multipliers

- A handful of recessions in the post-WWII data & relatively little variation in G
    - RZ: construct long, quarterly time series: 1880-2013.
        - Post-WWII data: standard
        - Pre-WWII data: many sources + interpolate annual series into quarterly

MOTIVATION

Key policy questions

- What is the size of the government spending multiplier?
    - Previous work: multiplier ≈ 1 (wide “confidence” bands)

- What is the size of the government spending multiplier **IN RECESSIONS**?

Challenges of estimating state-dependent multipliers

- A handful of recessions in the post-WWII data & relatively little variation in G
    - RZ: construct long, quarterly time series: 1880-2013.
        - Post-WWII data: standard
        - Pre-WWII data: many sources + interpolate annual series into quarterly

- Identification of exogenous, unanticipated shocks to government spending
    - RZ: News shocks (extend Ramey (QJE 2011)) about military gov’t spending

MOTIVATION

Key policy questions

- What is the size of the government spending multiplier?
  - Previous work: multiplier ≈ 1 (wide “confidence” bands)

- What is the size of the government spending multiplier **IN RECESSIONS**?

Challenges of estimating state-dependent multipliers

- A handful of recessions in the post-WWII data & relatively little variation in G
  - RZ: construct long, quarterly time series: 1880-2013.
    - Post-WWII data: standard
    - Pre-WWII data: many sources + interpolate annual series into quarterly

- Identification of exogenous, unanticipated shocks to government spending
  - RZ: News shocks (extend Ramey (QJE 2011)) about military gov’t spending

- Nonlinear models: sensitive estimates + how to model feedback/dynamics?
  - RZ: Use Jorda (2005) projection method as in AG (2012)

RESULTS

- Output responds more strongly in “slack times” (unemployment rate > 6.5%)

RESULTS

- Output responds more strongly in “slack times” (unemployment rate > 6.5%)
- Government spending responds more strongly in “slack times”
    - Multipliers $M \equiv \frac{\sum Y}{\sum G}$ are similar in “slack times” and “no-slack times”

RESULTS

- Output responds more strongly in “slack times” (unemployment rate > 6.5%)
- Government spending responds more strongly in “slack times”
  - Multipliers $M \equiv \frac{\sum Y}{\sum G}$ are similar in “slack times” and “no-slack times”
- Little variation/weak identification in post-WWII data
- Multipliers are similar at the zero lower bound (ZLB) and outside ZLB
  - More challenges for multipliers at ZLB

RESULTS

- Output responds more strongly in “slack times” (unemployment rate > 6.5%)
- Government spending responds more strongly in “slack times”
    - Multipliers $M \equiv \frac{\sum Y}{\sum G}$ are similar in “slack times” and “no-slack times”
- Little variation/weak identification in post-WWII data
- Multipliers are similar at the zero lower bound (ZLB) and outside ZLB
    - More challenges for multipliers at ZLB

A GREAT PAPER!

RESULTS

- Output responds more strongly in “slack times” (unemployment rate > 6.5%)
- Government spending responds more strongly in “slack times”
  - Multipliers $M \equiv \frac{\sum Y}{\sum G}$ are similar in “slack times” and “no-slack times”
- Little variation/weak identification in post-WWII data
- Multipliers are similar at the zero lower bound (ZLB) and outside ZLB
  - More challenges for multipliers at ZLB

A GREAT PAPER!

Why are the RZ results different from the results in Auerbach-Gorodnichenko and others?

- Measurement
- Specification
- Estimation
- Identification

RZ APPROACH

$$Y_t = \alpha_0 shock_t + error_t$$

$$Y_{t+1} = \alpha_1 shock_t + error_{t+1}$$

$$Y_{t+2} = \alpha_2 shock_t + error_{t+2}$$

$$\dots$$

$$Y_{t+h} = \alpha_h shock_t + error_{t+h}$$

$$IRF^Y = \{\alpha_h\}_{h=0}^{H}$$

RZ APPROACH

$$Y_{t+h} = \alpha_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^Y = \{\alpha_h\}_{h=0}^{H}$$

$$G_{t+h} = \beta_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^G = \{\beta_h\}_{h=0}^{H}$$

RZ APPROACH

$$Y_{t+h} = \alpha_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^Y = \{\alpha_h\}_{h=0}^H$$

$$G_{t+h} = \beta_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^G = \{\beta_h\}_{h=0}^H$$

Multiplier at horizon h: $M_h \equiv \frac{\alpha_h}{\beta_h}$

RZ APPROACH

$$Y_{t+h} = \alpha_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^Y = \{\alpha_h\}_{h=0}^H$$

$$G_{t+h} = \beta_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^G = \{\beta_h\}_{h=0}^H$$

Multiplier at horizon h: $M_h \equiv \frac{\alpha_h}{\beta_h} = \frac{\frac{\mathrm{cov}(Y_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\mathrm{var}(shock_t)}}{\frac{\mathrm{cov}(G_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\mathrm{var}(shock_t)}} = \frac{\mathrm{cov}(Y_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\mathrm{cov}(G_{t+h}, shock_t)}$

RZ APPROACH

$$Y_{t+h} = \alpha_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^Y = \{\alpha_h\}_{h=0}^{H}$$

$$G_{t+h} = \beta_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^G = \{\beta_h\}_{h=0}^{H}$$

Multiplier at horizon h: $M_h \equiv \frac{\alpha_h}{\beta_h} = \frac{\frac{\mathrm{cov}(Y_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\mathrm{var}(shock_t)}}{\frac{\mathrm{cov}(G_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\mathrm{var}(shock_t)}} = \frac{\mathrm{cov}(Y_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\mathrm{cov}(G_{t+h}, shock_t)}$

Instrumental variable interpretation: Regress Y_{t+h} on G_{t+h} and use $shock_t$ as an IV.

RZ APPROACH

$$Y_{t+h} = \alpha_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^Y = \{\alpha_h\}_{h=0}^{H}$$

$$G_{t+h} = \beta_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^G = \{\beta_h\}_{h=0}^{H}$$

Multiplier at horizon h: $M_h \equiv \frac{\alpha_h}{\beta_h} = \frac{\frac{\mathrm{cov}(Y_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\mathrm{var}(shock_t)}}{\frac{\mathrm{cov}(G_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\mathrm{var}(shock_t)}} = \frac{\mathrm{cov}(Y_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\mathrm{cov}(G_{t+h}, shock_t)}$

Instrumental variable interpretation: Regress Y_{t+h} on G_{t+h} and use $shock_t$ as an IV.

The logic extends to state-dependent multipliers

$$Y_{t+h} = M_h^R G_{t+h} \times \mathbf{I}(recession_t) + M_h^E G_{t+h} \times \mathbf{I}(expansion_t) + error_t$$

$shock_t \times \mathbf{I}(recession_t)$ and $shock_t \times \mathbf{I}(expansion_t)$ as IVs.

RZ APPROACH

$$Y_{t+h} = \alpha_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^Y = \{\alpha_h\}_{h=0}^{H}$$

$$G_{t+h} = \beta_h shock_t + error_t \Rightarrow IRF^G = \{\beta_h\}_{h=0}^{H}$$

Multiplier at horizon h: $M_h \equiv \frac{\alpha_h}{\beta_h} = \frac{\frac{\text{cov}(Y_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\text{var}(shock_t)}}{\frac{\text{cov}(G_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\text{var}(shock_t)}} = \frac{\text{cov}(Y_{t+h}, shock_t)}{\text{cov}(G_{t+h}, shock_t)}$

Instrumental variable interpretation: Regress Y_{t+h} on G_{t+h} and use $shock_t$ as an IV.

The logic extends to state-dependent multipliers

$$Y_{t+h} = M_h^R G_{t+h} \times \mathbf{I}(recession_t) + M_h^E G_{t+h} \times \mathbf{I}(expansion_t) + error_t$$

$shock_t \times \mathbf{I}(recession_t)$ and $shock_t \times \mathbf{I}(expansion_t)$ as IVs.

Single equation approach

$Y_{t+h} = M_h^R G_{t+h} \times \mathbf{I}(recession_t) + error_t$ $\quad$ $IV: shock_t \times \mathbf{I}(recession_t)$

$Y_{t+h} = M_h^E G_{t+h} \times \mathbf{I}(expansion_t) + error_t$ $\quad$ $IV: shock_t \times \mathbf{I}(expansion_t)$

First stage fit: Full sample



Note: controls are included. F-stat in the figure is capped at 45.

First stage fit: Exclude WWII



Note: controls are included. F-stat in the figure is capped at 45.

FIRST STAGE FIT: RECESSION



Horizon $h = 8$

First stage fit: Recession



Horizon $h = 8$

Question: which shocks should one use to design/assess the fiscal stimulus in 2009?

Ramey-Zubairy vs. Blanchard-Perotti

Ramey-Zubairy:

- $Y_{t+h} - Y_{t-1} = M_h(G_{t+h} - G_{t-1}) + controls + error_t$
- use military spending shocks as the instrument

Ramey-Zubairy vs. Blanchard-Perotti

Ramey-Zubairy:

- $Y_{t+h} - Y_{t-1} = M_h(G_{t+h} - G_{t-1}) + controls + error_t$
- use military spending shocks as the instrument

Blanchard-Perotti

- $Y_{t+h} - Y_{t-1} = M_h(G_{t+h} - G_{t-1}) + controls + error_t$
- use $(G_t - G_{t-1}) \perp controls$ as the instrument

RAMEY-ZUBAIRY VS. BLANCHARD-PEROTTI

Ramey-Zubairy:

- $Y_{t+h} - Y_{t-1} = M_h(G_{t+h} - G_{t-1}) + controls + error_t$
- use military spending shocks as the instrument

Blanchard-Perotti

- $Y_{t+h} - Y_{t-1} = M_h(G_{t+h} - G_{t-1}) + controls + error_t$
- use $(G_t - G_{t-1}) \perp controls$ as the instrument
  - First-stage fit for $h = 0$ is perfect ($R^2 = 1$)

Ramey-Zubairy vs. Blanchard-Perotti

Ramey-Zubairy:

- $Y_{t+h} - Y_{t-1} = M_h(G_{t+h} - G_{t-1}) + controls + error_t$
- use military spending shocks as the instrument

Blanchard-Perotti

- $Y_{t+h} - Y_{t-1} = M_h(G_{t+h} - G_{t-1}) + controls + error_t$
- use $(G_t - G_{t-1}) \perp controls$ as the instrument
  - First-stage fit for $h = 0$ is perfect ($R^2 = 1$)
- Alternative IV (Auerbach-Gorodnichenko):

  $(G_t - F_{t-1}G_t) \perp controls$

  $F_{t-1}G_t \equiv$ a professional forecast as of time $t - 1$ of government spending at time t

Ramey-Zubairy vs. Blanchard-Perotti

Ramey-Zubairy:

- $Y_{t+h} - Y_{t-1} = M_h(G_{t+h} - G_{t-1}) + controls + error_t$
- use military spending shocks as the instrument

Blanchard-Perotti

- $Y_{t+h} - Y_{t-1} = M_h(G_{t+h} - G_{t-1}) + controls + error_t$
- use $(G_t - G_{t-1}) \perp controls$ as the instrument
  - First-stage fit for $h = 0$ is perfect ($R^2 = 1$)
- Alternative IV (Auerbach-Gorodnichenko):

  $(G_t - F_{t-1}G_t) \perp controls$

  $F_{t-1}G_t \equiv$ a professional forecast as of time $t-1$ of government spending at time t

Strength of 1st stage: RZ vs. BP

- BP (AG) instrument is nearly impossible to beat over short horizons.
- RZ can perform better over longer horizons b/c it measures present values.

CHALLENGES IN CONSTRUCTING AND ANALYZING LONG-TIME SERIES

- Data quality is likely to vary
  - o Linear interpolation

    ⇒ Attenuate differences between recession/expansion

CHALLENGES IN CONSTRUCTING AND ANALYZING LONG-TIME SERIES

- Data quality is likely to vary
  - Linear interpolation
    - ⇒ Attenuate differences between recession/expansion

- Regime changes
  - Balanced budget provisions
  - Gold standard

CHALLENGES IN CONSTRUCTING AND ANALYZING LONG-TIME SERIES

- Data quality is likely to vary
    - Linear interpolation
        $\Rightarrow$ Attenuate differences between recession/expansion

- Regime changes
    - Balanced budget provisions
    - Gold standard

- Structural changes
    - Changes in the volatility of government spending

% CHANGE IN REAL PER CAPITA GOVERNMENT SPENDING



CHALLENGES IN CONSTRUCTING AND ANALYZING LONG-TIME SERIES

- Data quality is likely to vary
  - Linear interpolation
    ⇒ Attenuate differences between recession/expansion

- Regime changes
  - Balanced budget provisions
  - Gold standard

- Structural changes
  - Changes in the volatility of government spending
  - Secular trend in the size and composition of the government

SHARE OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING IN GDP



Challenges in constructing and analyzing long-time series

- Data quality is likely to vary
  - Linear interpolation

    ⇒ Attenuate differences between recession/expansion

- Regime changes
  - Balanced budget provisions
  - Gold standard

- Structural changes
  - Changes in the volatility of government spending
  - Secular trend in the size and composition of the government

  ⇒ avoid using variables in levels, use differences or/and growth rates

RZ: $\frac{Y_{t+h}-Y_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} = M_h \frac{G_{t+h}-G_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} + \sum_k \psi_k \ln Y_{t-k} + \sum_q \gamma_q \ln G_{t-q} + \sum_s \phi_s t^s + error$

Alt.: $\frac{Y_{t+h}-Y_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} = M_h \frac{G_{t+h}-G_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} + \sum_k \psi_k \Delta \ln Y_{t-k} + \sum_q \gamma_q \Delta \ln G_{t-q} + \sum_s \phi_s t^s + error$

NORMALIZATION

Typical approach: $\Delta \log Y_t = b \times \Delta \log G_t + error \quad \Rightarrow multiplier\ \ M = b \times \overline{\left(\frac{Y_t}{G_t}\right)}$

Normalization

Typical approach: $\Delta \log Y_t = b \times \Delta \log G_t + error \quad \Rightarrow multiplier \;\; M = b \times \overline{\left(\frac{Y_t}{G_t}\right)}$

Alternative approach: $\frac{Y_t - Y_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} = b \times \frac{G_t - G_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} + error \quad \Rightarrow multiplier \;\; M = b$

Normalization

Typical approach: $\Delta \log Y_t = b \times \Delta \log G_t + error \quad \Rightarrow multiplier\ \ M = b \times \overline{\left(\frac{Y_t}{G_t}\right)}$

Alternative approach: $\frac{Y_t - Y_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} = b \times \frac{G_t - G_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} + error \quad \Rightarrow multiplier\ \ M = b$

$$\frac{G_t - G_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} \approx \Delta \log G_t \times \frac{G_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}}$$

NORMALIZATION

Typical approach: $\Delta \log Y_t = b \times \Delta \log G_t + error \quad \Rightarrow multiplier \;\; M = b \times \overline{\left(\frac{Y_t}{G_t}\right)}$

Alternative approach: $\frac{Y_t - Y_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} = b \times \frac{G_t - G_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} + error \quad \Rightarrow multiplier \;\; M = b$

$$\frac{G_t - G_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}} \approx \Delta \log G_t \times \frac{G_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}}$$

Potential concerns

- $\frac{Y_t - Y_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}}$ and $\frac{G_t - G_{t-1}}{Y_{t-1}}$ are correlated because Y_{t-1} shows up in the denominator
- $\frac{G_t}{Y_t}$ varies systematically over the business cycle

NORMALIZATION



Notes: post 1960 data; potential GDP is from the CBO.

MULTIPLIERS: RAMEY-ZUBAIRY



Spec: baseline, IV implementation

MULTIPLIERS: BLANCHARD-PEROTTI



Spec: IV implementation, include more lags, normalize by potential GDP, controls include variables in *growth rates* rather than levels.

These estimates are similar to the Auerbach-Gorodnichenko results.

EQUALITY OF MULTIPLIERS OVER THE BUSINESS CYCLE



CONCLUDING REMARKS

We need more variation/data to identify G shocks and estimate their effects

- Cross-state variation (e.g., Nakamura and Steinsson 2014)
- Natural experiments (e.g., Joshua Hausman 2013)
- Asset prices and high frequency data (e.g., Johannes Wieland 2012)

CONCLUDING REMARKS

We need more variation/data to identify G shocks and estimate their effects

- Cross-state variation (e.g., Nakamura and Steinsson 2014)
- Natural experiments (e.g., Joshua Hausman 2013)
- Asset prices and high frequency data (e.g., Johannes Wieland 2012)

We need to study responses of other variables to understand the workings of G shocks

- Consumption, investment, durables/non-durables
- Prices, wages, interest rates
- Employment, capacity utilization
- Export, import, exchange rates

CONCLUDING REMARKS

We need more variation/data to identify G shocks and estimate their effects

- Cross-state variation (e.g., Nakamura and Steinsson 2014)
- Natural experiments (e.g., Joshua Hausman 2013)
- Asset prices and high frequency data (e.g., Johannes Wieland 2012)

We need to study responses of other variables to understand the workings of G shocks

- Consumption, investment, durables/non-durables
- Prices, wages, interest rates
- Employment, capacity utilization
- Export, import, exchange rates

We need better theory to guide our empirical analyses

- RZ: Michaillat (2014) is the only modern macro model with state-dependent multipliers
- Most models are linearized or close to linear

Concluding remarks

We need more variation/data to identify G shocks and estimate their effects

- Cross-state variation (e.g., Nakamura and Steinsson 2014)
- Natural experiments (e.g., Joshua Hausman 2013)
- Asset prices and high frequency data (e.g., Johannes Wieland 2012)

We need to study responses of other variables to understand the workings of G shocks

- Consumption, investment, durables/non-durables
- Prices, wages, interest rates
- Employment, capacity utilization
- Export, import, exchange rates

We need better theory to guide our empirical analyses

- RZ: Michaillat (2014) is the only modern macro model with state-dependent multipliers
- Most models are linearized or close to linear

"The problem with QE is it works in practice but it doesn't work in theory." – Bernanke