Impulse Response and Structural VAR

Jin-Lung Lin
Department of Finance, National DongHwa University

June 3, 2008

Outline

Introduction

- Impulse response is important in tracking the impact of any variable on others in the system.
- Essential tools in causal analysis and policy effectiveness.

Impulse response

Let Y_t be a k-dimensional vector series generated by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &= A_1 Y_{t-1} + \cdots + A_p Y_{t-p} + U_t && (1) \\ Y_t &= \Phi(B) U_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \Phi_i U_{t-i} && (2) \end{aligned}$$

where Φ_i is the MA coefficients measuring the impulse response. More specifically, $\Phi_{jk,i}$ represents the response of variable j to an unit impulse in variable k occurring i-th period ago. IR are used to evaluate the effectiveness of a policy change, say increasing rediscount rate.

As Σ is usually non-diagonal, it is impossible to shock one variable with other variables fixed. Some kind of transformation is needed. Choleski decomposition is the most popular one which we shall turn to now. Let P be a lower triangular matrix such that $\Sigma = PP'$. then eq. (2) can be rewritten as

$$Y_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \Theta_i w_{t-i}$$

where $\Theta_i = \Phi_i P, w_t = P^{-1} U_t$, and $E(w_t w_t') = I$.

Let D be a diagonal matrix with same diagonals with P and $W = PD^{-1}, \Lambda = DD'$. After some manipulations, we obtain

$$Y_t = B_0 Y_t + B_1 Y_{t-1} + \cdots + B_p Y_{t-p} + V_t$$

where $B_0 = I_k - W^{-1}, W = PD^{-1}, B_i = W^{-1} A_i$. Obviously, B_0 is a lower triangular matrix with 0 diagonals. In other words, Choleski decomposition imposes a recursive causal structure from the top variables to the bottom variables but not the other way around.

A useful remark

For a K-dimensional stationary VAR(p) process,

$$\phi_{jk,i} = 0, \quad \text{for } j \neq k,\ i = 1, 2, \cdots$$

is equivalent to

$$\phi_{jk,i} = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \cdots, p(K-1)$$

.

In other words, if the first $pK - p$ responses of variable j to an impulse in variable k is zero, then all the following responses are all zero. (Lutkepohl Proposition 2.4).

Critiques of IR

1. Sensitive to variables ordering.
   Generalized impulse response by Pesaran offers a partial solution and Granger and Swanson (1997) proposed a different but more promising one.
2. Omitting important variables may lead to major distortions in IR and make the empirical results worthless. However, its impact on forecasting is small. *Why?*

Unit root, Cointegration and IR

- If there exists unit roots and/or cointegration, then estimated IR is inconsistent at long horizons in unrestricted VARs. Error correction model produces consistent IR and optimal predictions
- Proper procedures for computing IR for a cointegrated system are:
    1. Determine the cointegration rank by LR test;
    2. Estimate the ECM model: $\Delta Y_t = \alpha\beta' Y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \Gamma_i \Delta Y_{t-i} + \Phi D_t + U_t$;
    3. Converted the ECM back to VAR model;
    4. Use the resulting VAR model to perform IR.

Generalized impulse response

Pesaran and Shin (1998) proposed the generalized impulse response (GI).

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_t &= \sum_{i=1}^{p} A_i X_{t-i} + U_t \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \Phi_i U_{t-i} \\
\Phi_i &= A_1 \Phi_{i-1} + A_2 \Phi_{i-2} + \cdots + A_p \Phi_{i-p}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $E(U_t U_t') = \Sigma$

Choleski decomposition of Σ, $PP' = \Sigma$ so that

$$X_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (A_i P)(P^{-1} U_{t-i})$$

IR is

$$\Psi_j^o(n) = \Phi_n P e_j, n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$$

where e_j is an $m \times 1$ selection vector with unity as its j-th element and zeros elsewhere.

GI is defined as :

$$GI_x(n, \delta_j, \Omega_{t-1}) = E(X_{t+n}|u_{jt} = \delta_j, \Omega_{t-1}) - E(X_{t+n}|\Omega_{t-1})$$

Assume normal distribution for U_t

$$E(U_t|U_{jt} = \delta_j) = (\sigma_{1j}, \sigma_{2j}, \cdots, \sigma_{mj})' \sigma_{jj}' \delta_j = \Sigma U_j \sigma_{jj}^{-1} \delta_j$$

Unscaled GI is:

$$(\frac{\Phi_n \Sigma U_j}{\sqrt{\sigma_{jj}}})(\frac{\delta_j}{\sqrt{\sigma_{jj}}}), n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$$

Scaled GI by setting $\delta_j = \sqrt{jj}$,

$$\Psi_j^g(n) = \sigma_{jj}^{-1/2} \Phi_n \Sigma U_j, n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$$

Forecast error decomposition

$$\theta_{ij}^{o} = \frac{\sum_{l=0}^{n}(U_l'\Phi_j P U_j)^2}{\sum_{l=0}^{n}(U_i'\Phi_l \Sigma A_l' U_i)}; \quad \theta_{ij}^{g} = \frac{\sigma_{ii}^{-1}\sum_{l=0}^{n}(U_i'\Phi_l \Sigma U_j)^2}{\sum_{l=0}^{n} U_i'\Phi_l \Sigma \Phi_l' U_i}, i, j = 1, \cdots, m$$

Note that $\sum_{j=1}^{m} \theta_{jj}^{o}(n) = 1, \sum_{j=1}^{m} \theta_{jj}^{g}(n) \neq 1$.

Comparing GI and IR

1. In stead of controlling the impact of correlation among residuals, GI follows the idea of nonlinear impulse response and compute the mean impulse response. When one variable is shocked, other variables also vary as implied the correlation. GI computes the mean by integrating out all other shocks.
2. When Σ is diagonal, GI is the same as IR.
3. GI is unaffected by ordering of variables
4. The generalized impulse response of the effect of an unit shock to j-th equation is the same as that of an orthogonal impulse response but different for other shocks. To be specific,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1^g(n) &= \Phi_1^o(n) \\ \Phi_j^g(n) &\neq \Phi_j^o(n), \quad j = 2, 3, \cdots, m \end{aligned}$$

   Thus the GI can be easily computed by usual IR with each variable as leading one.
5. The formula of GI is derived under the assumption of multivariate normality that might not be true for some empirical applications.

Structural VARs

This part is taken from the VAR.SRC written by Norman Morin (nmorinfrb.gov).
REDUCED FORM

$$Y_t = A_1 * Y_{t-1} + \cdots + A_p Y_{t-p} + W * Z(t) + c + d * t + U_t$$

where Y denotes vector of endogenous variables of interest, X vector of exogenous variables, U is vector of residuals and $EU_t U_t' = \Sigma$. The innovations can be written terms of uncorrelated error terms

$$\begin{aligned} U_t &= G * U_t + E_t \\ E(E_t E_t') &= D \end{aligned}$$

where D is a diagonal matrix whose diagonals are the variances of E and G has zeroes on the diagonals.

Now, let $B * U_t = E_t$ or $A * E_t = U_t$ where $B = I - G$, and $A = B^{-1}$, where B and A have unit diagonals Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} B * \Sigma * B' &= D = E(E_t E_t') \\ A * D * A' &= \Sigma = E(U_t U_t') \end{aligned}$$

This will yield the structural form based on the orthogonalization.

$$B * Y_t = B_1 * Y_{t-1} + \cdots + B_p * Y_{t-p} + F * X(t) + v + k * t + E_t$$

with $B_i = B * A_i, i = 1, \cdots, p, F = B * W, v = B * c$, and $k = B * d$.
Given B and D, one can write a structural form vector moving average based on the reduced form matrices $A_1, \cdots, A_p$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &= U_t + C_1 * U_{t-1} + C_2 * U_{t-2} + \cdots \\ Y_t &= M_0 * E_t + M_1 * E_{t-1} + M_2 * E_{t-2} + \cdots \end{aligned}$$

The coefficient $(i, j)th$ element of M_k is the effect on variable i of a shock to j-th structural form innovation k periods ago.

The various choices of orthoganalizations for impulse responses place conditions on the structural form matrices B and D:

1. CHOLESKI:
   Factors Σ into $P * P'$ where P is lower triangular whose diagonals are the standard deviations of E. Thus, the first variable in the VAR is only affected contemporaneously by the shock to itself. The second variable in the VAR is affected contemporaneously by the shocks to the first variable and the shock to itself, and so on... $P = B^{-1}D^{1/2}$
2. BERNANKE-SIMS:
   Factors Σ into $B^{-1}DB^{-1'}$ where D is diagonal (with the variances of E), B has unit diagonals, but allows for the user to force certain $B(i,j) = 0$, (not for $i = j$) and will test these restrictions. You are asked for the number of nonzero NONDIAGONAL free coefficients, and is then asked to input the row number and column number for each non-diagonal free coefficient (this is done by entering the row number and column number separated by a comma (preferred) or a space).

3. HARVEY-SARGAN:
   Factors Σ into $B^{-1}DB^{-1'}$ where the user can distribute unit coefficients and zeros among both B and D, but one or the other will have unit diagonals. The user chooses which matrix will contain unit diagonals, is then prompted for the number of NON-DIAGONAL free coefficients in B and in D, and is then asked to input the row number and column number for each non-diagonal free coefficient (this is done by entering the row number and column number separated by a comma (preferred) or a space).
4. IDENTITY:
   Assumes Σ is diagonal, i.e., the reduced form innovations are contemporaneously uncorrelated.

5. BLANCHARD-QUAH:
   Factors Σ into PP' where $P = C_1^{-1}G$ where G is the LT Choleski decomposition of $C_1\Sigma_1' C_1'$ and C_1 is the sum of the ∞-order VMA coefficients from the Wold decomposition of the VAR. This yields impulse responses such that the 1st variable may have long run effects on all variables, the 2nd may have long run effects on all but the 1st, the 3rd on all but the 1st and 2nd, etc .... In the BQ article, shocks are assigned as "supply" and "demand" shocks, without reference to a variable ordering. Here, the shocks are labelled with the ordering of the variables in the VAR, but need not be given that interpretation. $B = P^{-1}$ and $D = I$.

NOTE that 2, 3, and 4 will test the restrictions. For 2 and 3, the number of free coefficients (restrictions) should be less than or equal to $p(p+1)/2$, where p is number of variables, and there must be no zeros on the diagonals