A NONLINEAR APPROACH TO U.S. GNP

BY

SIMON M. POTTER

Working Paper No. 693

Department of Economics
University of California, Los Angeles
March 1993

1st version November 1989
This version February 1993

A NONLINEAR APPROACH TO U.S. GNP*

Simon M. Potter
Department of Economics
University of California, Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1477
310-206-6732

E-Mail potter@econ.sscnet.ucla.edu

Summary

A univariate nonlinear model is estimated for U.S. GNP that on many criteria outperforms standard linear models. The estimated model is of the threshold autoregressive type and contains evidence of asymmetric effects of shocks over the business cycle. In particular the nonlinear model suggests that the Post-1945 U.S. Economy is significantly more stable than the Pre-1945 U.S. Economy.

*This is a revised version of parts of Potter (1989). I would like to thank Buz Brock for introducing me to the question of nonlinearity in the economy and guiding my research. I have also received many useful comments and suggestions from Blake LeBaron, Roger Farmer, Hashem Pesaran, James Powell, Julie Press, Ken West and seminar participants at University of California at Los Angeles, Davis, Riverside and San Diego, Columbia, Stanford and University of Wisconsin-Madison. Financial support from the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin and the Academic Senate, UCLA is gratefully acknowledged. All errors are my own responsibility.

1. INTRODUCTION

The modern study of economic fluctuations is built on the foundation that the economy's temporal behavior can be well represented by random impulses being propagated through time by an invariant linear structure. This foundation is sometimes known as the extrinsic view or Frisch/Slutsky paradigm. An alternative earlier approach, often given the title intrinsic, places more emphasis on a nonlinear deterministic mechanism and little emphasis on random shocks for the generation of cycles. The subject of this paper is a synthesis of the propagation/impulse characterization of the extrinsic paradigm with the nonlinear structure of the intrinsic approach applied to the modeling of U.S. GNP. I find that an important aspect of U.S. GNP's time series properties is hidden by the use of linear methods: the response of output to shocks at different stages of the business cycle is asymmetric. Starting with the seminal contribution of Hamilton (1989) a number of other researchers have also recently estimated nonlinear time series models (Beaudry and Koop (1991), Teräsvirta and Anderson (1992), Mittnik (1991), Tiao and Tsay (1991)). As well as the dramatic (and asymmetric in the probabilistic sense) movement from expansion into recession and vice versa found in Hamilton's model, these researchers have also found similar additional asymmetries to those examined in this paper.

I find that the form of the asymmetry has very interesting economic content. Nonlinear models for Post-1945 output suggest that even if the economy was hit by negative shocks similar to the Great Depression era output would return to "trend" quickly. Linear models for Post-1945 Output show no evidence of increased stability with Output remaining approximately below "trend" for many years if hit by shocks of the magnitude experienced during the Great Depression. As the extra stability found is based on Post-1945 data it is not vulnerable to the suspicion of measurement error raised by the work of Romer (for example, Romer 1986).

Since U.S. GNP is perhaps the most examined univariate time series in modern macroeconomics it is important to understand why previous studies have not found the extra stability contained in the nonlinear model. The Wold Representation tells us that any purely nondeterministic second order stationary time series has a representation as a linear mechanism propagating <u>uncorrelated</u> impulses. In order to produce the linear model the Wold Representation exclusively utilizes the information contained in the autocovariance function of the time series. With the exception of the work cited above all previous statistical models of U.S. GNP have only used the information in the covariance structure. Thus, necessarily only linear models could be estimated.

The nonlinear approach used in this paper analyzes models whose impulses are not predictable from their own past (martingale difference sequences). This is a stronger condition than lack of unconditional correlation and requires one to use moments of the data in addition to the autocovariance function to estimate the model. Thus, in some sense there is no information in the previous linear models about the form that the nonlinear model should take. Alternatively, the nonlinear model estimated in this paper has a Wold Representation that is the same (up to estimation error) as the Wold Representation of all the linear models that have been estimated on U.S. GNP.

The plan of the paper is as follows. Section 2 describes the nonlinear model, Self-Exciting Threshold Autoregression, used in this paper and relates it to the other nonlinear models that have been estimated with an emphasis on the Markov switching models introduced by Hamilton. It also reviews the statistical evidence in favor of U.S. GNP containing nonlinearities. Section 3 introduces the concept of a nonlinear impulse response function as a means of illustrating asymmetries and provides examples of the asymmetries produced by the estimated nonlinear propagation mechanism. Section 4 provides an illustration of the estimated stabilizing property of Post-1945 U.S. Output by attempting to "recreate" the Great Depression. Section 5 introduces a test statistic for testing the null hypothesis of a symmetric propagation mechanisms. I find that allowing for parameter uncertainty does not change the conclusion of asymmetries in the propagation mechanism. Section 6 offers some concluding remarks.

2. SETAR MODELS: IDENTIFICATION AND ESTIMATION TECHNIQUES

2.a Overview of Nonlinear Time Series Models

Self-Exciting Threshold Autoregressions (SETAR) and many of the other recent models estimated on economic time series are a special cases of nonlinear models with a single index restriction. Let Y_t represent the observed univariate time series and Z_t an unobserved time series. Let H_t denote the single index, which is assumed to be a continuous map from the history of $\{Y_t, Z_t\}$ to the line. Let be $F(\cdot)$ a function from the line to itself with at most a finite number of discontinuities. Then a univariate first order Single Index Generalized Multivariate Autoregressive (SIGMA model would be:[1]

$$Y_t = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 F(H_t) + \{\phi_1 + \phi_2 F(H_t)\}Y_{t-1} + \{\psi_1 + \psi_2 F(H_t)\}V_t$$

where V_t is Independent and Identically Distributed (IID).

Some special cases are:

(i) If $\alpha_2 = \phi_2 = \psi_2 = 0$, we have an AR(1) model.

(ii) If $F(H_t) = Z_t$ and Z_t is a two state Markov Chain then we have the regime switching model of Hamilton (1990). Such models are different from the GNP model in Hamilton (1989) where Y_t is composed of two unobserved processes:

$$Y_t = Z_t + X_t$$

Where Z_t is a two state Markov Chain and X_t is a Gaussian autoregression. The unobservability of both Z_t and X_t makes the estimation of the model particularly difficult. Also in some sense the model is linear (albeit nongaussian) since if one could condition on past values of Z_t and X_t then optimal forecasts would be linear combinations of these values.

(iii) If $F(H_t) = 1(Y_{t-d}>r)$ then we have a SETAR (1,d,r) model, where $1(A)$ is the indicator function equal to one if the event A occurs and zero otherwise, and d is known as the delay parameter and r the threshold parameter. In contrast to the Markov switching models the nonlinearity is defined by the directly observable history of the time series. This greatly simplifies

[1] See Potter (1990) for a more complete description.

estimation. Further, the probabilities of switching between regimes in the future are endogenous in the underlying model, whereas in the Markov switching model the probabilities are fixed. This gives the SETAR model much greater flexibility in fitting the observed data and a greater range of dynamic response.

SETAR models are also fitted to U.S. GNP by Tiao and Tsay (1991). The single index I use is the two quarter lagged growth rate of GNP with a threshold value of zero whereas they refine it to the following four regime model:

Regime 1 if $Y_{t-2} \le 0$, and $Y_{t-2} > Y_{t-1}$, a worsening recession
Regime 2 if $Y_{t-2} \le 0$, and $Y_{t-2} < Y_{t-1}$, an improving recession
Regime 3 if $Y_{t-2} \ge 0$, and $Y_{t-2} > Y_{t-1}$, a contraction without negative growth
Regime 4 if $Y_{t-2} \ge 0$, and $Y_{t-2} < Y_{t-1}$, an expansion with increasing growth

(iv) If $F([Y_{t-1}-r]/\gamma])$ is a cumulative distribution function then we have the Smooth Transition Autoregression (STAR) model of Chan and Tong (1985). Note that in the limit as $\gamma \to 0$ the SETAR model and STAR model are observationally equivalent. Teräsvirta and Anderson (1992) make extensive use of the logistic distribution function in their analysis of OECD Industrial Production indices.

(v) Beaudry and Koop (1991) define a single index on the logarithm of level of GNP: $H_t = X_t - \max(X_t, X_{t-1}, X_{t-2}, \ldots)$ and $Y_t = (1-L)X_t$. They consider two possible functional forms: $F(\cdot)$ is the identity function and $F(\cdot)$ as an indicator function equal to one when H_t is greater than zero. The index used by Beaudry and Koop has the attractive characteristic that it comes into effect when output falls below its previous peak.

None of the above models are structural in the traditional sense. However, in order to estimate models (ii) through (v) the econometrician is required to use more information than is contained in the autocovariance function of the time series. Thus, the estimated propagation mechanisms can be very different to linear models that are based exclusively on the autocovariance properties of the observed data.

2.b A SETAR Model for U.S. GNP

A SETAR $(p,d,r_1,\ldots r_k)$ has the following form.

$$Y_t=\alpha_i+\phi_i(L)Y_{t-1}+e_{it} \text{ if } Y_{t-d} \in A_i,\ i=1,\ldots k,$$

where $\phi_j(L)= \phi_{1j} + \phi_{2j}L +\ldots+\phi_{pj}L^{p-1}$, $LY_t=Y_{t-1}$ and $A_i=[r_{i-1},r_i)$

Tong (1983 and 1990) in his authoritative books on threshold models suggested a grid search method for estimation of the structural parameters $d,\{r_i\}$. Potter (1990) contains an extensive discussion of a graphical and testing approach to "estimating" d, $\{r_i\}$ that is developed from earlier work by Tsay (1991). This method has the advantage over the grid search method of not restricting attention to SETAR models in the initial steps but the disadvantage of introducing a subjective element on the part of the individual researcher that is hard to quantify. These testing and graphical techniques produced estimates of $d = 2$ and $r = 0$ (Potter (1990)). A similar set of techniques were also used by Tiao and Tsay on U.S. GNP with identical results. Hansen (1991a) used a grid search based method on the same data that produced an estimate of $d = 2$ and an estimate of $r = 0.1$.

Given the single index lag 2 and threshold of zero, two linear least squares estimation techniques are available:

1. One can split the data into 2 groups and run a least squares regression for each regime separately. Thus, the estimated residual variance for each regime will be different (the estimation approach used below).

2. One can run a single regression with indicator functions given by the single index multiplying the lags of the time series. Thus, the estimated residual variance is restricted to be constant across the regimes.

The second method is useful if one wishes to restrict certain estimated coefficients to be the same across regimes or an exogenous variable is introduced whose regression coefficient does not change with the single index.[2] Both methods give consistent estimates for the intercept and slope coefficients in each regime (see Tong 1990), conditional on the correct choice of r and d.

The observations are post-Second World War quarterly, seasonally adjusted, real U.S. Gross National Product drawn from the Citibase data bank. The sample used is 1947(i) to 1990(iv).[3] The nonlinearity I find is robust to changes in samples and I concentrate on the results from the full sample. Prior to analysis logarithms and first differences of the data were taken (the result was multiplied by 100 and called Y_t). The qualitative results are also robust to the maintained assumption of an integrated specification for output. If one estimates the model in levels but uses the same single

---

[2] The second method is also easy to implement in a standard regression package with a sign function or similar. Thus, many of the results in this paper can be replicated by anyone with access to a standard regression package and quarterly GNP data.

[3] Drawn in the first quarter of 1991, with the 1982 index year.

index defined on the growth rates r then the short run dynamics discussed below are not affected.

Table 1 reports results for a fifth order autoregressive specification. The number shown for AIC is the value of Akaike's Information Criterion which is a weighting of the residual variance by the number of parameters estimated. Smaller values indicate better fitting models.[4]

{Table 1 here}

It is useful to label the cases where $Y_{t-2} \leq 0$ regime 1 or the contractionary regime, and those where $Y_{t-2} > 0$ regime 2 or the expansionary regime. Table 2 contains estimation results based on the use of $1(Y_{t-2}>0)$ as the relevant nonlinear function.

{Table 2 about here}

Using a combination of AIC, evidence of residual autocorrelation and individual significance, the final subset AR(5) specification reported in Table 3 was arrived at. The presence of the two AR5 terms may seem somewhat strange but they improve the fit of the model.[5] Tiao and Tsay (1991) in their model for U.S. GNP decide to ignore the AR5 terms without affecting any qualitative conclusions. The motivation for considering subsets is the need to explain the correlation in the data yet estimate coefficients to a reasonable level of precision. {Table 3 here}

Perhaps the most striking aspect of the results is the very large negative coefficient on the AR2 term in the contractionary regime (remember in this regime the lag 2 value must be negative implying a positive effect on

---

[4] See Tong (1983) for a description of its use in nonlinear time series.

[5] Potter (1990) estimates a SETAR model on seasonally unadjusted data and finds the large change in the intercept and AR2 coefficients is still present.

growth when multiplied by the negative coefficient).[6] For both the impulse response and stability properties of the post-1945 propagation mechanism this will be a crucial term. Another striking aspect of the results is the size of the estimated discontinuity for $Y_{t-2} = 0$. However, note that the residual variance doubles in the contractionary regime smoothing the sample path effect of the discontinuity.

The combined error variance indicates a reduction of 7% over the linear model. In order to assess whether this indicated a real improvement or just overfitting in-sample the nonlinear model and linear model were estimated recursively. The correlation of the recursive forecasts with actual output growth from 1960(i) to 1990(iv) was .23 for the linear model, .25 for the unrestricted SETAR and and .35 for the restricted SETAR. A six variable (output, consumption, investment, interest rates, money and prices) 5 lag equation was also estimated recursively for output growth. Its recursive forecasts have a correlation of .44 (.32 for the univariate model) with output growth from 1979(iv) to 1990(iv) compared to .47 and .52 for the unrestricted and restricted SETAR models respectively.[7] Tiao and Tsay (1991)

---

[6] Potter (1990) presents a Monte Carlo evaluation of the potential for small sample bias to be causing the results. It is found that the choice of the second lag of the growth rate as the index does produce some downward bias in the first regime estimate of the AR2 coefficient but is incapable of simultaneously moving the intercept in the required direction in the first regime. Hansen (1991b) also finds evidence using a Hamilton (1990) type model that Gaussian linear models fitted to U.S. GNP can be rejected by a model that allows for perfect correlation between movements in the intercept and AR2 coefficient.

[7] To assess whether these results could be explained by parameter instability in less restricted models the **smallest** forecast errors of univariate linear models ranging from a AR(1) to an AR(5) were compared to the forecast errors from the SETAR model for the 1979(iv) to 1990(iv) sample period. The minimization over the forecast errors of the linear models produced a root

obtain an even more dramatic forecast improvement for the refined four regime SETAR model and present additional evidence on the forecasting superiority of the two regime model over linear autoregressions.

2.c Statistical Evidence in Favor of SETAR Nonlinearity in U.S. GNP

There are numerous conceptual and practical difficulties in providing definitive tests of a null hypothesis of linearity in a time series (see Brock and Potter (1991) for an extended discussion). Some of the difficulties are shared with the controversy over testing for unit roots, others are new. With the exception of a test known as the Bispectrum the econometrician must commit to a particular linear model (i.e., the number of lags in the autoregressive and moving average parts of the model) in order to test for linearity. Furthermore, most tests (the main exceptions are the Bispectrum again and the BDS test) require the econometrician to specify a direction to look in for evidence of nonlinearity. This causes problems in deciding the overall significance of a test if a number of directions are examined or moral hazard problems if the result of only one direction is used (Leamer (1978)). Even if a specific direction can be derived by theoretical arguments one must still deal with the difficulties produced by nuisance parameters present under the alternative hypothesis but notunder the null. In the SETAR model the nuisance parameters are the threshold, r, and the the delay, d. Recently the issue has been given considerable attention

---

mean squared error of .821 (none of the individual models performed better than either nonlinear model) compared to .858 and .821 for the unrestricted and restricted models respectively (if one minimizes over the forecast errors of the unrestricted and restricted nonlinear model one obtains .800 for the RMSE).

in the econometric literature by Hansen (1991a) and Andrews and Ploberger (1992).

Over the course of the last four years, myself and a number of researchers have tried a large number of nonlinearity tests on U.S. GNP. A summary of the results is as follows:

(i) The Bispectrum and BDS tests cannot reject the null hypothesis of linearity, and this result is supported by other researchers (e.g. Brock and Sayers (1988)).

(ii) Polynomial type tests (i.e. testing the orthogonality of the residuals from the linear model against polynomial functions of the observed history, see Tsay (1986)) have also been applied. For certain choices of the polynomial function it is possible to reject linearity. However, the overall significance of these rejections is uncertain since one is basically minimizing over probability values;

(iii) Tsay's (1989 and 1991) Recursive polynomial tests find strong evidence of nonlinearity using the two-quarter-lagged-growth rate as an index to define the ordering of the recursion. It was this test that led to my original adoption of the second quarter lagged growth rate as the index. Tiao and Tsay (1991) quote a probability value of 0.026 for a similar test. However, in Potter (1990) I show that if one takes account of the fact that a number of directions are examined in a similar test then the overall significance level is well above 5%.

(iv) Hansen (1991a) directly evaluates the restricted SETAR model estimated above against a restricted linear AR(5) with techniques that allow for the nuisance parameter problems. That is, he attaches a p-value to the results of the grid search procedure over d and r (discussed above) under the null hypothesis that the true model is linear. He finds evidence at the 5% level in favor of threshold nonlinearity. However, this is somewhat tempered when one allows for heteroscedascity.

Additional evidence in favor of the estimated model can be found in the similar models that have been estimated. A different type of supporting evidence can be found in studies of business cycle duration and turning points that estimate moments other than the first and second but do not estimate a particular model. Diebold and Rudebusch (1991) and Sichel (1992) find evidence of duration dependence during post-1945 recessions. The large negative coefficient on the second lag of the growth rate in the contractionary regime would tend to produce evidence of duration dependence. Especially in conjunction with the very negative intercept term that ensures that if contractions persist they will get deeper and the stabilizing effect of the AR2 coefficient will come into play. Sichel (1991) presents evidence that the growth rate in recoveries tends to be higher than the average expansion growth rate. This is difficult to reconcile with linear models but is a potential property of the SETAR model estimated above with the caveat that the magnitude of the recovery should be positively correlated with the magnitude of the recession.

Pesaran and Potter (1991) apply the Cox Non-Nested Testing methodology to distinguish between different nonlinear representations of the data. They concentrate on a comparison of Hamilton's (1989) model of GNP and the SETAR model above. If Hamilton's model is taken as the null model and the SETAR model as the alternative then it is possible to reject the Markov trend model. However, the SETAR cannot be rejected as the null model against the Hamilton model as the alternative. The test statistics were produced by simulation and there are potentially important conceptual difficulties produced by the nonlinear estimation required for Hamilton's model in this simulation procedure (see Hansen (1991b)).

3. USING NONLINEAR IMPULSE RESPONSE FUNCTIONS TO ASSESS ASYMMETRY

3.a Definition of Nonlinear Impulse Response Functions

The estimated model contains two main asymmetric effects between the contraction and expansion regimes: the change in the intercept and the AR2 value. In order to illustrate and quantify the extent of the asymmetry I shall use a Nonlinear Impulse Response Function (NLIRF). NLIRFs are defined in a similar manner to standard impulse response functions except one replaces the linear predictor with a conditional expectation:

$$\mathrm{NLIRF}_n(v;y_t,y_{t-1},..) =$$

$$E[Y_{t+n} \mid Y_t=y_t+v, Y_{t-1}=y_{t-1},..] - E[Y_{t+n} \mid Y_t=y_t, Y_{t-1}=y_{t-1},..]$$

Where lower case letters represent realized values and v is the postulated impulse.

For example:

if $Y_t = \phi Y_{t-1} + V_t$, with V_t IID Normal, then $\mathrm{NLIRF}_n(v;y_t,y_{t-1},\ldots) = \phi^n v$.

This result is identical to standard linear impulse response functions or transfer functions. Note that the response is independent of the history of the time series and the sign and magnitude of the postulated shock (suitably scaled).

Nonlinear models in contrast produce impulse response functions that are themselves functions of the history of the time series and the nonlinear functions of the size and magnitude of the shock. Asymmetric response occurs in two main forms. For any specific history the effect of shocks of varying magnitudes and signs is not a simple scaling of a unit shock. For the same shock but different histories the response can markedly vary. Except for a few special cases analytical results are not available and Monte Carlo Integration techniques as described in Potter (1991) are required. As discussed in Potter (1991) and Gallant, Rossi and Tauchen (1991) there is a difficulty in summarizing the information contained in the NLIRFs produced by all the possible different histories and shocks. In this paper I present 5 examples that appear to qualitatively represent the possible dynamic responses from the estimated model. In Potter (1991) I calculate some measures of persistence for the estimated nonlinear GNP model that suggest it implies more persistence in GNP than previously thought using linear models. However, I also discuss the ambiguities in the concept of persistence for nonlinear models.

3.b Comparison to previous approaches to measuring asymmetry

Neftci (1984) introduced the idea of modeling business cycle asymmetry by measuring differences in the retention probabilities. for positive and negative growth in an economic time series. That is:[8]

$$P_{11} = E[1(Y_t \geq 0) \mid Y_{t-1} \geq 0]$$

$$P_{22} = E[1(Y_t < 0) \mid Y_{t-1} < 0]$$

[8] Neftci actually examined a second order case but it is easier to use a first order example.

It is clear that an econometrician could find statistical significant evidence that $P_{11} \neq P_{22}$ because the time series was linear (i.e., has a symmetric propagation mechanism) but driven by asymmetric innovations. Similarly the approach advocated by Sichel (1988) based on the skewness coefficient cannot distinguish between asymmetries in the propagation mechanism and asymmetries in the innovations. In addition neither of these approaches is useful for describing the extent of the asymmetry.

Teräsvirta and Anderson (1992) suggest analyzing the roots of the characteristic polynomial of the lag operator defined by specific values of the single index of a nonlinear model. Although concentrating on the propagation mechanism their approach ignores the effect of switching intercepts in the estimated equation and the future movement between regimes. Therefore, it is potentially very misleading.

Many other studies have used the "zero innovation" impulse response function where all shocks after time t are set to zero. As shown in Potter (1991), unlike the case of large Macroeconometric models the zero innovation prediction can be very uninformative about the behavior of the conditional expectation. In the context of the model for GNP used here that is because the nonlinearity is more severe than the presence of log-linear behavioral equations and linear accounting relations.

3.c Nonlinear impulse response functions for U.S. GNP

Figures 1-5 give the possible effects of the positive and negative shocks of ± 1% and ± 2% on the logarithm of the level of output for various historical periods. The graphs start at the date before the shock. The size of the shock for each line can be found by looking at the effect at the second date on the x-axis (this matches the date in the title). Dates instead of conventional numbering for the horizon of the NLIRF are used to emphasize the history dependence.

(Figures 1 to 5 around here)

1. If the shock keeps the growth rate positive (Figure 1, 1984(i)) then the response is very similar to that obtained from a linear model. If one calculated an impulse response function for the linear AR(5) of Table 1 it would look very similar to Figure 1 for all shocks and histories of output growth.

2. If the negative unit shock turns the growth rate negative (Figure 2, 1978(i)) then its effect will be magnified compared to Figure 1 by the switch in the intercept term. Magnification occurs for the positive shock as well because the probability of a future contraction decreases. This is a similar effect to the abrupt switch between contraction and expansion in Hamilton's GNP model. However, for the negative two shock the stabilizing influence of the AR2 coefficient in the contractionary regime starts to take hold. Notice that the effect after two years of the negative two shock is smaller in absolute value than the negative unit shock. Hamilton's GNP model is unable to capture such an effect since it constrains the probability of movement out of contraction to be fixed no matter how large the negative shock is.

3. If the value of growth perturbed in the starting values is only slightly greater than zero (Figure 3, 1956(iii)) then for the positive shocks the effects are very similar to Figure 2. For negative shocks the effect after two years is now **smaller** than in Figure 2 because of the increased stabilizing effect of the AR2 coefficient.

4. If the value of growth perturbed in the starting value is only slightly below zero (Figure 4, 1970(ii)) then there is an approximate doubling of the effects of positive shocks compared to Figure 1. The main reason is the switch in the intercept values produced by the perturbation. For the negative shocks the stabilizing property is now more powerful with output returning to "trend" after 8 quarters.

5. Figure 5 shows another possibility for 1980(ii) where the negative growth of 2.3% produces a reaction to positive shocks similar to a trend stationary process but negative shocks tend to increase the logarithm of the level of output. That is, the effect of the positive shock is canceled by the reduction in the strength of the stabilizing force, whereas the negative shock adds to the power of the stabilizing force. I label this effect an intrinsic stabilizer. One can estimate the SETAR model in trend stationary form (take out a time trend but split the data according to the growth rate of GNP two quarters ago) and obtain impulse response functionsfor 1980(ii) with very similar responses for the two year horizon.

4. RECREATING THE GREAT DEPRESSION: LINEAR AND NONLINEAR PERSPECTIVES

The reaction to negative shocks for periods of negative growth suggests that the Post-1945 U.S. economy contains an "intrinsic" stabilizer. In this section I illustrate how covariance analysis might hide significant stability properties by conducting the following thought experiment: imagine in the current quarter and for the next eighteen quarters the impulses to U.S. GNP were of "Great Depression" size and magnitude. What would be the effect on output if growth rates prior to the occurrence of the shocks were the same as in 1928 and 1929? I took Great Depression sized residuals[9] from simple linear and SETAR nonlinear models estimated on the pre-war GNP series reported in the Data Appendix of Gordon (1986). Both models were based on five lags of output growth rates, the nonlinear one having a threshold of zero and a delay of 1. I used data from 1875(i) to 1934(iv) to estimate the models.

Figure 6 shows the effect of such shocks from linear and nonlinear perspectives and the actual realization of U.S. GNP from 1929 to 1934. By linear perspective I mean using the residuals from the linear model Pre-1945 to propagate the Post-1945 linear model. For the nonlinear perspective I took residuals from the Pre-1945 nonlinear model and used them to propagate the Post-1945 restricted nonlinear model. Observe that the Post-1945 linear model shows little improvement in the stability properties of the U.S. economy (that is, it mimics the path of the actual Great Depression) but the nonlinear model does (that is, it does produce a smaple path that looks like the Great Depression). The asymmetric response to shocks suggests that since the Second World War the long run effect of large negative shocks has been considerably diminished.

In this period actual U.S. GNP measured in 1972 dollars dropped 27% from 1929(iii) to 1934(iv), recreating the Great Depression from the linear perspective produces a drop of 25%. Using the nonlinear approach there is a slight increase of 6%. If one mixes paradigms then the "best" the linear model can do is a 22% drop in output using the nonlinear residuals. The

---

9 The standard deviation of the residuals from the linear and nonlinear models are very similar, however, the linear residuals contain approximate- an extra 2% drop in GNP.

unrestricted nonlinear model combined with the linear residuals produces a decrease of 4%.

Of course the data used are probably full of measurement error for the exact timing of the fluctuations but the total fall in GNP is similar to that found in more accurate data. Further, the fact that the pre-1945 data used might contain spurious volatility only reinforces the extra stability found by using the nonlinear model. It is crucial to realize that covariance analysis, as represented by the linear perspective above, is incapable of uncovering such extra stability. I now turn to assessing the statistical significance of the extra stability conditional on the the SETAR specification.

5. TESTING FOR ASYMMETRIC EFFECTS ALLOWING FOR PARAMETER UNCERTAINTY

Define a measure of asymmetry, ASYM, as follows:

$$ASYM_k(v;y_t,y_{t-1},\ldots) = \sum_{n=1}^{k} ASY_n(v;y_t,y_{t-1},\ldots)$$

$$ASY_n(v;y_t,y_{t-1},\ldots) = NLIRF_n(v;y_t,y_{t-1},\ldots) + NLIRF_n(-v;y_t,y_{t-1},\ldots)$$

If Y_t is a linear time series then $ASYM_k$ is identically equal to zero. Furthermore, if $Y_t = (1-L)X_t$, then $ASYM_k$ is a measure of the asymmetry in the expected level of the series at horizon k for a specific history. In our AR(1) example independent of the history of the process:

$ASY_n(v) = \phi^n v + \phi^n(-v) = 0$, for all values of v,n.

Therefore, actual sample paths of Y_t could be highly asymmetric due to asymmetries in the innovations but if the propagation mechanism is linear then $ASYM_k$ will be identically zero.

One expects all nonlinear time series models to contain asymmetries.

The finding of no asymmetries would be as surprising as a linear impulse response function that was identically equal to zero after the initial impulse. It is standard to assess whether the impulse response function is significantly different from zero given the sampling variability. Similarly a test is required to see whether whether the asymmetry is significant given the sampling variability in the estimated models. The reader should realize that such a test cannot take into account the uncertainty surrounding the choice of a SETAR specification to represent the nonlinearity.

The asymmetries in the estimated SETAR model are only present for certain values of the shock and for particular histories of the growth rate. Hence, the statistical significance of the test is conditional on the particular history and shock chosen. Since the economic significance of the stabilizing effect found is conditional on negative growth such a test is valid. Furthermore, we are only interested in a one-sided confidence interval, unlike the two-sided case for linear impulse response functions. The following simulation technique is used to form a sampling distribution for the NLIRFs:

1. Pick an initial condition from the distribution of realized growth rates and a shock. Then calculate $\widehat{ASYM}_k$ using the estimated (i.e. fixed values) of the individual regime coefficients.

2. Use the estimated coefficients and their variance covariance matrix to generate M samples of the regime coefficients by drawing from their asymptotic normal variance covariance matrix.[10]

---

[10] An alternative method would be to simulate data from the estimated model. Then use the simulated data to estimate a new model whose nonlinear impulse response functions could then be calculated. I do not provide a formal

3. For each sample of the regime coefficients use simulation to generate the set of asymmetry statistics, $\{ASYM_k\}$.

4. Find the 5th percentile of $\{ASYM_k\}$. Call it χ. If $\chi \leq 0$ then the symmetric response lies within a 95% confidence interval for the particular initial condition and shock. If $\chi > 0$ then the symmetric response lies outside the 95% confidence interval for the particular initial condition and shock.

5. The effect of the variability introduced by Monte Carlo Integration is to make rejection of the null hypothesis of asymmetry more likely, hence the actual size of the test will be higher than 5%.

The results for 1990(iv) and shocks of ±2% using the coefficient estimates and variance covariance matrix from the unrestricted SETAR model for an 8 quarter horizon are shown in Figure 7.[11] The lower 5th percentile is well above zero for each horizon. Such findings can be replicated for other histories and shocks.[12]

8 CONCLUSIONS

Macroeconomics has been dominated by the use of linear time series methods since the Second World War partly because these were the only

---

justification approach used here but it is the analog of Bayesian techniques in the case of producing standard errors for impulse response functions from VARs.

[11] The results are produced by 1000 draws from the variance covariance matrix of the coefficients and 10000 replications for each impulse response function.

[12] The mean and median are shown to see if there is any additional asymmetry in the distribution of the NLIRFs allowing for parameter uncertainty. The divergence at the 8th quarter is not significant given the simulation error. They also agree very closely with the NLIRF produced by the point estimates of the coefficients.

statistical techniques available and partly because economic theories are usually tested in a linear form whether exact or as an approximation. In this paper I have shown that linear methods can hide much interesting economic structure in the most examined of all univariate time series, U.S. GNP. It would be convenient if one could point to an economic theory that is consistent with the results I find or more negatively an economic theory that is incompatible with the results. However, that is not possible, since nothing I have found is incompatible with previous research that has concentrated on the **covariance properties** of time series. The results of the paper do suggest that, for example, Real Business Cycle simulations should examine more than covariance properties in their model evaluations.

REFERENCES

Anderson, H.M., and Teräsvirta, T. (1991): "Modelling Nonlinearities in Business Cycles Using Smooth Transition Autoregressive Models," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, forthcoming

Beaudry, P., and Koop, G., (1991): "Do Recessions Permanently Change Output?" *mimeo*, Boston University.

Brock, W.A., and Potter, S.M. (1991): "Nonlinear Time Series and Macroeconometrics," Paper prepared for Volume 10 of the Handbook of Statistics edited by G.S. Maddala and C.R. Rao.

Brock, W.A. and Sayers, C. (1988): "Is the Business Cycle Characterized by Deterministic Chaos," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22, 71-90.

Chan, K.S. and Tong, H. (1985): "On Estimating Thresholds in Autoregressive Models," *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 7, 179-190.

Diebold, F., and Rudebusch, G., (1991): "Have Postwar Economic Fluctuations been Stabilized?" *mimeo*, University of Pennsylvania

Gallant, R., Rossi, P., and Tauchen, G., (1991): "Nonlinear Dynamic Structures," *mimeo*, Department of Economics, Duke University

Gordon, R.J., (1986): *American Business Cycle: Continuity and Change*, National Bureau of Economic Research and University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Hamilton, J.D. (1989a): "A New Approach to the Economic Analysis of Nonstationary Time Series and the Business Cycle," *Econometrica*, 57, 357-384.

Hamilton, J.D. (1990): "Analysis of Time Series Subject to Changes in Regime," *Mimeo*, University of Virginia Department of Economics.

Hansen, B.E., (1991a): "Inference when a nuisance parameter is missing under the null hypothesis," *mimeo* Department of Economics, University of Rochester

Hansen, B.E. (1991b): "Testing the Markov Trend Model," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, forthcoming

Leamer, E.E., (1978): *Specification Searches*, John Wiley, New York.

Mittnik, S. (1991): "State Space Modeling of Nonlinear Time Series," Paper presented at the U.C.L.A. and Journal of Applied Econometrics Conference on Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics.

Neftci, S.N. (1984): "Are Economic Time Series Asymmetric Over The Business Cycle," *Journal of Political Economy*, 92, 307-328.

Pesaran, M.H., and Potter, S.M., (1991): "Application of Non-Nested Hypothesis Testing to Nonlinear Time Series," *mimeo*, UCLA.

Potter, S.M. (1989): "A Nonlinear Approach to U.S. GNP," *mimeo,* University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Economics

Potter, S.M. (1990): *Nonlinear Time Series And Economic Fluctuations,* Unpublished Ph.D Thesis University of Wisconsin.

Potter, S.M. (1991): "Nonlinear Impulse Response Functions," *mimeo,* UCLA

Potter, S.M., (1992): "Self-Exciting Threshold Autoregression Models of U.S. GNP," *mimeo,* UCLA.

Romer, C.D. (1986): "Is the Stabilization of the Postwar Economy A Figment of the Data?" *American Economic Review,* 76, 314-334.

Sichel, D. (1988): *Essays in Business Cycle Asymmetry,* Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Department of Economics Princeton University.

Sichel, D. (1991): "The Three Phases of the Business Cycle: What Goes Down Must Come Up," *mimeo,* Board of Governors Federal Reserve

Sichel, D., (1992): "Business Cycle Duration Dependence: A Parametric Approach," *Review of Economics and Statistics,* forthcoming.

Tiao, G., and Tsay, R., (1991): "Some Advances in Nonlinear and Adaptive Modeling in Time Series Analysis," University of Chicago Graduate School of Business Statistics Research Center Report #118.

Tong, H. (1983): *Threshold Models in Non-linear Time Series Analysis,* Springer-Verlag, New York.

Tong, H. (1990): *Non-Linear Time Series: A Dynamical Systems Approach,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Tsay, R.S. (1986): "Nonlinearity Tests for Time Series," *Biometrika,* 73, 461-466.

Tsay, R.S. (1989): "Testing and Modeling Threshold Autoregressive Processes," *Journal of the American Statistical Association,* 84, 231-240.

Tsay, R.S. (1991): "Modeling Nonlinearity in Univariate Time series," *Statistica Sinica, forthcoming.*

Table 1: Linear Model Results 1948q3 to 1990q4

COEFFICIENT	ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR
INTERCEPT	.540	.122
AR1	.330	.078
AR2	.193	.082
AR3	-.105	.083
AR4	-.092	.082
AR5	-.024	.078

S.E. of Regression 0.99415
NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS 170
AIC 8.00

Table 2: SETAR WITHOUT RESTRICTIONS 1948q3 to 1990q4

	Regime 1 Estimate (S.E.)	Regime 2 Estimate (S.E.)
Intercept	-.705 (.480)	.545 (.161)
AR1	.510 (.192)	.312 (.081)
AR2	-.849 (.416).	.245 (.113)
AR3	-.048 (.223)	-.104 (.084)
AR4	-.123 (.275)	-.057 (.077)
AR5	.398 (.240)	-.094 (.076)
$\hat{\sigma}^2$	1.59	.758
OBSERVATIONS	37	133

Threshold =0 Delay=2 Standard error of Regression = .95948 AIC=4.22

Table 3: SETAR WITH RESTRICTIONS 1948q3 to 1990q4

	Regime 1 Estimate (S.E.)	Regime 2 Estimate (S.E.)
Intercept	-.808 (.423)	.517 (.161)
AR1	.516 (.185)	.299 (.080)
AR2	-.946 (.353)	.189 (.107)
AR5	.352 (.216)	-.143 (.069)
$\hat{\sigma}^2$	1.50	.763
OBSERVATIONS	37	133

Threshold =0 Delay=2 Standard error of Regression = .95597 AIC=-4.89

Table 1: Linear Model Results 1948q3 to 1990q4

COEFFICIENT	ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR
INTERCEPT	.540	.122
AR1	.330	.078
AR2	.193	.082
AR3	-.105	.083
AR4	-.092	.082
AR5	-.024	.078

S.E. of Regression 0.99415
NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS 170
AIC 8.00

Table 2: SETAR WITHOUT RESTRICTIONS 1948q3 to 1990q4

	Regime 1 Estimate (S.E.)	**Regime 2 Estimate (S.E.)**
Intercept	-.705 (.480)	.545 (.161)
AR1	.510 (.192)	.312 (.081)
AR2	-.849 (.416).	.245 (.113)
AR3	-.048 (.223)	-.104 (.084)
AR4	-.123 (.275)	-.057 (.077)
AR5	.398 (.240)	-.094 (.076)
$\hat{\sigma}^2$	1.59	.758
OBSERVATIONS	37	133

Threshold =0 Delay=2 Standard error of Regression = .95948 AIC=4.22

Table 3: SETAR WITH RESTRICTIONS 1948q3 to 1990q4

	Regime 1 Estimate (S.E.)	**Regime 2 Estimate (S.E.)**
Intercept	-.808 (.423)	.517 (.161)
AR1	.516 (.185)	.299 (.080)
AR2	-.946 (.353)	.189 (.107)
AR5	.352 (.216)	-.143 (.069)
$\hat{\sigma}^2$	1.50	.763
OBSERVATIONS	37	133

Threshold =0 Delay=2 Standard error of Regression = .95597 AIC=-4.89



+VE & -VE SHOCKS 84i
CHANGE IN LEVEL
4
3
2
1
0
-1
-2
-3
-4
83iv
84i
84ii
84iii
84iv
85i
85ii
85iii
85iv

FIGURE 1


+VE & −VE SHOCKS 78
CHANGE IN LEVEL
5
4
3
2
1
0
−1
−2
−3
−4
77iv
78i
78ii
78iii
78iv
79i
79ii
79iii
79iv

FIGURE 2


+VE & −VE SHOCKS 56iii
CHANGE IN LEVEL
4
3
2
1
0
−1
−2
−3
56ii
56iii
56iv
57i
57ii
57iii
57iv
58i
58ii

FIGURE 3


+VE & −VE SHOCKS 70ii
CHANGE IN LEVEL
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0
−1
−2
−3
70i
70ii
70iii
70iv
71i
71ii
71iii
71iv
72i

FIGURE 4


+VE & −VE SHOCKS 80ii
CHANGE IN LEVEL
3
2
1
0
−1
−2
−3
80i
80ii
80iii
80iv
81i
81ii
81iii
81iv
82i

FIGURE 5


GREAT DEPRESSION: LINEAR AND NONLINEAR
GNP IN 1972$
200
220
240
260
280
300
320
340
360
1930q3
1931q3
1932q3
1933q3
1934Q3
ACTUAL
LINEAR
NONLINEAR

FIGURE 6

ASYM TEST FOR 90iv AND –VE 2 SHOCK



FIGURE 7