# Estimating General Equilibrium Spillovers of Large-Scale Shocks

Summary Slides Kilian Huber

- Researchers often want to quantify GE spillovers: how shocks to some firms/households affect others
  - evaluate GE channels in models
  - convert estimates to other levels of aggregation

- Researchers often want to quantify GE spillovers: how shocks to some firms/households affect others
  - evaluate GE channels in models
  - convert estimates to other levels of aggregation
- E.g.: We know effect of regional house prices on employment. To calibrate models, we need direct effect (net of spillovers).

- Researchers often want to quantify GE spillovers: how shocks to some firms/households affect others
  - evaluate GE channels in models
  - convert estimates to other levels of aggregation
- E.g.: We know effect of regional house prices on employment. To calibrate models, we need direct effect (net of spillovers).
- E.g.: We know direct effect of credit cut on firms relative to other firms. Regional policymaker wants regional effect.

- Researchers often want to quantify GE spillovers: how shocks to some firms/households affect others
  - evaluate GE channels in models
  - convert estimates to other levels of aggregation
- E.g.: We know effect of regional house prices on employment. To calibrate models, we need direct effect (net of spillovers).
- E.g.: We know direct effect of credit cut on firms relative to other firms. Regional policymaker wants regional effect.
- Traditional approach: write down full GE model Browning et al. 1999; Acemoglu 2010; Nakamura and Steinsson 2018

- Researchers often want to quantify GE spillovers: how shocks to some firms/households affect others
  - evaluate GE channels in models
  - convert estimates to other levels of aggregation
- E.g.: We know effect of regional house prices on employment. To calibrate models, we need direct effect (net of spillovers).
- E.g.: We know direct effect of credit cut on firms relative to other firms. Regional policymaker wants regional effect.
- Traditional approach: write down full GE model Browning et al. 1999; Acemoglu 2010; Nakamura and Steinsson 2018
- Alternative: directly estimate spillovers using multi-layered variation

### **Related Literature**

- Few studies in macro and finance directly estimate spillovers Dupor and McCrory 2018; Huber 2018; Bernstein et al. 2019; Auerbach et al. 2020; Gathmann et al. 2020; Helm 2020; Verner and Gyöngyösi 2020; Conley et al. 2021; Berg et al. 2021; Mian et al. 2022
- Methods tailored to labor and RCTs ("closed economies", Egger et al.) Ammermueller and Pischke 2009; Epple and Romano 2011; Sacerdote 2011; Angrist 2014; List et al. 2019

## **Related Literature**

- Few studies in macro and finance directly estimate spillovers Dupor and McCrory 2018; Huber 2018; Bernstein et al. 2019; Auerbach et al. 2020; Gathmann et al. 2020; Helm 2020; Verner and Gyöngyösi 2020; Conley et al. 2021; Berg et al. 2021; Mian et al. 2022
- Methods tailored to labor and RCTs ("closed economies", Egger et al.) Ammermueller and Pischke 2009; Epple and Romano 2011; Sacerdote 2011; Angrist 2014; List et al. 2019
- This paper: framework and advice tailored to macro and finance
  - multiple spillover types
  - nonlinearities
  - mismeasurement (Ammermueller and Pischke 2009; Angrist 2014)
  - policy multipliers

1. Conceptual framework for estimating spillovers

- 1. Conceptual framework for estimating spillovers
- 2. Mechanical bias due to multiple spillovers

- 1. Conceptual framework for estimating spillovers
- 2. Mechanical bias due to multiple spillovers
- 3. Mechanical bias due to mismeasurement

- 1. Conceptual framework for estimating spillovers
- 2. Mechanical bias due to multiple spillovers
- 3. Mechanical bias due to mismeasurement
- 4. Interpretation and policy multipliers

- 1. Conceptual framework for estimating spillovers
- 2. Mechanical bias due to multiple spillovers
- 3. Mechanical bias due to mismeasurement
- 4. Interpretation and policy multipliers
- 5. Practical advice

# Setup

- Identify a research question and shock.
- Define types of spillovers to be estimated, e.g., across firms/households in
  - same region
  - same industry
  - same lender
  - same country ...

# Setup

- Identify a research question and shock.
- Define types of spillovers to be estimated, e.g., across firms/households in
  - same region
  - same industry
  - same lender
  - same country ...
- Assign all firms/households to distinct groups.
- Assume shock is exogenous to both individual firms'/households' and groups' outcomes.

# Setup

- Identify a research question and shock.
- Define types of spillovers to be estimated, e.g., across firms/households in
  - same region
  - same industry
  - same lender
  - same country ...
- Assign all firms/households to distinct groups.
- Assume shock is exogenous to both individual firms'/households' and groups' outcomes.
- Application: effect of credit cut on firms, both directly affected firms and unaffected firms in same region and product market.

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \sum_{j \neq i, reg.} \gamma^j x_j + \sum_{k \neq i, ind.} \lambda^k x_k + \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

• Linear model:

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \sum_{j \neq i, reg.} \gamma^j x_j + \sum_{k \neq i, ind.} \lambda^k x_k + \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

•  $y_i$  = outcome (firm growth)

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \sum_{j \neq i, reg.} \gamma^j x_j + \sum_{k \neq i, ind.} \lambda^k x_k + \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

- $y_i$  = outcome (firm growth)
- $x_i$  = indicator for direct treatment of *i* (firm has crisis bank)

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \sum_{j \neq i, reg.} \gamma^j x_j + \sum_{k \neq i, ind.} \lambda^k x_k + \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

- $y_i$  = outcome (firm growth)
- $x_i$  = indicator for direct treatment of *i* (firm has crisis bank)
- $\beta$  = direct effect = change in  $y_i$  if *i* alone got treated

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \sum_{j \neq i, reg.} \gamma^j x_j + \sum_{k \neq i, ind.} \lambda^k x_k + \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

- $y_i$  = outcome (firm growth)
- $x_i$  = indicator for direct treatment of *i* (firm has crisis bank)
- $\beta$  = direct effect = change in  $y_i$  if *i* alone got treated
- $\gamma^j$  = spillover = change in  $y_i$  due to treatment of firm j (same region)
- $\lambda^k$  = spillover = change in  $y_i$  due to treatment of firm k (same industry)

Assume spillovers in same region are homogeneous (or proportional to size).

- Assume spillovers in same region are homogeneous (or proportional to size).
- Reduce dimensionality:

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \gamma \overline{x_{r(i)}} + \lambda \overline{x_{s(i)}} + \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

- Assume spillovers in same region are homogeneous (or proportional to size).
- Reduce dimensionality:

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \gamma \overline{x_{r(i)}} + \lambda \overline{x_{s(i)}} + \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

• Spillover coefficient multiplies the "leave-out mean" (or size-weighted mean):

$$\overline{x_{r(i)}} = \frac{\sum_{j \neq i, r(j) = r(i)} x_j}{N_{r(i)} - 1}$$

- Assume spillovers in same region are homogeneous (or proportional to size).
- Reduce dimensionality:

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \gamma \overline{x_{r(i)}} + \lambda \overline{x_{s(i)}} + \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

• Spillover coefficient multiplies the "leave-out mean" (or size-weighted mean):

$$\overline{x_{r(i)}} = \frac{\sum_{j \neq i, r(j) = r(i)} x_j}{N_{r(i)} - 1}$$

- Assume exogeneity, so biases not driven by endogeneity or "reflection problem":  $E(x_i\epsilon_i) = 0$
- Assume systematic variation across groups:

$$x_i = u_{r(i)} + u_{s(i)} + \nu_i$$

•  $\gamma$  = estimated regional spillover, useful for models and aggregation

- $\gamma$  = estimated regional spillover, useful for models and aggregation
- Average across regions:

$$\overline{y}^{r(i)} = (\beta + \gamma) \ \overline{x}^{r(i)} + \lambda \ \overline{x_{s(i)}}^{r(i)} + \alpha + \overline{\epsilon}^{r(i)}$$

- $\gamma$  = estimated regional spillover, useful for models and aggregation
- Average across regions:

$$\overline{y}^{r(i)} = (\beta + \gamma) \ \overline{x}^{r(i)} + \lambda \overline{x_{s(i)}}^{r(i)} + \alpha + \overline{\epsilon}^{r(i)}$$

• Total regional effect of average treatment

$$\frac{d\overline{y}^{r(i)}}{d\overline{x}^{r(i)}} = \beta + \gamma$$

• Direct effect of average treatment, assuming zero spillovers

$$\frac{d\overline{y}^{r(i)}}{d\overline{x}^{r(i)}}\mid (\gamma=0)=\beta$$

- $\gamma$  = estimated regional spillover, useful for models and aggregation
- Average across regions:

$$\overline{y}^{r(i)} = (\beta + \gamma) \ \overline{x}^{r(i)} + \lambda \overline{x_{s(i)}}^{r(i)} + \alpha + \overline{\epsilon}^{r(i)}$$

• Total regional effect of average treatment

$$\frac{d\overline{y}^{r(i)}}{d\overline{x}^{r(i)}} = \beta + \gamma$$

• Direct effect of average treatment, assuming zero spillovers

$$\frac{d\overline{y}^{r(i)}}{d\overline{x}^{r(i)}} \mid (\gamma = 0) = \beta$$

• More on how to calculate dollar multipliers etc. in paper.

# Application: Credit Cut

- A German bank (Commerzbank) cuts lending due to international losses (Huber 2018).
- Some firms depend on this bank for credit.

# Application: Credit Cut

- A German bank (Commerzbank) cuts lending due to international losses (Huber 2018).
- Some firms depend on this bank for credit.
- Treatment: Indicator for direct dependence on the bank.
- Research question: amplification or dampening through spillovers?

#### Credit cut by Commerzbank



#### **Direct Employment Effect**



# **Product Market Spillovers**

- IO economists write theories about product markets: demand versus technology spillovers.
- Test by constructing product market leave-out mean (industry for tradable and industry-region for non-tradables).
- Estimate:

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \lambda \overline{x_{s(i)}} + \alpha + u_i$$

# Negative Industry Spillover

Coefficient on $x_i$	-0.030*** (0.007)	
Coefficient on $\overline{x_{s(i)}}$	-0.030* (0.018)	
Coefficient on $\overline{x_{r(i)}}$		
Sectors in sample	All se	ectors
Observations	45,252	45,252

### Mechanical Bias With Multiple Spillovers

• There are other potential spillovers, e.g., region. But region and industry means are uncorrelated. So no OVB?

### Mechanical Bias With Multiple Spillovers

- There are other potential spillovers, e.g., region. But region and industry means are uncorrelated. So no OVB?
- No, cannot take spillover estimate at face value.
- There will be mechanical bias if a true spillover is excluded, even if uncorrelated to other spillover.

### Mechanical Bias With Multiple Spillovers

- There are other potential spillovers, e.g., region. But region and industry means are uncorrelated. So no OVB?
- No, cannot take spillover estimate at face value.
- There will be mechanical bias if a true spillover is excluded, even if uncorrelated to other spillover.
- Regional spillovers operate through demand versus agglomeration spillovers.

# Add Regional Spillover

Coefficient on $x_i$	-0.030*** (0.007)	-0.027*** (0.007)
Coefficient on $\overline{x_{s(i)}}$	-0.030* (0.018)	-0.015 (0.018)
Coefficient on $\overline{x_{r(i)}}$		-0.114** (0.051)
Sectors in sample	All se	ectors
Observations	45,252	45,252

#### **Understanding Mechanical Bias**

• True model:

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \gamma \overline{x_{r(i)}} + \lambda \overline{x_{s(i)}} + \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

• Excluded regional term correlated with direct effect, so all coefficients biased.

## **Understanding Mechanical Bias**

• True model:

$$y_i = \beta x_i + \gamma \overline{x_{r(i)}} + \lambda \overline{x_{s(i)}} + \alpha + \epsilon_i$$

- Excluded regional term correlated with direct effect, so all coefficients biased.
- Suggestions:
  - if observed, include other spillover types
  - IV
  - heterogeneity in spillovers using theory

#### Heterogeneous Regional Spillover



# Heterogeneous Regional Spillover

-0.026*** (0.009)
-0.007
-0.067 (0.055)

Non-tradable and	Tradable and
high R&D	low R&D
14,810	30,442

### Mechanical Bias due to Mismeasurement

- Incorrectly specified regressors generate mechanical bias:
  - direct effect is nonlinear, but direct treatment is measured using linear regressor
  - measurement error in direct treatment
- For exposition, introduce measurement error in direct treatment

### Mechanical Bias due to Mismeasurement

- Incorrectly specified regressors generate mechanical bias:
  - direct effect is nonlinear, but direct treatment is measured using linear regressor
  - measurement error in direct treatment
- For exposition, introduce measurement error in direct treatment
- Size of "high" error calibrated using Bound and Krueger (1991) error in earnings growth.

# Measurement Error

Coefficient on $x_i^*$	-0.027*** (0.007)	-0.023*** (0.006)	-0.024*** (0.006)	-0.009 (0.006)	
Coefficient on $\overline{x_{r(i)}}^*$	-0.123** (0.050)	-0.155*** (0.054)	-0.160*** (0.058)	-0.256*** (0.086)	
Measurement error Sectors in sample	None	Low All se	Medium ectors	High	
Observations	45,252	45,252	45,252	45,252	

### **Understanding Mechanical Bias**

- Individual measurement error gets averaged away in leave-out mean.
- Less error in leave-out mean than in direct effect.

## **Understanding Mechanical Bias**

- Individual measurement error gets averaged away in leave-out mean.
- Less error in leave-out mean than in direct effect.
- True direct effect erroneously loads onto spillover coefficient.
- Analytical derivation for biases in paper.

# Little Heterogeneity with ME

-0.021**	-0.004
(0.010)	(0.007)
-0.346***	-0.214**
(0.128)	(0.094)

High	High
Non-tradable and	Tradable and
high R&D	low R&D
14,810	30,442

# **Mismeasurement Solutions**

- Suggestions:
  - heterogeneity in spillover
  - IV

# **Mismeasurement Solutions**

- Suggestions:
  - heterogeneity in spillover
  - IV
- Same intuition for nonlinear effect, very relevant for finance, e.g., borrowing and liquidity constraints.

# **Policy Multiplier**

- Show how to interpret spillover estimates.
- Bank debt: Direct effect = 0.47 mio decline at average firm.
- Employment: Total effect = 10 jobs.

# **Policy Multiplier**

- Show how to interpret spillover estimates.
- Bank debt: Direct effect = 0.47 mio decline at average firm.
- Employment: Total effect = 10 jobs.
- Undo direct effect at 0.47 mio per firm, get 10 jobs in region.
- Provide 100k USD in debt, get 1.4 jobs.
  - Know only direct effect: would estimate 0.4 jobs.
  - Know only region effect: don't know how to target direct firms.

• 1. Define spillovers of interest and exogenous variation.

- 1. Define spillovers of interest and exogenous variation.
- 2. Attempt to measure other omitted spillover types.

- 1. Define spillovers of interest and exogenous variation.
- 2. Attempt to measure other omitted spillover types.
- 3. Try flexible functional forms to overcome bias from nonlinearity.

- 1. Define spillovers of interest and exogenous variation.
- 2. Attempt to measure other omitted spillover types.
- 3. Try flexible functional forms to overcome bias from nonlinearity.
- 4. IV solves all forms of mechanical bias.

- 1. Define spillovers of interest and exogenous variation.
- 2. Attempt to measure other omitted spillover types.
- 3. Try flexible functional forms to overcome bias from nonlinearity.
- 4. IV solves all forms of mechanical bias.
- 5. Identify theoretical mechanisms driving spillovers.
  - regional: demand and agglomeration effects
  - sectoral: competition and productivity
  - cross region: trade, migration, capital mobility, and aggregate policy

- 1. Define spillovers of interest and exogenous variation.
- 2. Attempt to measure other omitted spillover types.
- 3. Try flexible functional forms to overcome bias from nonlinearity.
- 4. IV solves all forms of mechanical bias.
- 5. Identify theoretical mechanisms driving spillovers.
  - regional: demand and agglomeration effects
  - sectoral: competition and productivity
  - cross region: trade, migration, capital mobility, and aggregate policy
- 6. Estimate heterogeneous spillovers as suggested by theory

# Conclusion

- Macro shocks affect firms/households through many complex GE spillover channels.
- Need to know GE channels for modeling and policy -> estimating spillovers is potentially powerful.
- More potential applications sketched in paper, ranging from sectoral, labor market, and country-level spillovers.
- Most challenging: estimating country spillovers requires exogenous country variation.
  - fiscal spending due to wars (Ramey 2019)
  - foreign policy (Jiménez et al. 2012)
  - political upheavals (Fuchs-Schündeln 2008)
  - idiosyncratic policy (Romer and Romer 2004)