

Economics Working Paper 135*

International Consumption Risk Sharing[†]

Fabio Canova[‡]

and

Morten O. Ravn^{**}

June 1995^{††}

Keywords: Consumption insurance, optimal allocations, generalized method of moments, long run convergence.

Journal of Economic Literature classification: D81, E32, F21.

* This paper is also number 6 Finance and Banking Discussion Papers Series, UPF.

[†] Part of this research was undertaken while both authors were associated with the European University Institute, Florence. Canova acknowledges the financial support of the European Community through a EUI research grant. We would like to thank three anonymous referees, Dave Backus, Bernard Dumas, Alex Kane, Karen Lewis, Jane Marrinan, Maurice Obstfeld, Linda Tesar, Eric van WinCoop and the participants of seminars at Aarhus, Brown, Magdeburg, Southampton, UCSD, USC, UCSB, the 1993 SEDC Meeting, Nauplio and of the Conference on International Asset Markets, LSE, London for comments and suggestions.

[‡] Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Università' di Catania and CEPR.

^{**} University of Southampton.

^{††} First Draft: March 1993.

Abstract

This paper formally examines the implications of international consumption risk sharing for a panel of industrialized countries. We theoretically derive the international consumption insurance proposition in a simple setup and show how it should be modified in more complicated models. We empirically analyze the implications of the theory for pairs of countries across frequencies of the spectrum and find that aggregate domestic consumption is almost completely insured against idiosyncratic real, demographic, fiscal and monetary shocks over short cycles, but that it covaries with these variables over medium and long cycles. The cross equation restrictions imposed by the theory are, in general, rejected. The policy implications of the results are discussed.

1 Introduction

The idea that agents attempt to insure their consumption streams against individual income fluctuations is a pervasive feature of many modern dynamic macro models. It arises in closed economy setups where there is heterogeneity in income or preferences (see e.g. Mace (1991) or Marcet and Marimon (1992)), in open economy setups where countries with heterogeneous income streams borrow and lend internationally in order to bear only aggregate world-wide risk (see e.g. Backus, Kehoe and Kydland (1992)), and in models where consumption insurance may be a trigger (or a deterrent) for long term growth (see e.g. Devereux and Smith (1994) and Obstfeld (1994)). As emphasized by Cochrane (1991), the basic idea of consumption insurance is the cross-sectional counterpart of the permanent income hypothesis. With complete insurance consumption of the individual units (agents, families or countries) should not vary in response to idiosyncratic income shocks while if the permanent income hypothesis holds consumption of an individual unit should not vary in response to transitory shocks.

Full consumption insurance obtains in a competitive equilibrium when financial markets are complete or when there are institutions implementing optimal allocations. Some of these institutional arrangements do exist in the real world. At the individual agent level, unemployment or medical insurance schemes, welfare and social government programs or even intergenerational transfers may help in reducing the effect of individual specific shocks. At a country level, charities or disaster relief programs, international lending agreements or direct foreign aid may help to insure national consumption from catastrophic, idiosyncratic income fluctuations. Completeness of financial markets or the presence of institutions implementing first best allocations are, however, only sufficient conditions for full consumption insurance to take place. For example, Duffie and Huang (1985) show that continuous trading of a few long lived securities may implement optimal allocations. Similarly, Marcet and Singleton (1992) and Baxter and Crucini (1995) show that close to full insurance obtains even when financial markets are strongly incomplete and no mechanism for implementing optimal allocations exists as long as agents have similar preferences (like more consumption to less and less variability to more) and differ only in their income streams.

Although the theoretical mechanics of consumption insurance are very simple, casual empiricism suggests that perfect international risk sharing is hardly a feature of the real world. It is often claimed that national aggregate consumption *does* react to country specific shocks. In support of this idea it is typically reported that poor underdeveloped countries starve when droughts or

civil wars cut their own food supplies. For these countries, insurance markets seem to be imperfect or partially inaccessible, no institutions implementing optimal allocations exist and borrowing opportunities are limited (see Atkeson (1991)).

Furthermore, many authors (see e.g. Backus, Kehoe, Kydland (1992) or Devereux, Gregory and Smith (1992)) have informally suggested that cross country consumption correlations among developed countries are less than perfect and, in general, lower than cross country correlations of national outputs. This evidence, combined with simulation results obtained in models where perfect risk sharing occurs, have lead Backus, Kehoe and Kydland (1995) to label the empirical cross country relationship of consumptions and incomes a major puzzle.

One additional piece of often cited evidence indicating the lack of complete insurance is the fact that the portfolio of developed countries is composed in large part of domestic assets (see e.g. Tesar and Werner (1993)) and that agents would be better off by changing the composition of their portfolio (see e.g. French and Poterba (1991) or Van Wincoop (1994)). While the question of why portfolios are so little diversified is a subject of a debate, several authors have provided a simple rationalization of this phenomenon. Stockman and Dellas (1989) and Tesar (1993) show that nondiversification may occur if nontraded goods account for a large fraction of total consumption. Alternatively, Cole and Obstfeld (1991) and Obstfeld (1992) have suggested that the gains from international diversifications may be small either because there are large informational costs involved in predicting future payoffs of foreign assets or because the cyclical properties of national incomes are alike (see e.g. Backus and Kehoe (1992)).

The purpose of this paper is to formally examine the validity of the theory of international consumption insurance. We begin in section 2 by formulating a simple setup and showing that for consumption insurance to hold a monotonic transformation of the marginal utility of aggregate consumption must be highly correlated across countries. Given a functional form for utility, we next derive three testable implications of the theory. We then describe how to modify the conclusions when some of the restrictive assumptions are removed and derive exact restrictions in two cases of interest: when the planner can not relocate factors affecting the utility of agents (e.g. non-tradable goods or government expenditure) and when she can (e.g. leisure).

Next we address issues of crucial importance in empirically verifying the implications of the theory. In particular, we discuss problems connected with the choice of instruments and the presence of measurement errors in the variables. Because our theoretical setup disregards possible realloca-

tions of wealth across countries over time, we need to abstract from redistributive considerations in conducting our tests. In addition, because our testing procedure requires stationarity, we will focus attention only on stationary fluctuations and this brings up the issue of which stationary inducing transformation to employ. Canova (1993) shows that different detrending methods leave cycles of different length in the data. Therefore, by appropriately selecting the detrending procedure, we can examine the extent of international risk sharing by frequencies. Such an analysis may shed light on three important issues. First, whether consumption insurance primarily covers temporary or more permanent types of disturbances (see e.g. Marcet and Marimon (1992)). Second, whether international insurance can be achieved without permanent income redistribution across countries (see Melitz and Vori (1992)). Third, whether measurement errors have different properties at different frequencies. Finally, we compare our testing approach to others existing in the literature. With the exceptions of Obstfeld (1989), (1993), Lewis (1993) and Kollman (1995) the literature has only informally tested international risk sharing primarily by computing consumption correlation between the US and some other country (typically Japan or Canada). The reported evidence, however, concerns primarily the US and one may expect closer ties between EEC countries or between countries where labor migrations have created a self-insurance mechanism of transfers to chronically depressed areas. In addition, since no standard errors are provided, point estimates of international consumption correlations do not provide conclusive evidence on the issue.

In section 3 we formally study the properties of pairs of aggregate consumption for a panel of nine fairly homogeneous countries over the sample 1970-1990. Since the theory requires that aggregate domestic consumption should be unpredictable once we control for aggregate foreign consumption, natural orthogonality conditions emerge by interacting domestic variables (including variables proxying for real, fiscal, monetary and demographic factors) with the residuals of the regression between pairs of aggregate consumption. The theory in its simplest form also imposes two additional restrictions: a set of cross-equation constraints across the moments we test and the restriction that cross country consumption correlations are perfect. We examine all these implications using a GMM technique. As a byproduct of our analysis, we also provide novel estimates and standard errors of the ratios of relative risk aversion coefficients of the representative agent of pairs of countries which are of independent interest for researchers engaged in calibrating international business cycle models.

Four major results stand out from our analysis. First, aggregate consumption appears to be

fully insured against high frequency fluctuations in real, fiscal, monetary and demographic variables. Second, aggregate consumption covaries with some lagged demographic and labor market variables over medium-long cycles. These two results are robust to the presence of measurement errors, modifications of the empirical specification of the model, changes in the set of instruments and alterations of the functional form for the utility function. Third, the remaining two implications of international risk sharing are rejected regardless of the type of fluctuations we considered. Fourth, there is little evidence of risk sharing in the long run, both in the sense that consumption patterns tend to diverge and that the more permanent component of domestic consumption responds to fluctuations in domestic variables.

Two important conclusions emerge from our investigation which we discuss in section 4. These conclusions have implications for the design of institutions intended to implement optimal allocations, for the opening of new financial markets and for questions concerning fiscal independence of national governments in a unified Europe. First, because existing arrangements appear to provide substantial insurance against business cycle fluctuations in the short run, both the opening of international financial markets or the introduction of government institutions intended to augment the efficiency of existing markets (see e.g. Persson and Tabellini (1992))) would only marginally affect the welfare of the representative agents of these countries. This result is particularly important for European countries since one of the foreseeable tasks of the central authority of a unified Europe is to provide short run consumption insurance to member countries (see e.g. Padoa-Schioppa (1987)). Second, because consumption insurance is harder to obtain for low frequency fluctuations in consumption, international institutions (old and new) should be more concerned with shielding consumers from this type of domestic fluctuations. However, this type of insurance may involve semi-permanent redistribution of income. Therefore, to fully evaluate the effects of these programs on the well being of agents, it is necessary to examine them in the context of a specific model of risk sharing and redistribution.

2 The Theory of International Risk Sharing

2.1 The Basic Setup

We assume that there is a representative consumer in each of the J countries of the world, $j = 1, \dots, J$, with preferences defined over a homogeneous aggregate nondurable consumption good. Let s^t be the realization of the state at time t . $s = 1, \dots, S < \infty$ and assume that $s_t = \{s^t, s^{t-1}, \dots, s^1\}$.

all histories s_t and all periods t , they are not distinct (taking the difference between any two indices j and k in (4) we obtain (3)) and the first is stronger than the second since there is a loss of information in (4) due to the averaging of consumption across countries. That is to say, if (3) holds for all j, k , then (4) must be satisfied, while the reverse is not true.

Both (3) and (4) impose strong restrictions on the data since they equate the marginal utility of consumption for any j, k and for all histories and dates. Because c_t is not observable for all histories, and in testing risk sharing we have to face the problem of uneven quality of international consumption data, we next derive weaker restrictions based on moments of the logarithm of the marginal utility of aggregate consumption. These implications are easily testable and more robust to measurement errors. From (3) it is straightforward to obtain

$$E[\log U_{c_t}^j] = E[\log U_{c_t}^k] + \xi_{jk} \quad (5)$$

$$\text{var}[\log U_{c_t}^j] = \text{var}[\log U_{c_t}^k] \quad (6)$$

$$\text{cov}[\log U_{c_t}^j, \log U_{c_t}^j] = \text{cov}[\log U_{c_t}^j, \log U_{c_t}^k] \quad (7)$$

Note that (6) and (7) hold regardless of the welfare weights employed in the planner problem as long as they are constant. Therefore, there are two reasons why (5)-(7) are weaker than (3). First, because they imply that international consumption insurance holds for moments of the data instead of point by point in time and state. Second, because these relationships can be examined even when the planner weights are unknown.

There are many decentralization schemes which support the optimal risk sharing allocations. To achieve optimality in decentralized economies it is typical to assume the existence of equity markets in each country (as in Lucas (1982)) or of contingent claim markets where countries trade claims to each others income (as in Backus, Kehoe and Kydland (1992)). However, even when contingent claims markets are missing, richness in the set of trading opportunities may partially compensate for the lack of variety in the available securities (see, e.g. Duffie and Huang (1985)). At the polar extreme, the lack of international financial markets is not sufficient to prevent risk sharing. For example, Persson and Tabellini (1992) describe a cooperative political equilibrium arrangement which implements optimal allocations even when international financial markets are absent. Because of these considerations and since the implementation of the tests is unaffected, we decided to leave the financial instruments available to agents unspecified (see also Townsend (1994) on this point).

the history of realizations of s^t , is observed by the agents of all countries at time t , that the ex-ante probability (at time $t = 0$) of a particular history realization is $\pi(s_t)$ and that $\sum_{s_t} \pi(s_t) = 1$. Each country is endowed with an exogenous stochastic amount $y_t(s_t)$ of the good at each t . The lifetime expected utility of the representative consumer in each country is given by:

$$V \equiv \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \beta^t \sum_{s_t} \pi(s_t) U^j[c_t^j(s_t), b_t^j(s_t)] \quad (1)$$

where $0 < \beta < 1$ is the discount factor common to all j 's and is independent of s_t , $c_t^j(s_t)$ is the consumption of country j at time t , if the history s_t occurs and $b_t^j(s_t)$ represents factors other than consumption affecting agents' utility (such as leisure, government consumption, consumption of nontradables or home production effects, as in e.g. Benhabib, Rogerson and Wright (1992), etc.). In our simplest setup b_t^j captures all those factors which are uninsurable from the planner's point of view (see Obstfeld (1993) for a similar interpretation). That is, the planner computes optimal allocations of the consumption goods only, taking everything else as given. This restrictive assumption will be relaxed in the next subsection where the planner will be allowed to allocate some components of b_t^j (e.g. leisure) in addition to the consumption good.

The optimality condition for the planner problem is:

$$\Phi_j U_{c_t}^j = \mu_t \quad (2)$$

where $U_{c_t}^j = \frac{\partial U}{\partial c_t^j(s_t)}$, $\mu_t = \frac{\beta^t \lambda_t}{\pi(s_t)}$, λ_t is the Lagrange multiplier for the resource constraint and $\Phi_j = \frac{\Psi_j}{N_j}$ is a set of time and state invariant weights which are related to the size N_j and the initial wealth Ψ_j of each country. Implicit in the formulation of the problem are the assumptions that along the equilibrium path the planner does not reallocate wealth and that the size of the country (in terms of population) does not change.

The essence of the theory is embodied in (2) and it is given by the fact that μ_t is the same for all countries. Consequently, (2) implies that, apart from a scale factor, the marginal utility of consumption is equalized across countries. We can use (2) and the fact that μ_t is independent of j , to derive the following two conditions, which must hold for any pair $j, k \in J$:

$$\log U_{c_t}^j - \log U_{c_t}^k = \xi_{jk} \quad (3)$$

$$\log U_{c_t}^j - \log U_{c_t}^a = B_j \quad (4)$$

where $U_{c_t}^a = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J U_{c_t}^j$, and where $\xi_{jk} = \log \Phi_k - \log \Phi_j$ and $B_j = \log \Phi_a - \log \Phi_j$, $\Phi_a = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \Phi_j$, are independent of the date and the state. Both equations must hold for all countries,

Finally, since (3) is independent of the functional form for utility selected, it holds when preferences do not display time separability in consumption (e.g. when there is habit persistence or durability in consumption, see Mace (1991)). Furthermore, because versions of the Porteus-Kreps preferences are observationally equivalent to von Neumann-Morgenstern preferences with a particular form of habit persistence (see e.g. Constantinides (1991)), (3) holds even when preferences satisfy non-expected utility axioms. If the instantaneous utility function is specified as in (8) and (9), where now $c_t^j = C_t^j - \sum_{p=1}^P \alpha_p C_{t-p}^j$ and $\alpha_p > 0$ with habit persistence and $\alpha_p < 0$ with durability, the three testable implications we derived still hold with c_t now representing a linear combination of current and past consumption. There are two consequences of this. First, the theory predicts that X_t , constructed with linear combinations of current and past consumptions, is unpredictable. Second, if only current consumption is used to generate orthogonality conditions, $E(X_t|Z_t) \neq 0$, unless Z_t are uncorrelated with past p lags of consumption.

2.2 Extensions

The setup we have used so far is appealing because it is simple but it imposes restrictive assumptions on the type of effects that b_t^j may capture and on the activities of the planner. Here we examine first what happens when some of the components of b_t^j are stochastic but still beyond the control of the planner (e.g. if there is domestic stochastic government expenditure or stochastic non-traded (home produced) goods in the utility) and, second, what happens when some of the stochastic components of b_t^j are under the control of the planner (e.g. if b_t^j includes leisure choices).

To see exactly what the first extension entitles we consider the special case where b_t^j represents non-tradables. In this case (3) still holds. However, if there are tradable and non-tradable goods and the instantaneous utility function is of the form:

$$U[c_t^j(s_{rt}), b_t^j(s_{rt})] = \frac{1}{1 - \sigma_j} ((tr_t^j)^{\gamma_j} (nt_t^j)^{1 - \gamma_j})^{1 - \sigma_j} \quad \text{if } \sigma_j \neq 1 \quad \forall j \quad (14)$$

$$U[c_t^j(s_{rt}), b_t^j(s_{rt})] = \log(tr_t^j) + A^j \log(nt_t^j) \quad \text{if } \sigma_j = 1 \quad \forall j \quad (15)$$

where nt_t^j is non-tradable consumption, tr_t^j is tradable consumption and γ_j is the share of tradables in total consumption in country j , the optimality condition implies that

$$x_{1t}^* = \log(tr_t^j) - \frac{\gamma_k(1 - \sigma_k) - 1}{\gamma_j(1 - \sigma_j) - 1} \log(tr_t^k) - w_{1t} - w_2 \quad (16)$$

$$x_{2t}^* = (\log tr_t^j)^2 - \left(\frac{\gamma_k(1 - \sigma_k) - 1}{\gamma_j(1 - \sigma_j) - 1} \right)^2 (\log(tr_t^k))^2 - w_{1t}^2 \quad (17)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{3t}^* &= \sqrt{(\log tr_t^j)^2 (\log tr_t^k)^2} - \left(\frac{\gamma_j(1-\sigma_j)-1}{\gamma_k(1-\sigma_k)-1} \right) (\text{corr}(\log(tr_t^j) \log(tr_t^k)) (\log(tr_t^j))^{-2} \\
&\quad - \sqrt{(\log tr_t^k)^2 (\log tr_t^j)^2} w_{1t} (\log tr_t^j)^{-1}) \quad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

are unpredictable where $w_{1t} = \frac{1}{\gamma_j(1-\sigma_j)-1} [(1-\gamma_k)(1-\sigma_k) \log nt_t^k - (1-\gamma_j)(1-\sigma_j) \log nt_t^j]$, $w_{2t} = \frac{1}{\gamma_j(1-\sigma_j)-1} (\log \Phi_k - \log \Phi_j + \log \gamma_k - \log \gamma_j)$. From (16)-(18), it is clear that if the marginal utility of consumption is nonseparable in the consumption of traded and non-traded goods, fluctuations in the endowment of domestic and foreign non-tradables affect the optimal allocation of the traded good. In particular, the optimal allocation depends on the share parameter (γ_j), the intertemporal elasticity of substitution ($\frac{1}{\sigma_j}$) and the joint stochastic processes for traded and non-traded goods (see e.g. Tesar (1993)).

Similarly, if b_t^j is identified with home production or with exogenous government consumption expenditure affecting the utility of the agents of their own country, the optimality condition for the planner problem still requires the equalization of the marginal utility of private consumption across countries. However, when private and government consumption expenditure (or home production) are nonseparable in the utility function and because these factors are country specific and can not be reallocated by the planner, the logic of these cases is identical to the case of non-tradables: fluctuations in government expenditure or home produced output affects the optimal allocations of the market consumption good.

There are several implications of these results. First, while the optimality condition requires that $E(X_t^*|Z_t) = 0$, it is not necessarily the case that $E(X_t|Z_t) = 0$ where X_t is computed neglecting that b_t^j are stochastic. In other words, unless Z_t are chosen to be uncorrelated with b_t^j , tests conducted using consumption data only will generally reject unpredictability. Second, while the cross equation restrictions still hold, the estimated slope parameter measures a nonlinear combination of the ratio of the relative risk aversion coefficients between pair of countries and the ratio of shares of private (tradable) consumption in the utility. Third, it is no longer true that international consumption correlations are perfect, unless the utility function is separable in c_t^j and b_t^j . Therefore, finding that consumption correlations are less than perfect is not necessarily an indication of the lack of full risk sharing. Conversely, even if risk sharing is perfect, the presence of factors entering in a nonseparable way with consumption in the utility function drives a wedge between the profile of domestic and foreign consumption (see also Marrinan (1994) on this point).

Next, consider the case where the planner has control over the cross country allocation of b_t^j .

To give empirical content to the theory, we use a homothetic utility function of the type

$$U(c'_t, b'_t) = \frac{1}{1 - \sigma_j} [(c'_t b'_t)^{1 - \sigma_j} - 1] \quad \text{if } \sigma_j \neq 1 \quad \forall j \quad (8)$$

$$U(c'_t, b'_t) = \log(c'_t) + A^j \log(b'_t) \quad \text{otherwise} \quad \forall j \quad (9)$$

where σ_j is the coefficient of constant relative risk aversion (CRRA) of country j . Although we adopted a CRRA specification, any member of the class of HARA utility functions would serve the purpose (see e.g. Brennan and Solnick (1989)). We selected a CRRA utility function because it is consistent with a balanced growth path. Devereux, Gregory and Smith (1992), who have studied the implications of risk sharing in an international model of the business cycle where leisure choices are included, have used a utility function of the form:

$$U[c'_t(s_t), n'_t(s_t)] = \log(c'_t - \gamma n'_t) \quad (10)$$

where n_t is hours. For these preferences, the marginal utility of consumption is not independent of labor supply choices but the income elasticity of leisure is zero. However these preferences are not of the HARA class and are incompatible with balanced growth.

Given (8)-(9) and setting $b'_t = b$, $\forall j, t$ for the moment, we let

$$X_{1t} = \log c'_t - \left(\frac{\sigma_k}{\sigma_j}\right) \log c_t^k + \xi_1 \quad (11)$$

$$X_{2t} = (\log c'_t)^2 - \left(\frac{\sigma_k}{\sigma_j}\right)^2 (\log c_t^k)^2 \quad (12)$$

$$X_{3t} = \sqrt{(\log c'_t)^2 (\log c_t^k)^2 - \left(\frac{\sigma_k}{\sigma_j}\right) \text{corr}(\log c'_t, \log c_t^k) (\log c'_t)^{-2}} \quad (13)$$

where ξ_1 is a constant function of the welfare weights and of the CRRA coefficient of country j and let $X_t = [X_{1t}, X_{2t}, X_{3t}]'$. The first testable implication of the theory of international consumption insurance, given our setup and the auxiliary assumptions, is that X_t should be unpredictable. That is, for any variable Z_t belonging to the information set available at t , $E_t[X_t | Z_t] = 0$. Since s_t is observed in all countries, Z_t may in principle include variables of all countries in the panel. However, to make tests of the theory more stringent, we will consider only Z_t variables which are specific to country j .

The theory of international risk sharing also imposes cross equation constraints across (11)-(13). A second implication of the theory is therefore that a transformation of the slope coefficient of the three moment conditions equals the ratio of the coefficients of relative risk aversion of the representative agents of the two countries. These restrictions are distinct from the basic orthogonality

conditions, independent of the chosen functional form for utility (see (5)-(7)) and provide a further and more stringent test of the theory. Finally, in our restricted setup, risk sharing implies that consumption correlations for any pair of countries should be perfect. This can be easily seen from (6) and (7) and the fact that $\text{cov}[\log U_{c_{rt}}^k, \log U_{c_{rt-q}}^k] = \text{cov}[\log U_{c_{rt}}^j, \log U_{c_{rt-q}}^j] \forall q$. This restriction is independent of the functional form for the utility, but not independent of the other restrictions imposed by the theory.

The three implications we have derived are robust to modifications of several assumptions of the model. For example, we can relax the assumption that there is only one good in the model. As long as there is complete specialization, i.e. country j receives an endowment of good j only, pairs of aggregate consumption still satisfy (3), and given our CRRA specification for utility, the implications we derived still hold. However, when there are multiple goods country specific disturbances change the terms of trade and these changes may automatically pool national risk. For example, in Cole and Obstfeld (1991) a technology shock induces, other things being equal, a negative relationship between terms of trade and output. We could further relax the exchange economy setup, assume that production requires capital goods from one or more countries and still generate the same three empirical implications we have obtained in the simplest setup (see Cole and Obstfeld (1991)).

The empirical implications we have derived are also qualitatively robust to the assumption of a representative agent in each country. If there is some heterogeneity within each country one can in fact assume that the planner maximizes a weighted average of the expected utility of the median voter of each country (as in Persson and Tabellini (1992)) and obtain, once again, condition (3). If (8) and (9) are the instantaneous utility function of the median voter with $b_t^j = b, \forall t, j$, then (11)-(13) still hold but now ξ_1 is a function of the characteristics of the median voter of countries j and k .

It is useful to ask whether it makes any difference for the restrictions we have derived if y_t contains both an idiosyncratic and an aggregate component. Since (3) is obtained without any reference to the stochastic process for income, it holds under alternative assumptions on the properties of the idiosyncratic and of the aggregate component of income. Therefore, in our simple setup and given the auxiliary assumptions made, risk sharing implies that domestic consumption should react to total world income not to individual income or to any of the two components of individual income (see also Crucini (1994)).

To make the exposition concrete we let b_t^j represent leisure. To make the problem meaningful we abandon the pure exchange setup and assume that y_t^j is produced with domestic labor according to $y_{jt} = f_t^j(1 - L_{jt})$ where $(1 - L_{jt})$ is the amount of labor used in country j . f_t^j is time varying because of a country specific technology disturbance and satisfies standard regularity conditions. Let the instantaneous utility function be:

$$U[c_t^j(s_{\tau t}), b_t^j(s_{\tau t})] = \frac{1}{1 - \sigma_j} ((c_t^j)^{\gamma_j} (L_t^j)^{1 - \gamma_j})^{1 - \sigma_j} \quad \text{if } \sigma_j \neq 1 \quad \forall j \quad (19)$$

$$U[c_t^j(s_{\tau t}), b_t^j(s_{\tau t})] = \log(c_t^j) + A^j \log(L_t^j) \quad \text{if } \sigma_j = 1 \quad \forall j \quad (20)$$

where γ_j represents the share of consumption in the utility function of country j . Manipulation of the two first order conditions, yields that $\hat{X}_t = [\hat{x}_{1t}, \hat{x}_{2t}, \hat{x}_{3t}]$, defined as:

$$\hat{x}_{1t} = \log c_t^j - \log c_t^k - \log L_t^j + \log L_t^k - \log f_{jt}' + \log f_{kt}' - B_{jk} \quad (21)$$

$$\hat{x}_{2t} = (\log c_t^j)^2 - (\log c_t^k)^2 - (\log L_t^j)^2 + (\log L_t^k)^2 - (\log f_{jt}')^2 + (\log f_{kt}')^2 \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}_{3t} &= \sqrt{(\log c_t^j)^2 (\log c_t^k)^2} - \text{corr}(\log(c_t^j), \log(c_t^k)) (\log c_t^j)^{-2} \\ &\quad - \log(c_t^j)^{-1} [(\log L_t^j) - (\log L_t^k) + (\log f_{jt}') - (\log f_{kt}')] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

should be unpredictable given the information available at t , where f_{jt}' is the marginal product of labor in country j and where $B_{jk} = \log \frac{(1 - \gamma_k)}{\gamma_k} - \log \frac{(1 - \gamma_j)}{\gamma_j} + \log \frac{\Phi_k}{\Phi_j}$. The modified condition for international insurance states that differences in the moments of consumption profiles across countries should be matched by differences in the moments of leisure and productivity profiles. No other variable should be important in predicting differences in aggregate consumption across countries. Once again, while there are cross equation constraints, it is no longer true in this setup that cross country consumption correlations are perfect.

2.3 Empirical Issues

In both extensions we have presented and when utility is time nonseparable, testing international consumption risk sharing using only private aggregate consumption data to construct X_t is valid as long as the instruments are judiciously chosen. In other words, if an econometrician omits variables which are stochastic and either nonseparable with consumption in the utility function, or enter in the computation of the optimal planner rule or help to predict these variables, she may reject full risk sharing even if it holds true. For example, when tradables and non-tradables are nonseparable in the utility function, variables like domestic income or domestic production may be significant

in predicting X_t because they may be correlated with consumption of non-tradables in country j (as noted e.g., by Dellas and Stockman (1989)). Similarly, domestic income is a poor instrument if government consumption enters the utility function, in particular, when government expenditure accounts for a large portion of GDP: lagged consumption may help to predict cross country differences if preferences are time nonseparable in consumption; finally variables correlated with the marginal product of labor may be significant in explaining differences in private consumption across countries if leisure is a choice variable.

Because we want to examine the implications of the theory in its simplest form and interpret deviation from full risk sharing when they arise we proceed in two steps: first, we exclude all these variables from the Z_t vector and examine whether the basic implications of the theory hold. Second, if the theory is rejected we add them to the instruments to see if their omission is responsible for the results. If not, misspecification of the nonseparable effects in preferences is unlikely to be the cause of the rejection of the theory.

There are three further empirical issues, all having to do with the selection of the Z_t vector, which need to be addressed before the tests are undertaken. The first concerns the presence of measurement error in consumption. It is very likely that the properties of the measurement error in consumption differ across countries given the variety of collection procedures employed and this may generate serially correlated measurement errors in X_t . In this case, care must be exercised in selecting the Z_t 's because testing may be invalid if the instruments are mismeasured and the error is correlated with the measurement error in X_t .

For example, if measurement errors in consumption are highly serially correlated but uncorrelated across countries, lagged consumption may not be a valid instrument even when the theory in its simplest form holds. Similarly, current GDP may not be a valid instrument since its measurement error may be highly correlated with the measurement error in domestic consumption (see also Cochrane (1991)). To reduce the extent of the serial correlation in the measurement errors one can consider instruments sufficiently lagged in the past. This procedure has however the disadvantage of also reducing the power of the test since the correlation of the instruments with the current marginal utility of consumption will also be smaller. An alternative approach, which will reduce the importance of measurement error without necessarily affecting the power of the tests, is to use as instruments the component of Z_t which is unexplained by past values of Z_t . To see why this may solve the problem suppose that measurement error is the same for all variables in a given country.

it is stationary and it is serially correlated over time. Then $T^{-1} \sum_t X_t Z_{t-m} \rightarrow 0$ only as $m \rightarrow \infty$. However, $T^{-1} \sum_t X_t \hat{Z}_{t-m}$ where $\hat{Z}_{t-m} = Z_{t-m} - E[Z_{t-m} | I_{t-m}]$, where I_t is the information set at t , is likely to be zero even for small m since the constant and common component of the measurement error is purged, to some extent, from the instruments. Using \hat{Z}_t in place of Z_t may also be more consistent with the idea that the logarithm of the marginal utility of domestic consumption is insensitive to idiosyncratic *shocks* (see Mace (1991) or Townsend (1994)). Comparing the results obtained with \hat{Z}_t and Z_t as instruments may therefore shed light on some of the properties of these measurement errors.

As we have already stressed, in our setup the planner does not reallocate wealth along the equilibrium path. To examine the empirical counterpart of the theory we therefore need to abstract from redistributive considerations. That is to say, variables correlated with wealth differences across pairs of countries should be excluded from the Z_t vector as they are likely to be correlated with cross country differences in consumption profiles. As this exclusion may substantially reduce the dimensionality of the Z_t vector, one can alternatively restrict attention to those Z_t 's which may reflect idiosyncratic *cyclical* fluctuations. One way to insure that this is the case is to transform the data into a stationary form. Apart from theoretical considerations, stationarity of X_t and Z_t is also needed by our estimation and testing methodology.

The third issue concerns how to induce stationarity in the data. Since there are many detrending procedures which make a time series stationary, one may consider whether the choice of detrending affects the conclusions. There are various reasons for why this could happen. For example, it may be the case that short term fluctuations are easier to insure than fluctuations that have a more permanent nature since the latter may signal structural imbalances and the possibility of debt repudiation. Alternatively, it may well be the case that measurement errors are more important at some frequencies than others (e.g. growth rates are easier to measure than levels). For this reason we detrend the data with three methods: linear detrending (LT), Hodrick and Prescott filtering (HP) and first order differencing (FOD). Canova (1993) has demonstrated that these detrending methods leave stationary cycles in the data with an average periodicity of less than 3 years for FOD, between 4-6 years for HP and 7-10 years for LT. By using three different methods we are therefore able to investigate whether risk sharing occur at some or all frequencies of the spectrum¹. To illustrate these characteristics of the filters, we plot in figure 1 the three cyclical components

¹It is useful to stress that an approach that separates the information by frequency shares some similarities with "band spectrum regression" technique of Engle (1974), and with the procedure used in Canova and Dellas (1993).

obtained by applying the three detrending methods to US consumption data. An alternative view about this topic is that certain detrending methods are optimal given a particular generating process for the data (see e.g. King and Rebelo (1993)). Accordingly, the use of a particular filter may lead to distortions if applied to a series for which it is not optimal (e.g. the application of HP filter to random walk data in Harvey and Jaeger (1993)). However, to proceed this way one has to assume that the investigator knows the DGP of the series, an assumption we are reluctant to make given the size of the available data and existing econometric techniques.

To test the three implications of the theory we will employ a GMM methodology. To check for the unpredictability of X_t we examine whether the coefficients of a regression of X_t on the instruments are all zero using a J-test. To test the validity of the cross equation constraints, we take unrestricted GMM estimates of the slope coefficients of the three moment conditions and test their equality using a Wald test. Finally, to examine whether cross country consumption correlations are perfect we employ a t-test using a Fisher Z-transform of the estimated correlations implicit in the slope coefficient of X_{3t} and their standard deviations.

We conduct our investigation using a panel consisting of 9 OECD countries: Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and USA and test the restrictions on a country-pair basis. This strategy minimizes the chance of incorrect inferences due to anomalies associated with one specific country and gives more power to the tests. The countries were selected because they are structurally homogeneous and because they are the only ones with consistent quarterly data for a sufficiently long span of time.

As a measure of consumption we use the natural logarithm of total real aggregate consumption per-capita. Total consumption may not be an ideal measure for our exercises, especially if there are persistent cross country differences in the components of aggregate consumption (such as services, which account for a large portion of nontraded goods). Nevertheless, there are serious problems in obtaining disaggregated data and if one wants to restrict attention to only nondurables and services or exclude non-tradables from consumption data, the panel of countries must be drastically reduced. In addition, there is no a-priori reason to expect that the use of more disaggregated data would reduce misspecification. If risk sharing is associated with consumption of nondurables and services or tradables and the utility function is separable between various categories of consumption goods, it is appropriate to use a consumption measure that excludes durables and nontradables.

where one computes the average coherence between pairs of series in a selected frequency band and checks whether the value of the statistic over the band can be related to interesting variables.

However, if the utility function is nonseparable between various types of goods, then excluding durables or nontradables would cause distortions. Finally, it has to be kept in mind that cross country differences in measurement errors are likely to be more serious the more disaggregated is the consumption data used. As instruments in the tests we use proxies for real, fiscal, monetary and demographic variables. The sources of the data, its definition and its sample availability are described in the appendix.

2.4 A Comparison with the Existing literature

Although the theory of consumption insurance is a quarter of a century old (see e.g. Wilson (1968)) relatively few *formal* empirical investigations of the implications of the insurance proposition have been conducted. Mace (1991), Cochrane (1991) and Townsend (1994) have investigated whether agents respond to aggregate but not to idiosyncratic shocks. Mace and Townsend use individual income as a measure of idiosyncratic shocks and investigate whether individuals react to individual income using pooled time series cross sectional regressions. Cochrane employs a number of individual characteristics to capture idiosyncratic shocks and test whether variations in consumption are related to changes in these individual characteristics using a cross-section approach. All authors find some evidence of pooling of idiosyncratic shocks, but they also find that there are many sources of individual risk (such as long illnesses or long unemployment spells) which can not be insured. There are two major differences between our approach and theirs. First, we test risk sharing employing time series observations for a sufficiently long time span (Townsend attempted to do the same but had only 10 annual observations per individual household). Second, we use different estimation and testing techniques.

Asdrubali, Sorensen and Yosha (1995) have examined the extent of regional risk sharing in the US in an ingenious way. Instead of testing whether allocations are optimal, their work aims at examining how much of the time series variance of state income is insured by factor mobility, government transfers and credit markets. They find that the first two channels insure a substantial portion of statewide GDP fluctuations. Crucini (1994), on the other hand, examines the extent of risk sharing in US and in Canadian provinces by allowing consumers to invest in a world mutual fund. The regression coefficient of provincial consumption on this mutual fund measures the extent of risk pooling needed to achieve full insurance, with zero indicating perfect risk sharing and one complete autarky. As Atkeson and Bayoumi (1993), he finds that there is insurance but it is far from perfect.

At an international level, and to the best of our knowledge, only Obstfeld (1989), (1993), Lewis (1993) and Kollman (1995) have formally examined the implications of risk sharing. Obstfeld (1989) tests uncovered interest parity in an attempt to measure the extent of capital mobility across countries and Obstfeld (1993) tests implication (11) of risk sharing as a way to gauge the completeness of the international financial markets. Kollman (1995), on the other hand, examines the implications of complete and incomplete markets for consumption and the real exchange rate in the short and long run. Because completeness of financial markets is only a sufficient but not necessary condition for full insurance to take place their tests are not completely comparable to ours. Finally, Lewis exploits cross sectional information to examine whether domestic consumption varies with domestic income once world income is included in the regression. The results of these investigations are mixed: they detect some evidence of financial market incompleteness but they also find that risk sharing has increased after 1973. Because our model specification, estimation technique, testing approach, data set and panel employed differ from theirs, our investigation provides an alternative and complementary attempt to evaluate the optimality of international consumption allocations.

3 The results

3.1 Business Cycle Implications

3.1.1 Testing the Orthogonality Conditions

Table 1 presents the basic results of our investigation. It reports the significance level (in percentage terms) of a J -test for the overidentifying restrictions implied by risk sharing when we jointly use the three moment conditions (11)-(13). The first panel of the table presents results for LT detrended data, the second for HP detrended data and the third for FOD detrended data. The instruments we employ are a constant, lagged domestic outputs, lagged domestic population and lagged domestic prices. This means that when we consider, e.g., the Australia-Canada pair, the instruments are a constant and lagged Australian output, population and prices. We only use lagged values of the instruments in order to minimize endogeneity problems, which are primarily present with output data, and mismeasurement problems, which may arise when the measurement error in the instruments is contemporaneously correlated with the measurement error in consumption. In all cases we apply the same detrending transformation to consumption data and to the instruments. That is, if we linearly detrend consumption, we also linearly detrend the instruments. This makes

the cross frequency comparison more appropriate and allows us to address the question of the comovements between consumption and the instruments at various frequencies.

Two main results stand out from table 1. First, aggregate domestic consumption covaries with some of the instruments. Second, the strength of the association depends on the length of the cycle considered. In particular, the three orthogonality conditions are never rejected for short cycles (FOD detrended data), are rejected in approximately one-third of the cases for medium cycles (HP detrended data) and are rejected in all but three cases for long cycles (LT detrended data). Therefore, there appears to be more support for the hypothesis that consumption allocations across countries are optimal the shorter are the fluctuations in consumption we examine. When we ask which of the instruments is responsible for the rejection of the orthogonality conditions over medium-long cycles, we find that domestic consumption covaries primarily with demographic variables. This is not entirely surprising since the tests are performed with per-capita consumption data and population, which is highly serially correlated within each country, does not comove over the medium long run across the nine countries.

Since casual empiricism suggests that full risk sharing should be rejected, one may be inclined to believe that the results obtained with FOD and the majority of HP detrended data are dubious. In support of this one can claim that (the log of) aggregate consumption is well approximated by a random walk. That is, the cyclical component of aggregate consumption extracted with a FOD filter is, for most practical purposes, unpredictable given available information. Therefore, tests conducted with FOD detrended data tell us nothing about risk sharing. Similarly, since consumption is very smooth over medium cycles, variables with large cyclical fluctuations like output and prices are unlikely to be significant in explaining the time series properties of X_t . In this case the tests conducted with HP detrended data are weak: the orthogonality conditions will not be rejected frequently, since the chosen variables are not useful in predicting consumption movements over medium cycles.

We do not give much credence to these arguments for at least three reasons. First, the spectrum of FOD detrended consumption in many countries does not resemble the flat spectrum of a white noise. Second, the estimated coefficient on foreign aggregate consumption is significant in almost half of the cases when FOD detrended data is used so that the growth rate of consumption is not completely unpredictable. Third, foreign aggregate consumption always has a significant coefficient and both output and prices are significant in some cases when HP detrended data is used. In

conclusion, it is incorrect to establish a direct relationship between the rejection of the risk sharing hypothesis and the univariate time series properties of consumption.

A second and related argument which may lead us to doubt the results obtained with FOD detrended data has to do with the type of consumption data we are using. Recall that because of data constraints, we are forced to use total aggregate consumption in testing international risk sharing. If consumer durables respond more to permanent fluctuations in the instruments, the high frequency results we obtained are spurious. In other words, if important components of total aggregate consumption have some durability aspect, aggregate consumption will be acyclical over short cycles but will react to the state of the economy when the length of the fluctuations increases. While this fact constitutes a matter of concern, we believe it does not satisfactorily explain the phenomena because the pattern of cross-frequency results is robust to the choice of country pair despite the fact that the durable component of total consumption is not very homogeneous across countries.

A third argument which may lead us to doubt the results obtained with FOD and HP detrended data is the possibility that measurement errors are more of a problem at the higher frequencies of the spectrum. This could be the case, for example, if the collection of higher frequency data involves substantial costs. In this situation the results we obtain with FOD (and to some extent HP) detrended data are spurious since X_t may be highly contaminated by large and unpredictable measurement errors. We find this explanation somewhat more appealing but also difficult to quantify. As mentioned in section 2.3 we can get some grasp of the properties of the measurement errors present by employing \hat{Z}_t , the unpredictable component of Z_t , in testing the orthogonality conditions. Because shocks in Z_t are exogenous to agents' information set, they are more likely to be uncorrelated with the measurement error in X_t .

Table 2 presents the significance level of the J-test for the overidentifying restrictions using the three moment conditions (11)-(13) and a constant, current and lagged *shocks* to real, demographic and nominal domestic variables as instruments. Shocks are constructed as the residuals of a VAR(4) on domestic output, domestic population and domestic prices. The message of table 2 is very strong: no matter how we detrend the data we always fail to reject the orthogonality conditions. Therefore, if measurement error exists it is likely to be stronger at low frequencies and more correlated across domestic variables than across consumption of different countries.

3.1.2 Assessing the Relevance of Misspecifications

To try and further understand why the orthogonality conditions are rejected at some frequencies but not others, we have conducted several experiments designed to check for three possible sources of misspecification. First, we want to study whether misspecification of the empirical relationship can explain the pattern of results of table 1. The tests we have conducted so far examine the implications of the theory in its simplest form. As we argued, in more complicated setups international risk sharing implies that consumption across countries should be proportional after accounting for factors which are nonseparable in utility with consumption. If these factors are correlated with the instruments we used, the rejections we observe at low and medium frequencies may be the result of the misspecification of the orthogonality conditions. Prime candidates to enter the computation of the orthogonality conditions are government expenditure, if it partially substitutes for private consumption in utility, employment, if utility is nonseparable in consumption and leisure, and lagged consumption, if utility is time nonseparable in consumption. We investigate their relevance for patterns of rejections by adding them to the set of instruments. If empirical misspecification is the reason for the rejection of the orthogonality conditions, some of these new instruments should have significant coefficients. Surprisingly, none of the instruments appears to be relevant. Particularly important are the results concerning government consumption expenditure, which, for the nine countries we consider, is essentially acyclical. This may signal the lack of direct programs aimed at insuring private consumption through automatic movements in government expenditure and is in contrast with some of the results of Christiano and Eichenbaum (1992), who suggest that government expenditure is an important determinant of cyclical fluctuations in aggregate consumption in the US. In conclusion, misspecification of the X_t vector does not appear to be the reason for rejections obtained at the low frequencies of the spectrum.

Second, we are interested in knowing whether the results we have obtained depend on the choice of instruments or on some of the auxiliary assumptions made. To examine these possibilities we checked whether the timing of the instruments is important, conducting tests using current and lagged instruments and adding income to the instruments. Since current values of the instruments may be endogenous, it is possible that this may amplify the significance of measurement error. Therefore, this set of tests may further shed light on whether endogeneity and measurement errors are the primary reasons for the rejections. In addition, to examine whether the choice of variables is important, we have modified our proxies for real, demographic and monetary instruments and

included net exports among the instruments. To check whether a country specific effect mattered for the results we also omitted a constant in constructing X_{1t} . Finally, to examine whether the sample period mattered, we excluded from the tests observations prior to 1974. The results of table 1 appear to be very robust: none of the main qualitative conclusions is affected by any of our modifications and even quantitatively results are fairly similar.

Third, we would like to know if the pattern of rejections is sensitive to the choice of functional form for the utility of the representative agent. So far we have used a CRRA specification and it may be that a (locally) quadratic utility function is more appropriate (see e.g. Townsend (1994)). With quadratic utility, international consumption risk sharing implies that the cyclical component of consumption (as opposed to the cyclical component of the logarithm of consumption) should be proportional across countries. In contrast to Mace (1991), we find that the pattern of rejections of the orthogonality conditions is not sensitive to such respecification.

In summary, none of modifications we tried changed the essence of the results. With caveats concerning possible differential features of measurement error at different frequencies, the results indicate that risk sharing is strong at high frequencies of the spectrum, exists to some extent at standard business cycle frequencies and appears to be lacking at low frequencies. The question of interest is whether this finding can be rationalized with economic arguments. One could be that the longer is the average period of the fluctuation in consumption, the harder countries will find it to insure them since longer fluctuations may signal structural imbalances which would require wealth redistribution rather than risk sharing. Marcet and Marimon (1992) showed that in an economy with participation constraints agents will be able to insure only short run fluctuations so that domestic consumption will track permanent income in the medium-long run. It may be argued that the countries of the panel may not really qualify as countries for which the participation constraint is binding. However, debt repudiation need not ever occur as contracts are written so that countries will never find it optimal to repudiate. A version of the informationally constrained model analyzed by Phelan and Townsend (1991) may also lead to risk sharing in the short but not long run. Therefore, it may well be the case that, given existing institutions, short run fluctuations are much easier to insure than more persistent ones.

3.1.3 Testing the Cross-equation Restrictions

As discussed in section 2, the theory of international risk sharing implies, apart from orthogonality conditions, a set of cross equation constraints on the slopes of (11)-(13). These constraints can be used to perform an alternative and somewhat stronger test of the theory: the previous subsections examined if X_t can be predicted by the instruments. Here we check whether the three moment conditions contain the same information.

The results of the Wald tests are very strong. Regardless of the instruments used, the country pair and the length of the cycles considered, the cross equation constraints are always rejected. Hence, although there were instances where X_t appears to be unpredictable, we reject the stronger implication that the information contained in (11)-(13) is the same.

To gain some intuition on the reasons for this sound rejection, we examine whether estimates of the slope coefficient are sensitive to measurement errors in the instruments. Table 3 presents point estimates of the slopes obtained with (12) and their standard errors using basic Z_t or their unpredictable component. We present estimates obtained with (12) because they are more reasonable as they are constrained to be positive. Point estimates of these slopes obtained with the other two moment conditions appear in an appendix available on request. To provide an intuitive meaning to the estimates we present values obtained when one of the countries is the US. Because for the specification we tested the slopes should measure the ratio of CRRA coefficients of the representative agent of the two countries and because more is known about the CRRA parameter for US consumers, this approach may help to gauge the risk characteristics of the representative consumer of various countries. For example, looking at the first line of table 3, the Australian representative agent is as risk averse as the American one with LT detrended data (1.006), slightly more risk averse with HP data (1.282) and slightly less with FOD data (0.819) when standard instruments are used to estimate the slope.

The impression that one gets from table 3 is that, in general, the representative agent of half of the countries are less risk averse than the representative agent in the US. Moreover, estimates obtained with the two types of instruments are not statistically different. On the other hand, estimates appear to vary with the length of the fluctuation considered. Since the CRRA coefficients are among the deep parameters of the model, one would hope that slope estimates are invariant across frequencies. We tested this formally using a Wald test with mixed results. Except for France, Switzerland and the UK, estimates of the ratio of CRRA coefficients obtained with LT and FOD are

not significantly different. On the other hand, except for the case of UK and Switzerland, estimates of the ratio of CRRA coefficients obtained with HP and FOD are significantly different. Finally, estimates of the ratio of CRRA coefficients obtained with HP and LT are significantly different in all cases. As a qualification, one should note that even though the null hypothesis is rejected, the range of estimates obtained is economically small, except perhaps for Switzerland.

Obstfeld (1989) has also provided estimates of the risk aversion parameter for the US, Germany and Japan and found that over the sample 1961-1985 they are significantly different from each other, while over two subsamples (1961-1972, 1973-1985) they are not. The point estimates he reports are comparable to ours but the standard errors are very different: Obstfeld's estimated standard errors are in fact 100 times larger than ours. This indicates that the instruments he chose may contain little information to gauge the risk characteristics of the three countries.

3.1.4 Examining the Magnitude of Consumption Correlations

As we have discussed at length in section 2, cross country correlations need not be perfect even when risk sharing is perfect. However, the results we have obtained so far imply that nonseparabilities between consumption and other factors in utility, if they exist, are not particularly important so that, apart from measurement errors, consumption profiles should be perfectly correlated across countries. Clearly, the rejection of the cross equation restrictions suggests that consumption correlations are unlikely to be perfect. However, it may still be of interest to examine the size of the correlations implicit in the estimated slope of (13) first, to formally test whether they are different from one and, second, to assess whether their magnitude may explain some of the differences between our results and existing work.

Table 4 presents the estimated correlation and their standard errors when Z_t includes a constant, lagged domestic output, prices and population. Three major facts stand out. First, estimated correlations are significantly different from one in almost all cases, regardless of the length of cycle considered. This finding confirms the informal analyses of Backus, Kehoe and Kydland (1992) and Devereux, Gregory and Smith (1992). Second, consumption correlations are stronger for pairs of EEC countries, a result which suggests that countries with closer economic ties may also have more efficient risk sharing mechanisms. Third, consumption correlations obtained when the UK is one of the countries are negative with LT detrended data, a result which suggests the presence of high durability content in UK consumption data (see also Blackburn and Ravn (1992)).

3.2 Long Run Implications

The risk sharing proposition is an appropriate idealization to describe a mechanism which insures cross-country aggregate consumption from domestic *cyclical* fluctuations. However, it is possible to investigate the risk sharing proposition even when country specific fluctuations have a permanent component, so long as it is common to all countries. In this case the theory requires (i) that the aggregate consumption profile of pairs of countries should move together in the long run (i.e., the vector X_t must be stationary) and (ii) that the error in predicting the logarithm of the marginal utility of consumption of country j , given the logarithm of the marginal utility of consumption of country k , should be unpredictable using long run characteristics of country j . Note that, even if the long run component of consumption differs across countries, a certain type of risk sharing may still take place, but, as pointed out in the literature (see Melitz and Vori (1992)), it involves a permanent system of transfers across countries.

An analysis of the long run implications of international risk sharing may also shed some light on a related issue which is of interest to macroeconomists. Following the permanent income tradition, it is typical to identify the permanent component of income with the long run behavior of consumption (see e.g. Quah (1990)). Our analysis may therefore shed light on the relationship among permanent incomes of different countries and on the issue of convergence of national incomes, a topic which has received substantial attention in the current growth literature (see e.g. Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1992)).

We first examine the implication that X_t is stationary. This is a very weak implication since it does not involve the additional restriction of unpredictability given country specific characteristics. To test this restriction we retain the assumption that the instantaneous utility is of CRRA type, that the marginal utility of consumption is independent of factors other than consumption and examine whether X_t contains a unit root. We conduct tests for integration and cointegration in aggregate consumption data using Phillips and Perron's (1986) Z-test² and we find that we cannot reject the hypothesis that aggregate consumption is an I(1) variable, except for Switzerland. For each pair of countries for which consumption is I(1), we run a regression like $\log c_{jt} = a + b * \log c_{kt} + \epsilon_{jt}$

²For sensitivity we also conducted tests using the Dickey and Fuller (1981) and Stock and Watson (1989) tests. The three procedures produce the same answer for all series except for French private consumption where the Stock and Watson test rejects the null of a unit root. We also experimented with different lag augmentations and also excluded the linear trend from the regression but this change did not alter in any way the essence of the results. Tables with the results are available on request from the authors.

and check if the residuals are stationary³. Table 5, panel A reports the largest (in absolute value) t-statistics over possible lag augmentations (up to a maximum of 10 lags), and the lag value at which it occurs. The results show that the regression error appears to contain a unit root in many cases. The exceptions are the pairs Australia-Japan, Japan-France, Australia-France in addition to few borderline cases. Hence, consumption patterns tend to permanently diverge and even this weaker restrictions implied by risk sharing in the long run is generally unsupported.

For those pairs of countries for which X_t appears to be stationary we next examine whether it is unpredictable. Table 5, panel B reports the results of the J-test. We find that risk sharing is rejected in the long run in all cases and that domestic consumption covaries in the long run with all domestic instruments. Two interesting conclusions can be derived from these results. First, contrary to the implications of the basic neoclassical growth model and, consistent with the findings of Canova and Marcet (1995), permanent incomes across countries show little signs of convergence. Second, if any insurance scheme is in place in the long run, it must involve a permanent redistribution of income across countries.

4 Conclusions

In this paper we have formally analyzed international aspects of the theory of risk sharing. We showed that risk sharing is a property of optimal international consumption allocations in a wide variety of theoretical setups and empirically examined three testable implications of the theory. We find that aggregate domestic consumption covaries with demographic variables once foreign consumption is taken into account over long but not over medium-short cycles. In addition, we find evidence indicating that measurement errors present in both consumption data and in the instruments may be responsible for these results. We strongly reject the other two implications of the theory, namely the cross equation constraints and the implication that consumption correlations are perfect and show that little risk sharing appears in the long run. As a by-product of the analysis, we have provided novel estimates of the CRRA coefficients for the representative agent of the countries in the panel (relative to the US), which can be used by researchers interested in calibrating international business cycle models.

³Because of the poor quality of consumption data and the relative short sample available we also considered an approach which imposes that pairs of consumption series are cointegrated with cointegrating vectors $[1, -1]$ (so that all countries have the same attitude toward risk) and examine whether or not the residuals display a unit root. Although some of the results change, the basic message of the exercise is maintained.

Our results are, overall, in agreement with those of Obstfeld (1993), Atkeson and Bayoumi (1993), Lewis (1993) and Kollman (1995). We find some evidence of risk sharing in international consumption data, but contrary to them, we are also able to distinguish which of the implications of the theory is at odds with the data. Our conclusions are also in line with those of Backus, Kydland and Kehoe (1992) and Devereux, Gregory and Smith (1992). We find that consumption correlations are both statistically and economically different from one but also that they are higher among European countries suggesting that more risk sharing is taking place in the EEC.

Although the analysis we have conducted did not specify the market structure supporting the optimal allocations, there are at least two implications of our results which are useful in designing mechanisms intended to implement optimal allocations. Our analysis has shown that, whatever they are, existing market structures are able to shield domestic consumption from business cycle shocks in the short run (recall that government consumption expenditure does not play a major insurance role). This result seems to question the need of government intervention both in terms of providing automatic stabilizers in the economy and new institutions which may help the economies to achieve optimal allocations. However, this statement needs two qualifications. First, the countries we examined are among the most industrialized of the world and for some of them temporary labor migrations or semi-permanent remittance programs from emigrants or other individual schemes may have created strong insurance which need not to be present for other OECD countries or even less for LDC countries. Second, because domestic aggregate consumption covaries with some domestic variables over cycles of 8-10 years, there is room to improve the quality of consumption allocations by designing institutions (or opening markets) which insure agents against this type of fluctuation. However, insuring fluctuations of longer average period may have marked redistributive effects.

A second issue which is of interest concerns the integration of domestic financial markets into a world market and its effect on domestic business cycle fluctuations. Our results suggest that the opening of foreign financial markets to domestic consumers may improve welfare even though the gains may be small given that existing structures offer sufficient insurance against the most interesting sources of domestic business cycle fluctuations. Hence, the prospective integration of European financial markets and the current globalization of security markets need not bring substantial changes in the features of domestic consumption fluctuations.

Data Appendix

The data we use is taken from Datastream. Consumption measures aggregate private consumption expenditure on nondurables, durables and services. It is transformed into a per-capita series by dividing the original series by population. Because data on population is annual, quarterly data are obtained by taking the predicted values of an AR(3) regression fitted to a dummy quarterly series, constructed assigning the annual value to each of the four quarters. Government data measures current government expenditure except in the case of Australia where also gross government fixed investment is included. Income data measures gross domestic product (GDP) except for Japan, US and West Germany where it measures gross national product (GNP). All data is in real terms. The base year however, differs across countries. For Australia, Italy, Japan, UK, and West Germany the base is 1985, for France and Switzerland the base is 1980, for Canada the base is 1986 and for the US the base is 1987. All variables are measured in annual rates. Employment data is not completely compatible since it measures different aggregates in different countries. The series used measure total employment in Canada, Italy, Japan, Switzerland, UK, USA, West Germany, employment on the payroll in Australia and civilian employment in France. Because some of these series are non-seasonally adjusted, we deseasonalize them by using an exponential smoothing procedure. UK employment data are the same as those employed by Blackburn and Ravn (1992). Finally, the price data measures the implicit price deflator for GNP (or GDP).

The sample we have available covers the period 1960.1-1991.4 for Australia, Canada, United Kingdom, USA and Germany; the period 1965.1-1991.4 for Japan; the period 1967.1-1991.4 for Switzerland; and the period 1970.1-1991.4 for France and Italy. The tests are constructed using the shortest of the two data samples for each pair.

References

- [1] Asdrubali, P., Sorensen, B. and Yosha, O. (1995). "Channels of Interstate Risk Sharing: US 1963-1990". Brown University, working paper 95-13.
- [2] Atkeson, A. (1991), "International Lending with Moral Hazard and Risk of Repudiation", *Econometrica*, 59, 1069-1084.
- [3] Atkeson, A. and Bayoumi, T. (1993). "Do Private Capital Markets Insure Regional Risk? Evidence from the United States and Europe", *Open Economies Review*, 4, 303-354.
- [4] Backus, D., Kehoe, P. (1992), "Historical Properties of Business Cycles", *American Economic Review*, 82, 864-888.
- [5] Backus, D., Kehoe, P. and Kydland, F. (1992). "International Real Business Cycles", *Journal of Political Economy*, 101, 745-775.
- [6] Backus, D., Kehoe, P. and Kydland, F. (1995). "International Business Cycles: Theory and Evidence", T. Cooley, ed., *Frontiers of Business Cycle Research*, Princeton University Press.
- [7] Barro, R. and Şala-i-Martin, X. (1992). "Convergence", *Journal of Political Economy*, 101, 233-252.
- [8] Baxter, M. and Crucini, M. (1993). "Explaining Saving-Investment Correlations", *American Economic Review*, 83, 416-436.
- [9] Baxter, M. and Crucini, M. (1995). "Business Cycles and the Asset Structure of Foreign Trade", forthcoming, *International Economic Review*.
- [10] Benhabib, J., Rogerson, R. and Wright, R. (1992). "Homework in Macroeconomics II: Aggregate Fluctuations", *Journal of Political Economy*, 99, 1166-1187
- [11] Blackburn, K. and Ravn, M. (1992). "Business Cycles in the UK: Facts and Fictions", *Economica*, 59, 383-401.
- [12] Canova, F. (1993). "Detrending and Business Cycle Facts", CEPR working paper 781.
- [13] Canova, F. and Dellas, H.. (1993). "Trade Interdependences and International Business Cycle", *Journal of International Economics*, 34, 23-48.
- [14] Canova, F. and Marcet, A. (1995). "The Poor Stay Poor: Non-convergence across Countries and Regions", manuscript.
- [15] Cochrane, J. (1991). "A Simple Test of Consumption Insurance", *Journal of Political Economy*, 99, 957-976.
- [16] Cole, H. and Obstfeld, M. (1991). "Commodity Trade and International Risk Sharing: How Much Do Financial Markets Matter?", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 28, 3-24.
- [17] Constantinides, G. (1991). "Habit Formation: A Resolution of the Equity Premium Puzzle", *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, 519-543.
- [18] Crucini, M. (1994), "On the International and National Dimension of Risk Sharing", manuscript, Ohio State University.
- [19] Devereux, M., Gregory, A. and Smith, G. (1991). "Realistic Cross Country Consumption Correlations in a Two-Country, Equilibrium, Business Cycle Model", *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 11, 3-16.

- [20] Devereux, M., and Smith, G. (1991). "International Risk Sharing and Economic Growth". *International Economic Review*, 34, 535-550.
- [21] Dickey, D. and Fuller, W. (1979). "Distribution of the Estimators for a Autoregressive Time Series with a Unit Root". *Journal of The American Statistical Association*, 74, 424-431.
- [22] Duffie, D. and Huang, C.F. (1985). "Implementing Arrow-Debreu Equilibria by Continuous Trading of Few Long Lived Securities". *Econometrica*, 53, 1137-1356.
- [23] Engle, R. (1974), "Band Spectrum Regression". *International Economic Review*, 15, 1-11.
- [24] French, K. and Poterba, J.(1991) "Investors Diversification and International Equity Markets". *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, 81, 222-226.
- [25] Harvey, A. and Jaeger, (1993). "Detrending, Stylized Facts and the Business Cycle". *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 8, 231-247.
- [26] King, R. and Rebelo, S. (1993), "Low Frequency Filtering and Real Business Cycles. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 17, 207-231.
- [27] Kollman, R. (1995), "Consumption, Real Exchange Rates and the Structure of International Asset Markets". *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 14, 191-211.
- [28] Lewis, K. (1993) "What Can Explain the Apparent Lack of International Consumption Risk Sharing?". University of Pennsylvania, manuscript.
- [29] Lucas, R. (1982). "Interest Rates and Currency Prices in a Two Country World". *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 10, 335-360.
- [30] Mace, B. (1991). "Full Insurance in the Presence of Aggregate Uncertainty". *Journal of Political Economy*, 99, 928-956
- [31] Marcet, A. and Marimon, R. (1992). "Communication, Commitment and Growth". *Journal of Economic Theory*, 58, 219-249.
- [32] Marcet, A. and Singleton, K. (1992). "Equilibrium Asset Prices and Savings of Heterogeneous Agents in the Presence of Incomplete Markets and Portfolio Constraints". Universitat Pompeu Fabra, manuscript.
- [33] Melitz, J. and Vori, S. (1992). "National Insurance Against Unevenly Distributed Shocks in a European Monetary Union". INSEE manuscript.
- [34] Obstfeld, M. (1989). "How Integrated Are World Capital Markets? Some New Tests", in Calvo, G., et. al., *Debt, Stabilization and Development: Essays in the Memory of Carlos Diaz Alejandro*, Oxford, UK: Basic Blackwell.
- [35] Obstfeld, M. (1992). "International Risk Sharing and Capital Mobility: Another Look". *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 11, 115-121.
- [36] Obstfeld, M. (1993), "Are Industrial Country Consumption Risks Globally Diversified?". in L. Lederman and A. Razin, eds., *Capital Mobility: The Impact on Consumption, Investment and Growth*, Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press for the CEPR.
- [37] Obstfeld, M. (1994). "Risk Taking, Global Diversification and Growth". *American Economic Review*, 84, 1310-1330.
- [38] Padoa-Schioppa T. (1987). *Efficiency, Stability and Equity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- [39] Phelan, C. and Townsend, R. (1991). "Computing Multiperiod Information Constraint Optima". *Review of Economic Studies*, 58, 853-881.
- [40] Persson, T. and Tabellini, G. (1992). "Federal Fiscal Constitutions. Part I: Risk Sharing and Moral Hazard", CEPR working paper 728.
- [41] Phillips, P.C. and Perron, P. (1986). "Testing for Unit Roots in Time Series Regressions". *Biometrika*, 70, 335-346.
- [42] Quah, D. (1990). "Permanent and Transitory Movements in Labor Income: An Explanation Based on Excess Smoothness in Consumption". *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, 449-475.
- [43] Stock, J. and Watson, M. (1989). "Interpreting the Evidence on Money Income Causality". *Journal of Econometrics*, 40, 161-181.
- [44] Stockman, A. and Dellas, H. (1989). "International Portfolio Nondiversification and Exchange Rate Variability". *Journal of International Economics*, 26, 271-289.
- [45] Tesar, L. (1993). "International Risk Sharing and Nontraded Goods". *Journal of International Economics*, 35, 69-90.
- [46] Tesar, L. and Werner, I. (1993). "Home Bias and High Turnover". forthcoming. *Journal of International Money and Finance*.
- [47] Townsend, R. (1994). "Risk and Insurance in Village India". *Econometrica*, 62, 539-591.
- [48] van Wincoop, E. (1994). "Welfare Gains from International Risk Sharing". *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 34, 175-200.
- [49] Wilson, R. (1968). "The Theory of Syndicates". *Econometrica*, 36, 119-132.

Table 1
P-values (in percentages) for the test that $E[X_t|Z_t] = 0$:
Detrended Instruments

Linearly Detrended data									
	AUS	CAN	FRA	ITA	JAP	SWI	UK	US	WG
AUS		0.0143	0.0396	0.1008	0.0791	0.9778	0.0003	0.6023	6.3237
CAN			1.9655	0.0730	0.0131	2.9627	0.0001	0.0000	0.0079
FRA				1.7262	1.9468	6.2842	0.1165	0.5232	0.7088
ITA					0.2206	0.4928	0.8878	2.9091	0.2089
JAP						0.9912	0.0000	0.0161	0.9182
SWI							1.4268	7.5635	1.9050
UK								0.0041	0.0205
US									0.0090
HP Detrended data									
	AUS	CAN	FRA	ITA	JAP	SWI	UK	US	WG
AUS		0.8781	1.1076	12.965	10.040	25.763	7.2284	1.3623	14.541
CAN			15.918	3.3472	7.6228	4.2277	2.5303	0.8536	0.3313
FRA				8.8903	10.872	5.5677	7.3689	15.560	18.961
ITA					12.452	7.4112	3.4685	6.1406	74.793
JAP						16.439	5.1440	1.5182	40.020
SWI							27.766	14.668	14.614
UK								0.1582	4.2776
US									2.4461
FOD Detrended data									
	AUS	CAN	FRA	ITA	JAP	SWI	UK	US	WG
AUS		27.133	24.361	17.586	10.810	34.740	6.0590	51.467	15.893
CAN			74.914	48.487	48.610	15.277	34.339	92.790	18.617
FRA				15.146	49.769	38.609	62.368	43.603	59.375
ITA					18.040	12.192	6.2284	28.422	51.058
JAP						42.652	41.906	49.538	3.8762
SWI							26.881	54.242	39.708
UK								79.449	52.388
US									20.179

Notes: The table reports P-values for testing the hypothesis that X_t as defined in (11)-(13) can not be predicted using a vector Z_t consisting of a constant, domestic output, domestic prices and domestic population lagged one and two periods. Values in excess of 5.00 indicate failure to reject the null using a χ^2 test with 17 degrees of freedom.

Table 2
P-values (in percentages) for the test that $E[X_t|Z_t] = 0$:
Shock Instruments

Linearly Detrended data									
	AUS	CAN	FRA	ITA	JAP	SWI	UK	US	WG
AUS		81.9882	46.2925	97.6432	73.4789	65.6436	67.3339	65.1412	79.8557
CAN			65.6527	59.7208	42.5670	68.9452	21.3315	26.3213	42.7275
FRA				66.5922	44.5308	34.3820	24.6531	55.7311	31.3766
ITA					39.1124	53.3856	60.1932	37.9021	22.1858
JAP						74.5787	19.1094	93.1501	98.0725
SWI							25.9047	51.7344	10.1648
UK								2.9673	5.8525
US									3.0361
HP Detrended data									
	AUS	CAN	FRA	ITA	JAP	SWI	UK	US	WG
AUS		26.8775	44.3816	81.6847	2.9654	45.9652	29.9638	33.5965	20.1338
CAN			62.5038	75.9179	71.3667	65.4429	45.6255	50.0499	22.6597
FRA				58.9114	60.5837	32.4957	93.5456	56.5847	32.8338
ITA					60.0372	17.886	45.1379	33.8598	70.8611
JAP						52.9332	63.5244	15.1089	76.8317
SWI							54.5571	65.6172	76.2277
UK								50.3640	15.0141
US									10.7206
FOD Detrended data									
	AUS	CAN	FRA	ITA	JAP	SWI	UK	US	WG
AUS		67.8751	43.2496	52.1166	25.2209	68.4601	95.7350	83.7958	99.0131
CAN			7.4336	34.0989	79.2133	31.9034	56.5786	53.2041	42.6540
FRA				73.5163	11.8144	16.1363	54.6077	30.4766	55.0956
ITA					4.0657	18.2037	69.9286	66.8692	12.6185
JAP						60.3460	89.4216	67.3000	46.6399
SWI							21.0858	21.2397	18.6343
UK								46.1325	28.9546
US									86.2626

Notes: The table reports p-values for testing the hypothesis that X_t as defined in (11)-(13) can not be predicted using a vector Z_t consisting of a constant, the current and one period lagged residuals of a VAR(4) on domestic output, domestic prices and domestic population. Values in excess of 5.00 indicate failure to reject the null using a χ^2 test with 17 degrees of freedom.

Table 3
Estimates of the Ratio of CRRA Coefficients
Using the US as numeraire

Country	Detrended Instruments			Shock Instruments		
	LT	HP	FOD	LT	HP	FOD
AUS	1.006 (0.032)	1.282 (0.049)	0.819 (0.087)	0.947 (0.052)	1.486 (0.062)	0.859 (0.104)
CAN	0.739 (0.036)	0.857 (0.059)	0.786 (0.082)	0.715 (0.075)	1.049 (0.087)	0.777 (0.094)
FRA	1.940 (0.027)	1.621 (0.016)	1.170 (0.046)	1.808 (0.040)	1.677 (0.030)	1.138 (0.068)
ITA	1.912 (0.056)	1.179 (0.042)	1.632 (0.037)	1.305 (0.090)	1.117 (0.063)	1.526 (0.067)
JAP	0.472 (0.054)	1.020 (0.044)	0.695 (0.073)	0.546 (0.117)	1.045 (0.055)	0.678 (0.120)
SWI	2.581 (0.017)	1.492 (0.039)	1.132 (0.039)	2.879 (0.035)	1.521 (0.071)	1.303 (0.072)
UK	0.940 (0.038)	0.689 (0.073)	0.660 (0.089)	0.940 (0.094)	0.689 (0.106)	0.625 (0.114)
GER	0.571 (0.022)	0.830 (0.042)	0.509 (0.049)	0.571 (0.034)	0.830 (0.058)	0.618 (0.048)

Notes: The estimates are obtained from the variance restriction (12). Standard errors of the estimates are in parenthesis.

Table 4: Estimated Consumption Correlations

	AUS	CAN	FRA	ITA	JAP	SWI	UK	US	WG
Linearly Detrended data									
AUS		0.767 (0.027)	0.387 (0.042)	0.246 (0.047)	0.809 (0.014)	0.154 (0.063)	-0.514 (0.041)	0.726 (0.038)	0.783 (0.223)
CAN			0.638 (0.044)	0.393 (0.047)	0.629 (0.035)	0.560 (0.056)	-0.226 (0.071)	0.624 (0.032)	0.809 (0.020)
FRA				0.671 (0.042)	0.409 (0.054)	0.472 (0.061)	-0.184 (0.061)	0.292 (0.055)	0.586 (0.057)
ITA					0.194 (0.023)	0.449 (0.050)	-0.112 (0.041)	-0.103 (0.057)	0.274 (0.041)
JAP						0.367 (0.066)	-0.225 (0.031)	0.443 (0.036)	0.826 (0.015)
SWI							0.232 (0.064)	0.426 (0.052)	0.383 (0.053)
UK								-0.113 (0.059)	-0.331 (0.044)
US									0.551 (0.035)
HP Filtered data									
AUS		0.271 (0.065)	0.237 (0.083)	0.250 (0.087)	0.232 (0.072)	0.024 (0.083)	0.115 (0.061)	0.047 (0.067)	-0.194 (0.068)
CAN			0.401 (0.069)	0.244 (0.051)	0.039 (0.058)	0.455 (0.059)	0.392 (0.049)	0.607 (0.041)	0.060 (0.071)
FRA				0.172 (0.075)	0.428 (0.061)	0.439 (0.091)	0.508 (0.054)	0.580 (0.090)	0.258 (0.097)
ITA					0.317 (0.068)	0.468 (0.058)	0.395 (0.056)	0.060 (0.080)	0.205 (0.096)
JAP						0.287 (0.080)	0.552 (0.065)	0.408 (0.065)	0.229 (0.080)
SWI							0.429 (0.053)	0.451 (0.059)	0.511 (0.061)
UK								0.366 (0.058)	0.125 (0.080)
US									0.340 (0.074)
FOD Filtered data									
AUS		0.419 (0.068)	0.403 (0.068)	0.070 (0.097)	0.251 (0.073)	0.269 (0.093)	0.046 (0.078)	0.313 (0.066)	0.070 (0.066)
CAN			0.297 (0.068)	0.133 (0.112)	0.071 (0.068)	0.344 (0.103)	0.089 (0.080)	0.531 (0.059)	0.133 (0.066)
FRA				0.065 (0.071)	0.299 (0.068)	0.355 (0.073)	0.169 (0.092)	0.162 (0.057)	0.305 (0.064)
ITA					0.090 (0.094)	0.355 (0.118)	0.094 (0.078)	-0.038 (0.101)	0.048 (0.098)
JAP						0.035 (0.068)	0.077 (0.048)	0.267 (0.046)	0.091 (0.053)
SWI							0.154 (0.061)	0.172 (0.084)	0.122 (0.053)
UK								0.189 (0.057)	0.149 (0.068)
US									0.233 (0.077)

Notes: Standard errors are in parenthesis.

Table 5.A
t-statistics of Phillips and Perron's Z-test

	AUS	CAN	FRA	ITA	JAP	UK	US	WG
AUS		-2.37 (10)	-3.88 (6)	-3.31 (6)	-4.40 (6)	-1.69 (10)	-2.88 (8)	-3.39 (8)
CAN			-1.89 (10)	-2.15 (10)	-2.37 (10)	-1.37 (10)	-2.16 (10)	-3.30 (10)
FRA				-3.39 (6)	-3.66 (10)	-1.93 (10)	-2.32 (10)	-3.46 (10)
ITA					-2.98 (6)	-1.63 (10)	-2.02 (10)	-3.19 (10)
JAP						-2.97 (2)	-2.29 (10)	-3.07 (10)
UK							-1.59 (10)	-1.65 (10)
US								-2.23 (10)

Table 5.B
P-values (in percentages) for the test that $E[X_t|Z_t] = 0$:
Long Run Cycles

	AUS	CAN	FRA	ITA	JAP	UK	US	WG
AUS			0.2636	0.0000	0.1043			0.0123
CAN								0.0000
FRA				0.2837	0.1265			0.2567
ITA								0.0000
JAP								0.0000
SWI								0.9871

Notes: Phillips and Perron's Z-test checks if the residuals of a cointegrating regression between pairs of consumptions are stationary. The table reports the largest t-statistics over possible lag augmentations of the test. The number in parenthesis refers to the lag augmentation used (maximum value is 10). The test is run with no deterministic variables. Panel B reports p-values for testing the hypothesis that X_t as defined in (11) is unpredictable when Z_t consisting of a constant, domestic output, domestic prices and domestic population lagged one and two periods. Values in excess of 5.00 indicate failure to reject the null using a χ^2 test with 17 degrees of freedom. Empty cells indicate that no test is undertaken for that pair.

WORKING PAPERS LIST

1. Albert Marcet and Ramon Marimon
Communication, Commitment and Growth. (June 1991) [Published in *Journal of Economic Theory* Vol. 58, no. 2, (December 1992)]
2. Antoni Bosch
Economies of Scale, Location, Age and Sex Discrimination in Household Demand. (June 1991) [Published in *European Economic Review* 35, (1991) 1589-1595]
3. Albert Satorra
Asymptotic Robust Inferences in the Analysis of Mean and Covariance Structures. (June 1991) [Published in *Sociological Methodology* (1992), pp. 249-278, P.V. Marsden Edt. Basil Blackwell: Oxford & Cambridge, MA]
4. Javier Andrés and Jaume Garcia
Wage Determination in the Spanish Industry. (June 1991) [Published as "Factores determinantes de los salarios: evidencia para la industria española" in J.J. Dolado et al. (eds.) *La industria y el comportamiento de las empresas españolas (Ensayos en homenaje a Gonzalo Mato)*, Chapter 6, pp. 171-196, Alianza Economía]
5. Albert Marcet
Solving Non-Linear Stochastic Models by Parameterizing Expectations: An Application to Asset Pricing with Production. (July 1991)
6. Albert Marcet
Simulation Analysis of Dynamic Stochastic Models: Applications to Theory and Estimation. (November 1991), 2d. version (March 1993) [Published in *Advances in Econometrics* invited symposia of the Sixth World Congress of the Econometric Society (Eds. J.J. Laffont i C.A. Sims). Cambridge University Press (1994)]
7. Xavier Calsamiglia and Alan Kirman
A Unique Informationally Efficient and Decentralized Mechanism with Fair Outcomes. (November 1991) [Published in *Econometrica*, vol. 61, 5, pp. 1147-1172 (1993)]
8. Albert Satorra
The Variance Matrix of Sample Second-order Moments in Multivariate Linear Relations. (January 1992) [Published in *Statistics & Probability Letters* Vol. 15, no. 1, (1992), pp. 63-69]
9. Teresa Garcia-Milà and Therese J. McGuire
Industrial Mix as a Factor in the Growth and Variability of States' Economies. (January 1992) [Forthcoming in *Regional Science and Urban Economics*]
10. Walter Garcia-Fontes and Hugo Hopenhayn
Entry Restrictions and the Determination of Quality. (February 1992)
11. Guillem López and Adam Robert Wagstaff
Indicadores de Eficiencia en el Sector Hospitalario. (March 1992) [Published in *Moneda y Crédito* Vol. 196]
12. Daniel Serra and Charles ReVelle
The PQ-Median Problem: Location and Districting of Hierarchical Facilities. Part I (April 1992) [Published in *Location Science*, Vol. 1, no. 4 (1993)]
13. Daniel Serra and Charles ReVelle
The PQ-Median Problem: Location and Districting of Hierarchical Facilities. Part II: Heuristic Solution Methods. (April 1992) [Published in *Location Science*, Vol. 2, no. 2 (1994)]
14. Juan Pablo Nicolini
Ruling out Speculative Hyperinflations: a Game Theoretic Approach. (April 1992)
15. Albert Marcet and Thomas J. Sargent
Speed of Convergence of Recursive Least Squares Learning with ARMA Perceptions. (May 1992) [Forthcoming in *Learning and Rationality in Economics*]
16. Albert Satorra
Multi-Sample Analysis of Moment-Structures: Asymptotic Validity of Inferences Based on Second-Order Moments. (June 1992) [Published in *Statistical Modelling and Latent Variables* Elsevier, North Holland. K.Haagen, D.J. Bartholomew and M. Deistler (eds.), pp. 283-298.]
- Special issue Vernon L. Smith
Experimental Methods in Economics. (June 1992)
17. Albert Marcet and David A. Marshall
Convergence of Approximate Model Solutions to Rational Expectation Equilibria Using the Method of Parameterized Expectations.
18. M. Antònia Monés, Rafael Salas and Eva Ventura
Consumption, Real after Tax Interest Rates and Income Innovations. A Panel Data Analysis. (December 1992)
19. Hugo A. Hopenhayn and Ingrid M. Werner
Information, Liquidity and Asset Trading in a Random Matching Game. (February 1993)

20. Daniel Serra
The Coherent Covering Location Problem. (February 1993) [Forthcoming in *Papers in Regional Science*]
21. Ramon Marimon, Stephen E. Spear and Shyam Sunder
Expectationally-driven Market Volatility: An Experimental Study. (March 1993) [Forthcoming in *Journal of Economic Theory*]
22. Giorgia Giovannetti, Albert Marcet and Ramon Marimon
Growth, Capital Flows and Enforcement Constraints: The Case of Africa. (March 1993) [Published in *European Economic Review* 37, pp. 418-425 (1993)]
23. Ramon Marimon
Adaptive Learning, Evolutionary Dynamics and Equilibrium Selection in Games. (March 1993) [Published in *European Economic Review* 37 (1993)]
24. Ramon Marimon and Ellen McGrattan
On Adaptive Learning in Strategic Games. (March 1993) [Forthcoming in A. Kirman and M. Salmon eds. "Learning and Rationality in Economics" Basil Blackwell]
25. Ramon Marimon and Shyam Sunder
Indeterminacy of Equilibria in a Hyperinflationary World: Experimental Evidence. (March 1993) [Forthcoming in *Econometrica*]
26. Jaume Garcia and José M. Labeaga
A Cross-Section Model with Zeros: an Application to the Demand for Tobacco. (March 1993)
27. Xavier Freixas
Short Term Credit Versus Account Receivable Financing. (March 1993)
28. Massimo Motta and George Norman
Does Economic Integration cause Foreign Direct Investment? (March 1993) [Published in *Working Paper University of Edinburgh* 1993:1]
29. Jeffrey Prisbrey
An Experimental Analysis of Two-Person Reciprocity Games. (February 1993) [Published in *Social Science Working Paper* 787 (November 1992)]
30. Hugo A. Hopenhayn and Maria E. Muniagurria
Policy Variability and Economic Growth. (February 1993)
31. Eva Ventura Colera
A Note on Measurement Error and Euler Equations: an Alternative to Log-Linear Approximations. (March 1993) [Published in *Economics Letters*, 45, pp. 305-308 (1994)]
32. Rafael Crespi i Cladera
Protecciones Anti-Opa y Concentración de la Propiedad: el Poder de Voto. (March 1993)
33. Hugo A. Hopenhayn
The Shakeout. (April 1993)
34. Walter Garcia-Fontes
Price Competition in Segmented Industries. (April 1993)
35. Albert Satorra i Brucart
On the Asymptotic Optimality of Alternative Minimum-Distance Estimators in Linear Latent-Variable Models. (February 1993) [Published in *Econometric Theory*, 10, pp. 867-883]
36. Teresa Garcia-Milà, Therese J. McGuire and Robert H. Porter
The Effect of Public Capital in State-Level Production Functions Reconsidered. (February 1993)
37. Ramon Marimon and Shyam Sunder
Expectations and Learning Under Alternative Monetary Regimes: an Experimental Approach. (May 1993)
38. José M. Labeaga and Angel López
Tax Simulations for Spain with a Flexible Demand System. (May 1993)
39. Daniel Serra and Charles ReVelle
Market Capture by Two Competitors: The Pre-Emptive Location Problem. (May 1993) [Published in *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 34, no.4 (1994)]
40. Xavier Cuadras-Morató
Commodity Money in the Presence of Goods of Heterogenous Quality. (July 1993) [Published in *Economic Theory* 4 (1994)]
41. M. Antònia Monés and Eva Ventura
Saving Decisions and Fiscal Incentives: A Spanish Panel Based Analysis. (July 1993)
42. Wouter J. den Haan and Albert Marcet
Accuracy in Simulations. (September 1993) [Published in *Review of Economic Studies*, (1994)]
43. Jordi Galí
Local Externalities, Convex Adjustment Costs and Sunspot Equilibria. (September 1993) [Forthcoming in *Journal of Economic Theory*]

44. Jordi Galí
Monopolistic Competition, Endogenous Markups, and Growth. (September 1993) [Forthcoming in *European Economic Review*]
45. Jordi Galí
Monopolistic Competition, Business Cycles, and the Composition of Aggregate Demand. (October 1993) [Forthcoming in *Journal of Economic Theory*]
46. Oriol Amat
The Relationship between Tax Regulations and Financial Accounting: a Comparison of Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom. (November 1993) [Forthcoming in *European Management Journal*]
47. Diego Rodríguez and Dimitri Vayanos
Decentralization and the Management of Competition. (November 1993)
48. Diego Rodríguez and Thomas M. Stoker
A Regression Test of Semiparametric Index Model Specification. (November 1993)
49. Oriol Amat and John Blake
Control of the Costs of Quality Management: a Review of Current Practice in Spain. (November 1993)
50. Jeffrey E. Prisbrey
A Bounded Rationality, Evolutionary Model for Behavior in Two Person Reciprocity Games. (November 1993)
51. Lisa Beth Tilis
Economic Applications of Genetic Algorithms as a Markov Process. (November 1993)
52. Ángel López
The Command for Private Transport in Spain: A Microeconomic Approach. (December 1993)
53. Ángel López
An Assessment of the Encuesta Continua de Presupuestos Familiares (1985-89) as a Source of Information for Applied Research. (December 1993)
54. Antonio Cabrales
Stochastic Replicator Dynamics. (December 1993)
55. Antonio Cabrales and Takeo Hoshi
Heterogeneous Beliefs, Wealth Accumulation, and Asset Price Dynamics. (February 1993, Revised: June 1993)
56. Juan Pablo Nicolini
More on the Time Inconsistency of Optimal Monetary Policy. (November 1993)
57. Lisa B. Tilis
Income Distribution and Growth: A Re-examination. (December 1993)
58. José María Marín Viguera and Shinichi Suda
A Model of Financial Markets with Default and The Role of "Ex-ante" Redundant Assets. (January 1994)
59. Angel de la Fuente and José María Marín Viguera
Innovation, "Bank" Monitoring and Endogenous Financial Development. (January 1994)
60. Jordi Galí
Expectations-Driven Spatial Fluctuations. (January 1994)
61. Josep M. Argilés
Survey on Commercial and Economic Collaboration Between Companies in the EEC and Former Eastern Bloc Countries. (February 1994)
62. German Rojas
Optimal Taxation in a Stochastic Growth Model with Public Capital: Crowding-in Effects and Stabilization Policy. (September 1993)
63. Irasema Alonso
Patterns of Exchange, Fiat Money, and the Welfare Costs of Inflation. (September 1993)
64. Rohit Rahi
Adverse Selection and Security Design. (February 1994)
65. Jordi Galí and Fabrizio Zilibotti
Endogenous Growth and Poverty Traps in a Cournotian Model. (November 1993)
66. Jordi Galí and Richard Clarida
Sources of Real Exchange Rate Fluctuations: How Important are Nominal Shocks?. (October 1993, Revised: January 1994) [Forthcoming in *Carnegie-Rochester Conference in Public Policy*]
67. John Ireland
A DPP Evaluation of Efficiency Gains from Channel-Manufacturer Cooperation on Case Counts. (February 1994)
68. John Ireland
How Products' Case Volumes Influence Supermarket Shelf Space Allocations and Profits. (February 1994)

69. Fabrizio Zilibotti
Foreign Investments, Enforcement Constraints and Human Capital Accumulation. (February 1994)
70. Vladimir Marianov and Daniel Serra
Probabilistic Maximal Covering Location Models for Congested Systems. (March 1994)
71. Giorgia Giovannetti.
Import Pricing, Domestic Pricing and Market Structure. (August 1993, Revised: January 1994)
72. Raffaella Giordano.
A Model of Inflation and Reputation with Wage Bargaining. (November 1992, Revised March 1994)
73. Jaume Puig i Junoy.
Aspectos Macroeconómicos del Gasto Sanitario en el Proceso de Convergencia Europea. (Enero 1994)
74. Daniel Serra, Samuel Ratick and Charles ReVelle.
The Maximum Capture Problem with Uncertainty (March 1994) [Forthcoming in *Environment and Planning B*]
75. Oriol Amat, John Blake and Jack Dowds.
Issues in the Use of the Cash Flow Statement-Experience in some Other Countries (March 1994)
76. Albert Marcet and David A. Marshall.
Solving Nonlinear Rational Expectations Models by Parameterized Expectations: Convergence to Stationary Solutions (March 1994)
77. Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
Lecture Notes on Economic Growth (I): Introduction to the Literature and Neoclassical Models (May 1994)
78. Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
Lecture Notes on Economic Growth (II): Five Prototype Models of Endogenous Growth (May 1994)
79. Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
Cross-Sectional Regressions and the Empirics of Economic Growth (May 1994)
80. Xavier Cuadras-Morató.
Perishable Medium of Exchange (Can Ice Cream be Money?) (May 1994)
81. Esther Martínez García.
Progresividad y Gastos Fiscales en la Imposición Personal sobre la Renta (Mayo 1994)
82. Robert J. Barro, N. Gregory Mankiw and Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
Capital Mobility in Neoclassical Models of Growth (May 1994)
83. Sergi Jiménez-Martin.
The Wage Setting Process in Spain. Is it Really only about Wages? (April 1993, Revised: May 1994)
84. Robert J. Barro and Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
Quality Improvements in Models of Growth (June 1994)
85. Francesco Drudi and Raffaella Giordano.
Optimal Wage Indexation in a Reputational Model of Monetary Policy Credibility (February 1994)
86. Christian Helmenstein and Yury Yegorov.
The Dynamics of Migration in the Presence of Chains (June 1994)
87. Walter García-Fontes and Massimo Motta.
Quality of Professional Services under Price Floors. (June 1994)
88. Jose M. Bailen.
Basic Research, Product Innovation, and Growth. (September 1994)
89. Oriol Amat and John Blake and Julia Clarke.
Bank Financial Analyst's Response to Lease Capitalization in Spain (September 1994) [Forthcoming in *International Journal of Accounting*.]
90. John Blake and Oriol Amat and Julia Clarke.
Management's Response to Finance Lease Capitalization in Spain (September 1994)
91. Antoni Bosch and Shyam Sunder.
Tracking the Invisible Hand: Convergence of Double Auctions to Competitive Equilibrium. (July 1994)
92. Sergi Jiménez-Martin.
The Wage Effect of an Indexation Clause: Evidence from Spanish Manufacturing Firms. (September 1994)
93. Albert Carreras and Xavier Tafunell.
National Enterprise. Spanish Big Manufacturing Firms (1917-1990), between State and Market (September 1994)
94. Ramon Faulí-Oller and Massimo Motta.
Why do Owners let their Managers Pay too much for their Acquisitions? (October 1994)

95. Marc Sáez Zafra and Jorge V. Pérez-Rodríguez.
Modelos Autorregresivos para la Varianza Condicionada Heteroscedástica (ARCH) (October 1994)
96. Daniel Serra and Charles ReVelle.
Competitive Location in Discrete Space (November 1994) [Forthcoming in Zvi Drezner (ed.): *Facility Location: a Survey of Applications and Methods*. Springer-Verlag New York.
97. Alfonso Gambardella and Walter García-Fontes.
Regional Linkages through European Research Funding (October 1994) [Forthcoming in *Economic of Innovation and New Technology*]
98. Daron Acemoglu and Fabrizio Zilibotti.
Was Prometheus Unbound by Chance? Risk, Diversification and Growth (November 1994)
99. Thierry Foucault.
Price Formation and Order Placement Strategies in a Dynamic Order Driven Market (June 1994)
100. Ramon Marimon and Fabrizio Zilibotti.
'Actual' versus 'Virtual' Employment in Europe: Why is there Less Employment in Spain? (December 1994)
101. María Sáez Martí.
Are Large Windows Efficient? Evolution of Learning Rules in a Bargaining Model (December 1994)
102. María Sáez Martí.
An Evolutionary Model of Development of a Credit Market (December 1994)
103. Walter García-Fontes and Ruben Tansini and Marcel Vaillant.
Cross-Industry Entry: the Case of a Small Developing Economy (December 1994)
104. Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
Regional Cohesion: Evidence and Theories of Regional Growth and Convergence (October 1994)
105. Antoni Bosch-Domènech and Joaquim Silvestre.
Credit Constraints in General Equilibrium: Experimental Results (December 1994)
106. Casey B. Mulligan and Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
A Labor-Income-Based Measure of the Value of Human Capital: an Application to the States of the United States. (December 1994)
107. José M. Bailén and Luis A. Rivera-Bátiz.
Human Capital, Heterogeneous Agents and Technological Change (March 1995)
108. Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
A Positive Theory of Social Security (February 1995)
109. J. S. Marron and Frederic Udina.
Interactive Local Bandwidth Choice (February 1995)
110. Marc Sáez and Robert M. Kunst.
ARCH Patterns in Cointegrated Systems (March 1995)
111. Xavier Cuadras-Morató and Joan R. Rosés.
Bills of Exchange as Money: Sources of Monetary Supply during the Industrialization in Catalonia (1844-74) (April 1995)
112. Casey B. Mulligan and Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
Measuring Aggregate Human Capital (January 1995)
113. Fabio Canova.
Does Detrending Matter for the Determination of the Reference Cycle and the Selection of Turning Points? (March 1995)
114. Sergiu Hart and Andreu Mas-Colell.
Bargaining and Value (February 1995)
115. Teresa Garcia-Milà, Albert Marcet and Eva Ventura.
Supply Side Interventions and Redistribution (June 1995)
116. Robert J. Barro and Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
Technological Diffusion, Convergence, and Growth (May 1995)
117. Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
The Classical Approach to Convergence Analysis (June 1995)
118. Serguei Maliar and Vitali Perepelitsa.
LCA Solvability of Chain Covering Problem (May 1995)
119. Serguei Maliar, Igor' Kozin and Vitali Perepelitsa.
Solving Capability of LCA (June 1995)
120. Antonio Ciccone and Robert E. Hall.
Productivity and the Density of Economic Activity (May 1995) [Forthcoming in *American Economic Review*]

121. Jan Werner.
Arbitrage, Bubbles, and Valuation (April 1995)
122. Andrew Scott.
Why is Consumption so Seasonal? (March 1995)
123. Oriol Amat and John Blake.
The Impact of Post Industrial Society on the Accounting Compromise-Experience in the UK and Spain (July 1995)
124. William H. Dow, Jessica Holmes, Tomas Philipson and Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
Death, Tetanus, and Aerobics: The Evaluation of Disease-Specific Health Interventions (July 1995)
125. Tito Cordella and Manjira Datta.
Intertemporal Cournot and Walras Equilibrium: an Illustration (July 1995)
126. Albert Satorra.
Asymptotic Robustness in Multi-Sample Analysis of Multivariate Linear Relations (August 1995)
127. Albert Satorra and Heinz Neudecker.
Compact Matrix Expressions for Generalized Wald Tests of Equality of Moment Vectors (August 1995)
128. Marta Gómez Puig and José G. Montalvo.
Bands Width, Credibility and Exchange Risk: Lessons from the EMS Experience (June 1995) [Finance and Banking Discussion Papers Series (1)]
129. Marc Sáez.
Option Pricing under Stochastic Volatility and Stochastic Interest Rate in the Spanish Case (August 1995) [Finance and Banking Discussion Papers Series (3)]
130. Xavier Freixas and Jean-Charles Rochet.
Fair Pricing of Deposit Insurance. Is it Possible? Yes. Is it Desirable? No (June 1995) [Finance and Banking Discussion Papers Series (4)]
131. Heinz Neudecker and Albert Satorra.
The Algebraic Equality of Two Asymptotic Tests for the Hypothesis that a Normal Distribution Has a Specified Correlation Matrix (April 1995)
132. Walter Garcia-Fontes and Aldo Geuna.
The Dynamics of Research Networks in Brite-Euram (July 1995)
133. Jeffrey S. Simonoff and Frederic Udina.
Measuring the Stability of Histogram Appearance when the Anchor Position is Changed (July 1995)
134. Casey B. Mulligan and Xavier Sala-i-Martin.
Adoption of Financial Technologies: Implications for Money Demand and Monetary Policy (August 1995) [Finance and Banking Discussion Papers Series (5)]
135. Fabio Canova and Morten O. Ravn.
International Consumption Risk Sharing (June 1995) [Finance and Banking Discussion Papers Series (6)]