NOTES D'ÉTUDES

ET DE RECHERCHE

TESTING HETEROGENEITY

WITHIN THE EURO AREA

Eric Jondeau and Jean-Guillaume Sahuc

September 2007

NER - R # 181

BANQUE DE FRANCE
EUROSYSTÈME

DIRECTION GÉNÉRALE DES ÉTUDES ET DES RELATIONS INTERNATIONALES

DIRECTION GÉNÉRALE DES ÉTUDES ET DES RELATIONS INTERNATIONALES
DIRECTION DE LA RECHERCHE

TESTING HETEROGENEITY WITHIN THE EURO AREA

Eric Jondeau and Jean-Guillaume Sahuc

September 2007

NER - R # 181

Testing heterogeneity within the euro area*

Eric Jondeau[†]
University of Lausanne
and Swiss Finance Institute

Jean-Guillaume Sahuc[‡]
Banque de France
and Audencia School of Management

August 2007

*We thank Stéphane Adjémian, Jean-Pascal Benassy, Miguel Casares, Patrick Fève, Michel Juillard, Jean-Pierre Laffargue, Hervé Le Bihan, Julien Matheron, Ferhat Mihoubi, Eva Ortega, Frank Smets and an anonymous referee for fruitful discussions or remarks. We have also benefited from comments by participants in seminars at the European Central Bank, Banque de France, CEPREMAP, Bank of Canada, UQAM and T2M. This paper does not necessarily reflect the views of the Banque de France.

†*Corresponding address:* University of Lausanne, Institute of Banking and Finance, Extranef 232, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland. E-Mail: eric.jondeau@unil.ch.

‡*Corresponding address:* Banque de France, Economic and Financial Research Division, 31 rue Croix des Petits Champs, F-75049 Paris, France. E-Mail: jean-guillaume.sahuc@banque-france.fr.

Abstract

This note estimates several constrained versions of an optimization-based multi-country model to test the sources of heterogeneity within the euro area. We show that the main source is the asymmetry of shocks affecting the economies and that the heterogeneity of behaviors does not seem to be of empirical relevance for the euro area.

Keywords: Euro area, heterogeneity, Bayesian econometrics, multi-country model.

JEL classification: C51, C52, F4.

Résumé

Ce papier estime plusieurs versions contraintes d'un modèle structurel multi-pays afin de tester les sources de l'hétérogénéité au sein de la zone euro. Nous montrons que la source principale est l'asymétrie des chocs affectant les économies et que l'hétérogénéité des comportements des agents privés n'a que peu d'importance d'un point de vue empirique.

Mots-clés : Zone euro, hétérogénéité, économétrie Bayésienne, modèle multi-pays.

Classification JEL : C51, C52, F4.

Non-technical summary

In the last few years, the policy discussion has focused on heterogeneity of economic performances across countries in the euro area. While some studies suggest that business cycles have converged to a large extent over the past decades, several recent studies focus on the differences between euro-area countries across several dimensions and obtain rather mixed evidence. A first source of heterogeneity, that may be named *structural heterogeneity*, corresponds to differences in preferences, technology, and constraints of private agents across countries or, more generally, in the propagation mechanism of shocks within the economy. A second component of heterogeneity is the asymmetry in the conduct of country-specific policies and may be named *policy heterogeneity*. It includes monetary policy (until 1999), fiscal policy and regulation. A last source of heterogeneity relies on the asymmetry of shocks across countries, or *stochastic heterogeneity*. The objective of this note is to investigate the various sources of heterogeneity across euro-area countries within an *optimization-based framework*. We show that heterogeneity within the euro area mainly comes from stochastic heterogeneity. Our joint modeling of the three economies allows us to be more precise on the source of heterogeneity. Indeed although preference and technology shocks have very similar properties, they are only very weakly correlated across countries. A consequence is that business cycle fluctuations are not likely to be synchronized within the euro area, even between core countries.

Résumé non technique

Durant les dernières années, beaucoup de discussions ont porté sur l'hétérogénéité des performances économiques des membres de la zone euro. Alors que certaines études suggèrent que les cycles des affaires ont convergé durant les dernières décennies, d'autres ont porté une attention particulière sur les différences entres les pays de la zone et ont obtenus des résultats plus mitigés. Une première source d'hétérogénéité, appelée *hétérogénéité structurelle*, provient des différences de préférences, de technologie et des contraintes de agents privés entre les pays (autrement dit des mécanismes de propagation des chocs au sein de l'économie). Une seconde composante de l'hétérogénéité est l'asymétrie des politiques économiques au sein de chaque pays, appelée *hétérogénéité politique*. Plus particulièrement, cela correspond à la politique monétaire jusqu'en 1999 et aux politiques fiscale et de régulation. Une dernière source d'hétérogénéité, appelée *hétérogénéité stochastique, provient* de l'asymétrie des chocs entre les pays. Ce papier analyse ces diverses sources d'hétérogénéité

entre les membres de la zone euro au sein d'un cadre d'analyse avec des fondements microéconomiques. Nous montrons que l'hétérogénéité est principalement due aux chocs macroéconomiques. Mais la modélisation jointe des trois plus gros pays de la zone euro (Allemagne, France et Italie) permet d'être encore plus précis sur cette source. En effet, bien que les chocs de préférences et technologiques ont des propriétés assez comparables, ils sont faiblement corrélés entre les pays. La conséquence directe est que les fluctuations du cycle des affaires ne semblent pas avoir été synchronisées avant l'apparition de la zone euro, même entre les pays les plus semblables.

1 Introduction

In the last few years, the policy discussion has focused on heterogeneity of economic performances across countries in the euro area. While some studies suggest that business cycles have converged to a large extent over the past decades (see the contributions in Angeloni *et al.*, 2003), several recent studies focus on the differences between euro-area countries across several dimensions and obtain rather mixed evidence.

A first source of heterogeneity, that may be named *structural heterogeneity*, corresponds to differences in preferences, technology, and constraints of private agents across countries or, more generally, in the propagation mechanism of shocks within the economy (*e.g.* Campa and González Mìnguez, 2004). A second component of heterogeneity is the asymmetry in the conduct of country-specific policies and may be named *policy heterogeneity*. It includes monetary policy (until 1999), fiscal policy and regulation (*e.g.* Demertzis and Hugues Hallett, 1998). A last source of heterogeneity relies on the asymmetry of shocks across countries, or *stochastic heterogeneity* (*e.g.* Verhoef, 2003).

The objective of this note is to investigate the various sources of heterogeneity across euro-area countries within an *optimization-based framework*. We first model and estimate the joint dynamics of the major economies in the euro area assuming full heterogeneity (*i.e.* allowing parameters to differ from one country to the other). Then, we consider the various sources of heterogeneity described above and compare the performances of the competing hypotheses.

2 The stylised multi-country model

The euro area is modelled as the aggregate of several economies.[1] For each country, we formulate a stylized open-economy sticky-price model derived from the "New Open Economy Macroeconomics" literature, which has a sufficiently rich dynamics to fit actual data fairly well. The main ingredients of the multi-country model (MCM) are: (i) habit formation in the households' preferences, (ii) Calvo pricing with indexation of non-optimized prices, (iii) differences in preferences and technologies across countries, (iv) imperfectly correlated domestic and foreign shocks, (v) taste bias towards home-produced goods, (vi) deviation from purchasing power parity, (vii) perfect risk sharing assumption. Log-linearization of this model around the steady state implies the following equations for the home block:[2]

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_t &= \frac{\gamma}{1+\gamma}c_{t-1} + \frac{1}{1+\gamma}\mathbb{E}_t c_{t+1} - \frac{(1-\gamma)}{(1+\gamma)\sigma}\left(i_t - \mathbb{E}_t \pi_{H,t+1}\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{(1-\gamma)(1-\omega)}{(1+\gamma)\sigma}\mathbb{E}_t \tau_{t+1} + \frac{(1-\rho_p)(1-\gamma)}{(1+\gamma)\sigma}\varepsilon_{p,t} && (1) \\
\pi_{H,t} &= \frac{\xi}{1+\xi\beta}\pi_{H,t-1} + \frac{\beta}{1+\xi\beta}\mathbb{E}_t \pi_{H,t+1} + \frac{(1-\beta\alpha)(1-\alpha)}{(1+\beta\xi)\alpha} \times \\
&\quad \left[\frac{\sigma\left(c_t - \gamma c_{t-1}\right)}{1-\gamma} + \varphi y_t + (1-\omega)\tau_t - (1+\varphi)\varepsilon_{a,t}\right] && (2) \\
\tau_t &= \frac{1}{\omega - \omega^*}\left[\frac{\sigma\left(c_t - \gamma c_{t-1}\right)}{1-\gamma} - \frac{\sigma^*\left(c_t^* - \gamma^* c_{t-1}^*\right)}{1-\gamma^*} + \varepsilon_{p,t}^* - \varepsilon_{p,t}\right] && (3) \\
y_t &= (\omega s)\, c_t + (1-\omega s)\, c_t^* + \theta\tau_t && (4) \\
i_t &= \psi_i i_{t-1} + (1-\psi_i)\left[\psi_\pi \pi_{H,t} + \psi_y\left(y_t - y_t^n\right)\right] + \varepsilon_{i,t} && (5)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathbb{E}_t\{.\}$ denotes the expectation operator conditional on time t information. Equation (1) is the IS curve where c_t denotes the home consumption, $\pi_{H,t}$ is the home inflation, i_t is the nominal interest rate, and τ_t is home terms of trade. Equation (2) is the forward-looking New Phillips curve where inflation varies according to real marginal cost and is indexed to past inflation. Equation (3) defines the terms of trade. Equation (4) represents the goods market clearing in the home country, where y_t is the aggregate output. Equation (5) represents a monetary policy rule, in which the interest rate is set in an inertial manner to respond to inflation and the output gap (the deviation of aggregate output to its flexible-price equilibrium value, y_t^n).

$\varepsilon_{p,t}$, $\varepsilon_{a,t}$, and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ are country-specific preference, productivity, and monetary policy shocks, respectively. They are assumed to follow AR(1) processes: $\varepsilon_{\varsigma,t} = \rho_\varsigma \varepsilon_{\varsigma,t-1} + \eta_{\varsigma,t}$, $\varsigma = p, a, i$.

Estimated parameters are defined in Table 1, while calibrated parameters are β the intertemporal discount factor, ω the weight of the home-country goods in the consumption of home-country household, s the home steady-state consumption/output ratio, and θ which is a composite parameter depending on ω, ω^* and s.

3 Empirical analysis

We adopt a Bayesian full information approach to estimate variants of the MCM. This method is helpful to compare models that are non-nested and takes explicit account of all uncertainty surrounding parameter estimates.

We take Germany, France, and Italy to represent the euro area. The sample period runs from 1970:1 to 1998:4 at a quarterly frequency. The data are drawn from OECD Business Sector Data Base. The estimation is based on four key macroeconomic variables for each country: real consumption, the inflation rate, the nominal short-term interest rate and the nominal exchange rate. Consumption is defined as real consumption expenditures, linearly detrended. Inflation is the annualized quarterly percent change in the implicit GDP deflator. The interest rate is the three-month money-market rate. Priors for common parameters have been chosen to be very close to those adopted by Smets and Wouters (2003) for the euro area. Finally, shocks in a given country are assumed to be uncorrelated, but we allow a non-zero correlation between a given shock in two countries.[3]

3.1 Estimates of the constrained models

Table 1 reports statistics on parameter estimates (mode and standard error) of the complete MCM and its various constrained versions.

First, we estimate the *complete* MCM. The overall picture that emerges from the first column is that the three countries display very similar parameter estimates. However, some differences are worth emphasizing regarding the habit persistence parameter (γ), the price indexation parameter (ξ) and the serial correlation of shocks. More importantly, most cross-country correlations between shocks are significantly positive, but shocks are far from being perfectly correlated across countries however, suggesting some asymmetry of shocks across countries.

Second, we estimate an MCM with *structural homogeneity* across countries. This model allows to test formally the hypothesis that private agents behave in a similar manner in the three countries. Structural parameters are found to be rather close to the complete MCM for the utility function parameters ($\gamma = 0.79$, $\sigma = 1.89$ and $\varphi = 2.20$). Turning to the behavior of firms, our estimates reveal that the price indexation parameter is significantly below the estimates obtained for the complete MCM, while other parameters are not significantly altered. Overall, this result suggests that, between core countries of the euro area, structural heterogeneity may be neglected at a first approximation.

Third, we estimate an MCM with *policy homogeneity*, so that monetary policy parameters are constant across countries. The common policy rule has parameters equal to $\psi_i = 0.87$, $\psi_\pi = 1.43$ and $\psi_y = 0$. The major change with respect to the complete MCM is that the policy rule does not respond to output gap anymore. Imposing policy homogeneity also alters some structural parameters significantly, like the habit parameter or the Calvo probability that rises to somewhat implausible values. In addition, we notice a sharp increase in the volatility of the preference and technology shocks. This result may be interpreted as the sign that the constraints imposed to the model imply a loss of adequacy to the data, so that the hypothesis of policy homogeneity has some undesirable outcomes.

When we jointly assume structural and policy homogeneity, we do not observe significantly changes as compared to the model with policy homogeneity. This suggests that combining the two sets of constraints does not imply side effects that would worsen the estimation of structural parameters.

Finally, the *stochastic homogeneity* hypothesis assumes that volatility and serial-correlation parameters are equal across countries. The volatility of preference and technology shocks is not significantly affected, while the volatility of the monetary policy shock increases in Germany and France. In contrast, the preference and technology shocks are more serially correlated under stochastic homogeneity. The main change in the parameter estimates is the large increase in the correlation of shocks across countries. In addition, this hypothesis does not affect the estimation of structural parameters too markedly. Actually, the main change in the parameter estimates is the sharp decrease in the value of the habit parameter that is found to be around 0.5 in Germany and France. Also the Calvo probability decreases slightly in all countries.

3.2 Model evaluation

Now, we adopt the Bayesian econometric procedure proposed by Schorfheide (2000) to compare the performance of (non-nested) DSGE models. First, we use posterior predictive measures and posterior odds as tools to assess the absolute and relative fit of probability models. Second, we evaluate the ability of the competing models to reproduce the cross-covariance functions of the data in using a quadratic loss function. The combination of these various criteria is expected to provide a clear ranking of the structural models under consideration.

For a given structural model $\mathcal{M}_i$, a set of structural parameters Θ, a prior distribution $\Gamma(\Theta|\mathcal{M}_i)$ and a likelihood function $\mathcal{L}(X_T|\Theta,\mathcal{M}_i)$ associated to the observable variables $X_T = \{x_t\}_{t=1}^T$, the four main Bayesian criteria are:

(i) the marginal likelihood: $\hat{\mathcal{L}}(X_T|\mathcal{M}_i) = \int_\Theta \mathcal{L}(X_T|\Theta,\mathcal{M}_i)\,\Gamma(\Theta|\mathcal{M}_i)\,\mathrm{d}\Theta$,

(ii) the Bayes factor: $\mathcal{B}_{i,j}(X_T) = \hat{\mathcal{L}}(X_T|\mathcal{M}_i)/\hat{\mathcal{L}}(X_T|\mathcal{M}_j)$,

(iii) the posterior odds: $\mathcal{PO}_{i,T} = \left[\mathcal{P}_{i,0}\hat{\mathcal{L}}(X_T|\mathcal{M}_i)\right] / \left[\sum_{j=0}^m \mathcal{P}_{j,0}\hat{\mathcal{L}}(X_T|\mathcal{M}_j)\right]$, where $\mathcal{P}_{i,0}$ is the prior probability of model $\mathcal{M}_i$ (with $\sum_{j=0}^m \mathcal{P}_{j,0} = 1$),

(iv) the quadratic loss function: $L_q(\Lambda,\hat{\Lambda}_i) = (\Lambda,\hat{\Lambda}_i)'W(\Lambda,\hat{\Lambda}_i)$, where Λ denote the population characteristics, $\hat{\Lambda}_i$ the prediction of model $\mathcal{M}_i$ and W a positive definite weighting matrix (here, the inverse of the covariance matrix of the population characteristics Λ).

As it clearly appears in panel A of the Table 2, the complete MCM does not dominate all nested models that allow some homogeneity. This result shows up in the Bayes factors that markedly favor the models with structural and policy homogeneity. The best model among DSGE models corresponds to the case of structural and policy homogeneity, whatever the criterion. On the other hand, the stochastic homogeneity hypothesis is very strongly rejected.

Panel B of the Table 2 reports the loss functions evaluated for the cross-covariance functions of all observable variables computed from 1 to 20 quarters. The first row gives the value of the overall loss function and the other rows propose a decomposition by country in order to get a better diagnosis on the ability of the competing models to reproduce the characteristics of the various economies. The model that performs worst is the model with stochastic homogeneity, since it is simply unable to reproduce the cross-covariance functions of the VAR model. Among the other models, the complete MCM does not perform very well. Since this is the less constrained model, this finding suggests that its additional degrees of freedom do not help in reproducing the characteristics of the data. Whereas no improvement is obtained in assuming structural homogeneity, in case of policy homogeneity, one observes a clear improvement, which mainly comes from German cross-covariances and from the interactions of shocks across countries. The best results are once again obtained for the model with both structural and policy homogeneity, since it yields the lowest loss function for each country.

4 Conclusion

This note investigates the sources of heterogeneity within the euro area. We show that heterogeneity within the euro area mainly comes from stochastic heterogeneity. Our joint modeling of the three economies allows us to be more precise on the source of heterogeneity. Indeed although preference and technology shocks have very similar properties, they are only very weakly correlated across countries. A consequence is that business cycle fluctuations are not likely to be synchronized within the euro area, even between core countries.

References

[1] Angeloni I., Kashyap A. and Mojon B. (2003), *Monetary Policy Transmission in the Euro Area*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[2] Batini N., Levine P. and Pearlman J. (2004), Indeterminacy with Inflation-Forecast Based in a Two-Bloc Model, *Working Paper n°340*, European Central Bank.

[3] Campa J. and González Mìnguez J. (2004), Differences in Exchange Rate Pass-Through in the Euro Area, *Working Paper n°4389*, CEPR.

[4] Demertzis M. and Hugues Hallett A. (1998), Asymmetric Transmission Mechanisms and the Rise in European Unemployment: A Case of Structural Differences or of Policy Failure? *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 22, 869–886.

[5] Jondeau E. and Sahuc J.-G. (2004), Optimal Monetary Policy in an Estimated DSGE Model of the Euro Area with Cross-country Heterogeneity, *Working Paper n*°04-13, University of Evry.

[6] Schorfheide F. (2000), Loss Function-Based Evaluation of DSGE Models, *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 15, 645–670.

[7] Smets F. and Wouters R. (2003), An Estimated Dynamic Stochastic General Equilibrium Model of the Euro Area, *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1, 1123–1175.

[8] Verhoef B. (2003), The (A)symmetry of Shocks in the EMU, *Staff Reports n°106*, De Nederlandsche Bank.

Table 1: Posterior distribution of parameter estimates under alternative hypotheses

		Complete MCM		Structural hom.		Policy hom.		Struct.+Pol. hom.		Stochastic hom.	
		Mode	Std dev.	Mode	Std dev.	Mode	Std dev.	Mode	Std dev.	Mode	Std dev.
Germany (country 1)											
Consumption habit	γ	0.630	0.050	0.792	0.029	0.759	0.045	0.885	0.018	0.479	0.042
Consumption elast. of subst.	σ	1.542	0.232	1.894	0.218	2.056	0.221	2.278	0.223	1.358	0.194
Labour desutility	φ	1.934	0.253	2.198	0.231	1.882	0.244	1.915	0.228	1.928	0.217
Price indexation	ξ	0.290	0.078	0.151	0.037	0.395	0.092	0.206	0.047	0.425	0.111
Calvo probability	α	0.839	0.019	0.877	0.013	0.928	0.010	0.950	0.007	0.667	0.047
Policy rule: lagged interest rate	ψ_i	0.871	0.020	0.886	0.017	0.870	0.015	0.875	0.014	0.705	0.039
Policy rule: inflation	ψ_π	1.507	0.100	1.499	0.102	1.427	0.105	1.361	0.105	1.705	0.076
Policy rule: output gap	ψ_y	0.458	0.104	0.361	0.119	0.005	0.005	0.003	0.003	0.544	0.096
Vol. preference shock	σ_p	0.048	0.008	0.093	0.014	0.091	0.017	0.191	0.031	0.059	0.010
Vol. productivity shock	σ_a	0.037	0.006	0.054	0.010	0.191	0.052	0.314	0.080	0.020	0.002
Vol. mon. policy shock (x100)	σ_i	0.244	0.020	0.233	0.019	0.213	0.015	0.210	0.013	0.455	0.033
Serial-corr. preference shock	ρ_p	0.640	0.065	0.408	0.070	0.511	0.083	0.310	0.061	0.947	0.014
Serial-corr. productivity shock	ρ_a	0.740	0.067	0.671	0.067	0.362	0.076	0.415	0.069	0.872	0.023
Serial-corr. mon. policy shock	ρ_i	0.506	0.067	0.570	0.059	0.435	0.059	0.450	0.063	0.356	0.048
France (country 2)											
Consumption habit	γ	0.688	0.045	*0.792*	-	0.898	0.025	*0.885*	-	0.453	0.039
Consumption elast. of subst.	σ	1.851	0.226	*1.894*	-	2.161	0.232	*2.278*	-	1.651	0.190
Labour desutility	φ	2.015	0.252	*2.198*	-	1.974	0.250	*1.915*	-	1.973	0.238
Price indexation	ξ	0.324	0.083	*0.151*	-	0.378	0.084	*0.206*	-	0.442	0.116
Calvo probability	α	0.822	0.017	*0.877*	-	0.943	0.009	*0.950*	-	0.648	0.039
Policy rule: lagged interest rate	ψ_i	0.820	0.027	0.825	0.027	*0.870*	-	*0.875*	-	0.688	0.041
Policy rule: inflation	ψ_π	1.517	0.101	1.497	0.099	*1.427*	-	*1.361*	-	1.487	0.078
Policy rule: output gap	ψ_y	0.482	0.102	0.303	0.118	*0.005*	-	*0.003*	-	0.383	0.099
Vol. preference shock	σ_p	0.063	0.010	0.089	0.012	0.188	0.042	0.176	0.029	*0.059*	-
Vol. productivity shock	σ_a	0.038	0.007	0.059	0.012	0.330	0.065	0.374	0.099	*0.020*	-
Vol. mon. policy shock (x100)	σ_i	0.426	0.034	0.427	0.035	0.365	0.024	0.364	0.025	*0.455*	-
Serial-corr. preference shock	ρ_p	0.509	0.077	0.402	0.071	0.271	0.061	0.292	0.063	*0.947*	-
Serial-corr. productivity shock	ρ_a	0.660	0.075	0.641	0.066	0.409	0.071	0.468	0.066	*0.872*	-
Serial-corr. mon. policy shock	ρ_i	0.447	0.067	0.515	0.080	0.337	0.057	0.326	0.058	*0.356*	-

Table 1: (cont'd)

		Complete MCM		Structural hom.		Policy hom.		Struct.+Pol. hom.		Stochastic hom.	
		Mode	Std dev.	Mode	Std dev.	Mode	Std dev.	Mode	Std dev.	Mode	Std dev.
Italy (country 3)											
Consumption habit	γ	0.777	0.029	*0.792*	-	0.903	0.022	*0.885*	-	0.695	0.031
Consumption elast. of subst.	σ	2.009	0.218	*1.894*	-	2.040	0.235	*2.278*	-	1.741	0.189
Labour desutility	φ	1.922	0.247	*2.198*	-	1.995	0.247	*1.915*	-	1.999	0.220
Price indexation	ξ	0.436	0.102	*0.151*	-	0.465	0.100	*0.206*	-	0.421	0.100
Calvo probability	α	0.794	0.022	*0.877*	-	0.935	0.011	*0.950*	-	0.646	0.034
Policy rule: lagged interest rate	ψ_i	0.906	0.014	0.902	0.018	*0.870*	-	*0.875*	-	0.814	0.028
Policy rule: inflation	ψ_π	1.497	0.094	1.466	0.101	*1.427*	-	*1.361*	-	1.642	0.082
Policy rule: output gap	ψ_y	0.522	0.091	0.226	0.087	*0.005*	-	*0.003*	-	0.538	0.111
Vol. preference shock	σ_p	0.055	0.008	0.058	0.007	0.116	0.027	0.105	0.017	*0.059*	-
Vol. productivity shock	σ_a	0.035	0.006	0.054	0.011	0.271	0.095	0.322	0.090	*0.020*	-
Vol. mon. policy shock (x100)	σ_i	0.228	0.021	0.231	0.025	0.227	0.018	0.222	0.017	*0.455*	-
Serial-corr. preference shock	ρ_p	0.793	0.036	0.812	0.034	0.688	0.058	0.729	0.046	*0.947*	-
Serial-corr. productivity shock	ρ_a	0.854	0.035	0.815	0.038	0.532	0.084	0.638	0.061	*0.872*	-
Serial-corr. mon. policy shock	ρ_i	0.414	0.071	0.466	0.088	0.510	0.073	0.493	0.068	*0.356*	-
Cross-correlations across countries											
Preference shock - 1/2	δ_{p12}	0.311	0.063	0.303	0.066	0.272	0.064	0.280	0.065	0.674	0.046
Preference shock - 1/3	δ_{p13}	0.166	0.067	0.147	0.069	0.136	0.065	0.112	0.061	0.617	0.063
Preference shock - 2/3	δ_{p23}	0.279	0.071	0.261	0.066	0.190	0.067	0.192	0.066	0.597	0.061
Productivity shock - 1/2	δ_{a12}	0.194	0.067	0.221	0.073	0.161	0.067	0.167	0.072	0.562	0.056
Productivity shock - 1/3	δ_{a13}	-0.032	0.076	-0.012	0.068	-0.006	0.069	0.016	0.071	0.511	0.040
Productivity shock - 2/3	δ_{a23}	0.135	0.075	0.161	0.072	0.187	0.075	0.201	0.071	0.513	0.058
Monetary policy shock - 1/2	δ_{i12}	0.198	0.070	0.211	0.069	0.274	0.066	0.265	0.066	0.608	0.042
Monetary policy shock - 1/3	δ_{i13}	0.124	0.066	0.132	0.069	0.148	0.066	0.144	0.067	0.494	0.059
Monetary policy shock - 2/3	δ_{i23}	0.239	0.069	0.243	0.064	0.226	0.070	0.238	0.067	0.577	0.041

Note: For the cross-correlations, "i/j" means the correlation between countries i and j.

Table 2: Model evaluation

	Complete MCM	Structural hom.	Policy hom.	Struct.+Pol. hom.	Stochastic hom.	VAR(1) model
Panel A: Posterior model probabilities						
Marginal likelihood	3971.93	3985.00	3993.33	4017.55	3819.39	4088.99
Bayes factor	1	473923	2.0E+09	6.5.E+19	5.6.E-67	6.9.E+50
Posterior odds	1.5E-51	6.9E-46	2.9E-42	9.4E-32	8.2E-118	1
Panel B: Loss function based on cross-covariance functions						
Overall	14.79	14.82	12.44	10.61	1661.44	N/A
Germany	3.12	3.46	2.03	1.29	515.91	N/A
France	2.63	2.76	2.66	2.28	77.82	N/A
Italy	0.93	0.58	0.85	0.51	17.75	N/A
Cross countries	8.11	8.02	6.89	6.53	1049.97	N/A

Note: In panel A, we assign equal prior to the models under consideration. The reference model is a VAR(1). In panel B, the population cross-covariance functions are given by the VAR(1) model.

Notes d'Études et de Recherche

156. J.-S. Mésonnier, "The Reliability of Macroeconomic Forecasts based on Real Interest Rate Gap Estimates in Real Time: an Assessment for the Euro Area," October 2006.

157. O. de Bandt, C. Bruneau and W. El Amri, "Convergence in Household Credit Demand across Euro Area Countries: Evidence from Panel Data," October 2006.

159. J. Idier, "Stock Exchanges Industry Consolidation and Shock Transmission," December 2006.

160. E. Gautier, "The Behaviour of Producer Prices: Some Evidence from the French PPI Micro Data," December 2006.

161. O. Loisel, "Bubble-free interest-rate rules," December 2006.

162. J. Boivin and M. P. Giannoni, "DSGE Models in a Data-Rich Environment," January 2007.

163. J. Coffinet, J. Matheron et C. Poilly, « Une évaluation structurelle du ratio de sacrifice dans la zone euro », janvier 2007.

164. P. Vermeulen, D. Dias, M. Dossche, E. Gautier, I. Hernando, R. Sabbatini and H. Stahl, "Price setting in the euro area: Some stylised facts from Individual Producer Price Data," February 2007.

165. C. Bordes, L. Clerc and V. Marimoutou, "Is there a structural break in equilibrium velocity in the euro area?" February 2007.

166. D. Fougère, « Les méthodes micro-économétriques d'évaluation », mars 2007.

167. C. Jardet and G. Le Fol, "Euro money market interest rates dynamics and volatility: How they respond to recent changes in the operational framework," May 2007.

168. L. Clerc, "Understanding asset prices: determinants and policy implications," May 2007.

169. F. Savignac, "The impact of financial constraints on innovation: What can be learned from a direct measure?," June 2007.

170. J. Idier, C. Jardet and A. de Loubens, "Determinants of long-term interest rates in the United States and the euro area: A multivariate approach," June 2007.

171. O. Darné et V. Brunhes-Lesage, « L'Indicateur Synthétique Mensuel d'Activité (ISMA) : une révision », Juillet 2007.

172. R. Kierzenkowski et V. Oung, « L'évolution des crédits à l'habitat en France : une grille d'analyse en termes de cycles », Juillet 2007.

173. O. de Bandt, A. Banerjee and T. Koźluk, "Measuring Long-Run Exchange Rate Pass-Through," July 2007.

174. J. Alho and V. Borgy, "Global Ageing and Macroeconomic Consequences of Demographic Uncertainty in a Multi-regional Model," July 2007.

175. J.-S. Mésonnier and J.-P. Renne, "Does uncertainty make a time-varying natural rate of interest irrelevant for the conduct of monetary policy?," September 2007.

176. J. Idier and S. Nardelli, "Probability of informed trading: an empirical application to the euro overnight market rate," September 2007.

177. H. Partouche, "Time-Varying Coefficients in a GMM Framework: Estimation of a Forward Looking Taylor Rule for the Federal Reserve," September 2007.

178. C. Ewerhart and N. Valla, "Financial Market Liquidity and the Lender of Last Resort," September 2007.

179. C. Ewerhart and N. Valla, "Forced Portfolio Liquidation," September 2007.

180. P.-A. Beretti and G. Cette, "Indirect ICT Investment," September 2007.

181. E. Jondeau and J.-G. Sahuc, "Testing heterogeneity within the euro area," September 2007.

Pour accéder à la liste complète des Notes d'Études et de Recherche publiées par la Banque de France veuillez consulter le site : http://www.banque-france.fr/fr/publications/ner/ner.htm

For a complete list of Working Papers published by the Banque de France, please visit the website: http://www.banque-france.fr/gb/publications/ner/ner.htm

Pour tous commentaires ou demandes sur les Notes d'Études et de Recherche, contacter la bibliothèque de la direction de la recherche à l'adresse suivante :

For any comment or enquiries on the Working Papers, contact the library of the Research Directorate at the following address :

BANQUE DE FRANCE
41- 1404 Labolog
75049 Paris Cedex 01
tél : 0033 (0)1 42 92 49 55 ou 62 65
fax :0033 (0)1 42 92 62 92
email : thierry.demoulin@banque-france.fr
jeannine.agoutin@banque-france.fr