
NOTES D'ÉTUDES

ET DE RECHERCHE

**ARE BUSINESS AND CREDIT CYCLES
CONVERGING OR DIVERGING?
A COMPARISON OF POLAND, HUNGARY,
THE CZECH REPUBLIC AND THE EURO AREA**

Sanvi Avouyi-Dovi, Rafal Kierzenkowski
and Catherine Lubochinsky

May 2006

NER - E # 144



**ARE BUSINESS AND CREDIT CYCLES
CONVERGING OR DIVERGING?
A COMPARISON OF POLAND, HUNGARY,
THE CZECH REPUBLIC AND THE EURO AREA**

Sanvi Avouyi-Dovi, Rafal Kierzenkowski
and Catherine Lubochinsky

May 2006

NER - E # 144

Les Notes d'Études et de Recherche reflètent les idées personnelles de leurs auteurs et n'expriment pas nécessairement la position de la Banque de France. Ce document est disponible sur le site internet de la Banque de France « www.banque-France.fr ».

Working Papers reflect the opinions of the authors and do not necessarily express the views of the Banque de France. This document is available on the Banque de France Website “www.banque-France.fr”.

Are Business and Credit Cycles Converging or Diverging? A comparison of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and the Euro Area ¹

Sanvi Avouyi-Dovi², Rafal Kierzenkowski³, Catherine Lubochinsky⁴

¹ The opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Banque de France or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated. The authors are grateful to Julien Matheron for providing programmes and useful suggestions. They also wish to thank Iikka Korhonen and Marina Vasjukova as well as the participants of the Third Workshop on Emerging Markets (Bank of Spain, Madrid, 24-25 November 2005) for valuable comments and discussions. The standard disclaimer applies.

² Economic and Financial Research Division, Banque de France and CREFED-CERPEM, Paris-Dauphine University.

³ Monetary Analyses and Statistics Division, Banque de France and LASER-LAEC, Montpellier 1 University.

⁴ Paris II Panthéon-Assas University.

Corresponding author: R. Kierzenkowski (rafal.kierzenkowski@banque-france.fr)

Résumé

Cet article propose l'analyse de co-mouvements entre variables réelles et financières dans trois nouveaux pays membres de l'Union européenne (Hongrie, Pologne et République Tchèque) ainsi que dans la zone euro. Il s'agit de l'examen du co-mouvement d'une part entre le crédit aux entreprises et la production industrielle réels, d'autre part entre les variables précédentes et un indicateur de politique monétaire, le taux d'intérêt réel à 3 mois. Partant du principe qu'il n'existe pas de définition unique du cycle économique, nous adoptons trois approches différentes : identification de points de retournement des séries et évaluation d'un indice de concordance ; décomposition et comparaison des différentes composantes cycliques des séries ; enfin, calcul des corrélations dynamiques entre les variables. Nous trouvons une meilleure convergence des cycles réels que des cycles financiers entre les nouveaux pays membres de l'UE et la zone euro. Il n'existe pas une forte dépendance entre crédits et la production industrielle dans tous les pays ; cependant, il apparaît que la politique monétaire lisse la distribution du crédit au cours des cycles.

Mots-clés : co-mouvements, points de retournement, analyse spectrale, cycle, crédit, production industrielle, taux d'intérêt, nouveaux pays membres de l'UE.

Classification JEL : E23, E32, E44, E51, P00

Abstract

This paper provides an analysis of co-movements between real and financial variables in three new EU member countries (the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland) and the euro area. It focuses on the co-movement between real credit granted to firms and real industrial output on the one hand, and between the aforementioned variables and a monetary policy indicator (the three-month real interest rate) on the other. Given that there is no single definition for the business cycle, we take three different approaches: we identify the turning points in the series and then estimate a concordance index; we decompose and compare the cyclical components of the series; and we calculate dynamic correlations across the variables. We find a better convergence of real than financial cycles between the new EU members and the euro area. There is no a high degree of dependence between loans and industrial output in all countries; yet, monetary policy appears to smooth the distribution of credit throughout the cycles.

Keywords: co-movements, turning points, spectral analysis, credit cycle, business cycle, New EU member states.

JEL Classification: E23, E32, E44, E51, P00

Résumé non-technique

Cet article propose l'analyse de co-mouvements entre variables réelles et financières dans trois nouveaux pays membres de l'Union européenne (Hongrie, Pologne et République Tchèque) ainsi que dans la zone euro. Il s'agit de l'examen du co-mouvement d'une part entre le crédit aux entreprises et la production industrielle réels, d'autre part entre les variables précédentes et un indicateur de politique monétaire, le taux d'intérêt réel à 3 mois. Pour effectuer cette analyse, nous avons retenu trois approches : examiner si deux variables se retrouvent régulièrement et de façon significative dans la même phase du cycle ; décomposer les séries en isolant leurs composantes cycliques et calculer ensuite des corrélations entre celles-ci ; estimer des corrélations dynamiques entre différentes variables.

La mise en œuvre de ces approches a conduit aux conclusions suivantes :

- a) il ne semble pas exister un fort lien de dépendance entre crédit et production industrielle dans les différents pays ; en revanche, la politique monétaire paraît lisser la distribution du crédit au cours des cycles ;
- b) l'intégration des marchés de crédit des nouveaux pays membres de l'UE semble faible ; cependant, le co-mouvement des cycles de crédit de ces pays et de ceux de la zone euro apparaît plus important, notamment pour la Pologne ;
- c) la corrélation de l'activité réelle avec celle de zone euro est très prononcée pour la Hongrie, plus faible pour la Pologne, et presque non significative pour la République Tchèque ;
- d) alors que l'intégration commerciale entre la Pologne et la Hongrie est très modeste, nous identifions une corrélation significative des cycles de production industrielle des deux pays. Ce dernier résultat peut s'expliquer par le fait que cette synchronisation s'opère via le cycle de la zone euro. A l'inverse, la corrélation significative entre les cycles d'activité polonaise et tchèque serait plutôt la conséquence de l'importance des flux d'échanges bilatéraux entre les deux pays et non la conséquence d'une transmission indirecte transitant par la zone euro.

Non-technical summary

This paper provides an analysis of co-movements between real and financial variables in three new EU member states (the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland) and the euro area. It focuses on the co-movement between real credit granted to firms and real industrial output on the one hand, and between the aforementioned variables and a monetary policy indicator (the three-month real interest rate) on the other. We have adopted three different approaches to analyse it: assess whether two variables regularly display a similar pattern during the same phase of the cycle; break the different series down by isolating their cyclical components with the objective of calculating correlations between them; estimate the dynamic correlations between different variables.

The main conclusions drawn from the empirical results are:

- a) there does not appear to be a high degree of dependence between credit extended to firms and industrial output in the different countries under review; yet, monetary policy seems to smooth the distribution of credit throughout the cycles;
- b) credit markets in the new EU member states are not highly integrated; nevertheless, the co-movement between the credit cycles in these countries and that of the euro area appears more significant, especially in the case of Poland;
- c) the correlation between the real economy of the new EU economies and that of the euro area is very high in Hungary, weaker in Poland, and almost insignificant in the Czech Republic;
- d) in addition, although trade integration between Poland and Hungary is very moderate, their industrial production cycles are highly correlated. This can be attributed to the fact that this synchronisation occurs via the euro area's production cycle. On the other hand, the significant correlation between Polish and Czech business cycles would rather result from the large bilateral trade flows between the two countries than from an indirect transmission via the euro area.

1. Introduction

In implementing the full *acquis communautaire*, and under the terms of the Maastricht Treaty, the new European Union member states are expected to join the euro area. Unlike the UK and Denmark, none of the new entrants has been granted an opt-out clause. The challenges of enlarging the euro area are intertwined with those of building an optimum currency area that encompasses the countries of central Europe. Optimum currency area theory offers a set of assessment criteria in this regard, including trade ties with the block of potential partner countries, and the nature – whether symmetric or asymmetric – of shocks. Against this backdrop, recent research has increasingly concentrated on analysing the synchronisation of business cycles in the new EU members with those of the euro area or its main member states.

In a recent paper, Fidrmuc and Korhonen (2004) conduct a meta-analysis that provides a summary of the main findings from 27 papers on business cycle correlation. The most frequent approach in this type of literature is to identify supply and demand shocks using bivariate SVAR models and then to calculate correlations between components in the home country and those in the benchmark economy (Germany or the euro area). There has also been a new wave of research devoted to analysing co-movements, based on multi-regime models. In our view, the size and reliability of the available data samples for central European countries are such that the robustness of SVAR or multi-regime model estimates cannot be guaranteed. For this reason, we follow Artis *et al.* (2004) and Darvas and Szapary (2005) in preferring methods based on filtering processes. Furthermore, we believe that the classical business cycle approach taken by Artis *et al.* (2004) and applied to the new EU countries offers a rich vein to mine.

In their analysis of eight central European countries and the euro area, Darvas and Szapary (2005) used quarterly series for GDP and its components, whereas Artis *et al.* (2004) used monthly data on industrial production. The results of Darvas and Szapary (2005) reveal that, of all likely new members of the euro area, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia have the most closely synchronised business cycles with EMU. This finding holds for GDP, output and exports, but not for consumption and services⁵.

This paper makes a three-fold contribution to the existing literature.

First, in addition to studying co-movements in output variables, we also look at credit and interest rate variables. Our decision to do this reflects the existence of an extensive body of literature on the effects of bank credit in the transmission of monetary policy via the role of credit in financing productive investment or via the ability of monetary policy to influence the supply of bank credit. These are key issues for industrialised countries, but they are also relevant for the countries of central Europe, given the low liquidity of their financial markets. Specifically, we examine co-movements in the real industrial production index, bank credit to businesses deflated by producer prices, and a monetary policy indicator (the real three-month interest rate) over the business cycle. We use the real interest rate (rather than the nominal rate); monetary authorities thus consider expected inflation as given. Furthermore, this ensures consistency between the real variables.

⁵ The linkage statistics between the series obtained using the IPI and GDP are qualitatively comparable but are usually higher when the IPI is used.

Second, the paper is both consistent in the data and methods used and exhaustive in its approach. A three-tier analysis is conducted: within the country, between new EU members, and finally between new EU countries and the euro area. The goal is to produce a set of stylised facts for three countries – Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic – and the euro area.

Third, given that there is no single definition for the business cycle, we take three different approaches: we estimate a concordance index; we decompose and compare the cyclical components of the series; and we calculate dynamic correlations across the variables. We innovate in our application of dynamic correlations to these questions, building on work done by Croux *et al.* (2001). Moreover, by comparing the findings from different methods, we should be able to achieve a more reliable analysis. Thus, the results obtained for the business and credit cycles can be considered in relation to the monetary policies applied over the period, with the relationships examined from several angles: first by analysing the behaviour of short-term interest rates during expansion and recession periods in industrial production and credit; second by calculating correlations between the cyclical components of economic activity, credit and interest rates, and the dynamic correlations between the same variables.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 presents the data and briefly reviews the financial systems in the new EU members. Section 3 deals with the identification of turning points and the calculation of concordance indicators. In Section 4 we study the co-movement of paired variables with the use of correlations between their components and investigate how correlations vary depending on different frequencies characterizing these variables (dynamic correlations). The final section concludes.

2. Description of data and brief overview of financial systems in new EU members

To capture real activity, we use real industrial production, the only consistent variable of this type available over the same period for all countries in our sample. The credit variable consists of bank lending to non-financial corporate and quasi-corporate enterprises⁶. The interest rate is the three-month interbank rate. For the transformation to real series, these two variables were deflated by the producer price index⁷. The data, which were taken from national and international sources, are monthly and run from January 1994 to September 2004. The Tramo-Seats method was used to seasonally adjust all the series except interest rates. We kept the option of automatic outlier detection and ignored calendar effects⁸. We used the same seasonal adjustment method for all the real and financial series of the analysed countries to avoid any methodological bias resulting from the use of official seasonally adjusted series.

Financing is typically bank-intermediated in the economies of the new EU countries considered in our paper. Credit institutions command over 80% of the total assets held by all financial institutions. As a result, banks supply the lion's share of the lending to the economy and channel the bulk of households' savings for investment purposes. Financial markets are tiny and play a

⁶ For want of long-run official series, we reconstituted a euro area credit variable by combining ECB sources (monthly since January 2003, quarterly since September 1997) and national sources drawn from BIS databases.

⁷ Overall index for Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic; index excluding construction for the euro area.

⁸ In their study, Artis *et al.* (2004) made seasonal adjustments by using unobservable components models to better capture specific holidays. We opted for a simpler and more "uniform" approach.

minor role. Market capitalisation stood between 20% and 30% of GDP in the new EU members in 2000 and 2004 compared with 91.5% and 53.3% respectively in the euro area (Table 1). In 2003, corporate debt securities amounted to just 3.3% of GDP in Poland, 0.9% in Hungary and 3.8% in the Czech Republic, compared with 61% in the euro area (ECB, 2005; IMF, 2004).

Table 1
Main characteristics of financial systems
(as a % of GDP)

| | | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Stock market capitalisation | PL | 5.0 | 7.4 | 9.2 | 14.9 | 18.0 | 13.9 | 14.1 | 14.2 | 18.8 |
| | HN | na | na | na | 30.0 | 30.7 | 18.8 | 17.4 | 16.8 | 21.4 |
| | CZ | na | na | na | 13.3 | 23.3 | 16.0 | 16.8 | 22.1 | 29.6 |
| | EA | 31.5 | 42.2 | 57.2 | 68.8 | 91.5 | 74.1 | 58.3 | 47.4 | 53.3 |
| Bank assets | PL | 53.7 | 55.0 | 60.1 | 61.9 | 65.8 | 66.5 | 64.6 | 64.7 | 65.3 |
| | HN | na | na | 69.2 | 69.2 | 68.7 | 69.1 | 70.4 | 79.6 | 84.0 |
| | CZ | 129.7 | 135.7 | 131.3 | 132.0 | 133.6 | 122.3 | 106.3 | 100.7 | 96.0 |
| | EA | na | 231.7 | 237.1 | 247.6 | 252.8 | 264.9 | 264.8 | 270.5 | 280.9 |
| Domestic credit to the private sector | PL | 21.0 | 22.7 | 24.5 | 27.6 | 28.9 | 28.4 | 28.6 | 29.0 | 27.7 |
| | HN | 22.1 | 24.3 | 24.2 | 26.1 | 32.3 | 33.7 | 35.8 | 43.4 | 46.6 |
| | CZ | 69.8 | 71.3 | 62.4 | 56.8 | 49.9 | 41.3 | 31.4 | 32.1 | 33.4 |
| | EA | na | 88.9 | 94.1 | 99.0 | 104.1 | 107.9 | 108.4 | 111.4 | 114.3 |
| Bank credit to non-financial corporations | PL | 17.6 | 18.5 | 19.6 | 20.9 | 21.1 | 20.4 | 19.8 | 19.4 | 17.4 |
| | HN | 18.3 | 20.8 | 20.5 | 21.4 | 24.2 | 23.5 | 22.1 | 24.0 | 24.6 |
| | CZ | 54.8 | 55.4 | 47.9 | 43.5 | 39.1 | 27.5 | 22.5 | 21.7 | 20.9 |
| | EA | 35.7 | 37.0 | 38.2 | 38.7 | 40.7 | 42.2 | 41.6 | 41.5 | 41.5 |

Notes: PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic, EA = euro area, na = non available
Sources: Eurostat, IMF IFS

Even so, the banking sector is still relatively small and the intermediation process relatively shallow in the new EU economies (Table 1). In 2004, bank assets were equivalent to 84% of GDP in Hungary, 65.3% in Poland and 96% in the Czech Republic, compared with 281% in the euro area. Similarly, whereas domestic credit to the private sector stood at between 30% and 45% of GDP in the new EU members at end-2004, the same ratio was around 114% in the euro area. The differences are smaller for bank credit to non-financial corporations. The credit market thus plays a central role in financing current operations and corporate investment. These observations are confirmed by survey data. According to monthly surveys by the National Bank of Poland, for example, in 1998, 77.4% of Polish companies were virtually or completely dependent on bank credit for their current operations, and 81.1% were similarly dependent in respect of their investments. Moreover, the percentage of companies using bank credit has risen, climbing from 80% in 1995 to more than 85% in 1999 (Lyziak, 2001).

Unlike in euro area economies, bank lending to households still occupies a relatively small share of total assets⁹, which lends added *a posteriori* support to the study's focus on the corporate sector. While lending to businesses in Poland and Hungary is following a similar path to that in the euro area, outstanding credit to Czech businesses contracted sharply between 1998 and 2003 following the collapse of a dozen or so banks between 1994 and 1996, including the fifth-largest by assets (Pruteanu, 2004).

The banking sector is also concentrated, reflecting a wave of mergers and acquisitions, chiefly since the second half of the 1990s. In 2003, the top five banks had a 52.3% share of the total assets of credit institutions in Hungary and Poland and a 65.8% share in the Czech Republic, compared

⁹ Although it did show a sustained increase between 2002 and 2003 from 21.4% to 26.3% in Hungary, from 16.7% to 21.1% in the Czech Republic and from 37.4% to 38.9% in Poland (ECB, 2005).

with 22% in Germany, 47% in France and 33% in the UK (ECB, 2004, 2005)¹⁰. The low level of financial intermediation and a series of bank privatisation programmes opened up a wealth of profitable opportunities for foreign investors. Non-residents have built up considerable equity interests in the three countries, and controlled 96% of total bank assets in the Czech Republic, 83.3% in Hungary and 67.8% in Poland in 2003¹¹. The presence of foreign banks, especially from euro area countries, creates a pathway towards full financial integration.

The figures for external trade reveal pronounced real integration. In 2004, when the openness ratio was equivalent to 113.2% of GDP in Hungary, 69.6% in Poland and 126% in the Czech Republic (Table A1, Appendix A), exports of goods to the EU-15 accounted for between 79% and 86% of the total, while the share of imports from the EU stood at between 68% and 75% (Table 2). Additionally, the structure of trade is broadly comparable across the new EU countries (Table A2, Appendix A). Exports and, to a lesser extent, imports are primarily concentrated in industrial products, including manufactured products and transport machinery and equipment. This specialisation appears to increase over time across all the countries.

Table 2
Trade with the European Union's 15 countries
(in %)

| | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2004 |
|------------------------------|----|------|------|------|---------------------|
| Share of exports to the EU | PL | 56.0 | 77.2 | 80.5 | 79.1 |
| | HN | 45.2 | 71.7 | 81.6 | 79.2 |
| | CZ | na | 62.9 | 85.1 | 86.4 |
| Share of imports from the EU | PL | 55.9 | 71.0 | 68.7 | 68.4 |
| | HN | 48.8 | 69.0 | 65.3 | 71.3 |
| | CZ | na | 64.3 | 77.3 | 74.8 ⁽¹⁾ |

Note: (1) data for the year 2003 ; PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic,
na = non available
Source: WIIW

More generally, in some cases (Table A1, Appendix A) the main real and nominal macroeconomic indicators for the new EU countries and the euro area seem to be converging. We will now extend our study of these linkages, looking at variables for credit, short-term interest rates and production.

3. Concordance in business cycles and credit cycles

The classical approach defines the business cycle directly by analysing the change in the level of a variable, characterising the cycle as a succession of expansions and recessions. Formally, an expansion is defined as the period of time separating a trough from a peak; conversely, a recession is the period between a peak and a trough. What is crucial in this approach, then, is to precisely define and identify the turning points, i.e. the peaks and troughs¹². Using these turning points, a recession (expansion) is defined as the time separating a peak (trough) from a trough (peak).

Though it fell out of fashion after the 1970s, this view of the cycle has recently been the subject of several papers, which proposed a simple method for analysing the concordance between two series, i.e. the simultaneous presence of the two series in the same recessionary or expansionary

¹⁰ In the Netherlands and Belgium, the top five had shares above 80%.

¹¹ In Poland, state-owned banks had a 24.4% asset share in 2003.

¹² See Appendix C1 for more details.

phase of the cycle¹³. Before compiling the concordance index, we first have to define a function to indicate the phases of increase (or decline), $s_{y,t}$, of a variable, y for example, which we will use to calculate the index: $s_{y,t} = 1$ if y increases at t , and 0 otherwise. We use a statistic developed by Harding and Pagan (2002, 2004) as the concordance index (see Avouyi-Dovi and Matheron (2003) for a recent application).

The concordance index for x and y , written c_{xy} , is defined as the average number of periods in which two variables x and y coincide at the same phase of the cycle, i.e.:

$$c_{xy} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T [s_{x,t} s_{y,t} + (1 - s_{x,t})(1 - s_{y,t})]. \quad (1)$$

The index has a value of 1 if x and y are always in the same phase, i.e. the two series are in perfect concordance, with expansions and contractions perfectly juxtaposed. If the index reads 0, x and y are always in opposite phases, i.e. the two series are in perfect discordance, with either a pronounced lag or a total contrast in phase.

In general, the distributional properties of c_{xy} are unknown. To calculate the significance levels for these indices, we use the method suggested by Harding and Pagan (2004), which we detail below. Let μ_{s_i} and σ_{s_i} , $i = (x,y)$ denote the empirical mean and the empirical standard deviation of $s_{i,t}$ respectively. If ρ_s denotes the empirical correlation between $s_{x,t}$ and $s_{y,t}$, it can be shown that the concordance index is equal to:

$$c_{xy} = 1 + 2 \rho_s \sigma_{s_x} \sigma_{s_y} + 2 \mu_{s_x} \mu_{s_y} - \mu_{s_x} - \mu_{s_y}. \quad (2)$$

According to this equation, c_{xy} and ρ_s are linked in such a way that either of these two statistics can be studied to the same effect. To estimate ρ_s , Harding and Pagan suggest estimating the linear relationship:

$$\left(\frac{s_{y,t}}{\sigma_{s_y}} \right) = \eta + \rho_s \left(\frac{s_{x,t}}{\sigma_{s_x}} \right) + \varepsilon_t, \quad (3)$$

where η is a constant and ε_t a residual. The estimation procedure for equation (3) must be robust to serial correlation in the residuals, because ε_t inherits the serial correlation properties of $s_{y,t}$ under the null hypothesis $\rho_s = 0$. We therefore use the ordinary least squares method augmented with an HAC procedure to estimate equation (3).

The estimated turning points are shown in Appendix B in Chart B1 for credit (in real terms) and Chart B2 for industrial production (in volume terms). The production series are more volatile than the credit series, suggesting a greater number of recessionary phases in the real economy. The turning points observed on the credit markets are either less frequent than (Hungary, euro area) or equivalent to (Poland) the turning points in industrial production, but span broadly comparable

¹³ Cf. Cashin *et al.* (1999), who apply the method in analysing the concordance of goods prices, and McDermott and Scott (2000) for a comparison of business cycles in the main OECD countries.

lengths of time. The Czech Republic is a case apart. Restructuring of the banking system there in the 1990s caused many institutions to close their doors, leading, as mentioned earlier, to a sharp decline in credit outstandings.

There is a visible mismatch between business and credit cycles in all the economies. That said, contractions and expansions in credit and industrial production sometimes coincide either between the new EU members or relative to the euro area. Tables B1-B3 (Appendix B) contain the concordance indices, which reveal any co-movements in production and credit variables.

Note the lack of concordance in industrial production and credit in the Czech Republic and the euro area (Table B1). The cycles appear to be weakly synchronised in Poland, while synchronisation is more strongly anchored in Hungary, at a higher confidence threshold. Recall that this study uses a restrictive indicator of real activity – the industrial production index – so caution is required when interpreting the empirical results.

The new EU countries do not appear to be characterised by significant concordance in their credit variables (Table B2). There seems to be a more marked linkage in industrial production, however. Specifically, we see a discordance (i.e. an almost total absence of co-movements in the variables in the same phases of the cycle) in Czech credit distribution relative to Hungary and weak concordance in industrial production. A stronger link is observed between industrial activity in Poland and Hungary, at the higher confidence level of 20%.

Similarly, we see a strong linkage between the euro area production cycle and the cycles in Hungary and, to a lesser extent, Poland (Table B3). By contrast, we did not detect any concordance between the euro area industrial production index and the Czech index. Meanwhile, only Poland's credit cycle exhibits a significant and high concordance with the euro area cycle.

Even so, the absence of significant concordance does not necessarily mean that the cycles as analysed in pairs are distinct or disconnected phenomena. The result merely underscores the fact that periods of expansion or recession in, say, industrial production and credit, do not coincide.

Chart B3 describes the relationship between business and credit cycles and monetary policy, captured via real money market rates. Strikingly, we see a marked interdependence between credit contractions and interest rate adjustments in all countries. In particular, each recessionary phase identified in the euro area coincides with a decline in interest rates. The situation is more mixed for industrial production. In Poland, recessionary phases occur alongside falling interest rates. In Hungary and the Czech Republic, by contrast, interest rates sometimes rise when activity is slowing.

As previously mentioned, concordance indices allow us to measure the degree to which two time series are juxtaposed, while avoiding the question of trends in the variables (i.e. the problem of non-stationarity). However, this is just one aspect of the cycle. We can extend our analysis, maintaining the notions of phase and duration, but without confining ourselves to indicators as limiting as concordance indices. To this end, we use another approach centred on calculating correlations between the stationary components of the variables, and define the business cycle with reference to the generally accepted definition used in the literature.

4. Correlations between cyclical components and dynamic correlations

The classical approach defines the business cycle directly by analysing changes in the level of a variable, with the attendant risk of establishing a relationship between trends in the variables. The modern or "growth cycle" approach, meanwhile, defines the business cycle as a set of movements that recur within a given period of time. In the wake of research by the NBER, this interval is usually set at 18-96 months for US data. Anas *et al.* (2004), however, use an interval of 18-72 months for their analysis of euro area industrial production.

We use the same definition for the variables studied in this paper. Though somewhat constraining, this choice reflects, *inter alia*, the size of our sample, for we have only a decade or so of observations.

More generally, the recent macroeconomic literature defines the movements of a variable according to the time frequency with which its components recur. The cyclical component corresponds to the business cycle and is obtained after stripping out long-run movements attributable to structural economic factors and short-run movements caused by random shocks, seasonal effects, etc.. In their construction, cyclical components obtained by means of filtering techniques are detrended and thus stationary. We use the band pass filter recently proposed by Christiano and Fitzgerald (2003) to identify them¹⁴.

Specifically, we identify a cyclical component for each variable and compute correlations between the cyclical portions of the different series¹⁵. The robustness of the analysis is supported by estimating the dynamic correlations between the variables (Croux *et al.*, 2001)¹⁶.

Charts B4 to B7 (Appendix B) present original data series and cyclical components after band pass filtering. We adopted the following convention to calculate correlations between cyclical components. Let x_t be the cyclical component of credit and y_{t+k} the cyclical component of industrial production with a lead or lag of k periods. For $k = 0$, a significantly positive correlation indicates procyclical behaviour in credit, while a significantly negative correlation indicates a countercyclical impact. With monthly data, a maximum correlation for $k = -1$ (or $+1$), for example, indicates that the cyclical component of the credit series lags (or leads) industrial production by one month. In accordance with the existing literature, our values for k range from -12 to $+12$ months. The correlations are estimated using the generalised method of moments augmented with the HAC procedure proposed by Andrews and Monahan (1992). The correlations are presented in Appendix B (Tables B4 to B10); Charts B8 to B14 reveal the corresponding cyclical components for paired variables.

The intra-country analyses indicate that credit to businesses is countercyclical in the euro area and Poland. In Poland, lending to businesses lags industrial production by three to four months (Table B4). Conversely, bank lending appears to be relatively acyclical in Hungary and the Czech Republic. Looking at credit developments across new EU members (Table B5), we see that credit

¹⁴ See Appendix C2 for further details.

¹⁵ The permanent component is driven by a trend. So to avoid obtaining spurious relationships, it is necessary to examine the growth rate of the permanent components. Because of the small sample used in the analysis, however, these growth rates are highly persistent, in some cases causing non-convergence in the algorithms. For this reason, we do not study the correlations between the growth rates of the permanent components of the variables.

¹⁶ See Appendix C3 for further details.

moves procyclically between Poland and Hungary, with a lag of eight to ten months. Credit distribution in the Czech Republic appears to be significantly countercyclical compared with Poland and Hungary, although the correlation is weak (but significant) in the case of Hungary. Industrial production cycles seem to be more synchronised across the new EU countries (Table B6). Correlations are generally positive and are particularly strong between Polish and Hungarian industrial production, weaker between Poland and the Czech Republic, and non-significant between Hungary and the Czech Republic.

There is a significant linkage between the credit and industrial production cycles of the new EU countries and the euro area (Tables B7 and B8). The EMU credit cycles are positively correlated with those of Poland and Hungary, and negatively correlated with those of the Czech Republic. While there is no lead or lag relative to Poland, the euro area cycles lead Hungarian and the Czech Republic cycles by five to six months. Real activity in the industrial sector in the new EU member states exhibits an even greater integration with EMU, especially in Hungary and, to a lesser extent, in Poland. Industrial production in the euro area almost coincides with the Hungarian cycle, displays a two-month differential with Poland and a one-month differential with the Czech Republic.

Comparing movements in real market interest rates with changes in credit distribution reveals a strongly stabilising monetary policy in the euro area and, to a lesser degree, in Hungary and Poland (Table B9). Monetary policy exerts this stabilising effect with at most one lag in the euro area, a lag of three to four months in Hungary, and an 11-month lead in Poland, which reflects a forward-looking monetary policy. By contrast, interest rate adjustments are significantly countercyclical in the Czech Republic.

We also note a two-month-lagged countercyclical relationship between the cyclical component of interest rates and the cyclical component of industrial production in Hungary (Table B10). Monetary policy seems to have a stabilising effect in Poland and the Czech Republic, though transmission effectiveness differs in the two countries. Spikes in activity are followed by rate hikes, which lead a significant decline (in Poland only) in the cyclical component of production.

It would be interesting to examine how sensitive the results are to the definition used for the cycle. Unfortunately, the size of the sample makes it impossible to test whether switching from 18-72 months (the European cycle) to 18-96 months (the US cycle) would corroborate the above findings. Still, dynamic correlations largely support the conclusions of the previous analysis (Charts B15 to B21). A business cycle of between 1.5 and 6 years corresponds to frequencies ranging from $\pi/36$ to $\pi/9$. Thus, frequencies under $\pi/36$ correspond to the long term and those over $\pi/9$ to the short term.

There does not seem to be a significant relationship between credit and production as measured on an intra-country basis. In particular, while credit may play a countercyclical role in Poland and the Czech Republic, as well as in the euro area in the medium and long term, the relationship is not statistically significant (Chart B15). Similarly, the credit cycles of the new EU countries do not appear to be synchronised to a statistically significant degree, or even the Hungarian and Czech cycles seem to be significantly out of synchronization in the medium and long term (Chart B16). However, estimates confirm the existence of a significant linkage in industrial production between Poland and Hungary on the one hand, and between Poland and the Czech Republic on the other (Chart B17).

The dynamic correlations bear out the findings from the analysis of correlations between the cyclical components of credit and production variables in the new EU members compared with those of the euro area. Thus, euro area credit cycles appear to be significantly correlated with those of the new EU countries: positively in the medium and long term in the case of Poland and Hungary, and negatively in the Czech Republic (Chart B18). The integration of the real economies is even more pronounced: the relationship is positive and large for Hungary, smaller in Poland and statistically non-significant for the Czech Republic (Chart B19).

Finally, dynamic correlations between real three-month interest rates and bank lending to the corporate sector are significantly positive in Poland, Hungary and especially in the euro area, reflecting the stabilising impact on the credit market of interest rate adjustments (Chart B20).

5. Conclusion

Looking ahead to an enlarged euro area takes us back to the question of the extent to which new EU countries are integrated with the EMU economies. In this paper, we proposed a view of integration via an analysis of the linkage between business cycles, credit cycles and interest rate cycles. We took a three-tiered approach, looking at linkages within individual countries, between new EU members, and relative to the euro area. For that, we used three tools to measure co-movements across series.

We began by taking a classical view of the business cycle, defined as a succession of expansions and contractions. We compared the cycles identified in this way by calculating concordance indices for paired variables. We then analyzed the linkages between the different series via a growth cycle approach, first identifying the cyclical components and calculating the correlations between them, and then estimating the dynamic correlations between the series.

Several conclusions emerge from our analyses. Credit and activity do not appear to be heavily interdependent in the countries studied. The fact that monetary policy is stabilising in Poland, Hungary and especially in the euro area, i.e. seeks to smooth the financing flows provided by banks, may go some way to explaining this result. Furthermore, we used industrial production as our variable for activity, thereby excluding services, a sector of major importance in the euro area and one that is enjoying rapid growth in the new EU countries. This may skew comparisons with the credit indicator, which has a broader scope. Indeed, industrial production accounts for a small share of GDP, although its share is higher in the new EU members than in the four main euro area economies¹⁷.

The corporate credit markets of the new EU countries do not appear to share major determining factors, although the Czech Republic's credit crunch since the late 1990s complicates cross-country comparisons. However, these markets are more integrated with the euro area, especially in Poland and, to a lesser extent, Hungary. The sizeable equity interests held by euro area banks in the Polish and Hungarian banking systems may be a key factor in this regard.

¹⁷ 32.2% in Poland, 30.6% in Hungary, 41.7% in the Czech Republic in 2004, compared with 24.8% in France, 26.4% in Germany, 28.8% in Italy and 28.4% in Spain.

Business cycles, however, appear to be better integrated. Industrial production cycles are shown to be significantly and positively correlated, especially between Poland and Hungary, and, to a lesser extent, between Poland and the Czech Republic. At the same time, we find Hungarian industrial production to be strongly correlated with that of the euro area, confirming that Hungary's manufacturing system is heavily oriented towards EMU countries. Polish production is less strongly correlated with euro area production, while for the Czech Republic, the relationship is non significant.

It is therefore likely that the integration of the Polish and Hungarian cycles is driven by the euro area business cycles (or via globalization effects, not studied in this paper). If the integration of production cycles can be traced back to trade, then this conjecture is borne out by the fact that Hungary is not one of Poland's top ten trade partners in exports or imports. Meanwhile, the significant correlation between Polish and Czech activities probably has more to do with large bilateral trade flows between the two countries¹⁸ than with indirect transmission effects channelled via the euro area.

In summary, the results obtained here have major implications for the conduct of monetary policy in an enlarged EMU. For looking ahead to an extended euro area takes us back to the question of the optimality of a currency area that includes the countries of central Europe. A range of assessment criteria are generally used in this regard. Notably, are the shocks affecting these economies asymmetric, and are the economies flexible enough to respond to them? A comparative analysis of credit, business and interest rate cycles delivers an initial response to these questions. In particular, our analysis highlights some convergence in the cyclical movements of the variables studied and in the reaction of the monetary authorities to these movements.

In all the countries that we looked at, the credit cycle appears to play an important part in the reaction function of the monetary authorities, which seek to smooth the distribution of bank financing to prevent excessive contractions or booms. This finding immediately suggests a convergence of objectives in the conduct of monetary policies within the European System of Central Banks. Furthermore, if the credit cycles of the euro area, Poland and Hungary were to become more closely synchronised in the future, this would facilitate decision-making in an enlarged monetary union.

This conclusion also holds for the real economy. Although an imperfect indicator is used for activity, the correlation of industrial production in Hungary and Poland with that of the euro area suggests a low risk of asymmetric shocks. These observations contrast with those obtained for the Czech Republic, where credit cycles appear to be out of synchronization, while industrial production cycles are weakly correlated with those of the current EMU. In the latter case, this probably reflects the exchange rate crisis of 1997, which delivered a major shock to the country's main macroeconomic balances. However, efforts to clean up the banking system, together with the similarity of economic structures and the Czech economy's considerable openness to the euro area should pave the way for better convergence in the future.

¹⁸ At end-2004, the Czech Republic was Poland's leading trade partner of all the central and eastern European countries (excluding Russia). On an all-countries basis, it was fifth-ranked for exports and sixth for imports.

References

- Anas J., Billio M., Ferrara L. and Duca M. Lo (2004), "A Turning Point Chronology for the Eurozone", *Greta Working Papers*, No. 04.01, April.
- Andrews D. and Monahan C. (1992), "An Improved Heteroskedasticity and Autocorrelation Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator", *Econometrica*, Vol. 60, No. 4, pp. 953-966.
- Artis M.J, Marcellino M. and Proietti T. (2004), "Characterizing the Business Cycle for Accession Countries", *CEPR Discussion Papers*, No. 4457, Centre for Economic Policy Research, June.
- Avouyi-Dovi S. and Matheron J. (2003), "Interactions Between Real Cycles, Financial Cycles and Interest Rates: Stylized Facts", *RSF Banque de France*, No. 3, November, pp. 80-99.
- Bry G. and Boschan C. (1971), "Cyclical Analysis of Time Series: Selected Procedures and Computer Programs", National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Cashin P., McDermott J. and Scott A. (1999), "The Myth of Comoving Commodity Prices", *IMF Working Papers*, No. 99/169, International Monetary Fund.
- Christiano L. and Fitzgerald T. (2003), "The Band Pass Filter", *International Economic Review*, Vol. 44, No. 2, May, pp. 435-465.
- Croux C., Forni M. and Reichlin L. (2001), "A Measure of Comovement for Economic Variables: Theory and Empirics", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 83, No. 2, May, pp. 232-241.
- Darvas Z. and Szapary G. (2005), "Business Cycle Synchronization in the Enlarged EU", *CEPR Discussion Papers*, No. 5179, Centre for Economic Policy Research, August.
- ECB (2004), *Report on EU Banking Structure*, European Central Bank, November, Frankfurt.
- ECB (2005), *Banking Structures in the New EU Member States*, European Central Bank, January, Frankfurt.
- Fidrmuc J. and Korhonen I. (2004), "A meta-analysis of business cycle correlation between the euro area and CEECs: What do we know – and who cares?", *BOFIT Discussion Papers*, No. 20, Bank of Finland. Forthcoming in *Journal of Comparative Economics*.
- Harding D. and Pagan A. (2002), "Dissecting the Cycle: A Methodological Investigation", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 365-381.
- Harding D. and Pagan A. (2004), "Synchronisation of Cycles", *CAMA Working Papers*, No. 3/2004, Centre for Applied Macroeconomic Analysis, The Australian National University.
- IMF (2004), *Global Financial Stability Report*, International Monetary Fund, September, Washington, D.C.

Lyziak T. (2001), "Monetary transmission mechanism in Poland. Theoretical concepts vs. Evidence", *NBP Working Papers*, No. 19, National Bank of Poland.

McDermott J. and Scott A. (2000), "Concordance in Business Cycles", *IMF Working Papers*, No. 00/37, International Monetary Fund.

Pruteanu A. (2004), "The Role of Banks in the Czech Monetary Policy Transmission Mechanism", *Czech National Bank Working Paper Series*, No. 3, Czech National Bank.

Appendix A: Descriptive statistics

Table A1
Main macroeconomic indicators

| | | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|----|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| GDP (yoy real growth rate, in %) | PL | 6.0 | 6.8 | 4.8 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 3.8 | 5.4 |
| | HN | 1.3 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 5.2 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 4.2 |
| | CZ | 4.2 | -0.7 | -1.1 | 1.2 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 3.2 | 4.4 |
| | EA | 1.5 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 2.0 |
| Domestic demand (yoy real growth rate, in %) | PL | 9.6 | 9.1 | 6.4 | 5.0 | 2.7 | -1.8 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 4.6 |
| | HN | 0.3 | 4.8 | 8.2 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 5.6 | 6.0 | 1.8 |
| | CZ | 7.7 | -0.7 | -1.5 | 1.3 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.6 |
| | EA | 1.1 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 1.9 |
| Final consumption expenditure (yoy real growth rate, in %) | PL | 7.2 | 6.2 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| | HN | -3.2 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 5.9 | 8.9 | 7.2 | 1.7 |
| | CZ | 6.6 | 1.5 | -1.4 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 4.4 | 0.9 |
| | EA | 1.8 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| CPI inflation rate (harmonized index, yoy growth rate, in %) | PL | na | 15.0 | 11.9 | 7.2 | 10.1 | 5.4 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 3.6 |
| | HN | 23.6 | 18.5 | 14.3 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 9.1 | 5.3 | 4.7 | 6.8 |
| | CZ | 9.1 | 8.0 | 9.8 | 1.8 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 1.4 | -0.1 | 2.6 |
| | EA | 2.3 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.2 |
| PPI inflation rate (yoy growth rate, in %) | PL | 13.2 | 12.2 | 7.3 | 5.5 | 7.8 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 7.0 |
| | HN | 21.8 | 20.3 | 11.4 | 5.0 | 11.7 | 4.8 | -1.4 | 2.4 | 3.6 |
| | CZ | 4.9 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 4.9 | 2.8 | -0.5 | -0.3 | 5.6 |
| | EA | 0.4 | 1.1 | -0.6 | -0.4 | 5.3 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 2.1 |
| Unemployment rate | PL | 13.2 | 10.9 | 10.2 | 13.4 | 16.4 | 18.5 | 19.8 | 19.2 | 18.8 |
| | HN | 9.6 | 9.0 | 8.4 | 6.9 | 6.3 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.9 |
| | CZ | 4.0 | 4.8 | 6.4 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 8 | 7.3 | 7.8 | 8.3 |
| | EA | 10.7 | 10.6 | 10.0 | 9.2 | 8.2 | 7.9 | 8.3 | 8.7 | 8.9 |
| Government deficit (as a % of GDP) | PL | na | -4.0 | -2.1 | -1.4 | -0.7 | -3.9 | -3.6 | -4.5 | -4.8 |
| | HN | na | -6.8 | -8.0 | -5.6 | -3.0 | -3.7 | -8.5 | -6.2 | -4.5 |
| | CZ | na | -2.5 | -4.2 | -3.4 | -3.7 | -5.9 | -6.8 | -11.7 | -3.0 |
| | EA | -4.3 | -2.6 | -2.2 | -1.3 | 0.1 | -1.8 | -2.5 | -2.8 | -2.7 |
| Government gross nominal consolidated debt (as a % of GDP) | PL | na | 44.0 | 39.1 | 40.3 | 36.6 | 36.7 | 41.2 | 45.4 | 43.6 |
| | HN | na | 64.2 | 61.9 | 61.2 | 55.4 | 52.2 | 55.5 | 56.9 | 57.6 |
| | CZ | na | 12.2 | 12.9 | 13.4 | 18.2 | 27.2 | 30.7 | 38.3 | 37.4 |
| | EA | 75.2 | 74.9 | 74.2 | 72.8 | 70.4 | 68.9 | 68.8 | 70.1 | 70.6 |
| Current account balance (as a % of GDP) | PL | -2.2 | -3.8 | -4.1 | -7.6 | -6.0 | -2.9 | -2.6 | -2.2 | -1.5 |
| | HN | -6.7 | -6.3 | -2.1 | -2.3 | -4.9 | -5.4 | -5.6 | -4.8 | -5.1 |
| | CZ | -3.9 | -4.4 | -7.2 | -7.8 | -8.7 | -6.3 | -7.1 | -8.9 | -9.4 |
| | EA | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 0.3 | -0.7 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| Openness ratio (exports+imports of goods, as a % of GDP) | PL | 40.1 | 44.2 | 48.6 | 45.9 | 50.6 | 49.1 | 52.5 | 60.8 | 69.6 |
| | HN | 74.4 | 87.1 | 104.7 | 111.1 | 129.5 | 124.9 | 110.4 | 109.7 | 113.2 |
| | CZ | 81.1 | 88.0 | 89.5 | 92.2 | 109.9 | 115.0 | 107.0 | 110.0 | 126.0 |
| | EA | 45.5 | 48.9 | 50.2 | 51.0 | 57.9 | 57.3 | 54.9 | 53.6 | 56.1 |
| Foreign direct investment (in US dollars, billions) | PL | 4.5 | 4.9 | 6.4 | 7.3 | 9.3 | 5.7 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 6.2 |
| | HN | 3.3 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 4.2 |
| | CZ | 1.4 | 1.3 | 3.7 | 6.3 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 8.5 | 2.5 | na |
| | EA | na | na | 101.6 | 209.7 | 404.8 | 175.7 | 171.2 | 158.2 | 86.4 |
| Gross Capital Formation (at constant prices, as a % of GDP) | PL | 20.6 | 23.1 | 25.1 | 25.5 | 25.6 | 22.1 | 20.3 | 20.1 | 21.9 |
| | HN | 25.2 | 27.3 | 31.3 | 32.1 | 32.3 | 28.8 | 26.8 | 26.4 | 26.3 |
| | CZ | 34.4 | 32.5 | 32.1 | 30.4 | 31.9 | 33.0 | 33.7 | 33.0 | 34.1 |
| | EA | 20.1 | 20.2 | 21.1 | 21.6 | 21.7 | 20.9 | 20.0 | 20.3 | 20.7 |
| Official reserves, excluding gold (in US dollars, billions) | PL | 17.8 | 20.4 | 27.3 | 26.4 | 26.6 | 25.6 | 28.6 | 32.6 | 35.3 |
| | HN | 9.7 | 8.4 | 9.3 | 11.0 | 11.2 | 10.7 | 10.3 | 12.7 | 15.9 |
| | CZ | 12.4 | 9.7 | 12.5 | 12.8 | 13.0 | 14.3 | 23.6 | 26.8 | 28.3 |
| | EA | - | - | - | 256.8 | 242.3 | 235.0 | 247.0 | 222.7 | 211.3 |

Notes: PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic, EA = euro area, na = non available
Sources: Eurostat, IMF IFS, OCDE

Table A2
The structure of exports and imports of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic during the transition period
(as a % of total amount)

| | | Exports | | | | Imports | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------|
| | | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2003 | 1990 | 1995 | 2000 | 2003 | |
| (1) | Food and live animals | PL | 10.9 | 9.2 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 5.6 | 8.0 | 5.2 | 4.6 |
| | | HN | 19.8 | 17.9 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 6.3 | 4.7 | 2.5 | 2.8 |
| | | CZ | 5.4 | 4.9 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| (2) | Beverages and tobacco | PL | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| | | HN | 1.3 | 2.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| | | CZ | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| (3) | Crude materials, inedible, except fuels | PL | 6.8 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 6.5 | 5.4 | 3.4 | 3.0 |
| | | HN | 4.7 | 4.8 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 5.3 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 1.8 |
| | | CZ | 3.3 | 5.2 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 6.8 | 4.5 | 3.2 | 2.8 |
| (4) | Mineral fuels, lubricants, etc. | PL | 10.7 | 8.2 | 5.1 | 4.3 | 21.9 | 9.1 | 10.8 | 9.1 |
| | | HN | 3.1 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 14.2 | 11.7 | 8.4 | 7.7 |
| | | CZ | 4.9 | 4.3 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 17.9 | 7.9 | 9.7 | 7.5 |
| (5) | Animal and vegetable oils, fats, waxes | PL | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| | | HN | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| | | CZ | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| (6) | Chemicals and related products | PL | 9.1 | 7.7 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 8.6 | 15.0 | 14.1 | 14.7 |
| | | HN | 12.4 | 11.8 | 6.6 | 6.9 | 14.9 | 14.2 | 8.8 | 9.7 |
| | | CZ | 7.9 | 9.3 | 7.1 | 5.9 | 9.0 | 11.8 | 11.2 | 11.4 |
| (7) | Manufactured goods class. by materials | PL | 22.9 | 27.5 | 24.8 | 23.7 | 11.5 | 21.6 | 20.0 | 21.0 |
| | | HN | 18.5 | 17.4 | 10.7 | 10.3 | 15.5 | 23.0 | 16.5 | 16.1 |
| | | CZ | 24.4 | 32.3 | 25.4 | 23.1 | 11.1 | 20.2 | 20.8 | 20.1 |
| (8) | Machinery and transport equipment | PL | 26.2 | 21.1 | 34.2 | 37.8 | 37.5 | 29.9 | 37.0 | 38.0 |
| | | HN | 25.6 | 25.6 | 60.0 | 61.1 | 34.6 | 30.8 | 51.5 | 51.6 |
| | | CZ | 37.7 | 30.3 | 44.5 | 50.1 | 30.8 | 37.1 | 40.0 | 42.8 |
| (9) | Miscellaneous manufactured articles | PL | 7.5 | 20.8 | 18.3 | 17.1 | 6.3 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 8.7 |
| | | HN | 10.7 | 16.2 | 11.5 | 10.6 | 7.8 | 10.6 | 9.8 | 9.4 |
| | | CZ | 12.9 | 12.6 | 12.5 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 10.3 | 10.6 |
| (10) | Commodities not classified by kind | PL | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| | | HN | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| | | CZ | 2.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Sum: (7)+(8)+(9) | PL | 56.7 | 69.5 | 77.3 | 78.6 | 55.3 | 60.8 | 65.6 | 67.7 | |
| | HN | 54.8 | 59.2 | 82.3 | 82.1 | 57.9 | 64.4 | 77.8 | 77.1 | |
| | CZ | 75.0 | 75.2 | 82.4 | 85.0 | 53.7 | 69.1 | 71.1 | 73.5 | |

Notes: PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic
Source: WIIW

Appendix B: Estimation results

Table B1
Concordance indices between industrial production and loans to non-financial corporations, intra-country basis

| | Poland | Hungary | Czech Republic | Euro area |
|--|---------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|
| | 0.57364 (***) | 0.82171 (*) | 0.41860 | 0.58140 |

Note: Coefficient significant at 20 % (*), 10 % (**), 5 % (***)

Table B2
Concordance indices, inter-new EU members basis

| <i>Variable</i> | Hungary – Poland | Czech Republic – Poland | Czech Republic – Hungary |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Loans to non-financial corporations | 0.68992 | 0.34884 | 0.22481 (***) |
| Industrial production | 0.79845 (*) | 0.64341 | 0.55039 (***) |


Note: Coefficient significant at 20 % (*), 10 % (**), 5 % (***)

Table B3
Concordance indices: euro area and new EU members


| <i>Variable</i> | Euro area – Poland | Euro area – Hungary | Euro area – Czech Republic |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Loans to non-financial corporations | 0.85271 (***) | 0.74419 | 0.38760 |
| Industrial production | 0.72093 (*) | 0.82946 (***) | 0.55039 |

Note: Coefficient significant at 20 % (*), 10 % (**), 5 % (***)


Chart B1
Turning points in loans to non-financial corporations (January 1994 – September 2004)




Note: Peak (2003:5), trough (1995:1)



Note: Peak (1994:7), trough (1996:6)




Note: Peaks (1997:11, 2003:11), trough (2003:5)




Note: Peaks (2002:8, 2004:3), troughs (1995:4, 2003:2)


Chart B2
Turning points in industrial production (January 1994 – September 2004)




Note: Peaks (1998:2, 2001:1), troughs (1998:12, 2002:5)



Note: Peaks (1995:5, 2001:1), troughs (1996:4, 2001:12)



Note: Peaks (1997:10, 2004:3), troughs (1995:7, 1999:1)



Note: Peaks (1995:2, 1998:7, 2000:12, 2002:9), troughs (1996:3, 1999:2, 2001:11, 2003:6)

Chart B3
Turning points in credit (charts on the left-hand-side) and industrial production (charts on the right-hand-side) and real
3-month money market interest rates (January 1994 – September 2004)




Chart B4
Original data and cyclical component after band pass filtering (Euro area)




Chart B5
Original data and cyclical component after band pass filtering (Poland)




Chart B6
Original data and cyclical component after band pass filtering (Hungary)




Chart B7
Original data and cyclical component after band pass filtering (Czech Republic)




Table B4
Correlations between cyclical components: loans to non-financial corporations (t) – industrial production ($t \pm k$), intra-country basis

| k | PL | HN | CZ | EA |
|-----|------------|-------|-------|------------|
| -12 | -0.09 | -0.41 | -0.19 | 0.34 (*) |
| -11 | -0.17 | -0.38 | -0.19 | 0.27 |
| -10 | -0.24 | -0.35 | -0.18 | 0.19 |
| -9 | -0.32 (*) | -0.31 | -0.18 | 0.10 |
| -8 | -0.39 (**) | -0.27 | -0.17 | -0.01 |
| -7 | -0.45 (**) | -0.22 | -0.17 | -0.12 |
| -6 | -0.51 (**) | -0.17 | -0.16 | -0.23 |
| -5 | -0.54 (**) | -0.12 | -0.15 | -0.33 (*) |
| -4 | -0.57 (**) | -0.08 | -0.14 | -0.43 (**) |
| -3 | -0.57 (**) | -0.03 | -0.13 | -0.52 (**) |
| -2 | -0.55 (**) | 0.01 | -0.13 | -0.58 (**) |
| -1 | -0.52 (**) | 0.05 | -0.12 | -0.63 (**) |
| 0 | -0.47 (**) | 0.08 | -0.11 | -0.66 (**) |
| +1 | -0.39 (**) | 0.12 | -0.11 | -0.65 (**) |
| +2 | -0.30 (*) | 0.15 | -0.10 | -0.63 (**) |
| +3 | -0.21 | 0.17 | -0.09 | -0.58 (**) |
| +4 | -0.12 | 0.19 | -0.07 | -0.53 (**) |
| +5 | -0.04 | 0.20 | -0.05 | -0.46 (**) |
| +6 | 0.03 | 0.20 | -0.02 | -0.39 |
| +7 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 0.01 | -0.31 |
| +8 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.05 | -0.22 |
| +9 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 0.08 | -0.14 |
| +10 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.11 | -0.06 |
| +11 | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 0.01 |
| +12 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.08 |

Note: * (**) coefficient significant at 10 % (5 %), PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic, EA = euro area

Table B5
Correlations between cyclical components of loans to non-financial corporations, inter-new EU members basis

| k | HN (t) – PL ($t \pm k$) | CZ (t) – PL ($t \pm k$) | CZ (t) – HN ($t \pm k$) |
|-----|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| -12 | 0.57 (**) | -0.21 | -0.06 |
| -11 | 0.59 (**) | -0.25 | -0.07 |
| -10 | 0.60 (**) | -0.29 | -0.07 |
| -9 | 0.60 (**) | -0.32 (*) | -0.07 |
| -8 | 0.60 (**) | -0.35 (*) | -0.08 |
| -7 | 0.58 (**) | -0.38 (**) | -0.08 |
| -6 | 0.56 (**) | -0.40 (**) | -0.09 |
| -5 | 0.52 (**) | -0.42 (**) | -0.09 |
| -4 | 0.47 (**) | -0.44 (**) | -0.10 |
| -3 | 0.42 (**) | -0.46 (**) | -0.12 |
| -2 | 0.35 (**) | -0.47 (**) | -0.13 |
| -1 | 0.28 (*) | -0.48 (**) | -0.15 |
| 0 | 0.20 | -0.49 (**) | -0.17 |
| +1 | 0.12 | -0.46 (**) | -0.18 (*) |
| +2 | 0.03 | -0.44 (**) | -0.19 (*) |
| +3 | -0.05 | -0.41 (**) | -0.20 (**) |
| +4 | -0.12 | -0.39 (**) | -0.20 (**) |
| +5 | -0.19 | -0.36 (**) | -0.20 (**) |
| +6 | -0.25 | -0.33 (*) | -0.19 (*) |
| +7 | -0.29 | -0.30 | -0.19 (*) |
| +8 | -0.33 | -0.28 | -0.17 (*) |
| +9 | -0.36 | -0.25 | -0.16 |
| +10 | -0.38 | -0.23 | -0.15 |
| +11 | -0.40 | -0.20 | -0.14 |
| +12 | -0.41 | -0.17 | -0.12 |

Note: * (**) coefficient significant at 10 % (5 %), PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic

Table B6
Correlations between cyclical components of industrial production, inter-new EU members basis

| k | HN (t) – PL ($t \pm k$) | CZ (t) – PL ($t \pm k$) | CZ (t) – HN ($t \pm k$) |
|-----|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| -12 | -0.13 | 0.01 | -0.25 |
| -11 | 0.00 | 0.06 | -0.22 |
| -10 | 0.13 | 0.12 | -0.19 |
| -9 | 0.26 (**) | 0.18 | -0.15 |
| -8 | 0.39 (**) | 0.24 (*) | -0.11 |
| -7 | 0.50 (**) | 0.30 (**) | -0.07 |
| -6 | 0.60 (**) | 0.36 (**) | -0.02 |
| -5 | 0.69 (**) | 0.41 (**) | 0.02 |
| -4 | 0.75 (**) | 0.44 (**) | 0.06 |
| -3 | 0.79 (**) | 0.45 (**) | 0.10 |
| -2 | 0.81 (**) | 0.45 (**) | 0.14 |
| -1 | 0.81 (**) | 0.42 (**) | 0.17 |
| 0 | 0.78 (**) | 0.38 (**) | 0.19 |
| +1 | 0.73 (**) | 0.30 (**) | 0.20 |
| +2 | 0.66 (**) | 0.21 (*) | 0.20 |
| +3 | 0.57 (**) | 0.10 | 0.18 |
| +4 | 0.48 (**) | -0.02 | 0.16 |
| +5 | 0.37 (**) | -0.15 | 0.12 |
| +6 | 0.27 | -0.27 (*) | 0.07 |
| +7 | 0.16 | -0.38 (**) | 0.01 |
| +8 | 0.06 | -0.48 (**) | -0.05 |
| +9 | -0.04 | -0.56 (**) | -0.12 |
| +10 | -0.13 | -0.62 (**) | -0.18 |
| +11 | -0.21 | -0.65 (**) | -0.24 |
| +12 | -0.28 (*) | -0.65 (**) | -0.29 |

Note: * (**) coefficient significant at 10 % (5 %), PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic

Table B7
Correlations between cyclical components of loans to non-financial corporations: euro area and new EU members

| k | EA (t) – PL ($t \pm k$) | EA (t) – HN ($t \pm k$) | EA (t) – CZ ($t \pm k$) |
|-----|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| -12 | -0.11 | -0.07 | 0.29 |
| -11 | -0.06 | -0.05 | 0.26 |
| -10 | 0.01 | -0.03 | 0.22 |
| -9 | 0.08 | -0.02 | 0.17 |
| -8 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.11 |
| -7 | 0.25 (*) | 0.03 | 0.04 |
| -6 | 0.33 (**) | 0.05 | -0.03 |
| -5 | 0.41 (**) | 0.08 | -0.12 |
| -4 | 0.49 (**) | 0.11 | -0.21 |
| -3 | 0.56 (**) | 0.15 | -0.30 (**) |
| -2 | 0.62 (**) | 0.19 | -0.39 (**) |
| -1 | 0.66 (**) | 0.23 | -0.47 (**) |
| 0 | 0.69 (**) | 0.27 (*) | -0.55 (**) |
| +1 | 0.66 (**) | 0.30 (**) | -0.61 (**) |
| +2 | 0.63 (**) | 0.33 (**) | -0.65 (**) |
| +3 | 0.58 (**) | 0.35 (**) | -0.68 (**) |
| +4 | 0.53 (**) | 0.37 (**) | -0.70 (**) |
| +5 | 0.47 (**) | 0.38 (**) | -0.71 (**) |
| +6 | 0.41 (**) | 0.39 (**) | -0.71 (**) |
| +7 | 0.34 (*) | 0.38 (**) | -0.69 (**) |
| +8 | 0.28 | 0.37 (**) | -0.66 (**) |
| +9 | 0.23 | 0.36 (*) | -0.62 (**) |
| +10 | 0.17 | 0.34 | -0.56 (**) |
| +11 | 0.12 | 0.31 | -0.50 (**) |
| +12 | 0.08 | 0.28 | -0.42 (**) |

Note: * (**) coefficient significant at 10 % (5 %), PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic, EA = euro area

Table B8
Correlations between cyclical components of industrial production: euro area and new EU members

| k | EA (t) – PL ($t \pm k$) | EA (t) – HN ($t \pm k$) | EA (t) – CZ ($t \pm k$) |
|-----|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| -12 | -0.03 | -0.25 | -0.30 |
| -11 | 0.07 | -0.15 | -0.23 |
| -10 | 0.18 | -0.04 | -0.15 |
| -9 | 0.29 (**) | 0.07 | -0.06 |
| -8 | 0.39 (**) | 0.20 | 0.03 |
| -7 | 0.49 (**) | 0.32 (*) | 0.13 |
| -6 | 0.58 (**) | 0.44 (**) | 0.23 |
| -5 | 0.65 (**) | 0.55 (**) | 0.32 (**) |
| -4 | 0.71 (**) | 0.66 (**) | 0.39 (**) |
| -3 | 0.74 (**) | 0.74 (**) | 0.44 (**) |
| -2 | 0.75 (**) | 0.81 (**) | 0.48 (**) |
| -1 | 0.74 (**) | 0.86 (**) | 0.49 (**) |
| 0 | 0.71 (**) | 0.89 (**) | 0.47 (**) |
| +1 | 0.64 (**) | 0.89 (**) | 0.43 (**) |
| +2 | 0.56 (**) | 0.86 (**) | 0.37 (**) |
| +3 | 0.46 (**) | 0.80 (**) | 0.30 (*) |
| +4 | 0.35 (**) | 0.72 (**) | 0.21 |
| +5 | 0.23 (*) | 0.63 (**) | 0.12 |
| +6 | 0.11 | 0.52 (**) | 0.03 |
| +7 | -0.01 | 0.40 (**) | -0.06 |
| +8 | -0.12 | 0.27 (*) | -0.15 |
| +9 | -0.22 | 0.14 | -0.23 |
| +10 | -0.30 (*) | 0.01 | -0.29 (*) |
| +11 | -0.38 (**) | -0.11 | -0.35 (**) |
| +12 | -0.43 (**) | -0.23 | -0.39 (**) |

Note: * (**) coefficient significant at 10 % (5 %), PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic, EA = euro area

Table B9
Correlations between cyclical components: 3-month money market interest rate (t) – loans to non-financial corporations ($t \pm k$), intra-country basis

| k | PL | HN | CZ | EA |
|-----|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| -12 | -0.46 (**) | 0.26 | -0.08 | -0.26 (*) |
| -11 | -0.43 (*) | 0.30 | -0.14 | -0.14 |
| -10 | -0.39 (*) | 0.34 | -0.20 | -0.01 |
| -9 | -0.34 | 0.37 | -0.26 | 0.12 |
| -8 | -0.29 | 0.40 (*) | -0.32 (*) | 0.27 (*) |
| -7 | -0.23 | 0.42 (**) | -0.36 (**) | 0.40 (**) |
| -6 | -0.16 | 0.44 (**) | -0.41 (**) | 0.54 (**) |
| -5 | -0.09 | 0.45 (**) | -0.44 (**) | 0.66 (**) |
| -4 | -0.02 | 0.46 (**) | -0.48 (**) | 0.76 (**) |
| -3 | 0.05 | 0.46 (**) | -0.50 (**) | 0.84 (**) |
| -2 | 0.12 | 0.45 (**) | -0.52 (**) | 0.90 (**) |
| -1 | 0.18 | 0.44 (**) | -0.54 (**) | 0.94 (**) |
| 0 | 0.25 | 0.42 (**) | -0.55 (**) | 0.94 (**) |
| +1 | 0.30 (**) | 0.40 (**) | -0.55 (**) | 0.91 (**) |
| +2 | 0.34 (**) | 0.37 (**) | -0.55 (**) | 0.86 (**) |
| +3 | 0.38 (**) | 0.34 (**) | -0.54 (**) | 0.78 (**) |
| +4 | 0.41 (**) | 0.31 (*) | -0.53 (**) | 0.69 (**) |
| +5 | 0.44 (**) | 0.27 | -0.51 (**) | 0.58 (**) |
| +6 | 0.46 (**) | 0.23 | -0.48 (**) | 0.46 (**) |
| +7 | 0.48 (**) | 0.19 | -0.45 (**) | 0.33 (**) |
| +8 | 0.50 (**) | 0.14 | -0.40 (*) | 0.20 |
| +9 | 0.51 (**) | 0.10 | -0.35 | 0.07 |
| +10 | 0.52 (**) | 0.05 | -0.28 | -0.05 |
| +11 | 0.53 (**) | 0.00 | -0.21 | -0.17 |
| +12 | 0.52 (**) | -0.05 | -0.14 | -0.27 (**) |


Note: * (**) coefficient significant at 10 % (5 %), PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic, EA = euro area

Table B10
Correlations between cyclical components: 3-month money market interest rate (t) – industrial production ($t \pm k$), intra-country basis

| k | PL | HN | CZ | EA |
|-----|------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| -12 | 0.55 (**) | 0.05 | 0.35 | 0.44 (**) |
| -11 | 0.56 (**) | -0.05 | 0.40 (*) | 0.36 (**) |
| -10 | 0.56 (**) | -0.15 | 0.43 (**) | 0.26 |
| -9 | 0.54 (**) | -0.26 | 0.46 (**) | 0.15 |
| -8 | 0.52 (**) | -0.36 (**) | 0.48 (**) | 0.03 |
| -7 | 0.48 (**) | -0.45 (**) | 0.48 (**) | -0.09 |
| -6 | 0.43 (**) | -0.53 (**) | 0.48 (**) | -0.21 |
| -5 | 0.36 (*) | -0.60 (**) | 0.46 (**) | -0.33 (**) |
| -4 | 0.29 | -0.64 (**) | 0.44 (**) | -0.43 (**) |
| -3 | 0.21 | -0.67 (**) | 0.40 (**) | -0.53 (**) |
| -2 | 0.13 | -0.68 (**) | 0.36 (**) | -0.60 (**) |
| -1 | 0.03 | -0.67 (**) | 0.30 (**) | -0.66 (**) |
| 0 | -0.06 | -0.63 (**) | 0.25 | -0.70 (**) |
| +1 | -0.15 | -0.58 (**) | 0.19 | -0.72 (**) |
| +2 | -0.25 | -0.51 (**) | 0.14 | -0.71 (**) |
| +3 | -0.34 (**) | -0.43 (**) | 0.08 | -0.69 (**) |
| +4 | -0.43 (**) | -0.34 | 0.03 | -0.66 (**) |
| +5 | -0.51 (**) | -0.25 | -0.01 | -0.61 (**) |
| +6 | -0.58 (**) | -0.15 | -0.05 | -0.55 (**) |
| +7 | -0.64 (**) | -0.04 | -0.07 | -0.48 (**) |
| +8 | -0.69 (**) | 0.06 | -0.09 | -0.40 (**) |
| +9 | -0.73 (**) | 0.16 | -0.09 | -0.31 (*) |
| +10 | -0.75 (**) | 0.25 | -0.09 | -0.23 |
| +11 | -0.75 (**) | 0.34 (*) | -0.09 | -0.13 |
| +12 | -0.74 (**) | 0.41 (**) | -0.09 | -0.04 |

Note: * (**) coefficient significant at 10 % (5 %), PL = Poland, HN = Hungary, CZ = Czech Republic, EA = euro area

Chart B8
Cyclical components of loans to non-financial corporations and industrial production, intra-country basis



Note: loans to non-financial corporations (left axis, dashed line), industrial production (right axis, solid line)

Chart B9
Cyclical components of loans to non-financial corporations, inter-new EU members basis




Chart B10
Cyclical components of industrial production, inter-new EU members basis




Chart B11
Cyclical components of loans to non-financial corporations: euro area and new EU members




Chart B12
Cyclical components of industrial production: euro area and new EU members






Chart B13
Cyclical components of loans to non-financial corporations and 3-month money market interest rates, intra-country basis



Note: 3-month money market interest rate (left axis, dashed line), loans to non-financial corporations (right axis, solid line)

Chart B14
Cyclical components of industrial production and 3-month money market interest rates,
intra-country basis



Note: 3-month money market interest rate (left axis, dashed line), industrial production (right axis, solid line)

Chart B15
Dynamic correlations: loans to non-financial corporations – industrial production, intra-country basis




Chart B16
Dynamic correlations of loans to non-financial corporations, inter-new EU members basis




Chart B17
Dynamic correlations of industrial production, inter-new EU members basis




Chart B18
Dynamic correlations of loans to non-financial corporations: euro area and new EU members




Chart B19
Dynamic correlations of industrial production: euro area and new EU members




Chart B20
Dynamic correlations: 3-month money market interest rate – loans to non-financial corporations, intra-country basis





Chart B21

Dynamic correlations: 3-month money market interest rate – industrial production, intra-country basis



Appendix C: Theoretical underpinnings

C1) Turning points identification: a brief synopsis of the approach

Bry and Boschan (1971) determined an algorithm that made it possible to replicate the contraction start dates identified by a committee of experts from the NBER. We used a variation of this algorithm, developed by Harding and Pagan (2002, 2004), whose steps are as follows.

– A peak (trough) is reached at t if the value of the series at date t is superior (inferior) to the previous k values and to the following k values, where k is a natural integer that varies according to the type of series studied and its sampling frequency.

– A procedure is implemented to ensure that peaks and troughs alternate, by selecting the highest (lowest) of two consecutive peaks (troughs).

– Cycles whose duration is shorter than the minimum time m are stripped out, as are cycles whose complete recurrence period (number of periods separating a peak from a peak or a trough from a trough) is lower than the prespecified number of M periods.

– Complementary rules are applied:

– the first peak (trough) cannot be lower (higher) than the first point in the series, and the last peak (trough) cannot be lower (higher) than the last point in the series;

– the first (last) peak or trough cannot be positioned at less than e periods from the first (last) point in the series studied.

As a general rule, the more the parameters k , e , m and M are set to small values, the more it is likely that all absolute declines in the level of the series will be identified as troughs, all the more so as the original variable is not too smooth. Conversely, if these are set to large values, the procedure will come up with almost no turning points. The values adopted for these parameters are in line with the existing literature, i.e. $e = 6$, $k = 5$, $m = 5$ and $M = 15$.

C2) The band pass filter

The ideal band pass filter used to isolate cyclical movements, whose recurrence periods are between the interval $[b_i, b_s]$, is defined by the following equation:

$$y_t^{cf} = B(L)y_t, \quad B(L) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k=+\infty} B_k L^k, \quad L^k y_t = y_{t-k},$$

where B_k are expressed as:

$$B_k = \frac{\sin(2k\pi / b_i) - \sin(2k\pi / b_s)}{\pi k}.$$

In order to interpret the role played by the filter, we introduce the concept of *spectral density*. The spectral density of the stationary stochastic process y_t , denoted $S_y(\omega)$, is interpreted as the decomposition of the variance of y_t in the frequency domain. As y_t can be decomposed into a

sum of orthogonal cyclical movements that each appear at a different frequency, we can interpret $S_y(\omega)$ as the variance of y_t , explained by the cyclical movements operating at frequency ω .

A classical result of spectral analysis shows us that, under certain conditions, the equation $y_t^{ct} = B(L)y_t$ implies that the spectral density of the process y_t^{ct} , $S_{y^{ct}}(\omega)$, is deduced from that of y_t , $S_y(\omega)$, using the formula:

$$S_{y^{ct}}(\omega) = \|B(e^{-i\omega})\|^2 S_y(\omega),$$

where $\|B(e^{-i\omega})\|^2$ is the squared module of $B(e^{-i\omega})$. Given the definition of B_k , a direct calculation shows that:

$$B(e^{-i\omega}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \omega \in [2\pi b_s, 2\pi b_i] \cup]-2\pi b_i, -2\pi b_s[\\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

From this formula, it can be observed that the spectral density of y_t is not zero on the frequency band $[2\pi b_s, 2\pi b_i] \cup]-2\pi b_i, -2\pi b_s[\subset]-\pi, \pi[$, and zero everywhere else. In other words, all the variance of y_t^{ct} is explained by cyclical movements whose recurrence periods are between b_i and b_s .

The definition of the filter $B(L)$ imposes a major limitation, as it requires a dataset of infinite length. In practice, we work with a finite sample and must therefore make an appropriate approximation of $B(L)$. Starting from a finite number of observations $\{y_1, \dots, y_T\}$ of the stochastic process y_t , Christiano and Fitzgerald (2003) define the optimal linear approximation \hat{y}_t^{ct} of y_t^{ct} as the solution to the problem:

$$\min E \left[\left(y_t^{ct} - \hat{y}_t^{ct} \right)^2 \mid \{y_1, \dots, y_T\} \right].$$

The method therefore consists in minimising the mathematical expectation of the square error between the ideally filtered series and the approximately filtered series, where the expectation is conditioned on all the available data.

C3) Dynamic correlations

Let us take a stationary bivariate process $(x_t, y_t)'$. The traditional concept of correlation is a static measure of the linear relation between x_t and y_t . By contrast, the dynamic correlation between x_t and y_t , denoted $\rho_{xy}(\omega)$, makes it possible to decompose the correlation between these series in the frequency domain. In particular, it allows us to quantify the amount of the correlation between x_t and y_t that is due to the movements observed at frequency ω . Let $S(\omega)$ denote the spectral density of $(x_t, y_t)'$ at frequency ω :

$$S(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} S_x(\omega) & S_{xy}(\omega) \\ S_{yx}(\omega) & S_y(\omega) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$$

where the cross spectrum $S_{xy}(\omega)$ is a complex number, such that $S_{xy}(\omega) = S_{yx}(\omega)'$ (with the sign “ ’ ” denoting the transpose-conjugate operation). The dynamic correlation $\rho_{xy}(\omega)$ associated with $(x_t, y_t)'$ is defined by

$$\rho_{xy}(\omega) = \frac{C_{xy}(\omega)}{\sqrt{S_x(\omega)S_y(\omega)}}, \quad \omega \in [0, \pi[$$

where $C_{xy}(\omega)$ is the real part of $S_{xy}(\omega)$. Thus, this statistic is nothing more than the correlation coefficient between real waves at frequency ω appearing in the spectral decomposition of $(x_t, y_t)'$.

To estimate $\rho_{xy}(\omega)$ we first calculate $S(\omega)$ using the relation

$$S(\omega) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{k=+\infty} \Gamma_k e^{-i\omega k}, \quad \omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$$

where $\Gamma_k = E z_t z'_{t-k}$ is the autocovariance at order k of $(x_t, y_t)'$. In practice, the Γ_k are not known. We use a VAR model, previously estimated on $(x_t, y_t)'$ and derive from it analytically the Fourier transform needed for the calculation of $S(\omega)$. The confidence intervals relating to the dynamic correlations are simply calculated from the sampling uncertainty associated with the VAR model.

Notes d'Études et de Recherche

1. C. Huang and H. Pagès, "Optimal Consumption and Portfolio Policies with an Infinite Horizon: Existence and Convergence," May 1990.
2. C. Bordes, « Variabilité de la vitesse et volatilité de la croissance monétaire : le cas français », février 1989.
3. C. Bordes, M. Driscoll and A. Sauviat, "Interpreting the Money-Output Correlation: Money-Real or Real-Real?," May 1989.
4. C. Bordes, D. Goyeau et A. Sauviat, « Taux d'intérêt, marge et rentabilité bancaires : le cas des pays de l'OCDE », mai 1989.
5. B. Bensaïd, S. Federbusch et R. Gary-Bobo, « Sur quelques propriétés stratégiques de l'intéressement des salariés dans l'industrie », juin 1989.
6. O. De Bandt, « L'identification des chocs monétaires et financiers en France : une étude empirique », juin 1990.
7. M. Boutillier et S. Dérangère, « Le taux de crédit accordé aux entreprises françaises : coûts opératoires des banques et prime de risque de défaut », juin 1990.
8. M. Boutillier and B. Cabrillac, "Foreign Exchange Markets: Efficiency and Hierarchy," October 1990.
9. O. De Bandt et P. Jacquinet, « Les choix de financement des entreprises en France : une modélisation économétrique », octobre 1990 (English version also available on request).
10. B. Bensaïd and R. Gary-Bobo, "On Renegotiation of Profit-Sharing Contracts in Industry," July 1989 (English version of NER n° 5).
11. P. G. Garella and Y. Richelle, "Cartel Formation and the Selection of Firms," December 1990.
12. H. Pagès and H. He, "Consumption and Portfolio Decisions with Labor Income and Borrowing Constraints," August 1990.
13. P. Sicsic, « Le franc Poincaré a-t-il été délibérément sous-évalué ? », octobre 1991.
14. B. Bensaïd and R. Gary-Bobo, "On the Commitment Value of Contracts under Renegotiation Constraints," January 1990 revised November 1990.
15. B. Bensaïd, J.-P. Lesne, H. Pagès and J. Scheinkman, "Derivative Asset Pricing with Transaction Costs," May 1991 revised November 1991.
16. C. Monticelli and M.-O. Strauss-Kahn, "European Integration and the Demand for Broad Money," December 1991.
17. J. Henry and M. Phelipot, "The High and Low-Risk Asset Demand of French Households: A Multivariate Analysis," November 1991 revised June 1992.
18. B. Bensaïd and P. Garella, "Financing Takeovers under Asymmetric Information," September 1992.

19. A. de Palma and M. Uctum, "Financial Intermediation under Financial Integration and Deregulation," September 1992.
20. A. de Palma, L. Leruth and P. Régibeau, "Partial Compatibility with Network Externalities and Double Purchase," August 1992.
21. A. Frachot, D. Janci and V. Lacoste, "Factor Analysis of the Term Structure: a Probabilistic Approach," November 1992.
22. P. Sicsic et B. Villeneuve, « L'afflux d'or en France de 1928 à 1934 », janvier 1993.
23. M. Jeanblanc-Picqué and R. Avesani, "Impulse Control Method and Exchange Rate," September 1993.
24. A. Frachot and J.-P. Lesne, "Expectations Hypothesis and Stochastic Volatilities," July 1993 revised September 1993.
25. B. Bensaid and A. de Palma, "Spatial Multiproduct Oligopoly," February 1993 revised October 1994.
26. A. de Palma and R. Gary-Bobo, "Credit Contraction in a Model of the Banking Industry," October 1994.
27. P. Jacquinet et F. Mihoubi, « Dynamique et hétérogénéité de l'emploi en déséquilibre », septembre 1995.
28. G. Salmat, « Le retournement conjoncturel de 1992 et 1993 en France : une modélisation VAR », octobre 1994.
29. J. Henry and J. Weidmann, "Asymmetry in the EMS Revisited: Evidence from the Causality Analysis of Daily Eurorates," February 1994 revised October 1994.
30. O. De Bandt, "Competition Among Financial Intermediaries and the Risk of Contagious Failures," September 1994 revised January 1995.
31. B. Bensaid et A. de Palma, « Politique monétaire et concurrence bancaire », janvier 1994 révisé en septembre 1995.
32. F. Rosenwald, « Coût du crédit et montant des prêts : une interprétation en terme de canal large du crédit », septembre 1995.
33. G. Cette et S. Mahfouz, « Le partage primaire du revenu : constat descriptif sur longue période », décembre 1995.
34. H. Pagès, "Is there a Premium for Currencies Correlated with Volatility? Some Evidence from Risk Reversals," January 1996.
35. E. Jondeau and R. Ricart, "The Expectations Theory: Tests on French, German and American Euro-rates," June 1996.
36. B. Bensaid et O. De Bandt, « Les stratégies "stop-loss" : théorie et application au Contrat Notionnel du Matif », juin 1996.
37. C. Martin et F. Rosenwald, « Le marché des certificats de dépôts. Écarts de taux à l'émission : l'influence de la relation émetteurs-souscripteurs initiaux », avril 1996.

38. Banque de France - CEPREMAP - Direction de la Prévision - Erasme - INSEE - OFCE, « Structures et propriétés de cinq modèles macroéconomiques français », juin 1996.
39. F. Rosenwald, « L'influence des montants émis sur le taux des certificats de dépôts », octobre 1996.
40. L. Baumel, « Les crédits mis en place par les banques AFB de 1978 à 1992 : une évaluation des montants et des durées initiales », novembre 1996.
41. G. Cette et E. Kremp, « Le passage à une assiette valeur ajoutée pour les cotisations sociales : Une caractérisation des entreprises non financières “gagnantes” et “perdantes” », novembre 1996.
42. S. Avouyi-Dovi, E. Jondeau et C. Lai Tong, « Effets “volume”, volatilité et transmissions internationales sur les marchés boursiers dans le G5 », avril 1997.
43. E. Jondeau et R. Ricart, « Le contenu en information de la pente des taux : Application au cas des titres publics français », juin 1997.
44. B. Bensaid et M. Boutillier, « Le contrat notionnel : efficience et efficacité », juillet 1997.
45. E. Jondeau et R. Ricart, « La théorie des anticipations de la structure par terme : test à partir des titres publics français », septembre 1997.
46. E. Jondeau, « Représentation VAR et test de la théorie des anticipations de la structure par terme », septembre 1997.
47. E. Jondeau et M. Rockinger, « Estimation et interprétation des densités neutres au risque : Une comparaison de méthodes », octobre 1997.
48. L. Baumel et P. Sevestre, « La relation entre le taux de crédits et le coût des ressources bancaires. Modélisation et estimation sur données individuelles de banques », octobre 1997.
49. P. Sevestre, “On the Use of Banks Balance Sheet Data in Loan Market Studies : A Note,” October 1997.
50. P.-C. Hautcoeur and P. Sicsic, “Threat of a Capital Levy, Expected Devaluation and Interest Rates in France during the Interwar Period,” January 1998.
51. P. Jacquinot, « L'inflation sous-jacente à partir d'une approche structurelle des VAR : une application à la France, à l'Allemagne et au Royaume-Uni », janvier 1998.
52. C. Bruneau et O. De Bandt, « La modélisation VAR structurel : application à la politique monétaire en France », janvier 1998.
53. C. Bruneau and E. Jondeau, “Long-Run Causality, with an Application to International Links between Long-Term Interest Rates,” June 1998.
54. S. Coutant, E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, “Reading Interest Rate and Bond Futures Options' Smiles: How PIBOR and Notional Operators Appreciated the 1997 French Snap Election,” June 1998.
55. E. Jondeau et F. Sédillot, « La prévision des taux longs français et allemands à partir d'un modèle à anticipations rationnelles », juin 1998.
56. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, “Estimating Gram-Charlier Expansions with Positivity Constraints,” January 1999.

57. S. Avouyi-Dovi and E. Jondeau, "Interest Rate Transmission and Volatility Transmission along the Yield Curve," January 1999.
58. S. Avouyi-Dovi et E. Jondeau, « La modélisation de la volatilité des bourses asiatiques », janvier 1999.
59. E. Jondeau, « La mesure du ratio rendement-risque à partir du marché des euro-devises », janvier 1999.
60. C. Bruneau and O. De Bandt, "Fiscal Policy in the Transition to Monetary Union: A Structural VAR Model," January 1999.
61. E. Jondeau and R. Ricart, "The Information Content of the French and German Government Bond Yield Curves: Why Such Differences?," February 1999.
62. J.-B. Chatelain et P. Sevestre, « Coûts et bénéfices du passage d'une faible inflation à la stabilité des prix », février 1999.
63. D. Irac et P. Jacquinot, « L'investissement en France depuis le début des années 1980 », avril 1999.
64. F. Mihoubi, « Le partage de la valeur ajoutée en France et en Allemagne », mars 1999.
65. S. Avouyi-Dovi and E. Jondeau, "Modelling the French Swap Spread," April 1999.
66. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, "The Tail Behavior of Stock Returns: Emerging Versus Mature Markets," June 1999.
67. F. Sédillot, « La pente des taux contient-elle de l'information sur l'activité économique future ? », juin 1999.
68. E. Jondeau, H. Le Bihan et F. Sédillot, « Modélisation et prévision des indices de prix sectoriels », septembre 1999.
69. H. Le Bihan and F. Sédillot, "Implementing and Interpreting Indicators of Core Inflation: The French Case," September 1999.
70. R. Lacroix, "Testing for Zeros in the Spectrum of an Univariate Stationary Process: Part I," December 1999.
71. R. Lacroix, "Testing for Zeros in the Spectrum of an Univariate Stationary Process: Part II," December 1999.
72. R. Lacroix, "Testing the Null Hypothesis of Stationarity in Fractionally Integrated Models," December 1999.
73. F. Chesnay and E. Jondeau, "Does correlation between stock returns really increase during turbulent period?," April 2000.
74. O. Burkart and V. Coudert, "Leading Indicators of Currency Crises in Emerging Economies," May 2000.
75. D. Irac, "Estimation of a Time Varying NAIRU for France," July 2000.
76. E. Jondeau and H. Le Bihan, "Evaluating Monetary Policy Rules in Estimated Forward-Looking Models: A Comparison of US and German Monetary Policies," October 2000.

77. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, "Conditional Volatility, Skewness, and Kurtosis: Existence and Persistence," November 2000.
78. P. Jacquinot et F. Mihoubi, « Modèle à Anticipations Rationnelles de la Conjoncture Simulée : MARCOS », novembre 2000.
79. M. Rockinger and E. Jondeau, "Entropy Densities: With an Application to Autoregressive Conditional Skewness and Kurtosis," January 2001.
80. B. Amable and J.-B. Chatelain, "Can Financial Infrastructures Foster Economic Development?," January 2001.
81. J.-B. Chatelain and J.-C. Teurlai, "Pitfalls in Investment Euler Equations," January 2001.
82. M. Rockinger and E. Jondeau, "Conditional Dependency of Financial Series: An Application of Copulas," February 2001.
83. C. Florens, E. Jondeau and H. Le Bihan, "Assessing GMM Estimates of the Federal Reserve Reaction Function," March 2001.
84. J.-B. Chatelain, "Mark-up and Capital Structure of the Firm facing Uncertainty," June 2001.
85. B. Amable, J.-B. Chatelain and O. De Bandt, "Optimal Capacity in the Banking Sector and Economic Growth," June 2001.
86. E. Jondeau and H. Le Bihan, "Testing for a Forward-Looking Phillips Curve. Additional Evidence from European and US Data," December 2001.
87. G. Clette, J. Mairesse et Y. Kocoglu, « Croissance économique et diffusion des TIC : le cas de la France sur longue période (1980-2000) », décembre 2001.
88. D. Irac and F. Sédillot, "Short Run Assessment of French Economic Activity Using OPTIM," January 2002.
89. M. Baghli, C. Bouthevillain, O. de Bandt, H. Fraise, H. Le Bihan et Ph. Rousseaux, « PIB potentiel et écart de PIB : quelques évaluations pour la France », juillet 2002.
90. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, "Asset Allocation in Transition Economies," October 2002.
91. H. Pagès and J.A.C. Santos, "Optimal Supervisory Policies and Depositor-Preferences Laws," October 2002.
92. C. Loupias, F. Savignac and P. Sevestre, "Is There a Bank Lending Channel in France? Evidence from Bank Panel Data," November 2002.
93. M. Ehrmann, L. Gambacorta, J. Martínez-Pagés, P. Sevestre and A. Worms, "Financial Systems and The Role in Monetary Policy Transmission in the Euro Area," November 2002.
94. S. Avouyi-Dovi, D. Guégan et S. Ladoucette, « Une mesure de la persistance dans les indices boursiers », décembre 2002.
95. S. Avouyi-Dovi, D. Guégan et S. Ladoucette, "What is the Best Approach to Measure the Interdependence between Different Markets?," December 2002.
96. J.-B. Chatelain and A. Tiomo, "Investment, the Cost of Capital and Monetary Policy in the Nineties in France: A Panel Data Investigation," December 2002.

97. J.-B. Chatelain, A. Generale, I. Hernando, U. von Kalckreuth and P. Vermeulen, "Firm Investment and Monetary Policy Transmission in the Euro Area," December 2002.
98. J.-S. Mésonnier, « Banque centrale, taux de l'escompte et politique monétaire chez Henry Thornton (1760-1815) », décembre 2002.
99. M. Baghli, G. Clette et A. Sylvain, « Les déterminants du taux de marge en France et quelques autres grands pays industrialisés : Analyse empirique sur la période 1970-2000 », janvier 2003.
100. G. Clette and Ch. Pfister, "The Challenges of the "New Economy" for Monetary Policy," January 2003.
101. C. Bruneau, O. De Bandt, A. Flageollet and E. Michaux, "Forecasting Inflation using Economic Indicators: the Case of France," May 2003.
102. C. Bruneau, O. De Bandt and A. Flageollet, "Forecasting Inflation in the Euro Area," May 2003.
103. E. Jondeau and H. Le Bihan, "ML vs GMM Estimates of Hybrid Macroeconomic Models (With an Application to the "New Phillips Curve")," September 2003.
104. J. Matheron and T.-P. Maury, "Evaluating the Fit of Sticky Price Models," January 2004.
105. S. Moyon and J.-G. Sahuc, "Incorporating Labour Market Frictions into an Optimising-Based Monetary Policy Model," January 2004.
106. M. Baghli, V. Brunhes-Lesage, O. De Bandt, H. Fraise et J.-P. Villette, « MASCOTTE : Modèle d'Analyse et de préviSion de la COnjoncture TrimesTrielle », février 2004.
107. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, "The Bank Bias: Segmentation of French Fund Families," February 2004.
108. E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger, "Optimal Portfolio Allocation Under Higher Moments," February 2004.
109. C. Bordes et L. Clerc, « Stabilité des prix et stratégie de politique monétaire unique », mars 2004.
110. N. Belorgey, R. Lecat et T.-P. Maury, « Déterminants de la productivité par employé : une évaluation empirique en données de panel », avril 2004.
111. T.-P. Maury and B. Pluyaud, "The Breaks in per Capita Productivity Trends in a Number of Industrial Countries," April 2004.
112. G. Clette, J. Mairesse and Y. Kocoglu, "ICT Diffusion and Potential Output Growth," April 2004.
113. L. Baudry, H. Le Bihan, P. Sevestre and S. Tarrieu, "Price Rigidity. Evidence from the French CPI Micro-Data," September 2004.
114. C. Bruneau, O. De Bandt and A. Flageollet, "Inflation and the Markup in the Euro Area," September 2004.
115. J.-S. Mésonnier and J.-P. Renne, "A Time-Varying "Natural" Rate of Interest for the Euro Area," September 2004.

116. G. Cette, J. Lopez and P.-S. Noul, "Investment in Information and Communication Technologies: an Empirical Analysis," October 2004.
117. J.-S. Mésonnier et J.-P. Renne, « Règle de Taylor et politique monétaire dans la zone euro », octobre 2004.
118. J.-G. Sahuc, "Partial Indexation, Trend Inflation, and the Hybrid Phillips Curve," December 2004.
119. C. Loupias et B. Wigniolle, « Régime de retraite et chute de la natalité : évolution des mœurs ou arbitrage micro-économique ? », décembre 2004.
120. C. Loupias and R. Ricart, "Price Setting in France: new Evidence from Survey Data," December 2004.
121. S. Avouyi-Dovi and J. Matheron, "Interactions between Business Cycles, Stock Markets Cycles and Interest Rates: the Stylised Facts," January 2005.
122. L. Bilke, "Break in the Mean and Persistence of Inflation: a Sectoral Analysis of French CPI," January 2005.
123. S. Avouyi-Dovi and J. Matheron, "Technology Shocks and Monetary Policy in an Estimated Sticky Price Model of the US Economy," April 2005.
124. M. Dupaigne, P. Fève and J. Matheron, "Technology Shock and Employment: Do We Really Need DSGE Models with a Fall in Hours?," June 2005.
125. P. Fève and J. Matheron, "Can the Kydland-Prescott Model Pass the Cogley-Nason Test?," June 2005.
126. S. Avouyi-Dovi and J. Matheron, "Technology Shocks and Monetary Policy in an Estimated Sticky Price Model of the Euro Area," June 2005.
127. O. Loisel, "Central Bank Reputation in a Forward-Looking Model," June 2005.
128. B. Bellone, E. Gautier et S. Le Coent, « Les marchés financiers anticipent-ils les retournements conjoncturels ? », juillet 2005.
129. P. Fève, « La modélisation macro-économétrique dynamique », juillet 2005.
130. G. Cette, N. Dromel and D. Méda, "Opportunity Costs of Having a Child, Financial Constraints and Fertility," August 2005.
131. S. Gouteron et D. Szpiro, « Excès de liquidité monétaire et prix des actifs », septembre 2005.
132. J. Baude, « L'impact des chocs boursiers sur le crédit en France depuis le milieu des années quatre-vingt-dix », septembre 2005.
133. R. Bourlès and G. Cette, "A Comparison of Structural Productivity Levels in the Major Industrialised Countries," October 2005.
134. T. Grunspan, "The Fed and the Question of Financial Stability: An Empirical Investigation," October 2005.

135. S. Fabiani, M. Druant, I. Hernando, C. Kwapil, B. Landau, C. Loupias, F. Martins, T. Mathä, R. Sabbatini, H. Stahl and A. Stockman, "The Pricing Behaviour of Firms in the Euro Area: New Survey Evidence," November 2005.
136. E. Dhyne, L. Alvarez, H. Le Bihan, G. Veronese, D. Dias, J. Hoffmann, N. Jonker, P. Lünemann, F. Rumler and J. Vilminen, "Price Setting in the Euro Area: Some Stylized Facts from Individual Consumer Price Data," November 2005.
137. D. Fougère, H. Le Bihan and P. Sevestre, "Heterogeneity in Consumer Price Stickiness: A Microeconomic Investigation," November 2005.
138. L. Alvarez, E. Dhyne, M. Hoeberichts, C. Kwapil, H. Le Bihan, P. Lünemann, F. Martins, R. Sabbatini, H. Stahl, P. Vermeulen and J. Vilminen, "Sticky Prices in the Euro Area: a Summary of New Micro Evidence," November 2005.
139. E. Kharroubi, "Illiquidity, Financial Development and the Growth-Volatility Relationship," February 2006.
140. M. Baghli, C. Cahn and H. Fraise, "Is the Inflation-Output Nexus Asymmetric in the Euro Area," April 2006.
141. E. Jondeau and J-G. Sahuc, "Optimal Monetary Policy in an Estimated DSGE Model of the Euro Area with Cross-country Heterogeneity," April 2006.
142. S. Avouyi-Dovi, M. Brun, A. Dreyfus, F. Drumetz, V. Oung et J.-G. Sahuc, « La fonction de demande de monnaie pour la zone euro : un réexamen », Mai 2006
143. C. Jartet, "Term Structure Anomalies : Term Premium or Peso Problem?" May 2006
144. S. Avouyi-Dovi, R. Kierzenkowski, C. Lubochinsky, "Are Business and Credit Cycles Converging or Diverging? A comparison of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and the Euro Area", May 2006

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 : (0)1 42 92 49 55
fax : (0)1 42 92 62 92
email : thierry.demoulin@banque-france.fr