

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

HOW HAS THE EURO CHANGED THE MONETARY TRANSMISSION?

Jean Boivin  
Marc P. Giannoni  
Benoît Mojon

Working Paper 14190  
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w14190>

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH  
1050 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
July 2008

We thank Daron Acemoglu, Olivier Blanchard, Andrea Ferrero, Jordi Galí, Bruce Preston, Veronica Rappoport, Kenneth Rogoff, Chris Sims, Frank Smets, Michael Woodford, and our discussants Lucrezia Reichlin and Harald Uhlig for valuable discussions and comments. We also benefited from the comments of participants at the 2008 NBER Macroeconomics Annual Conference, the NY Area Workshop on Monetary Policy, and seminar participants at the Bundesbank, CREI, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, European Central Bank, HEC Montréal, Universität Münster. Boivin and Giannoni are grateful to the National Science Foundation for financial support (SES-0518770). The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

© 2008 by Jean Boivin, Marc P. Giannoni, and Benoît Mojon. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

How Has the Euro Changed the Monetary Transmission?

Jean Boivin, Marc P. Giannoni, and Benoît Mojon

NBER Working Paper No. 14190

July 2008

JEL No. C3,D2,E31,E4,E5,F4

### **ABSTRACT**

This paper characterizes the transmission mechanism of monetary shocks across countries of the euro area, documents how this mechanism has changed with the introduction of the euro, and explores some potential explanations. The factor-augmented VAR (FAVAR) framework used is sufficiently rich to jointly model the euro area dynamics while permitting the transmission of shocks to be different across countries. We find important heterogeneity across countries in the effect of monetary shocks before the launch of the euro. In particular, we find that German interest-rate shocks triggered stronger responses of interest rates and consumption in some countries such as Italy and Spain than in Germany itself. According to our estimates, the creation of the euro has contributed 1) to a greater homogeneity of the transmission mechanism across countries, and 2) to an overall reduction in the effects of monetary shocks. Using a structural open-economy model, we argue that the combination of a change in the policy reaction function -- mainly toward a more aggressive response to inflation and output -- and the elimination of an exchange-rate risk can explain the evolution of the monetary transmission mechanism observed empirically.

Jean Boivin  
HEC Montreal  
3000, chemin de la Cote-Sainte-Catherine  
Montreal (Quebec)  
Canada H3T 2A7  
and NBER  
jean.boivin@hec.ca

Benoît Mojon  
Banque de France  
39 rue Croix des Petits Champs  
75001 Paris  
France  
benoit.mojon@gmail.com

Marc P. Giannoni  
Columbia Business School  
3022 Broadway, Uris Hall 824  
New York, NY 10027-6902  
and NBER  
mg2190@columbia.edu

# 1 Introduction

On January 1st, 1999, the euro officially became the common currency for 11 countries of continental Europe, and a single monetary policy started under the authority of the European Central Bank.<sup>1</sup> The European Monetary Union<sup>2</sup> (EMU) followed decades of monetary policies set by national central banks to serve domestic interests, even though these national policies were constrained by monetary arrangements such as the European Monetary System which was designed to limit exchange rate fluctuations. Approaching the tenth anniversary of the EMU, we begin to have sufficient data to potentially observe effects of the monetary union on business cycle dynamics.

This paper has three objectives. The first is to characterize the transmission mechanism of monetary policy in the Euro Area (EA) and across its constituent countries. The second is to document how this transmission might have changed since the creation of the euro. The third objective consists of providing a set of explanations, based on a structural open-economy model, for the observed differences over time and across countries in the responses of key macroeconomic variables.

Our first two objectives require an empirical model that captures empirically the EA-wide macroeconomic dynamics, while allowing us to estimate the potentially heterogenous transmission of EA shocks within individual countries. The factor-augmented VAR model (FAVAR) proposed by Bernanke, Boivin and Elias (2005) is a natural framework in this context. By pooling together a large set of macroeconomic indicators from individual countries, it allows us to identify area-wide factors, quantify their importance in the country-level fluctuations, and trace out the effect of identified aggregate shocks on all country-level variables. It also allows us to measure the spillovers between individual countries and the EA.

Many papers have attempted to characterize the dynamics of European economies. One common strategy has been to modeling the EA economy using only EA aggregates. Examples include evidence based on VARs (Peersman and Smets, 2003), more structural models (the ECB Area Wide

---

<sup>1</sup>At that date, the conversion rates of the national currencies of the Eurozone were fixed irrevocably, and a three-year transition period started until the introduction of the euro banknotes and coins, in January 2002. Since then other countries such as Greece, Slovenia, Malta and Cyprus have adopted the euro.

<sup>2</sup>We refer to the EMU as the stage III of the European Monetary Union, which involves the launch of the euro in January 1999.

Model; Fagan, Henry and Mestre, 2005) and optimization-based macroeconomic models (Smets and Wouters, 2003, Christiano et al., 2007; the New AWM; Coenen et al., 2007). Alternatively, authors have estimated models using country-level data either to analyze the effects of various macroeconomic shocks or for forecasting, using models of national central banks (Fagan and Morgan, 2006) or VARs (e.g., Mihov, 2001; Mojon and Peersman, 2003).

An important feature of the FAVAR is that it allows us to model jointly the dynamics of EA-wide variables and country-level variables within a single consistent empirical framework. In that respect, we see our empirical strategy as an improvement over the numerous papers that have compared impulse responses to shocks on the basis of models estimated separately for each country (e.g., Angeloni, Kashyap, and Mojon, 2003. chap. 3 and 5). The estimated model suggests that a significant fraction of country-level variables such as the components of output and prices, employment, productivity and asset prices, can be explained by EA-wide common factors.

In order to characterize the monetary transmission mechanism, we identify unexpected monetary policy shocks, and estimate their dynamic effects on the national macroeconomic variables. We are particularly interested in documenting differences over time and across countries in the sensitivity of national economies to such shocks. (In Appendix C, we also document the effects of identified oil price shocks.) It is important to note that it is not because we believe that monetary policy shocks constitute an important source of business cycle fluctuations that we are interested in documenting the effects of such shocks. In fact, much of the empirical literature finds that monetary shocks contribute relatively little to business cycle fluctuations (e.g., Sims and Zha, 2006). Instead, monetary policy affects importantly the economy through its systematic reaction to economic conditions. The impulse response functions to monetary policy shocks provide a useful description of the effects of a systematic monetary policy rule, by tracing out the responses of various macroeconomic variables following a surprise interest-rate change, and assuming that policy is conducted subsequently according to that particular policy rule.

The estimated monetary transmission mechanism is largely consistent with conventional wisdom. A monetary policy tightening in the EA as a whole or in Germany triggers an appreciation of the exchange rate, a downward adjustment of demand and eventually of prices. For the period preceding the EMU, we find considerable heterogeneity in the transmission of these shocks across

countries. In particular, we find larger responses of long-term interest rates in Italy and in Spain, which contribute to larger contractions of consumption in these two countries. Also, restrictive monetary policy in the EA tended to trigger a depreciation of the lira and the peseta, and a smaller decline of exports of these countries than in the rest of the EA.

The creation of the euro has contributed to an widespread reduction in the effect of monetary shocks. In particular, long-term interest rates, as well as consumption, investment, output and employment respond less to short-term interest rate shocks in the new monetary policy regime, while trade and the effective real exchange rate respond more strongly. While the monetary transmission mechanism has become more homogenous along the yield curve, some striking asymmetries persist, for instance in the response of national monetary aggregates to common interest rate shocks, suggesting pervasive differences in national savings practices.

We use a structural open-economy model to explore some potential explanations for this evolution of the transmission mechanism of monetary policy. More precisely, we extend the model of Ferrero, Gertler and Svensson (2007) with, among others, a risk premium on intra-area exchange rates for the period prior to the EMU. This deviation from the uncovered interest rate parity is necessary to replicate a larger response of Italian and Spanish interest rates to German monetary shocks. Using a calibrated version of this model, we show that the combination of two ingredients can replicate the evolution of the estimated transmission mechanism since the start of the EMU: the elimination of the exchange-rate premium that plagued some of the European countries by fixing the intra-area exchange rates, and a shift in monetary policy, mainly toward a more aggressive response to inflation and output. This latter finding suggests that the change in the transmission mechanism comes not only from the adoption of a single currency, but also from the ECB policy.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the econometric framework. It discusses the formulation and estimation of the FAVAR and its relation to the existing literature. In Section 3, we discuss the empirical implementation, describing the data used in our estimation, our preferred specification of the FAVAR as well as its basic empirical properties. Section 4 studies the effects of monetary shocks in the EA and in individual countries, and discusses their changes since the creation of the EMU in 1999. Section 5 attempts to explain the cross-country differences as well as the changes over time in the monetary transmission mechanism. Section 6 concludes.

## 2 Econometric Framework

We are interested in modeling empirically the EA wide macroeconomic dynamics, while allowing heterogeneity in the transmission of EA shocks within individual countries. A natural framework to achieve this goal is the factor-augmented vector autoregression model (FAVAR) described in Bernanke, Boivin and Elias (2005) (BBE). The model is estimated using indicators from individual European economies as well as from the EA. The general idea behind our implementation is to decompose the fluctuations in individual series into a component driven by common European fluctuations, and a component that is specific to the particular series considered. EA-wide common shocks can then be identified from the multi-dimensional common components. The FAVAR also allows us to characterize the response of all data series to macroeconomic disturbances, such as monetary policy shocks or oil price shocks. Importantly, by modeling jointly EA and country-level dynamics, this framework allows each country’s sensitivity to EA shocks to be different.

### 2.1 Description of the FAVAR model

We only provide here a general description of our implementation of the empirical framework and refer the interested reader to BBE for additional details. We assume that the economy is affected by a vector  $C_t$  of common EA-wide components to all variables entering the data set. Since we will be interested in characterizing the effects of monetary policy, this vector of common components includes a short-term interest rate,  $R_t$ , to measure the stance of monetary policy. Our specification also includes the growth rate of an oil price index,  $\pi_t^{oil}$ , as an observable factor. Both of these variables are allowed to have pervasive effect throughout the economy and will thus be considered as common components of all variables entering the data set. The rest of the common dynamics is captured by a  $K \times 1$  vector of unobserved factors  $F_t$ , where  $K$  is relatively small. These unobserved factors may reflect general economic conditions such as “economic activity,” the “general level of prices,” the level of “productivity,” which may not easily be captured by a few time series, but rather by a wide range of economic variables.<sup>3</sup> We assume that the joint dynamics of  $\pi_t^{oil}$ ,  $F_t$ , and

---

<sup>3</sup>As long as a sufficient number of unobserved factors are included, the inclusion of oil-price inflation as an observable factor should not affect our results. It does however allow us to identify oil price shocks and document their effects. We report such results in Appendix C.

$R_t$  are given by

$$C_t = \Phi(L)C_{t-1} + v_t \tag{1}$$

where

$$C_t = \begin{bmatrix} \pi_t^{oil} \\ F_t \\ R_t \end{bmatrix},$$

and  $\Phi(L)$  is a conformable lag polynomial of finite order which may contain a priori restrictions, as in standard structural VARs. The error term  $v_t$  is iid with mean zero and covariance matrix  $Q$ .

The system (1) is a VAR in  $C_t$ . The additional difficulty, with respect to standard VARs, however, is that the factors  $F_t$  are unobservable. We assume that the factors summarize the information contained in a large number of economic variables. We denote by  $X_t$  this  $N \times 1$  vector of “informational” variables, where  $N$  is assumed to be “large,” i.e.,  $N > K + 2$ . We assume furthermore that the large set of observable “informational” series  $X_t$  is related to the common factors according to

$$X_t = \Lambda C_t + e_t \tag{2}$$

where  $\Lambda$  is an  $N \times (K + 2)$  matrix of factor loadings, and the  $N \times 1$  vector  $e_t$  contains (mean-zero) series-specific components that are uncorrelated with the common components  $C_t$ . These series-specific components are allowed to be serially correlated and weakly correlated across indicators. Equation (2) reflects the fact that the elements of  $C_t$ , which in general are correlated, represent pervasive forces that drive the common dynamics of  $X_t$ . Conditional on the observed short-term interest rate  $R_t$ , the variables in  $X_t$  are thus noisy measures of the underlying unobserved factors  $F_t$ . Note that it is in principle not restrictive to assume that  $X_t$  depends only on the current values of the factors, as  $F_t$  can always capture arbitrary lags of some fundamental factors.<sup>4</sup>

The empirical model (1) and (2) provides a convenient decomposition of all data series into components driven by the EA factors  $C_t$  (i.e., the short-term interest rate, oil prices and other latent dimensions of aggregate dynamics, such as real activity and inflation) and by series-specific components unrelated to the general state of the economies,  $e_t$ . For instance, (2) specifies that

---

<sup>4</sup>In fact, Stock and Watson (1999) refer to (2) as a dynamic factor model.

indicators of country-level economic activity or inflation are driven by a European interest rate, EA latent factors  $F_t$ , and a component that is specific to each individual series (representing, e.g., measurement error or other idiosyncrasies of each series). The dynamics of the EA common components are in turn specified by (1).

As in BBE, we estimate our empirical model using a variant of a two-step principal component approach. In the first step, we extract principal components from the large data set  $X_t$  to obtain consistent estimates of the common factors.<sup>5</sup> Stock and Watson (2002) and Bai and Ng (2006) show that the principal components consistently recover the space spanned by the factors when  $N$  is large and the number of principal components used is at least as large as the true number of factors. In the second step, we add the oil price inflation and the short-term interest rate to the estimated factors, and estimate the structural VAR (1). Our implementation differs slightly from that of BBE as we impose the constraint that the observed factors ( $\pi_t^{oil}$  and  $R_t$ ) are among the factors in the first-step estimation.<sup>6</sup> This guarantees that the estimated latent factors recover dimensions of the common dynamics not captured by the observed factors.<sup>7</sup>

This procedure has the advantages of being computationally simple and easy to implement. As discussed by Stock and Watson (2002), it also imposes few distributional assumptions and allows for some degree of cross-correlation in the idiosyncratic error term  $e_t$ . Boivin and Ng (2005) document the good forecasting performance of this estimation approach compared to some alternatives.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>While alternative strategies to the estimation of factor models with a large set of indicators exist (see, among others, Forni, Lippi, Hallin and Reichlin, 2000; Kose, Otrok and Witheman 2003; BBE; Boivin and Giannoni, 2006b; Doz, Giannone and Reichlin, 2007), the evidence suggests that they perform similarly in practice.

<sup>6</sup>In contrast to the approach adopted here, BBE do not impose the constraint that the observed factors are among the common components in the first step. They instead remove these observed factors from the space covered by the principal components, by performing a transformation of the principal components exploiting the different behavior of what they call “slow-moving” and “fast-moving” variables, in the second step. Our approach here follows Boivin and Giannoni (2007) and Boivin, Giannoni and Mihov (2007).

<sup>7</sup>More specifically, we adopt the following procedure in the first step of the estimation. Starting from an initial estimate of  $F_t$ , denoted by  $F_t^{(0)}$  and obtained as the first  $K$  principal components of  $X_t$ , we iterate through the following steps: (1) we regress  $X_t$  on  $F_t^{(0)}$  and the observed factors  $Y_t = [\pi_t^{oil}, R_t]'$  to obtain  $\hat{\lambda}_Y^{(0)}$ ; (2) we compute  $\tilde{X}_t^{(0)} = X_t - \hat{\lambda}_Y^{(0)'} Y_t$ ; (3) we estimate  $F_t^{(1)}$  as the first  $K$  principal components of  $\tilde{X}_t^{(0)}$ ; (4) we repeat steps (1)-(3) multiple times.

<sup>8</sup>Note that this two-step approach implies the presence of “generated regressors” in the second step. According to the results of Bai (2003), the uncertainty in the factor estimates should be negligible when  $N$  is large relative to  $T$ . Still, the confidence intervals on the impulse response functions used below are based on a bootstrap procedure that accounts for the uncertainty in the factor estimation. As in BBE, the bootstrap procedure is such that 1) the factors can be re-sampled based on the observation equation, and 2) conditional on the estimated factors, the VAR coefficients in the transition equation are bootstrapped as in Kilian (1998).

## 2.2 Interpreting the FAVAR structure

Various approaches have been used in the literature to model macroeconomic dynamics in the EA. As we illustrate in this section, these approaches can be interpreted as special cases of the FAVAR framework. Our approach thus merges some of the strengths of these existing approaches and allows to answer a broader set of questions.

As in Bernanke, Boivin and Elias (2005) and in Boivin and Giannoni (2006b), we interpret the common component  $C_t$  as corresponding to the vector of theoretical concepts or variables that would enter a structural macroeconomic model of the EA. For instance, the structural open-economy model that we consider in section 5.1 fully characterizes the equilibrium evolution of inflation, output, interest rates, net exports and other variables in two regions. In terms of the notation in our empirical framework, all of these variables would be either included in  $C_t$ , or linear combinations of the elements of  $C_t$ . The dynamic evolution of these variables can be approximated by a VAR of the form (1).<sup>9</sup>

The existing approaches that model the dynamics of EA variables can be interpreted as special cases of the FAVAR model, in the case that the elements of  $C_t$  are perfectly observed, so that the system (1)–(2) boils down to a VAR. Interpreted in this way, the various existing empirical models differ about the assumptions they make about: the variables included in  $C_t$ , the indicators used to measure  $C_t$ , and the restrictions imposed on the coefficients of (1)–(2).

One approach is to assume that the elements of  $C_t$  are observed and correspond to EA aggregates.<sup>10</sup> Such model can be estimated directly using a VAR on EA aggregates only (e.g. Peersman and Smets, 2003), or a constrained version of a VAR corresponding, e.g., to the ECB Area Wide Model (Fagan, Henry and Mestre, 2005), or even optimization-based macroeconomic models (Smets and Wouters, 2003, Christiano et al., 2007; the New AWM; Coenen et al., 2006). Models estimated only on EA aggregates are silent about the regional effects of a shock.

A second approach is to assume that the elements of  $C_t$  are observed and correspond to variables

---

<sup>9</sup>For a formal description of the link between the solution of a DSGE model in state-space form and a VAR see, e.g., Sims (2000), and Fernández-Villaverde, Rubio-Ramírez, Sargent and Watson (2007). Boivin and Giannoni (2006b) establish formally the link between DSGE models and the FAVAR representation (1)–(2) in the context of a data-rich environment.

<sup>10</sup>The estimation of aggregate models for the EA has a relatively short history since there did not exist sufficiently long historical time series of consistent EA national accounts before the launch of the euro and the publication of Fagan, Henry and Mestre (2005). National accounts for the EA, published by Eurostat, start only in 1995.

of different regions. In that case, the FAVAR boils down to multi-country VARs and could be estimated directly, as in, e.g., Eichenbaum and Evans (1995), Scholl and Uhlig (2006).

A third approach is to assume that elements of  $C_t$  are observed and correspond to variables of a specific country. A large literature has in fact analyzed the cross-country differences in the response of monetary policy using country-level models that are estimated separately (see Guiso et al. 1999, Mojon and Peersman, 2003, Ciccarelli and Rebucci, 2006 and references therein). By construction these models focus on country-specific shocks and do not explicitly identify the effects of EA-wide shocks such as changes in the stance of monetary policy that would affect all countries simultaneously. The transmission of such shocks could potentially be amplified through trade and expectation spillovers.<sup>11</sup>

Importantly, in all these cases, since the variables necessary to capture the EA dynamics are observed, there is no need to use the large set of indicators  $X_t$ . However, there are reasons to believe that some relevant macroeconomic concepts are imperfectly observed. First, some concepts are simply measured with error.<sup>12</sup> Second, some of the macroeconomic variables which are key for the model's dynamics may be fundamentally latent. For instance, the concept of "potential output" often critical in monetary models cannot be measured directly. By using a large data set, one is able to extract empirically the components that are most important in explaining fluctuations in the entire data set. While each common component does not need to represent any single economic concept, the common components  $C_t$  should constitute a linear combination of all of the relevant latent variables driving the set of noisy indicators  $X_t$  to the extent that we extract the correct number of common components from the data set.

An advantage of this empirical framework is that it provides summary measures of the state of these economies at each date, in the form of factors which may summarize many features of the economy. We thus do not restrict ourselves to summarizing the state of the economies with particular measures of inflation and of output. Another advantage, as BBE argue, is that this framework should lead to a better identification of the monetary policy shock than standard VARs,

---

<sup>11</sup>van Els et al. (2003) show that spillovers across countries tend to reinforce the effects of monetary policy on output and on prices. See also Fagan and Morgan (2006).

<sup>12</sup>Boivin and Giannoni (2006b) argue, for example, that inflation is imperfectly measured by any single indicator, and that it is important to use multiple indicators of it for proper inference.

because it explicitly recognizes the large information set that the central bank and financial market participants exploit in practice, and also because, as just argued, it does not require to take a stand on the appropriate measures of prices and real activity which can simply be treated as latent common components. Moreover, for a set of identifying assumptions, a natural by-product of the estimation is to provide impulse response functions for any variable included in the data set. This is particularly useful in our case, since we want to understand the effects of macroeconomic shocks on a wide range of economic variables across EA countries.

Other papers have in fact followed a similar route. Sala (2001) estimates the effects of German and EA composite interest-rate shocks using a factor model. He stresses large asymmetries in the response of either output or prices to this shock. Favero et al. (2005) compare the effects of monetary policy shocks on output and inflation in Germany, France, Italy and Spain for alternative specifications of factor models. They find largely homogenous effects on output gaps and inflation rates across countries. Eickmeier and Breitung (2006) and Eickmeier (2006) characterize the effects of common shocks on GDP and inflation in 12 countries of the EA and in new European Union members that will adopt the euro in the future. They conclude that these common shocks transmit rather homogeneously across countries so that the remaining heterogeneity across EA countries seems to originate in idiosyncratic shocks.

In contrast, in this paper we seek to better understand the role of the monetary policy regime in explaining different monetary transmissions across countries of the EA. In that regard, we believe that countries of the EA, and their move toward a common currency, provide a unique experiment for monetary economists. For this reason our focus is not strictly on the response of countries' GDPs and inflation rates, but on many relevant dimensions of the economy. We thus seek to take full advantage of the FAVAR structure to document the effect of various shocks on various measures of real activity, such as GDP and its components, employment and unemployment, various inflation measures and financial variables. Although our scope is broader, our approach is similar to McCallum and Smets (2007), who use a similar FAVAR to study the role national and sectoral labor market characteristics imply wage rigidities that influence the monetary transmission mechanism.

## 3 Empirical Implementation

### 3.1 Data

The data set used in the estimation of our FAVAR is a balanced panel of 245 quarterly series, for the period running from 1980:1 to 2007:3. We limited the sample to the six largest economies of the EA, i.e., Germany, France, Italy, Spain the Netherlands and Belgium for which we could gather a balanced panel of 33 economic quarterly time series that are available back to 1980. Given these countries account for 90% of the EA population and output, we deem unlikely that the inclusion of other EA countries would alter our estimates EA business cycle characteristics.

The 33 economic variables that we gathered for each country and the EA include two interest rates, M1, M3, the effective exchange rate, an index of stock prices, GDP and its decomposition by expenditure, the associated deflators, PPI and CPI indices, the unemployment rate, employment, hourly earnings, unit labor cost measures, capacity utilization, retail sales and number of cars sold. In addition to these 231 country-level and EA-level variables, we also include an interest rate and real GDP for the UK, the U.S. and Japan, the euro/dollar exchange rate, an index of commodity prices and the price of oil. The database was mostly extracted from Haver. In a number of cases the Haver data were backdated using older vintages of OECD databases. The definition of the variables, the source, and details about the data construction are given in Appendix A. The graphs of the data are available in the appendix of the worker paper version of this paper.

We take year-on-year (yoy) growth rates of all time series except for interest rates, unemployment rates and capacity utilization rates. The yoy transformation is preferred to limit risks of noise due to improper or lack of seasonal adjustment in the data.

### 3.2 Sample period

The choice of the sample period is delicate. On the one hand, our interest lies in characterizing the monetary transmission in the period since the start of the monetary union, in January 1999. We therefore have about 9 years of data that correspond to the strict monetary union. However, the objective of stabilizing exchange rates within what would become the EA started much earlier. In fact, already in the seventies, European governments set up mechanisms that aimed at limiting

exchange rate fluctuations within Europe.<sup>13</sup> The march to the monetary union has been gradual and each country has progressed at its own speed. The pegs of Austria, Belgium and the Netherlands to the Deutsche mark were not realigned after the early 1980's. The last realignment of the French franc to core EMS currencies (the Deutsche mark, the Belgian Franc and the Dutch Crown) took place in January 1987. Ex post, we know that the parity between the French Franc, the Belgian Franc, the Dutch Guilder and the Deutsche Mark hardly changed at all since January 1987. However, a significant risk premium for fear of realignment plagued the French currency until 1995. Finally, countries such as Italy and Spain — as well as Greece, Portugal, Ireland and Finland, which are not in our sample — saw their currency fluctuate vis-à-vis their future partners in the monetary union well into the 1990s. Although interest rates remained much higher in Italy and Spain, than in Germany up until the mid 1990's because of risk premia, changes in the interest rates set by the Bundesbank would be echoed in domestic monetary conditions because of the official peg to the Deutsche Mark.

Another key aspect of the process of monetary integration is the degree of nominal convergence. Inflation rates were much further apart in the 1970's and early 1980's than ever since.

For all these considerations, and to avoid capturing the large changes on nominal variables that have occurred in the early 1980s, we propose to describe the effects of standard common shocks starting in 1988. We will also contrast the results with estimates for a sample corresponding to the strict monetary union regime starting in 1999.

### 3.3 Preferred specification of the FAVAR

For the model selection, the short sample size severely constrains the class of specifications we can consider, especially the number of lags in (1), as well as the number of latent factors. We were thus forced to consider models with no more than 8 factors and 3 lags. Among those, our approach has been to search for the most parsimonious model for which the key conclusions that we emphasize below are robust to the inclusion of additional factors and lags. Based on this, our preferred specification is one with a vector of common components  $C_t$  containing 5 latent factors

---

<sup>13</sup>Major steps in this process include the start of the EMS in 1979, the entrance of Spain and Portugal into the EMS in 1986, the post-reunification exchange rate crisis of 1992-1993 and the announcement of the parities between national currencies and the euro in May 1997.

in addition to the short-term interest rate and oil price inflation, and a VAR equation (1) with one lag. As we show below, these common factors explain a meaningful fraction of the variance of country-level variables.

### 3.4 European factors and EA-countries' dynamics

To assess whether our FAVAR model provides a reasonable characterization of the individual series, we now determine the importance of area-wide fluctuations for individual countries. Note that from equation (2), each of the variables  $X_{it}$  of our panel can be decomposed into a component  $\lambda_i' C_t$  which characterizes the effects of EA-wide fluctuations, and a component  $e_{it}$  which is specific to the series considered:

$$X_{it} = \lambda_i' C_t + e_{it}. \quad (3)$$

It is important to note that each variable may be affected very differently by the multidimensional vector  $C_t$  summarizing EA-wide fluctuations, as the estimated vectors of loadings  $\lambda_i$  may take arbitrary values. We first start by determining the extent to which key European variables are correlated with EA factors over three samples. We then discuss how the importance of these factors has changed over time. In the next section, we document how monetary shocks get transmitted to the EA, and across the different countries.

Several studies have recently attempted to determine the degree of comovement of a few macroeconomic series across countries.<sup>14</sup> Forni et al. (2000) and Favero et al. (2005) show that a small number of factors provides an efficient information summary of the main economic time series both at the EA level and for the 4 largest countries of the EA. Eickmeier (2006) and Eickmeier and Breitung (2006) confirm these results but also stress that country-level inflation and output fluctuations are somewhat less correlated with EA-wide common factors than their EA counterparts. However, Agresti and Mojon (2003) show that the comovement of either consumption or investment across EA countries is smaller than the comovement of GDP. Hence the possibility that the tightness of economic variables with the EA business cycle may be uneven across countries and

---

<sup>14</sup>For instance Kose, Otrok, Whiteman (2003), Stock and Watson (2005) study the comovement of output, consumption and investment, respectively for a large panel of countries, and for G7 countries. Giannone and Reichlin (2006) analyze the comovement of output across EA countries. In addition, the ECB is carefully monitoring real and nominal heterogeneity across countries (Benalal et al, 2006).

	<i>Euro Area</i>			<i>Average <math>R^2</math> over countries</i>		
	1987:1 –2007:3	1987:1 –1998:4	1999:1 –2007:3	1987:1 –2007:3	1987:1 –1998:4	1999:1 –2007:3
Short-term interest rate	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.97	1.00
Bond yield	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.94	0.94	0.95
Stock price	0.65	0.71	0.91	0.61	0.77	0.88
REX	0.78	0.82	0.93	0.73	0.79	0.93
M1	0.43	0.65	0.73	0.42	0.65	0.53
M3	0.70	0.92	0.74	0.50	0.71	0.69
Deflator GDP	0.88	0.89	0.88	0.73	0.81	0.84
Deflator PCE	0.88	0.90	0.72	0.77	0.90	0.83
Deflator investment	0.89	0.93	0.88	0.63	0.71	0.75
Deflator exports	0.86	0.80	0.97	0.72	0.71	0.94
Deflator imports	0.93	0.89	0.99	0.82	0.78	0.97
CPI	0.94	0.97	0.90	0.78	0.91	0.83
Real GDP	0.94	0.97	0.96	0.79	0.84	0.90
Consumption	0.88	0.92	0.90	0.71	0.75	0.81
Public consumption	0.54	0.71	0.54	0.42	0.59	0.63
Investment	0.92	0.93	0.94	0.65	0.76	0.78
Exports	0.70	0.71	0.93	0.67	0.68	0.88
Imports	0.84	0.95	0.93	0.74	0.81	0.89
Employment	0.85	0.90	0.97	0.78	0.85	0.85
Unemployment rate	0.92	0.97	0.96	0.86	0.93	0.96
Hourly earnings	0.94	0.97	0.69	0.79	0.92	0.74
Unit labor costs	0.89	0.96	0.88	0.81	0.92	0.89
CAP	0.86	0.92	0.95	0.67	0.80	0.77
Retail	0.73	0.80	0.60	0.53	0.67	0.60

Table 1:  $R^2$  for regressions of selected series on common factors

across variables of different kinds. This is why we consider a large number of economic variables, rather than a couple of macroeconomic indicators in our analysis.

### 3.5 Comovements between European variables and EA factors

Table 1 reports the fraction of the volatility in the series listed in the first column, that is explained by the 7 EA-wide factors  $C_t$  (i.e., 5 latent factors, the log change of the oil price, and the EA short-term interest rate). This corresponds to the  $R^2$  statistics obtained by the regressions of these variables on the appropriate set of factors.

The three columns labeled *Euro Area* report the  $R^2$  statistics obtained by regressing the respective EA-wide series on the common factors for our entire sample, a subsample representing the

period preceding the monetary union, and the sample starting in 1999 representing the period in which the EMU is in place. These numbers indicate that most of the variables listed are strongly correlated with the common factors, both before and after the monetary union.<sup>15</sup> While the short-term interest rate is a common factor by assumption, other key variables such as EA real GDP growth, CPI inflation, bond yields and the unemployment rate all have  $R^2$  statistics above 0.9. The common factors therefore summarize quite well the information contained in these EA series. Not all series are however as strongly correlated with the common factors. For instance the growth rate of the monetary aggregate M1 and public consumption for the EA, with  $R^2$  statistics of only 0.43 and 0.54, display much less comovement with the common factors.

Instead of estimating latent factors from our large data set, we could alternatively impose key EA macroeconomic variables such as GDP, consumption, inflation, exchange rate, bond yield, and unemployment as observed factors. Our proposed approach dominates, however, as the latent factors explain a substantially larger share of the variance of our sample than intuitive combinations of EA aggregates. The additional explanatory power of the latent factors amounts on average to 10 % of the variables' variance.

The last three columns of Table 1 report the average across countries of the  $R^2$  statistics for the relevant variables. The  $R^2$  statistics are overall lower than those for the entire EA area, as expected, to the extent that each country has country-specific features not summarized by the common factors  $C_t$ , and which tend to average out when considering the EA as a whole. Nonetheless, the table shows that on average over the six European countries, most of the variables are also strongly correlated with the common factors. Again, for the entire sample, country-level measures of GDP growth, short and long interest rates, inflation, employment and unemployment all show on average high degrees of comovement with the common factors, while growth rates of M1, M2 and public consumption show much lower degrees of comovement.

One might think that the relatively low  $R^2$  statistics for M1 and M3 reflect the fact that our panel includes a relatively small number of series of monetary aggregates. This intuition is however incorrect. If monetary aggregates constituted an important source of fluctuations for a wide range of variables in our panel, then the  $R^2$  for the monetary aggregate series should be high even if

---

<sup>15</sup>Camacho et al. (2006) argue however that the EA business cycle largely reflects the world business cycle.

	1987:1-2007:3	1987:1-1998:4	1999:1-2007:3
Euro-Area	0.83	0.88	0.87
Germany	0.69	0.77	0.82
France	0.76	0.84	0.87
Italy	0.73	0.82	0.79
Spain	0.76	0.84	0.78
Netherlands	0.64	0.74	0.86
Belgium	0.68	0.79	0.84

Table 2: Average  $R^2$  for regressions of selected series on EA factors

no such series was used for the estimation of the latent factors. In this case, the estimated latent factors should be capturing the common movements in the data that are generated by fluctuations in the monetary aggregates. So in theory, provided that we allow for a sufficiently large number of latent factors, the composition of the panel should not matter for the estimation of latent factors.

Looking across countries reveals that the correlation with the common factors is broadly similar across countries in each of the subsamples. Table 2 reports the average  $R^2$  statistic for each country, across the variables listed in the previous table. It shows that country-level  $R^2$  vary between 0.64 and 0.77 for the entire sample, between 0.74 and 0.84 in the first subsample, and between 0.78 and 0.87 in the post-EMU sample.

Table 2 also shows that in the case of Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium, the  $R^2$  are sensibly lower for the entire sample than for each of the subsamples considered. This suggests that the relationship between the variables in those countries and the common factors must have changed between the pre-99 and post-99 period. Finally, we observe that Italian and Spanish variables have become somewhat less tied to EA-wide developments over time. This comes essentially from the growth rates of real variables. This is particularly clear for Spain, as its GDP has grown at a faster pace than the rest of the EA since 1995, but is less clear-cut for Italy which has grown slightly less rapidly than the rest of the EA.

## 4 Monetary Policy Regimes and the Monetary Transmission Mechanism

In the last section, we have documented that the variables of each individual country have been on average fairly highly correlated with the EA-wide common factors. Nonetheless, aggregate shocks affecting the entire EA may have different implications on each individual country. To assess this, we use our estimated FAVAR to characterize the effects of monetary policy shocks, which we measure here as an unanticipated increase in the EA short-term interest rate of 100 basis points (bp), on the national economies considered. Our empirical model is well suited for this as it allows us to determine simultaneously the effects of such shocks on all country-level variables.

As mentioned above, the data reveal changes over time in the degree of comovement of key European variables with EA-wide common factors. A natural implication of such changes is that the transmission of monetary policy may have evolved over time. We thus report the effects of monetary policy shocks both for our benchmark sample and for the post-EMU period. The description of the effects of this shock is a natural starting point in a context where several countries have chosen to adopt a common currency and therefore to submit their economy to a single monetary policy.

### 4.1 Identification

To identify monetary policy shocks, we proceed similarly to Bernanke, Boivin and Elias (2005) by assuming in the spirit of VAR analyses, that the latent factors  $F_t$  and the oil price inflation  $\pi_t^{oil}$  cannot respond contemporaneously to a surprise interest-rate change, while the short-term rate  $R_t$  can respond to any innovation in the factors  $F_t$  or in oil prices. Of course, we don't restrict in any way the response of factors  $F_t$  and  $\pi_t^{oil}$  in the periods following the monetary shock. This constitutes a minimal set of restrictions needed to identify monetary policy shocks. We also impose that all prices and quantity series respond to monetary policy only through its lagged effect on  $F_t$  (and potentially  $\pi_t^{oil}$ ). This guarantees that none of these variables responds contemporaneously to unexpected monetary shocks, as is often assumed. These restrictions do however not prevent any of the financial variables such as bond yields, stock prices and exchange rates from responding contemporaneously to the short-term interest rate.

In the next section, we present a theoretical model that is designed provide some explanations for the monetary transmission mechanism. We note at this point that this model is consistent with the identifying assumptions made here. In particular, both the theoretical model and the FAVAR have the property that output, consumption, and inflation do not respond contemporaneously to monetary shocks.

Our assumption that the monetary policy instrument is the short-term EA interest-rate is certainly appropriate for the post-EMU period during which the ECB has set the short-term EA interest rate. It may be less appropriate however for the pre-EMU period, during which each national central bank could in principle choose its own interest rate. As in Peersman and Smets (2003), Smets and Wouters (2003) and many others, during the pre-EMU period, our monetary policy shock is a fictitious shock that we estimate would have been generated by the ECB, had it existed.

In the pre-EMU period, the German central bank, i.e., the Bundesbank, assumed a central role in setting the level of interest rates for all countries participating to the European Monetary System. Given the Exchange Rate Mechanism in place, which limited fluctuations in nominal exchange rates, most of the other national central banks had to respond to changes in interest rates by the Bundesbank. For this reason, we verified the robustness of our results for the pre-EMU period by identifying a monetary policy shock as a surprise increase in the German short-term interest rate. The results obtained are briefly described in section 4.5 that discusses the robustness of our results, and are reported in Appendix B.

## **4.2 Effects of monetary policy shocks in the Euro Area in the 1988-2007 period**

Figures 1a–1c report the estimated impulse responses to an unexpected 100 basis-point increase in the EA short-term interest rate. While the dark solid lines plot the responses of the variables in each country for the full sample of 1988-2007 along with the 90% confidence intervals (dotted lines), the dashed lines plot the responses for the post-EMU period starting in 1999. The figures plot in column the responses of a particular variable. The first five plots in each column show the impulse responses in the euro area, Germany, France, Italy and Spain. The bottom two plots combine the responses for all countries in the two different samples. They reveal the differences across regions

in each sample.

We first start by describing the response of the EA economy in the 1988-2007 period, by focusing on the plots in the first row. These plots show that faced with an unanticipated monetary tightening of 100 bp, bond yields overall increase on impact by even more than 100 bp, the EA real exchange rate appreciates by about 2% in the quarter of the shock and is expected to continue appreciating for more than 2 years, and the growth rate of the monetary aggregate M3 fall. The real GDP yoy growth rate falls by about 1% after a year and a half and does not revert to positive value before three years. Our point estimate of the impact of monetary policy on output tends to be larger than in Smets and Wouters (2003) and various estimates reported in Angeloni et al. (2003). The large drop in output reflects a broad-based decline in aggregate consumption, investment, and exports.<sup>16</sup> The decline in overall economic activity is furthermore clearly reflected in a fall in employment reaching about 0.7% after 6 quarters and a subsequent increase in the unemployment rate. It is followed by a reduction in hourly earnings and in CPI inflation.

### 4.3 Cross-country differences in the 1988-2007 period

The transmission of monetary policy disturbances on the EA just described hides however heterogeneity across the countries' responses. Looking at the other panels, we observe in Figure 1a that a surprise increase in the EA short-term interest rate results in much larger interest-rate increases in countries such as Italy and Spain than in the other countries.<sup>17</sup> This heterogeneity gets amplified when looking at long-term yields. In fact, the Italian and Spanish bond yields rise almost twice as much as the yields of some other countries such as Germany, France or the Netherlands.

Consistent with the larger rise in bond yields in Italy and Spain over the whole sample and with the interest-rate parity condition, the Italian and Spanish currencies depreciate with respect to the other countries's currencies in pre-EMU period. The Italian and Spanish real effective exchange rates depreciate on impact and in subsequent quarters, while the price levels remain unchanged

---

<sup>16</sup> Among the responses not reported in the figures, the growth rate of M1 also falls and the stock market drops by 10% on impact. Public consumption however remains unchanged for about a year and starts falling only after that.

<sup>17</sup> The responses of the variables in Belgium and the Netherlands (not reported) are very similar to those of the EA and countries such as Germany and France, but different from the responses in Italy and Spain. The responses of Belgium and the Netherlands are available from the authors upon request.

in the period of the shock (Figures 1a and 1c).<sup>18</sup> Instead, all of the other countries see their real exchange rates appreciate on impact and for several quarters after the shock, in response to the monetary tightening.

Following the increase in interest rates and the movements of the exchange rate, we observe a decline in the growth rate of GDP. While the GDP responses appear rather homogenous across countries, the responses of GDP components are not. Importantly, consumption falls by about twice as much in Italy and Spain than in the other countries, and investment also falls more. The depreciation of the Italian and Spanish real exchange rates however mitigates the fall in exports thus contributing to a more homogenous output response. These figures thus clearly reveal how diverse responses of bond yields and exchange rates affect differently the various European economies, when we consider economic adjustments in the pre-EMU period.

We note that the responses of CPI inflation reveal a temporary “price puzzle” in Germany and Italy, following a tightening of the artificial EA interest rate. While the price increases may be explained in Italy by the exchange rate depreciation — a feature that the model we present below is able to replicate — the price increase in Germany is more difficult to rationalize. One possibility is that the artificial EA interest rate may not properly capture surprise monetary shocks for Germany. In fact, when we identify monetary shocks as surprise increases in the German interest rate, for the sample starting in 1988, we obtain almost no price puzzle for Germany (see figures Appendix B). It is reassuring, however, that all other responses appear to be very similar to the ones reported in our benchmark specification, in Figures 1a-1c.

Finally, it should be stressed that the effects of interest rate shocks on M3 (as well as on M1) are quite different across countries. We have seen in section 3.5 that the monetary aggregates are markedly more loosely related to the common factors than most other variables under consideration. This may reflect the pervasive differences in the national habits and in the availability of savings instruments across countries of the EA. The ECB (2007) report on financial integration points to, inter alia, the large differences in financial assets of household sectors across countries (from four times annual consumption in Belgium and Italy to only twice in France and Germany), large

---

<sup>18</sup>Recall that the variables in the FAVAR are expressed in yoy growth rates. The impulse response functions of yoy growth rates and (log) levels are identical for the first 4 quarters following the shock.

differences in the composition of financial wealth, and different pass-through of the market interest rate to deposit interest rates (see Kok Sørensen and Werner, 2006, and references therein).

As we noted, the responses that we have documented reveal much larger increases in interest rates and sharper drops in consumption in Italy and Spain than in the other EA countries. Italy, for instance, has however been subject to considerable speculative attacks in the early 1990s. That forced the Bank of Italy to increase short-term rates considerably more than, e.g., in Germany, in order to defend its currency — thereby leading to a more important contraction of economic activity — until it had to abandon the exchange rate mechanism (ERM) in September 1992. One might thus wonder whether the effects that we uncovered are due to this unusual event that was the crisis of the ERM. To investigate this question, we re-estimated the impulse response functions for the entire sample, except that we excluded the observations from the third quarter of 1992 to the second quarter of 1993. We find that the responses of short- and long-term interest rates are almost identical to the one reported in Figures 1a. The only notable difference is that the response of consumption is slightly smaller in all countries, but we still observe a much larger contraction of consumption in Italy and Spain than in the other EA countries. So the facts that we have documented do not appear to be simply an artifact of a few observations around the ERM crisis.

#### **4.4 Has the transmission changed with the EMU?**

To determine whether the monetary transmission has changed since the start of the EMU, we re-estimate the effects of a monetary policy shock using the 37 quarterly observations that correspond to the post-1999 period corresponding to the EMU. The scarcity of degrees of freedom implies that we should be extremely cautious in interpreting the results. We nevertheless trust that the estimates provide an indication on the direction of evolution of the effects of monetary policy with respect to the full sample estimates.

Several results are worth underlying for the post-99 period, again in the face of a 100 bp increase in the short-term interest rate. First, the short-term interest rate responses are indistinguishable for all countries, given that they refer to the same currency. Second, the rise in bond yields in the EMU period is almost half of the one estimated for the entire sample, and the large differences across countries that were observable prior to the EMU vanish entirely. The EA effective exchange

rate appreciates considerably more than it did over the full sample. One reason for this is that real exchange rates uniformly appreciate in EA countries, including in Italy and in Spain.<sup>19</sup>

Given the relatively small change in bond yields, measures of economic activity such as real GDP, consumption, investment fall much less, if at all in the EMU period. As a result, employment falls much less, and the unemployment rate's increase is sensibly smaller.

Altogether, it appears that a major characteristic of the new monetary policy regime is the lack of response of long-term interest rates to surprise increases in the short-term interest rate.<sup>20</sup> We illustrate this evolution by comparing in Figure 2 the response of the long-term interest rate (dashed lines) to the response an artificial long-term interest rate excluding a term premium (crosses). The latter obtained by appealing to the expectations hypothesis and computed as the average response of the short-term interest rate over the subsequent 28 quarters, i.e. a theoretical bond of 7-year maturity. A striking difference between the full sample and the post-1999 regime is that, since the launch of the euro, the response of long-term interest rates displays a smaller term premium (i.e., a smaller difference between the market long-term rate and the artificial rate). The responses of these interest rates are represented in the lower right plot of Figure 2 for the EA, but they are almost identical for all individual countries in the post-1999 period. Moreover, over the entire sample, the term premium gap is the largest in Italy and in Spain, which suggests that prior to the launch of the euro, the premium for the risk of devaluation or depreciation of the peseta and the lira increased markedly following a tightening of the monetary policy stance in the euro area.

While most measures of economic activity appear to fall less in the EMU period, presumably in part because of smaller bond yield responses, much of the remaining output adjustment appears to be driven by international trade. This may be an important feature of the new monetary policy regime characterized by more stable long-term interest rates and a sharper responses of the EA-wide real exchange rate to monetary policy shocks.

Finally, the responses of several variables (some not reported) remain heterogenous across coun-

---

<sup>19</sup>The real exchange rate response is larger for the EA than for each of the individual countries as much of the trade of the individual countries is with other European economies, whereas the EA real exchange rate measures appreciations and depreciations solely relative to countries outside of the EA.

<sup>20</sup>This result is consistent with the ones of Ehrmann et al. (2007) who use daily interest rates to compare the responses of French, German, Italian and Spanish long-term yields to news in France, Germany, Italy and Spain before and after 1999.

tries, in the EMU period. To name a few, the responses of M1 are twice as negative in Spain and Belgium than in France, Germany and Italy. M3 increases in all countries, though to a different extent. Relatively larger responses of German exports and investment carry through to a larger GDP response than in other EA countries. Public consumption responses range from positive in Belgium and Italy — the two countries with the largest stock of government debt — to sharply negative in the Netherlands. We also note some differences in labor market dynamics, aspects analyzed in depth in McCallum and Smets (2007).

#### 4.5 Robustness

In view of the small number of degrees of freedom we have available to estimate the above set of results, we have conducted a series of robustness checks with respect to the econometric specification of the FAVAR. In particular, we estimated the above impulse response functions with models that admit additional lags, additional latent factors, quarter-on-quarter growth rates, and considering shocks to the German interest rate instead of the EA average interest rate.

Most of the results described above are robust. In particular the larger response of the Italian and Spanish interest rates and of their consumption are common outcomes of all these alternative specifications when estimated over the full sample. Interestingly, Italy and Spain also stand out in response to an unexpected oil-price increase, with Italian and Spanish bonds yields increasing more than in the other countries of the EA, and consumption falling more (see Appendix C). This provides further evidence that bond markets and credibility issues may contribute to the different responses of European economies to various shocks prior to the EMU.

In all specifications considered, we observe a smaller response of consumption after 1999 than in the full-sample estimates, following a monetary tightening. However, the specification with quarter-on-quarter growth rates and several lags shows that, due to a large response of exports, GDP declines as much in the post-1999 period as in the full sample. These impulse responses functions are however much less precisely estimated than in our benchmark specification.

In the case in which the monetary policy shock is defined in terms of the German short-term interest rate, nearly all the results reported in Figure 1 carry through. As mentioned above, however, the price puzzle for German CPI is very much attenuated. This reflects that the identification of

area-wide monetary shocks in the period prior to the euro is difficult. However, except for the response of German prices, nearly all other impulse responses are strikingly similar for a German or an area-wide monetary policy shock.

## 5 Explaining the Evolution of the Transmission Mechanism: The Role of Monetary Regimes and Interest-Rate Parity

As discussed in the previous section, the empirical characterization of the transmission of monetary policy in the EA displays a rich picture. In the pre-EMU period, interest-rate surprises in Germany or in the EA as a whole are found to cause larger responses of short-term rates in Italy and Spain, relatively large increase in long-term bond yields, depreciations of the Italian and Spanish currencies (both in nominal and real terms), a sharp contraction in consumption and investment in these countries. Such reductions in activity are offset by a relatively strong improvement in net exports, thereby resulting in a moderate contraction of real GDP. In the EMU period, however, a similar increase in the EA interest rate results in a much more homogenous response of individual EA countries, and a quantitatively smaller reduction in economic activity measures.

While the European economy has changed in many dimensions since the monetary union, we now attempt to determine to what extent the monetary regime in place can explain both the differences in the transmission of monetary policy across countries and over time. To do so, we use an open-economy DSGE monetary model along the lines of Obstfeld and Rogoff (2002, 2005), Clarida, Galí and Gertler (2002), Corsetti and Pesenti (2005), Altissimo et al. (2004), Benigno and Benigno (2006), and Ferrero, Gertler and Svensson (2007) (henceforth FGS) and others.<sup>21</sup> The specific variant considered here builds on FGS. This framework, while stylized, is sufficiently rich to generate a nontrivial effect of monetary policy variables such as output, consumption, net exports, and inflation measures. It also allows for different consumption responses across regions, and a switching of expenditures in consumption and net exports in response to real exchange rates movements.

We proceed by presenting the model. The model is explained in details in FGS, so we merely

---

<sup>21</sup>For a larger-scale model, see, e.g., Faruquee, Laxton, Muir, and Pesenti (2007).

summarize it here, emphasizing the changes relative to FGS. We next discuss the calibration of the model parameters, including those characterizing monetary policy. Finally, we analyze the model's implications, attempting to provide an explanation for the stylized facts just described.

## 5.1 A stylized two-country model

The model involves two large countries, Home (H) and Foreign (F), of equal size. Each country is populated by a representative household that consumes tradable and nontradable goods and that contains a continuum of workers who supply labor to intermediate-goods firms. Each of these firms hires one worker and produces either tradable or non-tradable goods which it sells on a monopolistically competitive market. These firms optimally reset their prices at random time intervals. In each sector, we also have competitive final-goods firms which combine the differentiated intermediate goods into a homogenous consumption good. In addition, to fit the evidence on imperfect pass-through (e.g., Campa and Goldberg, 2006), we assume as in Monacelli (2005) that monopolistically competitive importers of foreign tradable goods resell them to residents at prices set in domestic currency in a staggered fashion.<sup>22</sup> In order to account for different consumption behavior across countries, we assume incomplete financial markets across countries (even though the household provides perfect insurance within each country), by assuming that a single bond is traded internationally. As in FGS, one simplification is that we treat as nondurable consumption all domestic interest-rate sensitive expenditures, including what is commonly labeled as investment. However, as mentioned in Woodford (2003, chap. 5), to the extent that we are not interested in distinguishing consumption and investment, this should not affect importantly the model's predictions for the other variables.<sup>23</sup>

We will consider two monetary regimes. The pre-EMU regime is characterized by distinct central banks in each country, each setting short-term interest rates according to a generalized

---

<sup>22</sup>Corsetti and Dedola (2005) propose an alternative model of limited pass-through in which distributing imported goods requires nontradables.

<sup>23</sup>In fact, macroeconomic models that successfully explain the behavior of investment often assume adjustment costs in investment (e.g., Basu and Kimball, 2003; Christiano, Eichenbaum and Evans, 2005). As shown in Woodford (2003), such adjustment costs yield a log-linearized Euler equation for investment that is very similar to the one for consumption in the presence of internal habit formation. It follows that the intertemporal allocation of aggregate expenditures can be approximated by a similar Euler equation, in which the degree of habit formation also serves as a proxy for investment adjustment costs. Nonetheless, in treating investment similarly to non-durable expenditures, we do abstract from the effects of investment on future production capacities.

Taylor rule which may include responses to exchange-rate fluctuations. Area-wide variables are obtained by aggregating the relevant variables across the two countries. In the post-EMU regime, instead, a supra-national authority — the European Central Bank — is assumed to set an EA wide interest rate, according to a generalized Taylor rule involving area-wide variables.

In order for the model to be consistent with the identifying assumptions made in our empirical FAVAR to identify the monetary policy shocks, we assume in contrast to FGS but similarly to Rotemberg and Woodford (1997), Christiano, Eichenbaum and Evans (2005) that the households' aggregate consumption decisions and all firms' pricing decisions are made prior to the realization of exogenous shocks, so that prices and consumption respond do not respond contemporaneously to the monetary shock. In addition, we allow households to form habit in consumption, and the firms who don't reoptimize their prices to index them to past inflation. Such deviations from FGS allow the model to generate responses of consumption and inflation to shocks that are more in line with the FAVAR estimates.

As a last departure from FGS, we allow for a wedge in the uncovered interest rate parity (UIP) condition. This wedge, assumed to be exogenous here, is meant to capture deviations from the UIP, argued by Devereux and Engel (2002) to be needed in order to explain the disconnect between fluctuations in exchange rates and other macroeconomic variables. Empirical evidence for such deviations from UIP have also often been reported in the empirical literature, whether unconditionally (e.g., Bekaert and Hodrick, 1993; Engel, 1996; Froot and Thaler, 1990; Mark and Wu, 1998; Rossi, 2007), or conditionally on monetary policy shocks (Eichenbaum and Evans, 1995; Scholl and Uhlig, 2006). While Bekaert, Wei, and Xing (2007) find smaller departures from the UIP than reported previously, when adjusting for small sample bias, they find evidence of a time-varying risk premium displaying a highly persistent component in expected exchange rate changes. As discussed below, such a wedge will prove to be important in explaining the differential responses of consumption and investment across countries, in the pre-EMU period.

We now describe the environment, following closely FGS.

### 5.1.1 Households

We assume that in each country, the representative household maximizes a lifetime expected utility of the form

$$E_{t-1} \left\{ \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \theta_{t+s-1} \left[ \frac{(C_{t+s} - \omega C_{t+s-1})^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma} - \left( \int_0^{\gamma} \frac{L_{Ht+s}(f)^{1+\varphi}}{1+\varphi} df + \int_{\gamma}^1 \frac{L_{Nt+s}(f)^{1+\varphi}}{1+\varphi} df \right) \right] \right\} \quad (4)$$

where  $E_{t-1}$  is the expectation operator, conditional on the information up to the end of period  $t-1$ ,  $C_t$  denotes aggregate consumption,  $\omega \in (0, 1]$  is the degree of internal habit persistence,  $\sigma^{-1} > 0$  would correspond to the elasticity of intertemporal substitution in the absence of habit formation,  $\varphi$  is the inverse of the Frisch elasticity of labor supply,  $L_{kt}(f)$  represents hours worked by worker  $f \in [0, 1]$  in an intermediate-goods firm, in sector  $k$ , i.e., either the home tradable sector  $H$  (with measure  $\gamma$ ) or the domestic nontradable sector  $N$  (with measure  $1 - \gamma$ ). As in FGS, the discount factor  $\theta_t$  evolves according to  $\theta_t = \beta_t \theta_{t-1}$ , and  $\beta_t \equiv e^{\xi_t} / [1 + \psi (\log \bar{C}_t - \bar{\vartheta})]$  where  $\bar{C}_t$  corresponds to the household's consumption level but is treated by the household as exogenous, and where  $\xi_t$  is a preference shock.<sup>24</sup>

The consumption index  $C_t$  is an aggregate of tradable  $C_{Tt}$  and nontradable  $C_{Nt}$  consumption goods

$$C_t \equiv \frac{C_{Tt}^{\gamma} C_{Nt}^{1-\gamma}}{\gamma(1-\gamma)}$$

with  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$  representing the share of tradable goods. The consumption of tradable goods combines in turn home-produced goods  $C_{Ht}$ , and foreign-produced goods  $C_{Ft}$  as follows

$$C_{Tt} \equiv \left[ \alpha^{\frac{1}{\eta}} (C_{Ht})^{\frac{\eta-1}{\eta}} + (1-\alpha)^{\frac{1}{\eta}} (C_{Ft})^{\frac{\eta-1}{\eta}} \right]^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}}.$$

The coefficient  $\alpha \in (0.5, 1]$  denotes home bias in tradables, and  $\eta$  is the elasticity of substitution among domestically produced and imported tradables. The home consumer price index (CPI)

---

<sup>24</sup>This formulation of the discount factor incorporates — in the case that the representative household stands for a continuum of households — the stimulative effect on individual consumption of an increase in average consumption, as in Uzawa (1968). However, as emphasized in FGS, the parameter  $\psi$  is calibrated to such a small value that this effect is negligible. It merely serves as a technical device to guarantee a unique steady state in the case of incomplete financial markets across countries. One can alternatively obtain a such a unique steady state by assuming a constant discount factor  $\beta$ , but introducing a debt-elastic interest rate premium in the budget constraints (7) and (10) below, as in Benigno (2001), Kollmann (2002), Schmitt-Grohe and Uribe (2003), and Justiniano and Preston (2006).

which minimizes cost of consumer expenditures is given by

$$P_t = P_{Tt}^\gamma P_{Nt}^{1-\gamma}$$

where the price of tradables is given by  $P_{Tt} = \left[ \alpha P_{Ht}^{1-\eta} + (1-\alpha) P_{Ft}^{1-\eta} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}$ . In the foreign country, we assume symmetric preferences, consumption aggregates, and price indices which we denote by starred (\*) variables and coefficients.<sup>25</sup>

Optimal behavior on the part of each household requires first an optimal allocation of consumption spending across differentiated goods. While we assume that households choose their level of total consumption on the basis of information available at date  $t-1$ , we let them choose the allocation of their consumption basket after the contemporaneous shocks have realized. The optimal allocation of (domestically- and foreign-produced) tradables goods as well as nontradable goods takes then the usual form

$$C_{Tt} = \gamma \left( \frac{P_{Tt}}{P_t} \right)^{-1} C_t, \quad C_{Nt} = (1-\gamma) \left( \frac{P_{Nt}}{P_t} \right)^{-1} C_t, \quad (5)$$

$$C_{Ht} = \alpha \left( \frac{P_{Ht}}{P_{Tt}} \right)^{-\eta} C_{Tt}, \quad C_{Ft} = (1-\alpha) \left( \frac{P_{Ft}}{P_{Tt}} \right)^{-\eta} C_{Tt}. \quad (6)$$

As in FGS, we assume that there is a single internationally traded one-period bond. We denote by  $B_t$  the nominal holdings at the beginning of period  $t+1$ , denominated in units of the home currency. The household's budget constraint in the home country is then given by

$$P_t C_t + B_t = I_{t-1} B_{t-1} + \int_0^\gamma W_{Ht}(f) L_{Ht}(f) df + \int_\gamma^1 W_{Nt}(f) L_{Nt}(f) df + \Upsilon_t \quad (7)$$

where  $I_{t-1}$  is the gross nominal interest rate in domestic currency between period  $t-1$  and  $t$ ,  $W_{kt}(f)$  is the nominal wage obtained by worker  $f$  in sector  $k$ , and  $\Upsilon_t$  combines aggregate dividends, lump sum taxes and transfers. Maximizing the utility function (4) subject to (7) yields the following

---

<sup>25</sup>One notable difference with respect to the home economy is that the foreign household consumption of tradable goods is of the form  $C_{Tt}^* \equiv \left[ (1-\alpha)^{\frac{1}{\eta}} (C_{Ht})^{\frac{\eta-1}{\eta}} + \alpha^{\frac{1}{\eta}} (C_{Ft}^*)^{\frac{\eta-1}{\eta}} \right]^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}}$ .

optimal choice of expenditures

$$E_{t-1} \{ \Lambda_t P_t \} = E_{t-1} \{ (C_t - \omega C_{t-1})^{-\sigma} - \omega \beta_t (C_{t+1} - \omega C_t)^{-\sigma} \} \quad (8)$$

where  $\Lambda_t$  is the household's marginal utility of additional nominal income at date  $t$ . This expression makes clear that the plan for aggregate consumption at date  $t$  is made on the basis of information available at date  $t - 1$ . The marginal utilities of income must in turn satisfy the Euler equation

$$1 = E_t \left\{ I_t \frac{\beta_t \Lambda_{t+1}}{\Lambda_t} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

Furthermore, the optimal choice of labor supply equalizes the real wage with the marginal rate of substitution between consumption and leisure.

The representative household in the foreign country is very similar. One difference, however, between the two countries is that the foreign bond is not traded internationally. The foreign household's budget constraint, expressed in units of the foreign currency is then

$$P_t^* C_t^* + D_t^* + \frac{B_t^*}{\mathcal{E}_t} = I_{t-1}^* D_{t-1}^* + \frac{I_{t-1} B_{t-1}^*}{\mathcal{E}_t e^{\mu_{t-1}}} + \int_0^\gamma W_{Ft}^*(f) L_{Ft}^*(f) df + \int_\gamma^1 W_{Nt}^*(f) L_{Nt}^*(f) df + \Upsilon_t^* \quad (10)$$

where the labor income indicates that foreign workers and firms operate in either the foreign tradable sector or the nontradable sector,  $D_t^*$  represents the foreign household's holdings of the foreign debt while  $B_t^*$  denotes the foreign household's holdings of the domestic bond, issued in the home currency, and  $\mathcal{E}_t$  is the nominal exchange rate, i.e., the amount of home currency needed in exchange for a unit of foreign currency. In contrast to FGS, but as in McCallum and Nelson (2000) or Justiniano and Preston (2006) we introduce an exogenous term  $e^{\mu_{t-1}}$  which can be interpreted as a risk premium shock, or a bias in the foreign household's expectation of the period- $t$  revenue from holding home bonds. This shock can alternatively be interpreted as a bias in the foreign household's date  $t - 1$  forecast of the date  $t$  exchange rate,  $\mathcal{E}_t$ , as in Kollmann (2002).

The foreign household choice of consumption plans is also characterized by optimal conditions of the form (8) and (9). In addition, given that foreign citizen may hold bonds of both countries, they must be indifferent between holding home and foreign bonds. This results in the following

uncovered interest-rate parity (UIP) condition

$$E_t \left\{ I_t \frac{\mathcal{E}_t}{\mathcal{E}_{t+1} e^{\mu t}} \frac{\beta_t^* \Lambda_{t+1}^*}{\Lambda_t^*} \right\} = E_t \left\{ I_t^* \frac{\beta_t^* \Lambda_{t+1}^*}{\Lambda_t^*} \right\}. \quad (11)$$

### 5.1.2 Firms

We have three types of firms: final-goods firms, intermediate-goods firms, and importing retailers.

**Final-goods firms.** In each sector  $H$  and  $N$ , final goods firms, which are acting on a competitive market, combine intermediate goods to produce output

$$Y_{Ht} \equiv \left[ \gamma^{-\frac{1}{\theta}} \int_0^\gamma Y_{Ht}(f)^{\frac{\theta-1}{\theta}} df \right]^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}, \quad Y_{Nt} \equiv \left[ (1-\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{\theta}} \int_\gamma^1 Y_{Nt}(f)^{\frac{\theta-1}{\theta}} df \right]^{\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}}$$

where  $\theta > 1$  is the elasticity of substitution among intermediate goods. Cost minimization for the final-goods firms implies the following demand functions for intermediate-goods producing firms

$$Y_{Ht}(f) = \gamma^{-1} \left( \frac{P_{Ht}(f)}{P_{Ht}} \right)^{-\theta} Y_{Ht}, \quad Y_{Nt}(f) = (1-\gamma)^{-1} \left( \frac{P_{Nt}(f)}{P_{Nt}} \right)^{-\theta} Y_{Nt} \quad (12)$$

where the price indices  $P_{Ht}$  and  $P_{Nt}$  aggregate underlying prices  $P_{kt}(f)$ .

Each intermediate firm  $f$  in sector  $k = H, N$  produces output  $Y_{kt}(f)$  by hiring labor  $L_{kt}(f)$  and using the production function

$$Y_{kt}(f) = A_t L_{kt}(f)$$

where the total factor productivity term  $A_t = Z_t e^{a_t}$ , and  $Z_t/Z_{t-1} = 1 + g$  describes trend productivity, while  $e^{a_t}$  denotes temporary fluctuations in total factor productivity. As the firm competes to attract labor, its nominal marginal cost is  $MC_{kt}(f) = W_{kt}(f)/A_t$ .

**Intermediate firms.** Intermediate firms are assumed to set prices on a staggered manner. A fraction  $1 - \xi$  of firms (chosen independently of the history of price changes) can choose a new price in each period. Our informational assumptions imply that the firms that get to reset their prices must do so using information available at period  $t - 1$ . In addition, we assume that if a price is not

re-optimized, it is indexed to lagged inflation in sector  $k = H, N$  according to the rule

$$P_{kt}(f) = P_{k,t-1}(f) \left( \frac{P_{k,t-1}}{P_{k,t-2}} \right)^\delta, \quad (13)$$

for some  $\delta \in [0, 1]$ . Given that the problem is the same for all firms of sector  $k$  which reset their price at date  $t$ , they all choose an optimal price  $P_{k,t}^o$  that maximizes

$$E_{t-1} \left\{ \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \xi^s \Lambda_{t,t+s} \left[ P_{kt}^o \left( \frac{P_{k,t+s-1}}{P_{k,t-1}} \right)^\delta - MC_{k,t+s}(f) \right] Y_{k,t+s}(f) \right\}$$

subject to the demand for their good (12). In the previous expression,  $\Lambda_{t,t+s} = \beta_{t,t+s} \Lambda_{t+s} / \Lambda_t$  is the stochastic discount factor between periods  $t$  and  $t+s$ ,  $\beta_{t,t+s} = \prod_{j=0}^{s-1} \beta_{t+j}$ , for  $s \geq 1$ , and  $\beta_{t,t} = 1$ .

The price index then satisfies

$$P_{kt} = \left[ (1 - \xi) (P_{kt}^o)^{1-\theta} + \xi \left( P_{k,t-1} \left( \frac{P_{k,t-1}}{P_{k,t-2}} \right)^\delta \right)^{1-\theta} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}}.$$

**Importing retailers.** To model the imperfect pass-through found in the data, we assume that monopolistically competitive retailers import foreign tradables goods and sell them to domestic consumers, as in Monacelli (2005). These retailers also set their prices in a staggered fashion so that the law of one price does not hold at the consumer level. As for the intermediate firms, a fraction  $1 - \tilde{\xi}$  of retailers choose a new price in each period, on the basis of information available at period  $t-1$ . Again, if a price is not re-optimized, it is indexed to lagged inflation in that sector, according to the rule (13). Since the problem is identical for retailers which reset their price at date  $t$ , they all choose an optimal price  $P_{F,t}^o$  in domestic currency that maximizes

$$E_{t-1} \left\{ \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\xi}^s \Lambda_{t,t+s} \left[ P_{F,t}^o \left( \frac{P_{F,t+s-1}}{P_{F,t-1}} \right)^\delta - \mathcal{E}_t P_{F,t+s}^* \right] C_{F,t+s} \right\}$$

subject to the demand for the imported good (6). In the above expression,  $P_{F,t}^*$  denotes the price of foreign tradable goods in foreign currency. The price index of imported goods in domestic currency

satisfies

$$P_{Ft} = \left(1 - \tilde{\xi}\right) (P_{Ft}^o) + \tilde{\xi} P_{F,t-1} \left(\frac{P_{F,t-1}}{P_{F,t-2}}\right)^{\tilde{\delta}}.$$

### 5.1.3 Monetary Policy

We consider two distinct monetary regimes, one referring to the pre-EMU period in which each national central banks sets its own interest rate according to a generalized forward-looking Taylor rule, and one referring to the monetary union, in which a supra-national central bank sets common short-term interest rates.

More specifically, in the pre-EMU regime, we assume that the home national central banks sets its short-term riskless interest rate according to

$$i_t = \rho i_{t-1} + (1 - \rho) [\phi_\pi E_t \bar{\pi}_{t+h} + \phi_y y_t + \phi_i i_t^* + \phi_e \Delta e_t] + \varepsilon_t \quad (14)$$

where  $i_t \equiv \log(I_t/I)$  corresponds to the deviations of the interest rate from its steady-state value,  $\bar{\pi}_t \equiv \log(P_t/P_{t-4})$  denotes deviations of year-over-year CPI inflation around the steady state (assumed to be zero),  $y_t$  represents percent deviations of output from trend,  $\Delta e_t = \log(\mathcal{E}_t/\mathcal{E}_{t-1})$  denotes percent nominal depreciation of the home currency, and the iid shock  $\varepsilon_t$  measures unexpected interest-rate disturbances. The foreign central bank follows a similar rule

$$i_t^* = \rho^* i_{t-1}^* + (1 - \rho^*) [\phi_\pi^* E_t \bar{\pi}_{t+h}^* + \phi_y^* y_t^* + \phi_i^* i_t + \phi_e^* \Delta e_t] + \varepsilon_t^* \quad (15)$$

where, again, the stars refer to foreign variables or coefficients. Note that we allow for cross-country interactions as the national central banks may respond to fluctuations in the exchange rate or to the other country's interest rate. Clarida, Galí and Gertler (1998) and Angeloni and Dedola (1999) argue that such rules provide a good characterization of monetary policy in a number of countries, including Germany and Italy, before the monetary union.

In the EMU regime, a single common short-term rate prevails, so that  $i_t = i_t^* = i_t^{ea}$  where  $ea$  stands for Euro-area variables, and  $\Delta e_t = 0$  in all periods. We assume that the common central

bank — corresponding to the ECB — sets interest rate according to the interest-rate rule

$$i_t^{ea} = \rho^{ea} i_{t-1}^{ea} + (1 - \rho^{ea}) [\phi_\pi^{ea} E_t \bar{\pi}_{t+h}^{ea} + \phi_y^{ea} y_t^{ea}] + \varepsilon_t^{ea} \quad (16)$$

where area-wide inflation and output are defined as  $\bar{\pi}_t^{ea} = (\bar{\pi}_t + \bar{\pi}_t^*)/2$ ,  $y_t^{ea} = (y_t + y_t^*)/2$ .

#### 5.1.4 Equilibrium characterization

To close the model, we use equilibrium conditions stating that supply of tradables and nontradable goods must be equal to the respective demands in each country, and that international financial markets clear. To characterize the response of various variables to monetary shocks, we solve a log-linear approximation to the model's equilibrium conditions around a deterministic state, using standard techniques. We thus implicitly assume that the shocks are small enough for the approximation to be valid. In the steady state, both economies are symmetric, the trade balance and foreign debt are equal to zero, output in each sector grows at the constant trend productivity growth rate  $g$ , the relative prices of all goods, including the real exchange rate

$$Q_t \equiv \frac{\mathcal{E}_t P_t^*}{P_t}$$

are equal to 1, inflation is equal to zero, and the real interest rate is equal to  $(1 + g)/\beta$ , where  $\beta$  the steady-state value of  $\beta_t$ .

The log-linearized equilibrium conditions are described in Appendix D.

## 5.2 Model calibration

We calibrate the model's parameters in order to provide its quantitative predictions, and to determine whether we can replicate at least some of the stylized facts mentioned above. In particular we focus our attention on changes in responses of key macroeconomic variables between the pre-EMU and EMU period. We also focus on the difference in responses across countries in the pre-EMU period, especially the differences between Italy and Spain on the one hand, and Germany along with other EA countries on the other hand. We assume that Home (H), stands for Italy or Spain, and Foreign (F) stands for Germany along with the other EA countries.

We calibrate the structural parameters describing the behavior of the private sector similarly to earlier studies such as FGS or Obstfeld and Rogoff (2005), and use estimated coefficients for the policy rules. While the calibration of the structural parameters sacrifices somewhat the model’s ability to replicate the empirical responses, we did check that the model’s predictions are not too sensitive to the chosen parameter values. However, as we will see below, coefficients of the policy rules do play an important role on the shape of the responses to various shocks.

### 5.2.1 Structural parameters

As mentioned, most structural parameters are taken from FGS and are roughly in line with values chosen in other studies (e.g., Obstfeld and Rogoff, 2005) and with some microeconomic data. We set the same values for both countries. The steady-state growth rate of the economy  $g$  is set to 0.5%, so that annual growth is 2%. The steady-state discount factor  $\beta$  is set to 0.99. The parameters describing the evolution of the discount factor  $\vartheta = -1000$  and  $\psi = 7.2361 \cdot 10^{-6}$  are chosen so that fluctuations in  $\beta_t$  have no noticeable implications on the economy dynamics.<sup>26</sup> The Frisch elasticity of labor supply is  $\varphi^{-1} = 0.5$ . The elasticity of substitution among intermediate goods  $\theta = 11$  results in a steady-state markup of 10% in the tradable and nontradable sectors. We set the probability that intermediate-goods firms and importing retailers do not re-optimize their price to  $\xi = \tilde{\xi} = 0.66$ , corresponding to a mean duration between price re-optimizations of 3 quarters. Smets and Wouters (2002) find evidence that import prices display a similar degree of price stickiness as domestic prices on the basis of estimated responses to monetary shocks in the EA. For the parameters that determine the openness of the economies, we set the share of tradables in the consumption basket  $\gamma$  to 0.25, the preference share for home tradables  $\alpha = 0.7$  (it would be 0.5 in the absence of home bias), and the elasticity of substitution between home and foreign tradables is  $\eta = 2$ , as in FGS.

FGS assume a log utility function of consumption, and no habit persistence or inflation indexing. This yields however sharp responses in inflation and consumption to monetary shocks, in contrast to the empirical evidence. To generate more realistic hump-shaped responses of consump-

---

<sup>26</sup>As mentioned above, the assumption of a variable discount factor is merely a technical device yielding a unique steady state.

tion expenditures and output of the model economy we assume some degree of habit persistence  $\omega$ .<sup>27</sup> We calibrate this parameter at 0.59 which corresponds to the (median) estimate obtained by Smets and Wouters (2003), in their model of the EA. We similarly use the estimates of Smets and Wouters (2003) to calibrate the curvature of the utility of consumption and the degree of inflation indexing to respectively  $\sigma = 1.37$  and  $\delta = \tilde{\delta} = 0.47$ .

### 5.2.2 Policy rule coefficients

We calibrate the policy rule coefficients for the home and foreign country, in the pre-EMU period using estimates of Angeloni and Dedola (1999, Table 9b). These authors estimate interest rate rules of the form (14)-(15) jointly for Italy and Germany, for the period 1988-1997, which covers nearly entirely our pre-EMU sample. Their preferred specification involves horizons on inflation expectations of  $h = h^* = 0$ , so that the central banks set interest rates in response to inflation that has occurred over the past year. As the estimates are obtained using monthly data, we convert them for application to quarterly data.<sup>28</sup> We thus have  $\rho = 0.79$ ,  $\phi_\pi = 1.22$ ,  $\phi_y = 0.30$ ,  $\phi_i = 0.41$  for Italy,<sup>29</sup> and  $\rho^* = 0.82$ ,  $\phi_\pi^* = 1.41$ ,  $\phi_y^* = 0.30$ ,  $\phi_i^* = 0$  for Germany. Angeloni and Dedola (1999) do not include a bilateral DM/Lira exchange rate in their policy rules, but they include the \$/DM exchange rate. Since we abstract from the world outside of the EA in the model, we assume that German monetary policy does not respond to the exchange rate ( $\phi_e^* = 0$ ), while the annualized Italian interest rate responds with a short-run coefficient of 0.4 to the exchange rate depreciation. This is meant to capture the fact that the Italian central bank was required to maintain its exchange rate within narrow bands, as long as it took part in the exchange rate mechanism. This results in a long-run coefficient  $\phi_e = 5$ .

For the post-EMU period, we estimate an interest-rate rule of the form (16) on EA data, using GMM, similarly to Clarida, Galí and Gertler (1998). We use as instruments: the current value of

---

<sup>27</sup>The degree of habit persistence also proxies for investment adjustment costs in the case that consumption expenditures include also investment expenditures.

<sup>28</sup>For the conversion, we assume that monthly values of (annualized) short term interest rates are constant in a given quarter, and equal to the corresponding (annualized) quarterly rate. In that case, the coefficient on the quarterly lagged interest rate is  $\rho = \rho_m / (3 - 2\rho_m)$  where  $\rho_m$  is the policy coefficient on the monthly lagged interest rate. The long-run coefficients on inflation, output, and the foreign interest rate remain unchanged at the quarterly frequency.

<sup>29</sup>Angeloni and Dedola (1999)'s estimated policy rule for Spain is similar to that estimated for Italy.

inflation and detrended output as well as three latent factors extracted from the EA indicators. Our preferred horizon is  $h = 2$ . As the estimated coefficient on the lagged interest rate is relatively high,  $\rho^{ea} = 0.93$ , the implied long-run responses to expected inflation and output fluctuations are also quite strong:  $\phi_{\pi}^{ea} = 13.03$  and  $\phi_y^{ea} = 8.01$ .<sup>30</sup> Nonetheless, we verify that our conclusions remain robust to smaller values of these coefficients.

### 5.2.3 Wedge in uncovered interest-rate parity

The remaining parameters that we need to calibrate refer to the process describing the wedge in the uncovered interest-rate parity,  $\mu_t$ . The UIP condition (11) can be log-linearized to yield

$$i_t - i_t^* = E_t \Delta e_{t+1} + \mu_t. \quad (17)$$

We assume that  $\mu_t$  follows an AR(1) process which is allowed to respond to monetary shocks

$$\mu_t = \rho_{\mu} \mu_{t-1} + \nu \varepsilon_t^* + \varepsilon_{\mu t}$$

where  $\varepsilon_t^*$  are foreign monetary policy shocks and  $\varepsilon_{\mu t}$  denotes other possible shocks to that wedge. By allowing  $\mu_t$  to respond to monetary shocks, we hope to capture in an arguably reduced form the effect of monetary shocks on the risk premium emphasized by Scholl and Uhlig (2006). We assume that this wedge is very persistent, setting  $\rho_{\mu} = 0.98$ , and will consider different values of the parameter  $\nu$ .

## 5.3 Model's quantitative predictions: Explaining the changes in the monetary transmission mechanism

Having calibrated the model, we can now determine whether it can replicate the stylized facts mentioned above, namely the cross-country differences in responses as well as their changes with the introduction of the euro that we report in Figures 1a–1c.

---

<sup>30</sup>While this representation of the policy rule appears very aggressive, it is important to realize that this is due to the large coefficient on the lagged interest rate. The policy rule may equivalently be written in terms of changes of the interest rate:  $\Delta i_t^{ea} = 0.91 E_t \bar{\pi}_{t+2}^{ea} + 0.56 y_t^{ea} - 0.07 i_{t-1}^{ea} + \varepsilon_t^{ea}$ .

### 5.3.1 Pre-EMU cross-country differences

Figures 3a-3d indicate the responses of key variables to an unexpected interest-rate increase of 100 bp in the foreign economy — which stands for Germany — in the case that both economies set their interest-rates according to the estimated policy rules (14) and (15). This is meant to replicate the effects of a monetary policy tightening in the pre-EMU period, reported in Figures 1a-1c.

Figure 3a shows the responses of the home economy (i.e., Italy or Spain, solid lines) and the foreign economy (i.e., Germany, dashed lines) in the absence of a wedge in the UIP condition ( $\nu = 0$ , so  $\mu_t = 0$ ). The unexpected increase in the foreign short-term rate is associated with a rise in the long-term rate, a drop in output, consumption, and inflation. As the domestic currency depreciates more than prices adjust, the domestic real exchange rate ( $q_t$ ) also depreciates, and home terms of trade (TOT, measuring foreign prices relative to domestic prices, in domestic currency) increase. This stimulates an increase in net exports of home goods. Note that investors in the internationally traded security do not require as large an increase in the home interest rate as that observed for the foreign interest rate. The reason is that the domestic currency is expected to have depreciated beyond its long term value, so that it is expected to appreciate slightly in subsequent periods.

The response of home interest rates just described is however at odds with the interest-rate responses that we had documented for countries such as Spain and Italy in Figure 1a. In fact, in pre-EMU data, these short and long-term rates increased significantly more than those estimated for Germany and other countries. They were also associated with sharp contractions in consumption and employment in those countries. Instead, the model-based responses display a milder response of the home variables. One might think that by letting the home country's central bank respond more to exchange rate fluctuations (i.e., a larger  $\phi_e$ ), we may generate stronger responses of interest rates and consumption at home. However, even for very large values of  $\phi_e$ , we cannot produce larger responses of the home interest-rate, output and consumption than in the foreign economy. As shown in Figure 3c, in the limit, as  $\phi_e \rightarrow +\infty$ , the nominal exchange rate is perfectly stabilized, the variables have identical responses in both countries, and thus corresponds to those of a single closed economy.<sup>31</sup> In addition, changes in structural parameters don't generically modify the picture

---

<sup>31</sup>Recall that our calibration is such that apart from the policy rules, the home and foreign economies are perfectly symmetric.

presented.

The basic version of the model cannot replicate the transmission of monetary policy observed in a low-credibility regimes as long-term rates are tightly tied to expected future riskless short-term rates. One key parameter, however, that allows us to deviate from the standard case and that seems to explain the stylized facts reported in Figure 1a-1c is  $\nu$ . Figure 3b reports the model-based responses of the same variables in the case that  $\nu = 0.6$ . In that case, an unexpected increase in the foreign short-term rate triggers a much larger increase in the home interest rate — as observed in the data — as the wedge  $\mu_t$  suddenly rises in response to an interest-rate increase in the foreign country. This wedge suggests that in response to the foreign monetary shock, international investors require a higher return on domestic (internationally traded) bonds than they do on foreign securities, even after accounting for the rational expectation of nominal exchange rate changes.

Such an exchange-rate risk premium appears important to explain the stylized facts reported above. In fact, in Figure 3b, not only do short- and long-term rates respond more strongly at home than in the foreign country, but these interest-rate responses do also generate a larger drop in the home country consumption. As in the data, output falls less than consumption due to the fact that home-country net exports increase. Note also that while monetary policy reduces activity in both regions, prices do increase in the home country as a result of the currency depreciation. Interestingly, prices aggregated for both regions (dashed-dotted line) can also increase following the monetary tightening, to the extent that inflation in the depreciating country more than offsets the inflation reduction in the other region. This can explain an apparent “price puzzle” in the home country or in the area as a whole, in response to monetary tightening.

The exercise just performed thus suggests that conditional on EA-wide (or German) monetary shocks, changes in the risk premium on Italian and Spanish securities may provide an important explanation for the large observed responses in bond yields, and the fact that consumption and investment used to fall considerably more in those countries than in the rest of the EA.

### **5.3.2 Monetary union and changes in the monetary transmission mechanism**

By adopting the euro as their currency, all EMU countries essentially eliminated exchange-rate risks relative to the other member countries. Figure 3c reports the responses of the same variables

in the case of a monetary union, when monetary policy is conducted according to the estimated rule (16). Since both countries are symmetric in the calibration, they both respond identically to the EA interest-rate shock.

Comparing Figures 3a-3b on one hand with Figure 3c on the other hand reveals important differences in the responses to an unexpected increase in the interest rate set by the foreign central bank in the pre-EMU regime, and the common central bank in the EMU regime. The model predicts that the home economy benefits in many respects from participating to the monetary union, in response such a shock. In particular, by removing exchange-rate risks in the EMU regime, home (short- and long-term) interest-rates increase by less, as we observed in the empirical responses. As a result, home consumption falls by less and output remains more stable.

According to the model, removing exchange-rate risks may have helped stabilize not only countries such as Italy and Spain but also the entire EA. To isolate the effect of the exchange-rate risk, we report in Figure 3d the model-based responses of the EA variables obtained by aggregating the home and foreign responses, following a monetary shock in the foreign country. The figure reveals that the responses of short- and long-term interest rates, output, consumption and inflation are all more muted when we remove the risk-premium shock  $\mu_t$ .

The EMU has not only contributed to smaller responses by removing exchange-rate risks. The model predicts that a monetary policy that has more consistently aimed at stabilizing inflation and output in the EA, since the start of the EMU, should result in a smaller observed response of aggregate economic activity and inflation to monetary shocks, as observed in the data. To illustrate this, Figure 3e shows the model-based responses of EA variables to a monetary tightening (of 100 bp) assuming two different policy rules: the one estimated for the ECB (solid lines) and the one estimated previously (by Angeloni and Dedola, 1999) for the Bundesbank (dashed lines). The figure indicates that stronger responses by the ECB to inflation and output fluctuations, essentially stemming from a very inertial rule, have resulted in smaller responses of economic activity and inflation. It is important to stress, however, that the smaller response of output and inflation is not due to the fact that the economy is less sensitive to monetary policy. All elasticities describing the behavior of the private sector, such as the intertemporal elasticity of substitution and so on are maintained constant in this experiment. It is only the stronger commitment to inflation and

output stabilization that results in such an outcome.<sup>32</sup>

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have provided an empirical characterization of the monetary transmission mechanism in key European economies, exploiting the richness of the cross-country differences and the fact that a major change in monetary regime has occurred in 1999 with the adoption of the euro by 11 European countries. The combination of the cross-country heterogeneity and the changes over time provides a unique laboratory for the analysis of numerous macroeconomic indicators.

Focusing on six major European economies, we have argued that a large fraction of the fluctuations in these economic variables can be captured by a low-dimensional vector of common components. This finding is useful to the extent that it allows us to characterize the effects of monetary shocks on all variables of interest, despite the fact that we have extremely short samples with a relatively stable regime.

Looking at the EA as a whole, in the 1988-2007 sample, we have found that the responses of key macroeconomic variables to monetary disturbances conceal important heterogeneity across countries. Such responses can be rationalized by a two-country model, provided that we allow for a disturbance in the uncovered-interest-rate parity condition, which may be interpreted as a risk-premium shock. In addition despite the short samples, we have detected preliminary evidence of important changes in the transmission of monetary policy since the start of the EMU.

We have argued that some of the changes since 1999 can be explained by the change in the monetary regime. In particular, our model predicts that by removing an exchange-rate risk through the monetary union, and by having a central bank more decisively focused on inflation and output stabilization, the impact of monetary disturbances on measures of economic activity has been reduced, as observed in the data. While private consumption and investment in Italy and Spain appear to have been especially hard hit by German monetary policy disturbances in the pre-EMU period, the new monetary regime has contributed to stabilizing them more effectively, in part

---

<sup>32</sup>Boivin and Giannoni (2006a) argue that a stronger commitment to inflation stabilization in US monetary policy since the early 1980s can similarly explain the observed reduction in estimated responses of inflation and output in the US economy in the post-1980 period.

because long-term interest rate have become much more effectively anchored in such countries since the start of the monetary union.

We have also found that the exchange rate channel has become relatively more powerful in the monetary union period, than in the previous decade and that national monetary aggregates appear much less driven by euro area common shocks and show more heterogenous responses to monetary policy shocks than most other macroeconomic variables.

## References

- [1] Agresti Anna-Maria and Benoît Mojon (2003), “Some Stylized Facts on the Euro Area Business Cycle,” in I. Angeloni, A. Kashyap and B. Mojon (eds., op cited).
- [2] Altissimo, F., P. Benigno, D. Rodriguez-Palenzuela (2004), “Inflation Differentials in a Currency Area: Facts, Explanations and Policy,” NBER working paper.
- [3] Angeloni, Ignazio, and Luca Dedola (1999), “From the ERM to the Euro: New Evidence on Economic and Policy Convergence Among EU Countries,” ECB working paper 4.
- [4] Angeloni, Ignazio, Anil Kashyap and Benoît Mojon (2003), *Monetary Transmission in the Euro Area*, Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Bai, Jushan (2003), “Inferential Theory for Factor Models of Large Dimensions,” *Econometrica* 71(1): 135-72.
- [6] Bai, Jushan and Serena Ng (2006), “Confidence Intervals for Diffusion Index Forecasts and Inference for Factor-Augmented Regressions,” *Econometrica* 74(4): 1133-1150.
- [7] Basu, Susanto, and Miles S. Kimball (2003), “Investment Planning; Costs and the Effects of Fiscal and Monetary Policy,” manuscript, University of Michigan.
- [8] Bekaert, Geert, Robert J. Hodrick (1993), “On Biases in the Measurement of Foreign Exchange Risk Premiums,” *Journal of International Money and Finance* 12 (2): 115-138.
- [9] Bekaert, Geert, Min Wei and Yuhang Xing (2007), “Uncovered Interest Rate Parity and the Term Structure,” *Journal of International Money and Finance* 26(6): 1038-1069.
- [10] Benalal, Nicholai, Juan Luis Diaz del Hoyo, Beatrice Pierluigi and Nick Vidalis (2006), “Output Growth Differentials Across the Euro Area Countries: Some Stylised Facts,” ECB Occasional Paper 45.
- [11] Benigno, Gianluca, and Pierpaolo Benigno (2006), “Exchange Rate Determination under Interest Rate Rules,” manuscript, London School of Economics.
- [12] Benigno, Pierpaolo (2001), “Price Stability with Imperfect Financial Integration,” manuscript.

- [13] Bernanke, Ben S., Jean Boivin and Piotr Elias (2005), "Measuring Monetary Policy: A Factor Augmented Vector Autoregressive (FAVAR) Approach," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 120(1): 387-422.
- [14] Blanchard Olivier, and Jordi Galí (2008), "The Macroeconomic Effects of Oil Shocks: Why are the 2000s So Different from the 1970s?" forthcoming in Jordi Galí and Mark Gertler (eds.), *International Dimensions of Monetary Policy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [15] Boivin, Jean and Marc P. Giannoni (2006a) "Has Monetary Policy Become More Effective?" *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 88(3): 445-462.
- [16] Boivin, Jean, and Marc P. Giannoni (2006b), "DSGE Models in a Data-Rich Environment," NBER working paper no. 12772.
- [17] Boivin, Jean, Marc P. Giannoni (2007), "Global Forces and Monetary Policy Effectiveness," forthcoming in Jordi Galí and Mark Gertler (eds.), *International Dimensions of Monetary Policy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [18] Boivin, Jean, Marc P. Giannoni, and Ilian Mihov (2007), "Sticky Prices and Monetary Policy: Evidence from Disaggregated U.S. Data," NBER Working Paper no. 12824. (Revised, December 2007), forthcoming in *The American Economic Review*.
- [19] Boivin, Jean, and Serena Ng (2005), "Understanding and Comparing Factor-Based Forecasts," *International Journal of Central Banking* 1(3): 117-151.
- [20] Camacho, M., G. Pérez-Quirós, L. Saiz (2006), "Are European Business Cycles Close Enough to Be Just One?", *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 34: 538-563.
- [21] Campa, José, and Linda Goldberg (2006), "Distribution Margins, Imported Inputs, and the Sensitivity of the CPI to Exchange Rates," NBER working paper no. 12121.
- [22] Cavallo Michele, and Tao Wu (2006), "Measuring Oil-Price Shocks Using Market-Based Information," Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Working Paper Series, 2006-28.
- [23] Christiano, Lawrence J., Martin Eichenbaum, and Charles Evans (2005), "Nominal Rigidities and the Dynamic Effect of a Shock to Monetary Policy," *Journal of Political Economy* 113(1): 1-45.
- [24] Christiano, Lawrence J., Roberto Motto and Massimo Rostagno (2007), "Shocks, Structures or Monetary Policies? The Euro Area and US after 2001," ECB working paper 774.
- [25] Ciccarelli Matteo and Alessandro Rebucci (2006), "Has the Transmission Mechanism of European Monetary Policy Changed in the Run-Up to EMU," *European Economic Review* 50(3): 737-776.
- [26] Clarida, Richard, Jordi Galí and Mark Gertler (1998), "Monetary Policy Rules in Practice: Some International Evidence," *European Economic Review* 42(5): 1033-1067.
- [27] Clarida, Richard, Jordi Galí and Mark Gertler (2002), "A Simple Framework for International Monetary Policy Analysis," *Journal of Monetary Economics* 49(5): 879-904.

- [28] Coenen, Günter, Peter McAdam and Roland Straub (2007), “Tax reform and labour-market performance in the euro area: a simulation-based analysis using the New Area-Wide Model,” ECB working paper 747, forthcoming in *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*.
- [29] Corsetti, Giancarlo and Luca Dedola (2005), “A Macroeconomic Model of International Price Discrimination,” *Journal of International Economics* 67: 129-55.
- [30] Corsetti, Giancarlo and Paolo Pesenti (2005), “International Dimensions of Optimal Monetary Policy,” *Journal of Monetary Economics* 52(2): 281-305.
- [31] Devereux, Michael B. and Charles Engel (2002), “Exchange Rate Pass-Through, Exchange Rate Volatility, and Exchange Rate Disconnect,” *Journal of Monetary Economics* 49(5): 913-940.
- [32] Doz, Catherine, Domenico Giannone and Lucrezia Reichlin (2007), “A Quasi-Maximum Likelihood Approach for Large Approximate Dynamic Factor Models,” CEPR discussion paper 5724.
- [33] Ehrmann, Michael, Marcel Fratzscher, Refet S. Gürkaynak and Eric Swanson (2007), “Convergence and Anchoring of Yield Curves in the Euro Area,” ECB working paper 817.
- [34] Eichenbaum, Martin and Charles L. Evans (1995), “Some Empirical Evidence on the Effects of Shocks to Monetary Policy on Exchange Rates,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 110(4): 975-1009.
- [35] Eickmeier, Sandra (2006), “Comovements and Heterogeneity in the Euro Area Analyzed in a Non-Stationary Dynamic Factor Model,” Bundesbank discussion paper 31-2006.
- [36] Eickmeier, Sandra and Jörg Breitung (2006), “How Synchronized are New EU Member States with the Euro Area? Evidence from a Structural Factor Model,” *Journal of Comparative Economics* 34: 538-563.
- [37] van Els, Peter, Alberto Locarno, Julina Morgan and Jean-Pierre Villetelle (2003), “The Effects of Monetary Policy in the Euro Area: Evidence from Structural Macroeconomic Models”, in I. Angeloni et al (eds., op cited).
- [38] Engel, Charles (1996), “The Forward Discount Anomaly and the Risk Premium: A Survey of Recent Evidence,” *Journal of Empirical Finance* 3 (2): 123-192.
- [39] European Central Bank (2007), “Report on Financial Integration in the Euro Area,” March, [www.ecb.int](http://www.ecb.int).
- [40] Fagan, Gabriel, Jérôme Henry, and Ricardo Mestre (2005), “An Area-Wide Model (AWM) for the Euro Area,” *Economic Modelling* 22(1): 39-59.
- [41] Fagan, Gabriel, and Julian Morgan (2006), *Econometric Models of the Euro Area Central Banks*, Edward Elgar.
- [42] Faruquee, Hamid, Douglas Laxton, Dirk Muir, and Paolo A. Pesenti (2007), “Smooth Landing or Crash? Model-Based Scenarios of Global Current Account Rebalancing,” in Richard H. Clarida (ed.), *G7 Current Account Imbalances*, The University of Chicago Press, Chap. 10, pp. 377-451.

- [43] Favero Carlo, Massimiliano Marcellino and Francesca Neglia (2005), “Principal Components at Work: The Empirical Analysis of Monetary Policy with Large Datasets,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 20:603-620.
- [44] Fernández-Villaverde, Jesús, Juan F. Rubio-Ramírez, Sargent, Thomas J. and Mark W. Watson (2007) “ABCs (and Ds) of Understanding VARs,” *American Economic Review* 97(3): 1021-26.
- [45] Ferrero, Andrea, Mark Gertler, and Lars E.O. Svensson (2007), “Current Account Dynamics and Monetary Policy,” forthcoming in Jordi Galí and Mark Gertler (eds.), *International Dimensions of Monetary Policy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [46] Forni, Mario, Marc Hallin, Marco Lippi, and Lucrezia Reichlin (2000), “The Generalized Dynamic Factor Model: Identification and Estimation,” *Review of Economics and Statistics* 82:4, 540–554.
- [47] Forni, Mario and Lucrezia Reichlin (2001), “Federal Policies and Local Economies: Europe and the US,” *European Economic Review* 45(1): 109-134
- [48] Froot, K.A., R.H. Thaler (1990), “Foreign Exchange,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 4 (3): 179-192.
- [49] Galí, Jordi and Mark Gertler (eds.) (2007), *International Dimensions of Monetary Policy*. Forthcoming, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [50] Giannone, Domenico and Lucrezia Reichlin (2006), “Trends and Cycles in the Euro Area: How Much Heterogeneity and Should We Worry About It?,” ECB working paper 595.
- [51] Guiso L., A. Kashyap, F. Panetta and D. Terlizzese (1999), “Will a Common European Monetary Policy Have Asymmetric Effects?” *Economic Perspectives*, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, pp. 56-75.
- [52] Hamilton, James D. (2003), “What is an Oil Shock?” *Journal of Econometrics* 113: 363-398.
- [53] Justiniano, Alejandro, and Bruce Preston (2006), “Can Structural Small Open Economy Models Account for the Influence of Foreign Disturbances?” manuscript, Columbia University.
- [54] Kilian, Lutz (1998), “Small-Sample Confidence Intervals for Impulse Response Functions,” *Review of Economics and Statistics* 80(2): 218-230.
- [55] Kilian, Lutz (2008), “A Comparison of the Effects of Exogenous Oil Supply Shocks on Output and Inflation in G7 Countries,” *Journal of the European Economic Association* 6(1): 78-121.
- [56] Kollmann, Robert (2002), “Monetary Policy Rules in the Open Economy: Effects on Welfare and Business Cycles,” *Journal of Monetary Economics* 49(5): 989-1015.
- [57] Kok Sørensen, Christoffer and Thomas Werner (2006), “Bank Interest Rate Pass-Through in the Euro Area: A Cross Country Comparison,” ECB working paper series 580.
- [58] Kose, M. Ayhan, Christopher Otrok, and Charles H. Whiteman (2003), “International Business Cycles: World, Region, and Country Specific Factors,” *American Economic Review* 93(4): 1216–39.

- [59] Mark, Nelson C., Yangru Wu (1998), “Rethinking Deviations From Uncovered Interest Parity: The Role of Covariance Risk and Noise,” *The Economic Journal* 108 (451): 1686-1706.
- [60] McCallum, Andrew, and Frank Smets (2007), “Real Wages and Monetary Policy Transmission in the Euro Area,” Kiel working paper 1360.
- [61] McCallum, Bennett and Edward Nelson (2000), “Monetary Policy for an Open Economy: An Alternative Framework with Optimizing Agents and Sticky Prices,” *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 16, 74–91.
- [62] Mihov, Ilian (2001), “Monetary Policy Implementation and Transmission in the European Monetary Union,” *Economic Policy* 16(33): 369-406.
- [63] Mojon, Benoît and Gert Peersman (2003), “A VAR Description of the Effects of Monetary Policy in the Individual Countries of the Euro Area,” in Angeloni et al., op cited.
- [64] Monacelli, Tommaso (2005), “Monetary Policy in a Low Pass-Through Environment,” *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking* 37(6): 1047-1066.
- [65] Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth S. Rogoff (2002), “Global Implications of Self-Oriented National Monetary Rules,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 117: 503-536.
- [66] Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth S. Rogoff (2005), “The Unsustainable US Current Account Position Revisited,” in Richard H. Clarida (ed.), *G7 Current Account Imbalances*, The University of Chicago Press.
- [67] Peersman, Gert (2005), “What Caused the Early Millennium Slowdown? Evidence Based on Vector Autoregressions,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 20(2): 185–207.
- [68] Peersman, Gert, and Frank Smets (2003), “The Monetary Transmission Mechanism in the Euro Area: More Evidence From VAR Analysis,” in *Monetary Policy Transmission in the Euro Area*, I. Angeloni, A. Kashyap and B. Mojon (eds), Cambridge University Press.
- [69] Rossi, Barbara (2007), “Expectations Hypotheses Tests at Long Horizons,” *Econometrics Journal* 10: 554-579.
- [70] Rotemberg, Julio J., and Michael Woodford (1997), “An Optimization-Based Econometric Framework for the Evaluation of Monetary Policy,” *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 297-346.
- [71] Sala, Luca (2001), “Monetary Transmission in the Euro Area: A Factor Model Approach,” ECARES mimeo.
- [72] Schmitt-Grohé, Stephanie, and Martin Uribe (2003), “Closing Small Open Economy Models,” *Journal of International Economics* 61: 163-195.
- [73] Scholl, Almuth and Harald Uhlig (2006), “New Evidence on the Puzzles: Monetary Policy and Exchange Rates,” *Computing in Economics and Finance* 2006(5), Society for Computational Economics.
- [74] Sims, Christopher A. (2000), “Solving Linear Rational Expectations Models,” manuscript, Princeton University.

- [75] Sims, Christopher A. and Tao Zha (2006), “Does Monetary Policy Generate Recessions?,” *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 10(2): 231-272.
- [76] Smets, Frank, and Raf Wouters (2002), “Openness, Imperfect Exchange Rate Pass-Through and Monetary Policy,” *Journal of Monetary Economics* 49(5): 947-981.
- [77] Smets, Frank, and Raf Wouters (2003), “An estimated Stochastic DSGE model of the euro area” *Journal of Economic Association* 1(5): 1123-1175.
- [78] Stock, James H., and Mark W. Watson (1999), “Forecasting Inflation,” *Journal of Monetary Economics* 44: 293-335.
- [79] Stock, James H., and Mark W. Watson (2002), “Macroeconomic Forecasting Using Diffusion Indexes,” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 20(2): 147-162.
- [80] Stock James H., and Mark W. Watson (2005), “Understanding Changes in International Business Cycle Dynamics,” *Journal of the European Economic Association* 3(5): 968–1006.
- [81] Uzawa, Hirofumi (1968), “Time Preference, the Consumption Function and Optimum Asset Holdings,” in James Wolfe (ed.), *Value, Capital and Growth: Papers in Honor of Sir John Hicks*, Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh Press.
- [82] Woodford, Michael (2003), *Interest and Prices: Foundations of a Theory of Monetary Policy*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.




Figure 1a: Impulse response functions to a monetary tightening in EA

(shock = 100 bp increase in short-term rate; responses expressed in year-over-year growth rates except for interest rates)




Figure 1b: Impulse response functions to a monetary tightening in EA  
 (shock = 100 bp increase in short-term rate; responses expressed in year-over-year growth rates)




Figure 1c: Impulse response functions to a monetary tightening in EA  
 (shock = 100 bp increase in short-term rate; responses expressed in year-over-year growth rates)




Figure 2. Responses of short and long-term interest rates to monetary shock in EA

Notes: First five subplots represent responses of interest rates in 1998-2007 sample. Bottom right plot contains responses for EMU period. Solid line: short-term interest rate; Dashed line: bond yield; Crossed line: theoretical bond yield without term premium, based on expectations hypothesis.




Figure 3a: Model-based responses to a 100bp monetary tightening in foreign country (pre-EMU,  $\nu = 0$ ).




Figure 3b: Model-based responses to a 100bp monetary tightening in foreign country (pre-EMU,  $\nu = 0.6$ ).




Figure 3c: Model-based responses to a 100bp monetary tightening in common area (monetary union case,  $\nu = 0.6$ ).




Figure 3d: Model-based responses of aggregate EA variables to a 100bp monetary tightening in foreign economy (solid lines:  $\nu = 0$ ; dashed lines:  $\nu = 0.6$ ).




Figure 3e: Model-based responses of EA variables to a 100bp monetary tightening in EA under alternative policy rules (solid lines: ECB policy rule; dashed lines: Bundesbank policy rule).

## A Data description

The data were extracted from HAVER and their source is either the OECD's Main Economic Indicators (MEI) or Quarterly National Accounts (QNA) databases. The monetary aggregates are obtained from the national central banks and from the ECB for the euro area. The national accounts published in HAVER are available starting at different dates: 1978 in France, 1981 in Italy, 1988 in the Netherlands, 1991 in Germany, 1995 in Spain and Belgium. Some deflators in the euro area start in 1995. Missing data were backdated using yoy growth rates of an earlier vintage of OECD and ECB data. Table A1 gives a full account of the data used and Figures A1-A5 plot the data series.

Table A1: Data sources and definition of euro area and country-level data

	Haver	Euro area	Germany	France	Italy	Spain	Netherlands	Belgium	Series description
1	MEI	ECB 80-93			ECB 80-91		ECB 80-85	ECB	Short-term interest rate (3-month, interbank offered rate, % p.a.)
2	MEI								Government bond yields (10-year, % p.a.)
3	MEI	AV 80-86							National share price index (2000=100)
4	MEI								Real effective exchange rate (2000=100)
5	QNA	AV 80-94	OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	OEO 80-87	OEO 80-94	Implicit price deflator, GDP (SA, 2000=100)
6	QNA	AV 80-94	OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	=CPI 80-87	OEO 80-94	Implicit price deflator, Private consumption (SA, 2000=100)
7	QNA	AV 80-94	OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	OEO 80-87	OEO 80-94	Implicit price deflator, Investment (gross cap. form., SA, 2000=100)
8	QNA	AV 80-07	OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	OEO 80-87	OEO 80-94	Implicit price deflator, Exports (SA, 2000=100)
9	QNA	AV 80-07	OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	OEO 80-87	OEO 80-94	Implicit price deflator, Imports (SA, 2000=100)
10	QNA		OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	OEO 80-87	OEO 80-94	Gross Domestic Product (SA, Mil.2000 euros)
11	QNA		OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	OEO 80-87	OEO 80-94	Private final consumption exp. (SA, Mil.2000 euros)
12	QNA		OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	OEO 80-87	OEO 80-94	Gov. final consumption exp. (SA, Mil.2000 euros)
13	QNA		OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	OEO 80-87	OEO 80-94	Investment (gross fixed capital formation, SA, Mil.2000 euros)
14	QNA	AV 80-07	OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	OEO 80-87	OEO 80-94	Exports of goods & services (SA, Mil.2000 euros)
15	QNA	AV 80-07	OEO 80-90		OEO 80	OEO 80-94	OEO 80-87	OEO 80-94	Imports of goods & services (SA, Mil.2000 euros)
16	MEI	AV 80-84							Rate of capacity utilisation (mfg survey, SA, %)
17	MEI	AV 80-89			=C 80-90				Retail sales (volume, SA, 2000=100)
18	MEI	AV 80-07							Passenger cars registered (SA, 2000=100)
19	MEI	AV 80-81							PPI: Manufactured products (NSA, 2000=100)
20	MEI	AV 80-90							European harmonized CPI (NSA, 2000=100)
21	MEI	AV 80-90							CPI: Food (NSA, 2000=100)
22	MEI	AV 80-90							CPI: Fuel & electricity (NSA, 2000=100)
23	MEI	AV 80-95							CPI: All items excl Food, Energy (NSA, 2000=100)
24	MEI	AV 80-94							CPI: Rent (NSA, 2000=100)
25	MEI								Civilian employment (SA, Thous)
26	MEI	AV 80-95							Standardized unemployment rate (SA, %)
27	MEI								Hourly earnings: Manufacturing (SA, 2000=100)
28	MEI								Unit labor costs (Trend, 2000=100)
29	MEI								Unit labor costs: Manufacturing (Trend, 2000=100)
30	MEI								Unit labor costs: Construction (Trend, 2000=100)
31	MEI								Unit labor costs: Market services (Trend, 2000=100)
32	NCB	ECB			ECB 80-96	ECB	ECB 80-81	ECB 80-96	Money aggregate M1 (SA, EOP, Mil. euros)
33	NCB	ECB			ECB 80-96	NCB	ECB 80-81	ECB 80-96	Money aggregate M3 (SA, EOP, Mil. euros)
									CPI: Food (NSA, 2000=100)
									CPI: Fuel & electricity (NSA, 2000=100)
									CPI: All items excl Food, Energy (NSA, 2000=100)
									CPI: Rent (NSA, 2000=100)
									Civilian employment (SA, Thous)
									Standardized unemployment rate (SA, %)
									Hourly earnings: Manufacturing (SA, 2000=100)
									Unit labor costs (Trend, 2000=100)
									Unit labor costs: Manufacturing (Trend, 2000=100)
									Unit labor costs: Construction (Trend, 2000=100)
									Unit labor costs: Market services (Trend, 2000=100)
									Money aggregate M1 (SA, EOP, Mil. euros)
									Money aggregate M3 (SA, EOP, Mil. euros)

Notes: Haver indicates the default source; Other columns indicate the alternative source and definition of series. MEI = OECD Main Economic Indicators, QNA = OECD Quarterly National Accounts, OEO = OECD Economic Outlook, NCB = National Central Bank, ECB = European Central Bank, AV = country average using current population for weights. Merging two sources is done by applying y-o-y growth rates backward to data level available in most recent source. Shaded cells indicate the replacement of missing observations with an alternative time series.

Table A1 continued: Data sources and definition of international time series

Series #	Haver	backdating	Series description
232	FRB		U.S.: Federal Open Market Committee, Fed Funds Target Rate (EOP, %)
233	BoJ		Japan: Overnight call rate, uncollateralized (effective rate, EOP, %)
234	BoE	BIS 80-83	United Kingdom: Base rate (Repo rate, EOP, %)
235	FRB		U.S.: 10-Year Treasury bond yield at constant maturity (AVG, %)
236	JSDA	BIS 80-84	Japan: 10-year benchmark government bond yield (EOM, %)
237	BoE	BIS 80-84	UK: Government bonds, 10-year nominal par yield (AVG, %)
238	BEA		U.S. Gross Domestic Product (SAAR, Bil.Chn.2000\$)
239	CAO	OECD 80-93	Japan: Gross Domestic Product (SAAR, Bil.Chn.2000.Yen)
240	ONS		U.K.: Gross Domestic Product (SA, Mil.Chained.2003.Pounds)
241	OECD		Euro Zone + GR in 2001 Exchange rate (average, Euro/US\$)
242	CRB		KR-CRB Spot Commodity Price Index: All Commodities (1967=100)
243	WSJ		Spot Oil Price: West Texas Intermediate [Prior 82=Posted Price] (\$/Barrel)

Note: Haver indicates the default source. Column "backdating" indicates the source used to backdate the data.




Figure A1: Main financial and monetary data series in EA and six countries (year-over-year growth rates except for interest rates)




Figure A2: Main price data series and GDP in EA and six countries (year-over-year growth rates)




Figure A3: Main activity series in EA and six countries  
(year-over-year growth rates except for capacity utilisation)




Figure A4: Main activity and price series in EA and six countries  
(year-over-year growth rates)




Figure A5: Main price and labor market series in EA and six countries  
(year-over-year growth rates except for unemployment)




Figure B1: Impulse response functions to a monetary tightening in EA (solid line) and Germany (dotted line) (shock = 100 bp increase in short-term rate; responses expressed in year-over-year growth rates except for interest rates)




Figure B2: Impulse response functions to a monetary tightening in EA (solid line) and Germany (dotted line) (shock = 100 bp increase in short-term rate; responses expressed in year-over-year growth rates)




Figure B3: Impulse response functions to a monetary tightening in EA (solid line) and Germany (dotted line) (shock = 100 bp increase in short-term rate; responses expressed in year-over-year growth rates)

## C Effects of oil price shocks

This section briefly describes the effects of an unexpected increase in oil prices. Such a shock is an ideal experiment in the sense that it affects simultaneously all EA countries, and it is, arguably, an exogenous source of economic fluctuations (see Hamilton, 2003; Cavallo and Wu, 2007; Blanchard and Galí, 2008; and Kilian, 2008). The identification of the oil price shock is similar to the one in Blanchard and Galí (2008), although we implement it in the context of our FAVAR. Basically, the oil price shock can affect all other latent and observed factors instantaneously and through them, all indicators. However, we assume that the oil price responds to other factors only after a one quarter lag.

Figures C1-C3 show the response of selected variables to a 10% increase in the yoy inflation of oil prices, both for the 1988-2007 sample (solid lines) and for the post-1999 sample (dashed-dotted lines).

Interestingly, bond yields increase more in Italy and Spain than in the other countries or in the EA as a whole, and consumption declines by more in Italy than in other countries as well. This result is consistent with our findings in response to a monetary shock, and provides further evidence that bond markets and credibility issues are the locus of an important asymmetry in business cycle adjustments across countries prior to the EMU. In addition, CPI inflation increases by about 0.1% percent, reflecting in the first few quarters an increase in the food and energy component of CPI prices (not shown). We note that the responses of CPI inflation rates tend to be slightly less persistent in the recent sample, both at the EA level and in the countries reported. This is consistent with our finding, in response to monetary shocks, that the ECB monetary policy has better anchored inflation expectations than the national central banks had before the EMU. Turning to quantities, we estimate that an increase in the price of oil reduces the yoy growth rate of output by about 0.1% for the EA. This is broadly in line with Blanchard and Galí (2008) who emphasize a reduction in the effects of oil price shocks in the last two decades when compared with samples that include the seventies.




Figure C1: Impulse response functions to a 10% increase in oil prices  
 (responses expressed in year-over-year growth rates except for interest rates)




Figure C2: Impulse response functions to a 10% increase in oil prices  
(responses expressed in year-over-year growth rates)




Figure C3: Impulse response functions to a 10% increase in oil prices (responses expressed in year-over-year growth rates)

## D Model's log-linearized equilibrium conditions

We use lower-case variables to denote percent deviations from the deterministic steady state, except when noted.

The domestic household's optimal plan of consumption ( $c_t$ ) over time involves the log-linear Euler equation

$$\lambda_t = \lambda_{t+1} + E_t(i_t - \pi_{t+1}) + \hat{\beta}_t, \quad (18)$$

where  $i_t \equiv \log(I_t/I)$  corresponds to the deviation of the nominal interest rate from steady state,  $\pi_t \equiv \log(P_t/P_{t-1})$  is the quarterly CPI inflation rate, the marginal utility of income  $\lambda_t$  satisfies

$$E_{t-1}\lambda_t = E_{t-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{(1-\omega)(1-\beta\omega)} \left[ -\sigma(1+\beta\omega^2)c_t + \sigma\omega c_{t-1} + \sigma\beta\omega c_{t+1} - \beta\omega(1-\omega)\hat{\beta}_t \right] \right\}, \quad (19)$$

and the percent deviations of the discount factor  $\beta_t$  from steady state evolve according to

$$\hat{\beta}_t = -\psi\beta c_t + \xi_t. \quad (20)$$

Note that in the absence of habit formation, the above expression reduces to:  $E_{t-1}\lambda_t = -\sigma E_{t-1}c_t$ .

Domestic output  $y_t$  depends on home tradable ( $y_{Ht}$ ) and nontradable ( $y_{Nt}$ ) output:

$$y_t = \gamma y_{Ht} + (1-\gamma)y_{Nt} \quad (21)$$

where the demand for home tradables

$$y_{Ht} = (1-\alpha)\alpha\eta(\tau_{Ht} - \tau_{Ft}) + (1-\gamma)[\alpha x_t + (1-\alpha)x_t^*] + \alpha c_t + (1-\alpha)c_t^* \quad (22)$$

depends on the terms of trade  $\tau_{Ht} \equiv \log(P_{Ft}/P_{Ht})$ ,  $\tau_{Ft} \equiv \log(P_{Ht}^*/P_{Ft}^*)$ , as well as the home and domestic relative prices of nontradables  $x_t \equiv \log(P_{Nt}/P_{Tt})$ ,  $x_t^* \equiv \log(P_{Nt}^*/P_{Tt}^*)$ , and aggregate consumption in both regions. The demand for home nontradables is given by

$$y_{Nt} = -\gamma x_t + c_t. \quad (23)$$

The share of net exports in GDP is given by  $nx_t \equiv (P_{Ht}Y_{Ht} - P_{Tt}C_{Tt})/(Y_tP_t)$  and is assumed to have a steady-state value of 0. A first-order approximation yields

$$nx_t = \gamma[y_{Ht} - c_t - (1-\alpha)\tau_{Ht} - (1-\gamma)x_t]. \quad (24)$$

The terms of trade and the relative price of nontradables evolve according to

$$\tau_{H,t} = \tau_{H,t-1} + \pi_{F,t} - \pi_{H,t} \quad (25)$$

$$x_t = x_{t-1} + \pi_{N,t} - \pi_{H,t} - (1-\alpha)(\tau_{H,t} - \tau_{H,t-1}). \quad (26)$$

A log-linearization of the optimal price-setting condition for domestic intermediate producers yields an extension of the standard New Keynesian Phillips curve

$$E_{t-1}(\pi_{k,t} - \delta\pi_{k,t-1}) = \kappa E_{t-1}mc_{k,t} + \beta E_{t-1}(\pi_{k,t+1} - \delta\pi_{k,t}) \quad (27)$$

where  $\kappa \equiv (1-\xi)(1-\beta\xi)/(\xi(1+\varphi\theta)) > 0$ , in each of the sectors  $k = H, F$ , and the marginal

cost in the domestic traded-goods sector satisfies

$$mc_{H,t} = \varphi y_{Ht} - (1 + \varphi) a_t - \lambda_t + (1 - \alpha) \tau_{Ht} + (1 - \gamma) x_t, \quad (28)$$

while

$$mc_{N,t} = \varphi y_{Nt} - (1 + \varphi) a_t - \lambda_t - \gamma x_t \quad (29)$$

in the domestic nontraded-goods sector. Inflation of the GDP deflator is given by

$$\pi_{Yt} = \gamma \pi_{Ht} + (1 - \gamma) \pi_{Nt} \quad (30)$$

while CPI inflation is

$$\pi_t = \gamma \pi_{Ht} + (1 - \gamma) \pi_{Nt} + \gamma(1 - \alpha)(\tau_{H,t} - \tau_{H,t-1}), \quad (31)$$

where the last term captures the effects of imported goods.

Given the imperfect pass-through, imported goods inflation  $\pi_{F,t}$  (in domestic currency) is also determined by a Phillips curve-type equation

$$E_{t-1} \left( \pi_{F,t} - \tilde{\delta} \pi_{F,t-1} \right) = \tilde{\kappa} E_{t-1} \hat{\psi}_{F,t} + \beta E_{t-1} \left( \pi_{F,t+1} - \tilde{\delta} \pi_{F,t} \right) \quad (32)$$

where  $\tilde{\kappa} \equiv (1 - \tilde{\xi})(1 - \beta \tilde{\xi}) / \tilde{\xi} > 0$ , and  $\hat{\psi}_{F,t}$  represents the percent deviation from steady state (equal to 1) of the gap between the foreign price expressed in domestic currency and the domestic price of the same goods. That price gap evolves in turn according to

$$\hat{\psi}_{F,t} = \hat{\psi}_{F,t-1} + \Delta e_t + \pi_{Ft}^* - \pi_{Ft} \quad (33)$$

where  $\pi_{Ft}^*$  is the inflation of foreign tradable goods in foreign currency, while  $\pi_{Ft}$  is inflation in the prices of the same goods in the home country.

While equations (18)–(33) determine home variables, a similar set of equations determines the corresponding foreign variables. We also need a specification of monetary policy in each region. As mentioned in the text, we assume, in the pre-EMU case that the interest rate is set in each region according to the linear interest-rate rules (14) and (15). Instead in the EMU case, we assume that the nominal exchange rate is fixed,  $\Delta e_t = 0$ , that short-term interest rates are equal in both regions, and that the EA-wide interest rate  $i_t^{ea}$  is set according to the rule (16).

Finally, to close the model, we use our linearized UIP condition

$$i_t - i_t^* = E_t \Delta e_{t+1} + \mu_t \quad (34)$$

and the linearized condition characterizing the evolution of foreign debt

$$b_t = \beta^{-1} b_{t-1} + n x_t.$$

For reference, the percent deviations of the real exchange rate from its steady-state value of 1 can be expressed as follows

$$q_t = \hat{\psi}_{Ft} + (1 - \alpha) \tau_{Ft} + \alpha \tau_{Ht} + (1 - \gamma)(x_t^* - x_t).$$