

R O M E

Research On Money in the Economy

No. 14-10 – September 2014

The Relevance of International Spillovers and Asymmetric Effects in the Taylor Rule

Joscha Beckmann, Ansgar Belke and Christian Dreger

ROME Discussion Paper Series

"Research on Money in the Economy" (ROME) is a private non-profit-oriented research network of and for economists, who generally are interested in monetary economics and especially are interested in the interdependences between the financial sector and the real economy. Further information is available on www.rome-net.org.

ISSN 1865-7052

Research On Money in the Economy

Discussion Paper Series
ISSN 1865-7052

No 2014-10, September 2014

The Relevance of International Spillovers and Asymmetric Effects in the Taylor rule*

Joscha Beckmann, Ansgar Belke and Christian Dreger

Dr. Joscha Beckmann
University of Duisburg-Essen
Department of Economics
Universitaetsstr. 12
D-45117 Essen
e-mail: joscha.beckmann@wiwinf.uni-due.de
and
Kiel Institute for the World Economy
Kiellinie 66
D-24105 Kiel

Prof. Dr. Ansgar Belke
University of Duisburg-Essen
Department of Economics
Universitaetsstr. 12
D-45117 Essen
e-mail: ansgar.belke@uni-due.de
and
Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS)
Congresplaats 1
B-1000 City of Brussel

Prof. Dr. Christian Dreger
Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt/O.
Faculty of Business Administration
Große Scharnstr. 59
D-15230 Frankfurt (Oder)
and
Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW)
Mohrenstraße 58
D-10117 Berlin
e-mail: cdreger@diw.de

The discussion paper represent the authors' personal opinions and do not necessarily reflect the views of CEPS Brussels, DIW Berlin and Kiel Institute for the World Economy.

NOTE: Working papers in the "Research On Money in the Economy" Discussion Paper Series are preliminary materials circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comment. The analysis and conclusions set forth are those of the author(s) and do not indicate concurrence by other members of the research network ROME. Any reproduction, publication and reprint in the form of a different publication, whether printed or produced electronically, in whole or in part, is permitted only with the explicit written authorisation of the author(s). References in publications to ROME Discussion Papers (other than an acknowledgment that the writer has had access to unpublished material) should be cleared with the author(s) to protect the tentative character of these papers. As a general rule, ROME Discussion Papers are not translated and are usually only available in the original language used by the contributor(s).

ROME Discussion Papers are published in PDF format at www.rome-net.org/publications/.

Please direct any enquiries to the current ROME coordinator
Prof. Dr. Albrecht F. Michler,
Heinrich-Heine-University of Duesseldorf, Department of Economics, Universitaetsstr. 1,
Build. 24.31.01.01 (Oeconomicum), D-40225 Duesseldorf, Germany
Tel.: ++49(0)-211-81-15372
Fax: ++49(0)-211-81-15261
E-mail: helpdesk@rome-net.org
michler@uni-duesseldorf.de

Abstract

Deviations of policy interest rates from the levels implied by the Taylor rule have been persistent before the financial crisis and increased especially after the turn of the century. Compared to the Taylor benchmark, policy rates were often too low. This paper provides evidence that both international spillovers, for instance international dependencies in the interest rate setting of central banks, and nonlinear reaction patterns can offer a more realistic specification of the Taylor rule in the main industrial countries. The inclusion of international spillovers and, even more, nonlinear dynamics improves the explanatory power of standard Taylor reaction functions. Deviations from Taylor rates tend to be smaller and their negative trend can be eliminated.

JEL-Classification: E43, F36, C22

Keywords: Taylor rule, international spillovers, monetary policy interaction, smooth transition models

Corresponding author

Ansgar Belke, University of Duisburg-Essen, Universitätsstr. 12, 45117 Essen, Germany.

E-Mail: ansgar.belke@uni-due.de

* We would like to thank the participants of the 2014 annual conference of the German Economic Association (VfS) in Hamburg for their valuable comments.

1 Introduction

Since the 1980s central banks switched to policies based on rules, with strong emphasis on price stability. The Taylor rule has become popular to describe the monetary policy stance in both advanced and developing countries (Taylor, 1993). It links policy interest rates to deviations of inflation from its target and real output from its potential. According to the Taylor principle, the central bank should raise the nominal interest rate by more than one percentage point for each one percent increase in inflation. Taylor (1993) emphasized the importance of rule-like behavior on part of central banks as a key framework to ensure time-consistency, monetary transparency, and independence.

While policy rates have been broadly in line with the Taylor rule during the Great Moderation, they have been persistently moving below it in both advanced and developing countries since the turn of the century. The monetary accommodation implied by these deviations have been blamed as a potential factor in the build-up of imbalances in the period before the financial crisis (Kahn, 2010). Therefore, their explanation is of high academic and policy relevance.

A straightforward extension of the traditional Taylor rule is based on the idea of accounting for *international spillovers*. There are several reasons why international linkages have become more important. On the one hand, declining real interest rates may have introduced an upward bias in the Taylor rule, i.e. an overestimation of nominal interest rates implied by the Taylor rate. Capital inflows from emerging markets to the industrial countries might have led to lower real interest rates, as stated by the savings glut hypothesis. In general, the savings glut was in large part a result of policies that emerging market economies put in place when the global economy started to recover from the 2000-01 recession (Bernanke 2005 and 2007)². Underdeveloped financial

² The argument posits that an excess supply of savings - particularly in Emerging Asian countries - helped to generate a US current account deficit as savings had to flow somewhere. The US was the main destination and – due to its huge and non-fragmented bond market, also a capable recipient of the savings. See also Belke and Gros (2014).

markets in the emerging countries restricted the ability of their citizens to borrow against future income and redirected their savings to industrial countries, in particular to the US. Asset shortages triggered a reduction of the equilibrium real interest rates at a global scale (Caballero, Fahri and Gourinchas, 2008). This development might also reflect secular demographic trends in the industrial countries, specifically strong asset demand exerted by the baby boomer generation. A further explanation refers to an increase in the perceived riskiness of capital assets in the wake of asset price booms and busts after the turn of the century. Therefore, *policy interest rates fell below the Taylor rule levels in close synchronization* across countries. For example, Hofmann and Bogdanova (2012) have argued that deviations from the Taylor rule can be best interpreted as a change in the global equilibrium real interest rate.

A further transmission channel for international spillovers stems from the fact that central banks no longer decide on policy rates in an independent way (Taylor, 2013). While interest rates have been set according to national conditions up to the turn of the century, policy reactions have been increasingly affected by the international environment since then. Hence, the deviations might indicate a substantial shift in the monetary policy regime. Among others, Kim (2000) demonstrated that US monetary policy shocks can affect other countries. Belke and Gros (2005) provided evidence that the ECB followed the Fed in their interest rate decisions. In fact, low US interest rates can increase risk taking in other countries, and one option to react is to lower interest rates, see Bruno and Shin (2012). In addition, central banks tend to resist large exchange rate appreciations, and adjust their interest rates according to the behavior of other central banks. Most importantly, the actions of the Federal Reserve Bank have been magnified due to the mimicking responses of other central banks (Gray, 2012). Overall, deviations from a Taylor rule can amplify due to international spillovers (Taylor, 2013).

Deviations can also occur due to *asymmetric behavior* by the central banks. For example, interest rate reaction functions can be different in expansionary and restrictive periods of monetary policy. This distinction may hold independently of an impact of international spillovers. Asym-

metric responses lead to nonlinear Taylor rules as recently proposed by Riedl and Brüggemann (2011), among others. Such explanations might be better able to capture the evolution of policy rates. Expansionary and contractionary monetary decisions might be based on a different set of determinants. In this vein, Alcidi et al. (2009) show that linear Taylor rules fail to detect policy decisions driven by policymakers' judgment while smooth transition models are well-suited to improve linear Taylor reaction functions.

This paper examines the causes for the deviations from the standard Taylor rule by analyzing the *importance of both international spillovers and nonlinearities* for monetary policy decisions in the main industrial countries, i.e. the US, the Euro Area, the UK and Japan. A simple linear benchmark model is chosen as a point of departure and extended step by step. After incorporating international spillovers via foreign interest rates, nonlinear dynamics are examined through a smooth transition approach. Several variables steering the transition between the regimes are considered, such as lagged interest rate changes, the output gap, oil prices and lagged differentials between domestic and foreign interest rates. Our empirical results suggest that both incorporating international spillovers and, even more important, *allowing for nonlinear dynamics* are important to improve the Taylor reaction function to explain actual monetary policy behavior. International spillovers seem to be more important in periods of increasing interest rates, with the exception of the euro area. This appears consistent with recent evidence by the IMF in its spillover reports in the context of the envisaged Fed's exit from unconventional monetary policies (IMF, 2013).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The next section (Section 2) reviews the Taylor rule specification. Section 3 documents the deviations from the linear model and discusses the extension of the Taylor principle by international spillovers. In Section 4 nonlinear specifications are presented. Section 5 holds the empirical results. Finally, Section 6 concludes with some policy implications.

2 Deviations from the Taylor rule

The Taylor rule establishes a linear relationship between the nominal interest rate, inflation and the output gap. In its *standard* form

$$(1) \quad i_t = r^* + \pi^* + \alpha_1(\pi_t - \pi^*) + \alpha_2 y_t + \varepsilon_t$$

i is the nominal policy determined interest rate, r^* is the long-run equilibrium real interest rate, π^* stands for the central bank's inflation objective, π represents the actual inflation rate, and y is the output gap, i.e. the deviation of actual and potential output, expressed as a percentage of the latter. The error ε fulfills the white noise properties and the index t denotes time. The parameters describe how strong the policy interest rate should respond to deviations of inflation from its target and of output from its potential. The Taylor rule implies that central banks aim to stabilize inflation around its target and output around its potential. Positive (negative) deviations of the two variables from the respective levels would be associated with a tightening (loosening) of the monetary policy stance. An inflation reaction coefficient (α_1) above one ensures that real interest rates respond to inflationary pressures (Taylor, 1993, 1998). In that case an increase in inflation triggers a rise in the real interest rate.

Central banks often prefer to adjust policy rates not instantaneously, but gradually with small, distinct steps in a particular direction. If they partially adjust towards desired levels, *interest rate smoothing* can be incorporated through the inclusion of the lagged policy rate (Judd and Rudebusch, 1998).

$$(2) \quad i_t = \rho i_{t-1} + (1 - \rho)(r^* + \pi^* + \alpha_1(\pi_t - \pi^*) + \alpha_2 y_t) + \varepsilon_t$$

The higher the weight of the lagged policy rate, the slower is the adjustment to intended interest rate levels³. The lagged interest rate could be also seen as a proxy of further determinants of the

³ In contrast, nominal interest rates have been cut aggressively towards the zero lower bound during the global financial crisis to avoid output losses, especially after the Lehman collapse, see Gerlach and Lewis (2011).

policy rate which are less important and therefore excluded from the specification. Equations (1) and (2) are *ex post* specifications of the Taylor rule, i.e. setting of interest rates is conditional to contemporaneous inflation and the output gap. If monetary policy acts with a delay of k periods, a forward looking (*ex ante*) specification

$$(3) \quad i_t = \rho i_{t-1} + (1 - \rho)(r^* + \pi^* + \alpha_1(E_t \pi_{t+k} - \pi^*) + \alpha_2 E_t y_{t+k}) + \varepsilon_t$$

may be more appropriate, where E denotes the rational expectations operator (Clarida, Galí and Gertler, 2000). Nominal interest rates depend on their past levels, the expected deviations of inflation from its target and output from its long run potential. Expectations exploit all information available at time when the prediction is made. Nominal interest rates fluctuate around a constant equilibrium level, the latter defined as the sum of the real interest rate and the inflation target. It should be noted, that the Taylor rule acts as a rule of thumb and leaves out many factors that might be actually relevant for monetary policy, for example, the risk that the policy rate hits the zero lower bound.

Many empirical studies demonstrated that monetary policy of advanced countries can, to a lesser or larger extent, be explained by this kind of reaction function. Despite of the persistence of policy rates, the reaction coefficient of the inflation gap tends to be larger than unity and to exceed the coefficient of the output gap, especially in more recent periods of monetary history. Moreover, forward-looking models seem to fit the actual behavior of central banks slightly better than contemporaneous versions. For example, Orphanides (2001, 2003) used real-time instead of ex-post revised data. As the main interest in the relevance of international spillovers and nonlinearities, a distinction between real time and revised estimates is less important in this paper, as these issues are relevant in both datasets.

Since the turn of the century, however, deviations of actual policy rates from the Taylor rule increased. In particular, actual nominal interest rates fell persistently below the levels implied by the Taylor rule, suggesting a loose stance of monetary policy in the period before the finan-

cial crisis. According to Clarida (2012), the differences turn out to be slightly smaller if ex ante rates are considered. But the deviations might have also been caused by the omission of explanatory factors, such as international spillovers and asymmetric policy responses (Taylor, 2013). Note in this context that an exclusion of relevant variables might erroneously be interpreted as a change in the reaction coefficients with regard to the other variables, i.e. inflation and the output gap. Hence, we have to look at international spillovers and non-linearities.

3 Linear specifications of Taylor rules

Quarterly data are obtained from the OECD Main Economic indicators and cover the 1982:1 to 2008:4 period. In contrast to, for instance, Belke and Klose (2013), our main aim is to consider the period of conventional monetary policy, as in Taylor (2013). The starting point of our analysis is motivated by the end of the so-called pseudo monetarism policy of the Fed (Timberlake, 1993). As said, we exclude the developments during the recent financial crisis as the main interest is in the deviations from the rule prior to the crisis. Three months interbank interest rates are used. Inflation is measured as the percentage of the quarter-on-quarter change of prices inflation, i.e. $100 \cdot \log(p_t/p_{t-1})$, where p denotes the consumer price index. Potential output is obtained by the HP Filter ($\lambda = 1600$) applied to real GDP. The output gap is then determined by the difference between actual and potential GDP, expressed as a percentage of the latter. An output gap beyond (below) 100 percent thus indicates excess (under-) utilization of capacity.

-Table 1 and Figure 1 about here-

The analysis is conducted for the US, the euro area, the UK and Japan. As official euro area series are not available before 1999, German data is used instead in the previous period and the series is in the following denoted as “euro area” data. See also von Hagen and Fratianni (1990) for this strategy. As a starting point, the linear Taylor rule is estimated via OLS and taken as a

benchmark. To account for partial adjustment and serial correlation, the first two lagged interest changes are also included (Table 1).

The estimated coefficients are in line with theoretical predictions. Nonetheless, the output gap coefficient can be frequently considered as insignificant because of high standard errors. The inspection of the deviations from the respective country-specific rules shows that the Taylor principle is a reasonable approximation of monetary policy until the turn of the century, more or less (Figure 1). Outliers during the 1990s might be explained by particular events such as the start of the deflationary period in Japan. However, the limitations of the standard model became more pronounced since then. Therefore, explicitly taking into account international spillovers and asymmetric adjustment of central banks might be envisaged to capture monetary policy behavior.

To control for international spillovers, we extend the Taylor reaction function by adding the foreign interest rate. The latter is proxied by the US rate for the euro area, the UK and Japan. For the US, we employ a linear combination of interest rates in the euro area, UK and Japan. The weights used for this purpose reflect the relevance of the respective currencies in the international reserves held by the US. It should be noted that the evidence exhibited in Table 2 is robust to this choice⁴.

Table 2 and Figure 2 about here

Compared to the standard model, the coefficients of inflation and output are largely unchanged except for the euro area where the output gap becomes significant, although with a wrong sign. The foreign interest rate is highly relevant for each economy, except of the US where the coefficient is significant but of small size. Hence, the US monetary policy might matter for other countries, but not vice versa. The deviations from the rule displayed in Figure 2 have declined, but they are still pronounced even in the extended model. Hence, the inclusion of international

⁴ Detailed results are available from the authors upon request.

spillovers is not sufficient to solve the puzzle. Therefore, nonlinear dynamics are considered as a further improvement.

4 Nonlinear specifications of Taylor rules

4.1 Exponential and logistic smooth transition models

Smooth regression models suggested by Teräsvirta (1994, 1998) provide a convenient framework to capture nonlinear dynamics in the Taylor reaction function, see Alcidi et al (2009) and Brüggemann and Riedel (2012). Compared to specifications with discrete structural breaks, these models allow for gradual change between two regimes. In the extended Taylor rule specification

$$(4) \quad i_{t=}[\alpha_1 + \beta_1(y_t) + \beta_2(\pi_t - \pi_t^*) + \beta_3(i_{t-1}^*)] + [\beta_1'(y_t) + \beta_2'(\pi_t - \pi_t^*) + \beta_3'(i_{t-1}^*)] F(z_t, \gamma, c) + u_{t+k},$$

$F(z_t, \gamma, c)$ is a transition function which ascertains the speed of adjustment between the regimes and can have either a logistic or an exponential shape. The coefficients α_1 and β_i correspond to the lower regime, and $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_1')$ and $(\beta_i + \beta_i')$ to the upper regime (van Dijk et al., 2002). An exponential and a logistic transition function are close substitutes and relate to distinct patterns of nonlinearity. A logistic transition allows for different parameters above and below a threshold, while an exponential transition accounts for a distinction between small and large deviations from a threshold. The choice between the alternatives can be made according to economic arguments. For example, if the aim is to distinguish between regimes of increasing and decreasing interest rates, a logistic transition could be adopted. Brüggemann and Riedl (2011) and Alcidi et al. (2009) have provided evidence that the logistic smooth transition approach is a viable alternative to linear monetary policy reaction functions. However, exponential

specifications might be preferred if the transition between the regimes relies on some kind of interest rate differential.

To explain the underlying dynamics, consider the case where $F(z_t, \gamma, c)$ is a continuous *logistic* transition function bounded between 0 and 1:

$$(5) \quad F(z_t, \gamma, c) = [1 + \exp(-\gamma(z_t - c)/\sigma_{z_t})]^{-1} \quad \text{with } \gamma > 0.$$

It implies that the lower (upper) regime is associated with negative (positive) values of the transition variable z_t relative to the location parameter c . The logistic function rises monotonically from 0 to 1 as the transition variable increases, i.e. $F(z_t, \gamma, c) \rightarrow 0$ as $z_t \rightarrow -\infty$ and $F(z_t, \gamma, c) \rightarrow 1$ as $z_t \rightarrow +\infty$, while it is equal to 0.5 if $z_t = c$. The location parameter can be interpreted as a threshold dividing equation (4) into three different extreme regimes corresponding to $\lim_{z_t \rightarrow -\infty} F(z_t, \gamma, c)$, $\lim_{z_t \rightarrow +\infty} F(z_t, \gamma, c)$ and $z_t = c$. In the case of $z_t = c$, equation (4) reduces to the linear model (3), where $\alpha = \alpha_1 + 0.5\alpha_2$ and $\beta = \beta_i + 0.5\beta_i'$. Moreover, the smoothness parameter γ controls the speed of transition between the extreme regimes (Baillie and Kilic, 2006).

The second possibility we consider for some specifications corresponds to $F(z_t, \gamma, c)$ as a bounded continuous *exponential* transition function which lies between 0 and 1 and thus has the following functional form:

$$F(z_t, \gamma, c) = 1 - \exp(-\gamma(z_t - c)^2/\sigma_{z_t}) \quad \text{with } \gamma > 0 \quad (6)$$

where z_t indicates the transition variable, σ_{z_t} represents its standard deviation, γ denotes a slope parameter and c is a location parameter. The transition function given by Equation (6) is symmetrically U-shaped as $F(z_t, \gamma, c) \rightarrow 1$ for $z_t \rightarrow \pm\infty$ and $F(z_t, \gamma, c) \rightarrow 0$ for $z_t = c$. Hence, the adjustment for deviations of the transition variable z_t above and below c , which can be interpreted as a threshold value, is symmetric, as opposed to the logistic case mentioned below. The

slope parameter γ determines the speed of the transition between the extreme regimes, with lower absolute values implying slower transition.

4.2 Choice of the transition variable

By modelling the dynamics in a nonlinear form, transition variables need to be specified in advance. As the results might depend on this selection, different transition variables should be considered to assess the robustness of the results. A straightforward choice is the *lagged change of the interest rate* compared to the threshold c which is restricted to be zero. In this case, the different regimes correspond to periods of declining or rising interest rates, i.e. to different stances of the business cycle and/or different stances of monetary policy (negative change for expansionary and positive change for contractionary policy). As an alternative, the lagged *output gap* is selected to control for the possibility that monetary policy might be influenced by different phases of the business cycle. To account for potential determinants related to international spillovers due to, for example, the uncovered interest rate parity, the *lagged differential between the domestic and the foreign interest rate* is considered. In this case we take into account that central banks (such as the ECB most recently) may be interested in exchange rate stabilization by setting their policy rates. Finally, lagged *oil price changes* might – according to the savings glut hypothesis - steer the transition between the regimes (Belke and Gros, 2014). Revenues of oil exporters increase in case of rising oil prices. The recycling of petrodollars by purchases of US Bonds might drive US and worldwide interest rates down, resulting in international monetary policy coordination.⁵ To assess the robustness of the results, we consider all choices of transition variables in the analysis.

⁵ Lagged transition variables are preferred. In case of contemporary values the central bank would not be able to react to, for instance, change in oil prices in the same period.

5 Empirical results

To establish the presence of nonlinear effects in the Taylor rule we conduct a Lagrange multiplier test (Luukonen et al, 1988). Under the null hypothesis a linear model is assumed. If the linear specification in terms of the transition variable

$$(6) \Delta i_{t+k} = \varphi_0 + \varphi_1(c_t) + \varphi_2(c_t)z_t + \varphi_3(c_t)z_t^2 + \varphi_4(c_t)z_t^3 + \epsilon_{t+k}$$

is valid, the coefficients φ_i should be equal to 0 for $i=2,3,4$. Linearity is rejected if at least φ_i is different from 0 implying that the higher order terms are significant. The test statistic is distributed as Chi-squared with 3 degrees of freedom. Our findings for the two Taylor-rule specifications, excluding or including foreign interest rates, are shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Tables 3 and 4 about here

The *linear* specifications are *rejected* if lagged interest rate changes, the interest rate differential and oil price changes are chosen as transition variables. Note that these results are obtained for both specifications in most of the cases. Hence, spillovers are relevant. Since nonlinear effects are, however, less visible for the output gap if the foreign interest rate is included (Table 4), the output gap is no longer considered as a potential transition variable. We have gained substantial evidence of non-linearity, because linearity has been rejected. The true transition variable is not known; the output gap is, however, not suitable for that. Nonlinear effects are important to explain monetary policy behavior for all economies.

The nonlinear findings for the three transition variables (the lagged change of the interest rate, the lagged differential between the domestic and the foreign interest rate, and the lagged oil price changes) are reported in Tables 5 to 7. They are based on nonlinear least squares (NLS). Note that we pre-select a logistic transition function for each transition variable except for the interest rate differential where an exponential function can be more appropriate. We feel legitimised to do so because bigger interest rate differentials influence carry trades and Japan's inter-

est differential has been negative since the 90s.⁶ In line with the results from the nonlinearity tests, the Taylor coefficients frequently differ between the regimes. Overall, Figure 3 reveals that the inclusion of international spillovers and, even more, nonlinear dynamics improves the explanatory power of the standard Taylor reaction function. This can be inferred from smaller deviations of the interest rates from the Taylor levels. In comparison both Figures 1 and 2 seem to include a negative trend that can be eliminated by taking nonlinearities into account.

Tables 5 to 7 and Figure 3 about here

We now elaborate on the results for the different specifications with respect to the choice of the transition variable. We start with the case of lagged *interest rate changes as the transition variable* (case 1). The first regime corresponds to decreasing interest rates while the second corresponds to increasing interest rates. In the first regime, the output gap is positively signed for the US and the UK (coefficient β_1 in Table 5, 3rd column).⁷ While the output gap is not significant for Japan, a negative impact of this variable is found for the euro area, which is striking. The inflation coefficient β_2 turns out to be significant and positive for the UK, the euro area and Japan, but insignificant for the US (Table 5, 5th column). The coefficient β_3 of the lagged foreign interest rate is estimated with a positive sign and turns out to be significant in all cases except for the euro area (Table 5, 7th column). More or less, the signs of the estimated parameters are in line with theoretical predictions except for the euro area. The results imply that the Fed, and the Bank of England are guided by business cycle considerations even if the interest rates have decreased over the previous quarter.

In a regime of increasing interest rates ($\beta_1 + \beta_1'$, Table 5, 3rd plus 4th column), the impact of the output gap becomes negative for the UK and the US while the variable is still not important for Japan. An interesting result is that the output gap coefficient for the euro area turns out to be positive now, as expected from theory. For Japan, the euro area and the UK, the lagged US in-

⁶ The results of the logistic specification are available on request.

⁷ Note again that, according to eq. (4), the total effect is $\beta_1 + \beta_1'$.

terest rate becomes increasingly significant ($\beta_3+\beta_3'$, Table 5, 7th and 8th column). In contrast no difference is observed for the US. Overall, these findings show that periods of decreasing interest rates are more influenced by output developments, while the importance of international spillovers increases in periods of rising interest rates.

The result suggests that coordination of monetary policy is closer in periods of rising interest rates. It appears consistent with recent evidence by the IMF in its spillover reports in the context of the envisaged Fed's exit from unconventional monetary policies (IMF, 2013). The pattern that the monetary policy reaction in the euro area is only linked to domestic developments in times of increasing interest rates might be traced back to the period after the German unification when the Bundesbank raised interest rates to fight inflationary pressure as a result of accelerating capacity rates. As outlined above, the Bundesbank was a leading example for monetary policy guided by price stability within the sample until 1999.

Turning to the *oil prices as the transition variable* (case 2), we now distinguish between decreasing and increasing oil prices (Table 6). In case of decreasing oil prices, the inflation coefficient turns out to be significant for all economies (β_2 , Table 6, 5th column). Inflation becomes less important for the US and more important for Japan in case of positive oil price changes ($\beta_2+\beta_2'$, Table 6, 5th plus 6th column). For the euro area the inflation impact stays positive. As before, the importance of foreign interest rates increases in periods of rising oil prices for the US, Japan and the euro area ($\beta_3+\beta_3'$, Table 6, 7th and 8th column). The impact of the foreign interest rate for the UK is the same in both regimes.

Finally, we turn to case 3 in which the *lagged (home versus foreign) interest rate differential* is chosen as the *transition variable* (Table 7). Since we rely on an *exponential* function, the *first* regime corresponds to a *small* interest rate differential relative to the US while the *second* corresponds to a *large* interest rate differential. For the UK, the coefficients for the output gap and inflation are well signed for a small interest rate differential (β_1 and β_2 , Table 7, 3rd and 5th col-

umn). However, large interest rate differentials are associated with wrongly signed coefficients ($\beta_1+\beta_1'$ and $\beta_2+\beta_2'$, Table 7, 4th and 6th column). A similar pattern can be observed for the inflation coefficient of Japan. However, the output gap coefficient of Japan is correctly signed for a large interest rate differential ($\beta_1+\beta_1'$, Table 7, columns 3 and 4), it is wrongly signed for a small interest rate differential (β_1 , Table 7, 3rd column). In addition, international interest rate spillovers appear to be stronger for a large interest rate differential in case of Japan ($\beta_3+\beta_3'$, Table 7, 7th and 8th column). The picture for the euro area is different (Table 7, 4th row): a negative coefficient for the output gap and an insignificant inflation coefficient are observed in case of small interest rate differentials (β_1 and β_2). Large interest rate differentials lead to a positive inflation coefficient ($\beta_2+\beta_2'$) while the importance of the US interest rate decreases ($\beta_3+\beta_3'$). In general, US monetary policy shows less evidence of regime switches (Table 7, 2nd row). The only coefficient which changes is the impact of the output gap when large interest rate differentials are considered.

6 Conclusion

This study has allowed for *international spillovers* and various *nonlinear adjustment* patterns when analyzing monetary policy decisions against the background of the Taylor rule. Both effects are well-suited to capture actual central bank behavior. Our approach fits the data reasonably well and reduces deviations compared to standard Taylor reaction functions. We identify several cases where Taylor rule coefficients change their sign between the regimes, suggesting that nonlinear dynamics are important. It is also worthwhile mentioning that the magnitude of spillover effects is always positive and frequently larger compared to the output gap and inflation as traditional determinants.

From a general point of view, our findings suggest that nonlinear patterns in central bank behavior can be due to several aspects. On the one hand, coefficients of the Taylor rule are different

for expansionary and contractionary periods. In general, lagged changes of US interest rates are even more significant in times of increasing domestic interest rates. Hence, expansionary monetary policy decisions by the other central bank under observation have been more frequently related to changes in the US monetary policy stance. International spillovers resulting from interest rate differentials and different oil price pattern also introduce fluctuations in the Taylor reaction function coefficients. In contrast, the output gap turns out to be a less important determinant to model nonlinear dynamics.

Overall, we confirm the main argument of Taylor (2013) that international coordination has become a more important aspect of monetary policy. Our results show that the Taylor rule framework turns out to be useful for the assessment of monetary policy even after the millennium once nonlinear dynamics and international spillovers are included. Future research beyond this framework should for example be able to shed some light on the issue of policy coordination in a zero interest rate environment.

References

- Alcidi C, Alessandro F, Fracasso A (2009): Policy regime changes, judgment and Taylor rules in the Greenspan era, *Economica*, 78(309), 89-107.
- Baillie RT, Kilic R (2006): Do asymmetric and nonlinear adjustments explain the forward premium anomaly? *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 25(1), 22-47.
- Belke A, Gros D (2005): Asymmetries in Trans-atlantic monetary policy making: Does the ECB follow the Fed? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43, 921-946.
- Belke A, Cui Y (2010): US-Euro area monetary policy interdependence – New evidence from Taylor rule based VECMs, *The World Economy*, 33/5, 778-797.
- Belke, A, Gros D (2014): A simple model of an oil based global savings glut – The “China factor” and the OPEC cartel, *International Economics and Economic Policy*, 11/3, 413-430.
- Bernanke B (2005): The global saving glut and the US current account, Remarks at the Sandridge Lecture, Virginia Association of Economics, Richmond, Virginia, March 10.
- Bernanke B (2007): *Global imbalances: recent developments and prospects*, Bundesbank Lecture, Berlin.
- Bruno V, Shin HS (2012): Capital flows and the risk-taking channel of monetary policy, Paper presented at the 11th BIS Annual Conference, Basle.
- Caballero R, Farhi E, Gourinchas P (2008): An equilibrium model of global imbalances and low interest rates, *American Economic Review*, 58, 358-93.
- Clarida R, Galí J, Gertler M (2000): Monetary policy rules and macroeconomic stability: Evidence and some theory, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115, 147-180.

Clarida R (2012): What has and has not been learned about monetary policy in a low-inflation environment? A review of the 2000s, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 44, 123-140.

Dijk D van, T. Teräsvirta T, PH Franses PH (2002): Smooth transition autoregressive models - A survey of recent developments. *Econometric Reviews*, 21(1), 1-47.

Franses, PH, van Dijk, D (2000): Nonlinear time series models in empirical finance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gerlach S, Lewis J (2010): The zero lower bound, ECB interest rate policy and the financial crisis, CEPR Discussion Papers 7933.

Gray C (2012): Responding to a monetary superpower: Investigating the behavioral spillovers of US monetary policy, *Atlantic Economic Journal*, DOI 10.1007/s11293-012-9352-0.

Hofmann B, Bogdanova B (2012): Taylor rules and monetary policy: A global great deviation? *BIS Quarterly Review*, September.

International Monetary Fund (2013): IMF multilateral issues report - spillover report, Washington/DC, August.

Judd JP, Rudebusch GD (1998): Taylor rules and the fed: 1970–1997, Federal Reserve Board San Francisco, *Economic Review* 3, 3-16.

Kahn GA (2010): Taylor rule deviations and financial imbalances, *Economic Review*, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, 63-99.

Kim S (2000): International transmission of US monetary policy shocks: evidence from VARs, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 48, 339-372.

Luukkonen, R, Saikkonen P, Teräsvirta, T (1988): Testing linearity against smooth transition autoregressive models, *Biometrika*, 75(3), 491-499.

Orphanides A (2001): Monetary policy rules based on real-time data, *American Economic Review* 91, 964-985.

Orphanides A (2003): Historical monetary policy analysis and the Taylor rule, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 50, 983-1022.

Taylor JB (1993): Discretion versus policy rules in practice, *Carnegie Rochester Conference Series in Public Policy*, 39, 195-214.

Taylor JB (1998): A historical analysis of monetary policy rules, in: Taylor JB (ed): *Monetary policy rules*, University of Chicago Press, 319-348.

Taylor JB (2013): International monetary coordination and the great deviation, Paper prepared for the Session on International Policy Coordination, American Economic Association Annual Meetings, San Diego, California, January.

Teräsvirta, T (1994): Specification, estimation and evaluation of smooth transition autoregressive models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89(425), 208-218.

Teräsvirta, T (1998): Modelling economic relationships with smooth transition regressions. Giles, DEA, Ullah, A (eds), *Handbook of Applied Economic Statistics*. New York: Marcel Dekker, 507-552.

Timberlake, RH (1993): *Monetary policy in the United States – An intellectual and institutional history*, The University of Chicago Press.

von Hagen, J, Fratianni, M (1990): German dominance in the European Monetary System: Evidence from Interest Rates. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 9, 358-375.

Table 1 :Linear Estimations

| | Constant | <i>Gap</i> | <i>INFG</i> | ΔI_{t-1} | ΔI_{t-2} |
|-----------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| US | 3.983*** [10.979] | 0.087 [0.460] | 1.323*** [5.901] | -0.309 [-0.851] | -0.346 [-0.794] |
| UK | 5.824*** [27.830] | 0.063 [0.365] | 1.206*** [10.229] | 0.220 [0.805] | 0.119 [0.496] |
| Japan | 4.767*** [14.912] | 0.080 [0.774] | 1.761*** [12.297] | -0.561 [-1.208] | -0.388 [-0.838] |
| Euro area | 2.601 [6.745] | -0.043 [-0.29854] | 0.807 [2.549] | 0.5780 [0.863] | 0.5567 [0.876] |

Note: * Statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level, *** at the 1% level. T-values are given in parentheses.

Table 2: Linear Estimations including foreign interest rate

| | Constant | <i>Gap</i> | <i>INFG</i> | ΔI_{t-1} | ΔI_{t-2} | if_{t-1} |
|---------|----------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| US | 4.455*** [13.026] | 0.153 [0.798] | 1.395*** [6.330] | -0.233 [-0.0756] | -0.315 [-0.816] | 0.323*** [3.107] |
| UK | 3.666*** [7.009] | 0.158 [1.065] | 0.751*** [7.935] | -0.014 [-0.056] | -0.134 [-0.627] | 0.467*** [4.641] |
| Japan | 1.227* [1.792] | 0.175 [2.293] | 1.124*** [5.987] | -0.978** [-2.529] | -0.818 [-2.148] | 0.476*** [10.979] |
| Germany | 2.373*** [4,675] | 0.019 [0.197] | 0.6634* [3.083] | 0.5635 [1.429] | -0.3954 [-0.998] | 0.368*** [3.931] |

Note: * Statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level, *** at the 1% level. T-values are given in parentheses.

Table 3: Teräsvirta test for nonlinearity excluding foreign interest rates

| <i>j</i> | <i>UK</i> | <i>US</i> | Japan | Germany/Eurozone |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| <i>di</i> (<i>t</i> - 1) | (0.000) ** | (0.000) *** | (0.002) *** | (0.000) *** |
| <i>di</i> (<i>t</i> - 2) | (0.003) *** | (0.000) *** | (0.000) *** | (0.046) *** |
| <i>gap</i> (<i>t</i> - 1) | (0.031) ** | (0.000) *** | (0.028) ** | (0.000) *** |
| <i>gap</i> (<i>t</i> - 2) | (0.009) *** | (0.004) ** | (0.084) * | (0.000) *** |
| <i>doil</i> (<i>t</i> - 1) | (0.517) | (0.001) ** | (0.008) *** | (0.086) * |
| <i>doil</i> (<i>t</i> - 2) | (0.192) | (0.014) ** | (0.015) ** | (0.288) *** |
| <i>id</i> (<i>t</i> - 1) | (0.541) | (0.000) *** | (0.076) * | (0.002) *** |
| <i>id</i> (<i>t</i> - 2) | (0.693) | (0.000) *** | (0.168) | (0.009) *** |

Note: The table displays the p-Values of the LM test for nonlinearity as described in Section 3.3 for the lagged changes in interest rates, the lagged output gap, the lagged change in oil prices and the lagged interest rate differential. The test is distributed as χ^2 with three degrees of freedom. For details, see Teräsvirta (1998). */**/** implies rejection of the null hypothesis at the 10/5/1% significance level

Table 4: Teräsvirta test for nonlinearity including foreign interest rates

| <i>j</i> | <i>UK</i> | <i>US</i> | Japan | Germany/Eurozone |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| <i>di</i> (<i>t</i> - 1) | (0.034) ** | (0.000) *** | (0.001) *** | (0.007) *** |
| <i>di</i> (<i>t</i> - 2) | (0.000) *** | (0.000) *** | (0.001) *** | (0.001) *** |
| <i>gap</i> (<i>t</i> - 1) | (0.508) | (0.000) *** | (0.061) * | (0.386) |
| <i>gap</i> (<i>t</i> - 2) | (0.678) | (0.000) *** | (0.031) *** | (0.087) * |
| <i>doil</i> (<i>t</i> - 1) | (0.007) *** | (0.014) ** | (0.076) * | (0.000) *** |
| <i>doil</i> (<i>t</i> - 2) | (0.000) *** | (0.009) *** | (0.025) ** | (0.000) *** |
| <i>id</i> (<i>t</i> - 1) | (0.000) *** | (0.000) *** | (0.000) *** | (0.000) *** |
| <i>id</i> (<i>t</i> - 2) | (0.000) *** | (0.000) *** | (0.000) *** | (0.000) *** |

Note: The table displays the p-Values of the LM test for nonlinearity as described in Section 3.3 for the lagged changes in interest rates, the lagged output gap, the lagged change in oil prices and the lagged interest rate differential. The test is distributed as χ^2 with three degrees of freedom. For details, see Teräsvirta (1998). */**/** implies rejection of the null hypothesis at the 10/5/1% significance level

Table 5: Nonlinear estimates based on lagged interest rate changes as transition variable

| Country | a_0 | a_1 | β_1 | β_1' | β_2 | β_2' | β_3 | β_3' | γ_1 |
|----------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| UK | 3.858*** [5.055] | -0.261 [-0.504] | 0.506*** [3.759] | 0.577** [-2.556] | 1.027*** [15.336] | -0.386 [-1.552] | 0.257** [2.514] | 0.361** [2.478] | 3.014 [1.144] |
| US | 0.372 [0.312] | 1.237 [1.176] | 0.411*** [0.637] | 0.712** [-1.275] | -0.513 [0.994] | -0.159 [-0.540] | 0.513*** [2.790] | 0.100 [0.835] | 5.048 [1.489] |
| Japan | 2.885*** [5.665] | -3.167*** [-4.127] | 0.046 [0.485] | 0.146 [1.466] | 1.326*** [7.789] | -0.352 [-1.080] | 0.330*** [6.945] | 0.292*** [3.617] | 46.656* [1.671] |
| Eurozone | 3.431*** [4.546] | -3.448*** [-5.468] | -0.181** [-2.154] | 0.373*** [6.188] | 0.633*** [5.070] | 0.398* [1.947] | 0.024 [0.419] | 0.915*** [9.014] | 1.490*** [2.935] |

Note: * Statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level, *** at the 1% level. The coefficients are estimated by nonlinear least squares. T-values are given in parentheses. Logistic specification of the transition function. Coefficients refer to eq. (4).

Table 6: Nonlinear estimates based on change of the oil price as transition variable

| Country | a_0 | a_1 | β_1 | β_1' | β_2 | β_2' | β_3 | β_3' | γ_1 |
|----------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| UK | 4.392*** [4.008] | -1.079 [-0.561] | 0.959 [1.483] | -1.592 [-1.202] | 0.746*** [9.264] | 0.117 [0.565] | 0.394** [2.449] | 0.060 [0.210] | 2.574 [0.953] |
| US | 1.954*** [2.473] | -0.571 [-1.087] | 0.332 [0.824] | -0.621* [1.966] | 1.022** [3.547] | 0.675** [-4.245] | 0.385*** [3.107] | 0.106* [1.529] | 74.012 [0.779] |
| Japan | 2.026*** [3.924] | -0.708 [-1.381] | 0.0514 [0.403] | 0.138 [0.832] | 1.0285*** [6.782] | 0.337* [1.750] | 0.3705*** [7.006] | 0.146** [2.387] | 19.848 [0.737] |
| Eurozone | 3.528*** [3.716] | -1.900*** [-5.173] | 0.146*** [2.680] | -0.167 [-1.450] | 0.724*** [4.502] | -0.164 [-0.808] | 0.177 [1.645] | 0.330*** [5.076] | 20.561 [1.279] |

Note: * Statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level, *** at the 1% level. The coefficients are estimated by nonlinear least squares. T-values are given in parentheses. Logistic specification of the transition function. Coefficients refer to eq. (4).

Table 7: Nonlinear estimates based on the lagged interest rate differential as transition variable

| Country | a_0 | a_1 | β_1 | β_1' | β_2 | β_2' | β_3 | β_3' | γ_1 |
|----------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| UK | 1.567* [1.797] | 3.557** [2.700] | 0.147** [3.552] | -0.516** [-4.852] | 0.353* [1.753] | -0.626** [-2.055] | 0.743*** [5.197] | 0.462 [1.588] | 0.038*** [3.592] |
| US | -0.540*** [-3.411] | -6.785*** [-15.432] | -0.153*** [-3.707] | 0.844*** [8.912] | 0.333** [2.254] | -0.124 [-0.667] | 1.012*** [32.698] | -0.028 [-0.482] | 0.226*** [14.382] |
| Japan | 0.869*** [2.240] | -9.118*** [-5.719] | -0.221** [-4.008] | 0.405*** [3.497] | 0.561*** [5.447] | -0.758*** [-3.326] | 0.815*** [13.337] | 0.261* [1.972] | 0.001*** [5.370] |
| Eurozone | -0.307 [-0.752] | 3.207*** [2.380] | -0.170*** [-4.306] | 0.199 [1.426] | -0.088 [-0.539] | 1.326*** [4.251] | 1.068*** [13.334] | -0.860*** [-5.118] | 0.994 [6.778] |

Note: * Statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level, *** at the 1% level. The coefficients are estimated by nonlinear least squares. T-values are given in parentheses. Exponential specification of the transition function. Coefficients refer to eq. (4).

Figure 1: Deviations from a linear Taylor rule




Figure 2: Deviations from a linear Taylor rule including the foreign interest rate





Figure 3: Deviations from a nonlinear Taylor rule including foreign interest rate



Note: Logistic specification based on lagged interest rate change as a transition variable

The following ROME Discussion Papers have been published since 2007:

- | | | | |
|---|------|--|--|
| 1 | 2007 | Quo vadis, Geldmenge? Zur Rolle der Geldmenge für eine moderne Geldpolitik | Egon Görgens Karlheinz Ruckriegel Franz Seitz |
| 2 | 2007 | Money and Inflation. Lessons from the US for ECB Monetary Policy | Ansgar Belke Thorsten Polleit |
| 3 | 2007 | Two-Pillar Monetary Policy and Bootstrap Expectations | Peter Spahn |
| 4 | 2007 | Money and Housing – Evidence for the Euro Area and the US | Claus Greiber Ralph Setzer |
| 5 | 2007 | Interest on Reserves and the Flexibility of Monetary Policy in the Euro Area | Ulrike Neyer |
| 1 | 2008 | Money: A Market Microstructure Approach | Malte Krueger |
| 2 | 2008 | Global Liquidity and House Prices: A VAR Analysis for OECD Countries | Ansgar Belke Walter Orth Ralph Setzer |
| 3 | 2008 | Measuring the Quality of Eligible Collateral | Philipp Lehmbecker Martin Missong |
| 4 | 2008 | The Quality of Eligible Collateral and Monetary Stability: An Empirical Analysis | Philipp Lehmbecker |
| 5 | 2008 | Interest Rate Pass-Through in Germany and the Euro Area | Julia von Borstel |
| 1 | 2009 | Interest Rate Rules and Monetary Targeting: What are the Links? | Christina Gerberding Franz Seitz Andreas Worms |
| 2 | 2009 | Current Account Imbalances and Structural Adjustment in the Euro Area: How to Rebalance Competitiveness | Ansgar Belke Gunther Schnabl Holger Zemanek |
| 3 | 2009 | A Simple Model of an Oil Based Global Savings Glut – The “China Factor” and the OPEC Cartel | Ansgar Belke Daniel Gros |
| 4 | 2009 | Die Auswirkungen der Geldmenge und des Kreditvolumens auf die Immobilienpreise – Ein ARDL-Ansatz für Deutschland | Ansgar Belke |

| | | | |
|----|------|--|--|
| 5 | 2009 | Does the ECB rely on a Taylor Rule? Comparing Ex-Post with Real Time Data | Ansgar Belke Jens Klose |
| 6 | 2009 | How Stable Are Monetary Models of the Dollar-Euro Exchange Rate? A Time-varying Coefficient Approach | Joscha Beckmann Ansgar Belke Michael Kühl |
| 7 | 2009 | The Importance of Global Shocks for National Policymakers – Rising Challenges for Central Banks | Ansgar Belke Andreas Rees |
| 8 | 2009 | Pricing of Payments | Malte Krüger |
| 1 | 2010 | (How) Do the ECB and the Fed React to Financial Market Uncertainty? The Taylor Rule in Times of Crisis | Ansgar Belke Jens Klose |
| 2 | 2010 | Monetary Policy, Global Liquidity and Commodity Price Dynamics | Ansgar Belke Ingo G. Bordon Torben W. Hendricks |
| 3 | 2010 | Is Euro Area Money Demand (Still) Stable? Cointegrated VAR versus Single Equation Techniques | Ansgar Belke Robert Czudaj |
| 4 | 2010 | European Monetary Policy and the ECB Rotation Model Voting Power of the Core versus the Periphery | Ansgar Belke Barbara von Schnurbein |
| 5 | 2010 | Short-term Oil Models before and during the Financial Market Crisis | Jörg Clostermann Nikolaus Keis Franz Seitz |
| 6 | 2010 | Financial Crisis, Global Liquidity and Monetary Exit Strategies | Ansgar Belke |
| 7 | 2010 | How much Fiscal Backing must the ECB have? The Euro Area is not the Philippines | Ansgar Belke |
| 8 | 2010 | Staatliche Schuldenkrisen – Das Beispiel Griechenland | Heinz-Dieter Smeets |
| 9 | 2010 | Heterogeneity in Money Holdings across Euro Area Countries: The Role of Housing | Ralph Setzer Paul van den Noord Guntram B. Wolff |
| 10 | 2010 | Driven by the Markets? ECB Sovereign Bond Purchases and the Securities Markets Programme | Ansgar Belke |

| | | | |
|----|------|---|---|
| 11 | 2010 | Asset Prices, Inflation and Monetary Control – Re-inventing Money as a Policy Tool | Peter Spahn |
| 12 | 2010 | The Euro Area Crisis Management Framework: Consequences and Institutional Follow-ups | Ansgar Belke |
| 13 | 2010 | Liquiditätspräferenz, endogenes Geld und Finanzmärkte | Peter Spahn |
| 14 | 2010 | Reinforcing EU Governance in Times of Crisis: The Commission Proposals and beyond | Ansgar Belke |
| 01 | 2011 | Current Account Imbalances in the Euro Area: Catching up or Competitiveness? | Ansgar Belke Christian Dreger |
| 02 | 2011 | Volatility Patterns of CDS, Bond and Stock Markets before and during the Financial Crisis: Evidence from Major Financial Institutions | Ansgar Belke Christian Gokus |
| 03 | 2011 | Cross-section Dependence and the Monetary Exchange Rate Model – A Panel Analysis | Joscha Beckmann Ansgar Belke Frauke Dobnik |
| 04 | 2011 | Ramifications of Debt Restructuring on the Euro Area – The Example of Large European Economies' Exposure to Greece | Ansgar Belke Christian Dreger |
| 05 | 2011 | Currency Movements Within and Outside a Currency Union: The Case of Germany and the Euro Area | Nikolaus Bartzsch Gerhard Rösl Franz Seitz |
| 01 | 2012 | Effects of Global Liquidity on Commodity and Food Prices | Ansgar Belke Ingo Bordon Ulrich Volz |
| 02 | 2012 | Exchange Rate Bands of Inaction and Play-Hysteresis in German Exports – Sectoral Evidence for Some OECD Destinations | Ansgar Belke Matthias Göcke Martin Günther |
| 03 | 2012 | Do Wealthier Households Save More? The Impact of the Demographic Factor | Ansgar Belke Christian Dreger Richard Ochmann |
| 04 | 2012 | Modifying Taylor Reaction Functions in Presence of the Zero-Lower-Bound – Evidence for the ECB and the Fed | Ansgar Belke Jens Klose |

| | | | |
|----|------|--|--|
| 05 | 2012 | Interest Rate Pass-Through in the EMU – New Evidence from Nonlinear Cointegration Techniques for Fully Harmonized Data | Joscha Beckmann Ansgar Belke Florian Verheyen |
| 06 | 2012 | Monetary Commitment and Structural Reforms: A Dynamic Panel Analysis for Transition Economies | Ansgar Belke Lukas Vogel |
| 07 | 2012 | The Credibility of Monetary Policy Announcements: Empirical Evidence for OECD Countries since the 1960s | Ansgar Belke Andreas Freytag Jonas Keil Friedrich Schneider |
| 01 | 2013 | The Role of Money in Modern Macro Models | Franz Seitz Markus A. Schmidt |
| 02 | 2013 | Sezession: Ein gefährliches Spiel | Malte Krüger |
| 03 | 2013 | A More Effective Euro Area Monetary Policy than OMTs – Gold Back Sovereign Debt | Ansgar Belke |
| 04 | 2013 | Towards a Genuine Economic and Monetary Union – Comments on a Roadmap | Ansgar Belke |
| 05 | 2013 | Impact of a Low Interest Rate Environment – Global Liquidity Spillovers and the Search-for-yield | Ansgar Belke |
| 06 | 2013 | Exchange Rate Pass-Through into German Import Prices – A Disaggregated Perspective | Joscha Beckmann Ansgar Belke Florian Verheyen |
| 07 | 2013 | Foreign Exchange Market Interventions and the \$-¥ Exchange Rate in the Long Run | Joscha Beckmann Ansgar Belke Michael Kühl |
| 08 | 2013 | Money, Stock Prices and Central Banks – Cross-Country Comparisons of Cointegrated VAR Models | Ansgar Belke Marcel Wiedmann |
| 09 | 2013 | 3-Year LTROs – A First Assessment of a Non-Standard Policy Measure | Ansgar Belke |
| 10 | 2013 | Finance Access of SMEs: What Role for the ECB? | Ansgar Belke |
| 11 | 2013 | Doomsday for the Euro Area – Causes, Variants and Consequences of Breakup | Ansgar Belke Florian Verheyen |
| 12 | 2013 | Portfolio Choice of Financial Investors and European Business Cycle Convergence – A Panel Analysis for EU Countries | Ansgar Belke Jennifer Schneider |

| | | | |
|-----|------|---|--|
| 13 | 2013 | Exports and Capacity Constraints – A Smooth Transition Regression Model for Six Euro Area Countries | Ansgar Belke Anne Oeking Ralph Setzer |
| 14 | 2013 | The Transmission of Oil and Food Prices to Consumer Prices – Evidence for the MENA countries | Ansgar Belke Christian Dreger |
| 15 | 2013 | Target-balances: The Greek Example | Malte Krüger |
| 16 | 2013 | Competitiveness, Adjustment and Macroeconomic Risk Management in the Eurozone | Peter Spahn |
| 17 | 2013 | Contextualizing Systemic Risk | Lukas Scheffknecht |
| 01 | 2014 | Exit Strategies and Their Impact on the Euro Area – A Model Based View | Ansgar Belke |
| 02 | 2014 | Monetary Dialogue 2009-2014: Looking backward, looking forward | Ansgar Belke |
| 03 | 2014 | Non-Standard Monetary Policy Measures – Magic Wand or Tiger by the Tail? | Ansgar Belke |
| 04 | 2014 | Böhm-Bawerk und die Anfänge der monetären Zinstheorie | Peter Spahn |
| 05 | 2014 | State-of-play in Implementing Macroeconomic Adjustment Programmes in the Euro Area | Daniel Gros Cinzia Alcidi Ansgar Belke Leonor Coutinho Alessandro Giovannini |
| 06 | 2014 | Der Transaktionskassenbestand von Euro-Münzen in Deutschland | Markus Altmann Nikolaus Bartzsch |
| 06e | 2014 | The Volume of Euro Coins held for Transaction Purposes in Germany | Markus Altmann Nikolaus Bartzsch |
| 07 | 2014 | Labor Market Reforms and Current Account Imbalances – Beggar-thy-neighbor Policies in a Currency Union? | Timo Baas Ansgar Belke |
| 08 | 2014 | Do the poor pay for card rewards of the rich? | Malte Krüger |
| 09 | 2014 | The Bank Lending Channel in a Simple Macro Model – How to Extend the Taylor Rule? | Peter Spahn |
| 10 | 2014 | The Relevance of International Spillovers and Asymmetric Effects in the Taylor Rule | Joscha Beckmann Ansgar Belke Christian Dreger |