

R O M E

Research On Money in the Economy

No. 16-05 – July 2016

On the exposure of the BRIC countries
to global economic shocks

Ansgar Belke, Christian Dreger and Irina Dubova

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 2016-05, July 2016

On the exposure of the BRIC countries to global economic shocks

Ansgar Belke, Christian Dreger and Irina Dubova

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

Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW)

Mohrenstraße 58

D-10117 Berlin

e-mail: cdreger@diw.de

Irina Dubova

Ruhr Graduate School of Economics and

University of Duisburg-Essen

Department of Economics

Universitaetsstr. 12

D-45117 Essen

e-mail: irina.dubova@uni-due.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 References in publications to ROME Discussion Papers (other than an acknowledgment that the writer has had access to unpublished material) should be cleared with the author(s) to protect the tentative character of these papers.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

albrecht.michler@hhu.de and markus.penatzer@hhu.de .

Abstract

The financial crisis led to a deep recession in many industrial countries. However, the downturn in large emerging markets turned out to be less persistent. Despite the modest recovery in advanced economies, GDP growth declined in emerging markets in the last years. The higher divergence of business cycles is closely linked to the Chinese transformation. During the crisis, the Chinese fiscal stimulus prevented a decline in GDP growth not only in that country, but also in resource-rich economies. The Chinese shift to consumption-driven growth led to a decline in commodity demand, and the environment became more challenging for many emerging markets. This view is supported by Bayesian VARs specified for the BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, China) countries. The results reveal a strong impact of international variables on GDP growth. In contrast to the other countries, China plays a crucial role in determining global trade and oil prices. Hence, the change in the Chinese growth strategy puts additional reform pressure on countries with abundant natural resources.

JEL-Classification: F44, E32, C32

Keywords: business cycle divergence, Chinese transformation, Bayesian VARs

Corresponding author

Christian Dreger, German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin), cdreger@diw.de.

Introduction

Due to their fast catching-up in income, the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) account for 30 percent of world GDP at the current edge, as expressed in PPPs (Figure 1). With a weight of about 56 percent of GDP, the BRIC evolution is dominated by the Chinese economy. The BRICs have been the primary source for global GDP growth before the financial crisis until the first years thereafter. The rebound from the crisis started earlier in many emerging markets, evolved much faster than in advanced economies and was often characterized by a V-shaped pattern of output growth (Didier, Hevia, and Schmukler, 2012). However, despite a modest recovery in the industrial countries seems to be on the way, GDP growth in the BRICs started to decline in the most recent years. Although differences across countries are striking, the slowdown is synchronized to some extent. While the acceleration of output is still high in India, the Chinese economy experienced lower growth, and countries like Brazil and Russia entered even a recession. In terms of the BRIC aggregate, growth fell not only below the post-crisis peak of 2010/11, but even below the rates in the pre-crisis decade (Figure 2). Due to the increasing role of emerging markets in the global economy, a stronger slowdown could constitute a major risk for global growth in the years ahead.

-Figures 1 and 2 about here-

External conditions are often blamed for this development. For instance, Almansour, Aslam, Bluedorn and Duttagupta (2014) argue that global factors can account for one half of the variance of emerging markets growth. Tailwinds that supported the former catching up, like the vast acceleration of world trade, rocketing commodity prices and easy financial conditions did not continue and will probably not improve over the next years. The BRICs' slowdown might be traced back to the long-lasting effects of the crisis that have been temporarily whitewashed by expansionary policy measures. In particular, the Chinese authorities launched a huge fiscal program to compensate for the reduction in exports over the crisis period (Dreger and Zhang, 2014). The strategy prevented a sudden drop of output growth not only in China, but also in countries with strong exposure to natural resources. In the following years, the transformation towards consumption-driven growth lowered the Chinese demand for commodities, implying that external conditions became more challenging for other countries since then. In this sense,

the change in the Chinese growth strategy contributed to a higher divergence of international business cycles. The fiscal stimulus had a major impact on emerging markets, most notably on countries with abundant natural resources. In contrast, the effects on GDP growth in the main advanced economies have been relatively modest, probably with the exception of Japan (Dreger and Zhang, 2014).

This paper investigates the relative role of foreign factors for GDP growth in the BRIC economies. Foreign variables are captured by commodity prices, world trade and international financial conditions. Global shocks can be disseminated through various channels, like (a) the fiscal policy stance, as lower commodity prices put higher consolidation pressure on public budgets, (b) tighter monetary policy to combat capital outflows caused by a higher risk attitudes of investors, and (c) the real exchange rate, as the real depreciation of the BRIC currencies generates more inflation through higher import prices.

Our Bayesian VAR analysis suggests that the BRIC countries are heavily affected by the global economic conditions, albeit to a different degree. Commodity price movements are able to explain the downturn in Brazil and Russia to a huge extent. India is less affected by commodity markets, but the lower expansion of global trade depresses GDP growth. Prices for raw materials and world trade are both relevant for output growth in China. However, in contrast to the other countries, the relationship appears to be bidirectional, as China heavily affects the global economy. Therefore, China is an important driver for economic growth in other emerging markets. In former years, China's investment-oriented strategy boosted emerging markets via higher commodity demand. The strong expansion provided a buffer to emerging markets during the period of the financial crisis. In the following years, the slowdown in China softened output growth at a global scale.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews previous papers on the catching-up of the BRICs and the current slowdown of growth. Section 3 discusses our Bayesian VAR model and its specification. Section 4 presents the empirical findings about China's role in determining global variables and the impacts of external shocks on GDP growth in BRIC countries. Finally, Section 5 concludes.

2 BRIC countries during the crisis period

Since the 1990s, the fast integration of the BRICs into the world economy has been triggered by the favorable global environment. Strong foreign demand, facilitated by advances in trade liberalization, lower global interest rates, and the acceleration in commodity prices accounted for half of the growth acceleration in the 2000s compared to the 1990s (Cubeddu et al., 2014). The large and sustained increase in commodity prices raised investment and GDP in commodity-exporting economies, many of which enjoyed unprecedented windfall profits. The effects are most visible if countries are financially open. Higher growth in the years prior to the financial crisis reflected a combination of improved fundamentals and strong tailwinds that boosted demand and raised productivity in most countries.

By focusing on the acute financial crisis period, Blanchard, Das and Faruquee (2010) noted that emerging markets were severely hit by trade and financial shocks. For instance, capital outflows played a dominant role in Russia. Countries with high short-term foreign debt suffered larger declines in GDP compared to less leveraged economies. Interestingly, international reserves did not provide relevant buffers. Based on a decomposition of forecast errors, Fayad and Perrelli (2014) argued that lower demand from trading partners plays a key role to explain the slowdown, besides a general increase in the risk aversion of international investors. In addition, the crisis reduced the scope for expansionary fiscal and monetary policies in many emerging markets. According to Aslund (2013) the current decline in GDP growth is caused by the end of extraordinary commodity and credit booms, and overinvestment (China) or underinvestment (Brazil, Russia). Hence, the former acceleration was not sustainable, as structural factors are also important. Anand, Cheng, Rehman and Zhang (2014) concluded that the slowdown in China and India is related to lower potential output growth, mostly driven by a weaker evolution of TFP. In addition, the decline in the working-age population cuts long run growth in China and Russia. Hence, emerging markets should pursue structural reforms to ensure sustainable economic growth under more challenging global conditions (Didier, Kose, Ohnsorge and Ye, 2015).

The crucial role of China is often overlooked in the debate. The launch of the massive fiscal stimulus at the end of 2008 of six percent of GDP over a two years period might have delayed the adjustment in emerging markets and contributed to a higher divergence of business cycles. Due to the acceleration of investment, China was able to keep the former high growth path for some time. It also provided a buffer for many emerging market countries, as the demand for

commodities remained relatively strong. Because of high infrastructure investment to support the process of faster industrialization and urbanization, China contributed to a large and growing demand for commodities. Over the crisis period, the strategy has been intensified to bolster the economy against negative global shocks. Roache (2012) concluded that shocks in aggregate activity in China can exert substantial impacts on the prices of oil and some base metals even long before the crisis. Using a factor augmented VAR approach, Aastveit, Bjornland and Thorsrud (2015) argued that demand from emerging economies, especially from China is more than twice as important to explain the fluctuations in the real oil price and in oil production than demand from developed countries. In 2011/2012, China started to rebalance the growth strategy towards a more sustainable development. Subsequently, many other countries experienced a growth decline. According to Gruss (2014) lower growth in China poses a key downside risk for the Latin American countries. As the shift is not a temporary phenomenon, policies trying to offset the economic slowdown with demand-side measures will be not successful. Hence, structural reforms to secure higher growth over the medium run are on the agenda.

3 VAR and Bayesian SVAR analysis

3.1 Methodology

We estimate country-specific Bayesian SVARs. Our benchmark specification includes a constant and a linear time trend, which we omit from the notation for convenience:

$$\sum_{l=0}^L \begin{bmatrix} A_{11}(l) & A_{12}(l) \\ A_{21}(l) & A_{22}(l) \end{bmatrix} y(t-l) = \varepsilon(t),$$

$$y(t) = \begin{bmatrix} y_1(t) \\ y_2(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $y_1(t)$ is a vector of domestic macroeconomic variables, $y_2(t)$ is a vector of global macroeconomic variables.

$$\varepsilon(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_1(t) \\ \varepsilon_2(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\varepsilon(t)$ is uncorrelated with $y(t-l)$ for $l > 0$, and $E[\varepsilon(t)\varepsilon'(t)|y(t-l), l > 0] = I$, $E[\varepsilon(t)|y(t-l), l > 0] = 0$; $\varepsilon_1(t)$ is a vector of structural shocks of domestic origin, and $\varepsilon_2(t)$ is a vector of structural shocks emerging in the global economy.

The model is formulated separately for each BRIC country, where Brazil, Russia and India are treated as small open economies. For these countries the block exogeneity restriction is imposed, i.e. $A_{21}(l) = 0$ for all $l = 0, 1, \dots, L$. Hence domestic variables do not have contemporaneous or lagged effects on global variables. This assumption is in line with the econometric evidence and similar to the approach presented by Cushman and Zha (1997) and Dungey and Pagan (2000). As the number of parameters is reduced, it can lead to more precise estimates. For Brazil, Russia and India the near-SVAR model is specified and estimated by SURE (Seemingly Unrelated Regression Equations) techniques with the Bayesian inference.

For China, however, the block exogeneity assumption might not hold, although there is no consensus on this issue in the literature. For example with respect to oil prices, on the one hand, Du et.al (2010) found that China's economic activity fails to affect the world oil price, which means that the latter is still exogenous with respect to China's macro-economy. On the other hand, investigating China's growing role in the global economy and world commodity markets, Cashin et.al (2016) concluded that indeed a permanent negative Chinese GDP shock of one percent will reduce global growth in the short run by 0,2 percent and oil prices by 2,8 percent. We contribute to that literature and estimate the effect of the Chinese economy on commodity prices, world trade and global financial market volatility, and, thus, implicitly on the other BRIC countries.

3.2 Choice of variables and preliminary data analysis

The vector of domestic variables $y_1(t)$ includes real government expenditures, real GDP, the difference between the domestic short-term interest rate and corresponding US interest rate (IR), and real effective exchange rates (REER). The vector of external variables $y_2(t)$ includes the real oil price, the World Trade Index, and the CBOE Volatility Index (VIX). All data are obtained at the quarterly frequency from Datastream, with exception of merchandise world trade (2005=100), which comes from CPB World Trade Monitor. The real oil price was calculated by dividing the price of oil by the US GDP deflator. The data are seasonally adjusted and reported over the 2000:1-2015:2 sample. Therefore, periods before, during and after the glob-

al financial crisis are included². All variables are defined in logarithms, except of interest rate differentials.

The ADF tests for the presence of unit roots indicate that all the variables are $I(1)$, i.e. integrated of order one (Table 1). Although the VIX should be stationary in principle, the unit root test indicates non-stationarity, probably due to the small sample size. Therefore, the VIX is treated as $I(1)$, i.e. should not be excluded from set of integrated variables.

-Table 1 about here-

Next, possible cointegration relationships between the variables are explored by means of the trace statistic. Restricted linear trend specifications have been chosen in order to allow the cointegrating relationships to be trend-stationary and have non-zero intercepts³, the lag length of two was chosen according to the autocorrelation tests. See Table 2 for the results.

-Table 2 about here-

There is evidence of multiple cointegration relationships for each country: four for Brazil, three for China and India, and two for Russia. Thus, the use of differenced variables in estimations might lead to the loss of important information – such as long-run relationships. For instance, investigating some commodity exporting countries Chen and Rogoff (2002) and Cashin, Cespedes and Sahay (2003) concluded that real exchange rates cointegrate with the real price of commodities.

Sims et al. (1990) argued that VAR models in levels with non-stationary variables might incur some loss in the estimator's efficiency but not its consistency if cointegration holds. Since the main objective of the VAR is to analyze the inter-relationships between the variables and not the coefficients, the system should be estimated in levels. Alternatively a Vector Error Correc-

² The starting date was also chosen so that the financial turmoil periods in Brazil, 1997-1998 Asian Crisis, and 1998 default in Russia do not enter into the sample

³ The presence of long-run relationships for each country was also confirmed by the specification with an unrestricted constant, which allows for linear trends in the data, but it is assumed that the trends cancel in cointegrating relations

tion Model (VECM) could be estimated. However, identifying the underlying structural parameters with any degree of accuracy is not an easy task, given the relatively small numbers of degrees of freedom. Therefore, we decided to not impose any cointegrating restrictions.

3.3 Identification of SVARs

The identification of the SVAR models is based on short-run restrictions in order to let the data reveal the patterns of the responses and the transmissions. Within the domestic block, the following ordering of the variables is assumed to hold: real government expenditure, real GDP, the real effective exchange rate and interest rate differential. (GSpending, GDP, REER, IR). As a proxy for the fiscal stance the model includes government expenditures. Similar to Afonso et al. (2011) it is assumed that all reactions of fiscal policy within each quarter are purely automatic because of the presence of long decision and implementation lags. Blanchard and Perotti (2002) stated that they could not identify any automatic feedback from economic activity to government purchases of goods and services. Thus, government expenditure variable is the most inertial variable in the model, and cannot react to current changes in the economy.

The production sector is reflected in real GDP. Cushman and Zha (1997) argued that signals in financial sector variables (interest rate differential, real exchange rate) are related to production only through lags due to inertia, cost adjustments and production planning. Since the commodities boom and the acceleration of world trade spurred export demand, commodity prices and world trade can affect real GDP within one quarter.

The interest rate differential reflects the monetary policy stance compared to the global financial conditions, the latter proxied by US interest rate. As the only nominal variable in the model, it is the most fast-moving one. Given the lags in monetary policy transmission, the domestic interest rate reacts faster to the shocks to output, than the output reacts to changes in the interest rate. As pointed by Bernanke et al. (1997) oil price shocks may affect monetary policy, which in turn may influence economic activity. Moreover, central banks might also tighten monetary policy in order to combat capital outflows caused by changing global financial conditions. Within a quarter, domestic interest rates might also react to unexpected shocks in the US interest rate and financial volatility. Due to price rigidities we assume that real exchange rate reacts to monetary policy only with the lag, but monetary policy, on the other hand, could react to exchange rate developments simultaneously.

Within the global block we keep the variables in the lower-triangularized fashion of the order real oil prices, world trade, and financial volatility (OIL, WT, VIX). The volume of world trade is affected by oil prices through the demand changes in oil-importing and oil-exporting countries (Husain et. al (2015)). Lower oil prices might also reduce the distance elasticity of trade, and thus could promote globalization. Financial volatility can react immediately to unexpected shocks hitting both oil prices and global trade.

The identification of the structural form requires $n(n - 1)/2$ restrictions to hold. For all models we assume that global variables are not affected contemporaneously by domestic shocks (and with the lags for Brazil, India and Russia due to the block exogeneity assumption). Other restrictions come from the Cholesky orderings within the two blocks. As 21 zero restrictions are imposed, the model is exactly identified⁴. The following matrix summarizes the set of the contemporaneous restrictions:

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc|cccc|c}
 \varepsilon_{GSpend} & & & & & a_{15} & a_{16} & a_{17} & u_{GSpend} \\
 \varepsilon_{GDP} & a_{21} & & & & a_{25} & a_{26} & a_{27} & u_{GDP} \\
 \varepsilon_{REER} & a_{31} & a_{32} & & & a_{35} & a_{36} & a_{37} & u_{REER} \\
 \varepsilon_{IR} & a_{41} & a_{42} & a_{43} & & a_{45} & a_{46} & a_{47} & u_{IR} \\
 \varepsilon_{OIL} & & & & & 1 & & & u_{OIL} \\
 \varepsilon_{WT} & & & & & a_{65} & & & u_{WT} \\
 \varepsilon_{VIX} & & & & & a_{75} & a_{76} & & u_{VIX}
 \end{array}
 =
 \begin{array}{cccc|cccc}
 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & & & & & \\
 & 1 & & & & & & & \\
 & & 1 & & & & & & \\
 & & & 1 & & & & & \\
 & & & & 1 & & & & \\
 & & & & & 1 & & & \\
 & & & & & & 1 & & \\
 & & & & & & & 1 &
 \end{array}
 \cdot$$

This identification approach involves simultaneity among the contemporaneous variables. Therefore, the shape of the posterior density of the model parameters tends to be non-Gaussian. In order to obtain accurate statistical inferences from the parameter estimates we estimate the model employing the Metropolis-within-Gibbs sampling method. Bayesian methods provide an explicit, straightforward approach to incorporate uncertainty into modelling and forecasting. The other advantage of this method is that it can be efficiently used for the

⁴ Alternative Cholesky orderings within the two blocks, as well as imposing over-identifying restrictions do not change results significantly. The results are available upon request.

SVAR models that have a restricted covariance matrix of the reduced-from residuals as well as restrictions on the lagged coefficients (SVAR models with block exogeneity). In order to get initial estimates for the Gibbs sampler the model is estimated by seemingly unrelated regression (SURE) techniques. The maximum of the log of the marginal posterior density for the matrix with contemporaneous restrictions is computed using the Broyden, Fletcher, Goldfarb and Shanno (BFGS) approach. See Press et al (1989) for details. The prior degrees of freedom is equal to $(N+1)/2$, where N is the number of variables in the model. The covariance matrix of residuals Σ_{β} is also used as increment for the Random Walk Metropolis.

The following algorithm is applied. Firstly, we compute the log likelihood for the structural model given the covariance matrix of residuals at the current draw for the coefficients (Σ_{β}). After drawing a candidate set of structural parameters and computing the log likelihood, a Metropolis acceptance test is performed to determine whether to reject or accept the candidate draw. In case of acceptance, the diagonal elements are drawn for the structural covariance matrix using the set of structural parameters and Σ_{β} . Finally, the coefficients are drawn from the SURE, and Σ_{β} is computed for the next round.

4. Empirical findings

4.1 Weak exogeneity tests

The block exogeneity assumption for Brazil, India and Russia implies that these countries individually do not have dominant influence on the global markets. They are seen as price-takers, and their contribution to world trade can be neglected. On the other hand, China might play a significant role in affecting global conditions. Statistical evidence on the small open economy assumption for Brazil, India and Russia can be obtained by weak exogeneity tests⁵.

For each country three model variants are considered, one for each global variable. The specifications include all domestic variables, and a specific global variable. The cointegration rank is

⁵ Gujarati (2006) pointed that when the variables are integrated, one may not be able to use F-statistic to jointly test the Granger causality, since the test statistics do not have a standard distribution. Thus, the less strong concept of weak exogeneity is used. A variable is said to be weakly exogenous if it does not adjust to temporary deviations from the cointegration relationships.

determined by the trace test. Then, the global variable in question is tested for being weakly exogenous. See Table 3 for the results. According to the evidence, the global variables can be considered as weakly exogenous for all countries, except of China. While the near SVAR specification is appropriate for the other countries, it would not be the optimal choice for the Chinese case.

-Table 3 about here-

In the following we will present the findings of the role of China in determining global variables and proceed by the analysis of the relative role of external factors in the GDP developments for the BRIC economies.

4.2 China's role in determining global variables

In order to analyze the role of China in determining global variables, we proceed with the parsimonious VAR model, where only the global variables (world trade, oil price, financial volatility) and China's GDP are included. Table 4 contains the results of the VAR diagnostic tests, the weak exogeneity, as well as standard Granger causality tests.

-Table 4 about here-

To avoid potentially unreasonable restrictions the model is simply kept in its reduced form, where global variables are ordered first (WT, OIL, VIX, and China's GDP). Alternative orderings only slightly change the pattern of impulse responses. Figures 3 and 4 show that China indeed plays a significant role in determining oil prices and global trade. Hence, the change in the Chinese growth strategy puts reform pressure on countries with abundant natural resources. The China's effect on financial risk aversion is found to be insignificant.

-Figures 3 and 4 about here-

4.3 GDP responses in the BRIC countries

The impulse responses of the Bayesian SVAR models are listed in Figures 5 to 8 and show a sensible adjustment pattern after global shocks.

-Figures 5, 6, 7 and 8 about here-

Oil-exporting countries – Brazil and Russia – react positively to higher real oil prices. We observe the opposite effect for oil-importing China, and for India, the oil price shock tends to be insignificant. An acceleration of global trade is associated with output increase within the first two years in all countries under consideration. While a real exchange rate appreciation exerts a positive effect on Brazil's and Russia's GDP, it has a negative impact for China and India. For the latter countries this might be explained by losses in export competitiveness in a highly competitive global trade environment. Government expenditures have high expansionary effect on GDP for Brazil, for other countries the effect is positive as well, however, with less magnitude. The unexpected tightening of monetary policy (compared to the US) and an increase in financial uncertainty lead to fall in output in all BRIC countries. Overall, one can conclude that external variables played a significant role in the development of GDP in the BRIC countries.

4.4 Forecast error variance decomposition (FEVD) of BRIC's GDP

Variance decomposition separates the variation in an endogenous variable into the component of the VAR. Thus, it provides information about the relative importance of each innovation. The FEVD analysis suggests that the BRICs are heavily affected by the global economy, albeit in different manner and to a different degree.

-Figures 9, 10, 11 and 12 about here-

Commodity prices can explain the downturn in Brazil and Russia to a huge extent – the average share of the total variance of the forecast error for GDP attributable to the variance of oil shocks during first two years is 14 and 30 per cent. The time path of the responses is different in these two countries - in Russia it gains immediately about 27 per cent of the FEVD with the pick of 43 per cent already achieved in the second quarter, comparing with an initially small but persistently increasing role in Brazil up to 23.6 per cent in the 8th quarter. The effects of global trade are not instantaneous and gain importance for both countries after some time. Output in India is insignificantly affected by the oil price evolution. However, a slower expansion of world trade will depress GDP growth. Prices for raw materials and the expansion of world trade are both relevant to explain output growth in China. However, in contrast to other countries, the relationship for China is bidirectional.

Conclusions

In this contribution, we started from the observation that the financial crisis led to a deep recession in many industrial countries. However, the downturn in large emerging markets turned out to be less persistent. Despite the modest recovery in advanced economies, GDP growth declined in emerging markets in the last years. We argued that the higher divergence of business cycles is closely linked to the Chinese transformation. During the crisis, the Chinese fiscal stimulus prevented a decline in GDP growth not only in that country, but also in resource-rich economies. The Chinese shift to consumption-driven growth led to a decline in commodity demand, and the environment became more challenging for many emerging markets. We have been able to support this view by means of Bayesian VARs which we specified for the BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, China) countries. Our results revealed a strong impact of international variables on GDP growth. As a stylized fact and in contrast to the other countries, China plays a crucial role in determining global trade and oil prices. Hence, we concluded that the change in the Chinese growth strategy puts additional reform pressure on countries with abundant natural resources.

References

Aastveit KA, Bjornland HC, Thorsrud LA (2015): What drives oil prices? Emerging vs developed countries, *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 30, 1013-1028.

Afonso A, Baxa J, Slavík M (2011): Fiscal developments and financial stress: a threshold VAR analysis, ECB Working Paper Series 1319, European Central Bank, Frankfurt/Main.

Almansour A, Aslam A, Bluedorn J, Duttagupta, R (2014): On the receiving end? External conditions and emerging market growth before, during and after the global financial crisis, in: IMF, *World Economic Outlook*, 113-151.

Anand R, Cheng KC, Rehman S, Zhang L (2014): Potential growth in emerging Asia, IMF Working Paper 14/02, International Monetary Fund, Washington/DC.

Aslund A (2013): Why growth in emerging economies is likely to fall, Working Paper 13-10, Peterson Institute for International Economics, Washington/DC.

Bernanke B, Gertler M, Watson M (1997): Systematic monetary policy and the effects of oil price shocks, *Brookings Paper on Economic Activity* 28(1): 91-157.

Blanchard O, Das M, Faruquee H (2010): The initial impact of the crisis on emerging market countries, *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 263-307.

Blanchard O, Perotti R (2002): An empirical characterization of the dynamic effects of changes in government spending and taxes on output, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117, 1329-1368.

Cashin P, Cespedes LF, Sahay R (2003): Commodity currencies and the real exchange rate, Central Bank of Chile, Working Paper 236.

Cashin P, Mohaddes K, Raissi M (2016): China's Slowdown and Global Financial Market Volatility: Is World Growth Losing Out? IMF Working Paper 16/63, International Monetary Fund, Washington/DC.

Chen Y-C, Rogoff K (2003): Commodity currencies, *Journal of International Economics* 60, 133-160.

Cubeddu L, Culiuc A, Fayad G, Gao Y, Kochhar K, Kyobe A, Oner C, Perrelli R, Sanya S, Tsounta E, Zhang Z (2014): Emerging markets in transition: growth prospects and challenges, IMF Staff Discussion note 14/06, International Monetary Fund, Washington/DC.

Cushman D, Zha T (1997): Identifying monetary policy in a small open economy under flexible exchange rates, *Journal of Monetary Economics* 39, 433-448.

Didier T, Hevia C, Schmukler SL (2012): How resilient and countercyclical were emerging economies during the global financial crisis?, *Journal of International Money and Finance* 31, 2052–2077.

Didier T, Kose MA, Ohnsorge F, Ye LS (2015): Slowdown in emerging markets: Rough patch or prolonged weakness?, World Bank, Policy Research Note, Washington/DC.

Dreger C, Zhang Y (2014): The Chinese impact on output growth and inflation in the industrial countries, *Economic Modelling* 38, 184-189.

Du L, Yanan H, Chu W (2010): The relationship between oil price shocks and China's macro-economy: An empirical analysis, *Energy Policy* 38(8), 4142-4151.

Dungey M, Pagan A (2000): A structural VAR of the Australian economy, *Economic Record*, 76(235), 321-342.

Fayad G, Perrelli R (2014): Growth surprises and synchronized slowdowns in emerging markets - An empirical investigation, IMF Working Paper 14/173, International Monetary Fund, Washington/DC.

Gruss B (2014): After the boom. Commodity prices and economic growth in Latin America and the Caribbean, IMF Working Paper 14/154, International Monetary Fund, Washington/DC.

Gujarati, D.N (2006): *Essentials of Econometrics*, 3rd Edition, McGraw Hill.

Husain A, Arezki R, Breuer P, Haksar V, Helbling T, Medas P, Sommer M and an IMF Staff Team (2015): Global implications of lower oil prices, IMF Staff Discussion Note, SDN/15/15, International Monetary Fund, Washington/DC.


Press W, Teukolsky S, Vetterling W, Flannery B (1989): Numerical recipes – The art of scientific computing (FORTRAN version), New York: Cambridge University Press.

Roache SK (2012): China's impact on world commodity markets, IMF Working Paper WP/12/115, International Monetary Fund, Washington/DC.

Sims C, Stock J, Watson M (1990): Inference in linear time series models with some unit roots, *Econometrica* 58 (1), 113-144.


Sims C, Zha T (1995): Does monetary policy generate recessions? Yale University Working Paper, Yale University.

Figure 1: Share of the BRICs in the world economy



Note: Calculation based on PPPs. IMF World Economic Outlook.

Figure 2: Economic growth in the BRICs and China



Note: GDP growth rates based on PPPs. IMF World Economic Outlook.

Figure 3. Impulse responses for VAR model with global variables and China's GDP




Figure 4. FEVD for VAR model with global variables and China's GDP




Figure 5. Impulse Responses of Brazil's GDP




Figure 6. Impulse Responses of Russia's GDP




Figure 7. Impulse Responses of India's GDP




Figure 8. Impulse Responses of China's GDP




Figure 9. FEVD of Brazil's GDP




Figure 10. FEVD of Russia's GDP




Figure 11. FEVD of India's GDP




Figure 12. FEVD of China's GDP




Table 1. ADF test for included variables

	Brazil				Russia			
	<i>Level</i>	<i>Prob</i>	<i>Diff</i>	<i>Prob</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Prob</i>	<i>Diff</i>	<i>Prob</i>
Gspend	-0.48	0.89	-4.42	0.00	-1.69	0.43	-4.09	0.00
GDP	-1.30	0.63	-4.11	0.00	-2.04	0.27	-2.42	0.02
IR	-1.05	0.26	-4.97	0.00	-1.71	0.08	-3.81	0.00
REER	0.44	0.81	-7.40	0.00	2.03	0.99	-6.61	0.00
	China				India			
	<i>Level</i>	<i>Prob</i>	<i>Diff</i>	<i>Prob</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Prob</i>	<i>Diff</i>	<i>Prob</i>
Gspend	-1.09	0.71	-1.82	0.07	-0.45	0.89	-9.72	0.00
GDP	-1.27	0.64	-2.70	0.01	0.48	0.98	-7.75	0.00
IR	-1.15	0.23	-4.83	0.00	-0.27	0.58	-5.94	0.00
REER	1.65	0.97	-6.10	0.00	0.91	0.90	-7.08	0.00

	Global variables			
	<i>Level</i>	<i>Prob</i>	<i>Diff</i>	<i>Prob</i>
OIL	-1.74	0.40	-6.85	0.00
WT	-1.38	0.59	-3.98	0.00
VIX	-0.56	0.47	-8.34	0.00

Following ADF specifications were applied:

-for levels of Gspend, GDP, WT, OIL - ADF with intercept;

-for levels of IR, REER,VIX and all differences - ADF with no intercept and no trend;

Lag length was chosen according to Schwarz criterion

Table 2. Cointegration rank test⁶

<i>r</i> **	Brazil		China		India		Russia	
	<i>Trace</i>	<i>P-Value</i> ***	<i>Trace</i>	<i>P-Value</i>	<i>Trace</i>	<i>P-Value</i>	<i>Trace</i>	<i>P-Value</i>
0	162.66	0.01	169.86	0.00	197.06	0.00	172.15	0.00
1	119.74	0.04	119.80	0.04	128.89	0.01	122.99	0.02
2	87.29	0.06	87.15	0.06	84.87	0.09	83.47	0.11
3	60.90	0.09	56.71	0.17	55.51	0.21	52.75	0.30
4	38.11	0.14	35.26	0.24	29.16	0.56	29.25	0.55
5	15.90	0.51	19.64	0.25	9.52	0.94	14.78	0.60
6	3.06	0.86	9.28	0.17	3.24	0.84	6.71	0.39

* The model for each county includes domestic (GSpent, GDP, IR, REER) and global variables (WT, OIL, LVIX)

** *r* is the number of distinct cointegrating vectors

*** *P*-values for rank test with the null hypothesis that the number of cointegrating vectors is less or equal to *r* against a general alternative

Restricted linear trend specifications have been chosen in order to allow the cointegrating relationships to be trend-stationary and have non-zero intercepts, the lag length of two was chosen according to the autocorrelation tests.

⁶ Cointegration rank and weak exogeneity tests have been performed with the CATS in RATS software

Table 3. Weak exogeneity tests

		Brazil		China		India		Russia	
	r	Trace	P-Value	Trace	P-Value	Trace	P-Value	Trace	P-Value
*	0	76.38	0.01	98.12	0.01	95.15	0.02	96.61	0.01
	1	50.07	0.03	64.13	0.05	44.06	0.69	64.17	0.05
	2	26.47	0.12	39.73	0.01	20.51	0.95	34.29	0.28
	3	10.32	0.26	20.23	0.22	5.02	1.00	15.93	0.51
	4	1.27	0.26	8.03	0.26	0.92	1.00	5.45	0.54
Test WE**		$\chi^2(2) = 0.114,$ [0.944]		$\chi^2(3) = 11.044,$ [0.011]		$\chi^2(1) = 1.004,$ [0.316]		$\chi^2(2) = 2.251,$ [0.324]	
	r	Trace	P-Value	Trace	P-Value	Trace	P-Value	Trace	P-Value
**	0	67.81	0.07	86.72	0.07	96.82	0.01	90.93	0.03
	1	44.91	0.09	47.80	0.52	53.19	0.29	59.18	0.12
	2	24.15	0.20	28.51	0.60	22.46	0.89	36.28	0.20
	3	6.50	0.64	11.73	0.83	6.58	0.99	15.80	0.52
	4	1.51	0.22	3.94	0.75	1.72	0.97	7.87	0.27
Test WE		$\chi^2(2) = 3.027,$ [0.220]		$\chi^2(1) = 5.251,$ [0.022]		$\chi^2(1) = 1.173,$ [0.279]		$\chi^2(1) = 0.527,$ [0.468]	
	r	Trace	P-Value	Trace	P-Value	Trace	P-Value	Trace	P-Value
***	0	69.94	0.05	94.19	0.02	97.73	0.01	86.73	0.07
	1	46.49	0.07	54.12	0.25	56.90	0.17	51.17	0.37
	2	26.43	0.12	30.14	0.50	29.36	0.55	27.07	0.68
	3	11.75	0.17	13.65	0.69	8.27	0.97	13.57	0.70
	4	0.61	0.44	4.20	0.71	4.18	0.72	4.36	0.69
Test WE		$\chi^2(2) = 2.252,$ [0.324]		$\chi^2(1) = 5.293,$ [0.021]		$\chi^2(1) = 0.063,$ [0.802]		$\chi^2(1) = 1.118,$ [0.290]	

- * The model I for each country includes domestic variables (GSpending, GDP, IR, REER) and real oil prices
- ** LR test for weak exogeneity performed based on obtained cointegrating rank, P-values in brackets
- *** The model II for each country includes domestic variables (GSpending, GDP, IR, REER) and world trade
- **** The model III for each country includes domestic variables (GSpending, GDP, IR, REER) and VIX

Table 4. Diagnostic, weak exogeneity and Granger causality tests for the VAR model with global variables and China's GDP


Diagnostic tests⁷:

VAR Residual Serial Correlation LM Tests		
Lags	LM-Stat	Prob
1	20.38	0.20
2	14.25	0.58
3	21.67	0.15

Probs from chi-square with 16 df.

VAR Lag Order Selection Criteria			
Lag	AIC	SC	HQ
0	-6.05	-5.47	-5.82
1	-11.73	-10.58	-11.28
2	-12.36*	-10.64*	-11.69*
3	-12.05	-9.76	-11.16
4	-12.01	-9.14	-10.89
5	-11.92	-8.48	-10.58

* indicates lag order selected by the criterion
 AIC: Akaike information criterion
 SC: Schwarz information criterion
 HQ: Hannan-Quinn information criterion



The plot shows the inverse roots of the AR characteristic polynomial. The x-axis ranges from -1.5 to 1.5, and the y-axis ranges from -1.5 to 1.5. A unit circle is drawn around the origin. Several blue dots representing the roots are plotted, all of which are located within the unit circle, indicating that the model is stable.

Weak exogeneity tests:

Cointegration rank test

r	Trace	P-Value
0	63.74	0.05
1	27.68	0.65
2	11.52	0.84
3	0.43	1.00

Test of weak exogeneity

r	5% C.V.	GDP_ch	WT	OIL	VIX
1	3.84	7.20 [0.01]	2.96 [0.09]	16.74 [0.00]	0.01 [0.93]

Granger Causality tests:

Dependent variable: OIL

Excluded	Chi-sq	df	Prob.
WT	7.07	2	0.03
VIX	4.94	2	0.08
GDP_ch	14.20	2	0.00
All	30.71	6	0.00

Dependent variable: WT

Excluded	Chi-sq	df	Prob.
OIL	11.46	2	0.00
VIX	11.81	2	0.00
GDP_ch	4.70	2	0.10
All	45.90	6	0.00

⁷ Based on Schwarz, Akaike and Hannan-Quinn information criterions the lag length of 2 was chosen. According to the autocorrelation LM test the residuals don't show the signs of autocorrelation up to the third lag. Inverse roots of AR characteristic polynomial lie inside unit circle, and thus, the model is stable

Dependent variable: VIX			
Excluded	Chi-sq	df	Prob.
OIL	2.05	2	0.36
WT	0.87	2	0.65
GDP_ch	1.10	2	0.58
<i>All</i>	<i>4.03</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>0.67</i>

Dependent variable: GDP_ch			
Excluded	Chi-sq	df	Prob.
OIL	3.50	2	0.17
WT	7.73	2	0.02
VIX	6.96	2	0.03
<i>All</i>	<i>15.53</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>0.02</i>

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

11	2014	Sacrifice Ratios for Euro Area Countries: New Evidence on the Costs of Price Stability	Ansgar Belke Tobias Böing
01	2015	Zins- und Wohlfahrtseffekte extremer Niedrigzinspolitik für die Sparer in Deutschland	Gerhard Rösl Karl-Heinz Tödter
02	2015	Banking Union as a Shock Absorber	Ansgar Belke Daniel Gros
03	2015	The Demand for Euro Banknotes Issued in Germany: Structural Modelling and Forecasting	Nikolaus Bartzsch Franz Seitz Ralph Setzer
04	2015	Planned Fiscal Consolidations and Growth Forecast Errors – New Panel Evidence on Fiscal Multipliers	Ansgar Belke Dominik Kronen Thomas Osowski
05	2015	Exchange Rate Bands of Inaction and Play-Hysteresis in Greek Exports to the Euro Area, the US and Turkey – Sectoral Evidence	Ansgar Belke Dominik Kronen
06	2015	Beyond Balassa and Samuelson: Real Convergence, Capital Flows, and Competitiveness in Greece	Ansgar Belke Ulrich Haskamp Gunther Schnabl Holger Zemanek
07	2015	Regional Bank Efficiency and its Effect on Regional Growth in “Normal” and “Bad” Times	Ansgar Belke Ulrich Haskamp Ralph Setzer
08	2015	Brexit: Chance oder Untergang für Großbritannien	Markus Penatzer
09	2015	Did Quantitative Easing affect interest rates outside the US? New evidence based on interest rate differentials	Ansgar Belke Daniel Gros Thomas Osowski
01	2016	Transaction Balances: From accounting and economics to biology	Nikolaus Bartzsch Franz Seitz
02	2016	(When) should a non-euro country join the banking union?	Ansgar Belke Anna Dobrzańska Daniel Gros Paweł Smaga
03	2016	Population growth, saving, interest rates and stagnation	Peter Spahn
04	2016	Optimal adjustment paths in a monetary union	Ansgar Belke Daniel Gros
05	2016	On the exposure of the BRIC countries to global economic shocks	Ansgar Belke Christian Dreger Irina Dubova