

# ROME

Research On Money in the Economy

No. 12-05 – June 2012

Interest Rate Pass-Through in the EMU  
- New Evidence from Nonlinear Cointegration  
Techniques for Fully Harmonized Data

Joscha Beckmann, Ansgar Belke and Florian Verheyen

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](http://www.rome-net.org).

ISSN 1865-7052

# Research On Money in the Economy

Discussion Paper Series  
ISSN 1865-7052

No 2012-05, June 2012

## Interest Rate Pass-Through in the EMU – New Evidence from Nonlinear Cointegration Techniques for Fully Harmonized Data\*

*Joscha Beckmann, Ansgar Belke and Florian Verheyen*

*Dr. Joscha Beckmann*  
University of Duisburg-Essen  
Department of Economics  
Universitaetsstr. 12  
D-45117 Essen  
e-mail: [joscha.beckmann@wiwinf.uni-due.de](mailto:joscha.beckmann@wiwinf.uni-due.de)

*Prof. Dr. Ansgar Belke*  
University of Duisburg-Essen  
Department of Economics  
Universitaetsstr. 12  
D-45117 Essen  
e-mail: [ansgar.belke@uni-due.de](mailto:ansgar.belke@uni-due.de)  
and  
Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW)  
Mohrenstraße 58  
D-10117 Berlin

*Florian Verheyen, M.A.*  
University of Duisburg-Essen  
Department of Economics  
Universitaetsstr. 12  
D-45117 Essen  
e-mail: [florian.verheyen@uni-due.de](mailto:florian.verheyen@uni-due.de)

The discussion paper represent the authors' personal opinions and do not necessarily reflect the views of DIW Berlin.

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 References in publications to ROME Discussion Papers (other than an acknowledgment that the writer has had access to unpublished material) should be cleared with the author(s) to protect the tentative character of these papers.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/](http://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](mailto:helpdesk@rome-net.org)  
[michler@uni-duesseldorf.de](mailto:michler@uni-duesseldorf.de)

## **Abstract**

This study will put under close scrutiny the monetary transmission process in the eurozone between 2003 and 2011. To this purpose, we investigate the interest rate pass-through from money market rates to various loan rates for up to twelve countries of the European Monetary Union. Applying a variety of cointegration techniques, we first test for a long-run relationship between loan rates and the Euro OverNight Index Average (EONIA). From these findings, we allow for different nonlinear patterns in the short-run dynamics of loan rates. Our investigation contributes to the literature mainly in two ways. On the one hand, we use fully harmonized data from the ECB's MFI interest rate statistics and on the other hand, we consider smooth transition models as an extension of conventional threshold models. Our results point to considerable differences in the size of the pass-through with respect to either different loan rates or countries. In the majority of cases, the pass-through is incomplete and the dynamics of loan adjustment are different for reductions and hikes of money market rates.

**JEL-Classification: E43, E52, F36, G21**

**Keywords:** Interest rate pass-through, EMU, cointegration, ARDL bounds testing, smooth transition models

Corresponding author: Florian Verheyen, Department of Economics, University of Duisburg-Essen, Universitätsstraße 12, 45117 Essen Tel.: +49 201 183-3657, Fax: +49 201 183-4181, E-mail: [florian.verheyen@uni-due.de](mailto:florian.verheyen@uni-due.de).

\* We are grateful for valuable comments from participants at the 14th Annual INFER Conference, University of Coimbra/Portugal, the 11th Annual EEFS Conference, Koç University Istanbul/Turkey, and the 4th IFABS Conference "Rethinking Banking and Finance: Money, Markets and Models", Valencia/Spain.

## **1. Introduction**

Monetary transmission is a key issue when analyzing monetary policy decisions. Since the beginning of the recent crisis, most central banks have found themselves stuck in a liquidity trap, unable to provide further stimulus to the real economy by lowering interest rates. From a general point of view, a key question is whether the interest rate pass-through (IRPT) mechanism from money market rates to different credit categories continues to operate. Such a mechanism is important for achieving the aims of monetary policy, i.e. achieving price stability or influencing the path of the real economy.

When looking at the European Monetary Union (EMU), the question arises as to whether any asymmetric effects of a single European monetary policy across countries exist. Such a result might be traced back to structural divergences in the transmission mechanism of monetary policy across countries (Sander and Kleimeier, 2004). However, previous studies struggled to clearly attribute different findings across countries to varying IRPT dynamics rather than to different data characteristics owing to a lack of harmonized data. Another caveat is that they did not allow for threshold-related asymmetric IRPT dynamics in their empirical frameworks.

Our study, based on a completely harmonized dataset for EMU countries, analyzes the issue of a nonlinear IRPT process in the eurozone between 2003 and 2011. The main aim is to analyze the transmission mechanism with regard to possible nonlinearities from a new perspective. In this vein, the framework we apply carefully analyzes various dynamic patterns. After testing for a long-run relationship between the EONIA and credit categories with various maturities, we analyze adjustment and short-run dynamics while allowing for different patterns of nonlinearity. More precisely, the logistic smooth transition regression (LSTR) and exponential smooth transition regression (ESTR) models we apply refer to different IRPT dynamics for positive and negative (LSTR) as well as small and large (ESTR) changes in the EONIA. Overall, our framework enables us to analyze different transmission mechanisms with regard to varying maturities and different economies. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: the following section summarizes previous empirical findings. Section 3 first describes our data as well as our modelling cycle. Afterwards, in Section 4, the results are presented and analyzed. Section 5 concludes.

## 2. Literature review

Monetary transmission through the interest rate pass-through channel has been analyzed in numerous studies. The following selective overview briefly describes the most important studies with regard to our topic.

From a general perspective, Cottarelli and Kourelis (1994) can probably be seen as the pioneer researchers in the investigation of the IRPT mechanism. While they investigated the IRPT for 31 developing and developed countries, afterwards and in the advent of EMU, several studies focused on the IRPT in Europe. For a quantitative summary of that plethora of studies, see de Bondt (2002, 2005). He concludes that there is considerable cross-country variation in the IRPT mechanism in Europe, although no clear pattern emerges. Further, Sander and Kleimeier (2006) conclude that the IRPT in Europe can be characterized as sticky and that there are differences between the IRPT to lending and deposit rates as well as between countries. Furthermore, asymmetries and nonlinearities could be found in the IRPT mechanism. However, no clear structure of these asymmetries could be detected. Finally, there are some hints of an accelerating and more homogenous pass-through (PT).

Generally, one can differentiate roughly between three strands in the IRPT literature (Chionis and Leon, 2006).<sup>1</sup> The first strand focuses on the theoretical explanation of interest rate stickiness.<sup>2</sup> The second looks at cross-country differences of PT coefficients, and, lastly, differences in the IPRT mechanism are related to characteristics of the financial system.<sup>3</sup> In our study, we leave out the first and third strands and focus on the second.

Methodologically, Cottarelli and Kourelis (1994) used an autoregressive distributed lag model. However, this approach was soon replaced by the application of cointegration techniques. For example, de Bondt (2002, 2005) uses the single equation approach of Engle and Granger (1987) as well as the Johansen (1991) systems approach. Nowadays, for example, Mojon (2000), Sander and Kleimeier (2004, 2006) and Hofmann (2006) take into account asymmetric adjustment in terms of a discrete threshold switching of the PT mechanism.

Turning now to specific results for the IRPT mechanism of EMU countries based on cointegration and error correction methods, Sander and Kleimeier (2002) focus on pre-EMU

---

<sup>1</sup> Recently, a fourth kind of study has emerged based on disaggregate data, which examines the heterogeneity in bank pricing policies and its determinants (de Graeve et al., 2007, Gambacorta, 2008, Horvath and Podpiera, 2012).

<sup>2</sup> Cottarelli and Kourelis (1994) and de Haan et al. (2001) provide reasons for a delayed PT.

<sup>3</sup> Here, too, Cottarelli and Kourelis (1994) deliver early evidence. For a more recent investigation, see Gigineishvili (2011).

data for 15 European countries, from which 12 are now members of the single currency area. While confirming the short-run stickiness of lending rates, they find a complete PT in the long-run in most cases. In a following study, Sander and Kleimeier (2004) investigate the IRPT for 10 EMU countries for the period 1993-2002. They find evidence of structural change in the PT. In a more recent period, the PT to credit rates has increased and become more complete. However, this finding does not hold for deposit rates. Additionally, the authors find an incomplete PT in the long-run for most retail rates, which is somewhat at odds with their study from 2002.

De Haan et al. (2001) estimate PT coefficients for the six largest EMU countries. Their evidence points to national differences in the PT in the short- as well as the long-run. Furthermore, they cannot find any clue for convergence. While these results almost completely rely on pre-EMU data, Angeloni and Ehrmann (2003) compare the IRPT mechanism before and after the introduction of the single currency. Additionally, they take up other non-EMU countries as well as Japan and the US as a control group to work out whether there are specific developments in the EMU. Specific to the EMU, they find that the coefficients of the IRPT are less dispersed for the post-EMU sample. There is thus evidence of convergence. While Angeloni and Ehrmann (2003) more or less a priori set the structural break equal to the introduction of the single currency (supported by their analysis), Sander and Kleimeier (2004) find that there is indeed a structural break in the IRPT in EMU. However, their results suggest that the break occurred well before 1999 – their results on average suggest a structural break in October 1996. In contrast, Chionis and Leon (2006) find a structural break in the PT mechanism for Greece when the country accessed the eurozone in 2001.

Kok Sørensen and Werner (2006) estimate a dynamic panel for several European countries and test the two hypotheses of equal long-run PT and equal speed of adjustment. Both hypotheses can clearly be rejected, which points to considerable heterogeneity in the European PT mechanism. However, they cannot detect a clear pattern of heterogeneity apart from the fact that countries with a slow adjustment also tend to have a lower long-run PT. Furthermore, the degree of competition in the national banking sector seems to be a major determinant of the IRPT. This view is supported by Gropp et al. (2007) and van Leuvensteijn et al. (2008). The latter estimate a dynamic panel model for eight EMU countries and investigate the PT to loan as well as deposit rates. An interesting finding of theirs is that banks

compensate for small margins in loan markets by higher margins in less competitive deposit markets.

Mojon (2000) investigates the IRPT for six EMU economies. He splits his sample into two parts, both corresponding to complete interest rate cycles. His results show that short term retail rates respond fastest to changes in the money market. Moreover, the PT differs between times of rising and falling money market rates. Credit rates are adjusted faster when market rates are rising and slower when the money market rate declines. For deposit rates, this scheme is reversed. This finding is supported by Gropp et al. (2007), who use a panel model for the individual euro area countries and draw the same conclusion. Comparable evidence of asymmetric interest rate setting is found by Karagiannis et al. (2010). In the whole EMU, banks do not pass through increases in money market rates to depositors. Hofmann (2006) looks at the interest rate PT for France, Germany, Italy and Spain. From the beginning of the EMU he finds a quicker PT. However, German rates seem to be the stickiest. In contrast to Sander and Kleimeier (2006), Hofmann (2006) cannot discover nonlinearities in the PT. The non-existence of asymmetries is also found by Kwapil and Scharler (2010).

Finally, Čihák et al. (2009) focus on the IRPT mechanism during the financial crisis. For the EMU as a whole, they find a slower PT during the crisis. Thus, monetary policy impulses have been less effective during the last years. Karagiannis et al. (2010) hint at a widening spread between money market and retail rates at the beginning of the financial crisis, meaning that the PT was limited to some extent. Jobst and Kwapil (2008) do not support the view that the PT is impaired by the financial crisis. They investigate the PT to loan rates in Austria and cannot detect striking differences in the PT process since the beginning of the financial turmoil. What is more, ECB (2009) also provides no evidence for a structural change in the PT mechanism during the financial crisis.

With regard to the differences found for the IRPT mechanism in Europe, one should keep in mind that to the best of our knowledge no study besides those of Vajanne (2007)<sup>4</sup> and von Borstel (2008) rests on completely harmonized interest rate data. Hofmann (2006) hints at the drawback that there are no fully comparable time series of sufficient length. In fact, only a few authors use at least partly harmonized data.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> However, her focus is on  $\beta$ - and  $\sigma$ -convergence rather than estimating PT coefficients.

<sup>5</sup> For example, Kok Sørensen and Werner (2006), van Leuvensteijn et al. (2008) or ECB (2009) use the MFI interest rate statistics for data from January 2003. Interest rates prior to 2003 are counted back.

This study therefore tries to overcome this caveat. We will investigate the IRPT mechanism using a completely harmonized dataset for EMU countries. Accordingly, potential differences will no longer be attributable to various characteristics of the underlying data.

### **3. Empirical Analysis**

#### **3.1 Data**

As mentioned before, this study is one of the first that is based on purely harmonized data, which makes the results fully comparable across countries. Interest rate series are obtained from the MFI interest rate statistics of the ECB and cross-checked with the statistics of the national central banks to complete the data set. Nevertheless, for quite a few countries some data is not available. We will turn to this issue in greater detail when we analyze the empirical results. All data refer to loans for households and non-profit institutions and are monthly averages and exclusively new business. In our investigation we consider up to twelve EMU countries.<sup>6</sup> The sample ranges from January 2003, when the MFI interest rate statistics began, to September 2011.<sup>7,8</sup> Specifically, we investigate the IRPT for the following three credit categories with various maturities: loans for consumption (up to 1 year, 1 to 5 years, over 5 years), credits for house purchase (up to 1 year, 1 to 5 years, 5 to 10 years), and other lending (up to 1 year, 1 to 5 years, over 5 years). In total, we have 86 time series for which we estimate PT models. As the money market rate we consider the EONIA because it best reflects the stance of monetary policy. Additionally, using the same money market rate for each model makes the results more comparable.<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, to cover the financial market turmoil we use a dummy variable, which takes the value of one since September 2008.<sup>10</sup> From our point of view, this proceeding is the most convincing way to tackle the issue, since our comparably small sample does not allow for separate estimations based on the identification of possible breakpoints.

---

<sup>6</sup> The countries are Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal and Spain. We do not have data for all countries for each loan category. See the results section for details.

<sup>7</sup> The loans for consumption up to 1 year time series for the Netherlands ends in April 2011.

<sup>8</sup> We are aware that about 100 observations are probably at the lower limit when working with time series. However, we believe that using fully harmonized data overcomes this because our focus is on comparing the IRPT mechanism across EMU.

<sup>9</sup> Thus, our approach could be labelled as “monetary policy approach”. Another possibility would be to use the so-called “cost-of-funds approach”. This implies that the corresponding market rate is chosen according to the highest correlation with the retail rate under study. This emphasizes the funding cost of banks (Sander and Kleimeier, 2004).

<sup>10</sup> Imbalances in money markets had already started to appear in August 2007. However, monetary policymakers in the eurozone started to radically cut down interest rates in September 2009.

## 3.2 Modelling cycle and methodological issues

### 3.2.1 Analyzing the long-run

In order to explain our modelling cycle in greater detail, we start with a general consideration of the relationship under investigation. Equation (1) describes the possible long-run relationship between the retail bank rate and the money market rate (EONIA).

$$br_t = \pi_0 + \pi_1 mm_t + \pi_2 dum_t + \mu_t. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $br_t$  denotes the retail interest rate,  $mm_t$  represents the short-term money market rate and  $dum_t$  is a dummy variable for the financial crisis taking the value one from September 2008.  $\pi_0$  and  $\mu_t$  are a constant and the usual i.i.d. error term respectively. If the retail interest rate and the short-term money market rate are integrated of order one (I(1)) and share a common stochastic trend, Equation (1) corresponds to a cointegrating relationship and the resulting error term  $\varepsilon_t$  is stationary (I(0)).

In this case, the following error-correction representation for the retail bank rate arises:

$$\Delta br_t = a_1 \hat{\mu}_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^m a_2 \Delta br_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^n a_3 \Delta mm_{t-j} + \eta_t \quad (2)$$

where  $a_1$  denotes the adjustment coefficient with respect to deviations from the long-run relations in the previous period ( $\hat{\mu}_{t-1}$ ). The second and third terms on the right-hand side correspond to short-run dynamics and are included to avoid any misspecification due to autocorrelation, while  $\eta_t$  is an i.i.d. variable that follows a normal distribution with zero mean (Enders, 2009). If no long-run relationship is found,  $a_1$  is zero and the model may be considered as a traditional AR model estimated in first differences. We will reconsider Equations (1) and (2) further below when we introduce nonlinearities into our model.

Several approaches exist which allow testing for a long-run relationship as given in Equation (1). In this paper, we consider two popular approaches:<sup>11</sup> the multivariate approach of Johansen (1988, 1991) and the ARDL approach provided by Pesaran et al. (2001).<sup>12</sup> We now proceed with a brief description of each approach before we turn to the issue of nonlinearity in this context.

---

<sup>11</sup> We also carried out estimations based on the fully modified OLS (FMOLS) estimator. However, to keep the modelling cycle clearly laid out, we have not incorporated the findings into the modelling cycle. The findings do not differ significantly with respect to the overall findings on the number and character of the long-run relationships.

<sup>12</sup> For an early review of the different methods of estimating cointegrating relationships, see Phillips and Loretan (1991), Hargreaves (1994) and Caporale and Pittis (1999).

Starting with the approach of Pesaran et al. (2001), it is useful to modify Equation (2) as follows

$$\Delta br_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 br_{t-1} + \alpha_2 mm_{t-1} + \alpha_3 dum_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \Delta br_{t-i} + \sum_{j=0}^n \gamma_j \Delta mm_{t-j} + \sum_{k=0}^p \delta_k \Delta dum_{t-k} + \varepsilon_t \quad (3)$$

The test for cointegration then corresponds to the null hypothesis  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0$ . For this approach, Pesaran et al. (2001) tabulate critical value bounds for the two border cases where all time series are either I(0) or I(1). Evidence for a long-run relationship among the variables is delivered if the test statistic exceeds the upper critical value. In the case of a value between the critical bounds the test is inconclusive and if it falls below the lower critical value there is no evidence of cointegration. To obtain the long-run coefficients in the case of cointegration, we normalize on the retail rate. Accordingly, the long-run PT coefficients are calculated from Equation (3) as  $\pi_0 = -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1}$ ,  $\pi_1 = -\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}$  and  $\pi_2 = -\frac{\alpha_3}{\alpha_1}$ .

The second approach we consider is the multivariate cointegration test by Johansen (1988), which draws upon the vector autoregressive representation (VAR)

$$\Delta Y_t = \Pi Y_{t-1} + \Gamma(L)\Delta Y_{t-l} + \Phi D_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (4)$$

The vector  $Y = (br_t, mm_t)$  contains the retail interest rate and the short-term money market rate. The non-stationary behaviour is accounted for by a reduced rank ( $r < p$ ) restriction of the long-run level matrix  $\Pi$ , which can be decomposed into two  $r \times p$  matrices  $\alpha$  and  $\beta'$  ( $\Pi = \alpha\beta'$ ).  $\beta'$  gives the coefficients of the  $r$  long-run relations, while  $\alpha$  contains the adjustment coefficients describing the reaction of each variable to disequilibria in the  $r$  long-run relations given by the  $r \times 1$  vector  $\beta' Y_{t-1}$ . The deterministic components are given by the  $(p \times 1)$  vector  $\Phi D_t$ , while  $\varepsilon_t$  describes an independent and identically distributed error term (Juselius, 2006). The deterministic terms also include a shift dummy variable. This has been included to account for extraordinary effects in the long-run relationship stemming from the recent crisis as described at the end of the previous section. Juselius (2006) applies a similar setting when accounting for specific events in the context of monetary policy. The term  $\Gamma(L)\Delta Y_{t-l}$  describes the short-run dynamics of the model, which will not be explicitly considered in the following, since we focus on a nonlinear short-run model at a later stage of the analysis. To identify the number of cointegrating relations  $r$  we rely on the trace test

developed by Johansen (1988).<sup>13</sup> The results reported in the following correspond to the standard configuration of the test. If the Bartlett correction for small samples described in Juselius (2006) is applied, the character of the findings does not change to a significant degree.

### 3.2.2 Asymmetric short-run dynamics

Regardless of the choice of the two cointegration techniques, it is useful to allow for asymmetric adjustment when analyzing the resulting short-run and error correction dynamics. In contrast to previous studies,<sup>14</sup> we adopt a smooth transition instead of a threshold model, since the first offers a more realistic setting, in our view. More precisely, we modify Equation (3) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta br_t = & \\ & \tau_{1,t} \hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \sum_{k=1}^o \alpha_{1k} \Delta br_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^m \beta_{1i} \Delta mm_{t-i} + F(z_t, \gamma, c) (\tau_{2,t} \hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_{2i} \Delta br_{t-i} + \\ & \sum_{j=0}^n \beta_{2j} \Delta mm_{t-i}) + u_t \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $F(z_t, \gamma, c)$  is a transition function which ascertains the speed of adjustment and could either be a logistic or an exponential function. The terms  $\alpha_1$  and  $\beta_1$  correspond to the lower regime, while  $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$  and  $(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$  belong to the upper regime of the adjustment process (van Dijk et al., 2002). Hence, Equation (5) can be described as a nonlinear error correction framework.

Although a logistic and an exponential formulation are closely related, they refer to different kinds of dynamics. If  $F(z_t, \gamma, c)$  is a bounded continuous logistic transition function that lies between 0 and 1, the following form arises:

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

where  $z_t$  indicates the transition variable,  $\sigma_{zt}$  represents its standard deviation,  $\gamma$  denotes a slope parameter and  $c$  is a location parameter. The normalization by the standard deviation is necessary to obtain a scale-free smoothness parameter (Teräsvirta, 1998). The logistic function increases monotonically from 0 to 1 as the transition variable increases. Since,  $F(z_t, \gamma, c) \rightarrow 0$  as  $z_t \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $F(z_t, \gamma, c) \rightarrow 1$  as  $z_t \rightarrow +\infty$ , the lower (upper) regime is

<sup>13</sup> The idea of the test is to separate the eigenvalues  $\lambda_i, i = 1 \dots r$ , which correspond to stationary relations, from those eigenvalues  $\lambda_i, i = r + 1 \dots, p$  which belong to non-stationary eigenvectors. The test statistic of the corresponding likelihood test, the so-called trace test, is given by  $trace(r) = -T \sum_{i=r+1}^p \log(1 - \hat{\lambda}_i)$ .

Under the null hypothesis of  $(p - r)$  unit roots,  $\lambda_i, i = (r + 1 \dots, p)$  should behave like random walks and the test statistic should be small. Starting with the hypothesis of full rank, the number of cointegrating relations is determined using a top-bottom procedure until the null cannot be rejected (Juselius, 2006).

<sup>14</sup> For example, Sander and Kleimeier (2004, 2006) use models with a sharp cut-off.

associated with negative (positive) values of the transition variable relative to the location parameter  $c$ . If  $z_t = c$  Equation (2) reduces to the linear model given by Equation (3) with  $\alpha = \alpha_1 + 0.5\alpha_2$  and  $\beta = \beta_1 + 0.5\beta_2$ . The slope parameter  $\gamma$  determines the speed of the transition between the extreme regimes (Teräsvirta, 1994).

Turning to the second configuration,  $F(z_t, \gamma, c)$  may also be approximated by a bounded continuous exponential transition function which lies between 0 and 1:

$$F(z_t, \gamma, c) = 1 - \exp(-\gamma(z_t - c)^2 / \sigma_{z_t}) \text{ with } \gamma > 0. \quad (7)$$

The exponential transition function (7) is symmetrically inverse-bell-shaped ( $F(z_t, \gamma, c) \rightarrow 1$  for  $z_t \rightarrow \pm\infty$ ), so that an adjustment for deviations of the basis above and below the threshold  $c$  is symmetric as opposed to the logistic function, and the parameter  $\gamma$  again determines the smoothness of the transition, with lower absolute values implying slower transition (Taylor et al., 2001).

An important choice is the identification of an adequate transition variable, which is required to be stationary. In the following, we use the change of the EONIA as the transition variable. This choice is intuitive, as it allows for asymmetries stemming from positive and negative (LSTR) or small and large (ESTR) EONIA changes. An alternative specification would be to use the size of deviations from the established long-run relation or time as the transition variable. However, such a setting is not possible when no cointegration is found and also seems less attractive in terms of a straightforward interpretation. As a first step, we test for nonlinearity and choose the most adequate transition function in terms of lags for  $\Delta mm_{t-l}$  by relying on a Lagrange multiplier (LM) test, introduced by Luukkonen et al. (1988). As a starting point, consider the following third-order Taylor approximation of the transition function (Teräsvirta, 1998, Franses and van Dijk, 2000):<sup>15</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta br_t = & \varphi_0(a_{1,t}\hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \Delta br_{t-1} + \Delta mm_{t-1}) + \varphi_1(a_{1,t}\hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \Delta br_{t-1} + \Delta mm_{t-1})z_t + \\ & \varphi_2(a_{1,t}\hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \Delta br_{t-1} + \Delta mm_{t-1})z_t^2 + \varphi_3(a_{1,t}\hat{\varepsilon}_{t-1} + \Delta br_{t-1} + \Delta mm_{t-1})z_t^3 + \varepsilon_t \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The first test corresponds to the question of whether a nonlinear framework is adequate or not by testing whether the higher order terms are significant (Teräsvirta, 1998).

$$H_{01}: \varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = \varphi_3 = 0$$

---

<sup>15</sup> In the case of small samples in combination with a large number of explanatory variables, F versions of the LM test statistics are preferable (Teräsvirta, 1998, van Dijk et al., 2002).

The test statistic has a  $\chi^2$  distribution with three degrees of freedom (Teräsvirta, 1998). If the null is rejected, three further tests allow us to determine whether an exponential or a logistic transition function is more adequate (Granger and Teräsvirta, 1993; Teräsvirta, 1998; van Dijk et al., 2002).

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_{04}: \varphi_3 &= 0, \\
 H_{03}: \varphi_2 &= 0 \mid \varphi_3 = 0, \\
 H_{02}: \varphi_1 &= 0 \mid \varphi_2 = \varphi_3 = 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

If the rejection of  $H_{03}$  is the strongest in terms of the largest test statistic, the ESTR model should be chosen, otherwise the LSTR model should be preferred (Teräsvirta, 1994).<sup>16</sup>

### 3.2.3 The overall modelling cycle

The modelling cycle we adopt, based on the previous considerations, is illustrated in Figure 1. As previously mentioned, the short-term money market rate  $mm_t$  is integrated of order one (I(1)), while the retail rates are either stationary or also integrated of order one. Bearing these findings in mind, the first distinction to be made is whether the pair under investigation is both integrated of order one or whether this is only the case for the short-term money market rate. In the first case, we start by testing for a long-run relationship based on the procedures of both Johansen (1988, 1991) and Pesaran et al. (2001). If both tests detect cointegration, we rely on the Johansen (1988, 1991) estimates for the error correction framework, since this approach is less restrictive. If only one methodology points to cointegration we adopt the corresponding estimates. If the unit root tests are inconclusive as to whether the retail rate is I(0) or I(1) we prefer the approach of Pesaran et al. (2001), as it is specially designed to handle a combination of I(0) and I(1) variables.

Altogether, it is worth mentioning that the estimates only marginally differ if cointegration is found in both cases. If cointegration is evident in one procedure, we include the long-run estimates into the short-run framework, since the failure to detect a long-run relationship with the other procedure may be attributed to nonlinear adjustment, which may bias downward the speed of adjustment if a linear specification is used (Taylor, 2006).

After analyzing the underlying long-run dynamics, we proceed by testing for nonlinearity in either an error correction or a VAR framework, as given in Equation (5), with  $\tau_{1,t}$  being zero

---

<sup>16</sup> See Granger and Teräsvirta (1993) or Teräsvirta (1994) for details.

in the latter case where no long-run relationship is found in the first step. If evidence for nonlinear adjustment is found, we apply the procedure described above to further distinguish between an ESTR and an LSTR setting before estimating our final model.

#### **4. Working hypotheses and estimation results**

To develop an adequate modelling strategy, we now identify different working hypotheses, which are then empirically tested according to the modelling cycle explained in the previous section. We start with the fairly obvious question of whether a long-run relationship between the EONIA and the different retail rates prevails over the long-run.

*H1: The EONIA and the retail rates are cointegrated.*

As a next step, we would expect that changes in the EONIA transmit to retail market rates even if a complete pass-through is not always detected.

*H2: Retail rates react positively but probably not always proportionally to changes in the EONIA.*

If H1 and H2 are not rejected, the next question is whether it is possible to identify asymmetries in the interest rate pass-through process.

*H3: The adjustment of the retail rates to changes in the EONIA or long-run deviations follows a nonlinear path.*

When evaluating the first three hypotheses, an obvious question is whether differences can be traced back to either cross-country differences or different kinds of retail rates.

*H4: The degree of pass-through and asymmetry varies with respect to countries or retail interest rates.*

The empirical results are summarized in Tables 1-4 according to the chosen model class. It is first worth mentioning that most retail interest rates are integrated of order one. When carrying out the tests for cointegration, the choice of the lag length was based on tests for autocorrelation, ARCH-effects and the Schwarz information criterion.<sup>17</sup> For each pass-through model we estimate Equation (3) with a maximum lag length of twelve months for each variable when applying the ARDL approach.

Tables 1 to 4 about here

---

<sup>17</sup> According to Rahbek et al. (2002), the results we gain in the following are still robust under the ARCH effects that remain in some cases.

Turning to the results of the cointegration test, a long-run relationship between the EONIA and the retail rate is frequently detected, according to the results given in Tables 1 and 2. Table 5 summarizes the overall findings concerning the long-run coefficients in relation to countries and interest rates. It also shows which interest rates have not been analyzed due to a lack of data availability.

Table 5 about here

The established relationship between the retail bank rate and the money market rate generally matches theoretical predictions, with both variables always being positively correlated in the case of linear cointegration (Table 1). This is also true in the case of nonlinear cointegration (Table 2), where a negative coefficient is only observed for one interest rate in Germany and Spain, a finding which may be attributed to the nonlinear adjustment process. In all other cases the significant values for  $\pi_1$  always display a positive relationship and mostly range from 0 to 1. However, in order to test H2, we analyze whether a strictly proportional pass-through mechanism holds by testing  $\pi_1 = 1$  based on a likelihood ratio procedure suggested by Juselius (2006) in the Johansen (1988, 1991) framework and an F-test in the framework of Pesaran et al. (2001). The findings show that this restriction is frequently rejected for most interest rates, which points to an imperfect PT in the long-run. For example, for Belgium the hypothesis of a complete PT is rejected in each case. Similarly, the hypothesis is rejected in five out of seven cases for Germany. The country in which the PT seems to be most complete or even more than complete is Spain. There, in only one case out of eight is the hypothesis of a complete PT rejected. There are even cases where the PT turns out to be significantly greater than one. Generally, the finding of an incomplete PT may in many cases be attributed to the short sample under investigation, nonlinear adjustment patterns or the impact of the recent crisis. Altogether, H1 and H2 cannot be rejected, since a long-run relationship is frequently detected and the PT is incomplete in the majority of cases. Hence, a preliminary finding is that the long-run relationship between EONIA and retail rates is frequently found for the comparably small period under investigation.

As a next step we put the issue of asymmetric adjustment under closer scrutiny. Table 6 provides a general overview of the findings with respect to evidence of nonlinearity.

Table 6 about here

The detailed findings concerning the nonlinearity of coefficients are given in Tables 2 and 4. The overall results obtained by the test for nonlinearity show that the null hypothesis of linearity is rejected in most cases. In addition, the LSTR specification is chosen ahead of an

ESTR model in nearly all cases, pointing to asymmetries stemming from positive or negative changes in interest rates. Hence, H3 cannot be rejected. The results of the nonlinear estimation in both Table 2 and Table 4 clearly indicate that the IRPT mechanism works much more efficiently in the first regime, where the direct impact of EONIA changes on the retail rates ( $\beta_{11}$  in Equation (5)) as well as the adjustment towards long-run equilibrium ( $\tau_{1,t}$  in Equation (5)) is faster. Since the EONIA serves as a transition variable, the first regime corresponds to decreasing interest rates, while the second refers to an increase in interest rates in cases of LSTR configuration. Hence, the pass-through mechanism and the adjustment to disequilibria occur faster if interest rates decrease, which is good news for borrowers. These findings may be related to an advanced banking competition or lower costs of monitoring credit rates, which does not allow for a direct transmission of higher interest rates. This part of our results is at odds with those of Mojon (2000). However, his results are based on data obtained prior to 2000, which might explain the differences.

The evaluation of hypothesis H4 is the most demanding task in our context, since identifying cross-country differences or differences in maturities of credit rates demands a careful comparison of the results. According to our synthesis of the long-run relationships in Table 5, cointegration is found in at least 70 percent of all cases for most economies. On the one hand, in Greece a long-run relationship is only detected in one out of six cases. Thus, the Greek interest cycle seems to differ considerably from the EMU cycle. Furthermore, the long-run PT coefficient even enters with the wrong sign. For Luxemburg and Ireland, a long-run relationship is found in two out of four cases. On the other hand, for countries which are typically referred to as core EMU countries, like Austria, Belgium or Germany, cointegration is much more evident, which points to a much more synchronous interest cycle. This finding highlights the fact that conversion in EMU still has not finished and that substantial differences remain.

When averaging the long-run PT coefficients by country, it is apparent that the average PT in Belgium, France and Germany of about 0.35-0.45 is only half as large as that in Austria, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg and Spain.

With respect to the duration of interest rates, two important implications arise. First, the relative frequency with which cointegration is detected is higher for short-term interest rates than for long-term interest rates. Furthermore, cointegration is especially evident for other lending and to a somewhat lesser extent for credits for house purchases. Secondly, the degree of pass-through related to the long-run coefficient is also higher on average for interest rates

with a shorter duration. Both patterns are intuitively plausible, since long-term interest rates also reflect additional factors such as inflationary expectations. Regarding the short-run PT, our results suggest that it is incomplete in most cases. This can be justified, for example, by menu costs or short-run disturbances (Goloso and Lucas, 2007, as the seminal reference). However, there does not seem to be such a clear pattern compared with the long-run PT. Neither does there seem to be a declining short-run PT by maturity or country-specific properties. But in many cases, the short-run PT is weaker compared to the long-run effect. Turning to the degree of asymmetries, a nonlinear pattern in terms of ESTR or LSTR models is slightly more frequently observed than a long-run relationship, which points to the fact that asymmetries are also observed if cointegration is not found. No clear pattern arises with respect to nonlinearity and the duration of interest rates. Overall, the ambiguous results for the short-run may, as concerns countries and interest rates, be explained by the short-run volatility of interest rates and further determinants such as fundamental factors.

## **5. Conclusion**

This study has analyzed the interest rate pass-through from money market to various loan rates for up to twelve countries of the European Monetary Union between 2003 and 2011. Applying various cointegration techniques, we first tested for a long-run relationship between loan rates and the EONIA, before allowing for asymmetric short-run adjustment. Our results, based on completely harmonized data, point to considerable differences in the size of the pass-through with respect to either different loan rates or countries. In the majority of cases, the pass-through is incomplete and the dynamics of loan rate adjustment are different for reductions and rises in money market rates. The relative frequency with which cointegration is detected is higher for short-term than long-term interest rates. The degree of pass-through according to the long-run coefficient is also higher on average for loan rates with shorter maturity. On the country level, Greece in particular stands out. While for most of the countries under study there is a long-run relationship between retail rates and the short-term money market rate, in Greece cointegration is found only in one out of six cases. With regard to the extent of the PT, it is on the one hand Spain which seems to have the most complete or even more than complete PT, while on the other hand we have Belgium and Germany, where the hypothesis of a complete PT is most often rejected.

To sum up, our results confirm the findings of, for example, de Bondt (2002, 2005) or Sander and Kleimeier (2006), that the interest rate pass-through mechanism is characterized by considerable cross-country variation and that it is difficult to identify a clear pattern. This

conclusion holds even when using harmonized data, as in this investigation. A possible caveat is that our findings correspond to a comparably short period of time, owing to the fact that harmonized data are only available from 2003.

## References

- Angeloni, I. and Ehrmann, M. (2003): Monetary Transmission in the Euro Area: Early Evidence, *Economic Policy*, Vol. 18, 469-501.
- Caporale, G. M. and Pittis, N. (1999): Efficient Estimation of Cointegration Vectors and Testing for Causality in Vector Autoregressions, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 13(1), 1-35.
- Chionis, D. P. and Leon, C. A. (2006): Interest Rate Transmission in Greece: Did EMU Cause a Structural Break?, *Journal of Policy Modeling* 28, 453-466.
- Čihák, M., Harjes, T. and Stavev, E. (2009): Euro Area Monetary Policy in Uncharted Waters, IMF Working Paper, 09/185.
- Cottarelli, C. and Kourelis, A. (1994): Financial Structure, Bank Lending Rates, and the Transmission Mechanism of Monetary Policy, *IMF Staff Papers*, Vol. 41, No. 4.
- De Bondt, G. J. (2002): Retail Bank Interest Rate Pass-Through: New Evidence at the Euro Area Level, Working Paper No. 136.
- De Bondt, G. J. (2005): Interest Rate Pass-Through: Empirical Results for the Euro Area, *German Economic Review* 6(1), 37-78.
- De Haan, J., Sturm, J.-E. and Toolsema, L. A. (2001): Convergence of Monetary Transmission in EMU New Evidence, CESifo Working Paper No. 465.
- ECB (2009): Recent Developments in the Retail Bank Interest Rate Pass-Through in the Euro Area, *ECB Monthly Bulletin*, August, 93-105.
- Enders, W. (2009): *Applied Econometric Time Series*, 3rd Edition, Wiley, Hoboken.
- Engle, R. F., and Granger, C. W. (1987): Co-integration and Error-correction: Representation, Estimation and Testing, *Econometrica*, 55, 1251-1276.
- Franses, P.H. and Van Dijk, D. (2000): *Nonlinear Time Series Models in Empirical Finance*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Gigineishvili, N. (2011): Determinants of Interest Rate Pass-Through: Do Macroeconomic Conditions and Financial Market Structure Matter?, IMF Working Paper, 11/176.
- Golosov, M., and Lucas. R. E. Jr. (2007): Menu Costs and Phillips Curves, *Journal of Political Economy*, 115,171-199.

- Granger, C. W. J. and Teräsvirta, T. (1993): *Modelling Nonlinear Economic Relationships*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Gropp, R., Kok Sørensen, C. and Lichtenberger, J.-D. (2007): *The Dynamics of Bank Spreads and Financial Structure*, Working Paper Series, No. 714.
- Hargreaves, C. (1994): A Review of Methods of Estimating Cointegrating Relationships, in: Hargreaves, C. (ed.), *Nonstationary Time Series Analysis and Cointegration*, Oxford, 87-131.
- Hofmann, B. (2006): EMU and the Transmission of Monetary Policy: Evidence from Business Lending Rates, *Empirica*, No. 33, 209–229.
- Jobst, C. and Kwapil, C. (2008): The Interest Rate Pass-Through in Austria – Effects of the Financial Crisis, *Monetary Policy & The Economy Q4/08*.
- Johansen, S. (1988): Statistical Analysis of Cointegration Vectors, *Journal Of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 12(2-3), 231-254.
- Johansen, S. (1991): Estimation and Hypothesis Testing of Cointegrated Vectors in Gaussian Vector Autoregressive Models, *Econometrica*, 59(6), 1551-1580.
- Juselius, K., (2006): *The Cointegrated VAR Model: Econometric Methodology and Macroeconomic Applications*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Karagiannis, S., Panagopoulos, Y. and Vlamis, P. (2010): Interest Rate Pass-Through in Europe and the US: Monetary Policy After the Financial Crisis, *Journal of Policy Modeling* 32, 323–338.
- Kwapil, C. and Scharler (2010): Interest Rate Pass-Through, Monetary Policy Rules And Macroeconomic Stability, *Journal of International Money and Finance* 29, 236–251.
- Kok Sørensen, C. and Werner, T. (2006): Bank Interest Rate Pass-Through in the Euro Area - a Cross Country Comparison, Working Paper Series, No. 580.
- Luukonen, R., Saikkonen, P. and Teräsvirta, T. (1988): Testing Linearity Against Smooth Transition Autoregressive Models, *Biometrika*, 75, 491-499.
- Mojon, B. (2000): Financial Structure and the Interest Rate Channel of ECB Monetary Policy, European Central Bank, Working Paper No. 40.
- Pesaran, M. H., Shin, Y., and Smith, R. J. (2001): Bounds Testing Approaches to the Analysis of Level Relationships, *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 16, 289-326.
- Phillips, P.C.B. and Loretan, M. (1991): Estimating Long-Run Economic Equilibria, *Review of Economic Studies*, 58(3), 407-436.

- Rahbek, A., Hansen, E. and Dennis, J. G. (2002): ARCH Innovations and Their Impact on Cointegration Rank Testing, Department of Theoretical Statistics, Centre for Analytical Finance, Working Paper No. 22, University of Copenhagen.
- Sander, H. and Kleimeier, S. (2002): Asymmetric Adjustment of Commercial Bank Interest Rates in the Euro Area: An Empirical Investigation into Interest Rate Pass-Through, *Kredit und Kapital*, Heft 2, 1-32.
- Sander, H. and Kleimeier, S. (2004): Convergence in Euro-Zone Retail Banking? What Interest Rate Pass-Through Tells Us About Monetary Policy Transmission, Competition and Integration, *Journal of International Money and Finance*, No. 23, 461–492.
- Sander, H. and Kleimeier, S. (2006): Expected Versus Unexpected Monetary Policy Impulses and Interest Rate Pass-Through in Euro-Zone Retail Banking Markets, *Journal of Banking & Finance*, No. 30, 1839–1870.
- Taylor, M. P., Peel, D. A. and Sarno, L. (2001): Nonlinear Mean-Reversion in Real Exchange Rates, Towards a Solution To The Purchasing Power Parity Puzzles, *International Economic Review*, 42(4), 1015-42.
- Taylor, M. P. (2006): Real Exchange Rates and Purchasing Power Parity: Mean-Reversion in Economic Thought, *Applied Financial Economics*, 16(1-2), 1-17.
- 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): Modeling Economic Relationships With Smooth Transition Regressions, in: Giles, D. E. A. (ed.), *Handbook of Applied Economic Statistics*, New York, 507-552.
- Vajanne, L. (2007): Integration in Euro Area Retail Banking Markets – Convergence of Credit Interest Rates, *Bank of Finland Research Discussion Papers* 27.
- Van Dijk, D., Teräsvirta, T. and Franses, P. H. (2002): Smooth Transition Autoregressive Models - A Survey of Recent Developments, *Econometric Reviews*, 21(1), 1-47.
- Van Leuvensteijn, M., Kok Sørensen, C., Bikker, J. A. and Van Rixtel, A. (2008): Impact of Bank Competition on the Interest Rate Pass-Through in the Euro Area, *Working Paper Series*, No. 885.
- Von Borstel, J. (2008): Interest Rate Pass-Through in Germany and the Euro Area, *ROME Discussion Paper Series*, No.08-05.

**Table 1: Results for linear cointegration**

interest rate	Long-run PT coefficient	Constant	Dummy	Cointegration	complete PT	Short-run PT coefficient	EC-term	model
brc0_bel	0.364 (8.484)	5.726 (24.926)	-0.076 (-0.671)	42.058***	0.000	-0.053 (-0.189)	-1.001 (-6.649)	Johansen
brc2_ger	0.004 (0.149)	8.822 (4.775)	-0.549 (-4.480)	7.831**	0.000	-0.277 (-2.453)	-0.746 (-4.912)	ARDL
brc2_ita	0.477 (3.790)	6.345 (3.563)	0.813 (3.148)	5.392*	0.006	0.279 (3.022)	-0.253 (-4.064)	ARDL
brh0_fin	0.953 (36.022)	0.655 (4.657)	0.461 (6.706)	36.265***	0.169	0.054 (0.520)	-0.313 (-4.880)	Johansen
brh0_ger	0.861 (3.723)	2.57 (2.846)	0.314 (2.516)	5.771**	0.135	0.197 (2.668)	-0.273 (-4.206)	ARDL
brh0_ire	0.957 (3.360)	1.397 (2.501)	1.07 (3.652)	5.645*	0.539	0.323 (3.715)	-0.273 (-4.167)	ARDL
brh0_ita	1.018 (46.544)	0.869 (7.402)	0.539 (9.326)	36.724***	0.987	0.276 (3.840)	0.145 (1.970)	Johansen
brh0_lux	0.713 (29.685)	2.486 (19.013)	-0.447 (-6.896)	48.741***	0.000	0.032 (0.331)	-0.458 (-6.964)	Johansen
brh1_bel	0.549 (3.914)	2.886 (3.311)	0.599 (2.481)	5.620*	0.010	0.042 (0.556)	-0.130 (-4.152)	ARDL
brh1_fin	0.485 (5.692)	2.884 (6.194)	0.026 (0.113)	24.17*	0.017	0.065 (0.592)	-0.239 (-3.925)	Johansen
brh1_ger	0.560 (3.645)	3.010 (3.173)	0.038 (0.193)	5.134*	0.012	0.149 (2.820)	-0.131 (-3.971)	ARDL
bro0_aut	0.917 (19.198)	1.759 (6.834)	0.218 (1.727)	29.036**	0.223	0.132 (0.864)	-0.430 (-5.022)	Johansen
bro0_ger	0.796 (24.778)	2.077 (11.898)	-0.009 (-0.104)	24.605*	0.000	0.363 (2.680)	-0.548 (-4.726)	Johansen
bro0_lux	0.929 (4.780)	1.586 (4.232)	-0.025 (-0.222)	7.619**	0.146	0.458 (3.738)	-0.409 (-4.836)	ARDL
bro0_ned	0.806 (3.552)	1.452 (3.294)	0.457 (2.024)	4.780*	0.030	0.461 (3.430)	-0.310 (-3.826)	ARDL
bro0_por	0.764	5.162	0.172	7.287**	0.121	0.032	-0.424	ARDL

	(3.658)	(4.137)	(0.506)			(0.094)	(-4.728)	
bro1_aut	0.742 (5.702)	2.564 (4.859)	0.655 (3.382)	11.764***	0.005	0.812 (3.392)	-0.638 (-6.006)	ARDL
bro1_bel	0.653 (9.973)	2.172 (6.107)	0.878 (4.992)	30.747**	0.015	0.412 (2.580)	-0.419 (-4.285)	Johansen
bro1_ger	0.617 (9.428)	2.823 (7.941)	0.640 (3.644)	24.958*	0.177	0.329 (3.278)	-0.232 (-3.579)	Johansen
bro2_bel	-0.090 (-0.861)	6.155 (10.886)	-0.811 (-2.908)	23.263*	0.002	0.167 (1.700)	-0.075 (-1.910)	Johansen
bro2_ger	-0.011 (-0.098)	6.041 (10.032)	-0.903 (-3.045)	25.270*	0.007	0.066 (0.740)	-0.071 (-2.061)	Johansen
bro2_ned	0.524 (3.481)	3.129 (2.676)	0.681 (2.089)	4.753*	0.044	0.261 (1.690)	-0.304 (-3.816)	ARDL

Notes: brc, brh and bro denote loans for consumption, house purchase and other purposes respectively. 0, 1 and 2 stand for the different maturities of up to 1 year, 1-5 years and over 5 years (5-10 years for brh). The values in brackets give the t-values of the coefficients. The column labelled “Cointegration” gives either the trace test (Johansen system approach) or the F-test (ARDL approach) for the null hypothesis of no cointegration against the alternative of at least one cointegrating relationship. Asterisks (\*, \*\*, \*\*\*) denote significance at the 10-, 5- and 1%-levels respectively. The column “complete PT” gives the p-value of a test (LM test in the Johansen system approach and F-test in the ARDL approach) for a long-run PT coefficient equal to one. The last column shows the chosen model. The coefficients are derived from Equations (2) and (3) for the ARDL approach and Equation (4) for the Johansen approach.

**Table 2: Results for nonlinear cointegration**

interest rate	Long-run PT coefficient	Constant	Dummy	Cointegration	complete PT	$\beta_{10}$	$\beta_{20}$	$\tau_1$	$\tau_2$	$\gamma$	model
brc0_aut	0.890 (3.594)	2.143 (5.982)	1.057 (5.979)	26.424**	0.446	0.258 (2.497)	-0.081 (-0.558)	-0.444 (-6.807)	0.486 (3.598)	1.792 (1.412)	ARDL, LSTR
brc0_esp	-1.681 (-2.679)	22.198 (6.705)	-7.829 (-4.868)	27.912**	0.769	-0.706 (-0.545)	1.673 (0.688)	0.329 (1.069)	-0.642 (-1.099)	1.041 (0.999)	Johansen, LSTR
brc0_ire	0.652 (2.816)	3.745 (3.218)	1.357 (2.850)	5.061*	0.047	1.584 (3.003)	-0.844 (-0.851)	-0.452 (-1.020)	0.141 (0.355)	-15.057 (-0.767)	ARDL, LSTR
brc0_ita	-0.285 (-0.989)	15.693 (10.063)	-3.791 (-4.929)	24.619*	0.001	-0.648 (-0.683)	0.429 (0.378)	-0.575 (-7.350)	0.516 (6.961)	469.061 (4.366)	Johansen, ESTR
brc0_por	0.396	6.276	1.057	5.464*	0.171	0.611	-0.732	-0.090	0.002	0.559	ARDL,

	(1.270)	(2.043)	(1.167)			(-6.967)	(-1.791)	(-3.067)	(0.060)	(1.278)	ESTR
brc1_aut	1.395	1.463	2.219	7.515**	0.002	0.047	1.194	-0.456	0.410	8.836	ARDL,
	(4.082)	(2.181)	(3.409)			(0.095)	(3.996)	(-3.205)	(2.377)	(0.500)	LSTR
brc1_bel	0.035	8.622	-1.215	36.647***	0.000	0.273	-0.745	0.007	-0.349	1.328	Johansen,
	(0.392)	(17.739)	(-5.070)			(1.217)	(-1.333)	(0.089)	(-2.039)	(2.214)	LSTR
brc1_esp	0.948	2.731	2.511	39.250***	0.949	0.772	-0.478	-0.455	0.412	74.487	Johansen,
	(13.811)	(7.371)	(13.690)			(6.798)	(-1.952)	(-8.842)	(4.447)	(0.583)	LSTR
brc1_fra	0.018	7.165	-0.596	26.911**	0.003	-0.257	0.180	-0.300	0.177	15.695	Johansen,
	(0.214)	(15.824)	(-2.673)			(-5.858)	(2.665)	(-5.372)	(2.175)	(0.650)	LSTR
brc1_ger	-0.449	9.037	-1.752	29.076**	0.000	0.068	-0.732	-0.011	-0.145	3.101	Johansen,
	(-4.645)	(17.160)	(-6.728)			(0.531)	(-2.697)	(-0.158)	(-1.282)	(0.798)	LSTR
brc2_aut	0.589	3.407	0.773	6.360**	0.012	-0.137	0.509	-0.388	-0.590	30.781	ARDL,
	(4.065)	(3.421)	(2.712)			(-0.612)	(2.241)	(-2.109)	(-2.377)	(1.997)	LSTR
brc2_bel	0.037	10.815	-1.228	25.499*	0.011	-3.774	6.617	-0.395	0.448	0.503	Johansen,
	(0.164)	(8.878)	(-2.039)			(-1.276)	(1.133)	(-1.283)	(0.806)	(0.599)	LSTR
brc2_esp	1.064	0.803	3.925	57.410***	0.481	0.340	-0.247	0.001	-0.015	5.519	Johansen,
	(14.757)	(2.072)	(20.545)			(3.232)	(-1.849)	(0.112)	(-1.286)	(1.058)	LSTR
brh0_aut	0.924	1.965	0.091	56.243***	0.288	0.524	-0.799	-0.307	0.176	1.123	Johansen,
	(18.260)	(7.386)	(0.710)			(3.297)	(-2.432)	(-10.320)	(2.420)	(1.647)	LSTR
brh0_esp	1.171	0.812	1.278	5.324*	0.006	0.515	-0.250	-0.329	0.155	1.723	ARDL,
	(3.919)	(2.751)	(3.706)			(3.196)	(-0.745)	(-2.811)	(0.530)	(0.621)	LSTR
brh0_fra	0.850	1.729	1.082	9.331***	0.158	0.619	-0.835	-0.277	0.193	0.888	ARDL,
	(5.045)	(3.252)	(3.966)			(3.479)	(-1.882)	(-5.869)	(1.611)	(1.013)	LSTR
brh0_ned	1.181	0.966	2.229	8.856***	0.014	0.524	-0.175	-0.073	-0.064	19.244	ARDL,
	(4.732)	(2.462)	(4.490)			(7.515)	(-2.193)	(-2.195)	(-1.551)	(0.619)	LSTR
brh1_aut	0.531	2.021	0.084	24.637*	0.048	0.105	-0.162	0.054	-0.460	1.447	Johansen,
	(4.939)	(3.522)	(0.304)			(0.544)	(-0.343)	(0.668)	(-2.479)	(0.905)	LSTR
brh1_esp	1.314	-1.274	1.915	32.538***	0.000	0.883	-0.586	0.260	-0.149	3.475	Johansen,
	(19.321)	(-3.492)	(10.669)			(8.512)	(-5.785)	(6.112)	(-2.815)	(1.108)	LSTR
brh1_fra	0.636	2.329	0.633	15.869***	0.004	0.076	-0.117	-0.142	0.024	40.158	ARDL,
	(6.273)	(4.244)	(3.276)			(2.132)	(-2.797)	(-8.438)	(0.867)	(0.777)	LSTR
brh2_fra	0.780	1.935	0.697	10.897***	0.245	-0.133	0.302	-0.105	0.069	81.253	ARDL,
	(5.021)	(2.476)	(2.421)			(-1.801)	(3.026)	(-5.889)	(2.088)	(0.209)	LSTR
brh2_gre	-0.837	11.039	-2.928	25.346*	0.000	-0.329	0.730	-0.040	0.076	1.571	Johansen,

	(-4.527)	(10.922)	(-5.863)			(-0.683)	(0.770)	(-0.601)	(0.719)	(0.426)	LSTR
bro0_bel	0.822	2.262	-0.074	39.039***	0.001	0.710	-0.512	-0.598	0.452	1.528	Johansen, LSTR
	(20.960)	(10.628)	(-0.706)			(3.735)	(-1.513)	(-8.839)	(3.013)	(1.417)	
bro0_esp	0.854	0.974	-2.350	28.486**	0.045	2.333	-3.504	0.068	-0.164	0.405	Johansen, LSTR
	(12.089)	(2.626)	(-20.030)			(0.856)	(-0.643)	(0.447)	(-0.523)	(0.511)	
bro0_fra	0.261	5.504	-1.440	35.348***	0.000	0.295	0.039	-0.118	0.086	80.488	Johansen, LSTR
	(2.502)	(9.736)	(-5.164)			(1.884)	(0.234)	(-3.151)	(1.524)	(0.118)	
bro0_ita	1.206	0.351	1.666	24.109*	0.001	1.247	-1.285	-0.348	0.034	1.161	Johansen, LSTR
	(26.621)	(1.425)	(13.677)			(5.883)	(-4.846)	(-2.357)	(0.138)	(1.897)	
bro1_esp	1.134	-0.680	2.816	25.469*	0.345	1.048	-0.987	0.024	-0.037	12.411	Johansen, LSTR
	(9.585)	(-1.056)	(8.843)			(7.302)	(-5.544)	(1.869)	(-1.438)	(2.355)	
bro1_fra	-0.142	7.332	-1.832	37.037***	0.000	0.421	-0.539	0.045	-0.154	123.862	Johansen, LSTR
	(-1.395)	(13.255)	(-6.732)			(3.610)	(-1.979)	(1.225)	(-1.971)	(0.245)	
bro1_ita	0.846	1.599	1.448	28.158**	0.031	0.708	0.019	-0.358	-0.163	91.221	Johansen, LSTR
	(17.748)	(6.181)	(11.322)			(5.672)	(0.087)	(-4.944)	(-1.286)	(0.509)	
bro2_esp	0.894	0.093	3.368	24.554*	0.352	1.375	-0.841	-0.536	0.286	1.731	Johansen, LSTR
	(9.173)	(0.177)	(12.939)			(3.149)	(-1.086)	(-2.673)	(0.876)	(0.527)	
bro2_fin	0.810	2.494	0.873	4.666	0.376	0.015	0.519	-0.277	-0.365	6.524	ARDL, LSTR
	(3.314)	(2.349)	(1.711)			(0.078)	(1.676)	(-3.663)	(-3.217)	(1.039)	
bro2_fra	0.734	0.590	1.369	28.924**	0.496	0.466	-0.266	-0.022	-0.058	8.358	Johansen, LSTR
	(5.085)	(0.764)	(3.674)			(6.062)	(-1.766)	(-0.558)	(-0.694)	(0.540)	
bro2_ita	0.696	2.001	1.411	33.916***	0.004	1.043	-0.986	-0.231	0.167	1.303	Johansen, LSTR
	(14.060)	(7.439)	(10.608)			(1.713)	(-0.820)	(-0.925)	(0.395)	(0.735)	

Notes: brc, brh and bro denote loans for consumption, house purchase and other purposes respectively. 0, 1 and 2 stand for the different maturities of up to 1 year, 1-5 years and over 5 years (5-10 years for brh). The values in brackets give the t-values of the coefficients. The column labelled "Cointegration" gives either the trace test (Johansen system approach) or the F-test (ARDL approach) for the null hypothesis of no cointegration against the alternative of at least one cointegrating relationship. Asterisks (\*, \*\*, \*\*\*) denote significance at the 10-, 5- and 1%-levels respectively. The column "complete PT" gives the p-value of a test (LM test in the Johansen system approach and F-test in the ARDL approach) for a long-run PT coefficient equal to one. The last column shows the chosen model. The coefficients are derived from Equations (2), (3), (4) and (5).

**Table 3: Results for linear 1st differences**

interest rate	Short-run PT coefficient
brc0_fra	-0.225 (-1.146)
brc2_gre	-0.196 (-0.608)
brc2_ned	0.002 (0.007)
brh0_gre	0.445 (4.581)
brh2_aut	0.181 (1.210)
brh2_fin	0.413 (3.148)
brh2_ger	0.079 (1.778)
brh2_ita	0.106 (0.853)
bro0_fin	0.499 (3.681)
bro2_aut	-0.435 (-1.390)

Notes: brc, brh and bro denote loans for consumption, house purchase and other purposes respectively. 0, 1 and 2 stand for the different maturities of up to 1 year, 1-5 years and over 5 years (5-10 years for brh). The values in brackets give the t-values of the coefficients.

**Table 4: Results for nonlinear 1st differences**

interest rate	$\beta_{10}$	$\beta_{20}$	$\tau_1$	$\tau_2$	$\gamma$	model
brc0_ger	0.214 (0.675)	-2.310 (-0.716)	0.332 (1.08)	-0.795 (-0.841)	0.425 (1.647)	ESTR
brc0_gre	1.679 (2.855)	1.658 (3.476)	-1.655 (-5.186)	-1.681 (-6.990)	60.392 (2.339)	ESTR
brc0_fin	0.329 (1.226)	0.242 (0.456)	0.606 (1.68)	-0.631 (-1.483)	9.231 (0.450)	ESTR
brc0_ned	0.650 (1.626)	12.145 (0.750)	-0.482 (-0.812)	-10.255 (-0.820)	0.541 (1.030)	LSTR
brc1_fin	0.178 (0.910)	0.368 (0.896)	0.522 (3.390)	-0.416 (-2.020)	149.693 (1.194)	LSTR
brc1_gre	0.103 (0.281)	-4.051 (-0.323)	0.143 (0.454)	8.550 (0.391)	7.222 (0.769)	LSTR
brc1_ita	0.447 (2.751)	1.738 (1.811)	-0.253 (-1.578)	-1.014 (-1.877)	2.912 (0.499)	LSTR
brc1_ned	0.176 (0.685)	2.401 (0.244)	-0.082 (-0.251)	-11.934 (-0.266)	42.289 (0.126)	LSTR
brc1_por	-0.446 (-1.137)	1.856 (1.477)	0.552 (1.413)	-2.516 (-1.564)	24.940 (0.944)	ESTR
brc2_fin	0.547 (1.268)	3.361 (0.873)	-0.519 (-1.366)	-5.466 (-1.399)	5.017 (3.156)	ESTR
brc2_fra	0.112 (0.611)	-6.15 (-0.135)	0.023 (0.167)	18.244 (0.141)	0.983 (0.668)	ESTR
brc2_lux	0.438 (1.934)	-0.427 (-0.886)	1.073 (3.138)	-1.723 (-6.051)	-5.6792 (-1.708)	LSTR
brh0_por	-0.019 (-0.225)	3.335 (0.239)	0.027 (0.227)	56.460 (0.222)	1.181 (1.37)	LSTR
brh1_gre	-0.557 (-2.246)	0.946 (2.45)	0.502 (1.864)	-1.056 (-3.549)	3.363 (0.871)	LSTR
brh1_ita	0.253* (1.894)	-1.173 (-0.870)	0.246 (1.897)	1.858 (1.101)	15.533 (0.825)	LSTR
brh1_ned	0.279 (1.716)	-2.030 (-0.640)	0.222 (0.747)	-1.050 (-0.598)	0.670 (0.771)	ESTR

brh2_bel	0.027 (0.206)	-0.061 (-0.125)	0.267 (4.080)	-0.721 (-2.840)	17.002 (0.819)	ESTR
brh2_esp	-0.600 (-1.918)	1.625 (3.207)	0.703 (2.664)	-1.075 (-0.994)	5.285 (0.937)	ESTR
brh2_ned	0.056 (0.798)	0.191 (0.114)	0.043 (1.117)	-1.396 (-2.441)	50.590 (0.484)	LSTR
bro1_fin	0.951 (1.881)	1.355 (0.763)	-0.490 (-0.647)	-3.540 (-1.103)	-3.295 (-0.616)	LSTR
bro1_ned	0.467 (2.922)	-0.731 (-0.626)	0.550 (3.000)	-0.989 (-1.564)	-29,176 (-0.485)	LSTR

Notes: brc, brh and bro denote loans for consumption, house purchase and other purposes respectively. 0, 1 and 2 stand for the different maturities of up to 1 year, 1-5 years and over 5 years (5-10 years for brh). The values in brackets give the t-values of the coefficients. The last column shows the chosen model. The coefficients are derived from Equations (2), (3), (4) and (5). The coefficients are derived from Equation (5).

**Table 5: Synthesis of empirical results for the long-run**

	brc0	brc1	brc2	brh0	brh1	brh2	bro0	bro1	bro2	Cointegration
AUT	0.89	1.395	0.589	0.924	0.531	---	0.917	0.742	---	7/9
BEL	0.364	0.035	0.037	---	0.549	---	0.822	0.653	-0.09	7/9
ESP	-1.681	0.948	1.064	1.171	1.314	---	0.854	1.134	0.894	8/9
FIN	---	---	---	0.953	0.485	---	---	---	0.81	3/9
FRA	---	0.018	---	0.85	0.636	0.78	0.261	-0.142	0.734	7/9
GER	---	-0.449	0.004	0.861	0.56	---	0.796	0.617	-0.011	7/9
GRE	---	---	---	---	---	-0.837	/	/	/	1/6
IRE	0.652	/	/	0.957	/	/	/	/	/	2/2
ITA	-0.285	---	0.477	1.018	---	---	1.206	0.846	0.696	6/9
LUX	/	---	---	0.713	/	/	0.929	/	/	2/4
NED	---	---	---	1.181	---	---	0.806	---	0.524	3/9
POR	0.396	---	/	---	/	/	0,764	/	/	2/4
Cointegration	6/11	5/11	5/10	10/12	6/9	2/9	9/10	6/8	7/8	


Note: The table summarizes the findings with regard to the long-run coefficients obtained from cointegration according to Tables 1 and 3. “/” denotes cases where the interest rate is not available while “---” corresponds to the cases where cointegration is not detected.

**Table 6: Synthesis of the findings with regard to nonlinearity**

	brc0	brc1	brc2	brh0	brh1	brh2	bro0	bro1	bro2
AUT	LSTR	LSTR	LSTR	LSTR	LSTR	---	---	---	---
BEL	---	LSTR	LSTR	ESTR	---	LSTR	LSTR	---	---
ESP	LSTR								
FIN	ESTR	LSTR	LSTR	---	---	---	---	LSTR	LSTR
FRA	---	LSTR							
GER	ESTR	LSTR	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
GRE	ESTR	LSTR	---	---	LSTR	LSTR	/	/	/
IRE	LSTR	/	/	---	/	/	/	/	/
ITA	ESTR	LSTR	---	---	LSTR	---	LSTR	LSTR	LSTR
LUX	/	---	LSTR	---	/	/	---	/	/
NED	LSTR	LSTR	---	LSTR	LSTR	LSTR	---	LSTR	---
POR	ESTR	ESTR	/	LSTR	/	/	---	/	/

Note: The table summarizes the findings with regard to nonlinearity according to Tables 2 and 4. LSTR corresponds to a transition function of the logistic type, while ESTR corresponds to the exponential type. “/” denotes cases where the interest rate is not available while “---” corresponds to the cases where nonlinearity is not detected.

**Figure 1: Illustration of the modelling cycle**



**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<br>Karlheinz Ruckriegel<br>Franz Seitz  |
| 2 | 2007 | Money and Inflation. Lessons from the US for ECB Monetary Policy   | Ansgar Belke<br>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<br>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<br>Walter Orth<br>Ralph Setzer          |
| 3 | 2008 | Measuring the Quality of Eligible Collateral   | Philipp Lehmbecker<br>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<br>Franz Seitz<br>Andreas Worms |
| 2 | 2009 | Current Account Imbalances and Structural Adjustment in the Euro Area: How to Rebalance Competitiveness          | Ansgar Belke<br>Gunther Schnabl<br>Holger Zemanek    |
| 3 | 2009 | A Simple Model of an Oil Based Global Savings Glut – The “China Factor” and the OPEC Cartel                      | Ansgar Belke<br>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