

The background of the cover is a detailed black and white engraving of three figures in historical attire. On the left, a man in a cap and long coat stands with his hands on his hips. In the center, a woman in a long dress and hat stands with her hands clasped. On the right, another woman in a long dress and hat stands with her hands on her hips. The figures are set against a light background with some architectural elements.

WORKING PAPER 83

THE BUSINESS CYCLE OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

BAYESIAN CLUSTERING OF COUNTRY-

INDIVIDUAL IP GROWTH SERIES

SYLVIA KAUFMANN

Editorial Board of the Working Papers

Eduard Hochreiter, Coordinating Editor
Ernest Gnan,
Wolfdietrich Grau,
Peter Mooslechner
Kurt Pribil

Statement of Purpose

The Working Paper series of the Oesterreichische Nationalbank is designed to disseminate and to provide a platform for discussion of either work of the staff of the OeNB economists or outside contributors on topics which are of special interest to the OeNB. To ensure the high quality of their content, the contributions are subjected to an international refereeing process. The opinions are strictly those of the authors and do in no way commit the OeNB.

Imprint: Responsibility according to Austrian media law: Wolfdietrich Grau, Secretariat of the Board of Executive Directors, Oesterreichische Nationalbank

Published and printed by Oesterreichische Nationalbank, Wien.

The Working Papers are also available on our website:

<http://www.oenb.co.at/workpaper/pubwork.htm>

Editorial

In the present paper, Sylvia Kaufmann uses time series on industrial production growth of individual countries to investigate the following questions: (i) Is there a common growth cycle for the euro area countries? (ii) Did the synchronization change over time? (iii) Can we discriminate between a “European” and an “overseas” cycle? (iv) Which countries follow the “overseas” rather than the “European” cycle? To obtain the inference, the author uses an autoregressive panel data framework whereby the groups of co-moving countries are estimated adaptively along with the model parameters using Bayesian simulation methods.

July 14, 2003

The business cycle of European countries. Bayesian clustering of country-individual IP growth series.

Sylvia Kaufmann[†]

May 2003

Abstract

In the present paper, time series on industrial production growth of individual countries are used to investigate the following questions: (i) Is there a common growth cycle for the euro area countries? (ii) Did the synchronization change over time? (iii) Can we discriminate between a “European” and an “overseas” cycle? (iv) Which countries follow the “overseas” rather than the “European” cycle? To obtain the inference, I use an autoregressive panel data framework whereby the groups of co-moving countries are estimated adaptively along with the model parameters using Bayesian simulation methods.

JEL classification: C15, C33, E32

Key words: Business cycle, Bayesian clustering, Markov switching, Markov chain Monte Carlo, panel data.

1 Introduction

The paper deals with the question whether the growth rate of industrial production (IP) has followed the same or a similar business cycle pattern in euro area countries and in all European countries. Moreover, the approach taken here allows to assess the relation of the European countries with transatlantic or “overseas” countries, in particular Australia, Canada, Japan and the United States. The focus lies on three different observation periods, a long-term historical perspective (1978-2001), a medium-term (1990-2001)

*Oesterreichische Nationalbank, Economic Studies Division, P.O. Box 61, A-1010 Vienna, e-mail sylvia.kaufmann@oenb.co.at, phone +431 40420-7222, fax +431 40420-7299

[†]I would like to thank Melanie Groschan for assembling the dataset. The views expressed in the paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the OeNB.

and a short-term perspective (1999-2001), which reveals whether the synchronization of IP growth has changed among the countries in the course of increasing European integration.

The individual country series are analyzed within a panel data framework which enables us to enlarge the focus from the euro area towards a European versus overseas perspective or/and to restrict the observation period to the recent three years of the common European currency. The model specification allows for a time-varying constant that switches according to a latent state indicator which itself follows a Markov switching process. Countries that follow the same or a similar switching pattern are grouped together whereby the groupings, i.e. which countries can be pooled together, are not set a priori. Rather, for a given number of groups, the classification of countries is estimated along with the model parameters and the latent state indicator.

The first contribution of the paper lies in the methodological approach. The presence of two latent indicator variables renders maximum likelihood methods infeasible and therefore, the estimation is cast into a Bayesian framework. The posterior distributions of the model parameters and the inference on the state- and the group-indicators are obtained with the use of Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulations. The sampling scheme builds on the one proposed in Frühwirth-Schnatter and Kaufmann (2002a) and is extended here to group-specific switching state-indicators. The work is related to Artis et al. (1999), who estimate a common growth cycle for nine European countries by means of a Markov switching vector autoregressive (MS-VAR) model. From a methodological point of view, the advantage of the panel framework used in the present paper is that the number of countries entering the analysis may be increased without having to cope with an exponentially growing number of parameters to estimate. Moreover, while in Artis et al. (1999) all countries are pooled into one group and underly the switches simultaneously, here, potentially, different groups of countries are allowed for, that do not switch all at the same time.

The second contribution of the paper consists in the two pieces of evidence obtained from the results on the euro area and the European countries on the one hand and on the European versus the overseas countries on the other hand. When the euro area (and the European countries) are analyzed on their own, it turns out that in the long-term and in the medium-term perspective, they may be pooled together into one group. When the investigation includes all European and the overseas countries, we are able to identify a “European” and an “overseas” cycle whereby the latter is primarily determined by Australia, Canada and the US.¹ This is broadly consistent

¹Over the long-term and the medium-term perspective, Japan is following the European cycle, whereas during the last three years, it moved more closely with Canada and the US.

with previous literature that analyzed the synchronization and the correlation structure of European economies. Artis and Zhang (1997, 1999) find that the contemporaneous correlation between European countries has increased during the ERM period while at the same time the correlation with the US cycle has decreased. Forni and Reichlin (2001) analyze regional output fluctuations in 9 European countries and find out that the European component explains almost 50% of output growth in most regions and that it is highly correlated among the regions, which indicates a high degree of synchronization of output fluctuations in Europe. Finally, in a recent study, Mitchell and Mouratidis (2002) find that average correlation of various business cycle measures among the euro area countries has increased since the 1980s and continues to rise. The exception appears to be the United Kingdom, which, according to Artis and Zhang (1997), follows more closely the US rather than the German cycle and, according to Forni and Reichlin (2001), has a larger national than European component in output fluctuations. The present results are partly at odds with this evidence as the UK follows the European countries more closely than the overseas countries, in the long-term historical perspective (1978-2001) as well as in the medium-term perspective (1990-2001). In the recent short-term perspective (1999-2001), however, it turns out that the UK has been moving more closely with the US and Canada than before. The results also document the increasing synchronization among the euro area countries due to the integration process. Whereas over the long-term perspective Finland and Ireland are following the overseas cycle, they follow the European cycle when the perspective is restricted to the last decade (1990-2001) and to the past three years.

An additional byproduct of the estimation is obtained by using the inference on the posterior state probabilities to date business cycle turning points. They follow quite closely the dates for the 1990s published in the Monthly Bulletin of the ECB (2002) and lag the ones identified by EuroCOIN (see Altissimo et al., 2001) by two to three quarters.

The following section introduces the model and the questions that we might wish to answer after the investigation, section 3 discusses briefly the estimation method. Section 4 first describes the data and presents the results for the euro area countries. The results for all European and the overseas countries are found in section 5, and section 6 concludes. For the interested reader, two appendices describe in detail the assumptions on the prior distribution of the model parameters and the sampling scheme, respectively.

2 The model and the hypotheses

Let y_{it} represent the (quarterly or monthly) growth rate at date t of industrial production for country i , computed by taking the first difference of the logarithmic level. We then write:

$$\Delta y_{it} = \mu_i^G + \mu_i^R(I_{it} - 1) + \phi_1 \Delta y_{i,t-1} + \dots + \phi_p \Delta y_{i,t-p} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (1)$$

with $\varepsilon_{it} \sim \text{i.i.d.}N(0, \sigma^2)$, $t = 1, \dots, T$. For a single country, the model we fit to industrial production comes close to the one estimated in Hamilton (1989) for US GNP. We assume that the growth rate $\mu_{it} = \mu_i^G + \mu_i^R(I_{it} - 1)$ depends on a latent state variable I_{it} , which may take on either the value 0 or 1:²

$$\mu_{it} = \begin{cases} \mu_i^G - \mu_i^R & \text{iff } I_{it} = 0 \\ \mu_i^G & \text{iff } I_{it} = 1 \end{cases} . \quad (2)$$

The latent specification of I_{it} takes into account the fact that the state prevailing in each period t is usually not observable with certainty. Moreover, as the periods with a higher growth rate might have a different duration than the periods of lower growth rate, we specify I_{it} to follow a Markov switching process of order one, $P(I_{it} = l | I_{i,t-1} = j) = \eta_{jl}^i$, with the restriction $\sum_{l=0}^1 \eta_{jl}^i = 1$, $j = 0, 1$.

When the observation period is long enough, equation (1) might be estimated for each of the N investigated countries separately. The various processes for I_{it} might then be compared to assess the synchronization of the business cycles across the countries. However, the variance of estimation for I_{it} (and for the model parameters, too) might be reduced, if countries that switch at the same time, i.e. follow the same or a similar business cycle pattern, would be pooled in a group (see e.g. Hoogstrate et al., 2000, and Frühwirth-Schnatter and Kaufmann, 2002). Also, the gain in estimation precision would be greater the shorter the observation period. The difficulty in following this procedure is to form the appropriate grouping of countries. If we do not have a priori certain information about it, we might wish to draw an inference on the appropriate grouping characterizing the countries included in the panel. To this aim, an additional latent group-indicator S_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, is defined that relates to group-specific parameters, whereby S_i can take on one out of K different values, $S_i = k$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, if we assume to have K distinct groups of countries in the panel. The model for

²For the empirical analysis, it proved sufficient to assume two states driving the process. In principle, however, the present parameterization would allow a three-state specification with I_{it} potentially taking on additionally the value 2. The estimation assuming a higher number of states is possible; then, however, a “direct” parameterization would be appropriate: $\mu_{i,I_{it}} = \mu_{i,j}$ iff $I_{it} = j$, $j = 1, \dots, J$.

μ_{it} given in (2) may thus be extended to:

$$\mu_{it} = \begin{cases} \mu_k^G - \mu_k^R & \text{iff } S_i = k \text{ and } I_{kt} = 0 \\ \mu_k^G & \text{iff } S_i = k \text{ and } I_{kt} = 1 \end{cases}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (3)$$

whereby the probabilities $P(S_i = k)$ are given by η_k^G , $k = 1, \dots, K$ with the restriction $\sum_{k=1}^K \eta_k^G = 1$.

Note that in model (1), we assume that the parameters of the autoregressive process, ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_p are group- and state-independent. Although the analysis carries over to group- and state-dependent parameters in general, we do not introduce it here for expositional convenience and also because the results obtained from a preliminary investigation favoured a specification with group- and state-independent autoregressive parameters. Likewise, we assume that the variance of the error process is not group-specific, $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2$.

With the present model specification, we might investigate the following questions:

- Is there a common growth cycle for the euro area countries?
If this is the case, the estimation should yield a pooled group of the euro area countries, all following the same switching pattern of the state indicator, i.e. K should equal at most 1 when the euro area countries are investigated on their own. When all other countries are included in the panel, the euro area countries should again pool into the same group, even if more than one group could be identified ($K > 1$).
- Did the synchronization change over time?
The first dimension of synchronization relates to the estimated pattern of the state indicators, if more than one group can be identified in the panel. A changing lead-lag behaviour between the state indicators (over various time horizons) would document changing synchronization. The second dimension relates to the estimated country groupings. A change in synchronization would show up in a changing composition of the estimated country groups.
- Can we discriminate between a “European” and an “overseas” cycle?
Evidence in favour of a distinction would be reflected in two distinctively estimated state-indicators, whereby most European countries would fall into one group.
- Which countries follow the “overseas” rather than the “European” cycle?
Over different time horizons, it might be possible that a country switches between groups. This question is also related to the one in changes in synchronization.

3 Estimation via MCMC simulations

To briefly describe the estimation procedure, we introduce the following notation. While y_{it} denotes the observation of country i in period t , y_i^t gathers all observations of country i up to period t , $y_i^t = \{y_{it}, y_{i,t-1}, \dots, y_{i1}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. The variables Y_t and Y^T will denote accordingly all country observations in and up to period t , respectively, $Y_t = \{y_{1t}, y_{2t}, \dots, y_{Nt}\}$ and $Y^T = \{Y_T, Y_{T-1}, \dots, Y_1\}$. Likewise, the vectors $S^N = (S_1, \dots, S_N)$ and $I^T = (I_1^T, \dots, I_K^T)$, where $I_k^T = (I_{kT}, I_{k,T-1}, \dots, I_{k1})$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, collect the group and the state indicators, respectively. Moreover, for notational convenience, θ will denote all model parameters³ and $\psi = (\theta, S^N, I^T)$ will be the augmented parameter vector which includes additionally the two latent indicators.

Thus, the estimation of the model should not only yield an inference on the model parameters in θ , but also on the latent indicators S^N and I^T . If we knew S^N and I^T , roughly speaking we would be left with a regression model in (1) and standard methods (like GMM in the present case) could be used for estimation. Even if only one indicator were known, the estimation could be performed within the maximum likelihood framework, as the marginal likelihood $L(Y^T|\theta, S^N)$ or $L(Y^T|\theta, I^T)$ can alternatively be derived. However, if both indicators are unknown, the marginal likelihood $L(Y^T|\theta)$ is not feasible.⁴ Therefore, the estimation is cast into a Bayesian framework and the posterior distribution of ψ is estimated using Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation methods based on an adapted version of the sampling scheme proposed in Frühwirth-Schnatter and Kaufmann (2002).

Note first, that for known values of S^N and I^T , the likelihood might be factorized in the following way:

$$L(Y^T|\psi) = \prod_{t=1}^T \prod_{i=1}^N f(y_{it}|y_i^{t-1}, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_p, \sigma^2, I_{S_i,t}, S_i), \quad (4)$$

where $f(y_{it}|\cdot)$ denotes the density of the normal distribution:

$$f(y_{it}|y_i^{t-1}, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_p, \sigma^2, I_{S_i,t}, S_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \left(y_{it} - \mu_{S_i}^G - \mu_{S_i}^R (I_{S_i,t} - 1) - \sum_{j=1}^p \phi_j y_{i,t-j} \right)^2 \right\}. \quad (5)$$

³That is: $\theta = (\mu_1^G, \dots, \mu_K^G, \mu_1^R, \dots, \mu_K^R, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_p, \sigma^2, \eta_1^G, \eta_K^G, \eta^1, \dots, \eta^K)$, where $\eta^k = (\eta_{00}^k, \eta_{01}^k, \eta_{10}^k, \eta_{11}^k)$, $k = 1, \dots, K$.

⁴To derive $L(Y^T|\theta)$ we need to integrate out $L(Y^T|\theta, S^N)$ over S^N which itself depends on I^T . The same problem arises when we want to marginalize $L(Y^T|\theta, I^T)$. There is no way to circumvent the analytical problem.

The densities of the K state indicators, $\pi(I_k^T|\eta^k)$, are mutually independent and depend a priori only on the transition distributions η^k , $k = 1, \dots, K$. Thus,

$$\pi(I^T|\eta^1, \dots, \eta^K) = \prod_{k=1}^K \pi(I_k^T|\eta^k) = \prod_{k=1}^K \prod_{j=0}^1 (\eta_{jj}^k)^{N_{jj}^k} (1 - \eta_{jj}^k)^{N_{1-j,j}^k}, \quad (6)$$

where $N_{jl}^k = \#(I_{kt} = l, I_{k,t-1} = j)$, $l, j = 0, 1$, is the number of times that state l followed state j for the indicator k , $k = 1, \dots, K$. For the group indicator, in turn, we have

$$\pi(S^N|\eta_1^G, \dots, \eta_K^G) = \prod_{i=1}^N \pi(S_i|\eta_1^G, \dots, \eta_K^G) = \prod_{k=1}^K (\eta_k^G)^{(\#S_i=k)}. \quad (7)$$

The third layer within the Bayesian model setup comprises the specification of the prior distribution for the model parameter θ which, for the sake of brevity, is not describe here. The interested reader finds a detailed description of it in appendix A.

The inference on the joint posterior distribution $\pi(\theta, S^N, I^T|Y^T)$ is obtained by successively simulating parameter values and values for the group and state indicators out of their conditional posterior distributions:

- (i) $\pi(S^N|Y^T, \theta, I^T)$,
- (ii) $\pi(I^T|Y^T, \theta, S^N)$,
- (iii) $\pi(\theta|Y^T, S^N, I^T)$.

For given (sensible) starting values for θ and I^T , iterating several thousand times over the sampling steps (i)-(iii),⁵ thereby replacing at each step the conditioning parameters by their respective actual simulated values, yields a sample out of the joint posterior distribution $\pi(\theta, S^N, I^T|Y^T)$. The simulated values may then be post-processed to estimate the properties of the posterior distribution, e.g. the mean and standard error may be inferred by computing the mean and the standard deviation of the simulated values. For practical implementation, step (iii) involves a further break-down of the parameter vector θ into appropriate sub-vectors for which the conditional posterior distributions can fully be derived and simulated straightforwardly. Appendix B describes in detail the sampling steps and derives the posterior distributions (i)-(iii).

⁵The programs are written in Matlab and the estimation time for the largest setting, i.e. when all countries are included in the panel, the observation period is 1978-2001 and $K = 3$, is approximately 15 minutes on a PC Pentium.

4 The euro area countries

4.1 The data and the model selection procedure

All data are taken from the International Financial Statistics database. To perform the analysis for the long-term (1978-2001) and the medium-term perspective (1990-2001), we use quarterly data on seasonally adjusted industrial production of all (West-) European countries covering the period from the first quarter of 1978 to the last quarter of 2001. The recent period of the common European currency beginning with January 1999 and running through December 2001 is analyzed with monthly data, and to assess the relationship between the “European” and the “overseas” business cycle, we include additionally the industrial production series of Australia, Canada, Japan and the United States. For all countries, industrial production growth is computed by multiplying by 100 the first difference of the logarithmic level. Prior to the analysis, we standardize each time series to have unit standard deviation. Besides, the series undergo no other transformation, i.e. the series are included in the panel without weighting according to a country’s size and without smoothing prior to the estimation, in contrast to Artis et al. (1999) and Mitchell and Mouratidis (2000). Some series, in particular Greece and Norway, display breaks which are accounted for by including dummy variables for the observations 1990Q3 and 1990Q4, and 1986Q2 and 1986Q3, respectively, in the estimation.

One advantage of using each country’s industrial production series rather than a compiled euro area aggregate one, which usually weights each series relative to the entity under investigation, is that the country specific versus the regional/transatlantic optic may be compared directly. Also, the regional/transatlantic optic may be enlarged rather straightforwardly, without the need for reweighting each series. On the other hand, the standardization copes with the drawback one might perceive in the unweighed inclusion of each country’s series in the panel. Although a small and a large country’s performance enter with equal weights in the estimation of aggregate behaviour, the estimation yields an inference on groups of countries that display a common economic pattern over time that is not due to differences in business cycle volatility across countries. However, the estimation could also account for differences in volatility by assuming country-specific variances of the error process ($\sigma_i^2 \neq \sigma^2$). Here, the focus lies on the common pattern over time for groups of countries, so we abstain from this generalization.

Given (sensible) starting values for the model parameters and the state indicator, the model is estimated by iterating 10,000 times over the sampling steps described in detail in appendix B. The first 4,000 iterations are discarded to remove dependence from the starting values and the remain-

ing simulations are used to infer the posterior distributions, e.g. the mean and the standard error may be estimated by the mean and the standard deviation of the simulated values or the values can be used to estimate the marginal probability distribution functions of the model parameters.

A preliminary estimation of model (1) over all time horizons for the panel of euro area countries included four autoregressive lags of industrial production and allowed for three groups, i.e. $p = 4$ and $K = 3$, respectively. It turned out that two autoregressive lags were sufficient as higher order lags were not significantly different from zero. Moreover, the estimation revealed that all countries may be pooled into one group, $K = 1$, over the long-term and the medium-term perspective and, hence, that one state indicator is enough to capture the common pattern of the euro area countries' industrial production. Over the short-term perspective, however, the countries may be classified into two groups. The selection of K is based on the fact that when allowing for more than one group, the sampler is not able to discriminate between them distinctively which is reflected in a uniform posterior group probability distribution for the countries and in equal group-specific parameter estimates.⁶

Table 1 summarizes the posterior inference for the parameters of interest of the chosen model specification for the euro area countries. Over all time horizons, the two states specification is significant as μ_1^R and μ_2^R are significantly different from zero. The two-groups specification for the short-term perspective seems to be a borderline case. The mean of μ_2^G is not included in the confidence interval for μ_1^G whereas it is marginally the case the other way round. Having an additional look at the posterior group probabilities (see figure 5) turned the balance in favour of $K = 2$ rather than $K = 1$.

4.2 The long-term historical perspective


To interpret the results of the one-group specification for the euro area countries, we have a look at the posterior state probabilities depicted in figure 1 which are estimated by taking the average over all simulated paths I^T . The figure reveals that $I_t = 0$ relates to periods of economic recessions at the beginning of the 1980s, the 1990s and during 2001, and reflects additionally periods of growth slowdown in the mid 1980s and in the course of 1990s. The regime switches are quite distinct and, due to the fact of capturing recessions and slowdowns, nearly equally persistent for periods of economic recovery and for periods of economic slowdown. Table 1 documents that the mean persistence of the states $I_t = 0$ and $I_t = 1$, η_{00} and η_{11} , is 0.79 and 0.77,

⁶For example, when K is set $K = 3$ whereas in fact it should be $K = 1$, the estimated posterior group probabilities for each country would be approximately 1/3 for each group and the group-specific parameters μ_1^G , μ_2^G and μ_3^G would not significantly be different from each other, i.e. their confidence interval would largely overlap.

Table 1: Mean group-specific parameter estimates of the euro area model (with confidence interval). The confidence intervals are estimated by the shortest interval containing 95% of the 6,000 simulated parameter values. η_{00} and η_{11} refer to the persistence of state $I_t = 0$ and $I_t = 1$, respectively.

	$I_t = 1$		$I_t = 0$			
	μ_1^G	μ_2^G	$\mu_1^G - \mu_1^R$	$\mu_2^G - \mu_2^R$	μ_1^R	μ_2^R
1978Q1-2001Q4	0.70 (0.57 0.82)		-0.09 (-0.19 0.02)		0.79 (0.67 0.92)	
η_{00} conf.int.	0.79 (0.65 0.92)					
η_{11} conf.int.	0.77 (0.63 0.92)					
1990Q1-2001Q4	0.66 (0.52 0.81)		-0.21 (-0.36 -0.08)		0.87 (0.70 1.02)	
η_{00} conf.int.	0.77 (0.58 0.94)					
η_{11} conf.int.	0.79 (0.62 0.95)					
1999M1-2001M12	0.38 (0.02 0.74)	1.16 (0.32 3.03)	-0.63 (-2.14 0.12)	-0.30 (-1.48 1.80)	1.01 (0.03 2.19)	1.46 (0.05 3.34)
no. of countries	5	7				
η_{00} conf.int.	0.61 (0.22 0.99)	0.74 (0.37 1.00)				
η_{11} conf.int.	0.74 (0.37 1.00)	0.67 (0.27 1.00)				


Figure 1: Posterior probability $P(I_t = 0|Y^T, S^N, \theta)$ for the grouped euro area countries.



respectively. Note that due to the standardization, the coefficients μ_1^G and $\mu_1^G - \mu_1^R$ are not directly interpretable as quarterly growth rates. However, based on the estimate of the common state indicator, one might compute for each country the average state-dependent quarterly growth rates over the observation period. These are depicted in the left-hand scatter plot of figure 2. Although the countries followed a common economic pattern over the last two decades, there have been some remarkable differences in their growth performance. Ireland, followed by Finland, Austria and Portugal, represents the country experiencing the most pronounced catching up process. On the other hand, the three largest euro area countries, Germany, France and Italy, along with Spain, Belgium and the Netherlands displayed a more traditional growth pattern over the business cycle, around +4% a year in economic expansion and between -1% and -2% in slowdown periods.

The posterior state probabilities depicted in figure 1 might be used to date the business cycle turning points for the euro area, defining a peak (P) the quarter t if $P(I_t = 0|Y^T, \theta, S^N) < 0.5$ and $P(I_{t+1} = 0|Y^T, \theta, S^N) > 0.5$, $P(I_t + 2 = 0|Y^T, \theta, S^N) > 0.5$, and correspondingly the quarter t to be a trough (T) if $P(I_t = 0|Y^T, \theta, S^N) > 0.5$ and $P(I_{t+1} = 0|Y^T, \theta, S^N) < 0.5$, $P(I_t + 2 = 0|Y^T, \theta, S^N) < 0.5$. The first line in table 2 summarizes the turning points. The first line in the bottom panel includes the dating of the European Central Bank (ECB, 2002) obtained by extracting the euro area wide GDP cycle for the 1990s from the Baxter and King (1999) band-pass filter. Both dating series are quite in accordance with each other, in general peaks and troughs identified with industrial production lag and precede the ones identified with euro area GDP by one quarter, respectively, with the

Figure 2: State specific mean growth rates of the euro area countries.
(a) 1978Q1-2001Q4 (b) 1990Q1-2001Q4



exception of the trough in 1996:2 which leads the ECB's dating by three quarters. The second line in the bottom panel reproduces the turning points identified with EuroCOIN (Altissimo et al., 2001). The three full cycles during the 1990s broadly comove, EuroCOIN leads the state indicator by two to three quarters, however. Note finally, that the most recent downturn is identified by EuroCOIN nearly a year before the ECB and the present state indicator identify it.


The relative position of each country to the common cycle identified in figure 1 and table 2 can be assessed by estimating the model for each country separately. The posterior state probabilities estimated by a univariate

Table 2: Business cycle dating of the euro area countries. The bottom lines reproduce the dating of the European Central Bank (2002) based on the euro area GDP cycle extracted by the band-pass filter of Baxter and King (1999) and the dating based on the EuroCOIN indicator (see Altissimo et al., 2001, and www.cepr.org)

sample period	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	
1978-2001	80:1	82:4	84:3	87:1	89:4			93:3	95:2	96:2	98:2	98:4	00:4	
1990-2001						91:3	91:4	93:2	95:2	96:2	98:2	98:4	00:4	
ECB's dating								92:1	93:3	95:1	97:1	98:1	99:1	00:3
EuroCOIN					89:1			92:4	94:4	95:4	97:4	98:4	99:4	

(country-specific) Markov switching specification are depicted in figure 3 where the shaded areas refer to the common cycle. First of all, note that two significantly different states are identified for Germany and Finland only. For all other countries, the two-states specification does not seem as significant as for these two countries. In particular for Greece and for Ireland, the state indicator seems to relate more to long-term growth rather than to business cycle periods. As seen before, the catching up process has been especially strong for Ireland. The figure, however, documents the gain obtainable from pooling all countries' series. Despite the fact that generally two separate regimes cannot clearly be discriminated on an individual country basis, the information contained in the pooled data series is valuable to do so.


Figure 3: Posterior probabilities $P(I_t = 0|Y^T, S^N, \theta)$ estimated for each country separately. The shaded area refers to the common periods of economic slowdown.



4.3 The nineties

To get an insight on potential changes during the 1990s we restrict the sample period to run from the first quarter of 1990 to the last quarter of 2001. As already mentioned in subsection 4.1, the countries behave similar enough to be pooled into one group. Therefore, the specification remains the same as over the long-term perspective, $K = 1$ and $p = 2$. The pattern of the posterior state probabilities (see figure 4) reveals that the euro area countries experienced three peak-to-peak cycles during the 1990s, the turning points of which are given on the second line of table 2. Interestingly, although the observation sample has been restricted, the identification of the turning points appears quite robust and remains in strong accordance with the ECB's dating. Again, peaks and troughs identified with industrial production growth lag and precede the ones identified with band-pass filter detrended GDP.

Figure 4: Posterior probability $P(I_t = 0|Y^T, S^N, \theta)$ for the grouped euro area countries, sample period 1990Q1-2001Q4.



As it is the case for the long-term perspective, the common cyclical pattern in fact hides the still diverging growth performance among the euro area countries. Figure 2, panel (b), depicts the average country- and state-specific growth rates during the 1990s. Ireland still experienced a strong growth period, with average quarterly growth rates above 4% and nearly 1% when $I_t = 1$ and $I_t = 0$, respectively. Finland and Austria again follow with higher growth rates than the other countries, both countries come closer to the countries with a traditional positive and negative growth rate business cycle pattern, however. Greece, experiencing only a slow catching up process, builds the other exception of the euro area group.

4.4 The recent past

To estimate model (1) for the period during which the single common European currency was effectively in place, we use monthly data on industrial

production covering the years from 1999 through 2001. The preferred model specification sets $K = 2$ and $p = 2$. According to the posterior group probabilities depicted in figure 5 (estimated by averaging over all simulated S^N), the first group of countries consists of Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Portugal, while the largest euro area countries along with Austria, Belgium and Greece fall into the second group. The pattern of the posterior group-specific state probabilities in figure 6 and the mean state persistence, η_{00} and η_{11} , recorded in table 1 suggest that the countries of the first group experienced a longer recovery period through 2000 than the largest euro area countries, before the economic slowdown taking its pace in 2001 finally affected all countries. However, with the exception of Ireland and Finland, which both recorded relatively strong positive and negative growth rates, the growth performance of the first group's countries lies in the range of the largest euro area countries (see figure 7).

Figure 5: Posterior group probability $P(S_i = k|Y^T, I^T, \theta)$ for each euro area country, sample period 1999M1-2001M12.




Figure 6: Posterior probability $P(I_t = 0|Y^T, S^N, \theta)$ for the grouped euro area countries, sample period 1999M1-2001M12.





Figure 7: State specific (monthly) mean growth rates of the euro area countries. The first group is identified by the dotted marker, the second group by the squared marker.

(c) 1999M1-2001M12



5 The “European” and the “overseas” cycles

Before investigating the business cycle pattern of the European countries in relation to major overseas countries, i.e. Australia, Canada, Japan and the United States, it is worth mentioning that performing the analysis for all West-European countries, EU countries plus Norway and Switzerland, revealed that the main result, that countries may be pooled for the long term and the medium term analysis and may be classified into two groups in the short term perspective, turned out to be robust.⁷ Moreover, under the European long-term perspective, the estimated posterior state probabilities identified more distinctively the recessionary periods at the beginning of the 1980s, the 1990s and in 2001, without including the slowdown periods in the middle of the 1980s and 1990s as before (see table 3).⁸

Table 3: Business cycle dating of European countries in comparison with euro area dating.

sample period	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	
European countries																
1978-2001	80:1	80:4	81:4	82:4				90:4	91:2	92:1	93:2				01:1	
1990-2001								90:3	91:3	92:1	93:2	95:3	96:2	98:2	98:4	00:4
Euro area																
1978-2001	80:1			82:4	84:3	87:1	89:4			93:3	95:2	96:2	98:2	98:4	00:4	
1990-2001								91:3	91:4	93:2	95:2	96:2	98:2	98:4	00:4	

The estimation of model (1) for 17 European and 4 overseas countries identified for all time horizons two groups with distinct business cycle timing patterns whereby a preliminary analysis also confirmed that two autoregressive lags were sufficient to model the data. Table 4 summarizes the estimation for the group- and state-specific parameters. Over all time horizons, the two states are significant in each group and also significantly different from each other. Moreover, in particular over the long- and the medium-term perspective, the mean persistence of $I_t = 1$ is now higher than the mean persistence of $I_t = 0$. The changing number of countries

⁷Under this setting, the two nordic countries, Norway and Sweden, and Greece joined Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherland and Portugal (the countries defining the first group in the euro area setting) in the first group, while Denmark and the UK were classified into the second group with the largest euro area countries along with Austria and Belgium.

⁸As the results, overall, do not differ significantly from the previous ones, we do not display them here in order to save space.

Table 4: Mean group-specific parameter estimates of the grouped European and overseas countries (with confidence interval). The confidence intervals are estimated by the shortest 95% interval of the 6,000 simulated parameter values. η_{00} and η_{11} refer to the persistence of state $I_t = 0$ and $I_t = 1$, respectively.

	$I_t = 1$		$I_t = 0$		μ_1^R	μ_2^R
	μ_1^G	μ_2^G	$\mu_1^G - \mu_1^R$	$\mu_2^G - \mu_2^R$		
1978Q1-2001Q4	0.50 (0.40 0.60)	0.70 (0.56 0.84)	-0.33 (-0.50 -0.15)	-0.39 (-0.70 -0.08)	0.83 (0.70 0.98)	1.09 (0.75 1.38)
no. of countries	16	5				
η_{00}	0.71	0.79				
conf.int.	(0.52 0.89)	(0.61 0.95)				
η_{11}	0.87	0.90				
conf.int.	(0.76 0.96)	(0.82 0.98)				
1990Q1-2001Q4	0.53 (0.38 0.68)	0.69 (0.46 0.92)	-0.24 (-0.50 -0.04)	-0.83 (-1.45 -0.13)	0.77 (0.57 1.00)	1.51 (0.77 2.21)
no. of countries	18	3				
η_{00}	0.74	0.76				
conf.int.	(0.53 0.95)	(0.51 1.00)				
η_{11}	0.80	0.93				
conf.int.	(0.61 0.98)	(0.79 1.00)				
1999M1-2001M12	0.43 (0.32 0.57)	0.81 (0.57 1.09)	-0.29 (-0.46 -0.13)	-0.96 (-1.21 -0.72)	0.72 (0.55 0.89)	1.77 (1.42 2.17)
no. of countries	15	4				
η_{00}	0.68	0.94				
conf.int.	(0.39 0.95)	(0.83 1.00)				
η_{11}	0.76	0.90				
conf.int.	(0.56 0.94)	(0.77 1.00)				

falling into the two groups⁹ already hints towards changing business cycle synchronization among the countries.

5.1 The long term historical perspective

The characterization of the two groups is obtained from figure 9 which depicts the posterior group probabilities of the countries. The classification is very clear with all group probabilities being above 0.9 (0.8 for Finland) for one of the two groups. The countries falling into the second group over all time horizons, in particular Canada and the United States along with Australia, will determine what we call the “overseas” cycle. Under the long-term perspective, Finland and Ireland are following more closely the overseas rather than the “European” cycle, defined by the rest of the European countries falling into the first group. This might reflect overseas oriented trade relations of these two countries. On the other hand, the UK and Japan clearly fall into the group of European countries, while the situation will be the opposite in the short term perspective. The posterior group-specific state probabilities are graphed in figure 8. It nicely depicts that the state $I_t = 0$ relates to periods of recessionary tendencies, whereby until the mid 1990s the countries in the second group, following the “overseas” cycle, lead the countries following the “European” cycle by one quarter to over half a year (see the corresponding dates of the business cycle turning points given in table 5). Due to the lasting recovery experienced by the countries of the second group, the leading pattern has disappeared during the 1990s.


Table 5: Business cycle dating of the grouped European and overseas countries, sample period 1978Q1-2001Q4: The first group consists of the European countries (except Finland and Ireland), Japan and Australia, the second one of the United States, Canada and Finland and Ireland.

	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P
“European” cycle	80:1	80:4	81:4	82:4	86:3	87:1	90:4	93:2	98:2	98:4	00:4
“Overseas” cycle	79:3	80:2	81:3	82:4	85:4	86:2	89:3	91:2			00:4

Figure 10, panel (a), depicts the mean state-specific growth rate of each country. From there we can see that Ireland and Finland have been growing quite strongly over the last two decades, whereas Canada, Australia and the United States have not been growing (much) faster than the largest

⁹No monthly industrial production series are available for Switzerland and Australia, therefore they are excluded from the panel over the short-term perspective.

Figure 8: Posterior probability $P(I_t = 0|Y^T, S^N, \theta)$ for the “European” and the “overseas” state indicator , sample period 1978Q1-2001Q4.



European countries during periods of economic recovery. Canada and the United States even recorded stronger negative growth rates during periods of economic slowdown than most European countries did; but these periods turned out to be less frequent, however, in particular during the 1990s.

Figure 9: Posterior group probability $P(S_i = k|Y^T, I^T, \theta)$ for each country, sample period 1978Q1-2001Q4.





Figure 10: State specific mean growth rates of the European and the over-seas countries.



5.2 The nineties

Restricting the sample period to 1990Q1-2001Q4 yields a change in the country classification. During this decade, Ireland and Finland followed more closely the “European” cycle (see figure 11). Note that, still, Japan and the United Kingdom fall again into the first group. This reflects the convergence process that took place among the European countries in the course of increased economic and financial integration. The dating of the cycles in table 6 and the group-specific state probabilities in figure 12 reveal the already identified three full cycles for the euro area and all European countries, and the strong growth period of the overseas countries during the 1990s. Interestingly, the downturn that affected all countries in 2001 is identified to have already begun in the second half of 2000 for the overseas countries. Figure 10, panel (b) shows that the Nordic countries Finland and Sweden along with Ireland were the countries with the strongest growth during the recovery periods. Note that also Norway has been growing throughout the sample period. It is again the case that Canada and the US have not been growing much faster than the three largest European countries. However, their relative better economic performance was achieved by the long-lasting recovery throughout the 1990s.

Figure 11: Posterior group probability $P(S_i = k|Y^T, I^T, \theta)$ for each country, sample period 1990Q1-2001Q4.





Table 6: Business cycle dating of the grouped European and overseas countries: The first group consists of the European countries and Japan, the second one of the United States, Canada and Australia.

	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P
“European” cycle	90:4	91:3	92:1	93:2	95:2	96:2	98:1	98:4	00:4
“Overseas” cycle		91:1							00:3

Figure 12: Posterior probability $P(I_t = 0|Y^T, S^N, \theta)$ for the “European” and the “overseas” state indicator, sample period 1990Q1-2001Q4.



5.3 The recent past

Finally, the observation period is restricted to the years 1999 through 2001. According to figure 14, the classification into two groups is again very distinct and reveals that during the last three years, Japan and the UK followed the “overseas” cycle more closely than the “European” cycle. Moreover, the posterior group-specific state probabilities in figure 13 show that the overseas countries experienced a downturn in economic activity already in the second half of 2000, the European countries being affected later at the beginning of 2001. Finally, figure 15 reveals that Ireland and Finland, along with Denmark, represent the countries with the strongest growth rates during the first years of the common European currency. Canada, the US and the UK, on the other hand, experienced less decline in industrial production than most euro area countries during the recent downturn period.

Figure 13: Posterior probability $P(I_t = 0|Y^T, S^N, \theta)$ for the “European” and the “overseas” state indicator, sample period 1999M1-2001M12.




Figure 14: Posterior group probability $P(S_i = k | Y^T, I^T, \theta)$ for each country, sample period 1999M1-2001M12.





Figure 15: State specific (monthly) mean growth rates of the European and the overseas countries. The first group is identified by the dotted marker, the second group by the squared marker.

(c) 1999M1-2001M12



6 Conclusion

The paper presents a model for analyzing the common growth pattern of country-individual industrial production series. Within an autoregressive panel framework, the growth rate (the constant) is allowed to switch between two states according to a latent state indicator which is thought to capture the unobservable expansionary or recessionary state of the economy. Moreover, for a given number of groups, the appropriate grouping of the countries in terms of a “similar” growth rate pattern, is estimated along with the model parameters rather than setting it a priori on the basis of some ad hoc defined country characteristics.

For the analysis, we use quarterly and monthly data for all (Western) European countries and the major overseas countries, in particular Australia, Canada, Japan and the US. With quarterly data, the focus is set on a long-term (1978-2001) and on a medium-term (1990-2001) historical perspective. The monthly data are used to analyze the recent period of the common European currency (1999-2001). The advantage of using a panel data framework lies first in the possibility of enlarging the number of countries to be analyzed within a single model without having to cope with an exponentially increasing number of parameters to be estimated as it would be the case when estimating a vector autoregressive system. Another advantage lies in the possibility of analyzing a shorter time period as we can exploit the information contained in the cross-section.

The results obtained from the estimation of the model give us answers to the following questions. *Is there a common growth cycle for the euro area countries?* Yes; when the euro area and also the European countries are analyzed on their own, they fall into one group under either the long-term or the medium-term perspective. However, during the recent three years, two groups of countries can be discriminated. The first group consists of countries recording a longer-lasting expansionary period than the second group, whereby the largest euro area countries along with Spain and the UK, and along with Austria, Belgium and Denmark fall into this second group (and the Nordic countries with Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Portugal form the first group). When we include additionally the overseas countries, the European countries fall into one group in general, with the exception of Finland and Ireland under the long-term perspective and the UK during the recent three years. In these cases, the countries follow more closely the “overseas” cycle mainly characterized by Australia, Canada and the US.

Can we discriminate between a “European” and an “overseas” cycle? Yes; when the analysis includes Australia, Canada and the US, these three countries characterize one group over all time horizons, while most European countries fall into the other group.

Did the synchronization change over time? Yes; the increased integration of European countries is reflected in the changing classification of Finland and Ireland. While under the long-term perspective they follow more closely the “overseas” cycle, they follow more closely the European cycle during the nineties and during the period of the common European currency. Moreover, there is evidence for a changing synchronization between the European and the overseas cycle. Until the early nineties, overseas downturns were leading European downturns by half a year to about one year. During the nineties, however, overseas countries went through a long-lasting expansionary period while European countries experienced three full growth cycles. Several factors might have led to this disentangled cyclical pattern of the two regions, such as the German re-unification, a potential stronger European exposure to the Asian and the Russian crises, and a slow pace of appropriate (labour market and/or fiscal and economic) policy reforms needed to foster growth in an increasingly integrated European environment.

Which countries follow the “overseas” rather than the “European” cycle? The results document the increased integration of European countries and in particular the integration of the euro-area countries. Since the nineties, Finland and Ireland are following more closely the European cycle, while under the longer historical perspective, they were following the overseas cycle. In contrast to previous studies, the UK, and also Japan, follow more closely the European rather than the overseas cycle. It is only during the recent three years, that both countries are classified into one group with Canada and the US. Finally, the downturn in these countries is identified to have begun already in the second half of 2000, before affecting all countries in 2001.

References

- Altissimo, F., A. Bassanetti, R. Cristadoro, M. Forni, M. Lippi, L. Reichlin, and G. Veronese (2001). EuroCOIN: A real time coincident indicator of the euro area business cycle. Discussion Paper 3108, CEPR.
- Artis, M. J., H.-M. Krolzig, and J. Toro (1999). The European business cycle. Discussion Paper 2242, CEPR.
- Artis, M. J. and W. Zhang (1995). International business cycles and the ERM: Is there a European business cycle? *International Journal of Finance and Economics* 2, 1–16.
- Baxter, M. and R. G. King (1999). Measuring business cycles: Approximate band-pass filters for economic time series. *Review of Economics & Statistics* 81, 575–593.

- Carter, C. K. and R. Kohn (1994). On Gibbs sampling for state space models. *Biometrika* 84, 541–553.
- Chib, S. (1996). Calculating posterior distributions and modal estimates in Markov mixture models. *Journal of Econometrics* 75, 79–97.
- European Central Bank (2002). Characteristics of the euro area business cycle in the 1990s. Monthly bulletin, july, 39-49.
- Forni, M. and L. Reichlin (2001). Federal policies and local economies; Europe and the US. *European Economic Review*.
- Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. (1994). Data augmentation and dynamic linear models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 15, 183–202.
- Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. (2001). MCMC estimation of classical and dynamic switching and mixture models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 96, 194–209.
- Frühwirth-Schnatter, S. and S. Kaufmann (2002). Bayesian clustering of many short time series. mimeo, Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration, and Oesterreichische Nationalbank.
- Hamilton, J. D. (1989). A new approach to the economic analysis of nonstationary time series and the business cycle. *Econometrica* 57, 357–384.
- Hoogstrate, A. J., F. C. Palm, and G. A. Pfann (2000). Pooling in dynamic panel-data models: An application to forecasting GDP growth rates. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 18, 274–283.
- Kaufmann, S. (2002). Is there an asymmetric effect of monetary policy over time? A Bayesian analysis using Austrian data. *Empirical Economics* 99, 277–298.
- Mitchell, J. and K. Mouratidis (2002). Is there a common Euro-zone business cycle? National Institute of Economic and Social Research.
- Shephard, N. (1994). Partial non-Gaussian state space. *Biometrika* 81, 115–131.

A The prior distribution of θ

The vector θ gathers all model parameters, i.e. the group-specific regression parameters $(\mu_1^G, \dots, \mu_K^G)$ and $(\mu_1^R, \dots, \mu_K^R)$, the autoregressive parameters (ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_p) , the variance σ^2 , the group probabilities $(\eta_1^G, \dots, \eta_K^G)$ and the group-specific transition probabilities (η^1, \dots, η^K) , where $\eta^k = (\eta_{00}^k, \eta_{01}^k, \eta_{10}^k, \eta_{11}^k)$.

A priori, we assume that the parameter vectors are independent of each other:

$$\pi(\theta) = \pi(\mu_1^G, \dots, \mu_K^G, \mu_1^R, \dots, \mu_K^R) \pi(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_p) \pi(\sigma^2) \pi(\eta_1^G, \dots, \eta_K^G) \pi(\eta^1, \dots, \eta^K).$$

Specifically, the prior distributions are parameterized in the following way:

- The pairs of group-specific regression parameters, (μ_k^G, μ_k^R) , $k = 1, \dots, K$, are independent of each other and have a normal distribution,

$$N(m_0, M_0), \tag{8}$$

where

$$m_0 = \begin{pmatrix} b_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_0 = \begin{pmatrix} B_0 & B_0 \\ B_0 & 2B_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The specific feature of the prior comes from the parameterization of the state-specific constant in model (1). Remind that state 1 relates to $I_t = 0$ with parameter $\mu_k^G - \mu_k^R$ and state 2 relates to $I_t = 1$ with parameter μ_k^G . To apply the permutation sampler described in detail in the next section, the prior distribution of the state-specific parameters needs to be symmetric and invariant with respect to state permutation. Therefore, the prior distribution on the pair of coefficients $(\mu_k^G - \mu_k^R, \mu_k^G)$ is assumed to be normal,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mu_k^G - \mu_k^R \\ \mu_k^G \end{pmatrix} \sim N \left(\begin{pmatrix} b_0 \\ b_0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} B_0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_0 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

It is then easy to derive that the prior specification on $(\mu_k^G - \mu_k^R, \mu_k^G)$ implies the one given in (8) for (μ_k^G, μ_k^R) .

- The autoregressive parameters (ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_p) are independently normally distributed $N(0, \kappa I_p)$ where I_p denotes the identity matrix of dimension p and κ is a positive constant. Note that for the present investigation, it is not necessary to truncate the prior distribution to ensure a stationary autoregressive process. Throughout, the sampler itself yields autoregressive values that confine to the stationarity region.

- A natural prior for the variance σ^2 is the inverse gamma distribution, $\sigma^2 \sim IG(g_0, G_0)$.
- For the group probabilities $(\eta_1^G, \dots, \eta_K^G)$ we assume a Dirichlet prior distribution, $D(e_{1,0}^G, \dots, e_{K,0}^G)$.
- The distribution of the group-specific transition distributions, (η^1, \dots, η^K) , are assumed to be independent of each other and to have independent Dirichlet distributions *a priori*, $\eta^k \sim \prod_{j=0}^1 D(e_{j0,0}, e_{j1,0}), \forall k$.

When estimating the model, one can not be totally uninformative, i.e. use improper prior distributions, in particular about the group- and state-specific parameters. If the number of groups or states is set too large, it is quite possible that none country falls into the superfluous group or that one of the states is never simulated. In this case, noninformative/improper prior distributions would lead to improper posterior distributions. Therefore, we have to be informative; nevertheless, the hyperparameters chosen put only little information on the prior distribution. Specifically, $b_0 = 0.5$ and $B_0 = 4$; $\kappa = 1$; $g_0 = 1$ and $G_0 = 1$; $e_{k,0}^G = 4, k = 1, \dots, K$; $(e_{00,0}, e_{01,0}) = (2, 1)$, $(e_{10,0}, e_{11,0}) = (1, 2)$.

B The sampling scheme

The Markov chain Monte Carlo simulations are based on the permutation sampler proposed in Frühwirth-Schnatter and Kaufmann (2002a) which is extended to the present case of group-specific state indicators. Restate the model first:

$$\Delta y_{it} = \mu_{S_i}^G + \mu_{S_i}^R (I_{S_i,t} - 1) + \phi_1 \Delta y_{i,t-1} + \dots + \phi_p \Delta y_{i,t-p} + \varepsilon_{it},$$

with $\varepsilon_{it} \sim \text{i.i.d. } N(0, \sigma^2)$.¹⁰

To obtain the inference on the joint posterior distribution $\pi(\theta, S^N, I^T | Y^T)$, the sampling scheme involves the following steps:

- (i) $\pi(S^N | Y^T, \theta, I^T)$,
- (ii) $\pi(I^T | Y^T, \theta, S^N)$,
- (iii) $\pi(\theta | Y^T, S^N, I^T)$.

Simulating S^N out of $\pi(S^N | Y^T, \theta, I^T)$. Note first that the posterior distribution may be factorized

$$\pi(S^N | Y^T, \theta, I^T) \propto \prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{t=p+1}^T f(y_{it} | y_i^{t-1}, \mu_{S_i}^G, \mu_{S_i}^R, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_p, \sigma^2, I_{S_i,t}) \pi(S_i | \eta^G).$$

¹⁰The posterior distributions are derived explicitly for the present model. If the notation is generalized, the sampler also applies to models involving more right-hand side variables, however (see Frühwirth-Schnatter and Kaufmann, 2002a).

Therefore, the group indicators S^N are independent and may be simulated from the discrete distribution

$$\pi(S_i = k | y_i, \theta, I_k^T) \propto \prod_{t=p+1}^T f(y_{it} | y_i^{t-1}, \mu_k^G, \mu_k^R, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_p, \sigma^2, I_{kt}) \cdot \eta_k^G,$$

where the observation density $f(y_{it} | \cdot)$ is normal with mean $\mu_k^G + \mu_k^R(I_{kt} - 1) + \sum_{j=1}^p \phi_j \Delta y_{i,t-j}$ and variance σ^2 .

Denote by p_{ik} the k th cumulated sum of the normalized probability distribution,

$$p_{ik} = \sum_1^k \frac{\pi(S_i = k | y_i, \theta, I_k^T)}{\sum_{k=1}^K \pi(S_i = k | y_i, \theta, I_k^T)}.$$

Then, each group indicator S_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, may be simulated independently from a uniform distribution. Given a draw U , $S_i = k$ according to $k = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^K 1(U > p_{ij})$.

Simulating I^T out of $\pi(I^T | Y^T, \theta, S^N)$. Given the group indicator S^N , the group-specific state indicators are independent of each other. Therefore, the posterior distribution can be factorized by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(I^T | Y^T, \theta, S^N) &= \prod_{k=1}^K \pi(I_k^T | Y^T, \theta, S^N) = \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^K \pi(I_{kT} | Y_T, \theta, S^N) \prod_{t=0}^{T-1} \pi(I_{kt} | Y^t, I_{k,t+1}, \theta, S^N). \end{aligned}$$

whereby the typical element $\pi(I_{kt} | Y^t, I_{k,t+1}, \theta, S^N)$ is proportional to

$$\pi(I_{kt} | Y^t, I_{k,t+1}, \theta, S^N) \propto \pi(I_{kt} | Y^t, \theta, S^N) \cdot \eta_{I_{kt}, I_{k,t+1}}^k. \quad (9)$$

The first factor $\pi(I_{kt} | Y^t, \theta, S^N)$ is obtained from a forward filter, whereby

$$\pi(I_{kt} | Y^t, \theta, S^N) \propto \prod_{S_i=k} f(y_{it} | y_i^{t-1}, \theta, S_i, I_{kt}) \cdot \pi(I_{kt} | Y^t, \theta, S^N).$$

The observation density $f(y_{it} | \cdot)$ is normal with mean and variance given above, the element $\pi(I_{kt} | Y^t, \theta, S^N)$ is given by extrapolation:

$$\pi(I_{kt} | Y^t, \theta, S^N) \propto \sum_{I_{k,t-1}=0}^1 \pi(I_{k,t-1} | Y^{t-1}, \theta, S^N) \cdot \eta_{I_{k,t-1}, I_{kt}}^k.$$

The filter must be initialized at time 0, one possibility is to use the ergodic probabilities of the k th state indicator, $\pi(I_{k0}) = \rho^k$, or to start with a user-specific distribution, e.g. a uniform distribution, $\pi(I_{k0}) = (1/2, 1/2)$.

Once the filter densities $\pi(I_{kt}|Y^t, \theta, S^N)$, for $t = 1, \dots, T$ are computed, beginning in T , each group-specific state indicator I_{kT} , $k = 1, \dots, K$, may be sampled out of the discrete distribution $\pi(I_{kT}|Y_T, \theta, S^N)$. Then, the recursion in (9) is used to simulate I_{kt} for $t = T - 1, \dots, 0$, $\forall k$. This multi-move method has been independently proposed in the literature by Carter and Kohn (1994), Frühwirth-Schnatter (1994), and Shephard (1994) for latent state space variables and has been explicitly derived for latent Markov switching processes in Chib (1996).

Given S^N and I^T , the vector θ is blocked appropriately to simulate the model parameters out of their full conditional distributions.

Simulating the group probabilities $\eta^G = (\eta_1^G, \dots, \eta_K^G)$ from $\pi(\eta^G|Y^T, S^N, I^T)$. Given S^N , the posterior distribution in fact reduces to $\pi(\eta^G|S^N)$ and is given by the Dirichlet distribution

$$\pi(\eta^G|S^N) = D(e_1^G, \dots, e_K^G),$$

with $e_k^G = e_{k,0}^G + \sum_{i=1}^N 1(S_i = k)$.

Simulating the transition probabilities $\eta = (\eta^1, \dots, \eta^K)$ from $\pi(\eta|Y^T, S^N, I^T)$. In analogy, the posterior distribution reduces to $\pi(\eta|I^T)$ and is a mixture of independent Dirichlet distributions,

$$\pi(\eta|I^T) = \prod_{k=1}^K \prod_{j=0}^1 D(e_{j0}^k, e_{j1}^k)$$

with $e_{jl}^k = e_{jl,0}^k + \sum_{t=1}^T 1(I_{kt} = l, I_{k,t-1} = j)$.

Simulating the model parameters $\beta = (\mu_1^G, \dots, \mu_K^G, \mu_1^R, \dots, \mu_K^R, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_p)$ from $\pi(\beta|Y^T, S^N, I^T, \sigma^2)$. Given the sampled values S^N and I^T , the model in (1) can be written compactly as

$$\Delta y_{it} = Z_{it}\beta + \varepsilon_{it}$$

whith $\beta = (\mu_1^G, \dots, \mu_K^G, \mu_1^R, \dots, \mu_K^R, \phi_1, \dots, \phi_p)$ and

$$Z_{it} = \left(D_i^{(1)}, \dots, D_i^{(K)}, D_i^{(1)}(I_{1t} - 1), \dots, D_i^{(K)}(I_{Kt} - 1), \Delta y_{i,t-1}, \dots, \Delta y_{i,t-p} \right).$$

The dummy variables are defined as $D_i^{(k)} = 1$ iff $S_i = k$ and $D_i^{(k)} = 0$ otherwise. All parameters are then simulated jointly from a normal posterior distribution, $N(b, B)$, with variance B and mean b given by, respectively,

$$B = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=p+1}^T Z'_{it} Z_{it} / \sigma^2 + B_0^{*-1} \right)^{-1}$$

$$b = B \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=p+1}^T Z'_{it} y_{it} / \sigma^2 + B_0^{*-1} b_0^* \right).$$

The joint normal prior distribution $N(b_0^*, B_0^*)$ is constructed from the prior distribution of the parameter blocks (see appendix A for the definition of m_0 and M_0):

$$b_0^* = \begin{pmatrix} m_0 \otimes \iota_K \\ 0_{p \times 1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_0^* = \begin{bmatrix} M_0 \otimes I_K & 0 \\ 0 & \kappa I_p \end{bmatrix},$$

where \otimes denotes the Kronecker product, ι_K a $K \times 1$ vector of ones, $0_{p \times 1}$ a $p \times 1$ vector of zeros and I_K the identity matrix of dimension K .

Simulating the variance σ^2 from $\pi(\sigma^2 | Y^T, S^N, I^T, \beta)$. The posterior distribution is given by the inverted Gamma

$$\sigma^2 | Y^T, S^N, I^T, \beta \sim IG(g, G)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} g &= g_0 + N(T - p)/2 \\ G &= G_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=p+1}^T (\Delta y_{it} - Z_{it} \beta)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, throughout, the simulations are not constrained, i.e. we sample out of the unconstrained posterior distribution. However, to obtain an identified model, restrictions should be set on the group- and state-specific simulated values. To discriminate between the groups, we might set a restriction on the constant in state 2 ($I_t = 1$):

$$\mu_1^G < \dots < \mu_K^G, \quad (\text{R1})$$

and to discriminate between the states (in each group) we might use the restriction:

$$\mu_k^G > \mu_k^G - \mu_k^R, \quad \forall k \quad (\text{R2})$$

which in fact implies $\mu_k^R > 0$. It is obvious that a number of other restrictions could discriminate between the groups and the states, like e.g. the restrictions $\mu_1^R < \dots < \mu_K^R$ or $\eta_{00}^k < \eta_{11}^k, \forall k$, respectively. If the appropriate group- and state-identifying restrictions are known a priori, the Gibbs sampler described above is completed by a permutation step, in which all simulated group- and state-specific values are reordered appropriately to fulfill the restrictions. This amounts to first interchange the state-specific values in each group $k, k = 1, \dots, K$, if (R2) is violated:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k^G &:= \mu_k^G - \mu_k^R \\ \mu_k^R &:= -\mu_k^R \\ \eta_{jl}^k &:= \eta_{1-j, 1-l}^k, \quad j, l = 0, 1 \\ I_{kt} &:= 1 - I_{kt}, \quad t = 0, \dots, T. \end{aligned}$$

Then, if the group identifying restriction (R1) is violated, the group-specific parameters are reordered according to the permutation $\rho(1), \dots, \rho(K)$ that fulfills (R1):¹¹

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mu_1^G, \dots, \mu_K^G) &:= (\mu_{\rho(1)}^G, \dots, \mu_{\rho(K)}^G) \\
(\mu_1^R, \dots, \mu_K^R) &:= (\mu_{\rho(1)}^R, \dots, \mu_{\rho(K)}^R) \\
(\eta^1, \dots, \eta^K) &:= (\eta^{\rho(1)}, \dots, \eta^{\rho(K)}) \\
(I_1^T, \dots, I_K^T) &:= (I_{\rho(1)}^T, \dots, I_{\rho(K)}^T) \\
(S_1, \dots, S_N) &:= (\rho(S_1), \dots, \rho(S_N)) \\
(\eta_1^G, \dots, \eta_K^G) &:= (\eta_{\rho(1)}^G, \dots, \eta_{\rho(K)}^G).
\end{aligned}$$

If, on the other hand, a state- and a group-identifying restriction are not known a priori, one might permute the simulated values randomly at each iteration to force the sampler to explore the whole unconstrained posterior distribution. The simulated values might then be post-processed and displayed in scatter plots to find an appropriate identifying restriction (see Frühwirth-Schnatter, 2001, and Kaufmann, 2002). Indeed, it turned out that the restrictions (R1) and (R2) are the appropriate ones to obtain the inference in the present paper.

¹¹If e.g. $K = 3$ and the simulated values fulfill $\mu_1^G > \mu_2^G > \mu_3^G$ instead of (R1), the appropriate permutation would be $(\rho(1), \dots, \rho(K)) = (3, 2, 1)$.

Index of Working Papers:

August 28, 1990	Pauer Franz	1 ¹⁾	Hat Böhm-Bawerk Recht gehabt? Zum Zusammenhang zwischen Handelsbilanzpassivum und Budgetdefizit in den USA ²⁾
March 20, 1991	Backé Peter	2 ¹⁾	Ost- und Mitteleuropa auf dem Weg zur Marktwirtschaft - Anpassungskrise 1990
March 14, 1991	Pauer Franz	3 ¹⁾	Die Wirtschaft Österreichs im Vergleich zu den EG-Staaten - eine makroökonomische Analyse für die 80er Jahre
May 28, 1991	Mauler Kurt	4 ¹⁾	The Soviet Banking Reform
July 16, 1991	Pauer Franz	5 ¹⁾	Die Auswirkungen der Finanzmarkt- und Kapitalverkehrsliberalisierung auf die Wirtschaftsentwicklung und Wirtschaftspolitik in Norwegen, Schweden, Finnland und Großbritannien - mögliche Konsequenzen für Österreich ³⁾
August 1, 1991	Backé Peter	6 ¹⁾	Zwei Jahre G-24-Prozess: Bestandsaufnahme und Perspektiven unter besonderer Berücksichtigung makroökonomischer Unterstützungsleistungen ⁴⁾
August 8, 1991	Holzmann Robert	7 ¹⁾	Die Finanzoperationen der öffentlichen Haushalte der Reformländer CSFR, Polen und Ungarn: Eine erste quantitative Analyse
January 27, 1992	Pauer Franz	8 ¹⁾	Erfüllung der Konvergenzkriterien durch die EG-Staaten und die EG-Mitgliedswerber Schweden und Österreich ⁵⁾
October 12, 1992	Hochreiter Eduard (Editor)	9 ¹⁾	Alternative Strategies For Overcoming the Current Output Decline of Economies in Transition
November 10, 1992	Hochreiter Eduard and Winckler Georg	10 ¹⁾	Signaling a Hard Currency Strategy: The Case of Austria

1) vergriffen (out of print)

2) In abgeänderter Form erschienen in Berichte und Studien Nr. 4/1990, S 74 ff

3) In abgeänderter Form erschienen in Berichte und Studien Nr. 4/1991, S 44 ff

4) In abgeänderter Form erschienen in Berichte und Studien Nr. 3/1991, S 39 ff

5) In abgeänderter Form erschienen in Berichte und Studien Nr. 1/1992, S 54 ff

March 12, 1993	Hochreiter Eduard (Editor)	11	The Impact of the Opening-up of the East on the Austrian Economy - A First Quantitative Assessment
June 8, 1993	Anulova Guzel	12	The Scope for Regional Autonomy in Russia
July 14, 1993	Mundell Robert	13	EMU and the International Monetary System: A Transatlantic Perspective
November 29, 1993	Hochreiter Eduard	14	Austria's Role as a Bridgehead Between East and West
March 8, 1994	Hochreiter Eduard (Editor)	15	Prospects for Growth in Eastern Europe
June 8, 1994	Mader Richard	16	A Survey of the Austrian Capital Market
September 1, 1994	Andersen Palle and Dittus Peter	17	Trade and Employment: Can We Afford Better Market Access for Eastern Europe?
November 21, 1994	Rautava Jouko	18 ¹⁾	Interdependence of Politics and Economic Development: Financial Stabilization in Russia
January 30, 1995	Hochreiter Eduard (Editor)	19	Austrian Exchange Rate Policy and European Monetary Integration - Selected Issues
October 3, 1995	Groeneveld Hans	20	Monetary Spill-over Effects in the ERM: The Case of Austria, a Former Shadow Member
December 6, 1995	Frydman Roman et al	21	Investing in Insider-dominated Firms: A Study of Voucher Privatization Funds in Russia
March 5, 1996	Wissels Rutger	22	Recovery in Eastern Europe: Pessimism Confounded ?
June 25, 1996	Pauer Franz	23	Will Asymmetric Shocks Pose a Serious Problem in EMU?
September 19, 1997	Koch Elmar B.	24	Exchange Rates and Monetary Policy in Central Europe - a Survey of Some Issues
April 15, 1998	Weber Axel A.	25	Sources of Currency Crises: An Empirical Analysis
May 28, 1998	Brandner Peter, Diebalek Leopold and Schuberth Helene	26	Structural Budget Deficits and Sustainability of Fiscal Positions in the European Union

June 15, 1998	Canzeroni Matthew, Cumby Robert, Diba Behzad and Eudey Gwen	27	Trends in European Productivity: Implications for Real Exchange Rates, Real Interest Rates and Inflation Differentials
June 20, 1998	MacDonald Ronald	28	What Do We Really Know About Real Exchange Rates?
June 30, 1998	Campa José and Wolf Holger	29	Goods Arbitrage and Real Exchange Rate Stationarity
July 3, 1998	Papell David H.	30	The Great Appreciation, the Great Depreciation, and the Purchasing Power Parity Hypothesis
July 20, 1998	Chinn Menzie David	31	The Usual Suspects? Productivity and Demand Shocks and Asia-Pacific Real Exchange Rates
July 30, 1998	Cecchetti Stephen G., Mark Nelson C., Sonora Robert	32	Price Level Convergence Among United States Cities: Lessons for the European Central Bank
September 30, 1998	Christine Gartner, Gert Wehinger	33	Core Inflation in Selected European Union Countries
November 5, 1998	José Viñals and Juan F. Jimeno	34	The Impact of EMU on European Unemployment
December 11, 1998	Helene Schuberth and Gert Wehinger	35	Room for Manoeuvre of Economic Policy in the EU Countries – Are there Costs of Joining EMU?
December 21, 1998	Dennis C. Mueller and Burkhard Raunig	36	Heterogeneities within Industries and Structure-Performance Models
May 21, 1999	Alois Geyer and Richard Mader	37	Estimation of the Term Structure of Interest Rates – A Parametric Approach
July 29, 1999	José Viñals and Javier Vallés	38	On the Real Effects of Monetary Policy: A Central Banker's View
December 20, 1999	John R. Freeman, Jude C. Hays and Helmut Stix	39	Democracy and Markets: The Case of Exchange Rates
March 01, 2000	Eduard Hochreiter and Tadeusz Kowalski	40	Central Banks in European Emerging Market Economies in the 1990s

March 20, 2000	Katrin Wesche	41	Is there a Credit Channel in Austria? The Impact of Monetary Policy on Firms' Investment Decisions
June 20, 2000	Jarko Fidrmuc and Jan Fidrmuc	42	Integration, Disintegration and Trade in Europe: Evolution of Trade Relations During the 1990s
March 06, 2001	Marc Flandreau	43	The Bank, the States, and the Market, A Austro-Hungarian Tale for Euroland, 1867-1914
May 01, 2001	Otmar Issing	44	The Euro Area and the Single Monetary Policy
May 18, 2001	Sylvia Kaufmann	45	Is there an asymmetric effect of monetary policy over time? A Bayesian analysis using Austrian data.
May 31, 2001	Paul De Grauwe and Marianna Grimaldi	46	Exchange Rates, Prices and Money. A Long Run Perspective
June 25, 2001	Vítor Gaspar, Gabriel Perez-Quiros and Jorge Sicilia	47	The ECB Monetary Strategy and the Money Market
July 27, 2001	David T. Llewellyn	48	<i>A Regulatory Regime</i> For Financial Stability
August 24, 2001	Helmut Elsinger and Martin Summer	49	Arbitrage Arbitrage and Optimal Portfolio Choice with Financial Constraints
September 1, 2001	Michael D. Goldberg and Roman Frydman	50	Macroeconomic Fundamentals and the DM/\$ Exchange Rate: Temporal Instability and the Monetary Model
September 8, 2001	Vittorio Corbo, Oscar Landerretche and Klaus Schmidt-Hebbel	51	Assessing Inflation Targeting after a Decade of World Experience
September 25, 2001	Kenneth N. Kuttner and Adam S. Posen	52	Beyond Bipolar: A Three-Dimensional Assessment of Monetary Frameworks
October 1, 2001	Luca Dedola and Sylvain Leduc	53	Why Is the Business-Cycle Behavior of Fundamentals Alike Across Exchange-Rate Regimes?
October 10, 2001	Tommaso Monacelli	54	New International Monetary Arrangements and the Exchange Rate

December 3, 2001	Peter Brandner, Harald Grech and Helmut Stix	55	The Effectiveness of Central Bank Intervention in the EMS: The Post 1993 Experience
January 2, 2002	Sylvia Kaufmann	56	Asymmetries in Bank Lending Behaviour. Austria During the 1990s
January 7, 2002	Martin Summer	57	Banking Regulation and Systemic Risk
January 28, 2002	Maria Valderrama	58	Credit Channel and Investment Behavior in Austria: A Micro-Econometric Approach
February 18, 2002	Gabriela de Raaij and Burkhard Raunig	59	Evaluating Density Forecasts with an Application to Stock Market Returns
February 25, 2002	Ben R. Craig and Joachim G. Keller	60	The Empirical Performance of Option Based Densities of Foreign Exchange
February 28, 2002	Peter Backé, Jarko Fidrmuc, Thomas Reininger and Franz Schardax	61	Price Dynamics in Central and Eastern European EU Accession Countries
April 8, 2002	Jesús Crespo-Cuaresma, Maria Antoinette Dimitz and Doris Ritzberger-Grünwald	62	Growth, Convergence and EU Membership
May 29, 2002	Markus Knell	63	Wage Formation in Open Economies and the Role of Monetary and Wage-Setting Institutions
June 19, 2002	Sylvester C.W. Eijffinger (comments by: José Luis Malo de Molina and by Franz Seitz)	64	The Federal Design of a Central Bank in a Monetary Union: The Case of the European System of Central Banks
July 1, 2002	Sebastian Edwards and I. Igal Magendzo (comments by Luis Adalberto Aquino Cardona and by Hans Genberg)	65	Dollarization and Economic Performance: What Do We Really Know?
July 10, 2002	David Begg (comment by Peter Bofinger)	66	Growth, Integration, and Macroeconomic Policy Design: Some Lessons for Latin America

July 15, 2002	Andrew Berg, Eduardo Borensztein, and Paolo Mauro (comment by Sven Arndt)	67	An Evaluation of Monetary Regime Options for Latin America
July 22, 2002	Eduard Hochreiter, Klaus Schmidt-Hebbel and Georg Winckler (comments by Lars Jonung and George Tavlas)	68	Monetary Union: European Lessons, Latin American Prospects
July 29, 2002	Michael J. Artis (comment by David Archer)	69	Reflections on the Optimal Currency Area (OCA) criteria in the light of EMU
August 5, 2002	Jürgen von Hagen, Susanne Mundschenk (comments by Thorsten Polleit, Gernot Doppelhofer and Roland Vaubel)	70	Fiscal and Monetary Policy Coordination in EMU
August 12, 2002	Dimitri Boreiko (comment by Ryszard Kokoszcyński)	71	EMU and Accession Countries: Fuzzy Cluster Analysis of Membership
August 19, 2002	Ansgar Belke and Daniel Gros (comments by Luís de Campos e Cunha, Nuno Alves and Eduardo Levy-Yeyati)	72	Monetary Integration in the Southern Cone: Mercosur Is Not Like the EU?
August 26, 2002	Friedrich Fritzer, Gabriel Moser and Johann Scharler	73	Forecasting Austrian HICP and its Components using VAR and ARIMA Models
September 30, 2002	Sebastian Edwards	74	The Great Exchange Rate Debate after Argentina
October 3, 2002	George Kopits (comments by Zsolt Darvas and Gerhard Illing)	75	Central European EU Accession and Latin American Integration: Mutual Lessons in Macroeconomic Policy Design

October 10, 2002	Eduard Hochreiter, Anton Korinek and Pierre L. Siklos (comments by Jeannine Bailliu and Thorvaldur Gylfason)	76	The Potential Consequences of Alternative Exchange Rate Regimes: A Study of Three Candidate Regions
October 14, 2002	Peter Brandner, Harald Grech	77	Why Did Central Banks Intervene in the EMS? The Post 1993 Experience
October 21, 2002	Alfred Stiglbauer, Florian Stahl, Rudolf Winter-Ebmer, Josef Zweimüller	78	Job Creation and Job Destruction in a Regulated Labor Market: The Case of Austria
October 28, 2002	Elsinger, Alfred Lehar and Martin Summer	79	Risk Assessment for Banking Systems
November 4, 2002	Helmut Stix	80	Does Central Bank Intervention Influence the Probability of a Speculative Attack? Evidence from the EMS
June 30, 2003	Markus Knell, Helmut Stix	81	How Robust are Money Demand Estimations? A Meta-Analytic Approach
July 7, 2003	Helmut Stix	82	How Do Debit Cards Affect Cash Demand? Survey Data Evidence
July 14, 2003	Sylvia Kaufmann	83	The business cycle of European countries. Bayesian clustering of country-individual IP growth series.