

Transmission Effects in the Presence of Structural Breaks: Evidence from South-Eastern European Countries

Minoas Koukouritakis

Department of Economics, University of Crete, Greece

*Athanasios P. Papadopoulos**

Department of Economics, University of Crete, Greece

Andreas Yannopoulos

Department of Economics, University of Crete, Greece

Abstract: In this paper, we investigate the monetary transmission mechanism through interest rate and real effective exchange rate channels, for five South-Eastern European countries, namely Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Romania and Turkey. Recent unit root and cointegration techniques in the presence of structural breaks in the data have been used in the analysis. The empirical results validate the existence of a valid long-run relationship, with parameter constancy, for each of the five sample countries. Additionally, the estimated impulse response functions regarding the monetary variables and the real effective exchange rate converge and follow a reasonable pattern in all cases.

JEL Classification: E43, F15, F42

Keywords: Monetary Transmission Mechanism, Structural Breaks, LM Unit Root Tests, Cointegration Tests, Impulse Responses.

* *Corresponding author.* Full postal address: Department of Economics, University of Crete, University Campus, Rethymno 74100, Greece. Tel: +302831077418, fax: +302831077404, e-mail: appapa@uoc.gr . This study was financed by the Bank of Greece via the Special Account for Research (ELKE – Project KA3342) of the University of Crete. The authors would like to thank Professor Stephen G. Hall and Professor George S. Tavlas for their constructive suggestions and helpful comments that improved the quality of the paper. Of course, the usual caveat applies.

1. Introduction

The integration procedure of the South-Eastern European economies to the European Union (EU) is continuously evolving and becomes intense during the last decade. For instance, some of the South-Eastern European countries are either already members of the European Union (EU) or the Eurozone, or associated with the EU; and some others are set to become EU members. Of course, this implies that the EU affects the above countries in a more systematic way. At the same time, the economic transactions in this region have become more significant and systematic, leading banks, enterprises, trade and individuals to extend their activities in the whole region. Thus, there is a need of systematic and detailed research about the economic policies of the countries in this region, especially in our days when the current financial and debt crisis in the Eurozone is at stake. On the one hand, Greece, which is a Eurozone member since 2001, is in deep recession with high sovereign debt, and having signed the Memoranda I and II with the ECB-EU-IMF, is in fiscal contraction and faces high unemployment. On the other hand, the emerging economies of the South-Eastern Europe are characterised by relatively high current account deficits and are more vulnerable to the deterioration of the international economy, since they have been negatively affected by the reduction of external demand and the increase in the cost of borrowing from abroad.

In the present paper we attempt to investigate the monetary transmission mechanism for five countries of South-Eastern Europe, namely Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Romania and Turkey. Especially for the transition economies (Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania) this investigation is quite important, since it will allow us to understand how fast, and to what extent, a change in the central bank's instruments modifies domestic variables, such as inflation. Note that an increasing number of transition economies are already making use of inflation targeting regime, or are planning to do so. Also, it is important to evaluate whether monetary transmission operates differently in the transition economies. Coricelli, Égert and MacDonald, (2006) analysed monetary policy transmission mechanism in Central and Eastern Europe through four channels: (i) interest rate channel, (ii) exchange rate channel, (iii) asset price channel, and (iv) broad lending channel. In the present analysis we will focus on the interest rate and real effective rate channels.

The literature about monetary policy transmission mechanism is quite large and extending, both in the theoretical and empirical frameworks. Regarding the interest rate channel, there are three approaches. The 'cost of funds' approach, which tests how market interest rates are transmitted to retail bank interest rates of comparable maturity (De Bondt,

2002), the ‘monetary policy’ approach, which directly tests the impact on retail rates of changes in the interest rate controlled by monetary policy (Sander and Kleimeier, 2004a), and a unifying approach that includes two stages: the pass-through from the monetary policy rate to market rates and the transmission from market rates to retail rates. Note that the interest rate pass-through is usually investigated using an error correction model (ECM) framework. During the last two decades, several researchers have focused on the transition countries of the Central and Eastern Europe. They have mainly studied the asymmetry of the adjustment process, in relation to the Eurozone countries, and (b) the long-run pass through. Regarding the former their results are mixed (Opiela, 1999; Crespo-Cuaresma, Égert and Reininger, 2004; Horváth, Krekó and Naszódi, 2004; Sander and Kleimeier, 2004b; Égert, Crespo-Cuaresma and Reininger, 2006), while regarding the latter their results indicate that both the contemporaneous and long-run pass-through increase over time, while the mean adjustment lag to full pass-through decreases, as more recent data can be used (Crespo-Cuaresma, Égert and Reininger, 2004; Horváth, Krekó and Naszódi, 2004; Sander and Kleimeier, 2004b). The exchange-rate pass-through in the transition economies has also been studied by several researchers, using mainly vector autoregressive (VAR) and vector error-correction (VECM) models (see, for instance, Darvas, 2001; Mihaljek and Klau, 2001; Coricelli, Jazbec and Masten, 2003; Dabušinskas, 2003; Gueorguiev, 2003; Bitâns, 2004; Kara et al., 2005; Korhonen and Wachtel, 2005).

The novelty of this paper lies on the following issues. Firstly, we use the most recent data from the mid-1990s to 2011, in order to establish a valid long-run relationship for each sample country and to estimate impulse response functions. Secondly, recently developed Lagrange Multiplier (LM) unit root (Lee and Strazicich, 2003) and cointegration tests (Johansen, Mosconi and Nielsen, 2000 and Lütkepohl and Saikkonen, 2000, and their extensions in several recent papers noted below) have been implemented in the analysis. These tests allow for structural breaks in the data. Such breaks are important in this context, since the economic policies implemented in the sample countries are likely to have caused structural shifts in the level and trend of their variable. Additionally, the sample countries are heterogeneous and in different stages of integration with the EU: Bulgaria and Romania joined the EU in 2007 after a long transition period from centrally-planned to free market economies; Croatia will join the EU in 2013 having also followed a long transition period; Greece is a Eurozone member since 2001; and Turkey has settled a customs union with the

EU in 1996, is under negotiations for EU membership in the future, and also had a stand-by agreement with the IMF for a number of years.

In summary, the empirical evidence validates the existence of structural breaks and identifies a valid long-run relationship among the industrial production, the consumer price index, the money supply, the money market rate and the real effective exchange rate, for each of the five countries under consideration. Additionally, the estimated impulse response functions regarding the monetary variables and the real effective exchange rate converge and seem reasonable in all cases.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 describes briefly the theoretical framework of the analysis and outlines the unit root and cointegration tests in the presence of structural breaks. Section 3 describes the data and analyses the empirical results, while Section 4 provides some concluding remarks.

2. Theoretical Framework

In the present study, we estimate a reduced-form model in order to investigate the monetary transmission mechanism for the countries under consideration, namely Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Romania and Turkey. The analysis will focus on the interest rate channel and the real effective exchange rate channel. We did not attempt to construct a full structural model in order to capture relationships proposed by economic theory, due to (a) data limitations, and (b) the extreme heterogeneity of the sample countries. More specifically, Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania have been transformed from centrally-planned to free market economies and probably they have not yet settled to a long-run pattern. Also, Bulgaria and Romania are EU members since 2007, while Croatia is going to join the EU in 2013. On the other hand, Greece is a full Eurozone member since 2001, while Turkey has settled a customs union with EU since 1996 and is currently under negotiations for EU membership in the future. Thus, our analysis will be based on unit root and cointegration testing, in the presence of structural breaks, along with VECM specification and impulse response estimation. Note that structural breaks are important in this context, since the implemented economic policies in the sample countries are likely to have caused structural shifts in the level and trend of the variables under consideration.

2.1 Unit Root Tests with Structural Breaks

In order to test the statistical properties of the data, we used the two-break LM (Lagrange Multiplier) test developed by Lee and Strazicich (2003). This test has several desirable properties: (a) it determines the structural breaks “endogenously” from the data, (b) its null distribution is invariant to level shifts in a variable, and (c) it is easy to interpret; by including breaks under both the null and alternative hypotheses, a rejection of the null hypothesis of a unit root implies unambiguously trend stationarity.

Consider for instance the two-break LM unit root test for the process y_t generated by

$$y_t = \delta' Z_t + e_t, \quad e_t = \beta e_{t-1} + A(L)\varepsilon_t, \quad \varepsilon_t \sim iid(0, \sigma^2) \quad (1)$$

where $A(L)$ is a k -order polynomial and Z_t is a vector of exogenous variables, whose components are determined by the type of breaks in y_t . Lee and Strazicich (2003) extend Perron’s (1989, 1993) single-break models to include two breaks in the level (Model A) and two breaks in both the level and trend (Model C) of y_t . Eq. (1) shows that y_t has a unit root if $\beta = 1$, while it is trend stationary if $\beta < 1$. According to the LM principle, a unit root test statistic can be obtained from the test regression

$$\Delta y_t = \delta' \Delta Z_t + \phi \tilde{S}_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^k \theta_i \Delta \tilde{S}_{t-i} + u_t, \quad (2)$$

where $\tilde{S}_t = y_t - \tilde{\psi}_x - Z_t \tilde{\delta}$, $t = 2, \dots, T$, in which $\tilde{\delta}$ is a vector of coefficients in the regression of Δy_t on ΔZ_t and $\tilde{\psi}_x = y_1 - Z_1 \tilde{\delta}$, where y_1 and Z_1 are the first observations of y_t and Z_t , respectively, and u_t is a white noise error term. The lagged differences of \tilde{S}_{t-i} correct for serial correlation in u_t . The unit root null hypothesis is described by $\phi = 0$ in eq. (2) and is tested by the LM test statistic:

$$\tilde{\tau} = t\text{-statistic for the hypothesis } \phi = 0. \quad (3)$$

To endogenously determine the location of the two breaks ($\lambda_j = T_{B_j}/T$, $j=1,2$) the two-break minimum LM test statistic is determined by a grid search over λ :

$$LM_{\tau} = \inf_{\lambda} \{\tilde{\tau}(\lambda)\} \quad (4)$$

The critical values for this test are invariant to the break locations (λ_j) for Model A but depend on the break locations for Model C.

2.2 Cointegration Tests with Structural Breaks

As in the case with unit root testing, structural breaks in the data can distort substantially standard inference procedures for cointegration. Thus, it is necessary to account for possible breaks in the data before inference on cointegration can be made. In the recent literature on cointegration in a VAR framework, there are two main approaches that test for cointegration in the presence of structural breaks.

The first approach has been developed by Johansen, Mosconi and Nielsen (2000) (JMN). It extends the standard VECM with a number of additional dummy variables in order to account for q possible exogenous breaks in the levels and trends of the deterministic components of a vector-valued stochastic process. JMN then derive the asymptotic distribution of the likelihood ratio (LR) or trace statistic for cointegration and obtain critical values or p-values, for the multivariate counterparts of models A and C above with q possible breaks, using the response surface method.

To illustrate the JMN approach, consider briefly the simple case with only level shifts in the constant term μ of an observed p -dimensional time series $y_t, t=1, \dots, T$, of possibly $I(1)$ variables. JMN divide the sample observations into q sub-samples, according to the location of the break points, and assume the following VECM(k) for y_t conditional on the first k observations of each sub-sample $y_{T_{j-1}+1}, \dots, y_{T_{j-1}+k}$:

$$\Delta y_t = \Pi y_{t-1} + \mu D_t + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \Gamma_i \Delta y_{t-i} + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=2}^q g_{ji} D_{j,t-i} + \varepsilon_t, \quad \varepsilon_t \sim iidN(0, \Omega), \quad (5)$$

where $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_q)$ and $D_t = (D_{1,t}, \dots, D_{q,t})'$ are of dimension $(p \times q)$ and $(q \times 1)$, respectively, and the $D_{j,t}$'s are dummy variables, such that $D_{j,t} = 1$ for $T_{j-1} + k + 1 \leq t \leq T_j$ and $D_{j,t} = 0$ otherwise, for $j=1, \dots, q$. The hypothesis of at most r_0 cointegrating relations ($0 \leq r_0 < p$) among the components of y_t can be stated in terms of the reduced rank of the $(p \times p)$ matrix $\Pi = \alpha\beta'$, where α and β are matrices of dimension $(p \times r)$. The cointegration hypothesis can then be tested by the likelihood ratio statistic

$$LR_{JMN} = -T \sum_{i=r_0+1}^p \ln(1 - \hat{\lambda}_i) \quad (6)$$

where the eigenvalues $\hat{\lambda}_j$'s can be obtained by solving the related generalized eigenvalue problem, based on estimation of the VECM(k) in equation (5), under the additional restrictions that $\mu_j = \alpha\rho_j'$, $j=1, \dots, q$, where ρ_j is of dimension $1 \times r$. These restrictions are

required in order to eliminate a linear trend in the level of the process y_t (Johansen *et al.*, 2000, p. 218).

The second approach has been developed by Lütkepohl and his associates (Lütkepohl and Saikkonen, 2000; Saikkonen and Lütkepohl, 2000; Trenkler, Saikkonen and Lütkepohl, 2008) (henceforth the LST approach). These authors assume that the DGP for a vector-valued process y_t is such that its deterministic part does not affect its stochastic part. It is then possible to remove the deterministic part, with possible breaks, in the first stage, and carry out Likelihood Ratio (LR) or Lagrange Multiplier (LM) cointegration tests in the second stage using the *de-trended* stochastic part of y_t .

Briefly, in the LST approach the DGP for y_t is the sum of a deterministic part μ_t and a stochastic part x_t , where x_t is an unobservable zero-mean purely stochastic VAR process. Structural shifts in y_t are accounted for by the use of appropriate dummy variables in the deterministic component μ_t . To illustrate the LST approach for LR-type tests, consider the case of a single shift in both the level and the trend of y_t , at time T_B . LST specify the following DGP for y_t :

$$y_t = \mu_t + x_t = \mu_0 + \mu_1 t + \delta_0 d_t + \delta_1 b_t + x_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (7a)$$

where t is a linear time trend, μ_i ($i = 0, 1$) and δ_i ($i = 0, 1$) are unknown $(p \times 1)$ parameter vectors, d_t and b_t are dummy variables defined as $d_t = b_t = 0$ for $t < T_B$, and $d_t = 1$ and $b_t = t - T_B + 1$ for $t \geq T_B$. The unobserved stochastic error x_t is assumed to follow a $VAR(k)$ process with VECM representation

$$\Delta x_t = \Pi x_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \Gamma_i \Delta x_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t, \quad \varepsilon_t \sim iidN(0, \Omega), \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (7b)$$

It is also assumed that the components of x_t are at most integrated of order one processes and cointegrated (i.e. $\Pi = \alpha\beta'$) with cointegrating rank r_0 .

Given the DGP in (7a) and (7b), the first step of the LST approach involves obtaining estimates of the parameter vectors μ_0 , μ_1 , δ_0 and δ_1 in (7a) using a feasible GLS procedure under the null hypothesis $H_0(r_0) : rank(\Pi) = r_0$ vs. $H_1(r_0) : rank(\Pi) > r_0$ (see Saikkonen and Lütkepohl (2000) for details). Having the estimated parameters, $\hat{\mu}_0$, $\hat{\mu}_1$, $\hat{\delta}_0$ and $\hat{\delta}_1$, one then computes the de-trended series $\hat{x}_t = y_t - \hat{\mu}_0 - \hat{\mu}_1 t - \hat{\delta}_0 d_t - \hat{\delta}_1 b_t$. In the second step, an LR-type

test for the null hypothesis of cointegration is applied to the de-trended series. This involves replacing x_t by \hat{x}_t in the VECM (7b) and computing the LR or trace statistic:

$$LR_{LST} = -T \sum_{i=r_0+1}^p \ln(1 - \tilde{\lambda}_i) , \quad (8)$$

where the eigenvalues $\tilde{\lambda}_i$'s can be obtained by solving a generalized eigenvalue problem, along the lines of Johansen (1988).

Under the null hypothesis of cointegration, Trenkler *et al.* (2008) derive asymptotic results and p -values for the case of one level shift and one trend break in the y_t process, and show that, in this case, the asymptotic distribution of the LR statistic in (8) depends on the location of the break point. They also discuss how the results can be extended to the general case of $q > 1$ break points. Also, critical or p -values for a single level shift can be computed by the response surface techniques developed in Trenkler (2008).

Since the JMN and LST approaches have different finite sample properties, we employ both the LR_{LST} and LR_{JMN} test statistics in the subsequent analysis. It is worth noting here that Lütkepohl, Saikkonen and Trenkler (2003) studied the statistical properties of their tests in the case of shifts in the level of y_t and compare them to alternative tests developed by Johansen *et al.* (2000). They found that their tests have better size and power properties than the Johansen *et al.* tests in finite samples. For that reason, if the results of the JMN and LST tests are different, we will use those of the latter test. The break points are determined from the data on the basis of the results of the two-break LM unit root test discussed above.

3. Data and Empirical Results

3.1 Data

Our sample consists of monthly data that end on 2011:07. The starting date of the data for each country is different, depending on data availability. The time span for Bulgaria begins in 2000:01, for Croatia and Romania in 2002:01, for Greece in 1995:01, and for Turkey in 2003:01. We obtained data for industrial production (IP), consumer price index (CPI), money supply (M1 for Croatia, M2 for Romania, M3 for Bulgaria and Turkey, while for Greece that is a Eurozone member we did not use money supply in the analysis), money market rate (MMR) for all countries except Greece, for which we used Treasury bill rate (TB), and real effective exchange rates based on consumer price index (REER). All data were obtained from the International Financial Statistics of the IMF, except for the real effective exchange rate for

Turkey that was obtained from the Central Bank of Turkey. All data, except interest rates, were transformed into natural logarithms.

3.2 Unit Root Tests Results

Before proceeding to our analysis, each time series was first tested for a unit root. Table 1 reports the unit root results from the two-break LM test. Each time series was tested for a unit root using the two-break LM test at the 1- and 5 percent levels of significance. The number of lags, k , in equation (2) was determined using a “general to specific” procedure at each combination of relative break points (λ_1, λ_2) . Initially, the lag-length was set at $k = 12$, and the significance of the last lagged term was examined at the 10 percent level. The procedure was repeated until the last lagged term was found to be significantly different than zero, where the procedure stops.¹

As shown in the last column of table 1, the unit root hypothesis with two structural breaks cannot be rejected for all variables under consideration. Column 5 of table 1, which presents the estimated structural breaks in each time series, indicates that the consumer price index, the money supply and the money market rate of Croatia experience one structural break. Also, column 3 of table 1 reports that Model C (i.e. break(s) in both the level and the trend) fits the data best for all of the cases, over the sample period. Not surprisingly, the estimated structural breaks correspond well to specific events that have taken place in the sample countries during the sample period.

More specifically, the industrial production, the money market rate and the real effective exchange rate of Bulgaria experience a structural break in the 2008-2010 period, which is probably related with the consequences of the global financial crisis. The real effective exchange rate of the country, along with the consumer price index and the money supply appear to have a break in 2007, when Bulgaria became a full member of the EU. Also, the industrial production, the consumer price index, the money supply and the money market rate of Bulgaria experience a structural break in the 2001-2005 period. In general, these breaks can be attributed to certain measures that the country adopted during the long transition period that experienced, and the negotiations for EU accession. Note that following the 1997 economic and financial crisis, Bulgaria adopted a euro-based currency board to stabilise its

¹ The two-break and one-break LM tests were computed using the Gauss codes of J. Lee available at the website <http://www.cba.ua.edu/~jlee/gauss> .

exchange rate, and implemented a comprehensive economic plan, which included trade and price liberalisation, welfare sector reform, and divesting in state-owned enterprises.

For Croatia, all variables experience a structural break during the 2008-2010 period. Obviously, this break can be attributed to the consequences of the global financial crisis. The industrial production and the real effective exchange rate of the country appear to have a second break in the 2006-2007 period. During that period, the EU-Croatia negotiations for full membership were started and the process of screening 35 *acquis* chapters was completed.

The global financial crisis had, of course, a significant impact on the Greek economy. The structural break on the industrial production and the Treasury bill rate of the country in mid-2008 confirms the above argument. The Greek industrial production, consumer price index and real effective exchange rate experience a break in early 1999, which is probably related with the formation of the Eurozone. The consumer price index and the real effective exchange rate also experience a break in the 2001-2002 period, which can be attributed to Greece's membership in the Eurozone and the subsequent adjustments in the country's economy. Finally, the structural break on the Greek Treasury bill rate in early 2004 coincides with the increased budget deficit due to the preparation of the Olympic Games and the forthcoming elections.

Moving to Romania, the two structural breaks on the industrial production and the second break on the money market rate can be attributed to the global financial crisis. Also, the Romanian money supply and real effective exchange rate appear to have a break in 2007, when the country became a full member of the EU. Both structural breaks on the country's consumer price index, along with the first break on the money supply, the money market rate and the real effective exchange rate occur in the 2003-2006 period. In general, these breaks can be attributed to certain measures that the country adopted during its long transition period and the negotiations for EU accession. Note that since 2000, Romania has implemented tight fiscal and monetary policies along with structural reforms designed to support growth and improve financial discipline in the private sector. These reforms have placed the country's public finances and the financial system in a firmer footing. Further, Romania is currently considering a currency board vis-à-vis the euro, in order to reduce inflation and gain monetary policy credibility.

In the case of Turkey, the industrial production and the real effective exchange rate appear to have two breaks during the 2008-2009 period. Note that it is not clear if these breaks have been occurred due the global financial crisis, because during that period the

country was under negotiations in order to end the stand-by agreement with the IMF. Especially after the severe economic crisis that the country faced in the 2000-2001 period, Turkey implemented an IMF-engineered economic program based on high interest rates in order to attract foreign capital, accompanied by fiscal contraction and privatisations. This program led to overvaluation of the country's currency ('lira') and to an import boom both in consumption and investment goods. As a result, Turkey's external indebtedness increased and the deficit on the current account rose to 7.5 per cent of GNP by mid-2008. The structural breaks on the country's consumer price index, money supply and money market rates during the 2004-2007 period, can be attributed to the economic measures adopted due to the above IMF-engineered program.

3.3 Cointegration Tests Results

In this section we examine the cointegration results with structural breaks on our reduced-form vector. These results are based on the JMN and the LST procedures described in Section 2.2. As breaks for each country, we used the estimated structural breaks appeared most frequently in table 1. Also, we avoided using breaks very close to the beginning or the end of our sample. In the case of the JMN procedure we estimated the VECM in equation (5) for each country and computed the LR_{JMN} test statistics and the corresponding response surface p-values using the JMulti software. Also, the Akaike's information criterion was used in order to select the appropriate lag length, k , in the VECM for each of the five countries. In the case of the LST procedure, we estimated the model in equations (7a) and (7b) by adjusting (7a) to account for the structural breaks specific to each country. Since all five countries experience two significant breaks in both the level and the trend of their exchange rates, we extended equation (7a) by adding a second step dummy and a second linear trend dummy. Then, for each country we computed the LR_{LST} test statistic and the corresponding response surface p-values using GAUSS routines.²

Table 2 reports the LR_{JMN} and LR_{LST} test statistics and the respective p-values, for each of the five sample countries. As shown in the table, the JMN test indicates four cointegrating vectors for Bulgaria, three cointegrating vectors for Croatia and Romania, and two cointegrating vectors for Greece and Turkey, either at the 5 or at 10 percent level of significance. On the other hand, the LST test indicates a single cointegrating vector in each

² The authors are grateful to Carsten Trenkler for kindly providing them with the Gauss codes for these estimations.

case.³ As noted in Section 2.2, the LST test has better size and power properties than the JMN test in finite samples. Thus, our subsequent analysis will be based on the results of the LST test.

Note here, that the JMN and LST tests for cointegration in the presence of structural breaks, assume that the “long-run” cointegration parameters remain constant over the sample period. Otherwise, the test results and inference would be invalid. To test for parameter constancy, we used the methodology developed by Hansen and Johansen (1999), who suggest a graphical procedure based on recursively-estimated eigenvalues. Figure 1 shows the time path of each eigenvalue (i.e. the τ_{sum} -statistic) for the null hypothesis that it is stable. The dotted line in each plot corresponds to 1.36, which is the 5 percent critical value for the Hansen and Johansen parameter constancy test. The null hypothesis of long run parameter constancy cannot be rejected in all cases, as the time paths of the eigenvalues are always below the dotted line.⁴

3.4 VECMs and Orthogonal Impulse Responses

Based on the cointegration results of the previous section, we have established a valid relationship, which can be interpreted as the long-run relationship between the industrial production, the consumer price index, the money supply, the money market rate and the real effective exchange rate. Following the above, we estimate the corresponding VECMs, based on equations (7a) and (7b). Table 3 presents the estimated coefficients of the solved cointegrating vectors (i.e. reduced form equations) normalised on the industrial production, along with the results from the long-run exclusion test. As shown in table 3 most of the estimated coefficients have the expected signs. The long-run exclusion test investigates whether any of the variables under consideration can be excluded from the cointegrating space. Using the likelihood ratio test statistic, our results imply that the consumer price index can be excluded from the cointegrating equation for Bulgaria, while both the consumer price index and the real effective exchange rate can be excluded from the cointegrating equation for Croatia. For Greece no variable can be excluded from the cointegration space. The consumer price index and the money market rate can be excluded from the cointegrating equation for Romania, while for Turkey, the money supply, the money market rate and the real effective

³ We have also performed the cointegration tests using different combinations of structural breaks. The estimated results did not change and are available upon request.

⁴ We have included centred seasonal dummies in the Hansen-Johansen tests, the VECM estimations and the impulse responses.

exchange rate can be excluded from the cointegration space. When it comes to the implied structural breaks, the long-run exclusion test shows that none of the breaks can be excluded from the cointegrating space for Croatia and Romania. On the contrary, both structural changes are found statistically insignificant for Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey in the long run.

Also, we performed weak exogeneity tests, in order to investigate whether a variable can be considered as weakly exogenous to the long-run parameters. A variable is said to be weakly exogenous if the corresponding adjustment coefficient cannot be statistically different from zero. The results for this test are reported in table 4 and provide us information about the variables that drive the system to long-run equilibrium. Starting from the case of Bulgaria, money supply is found to be weakly exogenous and, thus, drives the system to its long-run equilibrium. For Croatia, consumer price index and real effective exchange rate are found to be weakly exogenous, while for Greece, the driving forces of the system are the industrial production and the real effective exchange rate. For Romania, industrial production and consumer price index are found to be weakly exogenous, while for Turkey weak exogeneity has been established for the consumer price index and the money supply.

Finally, and in order to complete our analysis for the monetary transmission mechanism in each country, we estimated orthogonal impulse response functions, based on an innovation of one standard deviation in size, for each of the monetary variables (money supply and money market rate or Treasury bill rate), as well as the real effective exchange rate. The impulse responses are presented in figures 2 to 6. As shown, for the most of them the range of values is of small magnitude. In general, they converge in all cases, implying stability of our model, and seem reasonable. Only in the case of Turkey, the response of money market rate to a shock in money supply and the response of industrial production to a shock in real effective exchange rate do not converge to a stable level. A possible explanation for this peculiar result could be attributed to the strong inflationary tendencies in the Turkish economy.

4. Concluding Remarks

In the present we attempted to investigate the transmission mechanism for five South-Eastern Europe countries, namely Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Romania and Turkey. We focused on the monetary transmission through interest rate channel and real effective exchange rate channel. Data limitations and the extreme heterogeneity of the above countries did not allow us to construct a full structural model based on economic theory. Thus, we used a small reduced-

form model for each country, consisted of five endogenous variables, in order to establish a valid long-run relationship and to analyse the impulse response functions. We also included structural shifts in our analysis, since the implemented economic policies in the sample countries are likely to have caused structural shifts in the level and trend of their variables

The unit root test results in the presence of structural breaks confirm the existence of one or two breaks for each variable. The cointegration test results in the presence of structural breaks show evidence of a single cointegrating vector with parameter constancy, among the industrial production, the consumer price index, the money supply, the money market rate and the real effective exchange rate, for each of the five countries under consideration. These results identify a long-run relationship among the above variables, while the estimated impulse response functions regarding the monetary variables and the real effective exchange rate converge and seem reasonable in all cases. The present analysis regarding the monetary transmission mechanism could be extended with the use of a global modelling framework, based on the Global VAR (GVAR) model, which avoids all limitations that arise by the use of single VAR and VECMs models and provides a consistent and flexible framework.

References

- Bitâns, M. (2004), 'Pass-Through of Exchange Rates to Domestic Prices in East European Countries and the Role of Economic Environment', *Bank of Latvia Working Paper*, No. 4.
- Coricelli, F., Égert, B. and MacDonald, R. (2006), 'Monetary Transmission Mechanism in Central and Eastern Europe: Gliding on a Wind of Change', *Bank of Finland, Institute for Economies in Transition, Discussion Paper* 8.
- Coricelli, F. Jazbec, B. and Masten, I. (2003), 'Exchange Rate Pass-Through in Acceding Countries: The Role of Exchange Rate Regimes', *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 30 (5), 1375-1391.
- Crespo-Cuaresma, J., Égert, B. and Reininger, T. (2004), 'Interest Rate Pass-Through in New EU Member States: The Case of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland', *William Davidson Institute Working Paper*, No. 671.
- De Bondt, G. (2002), 'Retail Bank Interest Rate Pass-Through: New Evidence at the Euro Area Level', *European Central Bank Working Paper*, No. 136.
- Dabušinskas, A. (2003), 'Exchange Rate Pass-Through to Estonian Prices', *Bank of Estonia Working Paper*, No. 10.
- Darvas, Z. (2001), 'Exchange Rate Pass-Through and Real Exchange Rate in EU Candidate Countries', *Deutsche Bundesbank Discussion Paper*, No. 10.
- Égert, B., Crespo-Cuaresma, J. and Reininger, T. (2006), 'Interest Rate Pass-Through in Central and Eastern Europe: Reborn from Ashes to Pass Away?', *Focus on European Economic Integration*, No. 1.
- Gueorguiev, N. (2003), 'Exchange Rate Pass-Through in Romania', *IMF Working Paper*, No. 130.
- Hansen, H. and Johansen, S. (1999). 'Some Tests for Parameter Constancy in Cointegrated VAR-models', *Econometrics Journal*, 2(2), 306-333.
- Horváth, C., Krekó, J. and Naszódi, A. (2004), 'Interest Rate Pass-Through: The Case of Hungary', *National Bank of Hungary Working Paper*, No. 8.
- Johansen, S. (1988). 'Statistical Analysis of Cointegration Vectors', *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 12(4), 231-254.
- Johansen, S., Mosconi, R. and Nielsen, B. (2000). 'Cointegration Analysis in the Presence of Structural Breaks in the Deterministic Trend', *Econometrics Journal*, 3(2), 216-249.

- Kara, H., Küçük Tuğer, H., Özlale, Ü., Tuğer, B., Yavuz, D. and Yücel, E.M. (2005), 'Exchange Rate Pass-Through in Turkey: Has It Changed and to What Extent?', *Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey Working Paper*, No. 4.
- Korhonen, I. and Wachtel, P. (2005), 'A Note on Exchange Rate Pass-Through in CIS Countries', *Bank of Finland Discussion Paper*, No. 2.
- Lee, J. and Strazicich, M.C. (2003). 'Minimum Lagrange Multiplier Unit Root Test with Two Structural Breaks', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85(4), 1082-1089.
- Lütkepohl, H. and Saikkonen, P. (2000). 'Testing for the Cointegrating Rank of a VAR Process with a Time Trend', *Journal of Econometrics*, 95(1), 177-198.
- Lütkepohl, H., Saikkonen, P. and Trenkler, C. (2003). 'Comparison of Tests for the Cointegrating Rank of a VAR Process with a Structural Shift', *Journal of Econometrics*, 113(2), 201-229.
- Mihaljek, D. and Klau, M. (2001), 'A Note on the Pass-Through from Exchange Rate and Foreign Price Changes to Inflation in Selected Emerging Market Economies', *Bank of International Settlements Paper*, No. 8.
- Opiela, T. P. (1999), 'The Responsiveness of Loan Rates to Monetary Policy in Poland: The Effects of Bank Structure', *National Bank of Poland Materials and Studies*, No. 12.
- Perron, P. (1989). 'The Great Crash, the Oil Price Shock, and the Unit Root Hypothesis', *Econometrica*, 57(6), 1361-1401.
- Perron, P. (1993). 'Erratum: The Great Crash, the Oil Price Shock, and the Unit Root Hypothesis', *Econometrica*, 61(1), 248-249.
- Saikkonen, P. and Lütkepohl, H. (2000). 'Testing for the Cointegrating Rank of a VAR Process with Structural Shifts', *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 18(4), 451-464.
- Sander, H. and Kleimeier, S. (2004a), '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*, 23(3), 461-492.
- Sander, H. and Kleimeier, S. (2004b), 'Interest Rate Pass-Through in an Enlarged Europe: The Role of Banking Market Structure for Monetary Policy Transmission in Transition Economies', *University of Maastricht, METEOR Research Memoranda*, No. 45.
- Trenkler, C. (2008). 'Determining P-values for Systems Cointegration Tests with a Prior Adjustment for Deterministic Terms', *Computational Statistics*, 23(1), 19-39.

Trenkler, C., Saikkonen, P. and Lütkepohl, H. (2008) 'Testing for the Cointegrating Rank of a VAR Process with Level Shift and Trend Break', *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 29(2), 331-358.

Table 1: Two-break minimum LM unit root test results

Country	Variable	Model	\hat{k}	\hat{T}_B	$\hat{\lambda}_1, \hat{\lambda}_2$	LM – statistic
Bulgaria	IP	C	12	2003:12, 2008:08	0.4, 0.8	-5.4237
	CPI	C	12	2002:04, 2007:10	0.2, 0.6	-4.4316
	M3	C	12	2005:02, 2007:08	0.4, 0.6	-4.4335
	MMR	C	10	2001:12, 2009:02	0.2, 0.8	-4.0249
	REER	C	2	2007:10, 2010:01	0.6, 0.8	-5.0334
Croatia	IP	C	11	2006:02, 2008:10	0.4, 0.8	-5.6393
	CPI	C	12	2006:03 ⁿ , 2008:01	0.4, 0.6	-4.5633
	M1	C	12	2005:03 ⁿ , 2008:11	0.4, 0.8	-3.9050
	MMR	C	1	2008:02 ⁿ , 2008:11	0.6, 0.8	-5.6928
	REER	C	1	2007:11, 2010:01	0.6, 0.8	-5.5588
Greece	IP	C	11	1999:12, 2008:08	0.4, 0.8	-5.5307
	CPI	C	10	1999:02, 2001:10	0.2, 0.4	-5.0288
	TB	C	6	2004:02, 2008:09	0.6, 0.8	-3.9003
	REER	C	12	1999:02, 2002:11	0.2, 0.4	-5.2925
Romania	IP	C	12	2008:08, 2010:03	0.6, 0.8	-5.4496
	CPI	C	10	2003:07, 2005:01	0.2, 0.4	-4.3414
	M2	C	12	2004:12, 2007:11	0.4, 0.6	-4.8818
	MMR	C	6	2006:09, 2009:03	0.4, 0.8	-4.7614
	REER	C	1	2004:11, 2007:10	0.4, 0.6	-4.4244
Turkey	IP	C	12	2008:09, 2009:10	0.6, 0.8	-5.5628
	CPI	C	12	2004:10, 2007:11	0.2, 0.6	-5.2050
	M3	C	6	2005:10, 2007:07	0.4, 0.6	-5.1521
	MMR	C	3	2004:10, 2006:10	0.2, 0.4	-5.2923
	REER	C	1	2008:04, 2009:12	0.6, 0.8	-4.7017
Break Points	Critical values for Model C					
$\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$	1%	5%				
$\lambda=(0.2, 0.4)$	-6.16	-5.59				
$\lambda=(0.2, 0.6)$	-6.41	-5.74				
$\lambda=(0.2, 0.8)$	-6.33	-5.71				
$\lambda=(0.4, 0.6)$	-6.45	-5.67				
$\lambda=(0.4, 0.8)$	-6.42	-5.65				
$\lambda=(0.6, 0.8)$	-6.32	-5.73				

\hat{k} is the estimated number of to correct for serial correlation. \hat{T}_B denotes the estimated break points. $\hat{\lambda}_1$ and $\hat{\lambda}_2$ are the estimated relative break points. IP stands for industrial production, CPI for consumer price index, M1, M2 and M3 for money supply, MMR for money market rate, TB for Treasury bill rate, and REER for real effective exchange rate. ⁿ indicates no significant break at the 10 percent level of significance. The critical values are from table 2 of Lee and Strazicich (2003).

Table 2. The JMN and LST cointegration tests with structural breaks

Country	$(p - r_0)$	$LR_{JMN}(r_0)$	$LR_{LST}(r_0)$	p-values JMN	p-values LST	\hat{k}
Bulgaria (breaks on: 2005:02, 2007:08)	5	230.57**	95.90**	0.000	0.001	9
	4	153.59**	41.77	0.000	0.428	
	3	99.36**	17.49	0.000	0.916	
	2	51.66**	7.58	0.021	0.938	
	1	21.12	3.32	0.132	0.756	
Croatia (breaks on: 2006:02, 2008:11)	5	195.25**	93.81**	0.000	0.001	2
	4	118.78**	37.92	0.004	0.624	
	3	71.95*	20.42	0.080	0.796	
	2	36.64	9.70	0.379	0.828	
	1	16.77	5.08	0.364	0.503	
Greece (breaks on: 1999:12, 2008:08)	4	164.08**	54.90**	0.000	0.048	8
	3	84.99**	11.92	0.003	0.996	
	2	42.12	4.01	0.118	0.998	
	1	13.21	2.48	0.551	0.838	
Romania (breaks on: 2004:12, 2007:11)	5	194.30**	81.54**	0.000	0.017	1
	4	130.27**	40.26	0.000	0.500	
	3	75.95**	17.58	0.042	0.915	
	2	35.66	3.27	0.444	0.999	
Turkey (breaks on: 2004:10, 2008:08)	5	162.06**	73.26*	0.001	0.084	1
	4	99.43*	34.87	0.090	0.765	
	3	61.17	27.50	0.309	0.356	
	2	34.08	8.16	0.471	0.912	
	1	12.42	1.07	0.668	0.987	

\hat{k} denotes the estimated lag length in the VECM. ** and * denote rejection of the null hypothesis at the 0.05 and the 0.10 level of significance, respectively.

Table 3. Estimated coefficients of the solved cointegrating vectors

Parameter estimates	Bulgaria	Croatia	Greece	Romania	Turkey
β_{IP}	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
β_{CPI}	2.926 (0.190)	0.162 (0.624)	-7.478** (0.000)	2.166 (0.288)	-1.697** (0.006)
β_M	1.439* (0.073)	0.533** (0.000)	NA	-2.253** (0.000)	-0.081 (0.113)
β_{IR}	-0.137** (0.009)	-0.004** (0.001)	-0.027** (0.006)	-0.016 (0.128)	0.003 (0.065)
β_{REER}	5.783** (0.000)	-0.009 (0.970)	-1.553** (0.002)	4.769** (0.000)	0.196 (0.106)
Trend	-0.050** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.422)	0.024** (0.000)	0.043** (0.006)	0.017** (0.000)
SB_1	-0.001 (0.787)	-0.001** (0.002)	0.001 (0.720)	-0.038** (0.000)	0.003 (0.153)
SB_2	0.003 (0.212)	-0.003** (0.000)	-0.000 (0.931)	-0.046** (0.000)	0.002 (0.465)

β 's are the parameters of the solved cointegrating vectors, normalised on the industrial production. M stands for M1, M2 or M3 depending on the country, while IR stands for MMR or TB depending on the country. SB_1 and SB_2 are the first and the second structural trend break, respectively. Numbers in parentheses are the p-values of the likelihood ratio test statistics for the long-run exclusion tests. NA stands for not available. ** (*) denotes rejection of the null hypothesis at the 0.05 (0.10) level of significance.

Table 4. Adjustment coefficients and weak exogeneity tests


Parameter estimates	Bulgaria	Croatia	Greece	Romania	Turkey
α_{IP}	-0.067* (0.032)	-0.642* (0.165)	0.028 (0.029)	-0.000 (0.023)	-0.455* (0.097)
α_{CPI}	0.025* (0.006)	0.014 (0.021)	-0.015* (0.004)	0.003 (0.002)	-0.022 (0.012)
α_M	-0.017 (0.013)	0.274* (0.129)	NA	-0.034* (0.007)	0.077 (0.119)
α_{IR}	1.849* (0.675)	-0.458* (0.085)	-0.952* (0.294)	-1.403* (1.436)	0.581* (0.143)
α_{REER}	0.058* (0.008)	-0.016 (0.043)	-0.006 (0.009)	0.014* (0.007)	-0.175* (0.069)

α 's are the adjustment coefficients. M stands for M1, M2 or M3 depending on the country, while IR stands for MMR or TB depending on the country. Numbers in parentheses are standard errors. NA stands for not available. * denotes rejection of the null hypothesis $H_0 : \alpha_i = 0$ at the 0.05 level of significance.

Figure 1. Parameter constancy tests (τ_{sum} -statistics)


Bulgaria

(Ho: this eigenvalue is stable) Tau_t statistics for eigenvalue 1




Croatia

(Ho: this eigenvalue is stable) Tau_t statistics for eigenvalue 1



Greece

(Ho: this eigenvalue is stable) Tau_t statistics for eigenvalue 1



Romania

(Ho: this eigenvalue is stable) Tau_t statistics for eigenvalue 1





Figure 1 (continued)

Turkey


(H₀: this eigenvalue is stable) Tau_t statistics for eigenvalue 1




Figure 2. Orthogonal Impulse Responses: Bulgaria
Money Supply → Industrial Production



Money Supply → Consumer Price Index



Money Supply → Money Market Rate



Money Supply → Real Effective Exchange Rate






Figure 2 (continued)


Money Market Rate → Industrial Production



Money Market Rate → Consumer Price Index



Money Market Rate → Money Supply



Money Market Rate → Real Effective Exchange Rate






Figure 2 (continued)


Real Effective Exchange Rate → Industrial Production



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Consumer Price Index



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Money Supply



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Money Market Rate







Figure 3. Orthogonal Impulse Responses: Croatia
Money Supply → Industrial Production



Money Supply → Consumer Price Index



Money Supply → Money Market Rate



Money Supply → Real Effective Exchange Rate






Figure 3 (continued)


Money Market Rate → Industrial Production



Money Market Rate → Consumer Price Index



Money Market Rate → Money Supply



Money Market Rate → Real Effective Exchange Rate






Figure 3 (continued)


Real Effective Exchange Rate → Industrial Production



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Consumer Price Index



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Money Supply



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Money Market Rate






Figure 4. Orthogonal Impulse Responses: Greece
Treasury Bill Rate → Industrial Production



Treasury Bill Rate → Consumer Price Index



Treasury Bill Rate → Real Effective Exchange Rate






Figure 4 (continued)

Real Effective Exchange Rate → Industrial Production



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Consumer Price Index



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Treasury Bill Rate







Figure 5. Orthogonal Impulse Responses: Romania
Money Supply → Industrial Production



Money Supply → Consumer Price Index



Money Supply → Money Market Rate



Money Supply → Real Effective Exchange Rate






Figure 5 (continued)


Money Market Rate → Industrial Production



Money Market Rate → Consumer Price Index



Money Market Rate → Money Supply



Money Market Rate → Real Effective Exchange Rate






Figure 5 (continued)


Real Effective Exchange Rate → Industrial Production



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Consumer Price Index



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Money Supply



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Money Market Rate







Figure 6. Orthogonal Impulse Responses: Turkey
Money Supply → Industrial Production



Money Supply → Consumer Price Index



Money Supply → Money Market Rate



Money Supply → Real Effective Exchange Rate






Figure 6 (continued)


Money Market Rate \rightarrow Industrial Production



Money Market Rate \rightarrow Consumer Price Index



Money Market Rate \rightarrow Money Supply



Money Market Rate \rightarrow Real Effective Exchange Rate






Figure 6 (continued)


Real Effective Exchange Rate → Industrial Production



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Consumer Price Index



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Money Supply



Real Effective Exchange Rate → Money Market Rate

