

Global and Regional Spillovers in Emerging Stock Markets: A Multivariate GARCH-in-mean Analysis

John Beirne
Guglielmo Maria Caporale
Marianne Schulze-Ghattas
Nicola Spagnolo

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2794
CATEGORY 7: MONETARY POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCE
SEPTEMBER 2009

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- *from the SSRN website:* www.SSRN.com
- *from the RePEc website:* www.RePEc.org
- *from the CESifo website:* www.CESifo-group.org/wp

Global and Regional Spillovers in Emerging Stock Markets: A Multivariate GARCH-in-mean Analysis

Abstract

This paper examines global (mature market) and regional (emerging market) spillovers in local emerging stock markets. Tri-variate VAR GARCH(1,1)-in-mean models are estimated for 41 emerging market economies (EMEs) in Asia, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East. The models capture a range of possible transmission channels: spillovers in mean returns, volatility, and cross-market GARCH-in-mean effects. Hypotheses about the importance of different channels are tested. The results suggest that spillovers from regional and global markets are present in the vast majority of EMEs. However, the nature of crossmarket linkages varies across countries and regions. While spillovers in mean returns dominate in emerging Asia and Latin America, spillovers in variance appear to play a key role in emerging Europe. There is also some evidence of cross-market GARCH-in-mean effects. The relative importance of regional and global spillovers varies too, with global spillovers dominating in Asia, and regional spillovers in Latin America and the Middle East.

JEL Code: F30, G15.

Keywords: volatility spillovers, contagion, stock markets, emerging markets.

John Beirne
European Central Bank
Kaiserstrasse 29
Germany – 60311 Frankfurt am Main
John.Beirne@ecb.int

Guglielmo Maria Caporale
Centre for Empirical Finance
Brunel University
UK - West London, UB8 3PH
Guglielmo-Maria.Caporale@brunel.ac.uk

Marianne Schulze-Ghattas
Financial Markets Group
London School of Economics
UK – London
M.Schulze-Ghattas@lse.ac.uk

Nicola Spagnolo
Centre for Empirical Finance
Brunel University
UK - West London, UB8 3PH
Nicola.Spagnolo@brunel.ac.uk

Marianne Schulze-Ghattas was on sabbatical from the International Monetary Fund and visiting fellow at the Financial Markets Group, London School of Economics when the research was done. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Central Bank or the International Monetary Fund.

1. Introduction

The empirical finance literature abounds with studies of cross-border links in stock market returns. This is not surprising. Empirical modelling of such links is relevant for trading and hedging strategies and provides insights into the transmission of shocks (news) across markets. Informed by standard asset pricing models and supported by advances in the econometric modeling of volatility, research in the past two decades has focused on interdependencies in terms of both first and second moments of return distributions.

Early studies of spillovers across national stock markets primarily covered advanced countries. Prompted by the October 1987 stock market crash in the US, Hamao, Masulis and Ng (1990), King and Wadhvani (1990) and Schwert (1990) examined spillovers across major markets before and after the crash. Subsequent research refined and expanded the analysis of advanced market links by examining spillovers in high frequency (e.g., hourly) data (Susmel and Engle, 1994); asymmetry in the transmission of positive and negative shocks (Bae and Karolyi, 1994; Koutmos and Booth, 1995); differences in the transmission of global and local shocks (Lin, Engle and Ito, 1994), and interactions among larger sets of advanced markets (Theodossiou and Lee, 1993; Fratzscher, 2002).

Research into cross-border links in emerging stock markets was boosted by the growth and increasing openness of these markets, as well as the speed and virulence with which past financial crises in emerging market economies (EMEs) spread to other countries. Bekaert and Harvey (1995, 1997, 2000) and Bekaert, Harvey and Ng (2005) analyse the implications of growing integration with global markets for local returns, volatility, and cross-country correlations, covering a diverse set of EMEs in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Mediterranean. Most other studies of EME stock markets focus on specific regions. Scheicher (2001), Chelley-Steeley (2005), and Yang, Hsiao and Wang (2006) examine extent and effects of stock market integration in Central and Eastern Europe, both within the region and with advanced markets, while Chen, Firth and Rui (2002) look at evidence of regional linkages among Latin American stock markets. Floros (2008) focuses on the Middle East, while Ng (2000), Tay and Zhu (2000), Worthington and Higgs (2004), Caporale, Pittis and Spagnolo (2006), Engle, Gallo and Velucchi (2008), and Li and Rose (2008) examine stock markets in emerging Asia.

These studies generally point to increasing links among emerging stock markets, and between these markets and mature markets. However, results are difficult to compare across countries because they are based on different methodologies, time periods, and data frequencies. This paper seeks to remedy this problem by applying a uniform specification to a large set of EMEs - 41 in all - spanning four regions: Asia, emerging Europe, the Middle East and North Africa, and Latin America. A downside of this approach is that, given the large number of countries in each region, we cannot model simultaneously the links among all local markets, and between these markets and major mature markets. We focus on links between local emerging markets and aggregate global and regional markets as we are interested in the impact of the latter on the former.

The paper relies on a broad model framework that encompasses several channels through which news in global and regional markets may influence local emerging markets. More

specifically, we apply a tri-variate VAR-GARCH-in-mean framework with the BEKK representation proposed by Engle and Kroner (1995) to model and test for cross-market spillovers in means and variances of stock returns as well as own and cross-market spillovers from second to first moments (GARCH-in-mean effects). This approach builds and expands on the methodologies adopted in earlier studies such as Hamao, Masulis and Ng (1990), Ng (2000), and Bekaert, Harvey and Ng (2005). The global market in each tri-variate model is a GDP-weighted average of the US, Japan, and Europe (Germany, France, Italy, and the UK),¹ and the regional market is a weighted average of all emerging markets in the region included in our country sample, except for the model's local market.² Our analysis is based on weekly stock returns in local currency. Time series end in mid-March 2008 and start in 1993 for emerging Asia, and in 1996 for Latin America, most markets in emerging Europe, South Africa, the Middle East and North Africa.

We use Wald tests to examine several hypotheses about spillovers in means and variances, as well as GARCH-in-mean effects, from global and regional markets to local markets. The results suggest that spillovers from regional and global markets are present in the vast majority of EMEs. However, the nature of cross-market linkages varies across countries and regions. While spillovers in mean returns dominate in emerging Asia and Latin America, spillovers in variance appear to play a key role in emerging Europe. There is also some evidence of cross-market GARCH-in-mean effects. The relative importance of regional and global spillovers varies too, with global spillovers dominating in Asia, and regional spillovers in Latin America and the Middle East.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 describes the econometric model. Section 3 provides details on the data set and outlines the hypotheses tested. Section 4 discusses the results; and section 5 offers some concluding remarks.

2. Methodology

We represent the first and second moments of returns in local, regional and global stock markets by a tri-variate VAR-GARCH(1,1)-in-mean process.³ In its general specification the model has the following form:

$$x_t = \alpha + B'x_{t-1} + \Gamma' h^*_t + u_t \quad (1)$$

with x_t a 3x1 vector of returns in local emerging markets, regional emerging markets, and mature markets; x_{t-1} a corresponding vector of lagged returns; $h^*_t = (\sqrt{h_{11,t}}, \sqrt{h_{22,t}}, \sqrt{h_{33,t}})$ a vector of the conditional standard deviations in local, regional, and global markets; and $u_t =$

¹ We used GDP weights because time series on market capitalisation were not available for all emerging markets in our sample.

² Bekaert, Harvey, and Ng (2005) adopt a similar approach.

³ The model is based on the multivariate GARCH(1,1)-BEKK representation proposed by Engle and Kroner (1995).

$(e_{1,t}, e_{2,t}, e_{3,t})$ a residual vector. The parameters of the mean return equations (1) comprise the constant terms $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$; the parameters of the autoregressive terms $B = (\beta_{11}, 0, 0 \mid \beta_{21}, \beta_{22}, 0 \mid \beta_{31}, \beta_{32}, \beta_{33})$, which allow for mean return spillovers from mature markets to regional and local emerging markets, and from regional markets to local markets; and $\Gamma = (\gamma_{11}, 0, 0 \mid \gamma_{21}, 0, 0 \mid \gamma_{31}, 0, 0)$ the parameters of the GARCH-in-mean terms.

The residual vector u_t is tri-variate and normally distributed $u_t \mid I_{t-1} \sim (0, H_t)$ with its corresponding conditional variance-covariance matrix given by:

$$H_t = \begin{bmatrix} h_{11,t} & h_{12,t} & h_{13,t} \\ h_{21,t} & h_{22,t} & h_{23,t} \\ h_{31,t} & h_{32,t} & h_{33,t} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

In the multivariate GARCH(1,1)-BEKK representation proposed by Engle and Kroner (1995), which guarantees by construction that the variance-covariance matrices in the system are positive definite, H_t takes the following form:

$$H_t = C_0' C_0 + \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & 0 \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} e_{1,t-1}^2 & e_{1,t-1}e_{2,t-1} & e_{1,t-1}e_{3,t-1} \\ e_{2,t-1}e_{1,t-1} & e_{2,t-1}^2 & e_{2,t-1}e_{3,t-1} \\ e_{3,t-1}e_{1,t-1} & e_{3,t-1}e_{2,t-1} & e_{3,t-1}^2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & 0 \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{bmatrix} \\ + \begin{bmatrix} g_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ g_{21} & g_{22} & 0 \\ g_{31} & g_{32} & g_{33} \end{bmatrix} + H_{t-1} \quad (3)$$

Equation (3) models the dynamic process of H_t as a linear function of its own past values H_{t-1} as well as own and cross products of past innovations $e_{1,t-1}, e_{2,t-1}, e_{3,t-1}$, allowing for own-market and cross-series influences in the conditional variances. The parameters of (3) are given by C_0 , which is restricted to be upper triangular, and two matrices A_{11} and G_{11} . Each of these two matrices has three zero restrictions as we are focusing on volatility spillovers (causality-in-variance) running from mature stock markets to regional and local emerging stock markets, and from regional to local emerging markets.

Given a sample of T observations, a vector of unknown parameters θ^4 and a 3×1 vector of variables x_t , the conditional density function for the model (1)-(3) is:

$$f(x_t | I_{t-1}; \theta) = (2\pi)^{-1} |H_t|^{-1/2} \exp(-[u_t'(H_t^{-1})u_t] / 2) \quad (4)$$

The log likelihood function is:

$$\text{Log-Lik} = \sum_{t=1}^T \log f(x_t | I_{t-1}; \theta) \quad (5)$$

3. Data and hypotheses tested

3.1. Data set

The tri-variate VAR-GARCH-in-mean model outlined above is estimated for 41 emerging market economies (EMEs) in Asia, Latin America, Europe (including South Africa⁵), and the Middle East and North Africa. The following EMEs are included in the country sample:

Emerging Asia: China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, and Thailand.

Latin America: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela.

Emerging Europe: Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, and Turkey.

Middle East and North Africa: Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, and Tunisia.

The model for each EME consists of returns in local, regional, and global markets. We use weekly returns, defined as log differences of local currency stock market indices for weeks running from Wednesday to Wednesday to minimize effects of cross-country differences in weekend market closures. Mature market returns are calculated as a weighted average of returns on benchmark indices in the US, Japan, and Europe (France, Germany, Italy, UK). Regional market returns are a weighted average of returns on benchmark indices for all sample EMEs in the region, except the local market. As time series on market capitalisation are not available for all EMEs in the sample, weights are based on US\$-GDP data from the

⁴ Standard errors are calculated using the quasi-maximum likelihood method of Bollerslev and Wooldridge (1992), which is robust to the distribution of the underlying residuals – these are not reported for reasons of space. A residual vector u_t following a t-student distribution has also been considered, but the results were qualitatively similar and therefore are not reported. The full set of results is available from the authors upon request.

⁵ South Africa has been included under the heading “Europe”, as this is the region with which it has the strongest economic and financial links.

IMF's World Economic Outlook database.⁶ All stock market indices were obtained from Datastream. Return time series run through 12 March 2008 and begin on the following dates:⁷ *Emerging Asia*: 1 September, 1993. *Emerging Europe*: 12 June, 1996 (except Bulgaria: 1 November, 2000; Croatia: 15 January, 1997; Romania: 1 October, 1997). *Latin America*: 3 January, 1996. *Middle East and North Africa*: 31 January, 1996 (except Saudi Arabia and Tunisia: 1 July, 1998).

3.2 Hypotheses tested

We test for spillovers in means and variances, and GARCH-in-mean effects by placing restrictions on the relevant parameters and computing the following Wald test:

$$W = [R\hat{\theta}]' [R\text{Var}(\hat{\theta})R']^{-1} [R\hat{\theta}] \quad (6)$$

where R is the $q \times k$ matrix of restrictions, with q equal to the number of restrictions and k equal to the number of regressors; $\hat{\theta}$ is a $k \times 1$ vector of the estimated parameters, and $\text{Var}(\hat{\theta})$ is the heteroscedasticity - robust consistent estimator for the covariance matrix of the parameter estimates. The tests involve joint hypotheses at one, two, three, four, and nine degrees of freedom (k). Specifically, a benchmark case that allows for no spillovers and three sets of null hypotheses about different spillover channels were tested:

Benchmark case of no spillovers and GARCH-in-mean effects

H01: No spillovers in mean, no spillovers in variance, and no GARCH-in-mean effects:
 $\beta_{21} = \beta_{31} = a_{21} = g_{21} = a_{31} = g_{31} = \gamma_{11} = \gamma_{21} = \gamma_{31} = 0.$

Tests of spillovers in mean

H02: No spillover in mean from regional to local markets: $\beta_{21} = 0.$
H03: No spillover in mean from global to local markets: $\beta_{31} = 0.$
H04: No spillover in mean from regional and global markets: $\beta_{21} = \beta_{31} = 0.$

Tests of spillovers in variance

H05: No volatility spillover from regional markets: $a_{21} = g_{21} = 0.$
H06: No volatility spillover from global markets: $a_{31} = g_{31} = 0.$
H07: No volatility spillover from regional and global markets: $a_{21} = g_{21} = a_{31} = g_{31} = 0.$

⁶ Annual GDP data were converted into weekly data and weights were calculated as 104-week moving averages.

⁷ Dates refer to end of week.

Tests of GARCH-in-mean effects

- H08: No GARCH-in-mean effect from local volatility to local mean returns: $\gamma_{11} = 0$.
- H09: No GARCH-in-mean effect from volatility in regional markets to local mean returns:
 $\gamma_{21} = 0$.
- H10: No GARCH-in-mean effect from volatility in global markets to local mean returns:
 $\gamma_{31} = 0$.
- H11: No GARCH-in-mean effects from regional or global volatility to local markets:
 $\gamma_{21} = \gamma_{31} = 0$.
- H12: No GARCH-in-mean effects whatsoever: $\gamma_{11} = \gamma_{21} = \gamma_{31} = 0$.

4. Discussion of results

The tri-variate VAR-GARCH(1,1)-in-mean specification captures conditional means and variances of returns in local stock markets fairly well. On the basis of Ljung-Box portmanteau (LB) autocorrelations tests of ten lags the null hypothesis of no autocorrelation is rejected in only three cases (India, Latvia, and Slovenia) for the standardised residuals, and in six cases (Argentina, Mexico, Hungary, Poland, Morocco, and Saudi Arabia) for the standardised squared residuals (Table 1). Most of the estimated own-market parameters for the variance-covariance equations (a_{11} and g_{11}) and a number of the spillover parameters are statistically significant (Table 2).

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here.

Tests of the hypotheses about spillovers from regional and global stock markets to local emerging markets suggest that such linkages matter in the vast majority of the EMEs in our sample, particularly in Asia, emerging Europe, and Latin America. The benchmark case (H01), which cuts all linkages and implies a simple univariate VAR-GARCH(1.1) model for each EME local market, is rejected for all but eight of the 41 countries - in most cases at the one percent level (Tables 3 and 4).

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here.

Spillovers from regional emerging and global mature markets to mean returns in local markets (H02-H04) appear to be present in all emerging regions. We reject the null hypotheses of no regional spillovers (H02) and/or no global spillovers (H03) for almost 90 percent of the countries in our sample. In emerging Asia, direct linkages with mature global markets dominate regional linkages, except in China, Korea, Sri Lanka, and Taiwan. By contrast, regional spillovers seem to be equally or more important than global spillovers in Latin America (except in Brazil and Mexico), emerging Europe (except in Hungary and Slovenia), and in the Middle East and North Africa (except in Saudi Arabia). We reject the joint hypothesis of no spillovers in mean from regional and global markets (H04) for three quarters of the sample EMEs in Asia, nearly two thirds of the Latin American countries, and half of the EMEs in Europe.

We also find evidence of volatility spillovers from regional and/or global markets to local emerging markets (H05-H07). These linkages appear to be somewhat less important than linkages in mean returns, except in emerging Europe. Our tests reject the hypotheses of no volatility spillovers from regional markets (H05) and/or global markets (H06)—as well as the joint hypothesis of no volatility spillovers whatsoever (H07)—for 85 percent of the EMEs in Europe and South Africa, but only for about half of the EMEs in Asia and Latin America, and for just over a quarter of the EMEs in the Middle East and North Africa. In Asia, regional spillovers appear to have been a more important source of volatility in local markets than global spillovers, while in other regions, global and regional spillovers have been equally important.

Volatility in regional and global markets may affect not only the volatility of local emerging markets but also expected returns in these markets (H09-H12). While such cross-market variance-to-mean spillovers (GARCH-in-mean effects) appear to be less prominent than spillovers in mean and variance, our results suggest that they do play a role as a transmission channel between regional and local emerging markets and, in particular, between global and local markets. We reject the hypothesis of no GARCH-in-mean effects from regional to local emerging markets (H09) for over a third of the EMEs in our sample. The null hypothesis of no variance-to-mean spillovers from global mature markets to local emerging markets (H10) is rejected for nearly half of the EMEs in Asia, Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. By contrast, own-market GARCH-in-mean effects seem to become negligible when the full range of possible spillover channels from regional and global markets are modeled. We reject the restriction of no such effects (H08) for only four EMEs in our sample.

5. Conclusions

The main objective of this study was to examine regional and global spillovers in emerging stock markets using a uniform model for a large set of EMEs to facilitate cross-country comparisons. A trivariate VAR GARCH(1,1)-in-mean model was chosen to capture a broad range of possible spillover channels in means and variances. We carried out a series of Wald tests involving restrictions on various spillover parameters to analyse the importance of different transmission channels.

Starting with a benchmark case that rules out any spillovers from regional or global stock markets to local emerging markets, we found that such spillovers are present in the vast majority of EMEs. The benchmark restrictions are rejected for all but a few countries in our sample. However, the nature of cross-market linkages varies across countries and regions. While spillovers in mean returns dominate in emerging Asia and Latin America, spillovers in variance appear to play a key role in emerging Europe. There is also some evidence of cross-market GARCH-in-mean effects. The relative importance of regional and global spillovers varies too, with global spillovers dominating in Asia, and regional spillovers in Latin America and the Middle East.

Our results offer a first stab at a comprehensive comparative analysis of cross-market linkages in emerging stock markets. Further research is no doubt needed. An important question is whether transmission channels and the relative importance of regional and global

spillovers have changed over time, in particular in the run-up to, and course of, the present crisis.

References

- Bae, K.-H., Karolyi, G.A., 1994. Good news, bad news and international spillovers of stock returns between Japan and the US. *Pacific-Basin Finance Journal* 2, 405-438.
- Bekaert, G., Harvey, C.R., 1995. Time-varying world market integration. *Journal of Finance* 50 (2), 403-444.
- Bekaert, G., Harvey, C.R., 1997. Emerging equity market volatility. *Journal of Financial Economics* 43, 29-77.
- Bekaert, G., Harvey, C.R., 2000. Foreign speculators and emerging equity markets. *Journal of Finance* 55 (2), 565-613.
- Bekaert, G., Harvey, C.R., Ng, A., 2005. Market integration and contagion. *Journal of Business* 78 (1), 39-69.
- Bollerslev, T., Wooldridge, J.M., 1992. Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation and inference in dynamic models with time-varying covariances. *Econometric Reviews* 11 (2), 143-172.
- Caporale, G.M, Cipollini, A., Spagnolo, N., 2005. Testing for contagion: a conditional correlation analysis. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 12, 476-489.
- Caporale, G.M., Pittis, N., Spagnolo, N., 2006. Volatility transmission and financial crises. *Journal of Economics and Finance* 30 (3), pp.376-390.
- Chelley-Steely, P.L., 2005. Modeling equity market integration using smooth transition analysis: a study of Eastern European stock markets. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 24, 818-831.
- Chen, G.-M., Firth, M., Rui, O. M., 2002. Stock market linkages: evidence from Latin America. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 26, 1113-1141.
- Engle, R.F., Gallo, G., Velucchi, M., 2008. A MEM-based analysis of volatility spillovers in East Asian financial markets. *Econometrics Working Papers Archive, WP 2008_09*, Universita' degli Studi di Firenze, Dipartimento di Statistica "G. Parenti".
- Engle, R.F., Kroner, K.F., 1995. Multivariate simultaneous generalized ARCH. *Econometric Theory* 11 (1), 122-50.
- Engle, R.F., Ng, V.K., 1993. Measuring and testing the impact of news on volatility. *Journal of Finance* 48 (5), 1749-1778.
- Floros, C. (2008). Modelling volatility using GARCH models: evidence from Egypt and Israel. *Middle Eastern Finance and Economics* 2, 31-41.
- Fratzscher, M., 2002. Financial market integration in Europe: on the effects of EMU on stock markets. *International Journal of Finance and Economics* 7, 165-193.

- Hamao, Y., Masulis, R.W., Ng, V., 1990. Correlations in price changes and volatility across international stock markets. *Review of Financial Studies* 3 (2), 281-307.
- King, M., Wadhvani, S., 1990. Transmission of volatility between stock markets. *Review of Financial Studies* 3 (1), 5-33.
- Li, X.-M., Rose, L.C., 2008. Market integration and extreme co-movements in APEC emerging equity markets. *Applied Financial Economics* 18 (2), 99-113.
- Lin, Wen-Ling, Engle, R.F., Ito, T., 1994. Do bulls and bears move across borders? *Review of Financial Studies* , 7 (3), 507-538.
- Ljung, G.M., Box, G. E. P., 1978. On a measure of lack of fit in time series models. *Biometrika* 65, 297-303.
- Ng, A., 2000. Volatility spillover effects from Japan and the US to the Pacific Basin. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 19, 207-233.
- Scheicher, M., 2001. The comovements of stock markets in Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic. *International Journal of Finance and Economics* 6, 27-39.
- Schwert, G.W., 1990. Stock volatility and the crash. *Review of Financial Studies* 3, 77-102.
- Susmel, R., Engle, R. F., 1990. Hourly volatility spillovers between international equity markets. Working Paper, University of California, San Diego.
- Tay, N.S.P., Zhu, Z., 2000. Correlations in returns and volatilities in Pacific-Rim stock markets. *Open Economies Review* 11, 27-47.
- Theodossiou, P., Lee, U., 1993. Mean and volatility spillovers across major national stock markets: further empirical evidence. *Journal of Financial Research*, 16, 337-350.
- Worthington, A., Higgs, H., 2004. Transmission of equity returns and volatility in Asian developed and emerging markets: a multivariate GARCH analysis. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 9, 71-80.
- Yang, J., Hsiao, C., Qi, L., Wang, Z., 2006. The emerging market crisis and stock market linkages: further evidence. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 21, 727-744.

Table 1. Parameter Estimates for Mean Equations and LB Test Statistics: Local Markets

| | β_{11} | β_{21} | β_{31} | γ_{11} | γ_{21} | γ_{31} | $LB_{(10)}$ | $LB_{(10)}^2$ |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| <i>Emerging Asia</i> | | | | | | | | |
| China | 0.055 | 0.047 | 0.073 | 0.146 | 0.001 | -0.372 ** | 12.70 | 5.67 |
| Hong Kong | -0.039 | -0.023 | 0.026 | -0.095 ** | 0.290 | 0.001 | 13.33 | 6.46 |
| India | 0.017 | 0.069 | 0.167 ** | 0.023 *** | -0.199 | 0.101 | 18.01 * | 4.38 |
| Indonesia | 0.025 | 0.009 | 0.244 *** | -0.093 | 0.068 | 0.137 | 14.98 | 14.59 |
| Korea | -0.074 | 0.053 | 0.108 | 0.011 | 0.210 | 0.195 | 14.62 | 15.53 |
| Malaysia | -0.015 | 0.079 * | 0.051 | 0.018 | 0.163 | 0.111 | 13.87 | 7.82 |
| Pakistan | 0.146 *** | 0.057 | 0.128 ** | -0.174 ** | -0.802 ** | 0.284 * | 14.54 | 15.72 |
| Philippines | -0.014 | 0.037 | 0.183 *** | 0.309 | -0.089 | -0.036 | 8.77 | 9.02 |
| Singapore | -0.005 | 0.017 | 0.145 *** | 0.007 | 0.093 | 0.086 | 11.19 | 13.44 |
| Sri-Lanka | 0.229 *** | 0.018 | 0.032 | -0.009 | 0.007 | -0.157 | 5.36 | 8.75 |
| Taiwan | -0.033 | 0.092 ** | 0.084 | 0.219 | -0.246 | -0.002 | 6.81 | 8.12 |
| Thailand | 0.030 | 0.019 | 0.092 | -0.311 | 0.404 | 0.526 *** | 6.67 | 4.71 |
| <i>Latin America</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Argentina | -0.010 | 0.116 ** | -0.150 * | 0.084 ** | -0.198 | 0.235 | 12.50 | 18.99 ** |
| Brazil | -0.113 *** | 0.050 | 0.238 ** | 0.018 | -0.050 | 0.079 | 13.63 | 12.89 |
| Chile | 0.160 *** | 0.090 ** | -0.105 ** | -0.237 | 0.027 | 0.080 | 12.05 | 12.67 |
| Colombia | 0.136 *** | 0.095 ** | -0.039 | -0.028 | -0.328 *** | 0.076 | 7.65 | 2.84 |
| Ecuador | 0.062 | 0.019 | -0.012 | 0.082 ** | -0.278 | 0.405 | 13.44 | 10.24 |
| Mexico | -0.036 | 0.060 | -0.126 ** | 0.354 | -0.155 | -0.110 | 8.58 | 21.99 ** |
| Peru | 0.114 *** | 0.108 *** | -0.048 | 0.161 *** | -0.178 | 0.064 | 4.49 | 5.48 |
| Venezuela | 0.141 *** | 0.157 * | -0.168 | -0.008 | -0.281 | 0.201 | 12.55 | 8.80 |
| <i>Emerging Europe</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Bulgaria | 0.097 | 0.059 | -0.066 | -0.115 ** | -0.873 *** | 0.449 *** | 2.71 | 8.38 |
| Croatia | 0.002 | 0.109 ** | 0.156 ** | -0.344 * | 0.163 | -0.187 | 3.51 | 3.86 |
| Czech Republic | -0.027 | 0.052 | -0.005 | 0.197 | -0.288 * | 0.136 | 5.81 | 5.94 |
| Estonia | 0.061 | 0.185 *** | 0.019 | 0.075 | -0.282 * | 0.351 ** | 12.42 | 12.62 |
| Hungary | -0.032 | 0.070 | 0.084 | 0.191 | -0.153 | -0.069 | 13.10 | 16.20 * |
| Israel | -0.084 ** | 0.025 | 0.066 | 0.169 ** | -0.094 | -0.089 | 9.43 | 7.36 |
| Latvia | 0.190 *** | 0.259 *** | 0.024 | -0.004 ** | -0.262 ** | -0.032 | 16.80 * | 3.28 |
| Poland | -0.067 * | 0.080 * | 0.050 | 0.183 *** | -0.235 ** | 0.053 | 7.87 | 17.02 * |
| Romania | 0.113 ** | 0.092 | 0.055 | -0.092 | 0.034 | 0.151 | 2.75 | 14.64 |
| Russia | 0.036 | 0.100 | -0.107 | 0.000 | 0.154 | 0.186 | 6.42 | 12.38 |
| Slovakia | 0.055 | 0.015 | 0.001 | 0.147 | -0.356 *** | 0.138 | 9.78 | 4.75 |
| Slovenia | 0.086 | -0.003 | 0.101 ** | 0.082 *** | 0.016 | -0.027 | 18.12 * | 15.96 |
| South Africa | -0.004 | -0.026 | 0.007 | -0.596 *** | 0.057 | 0.318 | 7.48 | 7.54 |
| Turkey | 0.010 | 0.217 * | 0.165 | -0.074 | 0.160 | 0.124 | 13.13 | 12.11 |
| <i>Middle East and North Africa</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Egypt | 0.043 | 0.170 ** | 0.104 | -0.088 | 0.077 | -0.153 | 14.66 | 13.08 |
| Jordan | 0.149 *** | 0.098 ** | 0.033 | -0.144 *** | 0.131 | 0.024 | 12.04 | 15.53 |
| Kuwait | 0.140 *** | 0.146 *** | -0.006 | 0.025 ** | 0.086 | 0.045 | 10.26 | 15.10 |
| Lebanon | 0.031 | 0.137 * | 0.039 | -0.134 | -0.058 | -0.007 | 6.03 | 8.40 |
| Morocco | 0.184 *** | 0.030 | 0.068 | -0.187 ** | 0.281 * | -0.138 | 9.74 | 18.40 ** |
| Saudi Arabia | 0.163 *** | 0.007 | 0.081 * | -0.394 *** | -0.215 | -0.265 ** | 5.35 | 21.81 ** |
| Tunisia | 0.132 | 0.009 | 0.015 | -0.184 | 0.101 | -0.169 ** | 9.53 | 5.66 |

Notes: Standard errors (S.E.) were calculated using the quasi-maximum likelihood method of Bollerslev and Wooldridge (1992), which is robust to the distribution of the underlying residuals. Rejection of the null hypothesis at 1%, 5%, and 10% levels is denoted by ***, **, and * respectively. The $LB_{(10)}$ and $LB_{(10)}^2$ are, respectively, the Ljung-Box autocorrelations test (1978) of ten lags in the local market standardised and standardised squared residuals. The covariance stationary condition is satisfied by all the estimated models with all the eigenvalues of $A \otimes A + G \otimes G$ being less than one in modulus. A residual vector u_t following a t-student distribution has also been considered, but the results were qualitatively similar and therefore are not reported. The full set of results (including results for regional and global markets) is available from the authors upon request.

Table 2. Parameter Estimates for Variance-Covariance Equations: Local Markets

| | a_{11} | a_{21} | a_{31} | g_{11} | g_{21} | g_{31} |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| <i>Emerging Asia</i> | | | | | | |
| China | 0.319 ** | 0.088 | -0.006 | 0.937 *** | -0.012 | -0.002 |
| Hong Kong | 0.247 *** | 0.098 | -0.097 | 0.963 *** | -0.009 | 0.019 |
| India | 0.326 *** | -0.049 | -0.034 | 0.918 *** | 0.138 | 0.013 |
| Indonesia | 0.182 *** | -0.039 | -0.037 | 0.977 *** | 0.013 | 0.009 |
| Korea | 0.237 *** | 0.005 | -0.089 | 0.968 *** | 0.004 | 0.019 |
| Malaysia | 0.330 *** | -0.039 | -0.011 | 0.948 *** | 0.011 | 0.004 |
| Pakistan | 0.438 *** | -0.111 | 0.115 | -0.835 *** | 0.310 *** | 0.223 * |
| Philippines | 0.222 *** | 0.063 | -0.143 * | 0.954 *** | 0.002 | 0.033 * |
| Singapore | 0.362 *** | -0.026 | -0.045 | 0.923 *** | 0.016 | 0.022 |
| Sri-Lanka | 0.433 *** | 0.008 | 0.145 * | 0.888 *** | -0.001 | -0.026 * |
| Taiwan | 0.136 *** | -0.111 ** | 0.115 * | 0.984 *** | 0.034 *** | -0.019 * |
| Thailand | 0.203 *** | -0.047 | 0.001 | 0.974 *** | 0.017 | 0.001 |
| <i>Latin America</i> | | | | | | |
| Argentina | 0.227 *** | -0.096 | 0.303 *** | -0.966 *** | 1.470 *** | 0.556 *** |
| Brazil | 0.274 *** | 0.087 | -0.284 ** | 0.931 *** | 0.014 | 0.071 ** |
| Chile | 0.336 *** | 0.001 | 0.080 | 0.873 *** | 0.022 | -0.011 |
| Colombia | 0.456 *** | 0.030 | 0.024 | 0.673 *** | 0.038 | 0.009 |
| Ecuador | -0.534 *** | 0.031 | -0.112 | -0.892 *** | -0.032 | 0.011 |
| Mexico | 0.047 | 0.369 ** | -0.100 | 0.148 | 0.309 *** | 0.554 *** |
| Peru | 0.312 *** | -0.044 | 0.091 ** | 0.922 *** | 0.021 | -0.015 |
| Venezuela | 0.566 *** | -0.112 | -0.056 | -0.575 | 0.576 | 0.039 |
| <i>Emerging Europe</i> | | | | | | |
| Bulgaria | 0.693 *** | 0.124 | -0.759 *** | -0.008 | 0.080 | 0.172 |
| Croatia | -0.078 * | -0.005 | 0.102 ** | -0.989 *** | 0.635 *** | 0.311 *** |
| Czech Republic | 0.195 | 0.312 * | -0.077 | 0.617 *** | 0.042 | 0.129 |
| Estonia | -0.386 *** | 0.010 | 0.159 | 0.917 *** | 0.013 | 0.003 |
| Hungary | -0.381 *** | 0.197 | 0.082 | -0.773 *** | 0.864 *** | 0.778 *** |
| Israel | -0.048 | -0.027 * | 0.234 *** | 0.994 *** | 0.011 *** | -0.026 *** |
| Latvia | -0.685 *** | 0.318 *** | 0.047 | 0.796 *** | 0.016 | -0.019 |
| Poland | -0.188 *** | 0.532 *** | -0.277 * | 0.599 *** | 0.034 | 0.266 *** |
| Romania | 0.570 *** | 0.030 | -0.079 | -0.780 *** | 0.484 *** | -0.134 |
| Russia | 0.390 *** | -0.323 | -0.132 | -0.906 *** | 0.147 *** | 0.329 |
| Slovakia | 0.593 *** | -0.029 | 0.096 | 0.493 *** | 0.016 | -0.029 |
| Slovenia | 0.420 *** | 0.197 *** | -0.050 | 0.709 *** | -0.008 | 0.018 |
| South Africa | 0.252 ** | 0.314 *** | -0.395 *** | -0.470 | 0.265 *** | 0.861 *** |
| Turkey | 0.431 * | 0.778 *** | -0.707 * | 0.017 | 0.428 *** | -0.581 *** |
| <i>Middle East and North Africa</i> | | | | | | |
| Egypt | 0.235 | 0.114 | 0.023 | 0.949 *** | -0.026 | -0.001 |
| Jordan | 0.490 *** | -0.041 | 0.037 | 0.502 *** | 0.096 ** | 0.017 |
| Kuwait | 0.491 *** | 0.114 | 0.013 | 0.368 | 0.062 | 0.012 |
| Lebanon | 0.566 *** | 0.242 | 0.103 | 0.565 *** | -0.189 * | 0.007 |
| Morocco | 0.298 *** | -0.211 *** | -0.018 | 0.912 *** | -0.049 ** | 0.010 |
| Saudi Arabia | -0.265 *** | -0.134 * | -0.004 | 0.944 *** | 0.512 *** | 0.192 *** |
| Tunisia | 0.655 *** | 0.019 | -0.091 | 0.489 | 0/047 | 0.023 |

Notes: ***, **, and * denote significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively. Standard errors (S.E.), not reported, are calculated using the quasi-maximum likelihood method of Bollerslev and Wooldridge (1992), which is robust to the distribution of the underlying residuals. A residual vector u_t following a t-student distribution has also been considered, but the results were qualitatively similar and therefore are not reported. The full set of results is available from the authors upon request.

Table 3. Wald Test Statistics for Hypotheses Tested: Asia and Latin America

| | No spillovers $\gamma_{11}=\gamma_{21}=\gamma_{31}=\alpha_{21}=\alpha_{31}=\alpha_{31}=\beta_{21}=\beta_{31}=0$ | No spillovers in mean | | | No spillovers in variance | | | No GARCH-in-mean effects | | | | |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| | | $\beta_{21}=0$ | $\beta_{31}=0$ | $\beta_{21}=\beta_{31}=0$ | $\alpha_{21}=\alpha_{31}=0$ | $\alpha_{31}=\alpha_{31}=0$ | $\alpha_{21}=\alpha_{31}=\alpha_{31}=0$ | $\gamma_{11}=0$ | $\gamma_{21}=0$ | $\gamma_{31}=0$ | $\gamma_{21}=\gamma_{31}=0$ | $\gamma_{11}=\gamma_{21}=\gamma_{31}=0$ |
| <i>Emerging Asia</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| China | 15.565 * | 4.439 ** | 1.174 | 5.771 * | 2.557 | 0.288 | 2.997 | 0.305 | 0.004 | 3.930 ** | 4.579 | 6.81 * |
| Hong Kong | 7.094 | 0.303 | 0.212 | 0.414 | 4.828 * | 1.817 | 3.883 | 0.449 | 0.730 | 0.479 | 0.808 | 0.83 |
| India | 17.086 ** | 1.666 | 5.155 ** | 9.929 *** | 4.629 * | 0.902 | 5.315 | 0.039 | 2.815 * | 0.569 | 1.513 | 1.519 |
| Indonesia | 23.218 *** | 0.044 | 13.817 *** | 15.559 *** | 2.142 | 0.509 | 3.886 | 0.206 | 0.101 | 0.666 | 0.731 | 0.736 |
| Korea | 328.358 *** | 4.934 ** | 0.626 | 6.735 ** | 41.791 *** | 20.615 *** | 38.939 *** | 1.639 | 1.332 | 3.977 ** | 4.589 | 5.189 |
| Malaysia | 236.498 *** | 3.61 * | 10.188 *** | 4.925 * | 91.987 *** | 27.655 *** | 23.829 *** | 0.027 | 0.117 | 2.368 | 2.368 | 3.593 |
| Pakistan | 48.906 *** | 1.787 | 4.442 ** | 7.654 ** | 8.531 ** | 4.834 * | 23.727 *** | 1.285 | 4.457 ** | 2.994 * | 12.743 *** | 14.825 *** |
| Philippines | 20.141 ** | 1.539 | 10.062 *** | 11.146 *** | 4.463 | 3.191 | 4.544 | 1.215 | 0.061 | 2.063 | 0.092 | 1.542 |
| Singapore | 20.982 ** | 0.269 | 14.262 *** | 14.285 *** | 2.106 | 1.413 | 2.109 | 0.001 | 0.064 | 0.322 | 0.333 | 1.225 |
| Sri-Lanka | 5.907 | 0.129 | 0.273 | 0.868 | 0.024 | 3.909 | 4.957 | 0.005 | 0.003 | 2.740 * | 1.151 | 1.168 |
| Taiwan | 34.695 *** | 4.504 ** | 2.097 | 6.045 ** | 17.451 *** | 3.917 | 20.257 *** | 1.134 | 0.016 | 2.008 | 2.016 | 2.7 |
| Thailand | 25.333 *** | 2.205 | 3.259 * | 3.456 | 2.161 | 0.006 | 2.583 | 3.579 * | 2.369 | 10.463 *** | 12.512 *** | 12.512 *** |
| <i>Latin America</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Argentina | 19.941 ** | 12.593 *** | 2.608 | 4.341 | 4.149 | 8.113 ** | 13.767 *** | 0.772 | 0.797 | 0.478 | 1.149 | 1.793 |
| Brazil | 16.366 * | 0.517 | 6.135 ** | 8.741 ** | 1.795 | 5.312 * | 6.735 | 0.006 | 0.027 | 0.133 | 0.186 | 0.254 |
| Chile | 10.951 | 5.737 ** | 4.361 ** | 6.746 ** | 2.148 | 2.216 | 3.282 | 1.259 | 0.083 | 0.902 | 1.462 | 2.248 |
| Colombia | 27.519 *** | 4.567 ** | 0.546 | 4.619 * | 3.916 | 0.458 | 6.949 | 0.017 | 8.125 *** | 0.421 | 8.425 ** | 8.523 ** |
| Ecuador | 9.143 | 4.164 ** | 2.038 | 2.173 | 10.616 *** | 8.517 *** | 1.631 | 1.579 | 1.889 | 2.662 | 2.697 | 3.924 |
| Mexico | 67.34 *** | 2.083 | 5.146 ** | 6.609 ** | 19.905 *** | 28.734 *** | 29.676 *** | 0.889 | 1.072 | 0.435 | 1.104 | 1.104 |
| Peru | 20.287 ** | 7.333 *** | 1.08 | 7.338 ** | 1.908 | 4.02 | 4.598 | 0.399 | 2.493 | 0.217 | 2.509 | 2.709 |
| Venezuela | 58.881 *** | 3.252 * | 2.603 | 4.169 | 6.928 ** | 0.095 | 47.207 *** | 0.002 | 9.634 *** | 0.970 | 2.665 | 3.925 |

Note: Rejection of the null hypothesis at the 1%, 5% and 10% is denoted by ***, **, and * respectively. The chi-squared critical values at 1%, 5% and 10% respectively are as follows; 1 degree of freedom: 6.635, 3.841, and 2.706; 2 degrees of freedom: 9.210, 5.991, and 4.605; 3 degrees of freedom: 11.345, 7.815, and 6.251; 4 degrees of freedom: 13.277, 9.488, and 7.779; 9 degrees of freedom: 21.666, 16.919, and 14.648.

Table 4. Wald Test Statistics for Hypotheses Tested: Emerging Europe, Middle East and North Africa

| | No spillovers $\gamma_{11}=\gamma_{21}=\gamma_{31}=\alpha_{21}=\alpha_{31}=\beta_{21}=\beta_{31}=0$ | No spillovers in mean | | | No spillovers in variance | | | No GARCH-in-mean effects | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| | | $\beta_{21}=0$ | $\beta_{31}=0$ | $\beta_{21}=\beta_{31}=0$ | $\alpha_{21}=\alpha_{31}=0$ | $\alpha_{31}=\alpha_{31}=0$ | $\alpha_{21}=\alpha_{31}=\alpha_{31}=0$ | $\gamma_{11}=0$ | $\gamma_{21}=0$ | $\gamma_{31}=0$ | $\gamma_{21}=\gamma_{31}=0$ | $\gamma_{11}=\gamma_{21}=\gamma_{31}=0$ |
| <i>Emerging Europe</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bulgaria | 33.205 *** | 2.793 * | 2.898 * | 3.300 | 22.51 *** | 7.591 ** | 12.827 ** | 2.459 | 6.601 ** | 9.923 *** | 13.526 *** | 11.919 *** |
| Croatia | 138.304 *** | 4.143 ** | 7.125 *** | 17.838 *** | 3.688 | 7.961 ** | 119.581 *** | 0.549 | 0.062 | 3.952 ** | 3.962 | 3.946 |
| Czech Republic | 13.769 | 1.056 | 0.009 | 1.120 | 3.057 | 1.727 | 4.204 | 0.522 | 2.870 * | 0.848 | 3.027 | 3.206 |
| Estonia | 75.377 *** | 8.720 *** | 0.046 | 16.155 *** | 6.308 ** | 5.134 * | 42.874 *** | 0.062 | 2.694 | 5.670 ** | 5.671 * | 6.841 * |
| Hungary | 70.154 *** | 1.773 | 3.483 * | 6.376 ** | 15.509 *** | 57.831 *** | 43.606 *** | 0.878 | 0.305 | 5.101 ** | 0.316 | 1.725 |
| Israel | 91.964 *** | 1.200 | 2.627 | 3.217 | 39.292 *** | 39.157 *** | 90.621 *** | 0.302 | 5.341 ** | 0.145 | 1.470 | 1.594 |
| Latvia | 41.443 *** | 30.295 *** | 10.230 *** | 34.456 *** | 11.217 *** | 0.964 | 13.043 ** | 0.007 | 4.807 ** | 0.073 | 6.462 ** | 8.084 |
| Poland | 275.742 *** | 5.132 ** | 3.581 * | 10.052 *** | 77.027 *** | 58.432 *** | 67.918 *** | 0.147 | 1.869 | 7.233 *** | 2.631 | 3.436 |
| Romania | 34.205 *** | 5.069 ** | 8.133 *** | 5.885 * | 2.499 | 10.635 *** | 21.725 *** | 3.641 * | 2.004 | 0.288 | 0.306 | 6.507 * |
| Russia | 52.562 *** | 6.126 ** | 4.100 ** | 0.128 | 138.731 *** | 10.521 *** | 93.633 *** | 0.003 | 0.059 | 1.510 | 3.026 | 11.897 *** |
| Slovakia | 138.542 *** | 4.119 ** | 0.101 | 0.246 | 0.336 | 0.361 | 0.682 | 1.236 | 9.759 *** | 0.916 | 18.102 *** | 72.518 *** |
| Slovenia | 20.268 ** | 0.008 | 3.013 * | 3.323 | 12.331 *** | 0.459 | 14.695 *** | 0.834 | 0.033 | 0.061 | 0.076 | 1.144 |
| South Africa | 145.446 *** | 0.519 | 0.019 | 0.519 | 47.938 *** | 18.715 *** | 99.08 *** | 6.814 *** | 0.357 | 3.115 * | 2.819 | 7.309 * |
| Turkey | 68.478 *** | 3.885 ** | 3.782 ** | 13.421 *** | 18.947 *** | 15.074 *** | 28.504 *** | 0.129 | 0.242 | 0.159 | 0.509 | 0.546 |
| <i>Middle East and North Africa</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Egypt | 14.821 * | 5.242 ** | 2.683 | 8.923 ** | 3.606 | 0.121 | 5.663 | 0.018 | 0.250 | 0.794 | 1.003 | 1.031 |
| Jordan | 11.608 | 4.515 ** | 3.585 * | 5.818 * | 4.099 | 1.467 | 4.939 | 0.255 | 0.534 | 0.057 | 0.562 | 0.590 |
| Kuwait | 26.093 *** | 6.905 *** | 0.519 | 7.951 ** | 5.897 * | 3.812 | 16.711 *** | 0.521 | 4.158 ** | 0.028 | 4.174 | 4.326 |
| Lebanon | 10.456 | 3.366 * | 0.549 | 3.719 | 4.377 | 2.229 | 7.813 * | 0.988 | 0.273 | 0.002 | 0.290 | 1.374 |
| Morocco | 9.840 | 3.116 * | 2.329 | 2.447 | 0.713 | 0.211 | 1.196 | 0.043 | 2.083 | 3.574 * | 5.679 * | 5.816 |
| Saudi Arabia | 47.962 *** | 2.611 | 3.305 * | 3.342 | 14.822 *** | 5.251 * | 28.856 *** | 5.710 ** | 0.171 | 3.956 ** | 4.297 | 8.243 ** |
| Tunisia | 19.439 *** | 3.086 * | 4.227 ** | 1.333 | 1.498 | 2.291 | 4.195 | 1.366 | 1.999 | 4.295 ** | 9.232 *** | 12.475 *** |

Note: Rejection of the null hypothesis at the 1%, 5% and 10% is denoted by ***, **, and * respectively. The chi-squared critical values at 1%, 5% and 10% respectively are as follows; 1 degree of freedom: 6.635, 3.841, and 2.706; 2 degrees of freedom: 9.210, 5.991, and 4.605; 3 degrees of freedom: 11.345, 7.815, and 6.251; 4 degrees of freedom: 13.277, 9.488, and 7.779; 9 degrees of freedom: 21.666, 16.919, and 14.648.

CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see www.cesifo-group.org/wp

(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, office@cesifo.de)

- 2733 Francesco Cinnirella and Joachim Winter, Size Matters! Body Height and Labor Market Discrimination: A Cross-European Analysis, July 2009
- 2734 Samuel Bowles and Sandra Polanía Reyes, Economic Incentives and Social Preferences: A Preference-based Lucas Critique of Public Policy, July 2009
- 2735 Gary Burtless, Lessons of the Financial Crisis for the Design of National Pension Systems, July 2009
- 2736 Helmuth Cremer, Firouz Gahvari and Pierre Pestieau, Fertility, Human Capital Accumulation, and the Pension System, July 2009
- 2737 Hans Jarle Kind and Frank Stähler, Market Shares in Two-Sided Media Industries, July 2009
- 2738 Pamela Campa, Alessandra Casarico and Paola Profeta, Gender Culture and Gender Gap in Employment, August 2009
- 2739 Sebastian Gechert, Supplementary Private Health Insurance in Selected Countries: Lessons for EU Governments?, August 2009
- 2740 Leif Danziger, Endogenous Monopsony and the Perverse Effect of the Minimum Wage in Small Firms, August 2009
- 2741 Yan Dong and John Whalley, A Third Benefit of Joint Non-OPEC Carbon Taxes: Transferring OPEC Monopoly Rent, August 2009
- 2742 Valentina Bosetti, Carlo Carraro and Massimo Tavoni, Climate Change Mitigation Strategies in Fast-Growing Countries: The Benefits of Early Action, August 2009
- 2743 Christina Felfe, The Willingness to Pay for Job Amenities: Evidence from Mothers' Return to Work, August 2009
- 2744 Jörg Franke, Christian Kanzow, Wolfgang Leininger and Alexandra Väh, Effort Maximization in Asymmetric N-Person Contest Games, August 2009
- 2745 Bruno S. Frey and Paolo Pamini, Making World Heritage Truly Global: The Culture Certificate Scheme, August 2009
- 2746 Frank N. Caliendo, Is Social Security behind the Collapse of Personal Saving?, August 2009
- 2747 Caterina Liesegang and Marco Runkel, Corporate Income Taxation of Multinationals and Fiscal Equalization, August 2009

- 2748 Chrysovalantou Milliou and Apostolis Pavlou, Upstream Horizontal Mergers and Efficiency Gains, August 2009
- 2749 Rüdiger Pethig and Christian Wittlich, Interaction of Carbon Reduction and Green Energy Promotion in a Small Fossil-Fuel Importing Economy, August 2009
- 2750 Kai Carstensen, Oliver Hülsewig and Timo Wollmershäuser, Monetary Policy Transmission and House Prices: European Cross-country Evidence, August 2009
- 2751 Olaf Posch, Explaining Output Volatility: The Case of Taxation, August 2009
- 2752 Beatrice Scheubel, Daniel Schunk and Joachim Winter, Don't Raise the Retirement Age! An Experiment on Opposition to Pension Reforms and East-West Differences in Germany, August 2009
- 2753 Daniel G. Arce, Dan Kovenock and Brian Roberson, Suicide Terrorism and the Weakest Link, August 2009
- 2754 Mario Larch and Wolfgang Lechthaler, Comparative Advantage and Skill-Specific Unemployment, August 2009
- 2755 Horst Raff and Nicolas Schmitt, Buyer Power in International Markets, August 2009
- 2756 Seppo Kari, Hanna Karikallio and Jukka Pirttilä, The Impact of Dividend Taxation on Dividends and Investment: New Evidence Based on a Natural Experiment, August 2009
- 2757 Mirco Tonin and Michael Vlassopoulos, Disentangling the Sources of Pro-social Behavior in the Workplace: A Field Experiment, August 2009
- 2758 Nicole Grunewald and Inmaculada Martínez-Zarzoso, Driving Factors of Carbon Dioxide Emissions and the Impact from Kyoto Protocol, August 2009
- 2759 Yu-Fu Chen and Michael Funke, Booms, Recessions and Financial Turmoil: A Fresh Look at Investment Decisions under Cyclical Uncertainty, August 2009
- 2760 Jan-Egbert Sturm and Jakob de Haan, Does Central Bank Communication really Lead to better Forecasts of Policy Decisions? New Evidence Based on a Taylor Rule Model for the ECB, August 2009
- 2761 Larry Karp, Sacrifice, Discounting and Climate Policy: Five Questions, August 2009
- 2762 Marianna Belloc and Samuel Bowles, International Trade, Factor Mobility and the Persistence of Cultural-Institutional Diversity, August 2009
- 2763 Charles Noussair and Fangfang Tan, Voting on Punishment Systems within a Heterogeneous Group, August 2009
- 2764 Birgit Bednar-Friedl and Karl Farmer, Internationally Coordinated Emission Permit Policies: An Option for Withdrawers from the Kyoto Protocol?, August 2009

- 2765 Pierre M. Picard and David E. Wildasin, Labor Market Pooling, Outsourcing and Labor Contracts, August 2009
- 2766 Stefan Voigt and Lorenz Blume, The Economic Effects of Federalism and Decentralization – A Cross-Country Assessment, August 2009
- 2767 David S. Jacks, Christopher M. Meissner and Dennis Novy, Trade Booms, Trade Busts, and Trade Costs, August 2009
- 2768 Mario Jametti and Thomas von Ungern-Sternberg, Hurricane Insurance in Florida, August 2009
- 2769 Alessandro Balestrino, Kind of Black: The Musicians' Labour Market in Italy, August 2009
- 2770 Yosr Abid Fourati and Cathal O'Donoghue, Eliciting Individual Preferences for Pension Reform, August 2009
- 2771 Christian Breuer and Chang Woon Nam, VAT on Intra-Community Trade and Bilateral Micro Revenue Clearing in the EU, August 2009
- 2772 Choudhry Tanveer Shehzad, Jakob De Haan and Bert Scholtens, Growth and Earnings Persistence in Banking Firms: A Dynamic Panel Investigation, August 2009
- 2773 Erdal Yalcin, Uncertain Productivity Growth and the Choice between FDI and Export, August 2009
- 2774 Klaus Abberger, Wolfgang Nierhaus and Shynar Shaikh, Findings of the Signal Approach for Financial Monitoring in Kazakhstan, September 2009
- 2775 Sascha O. Becker, Francesco Cinnirella and Ludger Woessmann, The Trade-off between Fertility and Education: Evidence from before the Demographic Transition, September 2009
- 2776 Thomas Aronsson and Erkki Koskela, Optimal Income Taxation, Outsourcing and Policy Cooperation in a Dynamic Economy, September 2009
- 2777 Joel Slemrod, Old George Orwell Got it Backward: Some Thoughts on Behavioral Tax Economics, September 2009
- 2778 Cagri Seda Kumru and Athanasios C. Thanopoulos, Social Security Reform and Temptation, September 2009
- 2779 Alessandro Buccioli and Roel M. W. J. Beetsma, Inter- and Intra-generational Consequences of Pension Buffer Policy under Demographic, Financial and Economic Shocks, September 2009
- 2780 Eduardo Strube and Marcelo Resende, Complementarity of Innovation Policies in the Brazilian Industry: An Econometric Study, September 2009

- 2781 Henry Tulkens and Vincent van Steenberghe, "Mitigation, Adaptation, Suffering": In Search of the Right Mix in the Face of Climate Change, September 2009
- 2782 Maria L. Loureiro, Anna Sanz-de-Galdeano and Daniela Vuri, Smoking Habits: Like Father, Like Son, Like Mother, Like Daughter, September 2009
- 2783 Momi Dahan, Tehila Kogut and Moshe Shalem, Do Economic Policymakers Practice what they Preach? The Case of Pension Decisions, September 2009
- 2784 Eytan Sheshinski, Uncertain Longevity and Investment in Education, September 2009
- 2785 Nannette Lindenberg and Frank Westermann, How Strong is the Case for Dollarization in Costa Rica? A Note on the Business Cycle Comovements with the United States, September 2009
- 2786 Leif Danziger, Noncompliance and the Effects of the Minimum Wage on Hours and Welfare in Competitive Labor Markets, September 2009
- 2787 Gerlinde Fellner, Rupert Sausgruber and Christian Traxler, Testing Enforcement Strategies in the Field: Legal Threat, Moral Appeal and Social Information, September 2009
- 2788 Gabriel J. Felbermayr, Mario Larch and Wolfgang Lechthaler, Unemployment in an Interdependent World, September 2009
- 2789 Sebastian G. Kessing, Federalism and Accountability with Distorted Election Choices, September 2009
- 2790 Daniel Gros, Global Welfare Implications of Carbon Border Taxes, September 2009
- 2791 Louis N. Christofides, Michael Hoy and Ling Yang, The Gender Imbalance in Participation in Canadian Universities (1977-2005), September 2009
- 2792 Jan K. Brueckner and Robert W. Helsley, Sprawl and Blight, September 2009
- 2793 Vidar Christiansen and Stephen Smith, Externality-correcting Taxes and Regulation, September 2009
- 2794 John Beirne, Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Marianne Schulze-Ghattas and Nicola Spagnolo, Global and Regional Spillovers in Emerging Stock Markets: A Multivariate GARCH-in-mean Analysis, September 2009