MAGYAR NEMZETI BANK

MNB WORKING PAPER

2004/1

Zsolt Darvas and György Szapáry*

BUSINESS CYCLE SYNCHRONIZATION IN THE ENLARGED EU: COMOVEMENTS IN THE NEW AND OLD MEMBERS

February, 2004

Zsolt Darvas Deputy Head of Research Division, Economics Department, Magyar Nemzeti Bank

E-mail: darvaszs@mnb.hu

György Szapáry Deputy Governor of the Magyar Nemzeti Bank

E-mail: szaparygy@mnb.hu

The purpose of publishing the Working Paper series is to stimulate comments and suggestions to the work prepared within the Magyar Nemzeti Bank. Citations should refer to a Magyar Nemzeti Bank Working Paper.

The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official view of the Bank.

Abstract

It is generally recognized that countries wanting to join a monetary union should display the optimal currency area properties. One such property is the similarity of business cycles. We therefore undertook to analyze the synchronization of business cycles between the EMU and eight new EU members from Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs), for which the next step to be considered in the integration process is entry into the EMU. In contrast to the usually analyzed GDP and industrial production data, we extend our analysis to the major expenditure and sectoral components of GDP and use several measures of synchronization. The main findings of the paper are that Hungary, Poland and Slovenia have achieved a high degree of synchronization with the EMU for GDP, industrial production and exports, but not for consumption and services. The other CEECs have achieved less or no synchronization. There has been a significant increase in the synchronization of GDP and also its major components in the EMU members since the start of the run-up to EMU. While this lends support for the existence of OCA endogeneity, it can not be unambiguously attributed to it because there is also evidence of a world business cycle. Another finding is that the consumption-correlation puzzle remains, but its magnitude has greatly diminished in the EMU members, which is good news for common monetary policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Please note that the figures are colorful.

1. Introduction

In the ten new EU members — eight of which are former socialist countries from Central and Eastern Europe (CEECs) — attention is increasingly focused on the next step of the European integration process: entry into the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU). The benefits and costs of a currency union have been extensively analyzed in the literature, prompted in part by the discussions leading up to the creation of EMU and, more recently, by the discussion about the future enlargement of the eurozone[1]. The theoretical foundations of currency unions have been developed in the literature on optimum currency areas (OCA) pioneered by Mundell (1961) to which McKinnon (1963), Kenen (1969), Tavlas (1993), Bayoumi and Eichengreen (1996) and many other authors have subsequently contributed[2]. The OCA theory postulates that the benefits of a currency union depend on whether the countries contemplating to form a monetary union share certain common characteristics, called the OCA properties. Among these properties, the similarity of business cycles features prominently, because if cycles are synchronized, the cost of foregoing the possibility of using counter-cyclical monetary policy is minimized. Therefore, when considering the appropriate timing of entry into the eurozone, satisfying the Maastricht criteria of nominal convergence of inflation, long term interest rates, fiscal deficit, public debt and exchange rate stability within ERM II is only one set of factors to be taken into account. The question also has to be asked whether the business cycles are sufficiently synchronized so that the new members can comfortably give up monetary and exchange rate policy independence.

The purpose of this paper is twofold: (1) to assess the current degree of business cycle synchronization in CEECs *vis-à-vis* the euro zone cycle and to see how it compares to the current and earlier levels of synchronization in the euro area countries; and (2) to analyze the evolution over time of the business cycle synchronization in the euro zone countries and to see, in particular, whether it has increased since 1993-97, the run-up period to the EMU. This latter question is relevant because it has been argued in the literature that participation in a currency union may itself lead to greater synchronization of business cycles. This is referred to in the literature as the endogeneity of the OCA properties. Using a panel of thirty years of data for twenty industrial countries, Frankel and Rose (1998) find a strong positive relationship between trade integration and business cycle correlation. Therefore, to the extent that participation in a currency union increases trade integration, membership in a currency union will lead to more highly correlated business cycles. Rose (2000) finds that currency unions increase trade substantially and hence concludes that a country is more

---

[1] See, in particular, Eichengreen (1992), Emerson et al. (1992), De Grauwe (2002) and HM Treasury (2003). Csajbók and Csermely (2002) analyses the costs and benefits of the introduction of the euro in Hungary. See also Szapáry (2002).
[2] See Mongelli (2002) for a comprehensive review of the OCA literature.

likely to satisfy the criteria for entry into a currency union *ex post* than *ex ante*. Krugman's (1993) "lessons from Massachusetts" warns however that trade integration might lead to specialization and therefore increase the likelihood of asymmetric shocks.

Since Rose (2000), many others have investigated the impact of common currencies on trade, for instance, Persson (2001), Glick and Rose (2001) Rose and Wincoop (2001), Frankel and Rose (2002), Bun and Klaassen (2002), Kenen (2002), and Micco, Stein and Ordoñez (2003). All these studies demonstrate a positive effect of common currencies on trade, although the effect found is smaller then the initial findings of Rose (2000).[3] Another argument supporting the endogeneity of the OCA criteria as it may apply to the EMU is that the common monetary policy, supported by the discipline of the Stability and Growth Pact, eliminates or at least diminishes the asymmetricity of policy responses. If policies are the source of shocks, EMU membership reduces the risk of asymmetricity of shocks.

Our research contributes to the business cycle comovement literature in the following ways. First, we look at a large number of countries: eight CEECs, ten euro zone countries and a control group consisting of the three EMU-outs and five other countries to check for the endogeneity of the OCA properties in the EMU. For the CEECs, we look at the last ten years, while for most of the other countries the last twenty years. We also include Russia in our investigation to document the shifts in comovements *vis-à-vis* this previously important trading partner of the CEECs. Second, there are some papers analyzing a broader or narrower group of CEECs with respect to synchronization, but these papers analyze GDP or industrial production only.[4] We also analyze the major expenditure and sectoral components of GDP. From the perspective of OCA and common monetary policy, it is relevant to know to what extent are synchronized those components of GDP which drive aggregate demand and therefore influence inflation. The analysis of the comovement of GDP components also sheds some further light on the so-called "consumption-correlation puzzle" which is one of the six major puzzles in international macroeconomics according to Obstfeld and Rogoff (2000). Third, in order to make our findings robust, we use five measurements of synchronization, two filtering techniques and two measures of euro area activity. Most previous empirical research on CEECs has looked at only cycle correlation with respect to Germany as a measure of comovement. We also analyze leads/lags, volatility and persistence of the cycle and a measure of impulse-response. Smaller leads/lags, less volatility, similar persistence, and equal impulse-response make the common monetary policy more suited for a country participating in a currency union. We made all our calculations with the two most popular filtering techniques in the business cycle literature: the Hodrick-Prescott and the Band-Pass filters. Both techniques have deficiencies, but if both reveal a similar trend, the finding can be regarded as more

---

[3] For an overview of the findings of empirical research on the topic see Rose (2002).
[4] Frenkel, Nickel and Schmidt (1999), Fidrmuc and Korhonen (2001), Boreiko (2002), Frenkel and Nickel (2002), Babetski, Boone and Maurel (2002), Korhonen (2003), Fidrmuc (2004). The exceptions are Boone and Maurel (1998 and 1999) who also study the unemployment rate.

robust. Finally, as we are more interested in synchronization *vis-à-vis* the euro area as a whole rather than just Germany, we look at the euro area activity against which we measure the synchronization of individual countries. For this purpose, we use an aggregate from the ECB area-wide model database and a common factor calculated by us, because the former is more burdened with measurement errors in the pre-1999 period.

It is necessary to say at the outset what are the questions that this paper does not investigate empirically. It does not examine the sources of shocks, i.e., whether the business fluctuations are caused by supply or demand shocks. Many authors have found that both demand and supply shocks contribute to fluctuations, the former dominating in the shorter frequencies and the latter becoming important in the longer run[5]. Identifying the sources of shocks is important because monetary policy can not deal with all types of shocks similarly. However, if business cycles are synchronized, it means that most likely the countries are not subject to significant asymmetric shocks. Another question our paper does not investigate empirically is what are the channels of transmission of business cycles from one country to another. The empirical evidence discussed in the literature shows that openness, trade integration and similarity of economic structures have a strong effect on international comovements. Investigating the sources of shocks and the transmission mechanism of business cycles remain challenging areas of research that exceeds the scope of this paper.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 explains the methodologies and Section 3 describes the data used. Section 4 presents and discusses the findings. Section 5 summarizes the main findings and concludes.

2. Methodology

Perhaps the most popular method in the synchronization literature of CEECs is the bivariate Blanchard–Quah-type SVAR decomposition of supply and demand shocks based on output and inflation data.[6] Once supply and demand shocks are identified separately for individual CEECs and Germany or the euro area, synchronization is assessed by the correlation between the shocks at home and in Germany/the euro area. However, the use of SVARs is debated even for countries having much longer sample periods[7]. Imposing long-run identifying restriction for six to ten years of data available for the CEECs would not make much sense in the framework of the SVAR model.

---

[5] See, for instance, Blanchard and Quah (1989), Karras (1994) and Bergman (1996). According to the well-known real business cycle (RBC) model, business fluctuations are caused by exogenous technology shocks. However, the RBC model has been criticized, particularly by Summers (1986) and Mankiw (1989) who argue that changes in total factor productivity can be explained by aggregate demand impulses rather than exogenous productivity shocks. Evans (1992) also argues that the RBC literature has overstated the role of exogenous productivity shocks. There are good reviews of the business cycle literature in Kydland and Prescott (1990), King and Rebelo (1999) and Fiorito and Kollintzas (1994).

[6] See Babetski, Boone and Maurel (2002), Frenkel and Nickel (2002), Fidrmuc and Korhonen (2001), Frenkel *et al.* (1999), and Csajbók and Csermely *eds.* (2002).

There is also an important problem with the inflation rates of CEECs used by the studies, as price developments were heavily affected in the 1990s by price and trade liberalization and administrative price adjustments which led to large changes in relative prices. Moreover, some of the inflation data series are not stationary and seem to be even an I(2) process (implying an I(3) process for the price level) which raises a problem that is quite difficult to handle.

Due to these theoretical and practical deficiencies of the SVAR technique, we use detrended time series as cyclical measures — which are standard in the synchronization literature — and calculate various synchronization measures based on them. In the following, we describe the methodological issues related to detrending, the measurement of the euro area economic activity, and the measurement of synchronization.

2.1. Detrending

The first issue we face is detrending. There are various detrending methods adopted in the literature and empirical results might depend on the specific filter adopted, as it is demonstrated in Canova (1998). Canova compared the properties of the cyclical components of seasonally adjusted US data as revealed by various filters and concluded that, both quantitatively and qualitatively, properties of business cycles vary across detrending methods and that alternative detrending methods extract different types of information from the data.

This result posts a warning sign for empirical business cycle research. In order to make our results more robust, we use and compare the results of the two most widely adopted filters in the literature, namely the Hodrick-Prescott filter (HP) and the Band-Pass filter (BP). Among these two, the BP filter is preferable from a theoretical point of view, as argued for instance by Stock and Watson (1999), since it intends to eliminate both high frequency fluctuations (which might be due to measurement errors and noise) and low frequency fluctuations (which rather reflect the long term growth component)[8]. However, the BP filter also has weaknesses, since in finite samples only various

---

[7] See, for instance, Faust and Leeper (1997) and Cooley and Dwyer (1998).

[8] Several criticisms of the HP filter have been raised in the literature. Some of the criticisms simply originate from the arbitrary choice of the smoothness parameter. In addition, Cogley and Nason (1995) shows that when applied to stationary time series (including trend-eliminated trend-stationary series), the HP filter works as a high-pass filter, that is, suppresses cycles with higher frequencies while letting low frequency cycles go through without change. However, for different stationary series, the HP filter is not a high-pass filter, but suppresses high and low frequency cycles and amplifies business cycle frequencies, therefore creating artificial business cycles. Similar criticism was voiced by Harvey and Jaeger (1993). They showed that the HP filter creates spurious cycles in detrended random walks and I(2) processes, and that the danger of finding large sample cross-correlations between independent but spurious HP cycles is not negligible. Another important weakness of the HP filter is the treatment of sudden structural breaks, as the HP filter smooths out its effect to previous and subsequent periods. Moreover, the HP filter works as a symmetric two-sided filter in the middle of the sample, but becomes unstable at the end and at the beginning of the sample, although end-point instability is also a weakness of BP filter. For both filters, it is recommended that three years at both ends of the sample of the filtered series be disregarded.

approximations could be used.[9] In particularly, since we have only ten years of data for the CEECs, the application of the BP filter, i.e., filtering out cycles with less than eight years periodicity, the standard upper band adopted in the literature, might be questionable. Therefore, analyzing the results based on the two filters increases the robustness of our results, even if both of them have deficiencies. The adoption of these two filters also allows better comparison of our results to previous empirical research reported in the literature.[10]

2.2.   Measuring the euro area economic activity

We use two measures of euro area economic activity: (1) a euro area aggregate from the ECB area-wide model database and (2) a common factor calculated by us. For the area-wide model of the ECB, euro area aggregates have been calculated for various series back until 1970[11]. However, these series must include various measurement errors, because quarterly national accounts are not available for all countries for earlier years, and because aggregation is affected by exchange rate fluctuations when there were separate currencies before 1999. Therefore, we also calculated a dynamic factor model for the detrended data of five core countries of the EMU in order to identify a common factor *vis-à-vis* which we can measure synchronization. The countries used for this calculation are France, Germany and Italy, as these countries are the three largest in the EMU. Austria and the Netherlands are also included as they had fixed exchange rates to the Deutsche mark for a long period of time and were highly integrated with the German economy. In principle, we could have calculated the common factor of all EMU members and use that as the measure of the euro area economic activity. However, individual quarterly time series of all countries are not available for the full sample period, so we had to select. The countries selected are those identified also by Artis and Zhang (1998) as the "core" EMU countries on the basis of several variables chosen to reflect OCA considerations, except that we include Italy and exclude Belgium.

Dynamic factor models have recently gained renewed interest in the business cycle literature[12]. In these models, there are unobservable measures of economic activity. These unobserved measures are either common factor(s) (for all or some groups of the countries/series analyzed) or idiosyncratic factors. For example, analyzing

---

[9] For the BP filter we adopt the approximation suggested by Christiano and Fitzgerald (2003), which is the latest among the three mostly commonly adopted approximations in the literature.

[10] As a preliminary check, we also used seasonal differencing, that is, the data in the format that most statistical offices of CEECs publish: real growth rates compared to the same quarter of previous year. The results, even for the GDP components, were qualitatively the same as the results obtained with the HP and BP filtered seasonally adjusted time series.

[11] For a description and further reference for the euro area aggregate national accounts see http://www.ecb.int/stats/stats.htm and Fagan *et al* (2001). The aggregate that we use has constant country composition and handles the issue of German unification so that there is no level shift in the series.

[12] See, for example, Gregory *et al.* (1997), Stock and Watson (1998), Forni and Reichlin (1998), Gregory and Head (1999), Forni *et al.* (2000), Kose *et al.* (2003), Monfort *et al.* (2003), Helbling and Bayoumi (2003) and Giannone *et al.* (2003).

a single indicator like GDP, the following model might describe the transmission of the euro area business cycles among k countries:

$$y_{i,t} = \beta_i^{EU} z_t^{EU} + \beta_i z_{i,t} + u_{i,t} \qquad i = 1, ..., k$$

$$z_t^{EU} = \gamma^{EU} z_{t-1}^{EU} + u_t^{EU}$$

$$z_{i,t} = \gamma_i z_{i,t-1} + u_{i,t} \qquad i = 1, ..., k$$

where $y_{i,t}$ is the detrended[13] GDP of country i, z_t^{EU} is the (unobservable) index of European activity, i.e. the common factor, and $z_{i,t}$ is the (unobservable) index of country specific economic activity not explained by the common factor. Hence, this formulation allows the adoption of the standard assumption behind empirical state-space models of no contemporaneous or lagged correlation among the error terms of the equations. The β-s and γ-s are parameters to be estimated along with the standard errors of the innovations. Note that there are $k+1$ state equations and k observation equations leading to a large number of estimated parameters even in the case of independent errors.

Before estimation, we standardized the cyclical components of individual countries, which is a standard procedure in the literature. The reason for that is to have equal variances across countries in order to have the possibility of an equal role in the common factor. As smaller countries tend to have more volatile cycles than large countries[14], small countries would receive higher weights without the transformation. Standardization ensures that all series are treated symmetrically, which does not imply that the common factor will explain equal portions of the variance of the standardized individual series. Since the common factor is estimated from standardized series, it will be no point to talk about the variance of the common factor, so that when we turn to the volatility of the cycles, only the results for the euro area aggregate will be analyzed.

There are various ways to estimate dynamic factor models. We chose the maximum likelihood (ML) estimation and Kalman-filtering of the state-space representation. Our choice stems from the small number of cross section units (five) which makes it virtually impossible to adopt other methods (e.g., the dynamic principal component analysis) requiring large cross sections. Our small cross-section leads to a reasonably small number of parameters to be estimated, hence the computation difficulties indicated by, for instance, Gregory et al. (1997) does not arise in our case. Indeed, our estimation converged to a unique maximum for various starting values.

2.3. Measures of synchronization

We use five measures to assess synchronization. Since we are interested in the analysis of temporal change in the synchronization of business cycles, we calculated our

---

[13] We calculate the common factor for both HP and BP filtered series.
[14] See, for instance, Gerlach (1988) and Head (1995).

measures for various sub-periods. Note, however, that detrending and calculation of the common factor was performed for the longest available sample of each series.

(a) *Correlation.* Contemporaneous unconditional correlation between the business cycle of the euro area and that of individual countries in different time periods. We use non-overlapping five-year long periods to study the changing pattern of correlations. We also calculated five-year rolling sample correlations, which led to similar results. We have therefore chosen the simpler way for expositional reasons.

(b) *Leads or lags.* We calculated the lead/lag for which the unconditional correlation is the largest. The interpretation of the results for this measure is the following: a value of zero indicates that contemporaneous correlation is the highest, negative values indicate that the euro area leads the country studied, while a positive number indicates the reverse. We have checked the values for up to 3 in order not to decrease the degrees of freedom too much, so the value of 3 indicates that the lead/lag is 3 or larger. From the perspective of optimum currency area, zero or small lead/lag would be optimal.

(c) *Volatility of the cycles.* We defined volatility as the squared deviation from the mean of the cycle, i.e., from zero. In order to evaluate the results more easily, we have normalized the values relative to the euro area.

(d) Persistence. The dynamic effect of any shocks depends on the persistence of the series: for highly persistent series, the shock has a long-lasting effect, while for weakly persistent series the effect of the shock diminishes sooner. Consequently, from the perspective of synchronization, similar persistence is rather important. The measure we use is the first order autocorrelation coefficient of the cycle. Persistence defined this way reflects a mixture of the effects of various shocks and the effects of transmission mechanism through which these shocks pass on to the economies. Some shocks could have longer-term effects while others might diminish sooner, and some economies could react to a given shock differently than the other. Therefore, this simple measure does not allow the identification of the relative importance of various shocks and the way the economies react to them; rather this measure reflects the aggregate effect of the similarities of shocks and their transmission. We do not formulate any normative statement on whether a "high" or a "low"' persistence is better, we are simply interested in whether persistence is *similar* across countries. As it is documented in the literature, the estimation of autocorrelation coefficients is downward biased in the case of large outliers and it is also documented that for noisy series the autocorrelation coefficient tends to be smaller. Therefore, our measure also gives an indication of the possible presence of outliers and noise in the series which, again, should be small when there are no country specific shocks.

(e) *Impulse-response.* The accumulated effect (up to six quarters) of a euro area shock (proxied as a shock to the common factor) on the individual countries. When correlation is contemporaneous and large and the volatility and the persistence of the cycle is the same as in the euro area, then this measure will not deliver results different from the previous ones. However, whenever any of the above conditions are not satisfied, then it can give an additional indicator of synchronization by showing a measure of the magnitude of the impact of a euro area shock. Moreover, by calculating the impact from a VAR, which by definition includes own lags as well, this indicator can assess whether the results from the previous unconditional correlation coefficient are blurred by persistence. To some extent, this can be regarded as a summary measure of the previous four measures of synchronization. The six-quarter period for adding up the responses was selected to measure the cumulative impact for a period which is usually regarded as the one during which monetary policy takes its effect.

The impulse-responses were calculated from three-variable VARs including the common factor, the euro area aggregate, and the individual country studied. We calculated our measure based on the "generalized impulse-response function" of Pesaran and Shin (1998), which is independent of the ordering of the variables. The lag lengths of the VARs were selected with Sims's likelihood-ratio test for each country, with six lags being the largest possible value. We calculated the accumulated impulse-response up to six quarters and normalized it with the effect of the common factor on the euro area itself. Therefore, the value of one indicates perfect synchronization according to this measure. Due to the large number of parameters to be estimated, we estimated the models for the most recent ten-year long period of 1993-2002, hence we cannot study the temporal change in the impact.[15] We look at the impulse-response only for GDP, not its components.

3. Data

We include in our study the eight CEECs (Estonia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovak Republic, Slovenia), ten members of the EMU (Austria, Belgium, France, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, Portugal)[16], and various other countries as a control group. The latter includes the EMU-outs (Denmark, Sweden and the United Kingdom), the other European countries (Switzerland and Norway), the United States and Japan to represent the other two main economic areas, and also Russia to represent the country which was formerly the most important trading partner of CEECs. The role of the control group is to assess whether there is evidence of

---

[15] Note that quarterly GDP data of Ireland is available only since 1997, so its sample period is shorter than in the case of all other countries. Due to the shorter sample, we have set the largest possible order of the VAR to three.

[16] Greece and Luxembourg are not included in the OECD's Quarterly National Accounts database which is our main source of statistics. The only Greek time series available at a quarterly frequency is gross industrial production, which we will compare to value added of industry available for other countries.

the endeogeneity of the OCA properties in the EMU and whether there is evidence of a "world business cycle".

Our analysis covers GDP and its major expenditure and sectoral components: private consumption, investments, exports, imports, industrial production, and services. We do not include government consumption as it is a policy-driven aggregate, the analysis of which falls outside of the scope of this paper. Furthermore, we do not study agricultural production and construction which have a small share in GDP and are subject to country specific shocks, such as seasonal factors (agriculture) or policies (for instance, housing subsidies or the availability of mortgage loans).

Our sample includes quarterly data between 1983-2002 grouped in four non-overlapping five-year periods: 1983-87; 1988-92; 1993-97 and 1998-2002.[17] Most of our data are from the OECD's Quarterly National Accounts database. The other sources and a full description of data availability is detailed in the Data Appendix. Unfortunately, not all time series are available for the full period. Most notably, CEECs' times series start only in 1993[18], but data for expenditure and sectoral components of GDP are not available for all CEECs, and some of the available data starts later than 1993. For the euro area aggregate, the sectoral breakdown of GDP is available only since 1991, hence industrial production and services are studied only for the period since 1991.

4. Results

Since we examine a relatively large number of countries (26) and use two measures of euro area economic activity, two filters and five measures of synchronization, and since we look at several measures of economic activity (GDP and its components) during consecutive five-year long periods, it would be cumbersome to show all the results. Therefore, we first analyze the comovement in GDP cycles in detail and continue with a less detailed description of the results for the rest of the aggregates, underlying the similarities and differences with the findings for GDP. Moreover, we present only the point estimate of various statistics but not their confidence bands for three reasons. First, for the large number of statistics we calculate, reporting their confidence bands would overburden the presentation and interpretation of results. Second, as we use filtered series which are themselves burdened with measurement errors, the confidence bands, calculated by standard ways, could reflect only the uncertainty related to estimation, but not the uncertainty inherent in the filtered series. Third, the various sub-

---

[17] Whenever data was available, detrending was performed for the 1980-2002 period in order to alleviate the instability property of both filters at the beginning of the sample period.

[18] Although for a few CEECs GDP is available for some years before 1993, we did not include them in the analysis in order to exclude most part of the transitional recession of the early nineties. In contrast to the US and most European data series, national accounts data series in CEECs are not seasonally adjusted. Therefore, we seasonally adjusted the times series using the Census X11 method.

samples we use allow the analysis of stability in the statistics, which is an indirect indication of the uncertainty of the estimates.

4.1. Gross Domestic Product

GDP is the most inclusive measure of economic activity and is therefore a useful proxy for overall business cycle, even though technically business cycles are defined as comovements of many aggregates. A large amount of empirical work in the business cycle and synchronization literature have used the GDP data. For a quick visual test, Figures 1/a-b-c show the cycles calculated with the HP (left column) and BP (right column) filters for the three country groups: CEECs, EMU and control group. We plot Russia in the Figure showing the cycles of the CEECs. The cycle of the euro area aggregate appears in all figures as the reference value. In general, the visual impression indicates a rather strong comovement with the euro area for most EMU members, somewhat less for the control group countries, although Switzerland stands out as a country well synchronized, and an even smaller or no comovement for the CEECs, with the notable exception of Hungary, Poland and Slovenia which exhibit significant synchronization in the most recent period. As for the main economic areas, the US seems to lead and Japan to lag the European cycle. We quantify these visual impressions one by one below.

4.1.1. Cycle correlation

Figures 2/a-b look at the *evolution over time* of correlation: Figure 2/a shows the contemporaneous correlation coefficients between the cycle of the euro area aggregate and the individual countries' cycles, while Figure 2/b shows the correlations using the common factor. The left column of panels shows the correlations based on the HP filter and the right column those based on the BP filter. The three rows of panels show results for the CEECs, the EMU members and the control group countries.

Among the CEECs, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia show strong improvement in cyclical correlation from the 1993-97 period to the 1998-2002 period. However, the other five CEECs show almost no tendency to move toward greater synchronization during this period. It is useful to look at the shifts in correlations of the CEECs *vis-à-vis* Russia, formerly their most important trading partner. Figure 3 crossplots the correlation with both the euro area and Russia in 1993-97 and in 1998-02. In 1993-97, the three Baltic states correlated quite strongly with Russia, with coefficients ranging between 0.4-0.7, but the other CEECs did not exhibit any correlation in this period. By 1998-2002, correlation of the Baltic states with Russia declined substantially, while the correlation of the other CEECs increased, though it remained weak, except for the Czech Republic.

The strong correlation between the business cycles of the Baltic States and Russia in the earlier period is not surprising given that these states were part of the Soviet Union. Following the independence of the Baltic countries, their integration into

the Russian economy came loose and their trade shifted increasingly toward Western countries. The lack of correlation of the other CEECs with Russia in the period 1993-97 is a result of both the collapse of trade with the Soviet Union and the rapid restructuring of trade of the CEECs toward the EU. The correlation of the Czech Republic seems to be a coincidence induced by the effects of independent currency crises — in the Czech Republic in 1997 and in Russia in 1998 — which led to a decline in GDP in both countries. It is noteworthy that the business cycle of Russia itself became more correlated with the EMU cycle between the two periods under consideration, an indication that Russia also is increasingly integrated into the world economy.

The EMU member countries have become more synchronized over time according to all the correlation measures calculated. The movement toward greater synchronization is particularly evident since 1993, the start of the run-up to the European Monetary Union.

Figure 4 shows in a more telling way the *level* of correlation for all countries for the most recent five-year period of 1998-2002 between the cycles of the euro area aggregate and individual countries (panel a) and between the cycles of the common factor and individual countries (panels b). There are two columns for each countries showing the correlation based on the HP-filter (left column) and BP-filter (right column). The countries are arranged in decreasing order of correlation based on the HP-filtered series.

The three leading CEECs mentioned above (Hungary, Poland and Slovenia) clearly stand out: the values of their correlation coefficients are comparable to that of several current EMU member states. On the other hand, the other five CEECs show zero comovement or even counter-movement. Among current EMU-members, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, and the Netherlands are the most synchronized, while Portugal, Finland, and Ireland show the least correlation. Interestingly, some of the control group countries are more synchronized than these three smaller EMU-members. The most notable example is Switzerland, which shows as high a correlation as the most synchronized EMU members. The UK and Sweden also reveal stronger synchronization than the above mentioned three EMU-members.

4.1.2. *Leads and lags in the cycles*

Tables 1/a-b show the values of the leads/lags in the business cycles for the highest correlation value between the euro area and the individual countries examined.[19] The three leading CEECs perform the best in this respect as well, having zero or close to zero phase shift in the most recent period. The other CEECs show a diverse picture with greater leads/lags. The tendency of almost all Western European countries to move toward contemporaneous correlation is further evidence of a strong business cycle

---

[19] As said earlier, we have checked the values up to 3, so the value of 3 indicates that the lead or lag is 3 or larger.

synchronization in Europe. It is noteworthy that the US led the European cycle in the past 15 years while Japan lagged the European cycle in the past decade.

4.1.3. *Volatility of the business cycles*

Table 2 shows the volatilities of the individual countries' business cycles *vis-à-vis* the EMU aggregate business cycle. Two main observations can be made from an examination of the data. First, as reported also by Gerlach (1988) and Head (1995), smaller countries exhibit larger fluctuations. Gerlach speculates that possible explanations for this phenomenon are that larger countries may be more diversified, and small, more open economies may be subject to more foreign disturbances. The latter argument is not supported by the examples of Austria, Denmark and Switzerland which show even smaller volatilities than the large countries. Since these countries pursued stability oriented economic policies which were reflected in the stability of their currencies and inflation rates, it is more likely that economic policy plays an important role in cyclical volatility. Second, there has been a clear trend toward a reduction in volatility in all countries. For the EMU members and the control group countries, this decline is most evident if one looks at the whole period of twenty years examined from 1983-87 to 1998-2002. The decline in volatility is also evident for most of the CEECs over the last ten years. Hungary and Slovenia show the smallest volatility of cycles among CEECs, with amplitudes lower then in many current euro zone members. Poland and the Czech Republic also exhibit relatively low volatility.

The long-term decline in output volatility has been demonstrated for the US by Blanchard and Simon (2001). According to their findings, this decline can be traced to a decrease in the volatility of consumption and investment. Factors mentioned by the authors which may have contributed to this development are improvements in financial markets allowing better risk sharing and improvement in the conduct of monetary policy which led to a reduction in inflation volatility. These factors have probably also played a role in the decline of the European countries' relative volatility *vis-à-vis* the euro area cycle. It is interesting to note that in the leading CEECs, the volatility is about the same as in the EMU countries in the period 1998-2002. This would indicate that the role of country specific shocks has greatly diminished in these countries (see below).

4.1.4. *Persistence of the business cycles*

Figure 5 shows the evolution over time of the first order autocorrelation coefficient, arranged the same way as Figure 2. From the 1993-97 to the 1998-2002 period, persistence in the cycles of CEECs tended to increase, which is indication of diminishing role of country specific shocks. There is only one country, Slovenia, whose value is substantially smaller than that of other CEECs, which is surprising based on our previous results on correlation, leads/lags, and volatility.

In the case of EMU members, the figure clearly illustrates a movement toward similar persistence, as in the 1980s and early 1990s the autocorrelation coefficients were

rather scattered, but have become higher and dense by the final period. This again illustrates the increased synchronization in the EMU. Ireland, whose quarterly data is available only for the final period, is the exception, but this is not surprising given the highly noisy cyclical measure shown in Figure 1/b.

4.1.5. Impulse-response

Figure 6 shows the relative impact of a euro area shock on the individual countries, based on estimations for the 1993-2002 period. A value of one indicates a full transmittal of euro area shock to the cycle of the country, while a larger (smaller) value indicates greater (lesser) sensitivity; a value of zero means no transmittal at all. Among CEECs, Slovenia and Poland are the most sensitive to euro area shocks followed by Hungary, but even these three leading CEECs show lesser sensitivity to euro area shocks than most current EMU members. Taking into account the high contemporaneous correlation and the similarity in volatility of the above three CEECs with the cycle of the euro area, this result is likely due to the lower persistence of their cycles which is probably a reflection of differences in economic structures. The other five CEECs show zero sensitivity or even a counter cyclical pattern, which would indicate that their economic structures are even more divergent. Among EMU countries, Ireland stands out as the most sensitive country, since a shock has twice as big an effect than the effect of a shock on most of the other EMU countries. This result is likely the consequence of the extraordinary high growth rate of the Irish economy in the period considered, which could have led to higher cyclical volatility and sensitivity to foreign shocks.

4.1.6. Methodological differences

In the above paragraphs, we highlighted the main findings, without discussing the differences resulting from the use of the two filtering techniques and the two different measures of euro area economic activity. The most important observation one can make is that the differences are not large enough to change the results or give reason to modify the interpretations. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning them. As for the two filtering techniques, HP tends to reveal stronger synchronization and higher persistence than BP for the EMU members and the control group. This is not surprising based on the results of Cogley and Nason (1995) who, as mentioned earlier, showed that the HP filter tends to amplify the business cycle frequencies. For the CEEC countries, on the other hand, the two filters give similar results, which is probably due to the shorter time period examined for these countries.

Comparing the results based on the euro area aggregate and the common factor, it is interesting to note that correlation coefficients tend to be less dispersed in the case of the common factor. Table 3 shows the dispersion of correlation coefficients in three country groups: (1) the 5 EMU-members that were used to calculate the common factor;

(2) four other EMU-members[20]; and (3) four non-EMU European countries. For the second and third groups of countries, the difference is smaller when using the common factor than when using the euro zone aggregate, irrespective of which filtering technique is used. This indicates that the group of countries which includes the three largest EMU countries (Germany, France, Italy) captures well the euro area "common cycle".

4.1.7. Summing up

Before proceeding further with the examination of the cyclical behavior of GDP components, let us sum up the main findings of the cyclical comovements of GDP.

1.   Among the CEECs, all measures of comovements for Hungary, Poland and Slovenia point toward increased and significant synchronization with the euro zone business cycle. As mentioned earlier, Frankel and Rose (1998) document a positive relationship between trade integration and synchronization. Figure 7 shows the share of the EMU in the export of the CEECs. For the above mentioned three CEECs, that share is among the highest. Imbs (2003) estimates by a system of simultaneous equations the relative contributions of trade, finance and specialization to international comovements. The author finds that the overall effect of trade is strong, but that it works mostly through intraindustry rather than interindustry trade. Fontagné and Freudenberg (1999) make a distinction between horizontal (two-way trade in varieties) and vertical (two-way trade in qualities) intraindustry trade and argue that it is the former which leads to greater synchronization.

Intraindustry trade between the EU and the CEECs has been studied by Fidrmuc (2001a and 2004). Fidrmuc finds that the Grubel-Lloyd (GL) index of intraindustry trade in Hungary, Poland and Slovenia is high, as high as in some EMU members, and that it is very low in the Baltic countries which exhibit little or no comovement in our calculations. Smaller intraindustry trade could be, therefore, one of the reasons for the lack of synchronization in the Baltic countries. In his 2004 paper, he regresses the correlation of business cycles among some OECD countries (not including CEECs) and finds that the GL index is an important explanatory variable. In spite of the success in explaining correlations of OECD countries, the GL index has weaknesses in measuring intraindustry trade. First, the sub-sectors adopted should be reasonably large to include all possible vertical links, which is difficult to determine. Second, the GL measure introduces a bias for small countries with high current account deficits, which are the characteristics of some CEECs, especially the Baltics. Frankel (2004) doubts the usefulness of distinguishing between intraindustry and interindustry trade from the perspective of synchronization. He notes that trade in inputs and intermediate products, constituting as it does a large share of today's trade, gives rise to positive correlations and yet it may be recorded as interindustry trade.

---

[20] Ireland is excluded since its data is available only since 1997.

2.   There is clear evidence of increased synchronization within the euro zone, particularly since the start of the run-up to EMU. This would, *prima facie*, strengthen the argument of the endogeneity of OCA properties as argued by Frankel and Rose (1998). To an extent this is no doubt the case, but other factors must also be at work, since several of the control group countries, including the U.S. and Japan and, to a lesser extent, also Russia, have also become more synchronized with the EMU. These results lend support to the empirical evidence for a world business cycle reported by several studies, such as, for example, Gerlach (1988), Lumsdaine and Prasad (1997) and Kose *et al.* (2003).

4.2.   Industry and Trade

4.2.1.   Industrial Production

We continue the analysis with the second most frequently analyzed series of the synchronization literature: industrial production. Figure 8 shows the *evolution* of the correlations of industrial production cycles of individual countries *vis-à-vis* the euro area aggregate cycle. Hungary had a high level of correlation already in the 1993-97 period, but the other two leading CEECs, Poland and Slovenia, made good progress toward synchronization. Previous studies (for instance, Fidrmuc 2001b, Korhonen 2003 and Fidrmuc 2004) also tended to conclude that Hungary and Slovenia are well integrated, but among recent papers, only Boreiko (2002) found high correlation for Poland. It is interesting to note that the Czech Republic and Estonia also made some progress in synchronization, in contrast to the results observed for GDP. Among EMU countries, the synchronization in Portugal increased substantially since 1993-97 to join the already high level of synchronization of the other euro zone countries. In the control group, the UK and the Swiss cycles became more synchronized with a level as high or higher than several EMU members. These results confirm the findings of Kaufmann (2003), who showed with a Bayesian cluster analysis of industrial production growth rates that EMU members belong to the same cluster and that the UK and Switzerland follow more closely the European rather than the overseas cycles.

Figure 9 shows the *level* of correlations between the cycles of the euro area aggregate and individual countries in the most recent five-year period of 1998Q1-2002Q4. Again, the three leading CEECs stand out as having the highest level of correlation, comparable to that of the EMU members.

The evolution of the *leads/lags* of the cycles shows increased contemporaneous comovement both for the three leading CEECs and all EMU members. Our *persistence* measure indicates similar or even larger values than most EMU members for the three leading CEECs and the Czech Republic, which could indicate that the role of country specific shocks were even less then in the EMU countries.

The high level of synchronization of industrial production in the EMU members and also in several CEECs is not surprising, since industry generates a large proportion

of foreign trade, which is one of the main channels through which synchronization can occur. In order to examine this question empirically, we continue with the analysis of exports and imports.

4.2.2. Trade

Figure 10 shows the correlation coefficients of *export* cycles. The evolution of the correlation coefficients and the leads/lags indicate a strong improvement in synchronization in *all* country groups, which is an indication of the globalized world of trade. The level of correlation is also very high in almost all countries and even exceeds the values observed for industrial production. Among the CEECs, in addition to the three leading countries, the Czech Republic and Slovakia also indicate high levels of correlation, in contrast to the case of GDP and industrial production. The only two countries standing out of the general trend are Norway and especially Russia, which could be explained by the specific commodity structure (oil) of their exports. *Import* cycles exhibit very similar trends, although the levels of correlation are somewhat lower, with the exception of Hungary (Figure 11). The lower level of import comovement across countries could be explained by the fact that imports are more sensitive to country specific shocks, such as government spending and changes in consumption behavior (see below).

4.3. Consumption, services and investment

We now turn to the analysis of the more domestically oriented expenditure components of GDP and start with private consumption. We only look at *private consumption*, since government consumption can be regarded as a policy-driven component, the synchronization of which, if any, is driven by policy actions. While in the EMU adherence to the Maastricht criteria and the Stability and Growth Pact may be a factor pushing toward greater fiscal policy synchronization, this is not the case in the CEECs for the time being.

There is a branch of business cycle literature that looks at the correlation across countries of consumption in comparison to output. The prediction of various one-good, complete-markets models is that consumption should be correlated across countries even if output does not correlate. The reason is that international risk sharing allows the separation of consumption from country specific income shocks. This result shows up both in simple two period optimizing models even when the coefficients of risk aversion and the subjective discount factors differ across countries (see, for example Chapter 5 of Obstfeld and Rogoff 1996), and in calibrated international real business cycle models (see, for example, Backus, Kehoe and Kydland, 1992). However, empirical studies have found that consumption is generally less synchronized across countries then GDP, which is regarded as one of the six major puzzles in international macroeconomics by Obstfeld and Rogoff (2000) and is referred to as the "consumption-correlation puzzle". For instance, in a comprehensive paper Ambler *et al* (2004) extend the country coverage

of previous papers by studying twenty industrial countries and consider all pairwise cross-country correlations, for the sample of 1960Q1-2000Q4, which is also broken into two subperiods at 1973. They conclude that the low cross-country correlation of consumption is the most important discrepancy with theory.[21] Factors most of the time mentioned in the literature contributing to this "puzzle" are non-traded goods, imperfection of financial market integration that hinders risk pooling and consumption smoothing, the presence of durable goods in consumption, imperfect competition, and trade costs.

Our data confirm that consumption is generally less synchronized than GDP. What is interesting from our perspective is that the comovement of private consumption has increased in all the euro zone countries since 1993-97 and in several of the control group countries as well, except in Denmark, Japan and Russia (Figure 12). Moreover, in most of the countries the increase in consumption correlation is larger than the increase in output correlation, as it is shown by Figure 13. The persistence of consumption cycles has also became more similar in the EMU (except Ireland) and in most of the control countries as well (Figure 14). This would indicate that the influence of the above mentioned factors that are behind the smaller comovement of private consumption across countries has been greatly diminished within the euro zone and, interestingly, also between the euro zone and the US. More globalized financial markets with fewer information barriers, less trade frictions and fewer asymmetric shocks are likely to be behind this development. Regarding international risk sharing, Figures 15/a and 15/b show that the stock of foreign assets and liabilities (FDI and portfolio investments in bonds and shares) rose indeed very sharply in the industrial world in the last ten years, a phenomenon observed in both EMU and non-EMU countries.[22] This suggests the international consumption-correlation puzzle could further lessen in the future.

The picture is very different when we look at the CEECs. Only Poland, and to a lesser extent Lithuania, show some increase toward greater comovement, while the other countries have a negative correlation with the EMU aggregate, and the movement has been toward greater asynchronicity.[23] The volatility of cycle relative to the euro area is also generally larger than in the case of output (compare Tables 2 and 4). We can only speculate about the reasons of this development. Trade and capital flows have been liberalized during the period under review which would argue in favor of greater, not smaller comovement. However, capital movement liberalization has been more gradual than trade liberalization in a number of CEECs. Furthermore, information barriers and stronger home bias in the financial markets due to the fact that capital markets had been

---

[21] For further models and empirical research on this topic see also Cole and Obstfeld (1991), Devereux, Gregory, and Smith (1992), Backus, Kehoe and Kydland (1993), Baxter (1995), Bayoumi and MacDonald (1995), Stockman and Tesar (1995), Lewis (1996), Christodoulakis, Dimelis and Kollintzas (1995) and Corsetti, Dedola and Leduc (2003).

[22] Hence, our results confirm the findings of Ahmadi (2004), who examines the decline in equity home bias over recent years. He attributes some of the decline to mutual fund investment and the internet.

restricted for many decades before the reforms have certainly contributed to weak risk pooling and less consumption smoothing. As Figure 15/c shows, the stock of assets invested abroad by the CEECs is negligible in sharp contrast with the development observed in the other countries examined.

Moreover, part of the causes for the lack of comovement in consumption can probably be traced back to the asymmetric shocks these countries were exposed to and the way in which private consumption reacted to them. As known, all CEECs experienced a sharp contraction in incomes in the early part of the 1990s as a result of the collapse of trade with the former Soviet Union and the market oriented reforms (price and trade liberalization, reduction in subsidies, increase in inflation). This led to sharp reductions in consumption. When things turned for the better after the mind-1990s as the reforms gained hold and the new investments matured into production, the pent-up consumption demand, fueled sometimes by loose fiscal policy and high wage increases, led to a strong growth in consumption. These developments, which did not occur at the same time in all CEECs, surely contributed to the observed lack of comovement in private consumption *vis-à-vis* the EMU cycle. The move toward synchronization in Poland could be explained by the fact that GDP growth recovered faster in Poland then in the other CEECs which led to an earlier return to more normal patterns of private consumption. That the CEECs were subject to grater shocks is also reflected in the much higher volatility and larger leads/lags of private consumption compared to the euro area and the control group countries.

The above considerations make us believe that the lack of comovement in private consumption is a temporary phenomenon which will turn around as agents become better informed about and more familiarized with the possibilities of risk pooling and, more importantly, as the effects of reform-induced shocks will fade away and consumption patterns will assume a smoother long-term pattern. It will be interesting to redo our calculations a few years from now to test this assumption.

Since *services* account for a large part of consumption, not surprisingly they exhibit similar trends as private consumption: increase in synchronization in the euro zone and the control group countries and decrease in the CEECs, except in Poland and Slovakia. Volatilities and leads/lags are also larger and persistence is lower in the CEECs then in the euro area and the control group countries.

The cyclical correlation of *investment* is not very different from that observed for consumption (Figure 16). In the euro zone, one can observe a trend toward greater comovement since 1993-97, although the level of synchronization is generally lower than for GDP or its other expenditure components. It is interesting to point out the increased comovement of the US and Japan with the EMU cycle. This again lends support to the argument that the business cycle of major countries is becoming more globalized and that there is a world business cycle. As for the CEECs, only Poland and

---

[23] This phenomenon also characterises Russia, as its GDP cycles are positively correlated, while consumption cycles correlate negatively.

Hungary show some moves toward greater synchronization. Not surprisingly, the volatility of investment in the CEECs is higher then in the other countries, as investments have been very much influenced by the pace of the reforms, in particular privatization and the associated FDI inflows.

5. Conclusion

This paper examines the business cycle synchronization in the new EU members of Central and Eastern Europe and the euro zone countries, together with a control group countries. We analyze GDP and its major expenditure and sectoral components. From the perspective of common monetary policy, it is relevant to know to what extent are synchronized those components of GDP which drive aggregate demand and therefor influence inflation. To make our findings more robust, we use five measures of synchronization, two filtering techniques and two measures of euro area economic activity against which we measure the comovements of individual countries' business cycles. One of our goals was to assess the current degree of synchronization of the CEECs and to see to what extent they are satisfying one of the OCA criteria, namely, the synchronization of their business cycles with the euro area. Our second goal was to see whether synchronization in the euro zone countries has increased in the run-up period to the EMU and since the start of the monetary union in order to test for OCA endogeneity. If there is evidence of such endogeneity, than CEECs can expect that once they are members of the EMU, their business cycles will start moving toward greater synchronization and they will need to be less concerned with initial idiosyncrasies. The empirical evidence suggests a number of conclusions of which we would like to emphasize the following.

In Tables 5-8 we have grouped the countries according to their degree of synchronization. We reverse the order followed so far and start with the EMU countries, which we can split into two groups: the "core" countries (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands) which show higher synchronization, and the "peripheric" countries (Finland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain) which exhibit lower comovement. We also grouped together the three EMU-outs (Denmark, Sweden, the UK) and Switzerland, and show separately the US, Japan, and Russia.

It is remarkable that the core EMU countries show a high degree of synchronization according to all the measures we use (high correlation, low volatility, small leads/lags, similar and high persistence, similar impulse-response) and this not only for GDP, but for its components as well. The synchronization has significantly increased between 1993-97 and 1998-2002, a period consisting of the run-up to EMU, followed by membership in the monetary union. For the peripheric EMU countries, the same overall trends can be observed, but their level of synchronization is less advanced, particularly for consumption and services. It is noteworthy that five out of the six core countries are the original funding members of the EU and the sixth, Austria, has had a fix exchange rate to the Deutsche mark since the mid-1970s. The peripheric countries

had lower income per capita and were on a catch-up growth path toward the average of EU level, which could be a reason for the slower convergence in business cycles, since the catch-up period could be accompanied by more intensive country specific shocks and uncertainties. Another reason could be that these countries joined the EU much later, hence they integrated into the EU trade later. Mitchell and Mouratidis (2003) also document an increase in the business cycle correlation in the euro zone, but they only analyze industrial production. Our study supports more broadly this trend and is thus more convincing.

Are the above trends evidence of the endogeneity of OCA? At first glance one could argue that yes, because synchronization has increased in all EMU members since the start of the run-up to EMU, when countries begun a process of meeting the Maastricht criteria of nominal convergence to be ready to adopt the euro in 1999. The reason why one can not be unambiguous about this interpretation is that the non-EMU European countries and even the US and to some extent Japan and Russia have also shown greater comovement with the euro cycle. This points toward the emergence of a "world business cycle" noted also by several authors.

Nevertheless, there are also some good news for the advocates of OCA endogeneity. First, the extent of synchronization is very high within the EMU core countries and the peripheric EMU countries have been moving toward that level. Second, synchronization has become high even for the traditionally less synchronized components of GDP, namely private consumption and services. Consumption, however, remains less synchronized than GDP. Our findings thus confirm the consumption-correlation puzzle, but they also show that this phenomenon is becoming significantly less important. Greater financial integration, more competition, reduced trade costs, including the elimination of separate currencies, and converging policies on the way to and within EMU have surely played a role in the greater business cycle synchronization. However, business cycle correlation is an evolutionary process and as Rogoff's (2001) Nail Soup story reminds us, we can not attribute all of the causes to one single ingredient, the euro. That said, it can be argued that the strong business cycle correlations observed in the EMU countries make the common monetary policy more suited and less of a problem for the current participants of the monetary union.

Turning to the CEECs, we can split them into three distinct groups: Hungary, Poland and Slovenia (labeled as CEE1 in the Tables 5-8), which are the most synchronized; the Czech Republic and Slovakia (CEE2), which are less synchronized; and the Baltic States (CEE3), which are not synchronized at all.

It is quite remarkable that in the three leading countries in the first group, synchronization for GDP, industrial production and exports has improved dramatically to reach by 1998-2002 levels that are similar to that in the core EMU countries and even higher than in the EMU peripheric countries. Within a short period of time, these three CEECs were able to completely restructure their production and orient their exports away from the Eastern Block and toward the EU, leading to strong correlation with the euro area business cycle. Privatization and FDI inflows have played a crucial role in that

process. The lesser synchronization of the Czech Republic and Slovakia is most likely due to the insufficient reforms and macroeconomic imbalances in the first half of the 1990s, leading to currency crises in the Czech Republic and Slovakia in 1997 and 1998, respectively, followed by a recession. Since the reforms have been accelerated and growth has resumed, these two countries will most probably reach as high a level of synchronization as the leading CEECs in the coming years.

The lack of synchronization in the Baltic countries is probably a reflection of the shocks that they experienced in the wake of the Russian crisis of 1998. The economic and trade links of the Baltic countries with Russia at the time were much more extensive than was the case for the other CEECs. This is reflected in the significant positive correlation with the Russian business cycle in 1993-97, which however declined to close to zero or even to negative value by 1998-2002. Another factor already discussed in the paper could be the smaller share of intraindustry trade between the EU and the Baltic States. Finally, the Baltic countries' trade links with the Nordic countries are important and, as we have seen, the synchronization of the Nordic countries with the euro zone is not as strong.

In all the CEECs there is minimal or even negative correlation with the EMU cycle of private consumption and hence also of services. Consumption represents an important share in aggregate demand and the question can be asked whether it is wise for a country to give up monetary policy independence if there is no correlation in consumption, even though there is high correlation for GDP, driven by industrial production and export correlation. This question has to be looked at from several perspectives. First, we have argued in the paper that the lack of consumption correlation is due to sudden shifts in consumption behavior and weak risk pooling, owing to greater information barrier and home bias in the financial assets markets. We believe that the influences of these factors are diminishing and that the lack of private consumption correlation is a temporary phenomenon.

Second, there is the question of sufficiency. As pointed out by Artis (2003), there is nothing in the relevant theory to establish what is a needed degree of synchronization to participate in a currency union. It may be enough to be assured that the new entrant is not substantially more idiosyncratic then those already in. The Five Tests study by HM Treasury (2003) looking at the United States as a monetary union concludes that a currency union can prosper with quite varied regional business cycles. This is because financial market integration, price and wage flexibility and labor market mobility can help adjust to idiosyncratic shocks. However, if wages are sticky and labor mobility is restricted by language and cultural barriers, the argument can be made that if cycles of major components of aggregate demand are very divergent, giving up monetary policy independence might not be the optimal solution. A counter argument is that, as discussed, participation in a currency union may itself lead to greater synchronization of business cycles. Furthermore, for small open economies like the CEECs, the room to follow independent monetary policy is rather limited and the arguments of Buiter (2000) and Artis and Ehrmann (2000) that exchange rate flexibility

can be as much a source of shocks as a shock absorber is to be reckoned with. Finally, one has to look at the counterfactual as well and ask the question whether the arguments in favor of retaining monetary independence are strong enough to negate the benefits of participating in the monetary union.

6. References

Ahmadi, Amir. (2004) " Equity Home Bias: A Disappearing Phenomenon?", mimeo, University of California, Davis.

Ambler, Steve, Emanuela Cardia and Christian Zimmermann. (2004) "International Business Cycles: What are the Facts?", Journal of Monetary Economics, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 257-276.

Artis, Michael. (2003) "Analysis of European and UK Business Cycles and Shocks", HM Treasury

Artis, Michael and Michael Ehrmann. (2000) "The Exchange Rate – A Shock-Absorber or Source of Shocks? A Study of Four Open Economies", CEPR Discussion Paper 2550

Artis, Michael and Wenda Zhang. (1998) "Core and Periphery in EMU: A Cluster Analysis", EUI Working Paper RSC No. 98/37.

Babetski, Jan, Laurence Boone and Mathilde Maurel. (2002) "Exchange Rate Regimes and Supply Shocks Asymmetry: The Case of the Accession Countries", CEPR Discussion Paper, No. 3408

Backus, David K., Patrick J. Kehoe and Finn E. Kydland. (1992) "International Real Business Cycles", *Journal of Political Economy*, pp. 745-775.

Backus, David K., Patrick J. Kehoe and Finn E. Kydland. (1993) "International Business Cycles: Theory vs. Evidence", Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Quarterly Review, Fall 1993

Baxter, Marianne. (1995) "International Trade and Business Cycles", NBER Working Paper Series, No. 5025

Bayoumi, Tamim and Barry Eichengreen. (1996) "Operationalising the Theory of Optimum Currency Areas", CEPR Discussion Paper No. 1484.

Bayoumi, Tamim and Ronald MacDonald. (1995) "Consumption, Income, and International Capital Market Integration, IMF Staff Papers 42, pp. 552-76.

Bergman Michael. (1996) "International Evidence on the Sources of Macroeconomic Fluctuations", *European Economic Review*, 40, pp. 1237-1258.

Blanchard, Olivier and John Simon. (2001) "The Long and Large Decline in U.S. Output Volatility", MIT, Department of Economics Working Paper 01-29

Blanchard, Olivier and Danny Quah. (1989) "The Dynamic Effects of Aggregate Demand and Supply Disturbances", *The American Economic Review*, pp. 655-673.

Boone, Laurence and Mathilde Maurel. (1998) "Economic Convergence of the CEECs with the EU", CEPR Discussion Paper, No. 2018.

Boone, Laurence and Mathilde Maurel. (1999) "An Optimal Currency Area Perspective of the EU Enlargement to the CEECs", CEPR Discussion Paper, No. 2119.

Boreiko, Dimitri. (2002) "EMU and Accession Countries: Fuzzy Cluster Analysis of Membership", Oesterreichische Nationalbank Working Paper No 71.

Buiter, Willem. (2000) "Optimum Currency Areas", *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 213-50.

Bun, Maurice J.G. and Franc J.G.M. Klaassen. (2002) "Has the Euro Increased Trade?", Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper, No. 02-108/02

Canova, Fabio. (1998) "Detrending and Business Cycle Facts", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 41, pp. 475-512.

Christiano, Lawrence J. and Terry J. Fitzgerald. (2003) "The Band Pass Filter", *International Economic Review*, 44, No. 2., May 2003, pp.435-65.

Christodoulakis, Nicos, Sophia P. Dimelis and Tryphon Kollintzas. (1995) "Comparisons of Business Cycles in the EC: Idiosynchracies and Regularities", *Economia*, 62, pp. 1-27.

Cogley, Timothy and James M. Nason. (1995) "Effects of the Hodrick-Prescott Filter on Trend and Difference Stationary Time Series: Implications for Business Cycle Research", *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, Vol. 19, pp. 253-278.

Cole, Harold L and Maurice Obstfeld. (1991) "Commodity Trade and International Risk Sharing: How Much Do Financial Markets Matter?", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 28, pp. 3-24.

Cooley, Thomas F. and Mark Dwyer. (1998) "Business Cycle Analysis without Much Theory: A Look at Structural VARs", *Journal of Econometrics*, 83., No. 1-2., March-April 1998, pp. 57-88.

Corsetti, Giancarlo, Luca Dedola and Sylvain Leduc. (2003) "International Risk-Sharing and the Transmission of Productivity Shocks", Paper presented at the AEA 2003 meetings, Washington, D.C.

Csajbók, Attila and Ágnes Csermely. eds. (2002) "Adopting the Euro in Hungary: Expected Costs, Benefits and Timing", NBH Occasional Working Papers, 24

De Grauwe, Paul. (2002) *"Economics of Monetary Union"*, Oxford University Press, Fourth Edition

Devereux, Michael B., Allan Gregory, and Gregor W. Smith. (1992) "Realistic Cross-Country Consumption Correlations in a Two-Country Equilibrium Business Cycle Model", *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 11, pp. 3-16.

Eichengreen, Barry. (1992) "Should the Maastricht Treaty Be Saved?", Princeton Studies in International Finance, No. 74.

Emerson, Michael, Daniel Gros, Alexander Italianer, Jean Pisani-Ferry and Horst Reichenbach. (1992) *"One Market, One Money"*, Oxford University Press

Evans, Charles L. (1992) "Productivity Shocks and Real Business Cycles", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 29, pp. 191-208.

Fagan, Gabriel, Jérôme Henry and Ricardo Mestre. (2001), "An Area-Wide Model (AWM) for the Euro Area", ECB Working Paper No. 42.

Faust, Jon and Eric M. Leeper. (1997) "When Do Long-Run Identifying Restrictions Give Reliable Results?", *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 15(3), pp. 345-353.

Fidrmuc, Jarko. (2001a) "Intraindustry Trade Between the EU and the CEECs – The Evidence of the First Decade of Transition", Focus on Transition 1/2001, pp. 65-78.

Fidrmuc, Jarko. (2001b) "The Endogeneity of the Optimum Currency Area Criteria, Intraindustry Trade, and EMU Enlargement", BOFIT Discussion Paper No 8/2001.

Fidrmuc, Jarko and Korhonen, Iikka. (2001) "Similarity of Supply and Demand Shocks Between the Euro Area and the CEECs", BOFIT Discussion Papers, No. 14.

Fidrmuc, Jarko. (2004) "The Endogeneity of the Optimum Currency Area Criteria, Intra-Industry Trade, and EMU Enlargement", *Contemporary Economic Policy*, Vol. 22, No. 1., January 2004, pp. 1-12.

Fiorito, Riccardo and Tryphon Kollintzas. (1994) "Stylized Facts of Business Cycles in the G7 from a Real Business Cycles Perspective", *European Economic Review*, 38, pp. 235-269.

Fontagné, Lionel and Michael Freudenberg. (1999) "Endogenous Symmetry of Shocks in a Monetary Union", *Open Economies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 263-287.

Forni, Mario and Lucrezia Reichlin. (1998) "Lets Get Real: A Factor Analytical Approach to Disaggregated Business Cycle Dynamics", *Review of Economic Studies*, 65, pp. 453-473.

Forni, Mario, Marc Hallin, Marco Lippi and Lucrezia Reichlin. (2000) "The Generalized Dynamic-Factor Model: Identification and Estimation", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 82(4), pp. 540-554.

Frankel, Jeffrey. (2004) "Real Convergence and Euro Adoption in Central and Eastern Europe: Trade and Business Cycle Correlations as Endogenous Criteria for Joining EMU", paper for Conference on Euro Adoption in the Accession Countries – Opportunities and Challenges, Czech National Bank, Prague, February 2-3, 2004.

Frankel, Jeffrey A. and Andrew K. Rose. (1998) "The Endogeneity of the Optimum Currency Area Criteria", *The Economic Journal*, 108, pp. 1009-1025.

Frankel, Jeffrey A. and Andrew K. Rose. (2002) "An Estimate of the Effect of Common Currencies in Trade and Income", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May, pp. 437-466.

Frenkel, Michael and Christiane Nickel. (2002) "How Symmetric Are the Shocks and the Shock Adjustment Dynamics Between the Euro Area and Central and Eastern European Countries?", IMF Working Paper, 02/222.

Frenkel, Michael, Christiane Nickel and G. Schmidt. (1999) "Some Shocking Aspect of EMU Enlargement, Deutsche Bank Research Note, No 99-4.

Gerlach, H. M. Stefan. (1988) "World Business Cycles under Fixed and Flexible Exchange Rates", *Money Market and Banking*, Vol. 20. No. 4., pp. 621-632.

Giannone, Domencio, Lucrezia Reichlin and Luca Sala. (2003) "VARs, Common Factors and the Empirical Validation of Equilibrium Business Cycle Models", CEPR Discussion Paper, No. 3701.

Glick, Reuven and Andrew K. Rose. (2001) "Does Currency Union Affect Trade? The Time Series Evidence", NBER Working Paper, No. 8396

Gregory, Allan W. and Allen C. Head. (1999) "Common and Country-Specific Fluctuations in Productivity, Investment, and the Current Account", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 44(3), pp. 423-451.

Gregory, Allan W., Allen C. Head and Jacques Raynauld. (1997) "Measuring World Business Cycles", *International Economic Review*, 38(3), pp. 677-701.

Harvey, A.C. and Jaeger, A. (1993) "Detrending, Stylized Facts and the Business Cycle", *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 8, pp. 231-47.

Head, Allen C. (1995) "Country Size, Aggregate Fluctuations, and International Risk Sharing", *The Canadian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 28., No. 4b., pp. 1096-1119.

Helbling, Thomas and Tamim Bayoumi. (2003) "Are They All in the Same Boat? The 2000-2001 Growth Slowdown and the G-7 Business Cycle Linkages", IMF Working Paper, 03/46.

HM Treasury. (2003) The Five Tests Framework.

Imbs, Jean. (2003) "Trade, Finance, Specialization, and Synchronization", IMF Working Paper, 03/81 and CEPR Discussion Paper Series, No. 3779

Kaufmann, Sylvia. (2003) "The Business Cycle of European Countries Bayesian Clustering of Country-Individual IP Growth Series", Oesterreichische Nationalbank, Working Paper 83.

Karras, Greorgios. (1994) "Sources of Business Cycles in Europe: 1960-1988. Evidence from France, Germany, and the United Kingdom", *European Economic Review*, 38, pp. 1763-1778.

Kenen, Peter B. (1969) "The Optimum Currency Area: An Eclectic View", in R. A. Mundell and A. Swoboda, eds., *Monetary Problems of the International Economy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kenen, Peter B. (2002) "Currency Unions and Trade: Variations on Themes by Rose and Persson", Reserve Bank of New Zealand, Discussion Paper, No. 2002/08, pp. 1-34.

King, R. G. and S. T. Rebelo. (1999)"Resuscitating Real Business Cycles", in John B. Taylor and Michael Woodford, eds., *Handbook of Macroeconomics*. The Netherlands: Elsevier Science, pp. 927-1007.

Korhonen, Iikka. (2003) "Some Empirical Tests On the Integration of Economic Activity Between the Euro Area and the Accession Countries", *Economics of Transition*, Vol. 11 (1), pp. 177-196.

Kose, A. Ayhan, Eswar S. Prasad, Marco Terrones. (2003) "How Does Globalization Affect the Synchronization of Business Cycles?", *The American Economic Review,* Paper presented at the AEA 2003 meetings, Washington, D.C.

Krugman, Paul. (1993) "Lessons of Massachusetts for EMU" in Francisco Torres and Francesco Giavazzi, eds., *Adjustment and Growth in the European Union*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 241-261.

Kydland, Finn E. and Edward C. Prescott. (1990) "Business Cycles: Real Facts and a Monetary Myth", Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Quarterly Review, Spring 1990, pp. 3-18.

Lewis, Karen K. (1996) "What Can Explain the Apparent Lack of International Consumption Risk Sharing?", *Journal of Political Economy*, 104, pp. 267-97.

Lumsdaine, Robin L. and Eswar S. Prasad. (1997) "Identifying the Common Component on International Economic Fluctuations", NBER Working Paper, No. 5984

Mankiw, N. Gregory. (1989) "Real Business Cycles: A New Keynesian Perspective", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 3. No. 3., pp. 79-90.

McKinnon, R. (1963) "Optimum Currency Areas", *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 717-725.

Micco, Alejandro, Ernesto Stein and Guillermo Ordoñez. (2003) "The Currency Union Effect on Trade: Early Evidence from EMU", *Economic Policy*, October, pp. 317-56.

Mitchell, James and Kostas Mouratidis. (2003) "Is There a Common Euro-Zone Business Cycle?", Working Papers and Studies, European Commission.

Monfort, A., J.P. Renne, Rasmus Rueffer and Giovanni Vitale. (2003) "Is Economic Activity in the G7 Synchronized? Common Shocks Versus Spillover Effects", Paper presented at the AEA 2003 meetings, Washington, D.C.

Mongelli, Francesco Paolo. (2002) "New Views on the Optimum Currency Area Theory: What is EMU Telling Us?", ECB, Working Paper No. 138

Mundell, Robert A. (1961), "A Theory of Optimum Currency Areas", *The American Economic Review*, 51 (4), pp. 657-665.

Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth Rogoff. (1996) *"Foundations of International Macroeconomics"*, Cambridge: The MIT Press

Obstfeld, Maurice and Kenneth Rogoff. (2000) "The Six Major Puzzles in International Macroeconomics: Is There a Common Cause?", in NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2000, pp. 339-390.

Persson, Torsten (2001), "Currency Unions and Trade: How Large is the Treatment Effect?", *Economic Policy*, October 2001, No.33., pp. 433-448.

Pesaran, M. Hashem and Yongcheol Shin. (1998) "Impulse Response Analysis in Linear Multivariate Models", *Economics Letters*, 58, pp. 17-29.

Rogoff, Kenneth. (2001) "Why not a Global Currency?", *The American Economic Review,* AEA Papers and Proceedings, 2001, Vol. 91., No. 2., pp. 243-247.

Rose, Andrew K. (2002) "The Effect of Common Currencies on International Trade: Where Do We Stand?" Monetary Authority of Singapore Occasional Paper No. 22.

Rose, Andrew K. (2000) "One Money, One Market: Estimating the Effect of Common Currencies on Trade", *Economic Policy*, Vol. 30, p. 7-33.

Rose, Andrew K. and Eric van Wincoop (2001) "National Money as a Barrier to International Trade: The Real Case for Currency Union", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 91, pp. 386-90.

Stock, James H. and Mark O. Watson. (1998) "Diffusion indexes", NBER Working Paper No. 6702.

Stock, James H. and Mark O. W. Watson. (1999) *"Business Cycle Fluctuations in US Macroeconomic Time Series"* in Handbook of Macroeconomics, Vol. 1., Edited by J.B. Taylor and M. Woodford, Elseiver Science B.V., pp. 3-64.

Stockman, Alan C. and Linda L. Tesar. (1995) "Tastes and Technology in a Two-Country Model of the Business Cycle: Explaining International Comovements", *American Economic Review*, 85, pp. 168-85.

Summers, L. H. (1986) "Some Skeptical Observations on Real Business Cycle Theory", Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Quarterly Review 10, pp. 23-27.

Szapáry, György (2002) "Is Maastricht Too Tough?", *Central Banking*, Volume XIII., Number 1, August 2002, pp. 75-91.

Tavlas, G.S. (1993) "The 'New' Theory of Optimum Currency Areas", *The World Economy*, pp. 663-685.

Várpalotai, Viktor (2003) "Numerical Method for Estimating GDP Data for Hungary", Magyar Nemzeti Bank Working Paper No. 2003/2.

7. Data Appendix

Our main data source is the OECD's Quarterly National Accounts database (January 2004 edition). Hence, data for sectoral components (i.e. industrial production and services) used in our paper are value added based. The table below lists the starting year of available data. Data from sources other than the OECD's database are underlined.

Starting year of available data

Country name	Country code	GDP	Private consumption	Investment	Exports	Imports	Indust. prod.	Services
CEECs								
Czech Republic	CZE	1993	1994	1994	1994	1994	1994	1994
Estonia	EST	1993	1993	1993	1993	1993	1994	n.a.
Hungary	HUN	1993	1993	1993	1993	1993	1995	1995
Latvia	LAT	1993	1995	1995	1995	1995	1995	n.a.
Lithuania	LIT	1993	1993	1993	1993	1993	n.a.	n.a.
Poland	POL	1993	1995	1995	1995	1995	1995	1995
Slovak Republic	SKK	1993	1993	1993	1993	1993	1994	1994
Slovenia	SLO	1993	1999	1999	1999	1999	1993	1993
EMU								
EMU-aggregate	EMU	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	1991	1991
Austria	AUT	✔	1988	1988	1988	1988	1988	1988
Belgium	BEL	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
France	FRA	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Finland	FIN	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Germany	GER	✔	1991	1991	1991	1991	1991	1991
Ireland	IRE	1997	1997	1997	1997	1997	✔	n.a.
Italy	ITA	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Netherlands	NDL	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	1987	1987
Portugal	POR	✔	1995	1995	1995	1995	1995	1995
Spain	SPA	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Control group								
Denmark	DEN	1988	1988	1988	1988	1988	1988	1988
Sweden	SWE	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
United Kingdom	UK	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Switzerland	SWI	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	n.a.
Norway	NOR	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
United States	USA	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Japan	JAP	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	n.a.
Russia	RUS	1993	1995	1995	1995	1995	1995	1995

Notes. ✔: the series is available since 1980; n.a.: not available. Series underlined are taken (at least partly) from other sources than the OECD's Quarterly National Accounts database.

Other sources:

Czech Republic: quarterly national accounts are available from the OECD database since 1994Q1. For 1993, GDP data was calculated with the method of Várpalotai (2003).

EMU-aggregate: 4th update (2003) of the ECB Area-Wide Model database for GDP and its expenditure components; see Fagan *et al* (2001). Value added of services and industrial production is from the ECB.

Estonia: The IMF - International Financial Statistics (IFS) database contains real GDP and nominal expenditure components. Consumption was deflated with CPI; investments, exports and imports were deflated with PPI. For industrial output only gross industrial output is available (source: Eesti Pank).

Greece: The only Greek data available at a quarterly frequency is gross industrial production, which is from the IFS.

Hungary: quarterly national accounts are available from the Hungarian Central Statistical Office since 1995Q1. For 1993-94, data were calculated by Várpalotai (2003).

Ireland: Gross industrial production is from the IFS.

Japan: Gross industrial production is from the IFS.

Latvia: The source of GDP and its expenditure components for 1995Q1-2003Q3 is the Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia (CSBL). GDP for 1993-1994 is taken from the IFS, which was chained back to CSBL data starting in 1995. For industrial output only gross industrial output is available (source: CSBL).

Lithuania: The IFS database contains real GDP and nominal expenditure components. Consumption was deflated with CPI; investments, exports and imports were deflated with PPI. The January 2004 issue of the IFS likely included measurement errors for real GDP as it indicated an annual real growth rate of around 40 percent in 1994. Therefore, we chained the data for 1993-94 as it was included in the November 2003 edition with data for 1995-2003 included in the January 2004 edition.

Poland: quarterly national accounts are available from 1995Q1 to 2002Q2 in the OECD dataset. Data for 2002Q3-Q4 (and some quarters in 2003) are from the dX Econdata of Emerging Market Economic Data Ltd. Quarterly GDP data for 1993-94 were calculated with the method of Várpalotai (2003).

Portugal: quarterly national accounts are available in the OECD database since 1995. Pre-1995 GDP data are from the IFS.

Russia: dX Econdata of Emerging Market Economic Data Ltd (January 2004 edition) for 1995-2003. GDP data for 1993-94 were calculated with the method of Várpalotai (2003).

Slovak Republic: dX Econdata of Emerging Market Economic Data Ltd (January 2004 edition).

Slovenia: Bank of Slovenia.

Switzerland: Gross industrial production is from the IFS.

United States: Services - US Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. Gross industrial production is from the IFS.

8. Tables

Table 1/a: GDP - Leads or Lags of the Largest Correlation with the EMU Aggregate, 1983-2002

	based on HP-filter					*based on BP-filter*			
	1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-2002		1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-2002
CEECs									
CZE			-1	-3				-2	-3
EST			-3	-1				-3	-1
HUN			2	0				3	0
LAT			3	-3				3	-1
LIT			-3	-3				-3	-3
POL			0	1				0	1
SKK			0	3				-1	-3
SLO			2	1				2	2
EMU member states									
AUT	0	-1	0	0		0	0	0	1
BEL	0	0	1	0		0	0	1	0
FIN	3	3	2	0		3	3	2	0
FRA	0	3	0	0		0	3	0	0
GER	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
IRE				0					1
ITA	0	3	0	-1		0	0	0	-1
NDL	0	0	0	1		0	0	0	1
POR		-1	0	0			0	0	-3
SPA	1	0	0	1		2	0	0	0
Control group									
DEN		2	1	0			2	1	0
SWE	0	3	0	1		0	0	0	1
SWI	-2	1	0	0		-1	1	1	0
UK_	2	3	2	0		2	3	2	-1
NOR	-2	0	2	0		-2	-1	1	0
JAP	-1	1	-2	-1		0	1	-3	-1
USA	-1	3	2	2		-1	3	3	2
RUS			-3	-1				-3	0

Notes. 0: contemporaneous correlation is the largest; negative value: the EMU leads the country studied; positive value: the EMU lags the country studied. The maximum leads/lags studied is 3 quarters.

Table 1/b: GDP - Leads or Lags of the Largest Correlation with the EMU-5 Common Factor, 1983-2002

	based on HP-filter					*based on BP-filter*			
	1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-2002		1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-2002
CEECs									
CZE			-2	-3				-2	-3
EST			3	-1				-3	-1
HUN			1	-1				1	-1
LAT			2	-2				2	-1
LIT			3	3				-3	3
POL			-3	0				-1	0
SKK			0	3				0	3
SLO			2	0				2	0
EMU member states									
AUT	0	-1	0	0		0	0	0	0
BEL	-1	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
FIN	3	3	0	0		3	3	0	-1
FRA	0	0	-1	-1		0	3	0	-1
GER	0	-1	-1	-1		0	0	0	-1
IRE				0					0
ITA	0	0	0	-1		0	0	0	-2
NDL	-1	0	0	0		-1	0	0	0
POR		-1	0	0			0	0	-3
SPA	1	0	0	0		2	0	0	0
Control group									
DEN		0	0	0			-2	0	0
SWE	0	0	0	0		0	3	0	-1
SWI	-2	0	0	-1		-2	3	1	-1
UK_	0	3	0	-1		2	3	2	-2
NOR	-2	0	1	0		-2	-1	1	-1
JAP	-1	0	-3	-2		0	1	-3	-2
USA	-2	3	0	0		-1	3	3	0
RUS			-3	-1				-3	0

Notes. 0: contemporaneous correlation is the largest; negative value: the EMU leads the country studied; positive value: the EMU lags the country studied. The maximum leads/lags studied is 3 quarters.

Table 2: GDP - Volatility of the Cycle Relative to the Euro Area, 1983-2002

	based on HP-filter					based on BP-filter			
	1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-02		1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-02
CEECs (EMU = 100)									
CZE			251	189				297	275
EST			367	261				413	399
HUN			216	90				253	122
LAT			305	180				356	263
LIT			636	354				699	615
POL			160	165				170	181
SKK			100	146				79	168
SLO			90	118				109	157
EMU member states (EMU = 100)									
AUT	140	101	95	111		147	114	91	131
BEL	127	104	128	151		123	109	138	181
FIN	178	340	277	182		242	416	220	159
FRA	122	105	114	114		88	90	122	102
GER	149	154	90	105		174	229	111	132
IRE				266					339
ITA	101	94	134	91		90	105	146	126
NDL	169	108	108	153		206	174	71	130
POR		166	149	168			248	106	137
SPA	163	143	139	101		104	128	106	60
Control group (EMU = 100)									
DEN		131	168	73			162	168	103
SWE	128	197	242	155		160	168	253	168
SWI	148	187	93	109		196	177	62	114
UK_	101	251	109	69		136	191	129	105
NOR	217	155	201	133		190	232	165	188
JAP	144	180	184	139		149	163	210	202
USA	169	152	75	145		204	130	112	162
RUS			414	457				420	464
Volatility of the euro area (in percent)									
	0.69	1.09	0.83	0.80		0.71	0.63	0.73	0.59

Notes. Volatility is defined as the standard deviation around the mean zero.

Table 3: GDP - Dispersion of Correlation Coefficients, 1983-2002

filter	EMU-measure	1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-02
Group 1					
HP	AG	0.15	0.18	0.17	0.03
HP	CF	0.19	0.10	0.11	0.08
BP	AG	0.09	0.26	0.18	0.07
BP	CF	0.11	0.26	0.11	0.15
Group 2					
HP	AG	0.26	0.28	0.18	0.14
HP	CF	0.14	0.17	0.13	0.12
BP	AG	0.22	0.31	0.12	0.18
BP	CF	0.18	0.28	0.11	0.14
Group 3					
HP	AG	0.22	0.35	0.19	0.12
HP	CF	0.09	0.25	0.10	0.07
BP	AG	0.24	0.31	0.20	0.14
BP	CF	0.19	0.33	0.12	0.21

Notes: The table shows mean absolute deviation from group-specific mean. *Group 1:* Austria, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands; *Group 2:* Belgium, Finland, Portugal, Spain; *Group 3:* Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, UK; *AG:* based on aggregate data for the euro area; *CF:* based on the common factor of the 5 countries included in group 1.

Table 4: Private Consumption - Volatility of the Cycle Relative to the Euro Area, 1983-2002

	based on HP-filter					*based on BP-filter*			
	1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-02		1983-87	1988-92	1993-97	1998-02
CEECs (EMU = 100)									
CZE			384	172				501	246
EST			393	398				554	602
HUN			350	143				392	206
LAT			435	221				627	277
LIT			1202	241				1826	353
POL			221	135				264	163
SKK			280	277				385	387
SLO				174					274
EMU member states (EMU = 100)									
AUT		84	102	88			106	145	116
BEL	106	94	93	112		161	100	103	132
FIN	155	317	330	136		393	311	333	117
FRA	120	85	121	82		154	60	159	69
GER			87	146				126	191
IRE				508					737
ITA	121	153	179	117		147	193	165	128
NDL	120	121	137	154		220	221	111	117
POR			141	171				197	184
SPA	183	165	159	104		120	117	125	77
Control group (EMU = 100)									
DEN		111	177	167			105	223	198
SWE	266	194	185	173		301	180	196	196
SWI	55	88	79	67		64	73	87	58
UK_	162	310	81	77		268	266	156	105
NOR	400	145	136	95		615	244	138	149
JAP	82	125	128	68		143	148	192	79
USA	93	134	65	99		172	117	152	118
RUS			391	482				578	550
Volatility of the euro area (in percent)									
	0.69	1.09	0.83	0.80		0.71	0.63	0.73	0.59

Notes. Volatility is defined as the standard deviation around the mean zero.

Table 5: Summary Table of Correlation, 1993-2002

1993-1997

		EMU1	EMU2	OUTS	USA	JAP	RUS	CEE1	CEE2	CEE3
GDP	AG-HP	0.72	0.54	0.71	0.27	0.04	-0.60	0.19	0.43	-0.29
	AG-BP	0.82	0.74	0.78	-0.17	0.08	-0.47	0.17	0.39	-0.33
	CF-HP	0.61	0.38	0.60	0.52	-0.31	-0.54	0.26	0.05	-0.06
	CF-BP	0.75	0.55	0.73	0.22	-0.27	-0.63	0.24	0.11	-0.25
Ind.	AG-HP	0.85	0.34	0.81	0.73	0.50	0.72	0.42	-0.14	0.25
	AG-BP	0.86	0.28	0.71	0.08	0.45	0.76	0.24	-0.18	-0.06
Exp.	AG-HP	0.77	0.50	0.54	0.58	0.36	0.14	-0.21	0.38	-0.07
	AG-BP	0.79	0.31	0.51	0.64	0.22	0.23	-0.19	0.34	-0.18
Imp.	AG-HP	0.87	0.84	0.67	0.54	0.32	-0.43	-0.41	-0.17	-0.33
	AG-BP	0.89	0.83	0.58	0.09	0.27	-0.49	-0.41	-0.23	-0.53
Serv.	AG-HP	0.28	0.09	-0.22	0.34		0.04	0.07	0.25	
	AG-BP	0.42	0.50	0.44	0.07		-0.32	0.02	0.18	
Cons	AG-HP	0.36	0.35	0.05	0.06	0.07	-0.03	-0.25	-0.23	-0.33
	AG-BP	0.58	0.66	0.41	0.05	0.19	-0.32	-0.35	-0.35	-0.52
Inv.	AG-HP	0.52	0.46	0.60	0.16	0.25	0.16	-0.19	-0.01	-0.16
	AG-BP	0.57	0.42	0.63	-0.17	0.11	0.44	-0.29	-0.13	-0.17

AG: using aggregate euro area data; CF: using the common factor; HP: Hordick-Prescott filter; BP: Band-Pass filter

EMU1: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands; *EMU2*: Finland, Portugal, Spain, *OUTS*: Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland (not in services), UK; *CEE1*: Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia (only in GDP, industry, and services); *CEE2*: Czech Republic, Slovakia; *CEE3*: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania (not in industry)

1998-2002

		EMU1	EMU2	OUTS	USA	JAP	RUS	CEE1	CEE2	CEE3
GDP	AG-HP	0.91	0.71	0.82	0.73	0.54	0.39	0.73	-0.34	-0.33
	AG-BP	0.88	0.51	0.65	0.68	0.73	0.53	0.71	-0.16	-0.26
	CF-HP	0.82	0.71	0.76	0.81	0.31	0.24	0.71	-0.31	-0.33
	CF-BP	0.78	0.52	0.46	0.77	0.49	0.36	0.71	-0.25	-0.20
Ind.	AG-HP	0.85	0.69	0.64	0.67	0.62	0.16	0.76	0.16	0.26
	AG-BP	0.82	0.59	0.48	0.44	0.66	0.26	0.67	0.29	0.54
Exp.	AG-HP	0.92	0.78	0.80	0.86	0.59	-0.03	0.79	0.64	0.28
	AG-BP	0.90	0.73	0.73	0.84	0.67	0.00	0.80	0.63	0.37
Imp.	AG-HP	0.91	0.77	0.91	0.89	0.47	-0.16	0.50	0.23	-0.09
	AG-BP	0.85	0.61	0.81	0.84	0.56	0.13	0.48	0.34	-0.03
Serv.	AG-HP	0.86	0.78	0.63	0.65		0.16	0.24	-0.67	
	AG-BP	0.79	0.58	0.48	0.59		0.48	0.19	-0.65	
Cons	AG-HP	0.82	0.65	0.47	0.74	-0.47	-0.68	-0.12	-0.54	-0.24
	AG-BP	0.73	0.41	0.21	0.57	-0.09	-0.62	0.03	-0.47	-0.22
Inv.	AG-HP	0.85	0.64	0.60	0.91	0.63	0.07	0.24	-0.40	-0.47
	AG-BP	0.75	0.23	0.30	0.93	0.64	0.33	0.22	-0.35	-0.55

AG: using aggregate euro area data; CF: using the common factor; HP: Hordick-Prescott filter; BP: Band-Pass filter

EMU1: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands (not in industry and services), *EMU2*: Finland, Ireland (not in industry and services), Portugal, Spain, *OUTS*: Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland (not in services), UK; *CEE1*: Hungary, Poland, Slovenia; *CEE2*: Czech Republic, Slovakia; *CEE3*: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania (not in industry)

Table 6: Summary Table of the Absolute Value of Leads/Lags*, 1993-2002

1993-1997

		EMU1	EMU2	OUTS	USA	JAP	RUS	CEE1	CEE2	CEE3
GDP	AG-HP	0.17	0.67	0.75	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.33	0.50	3.00
	AG-BP	0.17	0.67	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.67	1.50	3.00
	CF-HP	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.67
	CF-BP	0.00	0.00	0.75	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.33	1.00	2.67
Ind.	AG-HP	0.17	1.33	0.50	1.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	1.50
	AG-BP	0.17	1.67	0.75	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.50
Exp.	AG-HP	0.17	0.67	0.25	0.00	0.00	3.00	2.50	1.50	2.33
	AG-BP	0.17	1.67	0.50	0.00	0.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00
Imp.	AG-HP	0.00	0.00	0.75	2.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
	AG-BP	0.00	1.00	1.25	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Serv.	AG-HP	1.50	2.00	1.00	3.00		3.00	1.33	2.50	3.00
	AG-BP	1.33	1.67	1.00	3.00		3.00	1.67	2.50	3.00
Cons	AG-HP	1.00	0.33	2.50	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.67
	AG-BP	0.83	0.00	1.75	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Inv.	AG-HP	0.33	0.33	0.75	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	3.00
	AG-BP	0.67	1.33	1.25	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.50	2.50	3.00

AG: using aggregate euro area data; CF: using the common factor; HP: Hordick-Prescott filter; BP: Band-Pass filter

EMU1: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands; *EMU2*: Finland, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, *OUTS*: Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland (not in services), UK; *CEE1*: Hungary, Poland, Slovenia; *CEE2*: Czech Republic, Slovakia; *CEE3*: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania (not in industry)

1998-2002

		EMU1	EMU2	OUTS	USA	JAP	RUS	CEE1	CEE2	CEE3
GDP	AG-HP	0.33	0.25	0.25	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.67	3.00	2.33
	AG-BP	0.50	1.00	0.50	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	1.67
	CF-HP	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.00	2.00	1.00	0.33	3.00	2.00
	CF-BP	0.67	1.00	1.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.33	3.00	1.67
Ind.	AG-HP	0.17	0.33	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	0.67	1.00	1.00
	AG-BP	0.17	0.67	1.25	1.00	1.00	2.00	0.67	1.00	1.00
Exp.	AG-HP	0.00	0.25	0.75	1.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	1.33
	AG-BP	0.00	0.25	0.50	1.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.50	1.33
Imp.	AG-HP	0.17	0.50	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	0.33	1.50	1.67
	AG-BP	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00
Serv.	AG-HP	0.50	0.67	1.33	2.00		3.00	2.33	3.00	
	AG-BP	0.67	1.00	1.33	2.00		1.00	2.33	3.00	
Cons	AG-HP	0.83	1.75	0.75	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	3.00
	AG-BP	0.67	1.00	2.50	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	3.00
Inv.	AG-HP	0.17	0.75	0.75	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	2.67
	AG-BP	0.50	2.50	2.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	2.67

AG: using aggregate euro area data; CF: using the common factor; HP: Hordick-Prescott filter; BP: Band-Pass filter

EMU1: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands; *EMU2*: Finland, Ireland (not in industry and services), Portugal, Spain, *OUTS*: Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland (not in services), UK; *CEE1*: Hungary, Poland, Slovenia; *CEE2*: Czech Republic, Slovakia; *CEE3*: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania (not in industry)

* The table shows the group-specific mean of the absolute value of the leads/lags, since the mean of raw data could cancel out positive and negative values.
The maximum leads/lags studied is 3 quarters.

Table 7: Summary Table of Relative Volatility*, 1993-2002

1993-1997

		EMU1	EMU2	OUTS	USA	JAP	RUS	CEE1	CEE2	CEE3
GDP	HP	111	188	147	72	176	397	155	175	436
	BP	113	144	153	112	210	420	177	188	489
Ind.	HP	121	120	151	57	181	132	128	301	232
	BP	118	110	151	66	171	133	131	288	267
Exp.	HP	120	118	109	126	146	137	379	191	406
	BP	123	139	107	78	178	133	400	217	453
Imp.	HP	100	130	93	54	201	358	244	189	306
	BP	109	140	100	106	239	454	261	219	386
Serv.	HP	211	436	270	106		461	204	1067	
	BP	275	604	522	171		907	326	1900	
Cons	HP	120	210	134	66	131	401	285	332	676
	BP	135	218	166	152	192	578	328	443	1002
Inv.	HP	116	221	181	47	144	454	279	331	352
	BP	126	222	207	117	161	638	356	394	451

1998-2002

		EMU1	EMU2	OUTS	USA	JAP	RUS	CEE1	CEE2	CEE3
GDP	HP	121	179	102	145	139	457	124	168	265
	BP	134	174	123	162	202	464	153	222	426
Ind.	HP	129	152	204	219	300	413	201	303	394
	BP	138	150	229	188	370	471	233	387	454
Exp.	HP	103	128	119	138	148	131	202	128	276
	BP	106	132	124	147	176	144	219	153	328
Imp.	HP	95	134	102	132	116	480	141	142	250
	BP	104	149	103	160	181	596	164	194	337
Serv.	HP	133	154	125	64		359	99	386	
	BP	147	138	142	82		406	126	501	
Cons	HP	117	230	121	99	68	482	151	224	286
	BP	126	279	139	118	79	550	214	317	411
Inv.	HP	109	178	120	140	97	336	226	248	464
	BP	126	198	128	167	158	484	325	383	704

HP: Hordick-Prescott filter; BP: Band-Pass filter

EMU1: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands; *EMU2*: Finland, Portugal, Spain, *OUTS*: Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland (not in services), UK; *CEE1*: Hungary, Poland, Slovenia (only in GDP, industry, and services); *CEE2*: Czech Republic, Slovakia; *CEE3*: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania (not in industry)

* EMU = 100

HP: Hordick-Prescott filter; BP: Band-Pass filter

EMU1: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands; *EMU2*: Finland, Ireland (not in industry and services), Portugal, Spain, *OUTS*: Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland (not in services), UK; *CEE1*: Hungary, Poland, Slovenia; *CEE2*: Czech Republic, Slovakia; *CEE3*: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania (not in industry)

# Table 8: Summary Table of Persistence, 1993–2002

1993–1997

		EMU1	EMU2	OUTS	USA	JAP	RUS	CEE1	CEE2	CEE3
GDP	HP	0.56	0.60	0.77	0.65	0.87	0.88	0.26	0.84	0.49
	BP	0.65	0.69	0.79	0.88	0.89	0.84	0.29	0.83	0.49
Ind.	HP	0.80	0.76	0.69	0.82	0.91	0.59	0.60	0.54	0.48
	BP	0.82	0.72	0.73	0.90	0.91	0.52	0.58	0.51	0.64
Exp.	HP	0.64	0.31	0.70	0.84	0.82	0.50	0.06	0.41	0.79
	BP	0.67	0.37	0.64	0.60	0.86	0.41	0.04	0.46	0.81
Imp.	HP	0.63	0.63	0.69	0.79	0.96	0.54	0.53	0.42	0.68
	BP	0.68	0.61	0.61	0.92	0.96	0.41	0.45	0.27	0.72
Serv.	HP	0.65	0.76	0.70	0.42		-0.07	0.19	-0.08	
	BP	0.55	0.78	0.73	0.64		0.05	0.06	-0.04	
Cons.	HP	0.43	0.63	0.59	0.78	0.32	0.64	0.65	0.61	0.23
	BP	0.51	0.66	0.65	0.93	0.41	0.68	0.55	0.60	0.36
Inv.	HP	0.33	0.75	0.68	0.48	0.87	0.01	0.45	0.80	0.28
	BP	0.35	0.74	0.68	0.90	0.85	0.12	0.43	0.76	0.32

1998–2002

		EMU1	EMU2	OUTS	USA	JAP	RUS	CEE1	CEE2	CEE3
GDP	HP	0.83	0.63	0.65	0.88	0.72	0.81	0.59	0.80	0.71
	BP	0.78	0.34	0.67	0.83	0.74	0.69	0.56	0.78	0.79
Ind.	HP	0.70	0.65	0.57	0.94	0.80	0.73	0.73	0.30	0.77
	BP	0.69	0.52	0.61	0.89	0.81	0.72	0.73	0.36	0.78
Exp.	HP	0.79	0.61	0.72	0.85	0.75	0.34	0.53	0.57	0.80
	BP	0.76	0.53	0.70	0.82	0.77	0.32	0.50	0.61	0.81
Imp.	HP	0.80	0.71	0.79	0.90	0.80	0.78	0.24	0.69	0.74
	BP	0.75	0.61	0.70	0.88	0.84	0.77	0.30	0.72	0.75
Serv.	HP	0.81	0.85	0.62	0.78		0.76	0.34	0.46	
	BP	0.77	0.67	0.62	0.78		0.71	0.28	0.44	
Cons.	HP	0.84	0.53	0.73	0.86	0.56	0.80	0.34	0.76	0.28
	BP	0.77	0.25	0.67	0.83	0.40	0.75	0.42	0.77	0.33
Inv.	HP	0.69	0.63	0.78	0.95	0.80	0.64	0.05	0.72	0.56
	BP	0.52	0.41	0.64	0.92	0.80	0.62	0.11	0.76	0.56

HP: Hordick-Prescott filter; BP: Band-Pass filter

EMU1: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands; *EMU2*: Finland, Portugal, Spain, *OUTS*: Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland (not in services), UK; *CEE1*: Hungary, Poland, Slovenia (only in GDP, industry, and services); *CEE2*: Czech Republic, Slovakia; *CEE3*: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania (not in industry).

HP: Hordick-Prescott filter; BP: Band-Pass filter

EMU1: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands; *EMU2*: Finland, Portugal, Spain, *OUTS*: Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland (not in services), UK; *CEE1*: Hungary, Poland, Slovenia; *CEE2*: Czech Republic, Slovakia; *CEE3*: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania (not in industry).

9. Figures

Figure 1/a: GDP Cycles of CEECs and Russia, 1980-2002

Figure 1/b: GDP Cycles of EMU Members, 1980-2002

**Figure 1/c: GDP Cycles of Control Group Countries, 1980-2002**

Figure 2/a: GDP - Correlation with the Cycle of EMU Aggregate, 1983-2002

Figure 2/b: GDP - Correlation with the Cycle of EMU-5 Common Factor, 1983-2002

# Figure 3: GDP – Correlation of CEECs with the Cycles of Russia and the EMU, 1993-2002

Panel a :
Based on the HP-filter

Panel b :
Based on the BP-filter

Notes: Empty symbols indicate values for 1993-97, while filled symbols for 1998-2002. The three Baltic states are denoted with triangles, the Czech Republic and Slovakia with squares, and Hungary, Poland and Slovenia with circles.

Figure 4: GDP – Level of Correlation with the EMU Cycle, 1998-2002

Panel a **: using the euro area aggregate, left colum: HP, right column: BP**

Panel b **: using the EMU-5 common factor, left colum: HP, right column: BP**

Figure 5: GDP - Persistence, 1983-2002

Figure 6: GDP - Relative Impact of the EMU-5 Common Factor*, 1993-2002

left column: based on HP, right column: based on BP

* Accumulated response up to six quarters to a common factor impulse divided by the response of the EMU-aggregate.

Figure 7: The Share of EMU in Exports, 1993-2001

Source: IMF - Direction of Trade Statistics

Figure 8: Industrial Production - Correlation With the Cycle of the EMU Aggregate, 1983-2002

Figure 9: Industrial Production – Level of Correlation With the Cycle of EMU Aggregate, 1998-2002

left column: HP, right column: BP

Figure 10: Exports - Correlation With the Cycle of the EMU Aggregate, 1983-2002

Figure 11: Imports - Correlation With the Cycle of the EMU Aggregate, 1983-2002

Figure 12: Private Consumption - Correlation With the Cycle of the EMU Aggregate, 1983-2002

Figure 13: The Consumption-Correlation Puzzle: Correlation of Consumption *Less* **Correlation of GDP**

Panel a **: Based on HP-filter, left column: 1993-97, right column: 1998-02**

Note: no data is available for Ireland and Slovenia in 1993-97.

Panel b **: Based on BP-filter, left column: 1993-97, right column: 1998-02**

Note: no data are available for Ireland and Slovenia in 1993-97.

# Figure 14: Private Consumption - Persistence, 1983-2002

Figure 15/a: EMU members: International Investment Position, 1980-2002 (percent of GDP)

Note: all panels are equally scaled to [0,100] except that of Finland and Ireland. Liabilities are the stock of foreign investment in the domestic economy; assets are the stock of domestic investment abroad. FDI: foreign direct investment, PI: portfolio investment. Source: authors' calculation based on data in the IMF-International Financial Statistics.

Figure 15/b: Control group: International Investment Position, 1980-2002 (percent of GDP)

Notes: all panels are equally scaled to [0,70] except that of Switzerland. For wider international comparison, the Figure also includes data for Australia (AUS), Canada (CAN), Mexico (MEX), and South Africa (SAF). Liabilities are the stock of foreign investment in the domestic economy; assets are the stock of domestic investment abroad. FDI: foreign direct investment, PI: portfolio investment. Source: authors' calculation based on data in the IMF-International Financial Statistics.

Figure 15/c: CEECs: International Investment Position, 1980-2002 (percent of GDP)

Notes: all panels are equally scaled to [0,60]. For wider international comparison, the Figure also includes data for Bulgaria (BUL), Romania (ROM), and Croatia (CRO). Liabilities are the stock of foreign investment in the domestic economy; assets are the stock of domestic investment abroad. FDI: foreign direct investment, PI: portfolio investment. Source: authors' calculation based on data in the IMF-International Financial Statistics.

Figure 16: Investment - Correlation With the Cycle of the EMU Aggregate, 1983-2002

MNB Füzetek / MNB Working Papers

1995/1

SIMON András: Aggregált kereslet és kínálat, termelés és külkereskedelem a magyar gazdaságban 1990-1994

Aggregate Demand and Supply, Production and Foreign Trade in the Hungarian Economy, 1990-1994 (available only in Hungarian)

1995/2

NEMÉNYI Judit: A Magyar Nemzeti Bank devizaadósságán felhalmozódó árfolyamveszteség kérdései

Issues of Foreign Exchange Losses of the National Bank of Hungary (available only in Hungarian)

1995/3

DR. KUN János: Seignorage és az államadóság terhei

Seigniorage and the Burdens of Government Debt (available only in Hungarian)

1996/1

SIMON András: Az infláció tényezői 1990-1995-ben

Factors of Inflation, 1990-1995 (available only in Hungarian)

1996/2

NEMÉNYI Judit: A tőkebeáramlás, a makrogazdasági egyensúly és az eladósodási folyamat összefüggései a Magyar Nemzeti Bank eredményének alakulásával

The Influence of Capital Flows, Macroeconomic Balance and Indebtedness on the Profits of the National Bank of Hungary (available only in Hungarian)

1996/3

SIMON András: Sterilizáció, kamatpolitika az államháztartás és a fizetési mérleg

Sterilization, Interest Rate Policy, the Central Budget and the Balance of Payments (available only in Hungarian)

1996/4

DARVAS Zsolt: Kamatkülönbség és árfolyam-várakozások

Interest Rate Differentials and Exchange Rate Expectations (available only in Hungarian)

1996/5

VINCZE János – ZSOLDOS István: A fogyasztói árak struktúrája, szintje és alakulása Magyarországon 1991-1996-ban; Ökonometriai vizsgálat a részletes fogyasztói árindex alapján

The Structure, Level and Development of Consumer Prices in Hungary, 1991-1996 – An Econometric Analysis Based on the Detailed Consumer Price Index (available only in Hungarian)

1996/6

CSERMELY Ágnes: A vállalkozások banki finanszírozása Magyarországon 1991-1994

Bank Financing of Enterprises in Hungary, 1991-1994 (available only in Hungarian)

1996/7

DR. BALASSA Ákos: A vállalkozói szektor hosszú távú finanszírozásának helyzete és fejlődési irányai

The Development of Long-term Financing of the Enterprise Sector (available only in Hungarian)

1997/1

Csermely Ágnes: Az inflációs célkitűzés rendszere

The Inflation Targeting Framework (available only in Hungarian)

1997/2

Vincze János: A stabilizáció hatása az árakra, és az árak és a termelés (értékesítés) közötti összefüggésekre

The Effects of Stabilization on Prices and on Relations Between Prices and Production (Sales)

(available only in Hungarian)

1997/3

Barabás Gyula – Hamecz István: Tőkebeáramlás, sterilizáció és pénzmennyiség

Capital Inflow, Sterilization and the Quantity of Money

1997/4

Zsoldos István: A lakosság megtakarítási és portfolió döntései Magyarországon 1980-1996

*Savings and Portfolio Decisions of Hungarian Households, 1980-1996 (*available only in Hungarian)

1997/5

Árvai Zsófia: A sterilizáció és tőkebeáramlás ökonometriai elemzése

An Econometric Analysis of Capital Inflows and Sterilization (available only in Hungarian)

1997/6

Zsoldos István: A lakosság Divisia-pénz tartási viselkedése Magyarországon

Characteristics of Household Divisia Money in Hungary (available only in Hungarian)

1998/1

Árvai Zsófia – Vincze János: Valuták sebezhetősége: Pénzügyi válságok a '90-es években

Vulnerability of Foreign Currency: Financial Crises in the 1990s (available only in Hungarian)

1998/2

Csajbók Attila: Zéró-kupon hozamgörbe becslés jegybanki szemszögből

Zero-coupon Yield Curve Estimation from a Central Bank Perspective

1998/3

Kovács Mihály András - Simon András: A reálárfolyam összetevői

Components of the Real Exchange Rate in Hungary

1998/4

P.Kiss Gábor: Az államháztartás szerepe Magyarországon

The Role of General Government in Hungary

1998/5

Barabás Gyula – Hamecz István – Neményi Judit: A költségvetés finanszírozási rendszerének átalakítása és az eladósodás megfékezése; Magyarország tapasztalatai a piacgazdaság átmeneti időszakában

Fiscal Consolidation, Public Debt Containment and Disinflation; Hungary's Experience in Transition

1998/6

Jakab M. Zoltán – Szapáry György: A csúszó leértékelés tapasztalatai Magyarországon

Hungary's Experience of the Crawling Peg System (available only in Hungarian)

1998/7

Tóth István János – Vincze János: Magyar vállalatok árképzési gyakorlata

Pricing Behaviour of Hungarian Firms (available only in Hungarian)

1998/8

Kovács Mihály András: Mit mutatnak? Különféle reálárfolyam-mutatók áttekintése és a magyar gazdaság ár- és költség-versenyképességének értékelése

The Information Content of Real Exchange Rate Indicators (available only in Hungarian)

1998/9

Darvas Zsolt: Moderált inflációk csökkentése; Összehasonlító vizsgálat a nyolcvanas-kilencvenes évek dezinflációit kísérő folyamatokról

Moderate Inflations: a Comparative Study (available only in Hungarian)

1998/10

Árvai Zsófia: A piaci és kereskedelmi banki kamatok közötti transzmisszió 1992 és 1998 között

The Interest Rate Transmission Mechanism between Market and Commercial Bank Rates

1998/11

P. Kiss Gábor: A költségvetés tervezése és a fiskális átláthatóság aktuális problémái

Topical Issues of Fiscal Transparency and Budgeting (available only in Hungarian)

1998/12

Jakab M. Zoltán: A valutakosár megválasztásának szempontjai Magyarországon

Deriving an Optimal Currency Basket for Hungary (available only in Hungarian)

1999/1

Csermely Ágnes – Vincze János: Leverage and foreign ownership in Hungary

Tőkeáttétel és külföldi tulajdon (csak angol nyelven)

1999/2

Tóth Áron: Kísérlet a hatékonyság empirikus elemzésére a magyar bankrendszerben

An Empirical Analysis of Efficiency in the Hungarian Banking System (available only in Hungarian)

1999/3

Darvas Zsolt – Simon András: A növekedés makrogazdasági feltételei; Gazdaságpolitikai alternatívák

Capital Stock and Economic Development in Hungary

1999/4

Lieli Róbert: Idősormodelleken alapuló inflációs előrejelzések; Egyváltozós módszerek

Inflation Forecasting Based on Series Models. Single-Variable Methods (available only in Hungarian)

1999/5

Ferenczi Barnabás: A hazai munkaerőpiaci folyamatok Jegybanki szemszögből – Stilizált tények

Labour Market Developments in Hungary from a Central Bank Perspective – Stylized Facts

1999/6

Jakab M. Zoltán – Kovács Mihály András: A reálárfolyam-ingadozások főbb meghatározói Magyarországon

Determinants of Real-Exchange Rate Fluctuations in Hungary

1999/7

CSAJBÓK Attila: Information in T-bill Auction Bid Distributions

Az aukciós kincstárjegyhozamok információs tartalma (csak angol nyelven)

1999/8

BENCZÚR Péter: A magyar nyugdíjrendszerben rejlő implicit államadósság-állomány változásának becslése

Changes in the Implicit Debt Burden of the Hungarian Social Security System

1999/9

VÍGH-MIKLE Szabolcs – ZSÁMBOKI Balázs: A bankrendszer mérlegének denominációs összetétele 1991-1998 között

Denomination Structure of the Balance Sheet of the Hungarian Banking Sector, 1991-1998 (available only in Hungarian)

1999/10

DARVAS Zsolt – SZAPÁRY György: A nemzetközi pénzügyi válságok tovaterjedése különböző árfolyamrendszerekben

Financial Contagion under Different Exchange Rate Regimes

1999/11

OSZLAY András: Elméletek és tények a külföldi működőtőke-befektetésekről

Theories and Facts about Foreign Direct Investment in Hungary (available only in Hungarian)

2000/1

JAKAB M. Zoltán – KOVÁCS Mihály András – OSZLAY András: Hová tart a külkereskedelmi integráció? Becslések három kelet-közép-európai ország egyensúlyi külkereskedelmére

How Far has Trade Integration Advanced? An Analysis of Actual and Potential Trade by Three Central and Eastern European Countries

2000/2

VALKOVSZKY Sándor –VINCZE János: Estimates of and Problems with Core Inflation in Hungary

A maginfláció becslése és problémái (csak angol nyelven)

2000/3

VALKOVSZKY Sándor: A magyar lakáspiac helyzete

Situation of the Hungarian Housing Market (available only in Hungarian)

2000/4

JAKAB M. Zoltán – KOVÁCS Mihály András – LŐRINCZ Szabolcs: Az export előrejelzése ökonometriai módszerekkel

Forecasting Hungarian Export Volume

2000/5

FERENCZI Barnabás – VALKOVSZKY Sándor – VINCZE János: Mire jó a fogyasztói-ár statisztika?

What are Consumer Price Statistics Good for?

2000/6

ÁRVAI Zsófia – VINCZE János: Financial Crises in Transition Countries: Models and Facts

Pénzügyi válságok átmeneti gazdaságokban: modellek és tények (csak angol nyelven)

2000/7

György SZAPÁRY: Maastricht and the Choice of Exchange Rate Regime in Transition Countries during the Run-Up to EMU

Maastricht és az árfolyamrendszer megválasztása az átmeneti gazdaságokban az EMU csatlakozást megelőzően (csak angol nyelven)

2000/8

ÁRVAI Zsófia – MENCZEL Péter: A magyar háztartások megtakarításai 1995 és 2000 között

Savings of Hungarian Households, 1995-2000

2000/9

DARVAS Zsolt – SIMON András: A potenciális kibocsátás becslése a gazdaság nyitottságának felhasználásával

Potential Output and Foreign Trade in Small Open Economies

2001/1

SIMON András – VÁRPALOTAI Viktor: Eladósodás, kockázat és óvatosság

Optimal Indebtedness of a Small Open Economy with Precautionary Behavior

2001/2

TÓTH István János - ÁRVAI Zsófia: Likviditási korlát és fogyasztói türelmetlenség

Liquidity constraints and consumer impatience

2001/3

Sándor VALKOVSZKY – János VINCZE: On Price Level Stability, Real Interest Rates and Core Inflation

Árszintstabilitás, reálkamat és maginfláció (csak angol nyeleven)

2001/4

János VINCZE: Financial Stability, Monetary Policy and Integration: Policy Choices for Transition Economies

Pénzügyi stabilitás, monetáris politika, integráció: az átmeneti gazdaságok előtt álló választási lehetőségek (csak angol nyelven)

2001/5

György SZAPÁRY: Banking Sector Reform in Hungary: Lessons Learned, Current Trends and Prospects

A bankrendszer reformja Magyarországon: tanulságok, aktuális folyamatok és kilátások (csak angol nyelven)

2002/1

TÓTH István János: Vállalati és lakossági konjunktúra felmérések *Magyarországon*

Cyclical Surveys of the Hungarian Corporate and Household Sectors (available only in Hungarian)

2002/2

BENCZÚR Péter: A szuverén kötvényekben rejlő kockázatok azonosítása

Identifying Sovereign Bond Risks (available only in Hungarian)

2002/3

JAKAB M. Zoltán – KOVÁCS Mihály András: Magyarország a NIGEM modellben

Hungary in the NIGEM model

2002/4

BENCZÚR Péter – SIMON András – VÁRPALOTAI Viktor: Dezinflációs számítások kisméretű makromodellel

Disinflation Simulations with a Small Model of an Open Economy (available only in Hungarian)

2002/5

On the estimated size of the Balassa-Samuelson effect in five Central and Eastern European countries

Edited by Mihály András KOVÁCS (avaible only in English*)*

2002/6

GYOMAI György – VARSÁNYI Zoltán Máté: Az MNB átlal használt hozamgörbe-becslő eljárás felülvizsgálata

A Comparison of Yield-curve Fitting Methods for Monetary Policy Purposes in Hungary (available only in Hungarian)

2003/1

Péter BENCZÚR*: The behavior of the nominal exchange rate at the beginning of disinflations*

A nominálárfolyam viselkedése monetáris rezsimváltás után (csak angol nyelven)

2003/2

VÁRPALOTAI Viktor: Numerikus módszer gazdasági adatok visszabecslésére

Numerical Method for Estimating GDP Data for Hungary (available only in Hungarian)

2003/3

VÁRPALOTAI Viktor: Dezinflációs számítások dezaggregált kibocsátási résekre alapzó makromodellel

Disinflation Simulations with a Disaggregated Output Gap Based Model (available only in Hungarian)

2003/4

VÁRPALOTAI Viktor: Dezaggregált költségbegyűrűzés-alapú ökonometriai infláció-előrejelző modell

Disaggregated Cost Pass-Through Based Econometric Inflation-Forecasting Model for Hungary

2003/5

Zoltán M. JAKAB – Mihály András KOVÁCS: *Explaining the Exchange Rate Pass-Through in Hungary: Simulations with the NIGEM Model*

Az árfolyam-begyűrűzés meghatározói: szimulációk a NIGEM modellel (csak angol nyelven)

2003/6

Gábor VADAS: *Modelling households' savings and dwellings investment – a portfolio choice approach* (available only in English)

2003/7

Gábor PULA: *Capital Stock estimation in Hungary: A brief description of methodology and results*

Tőkeállomány becslése Magyarországon a PIM módszerrrel. Módszertani leírás és eredmények (csak angol nyelven)

2003/8

Zsolt DARVAS – GÁBOR VADAS: *Univariate Potential Output Estimations for Hungary* (avaiable only in English)

2003/9

Péter BENCZÚR: Nominális sokkok átmeneti reálhatása egy kétszektoros növekedési modellben

Real Effects of Nominal shocks: a 2-sector Dynamic Model with Slow Capital Adjustment and Money-in-the-utility

2003/10

Katalin MÉRŐ – Marianna ENDRÉSZ VALENTINYI: *The Role of Foreign Banks in Five Central and Eastern European Countries*

A külföldi bankok szerepe öt közép-kelet-európai országban (csak angol nyelven)

2003/11

VILÁGI Balázs**:** Az optimális euró konverziós ráta meghatározása egy sztochasztikus dinamikus általános egyensúlyi

The Optimal Euro Conversion Rate in a Stochastic Dynamic General Equilibrium Model

2003/12

MÓRÉ *Csaba* – NAGY *Márton:* A piaci struktúra hatása a bankok teljesítményére: empirikus vizsgálat Közép-Kelet Európára

Relationship between Market Structure and Bank Performance: Empirical Evidence for Central and Eastern Europe

2003/13

BENCZÚR *Péter* – SIMON *András* - VÁRPALOTAI *Viktor*: Fiskális makropolitika és a növekedés elemzése kalibrált modellel (available only in Hungarian)

2004/1

Zsolt DARVAS – *György* SZAPÁRY: *Business Cycle Synchronization in the Enlarged EU: Comovements in the New and Old Members (available only in English)*