



národní
úložiště
šedé
literatury

Identification of Asset Price Misalignments on Financial Markets With Extreme Value Theory

Kadlčáková, Narcisa; Komárek, Luboš; Komárková, Zlataše; Hlaváček, Michal
2013

Dostupný z <http://www.nusl.cz/ntk/nusl-173870>

Dílo je chráněno podle autorského zákona č. 121/2000 Sb.

Tento dokument byl stažen z Národního úložiště šedé literatury (NUŠL).

Datum stažení: 29.04.2024

Další dokumenty můžete najít prostřednictvím vyhledávacího rozhraní nusl.cz .

WORKING PAPER SERIES 14

Narcisa Kadlčáková, Luboš Komárek, Zlatuše Komárková, Michal Hlaváček:
Identification of Asset Price Misalignments on Financial Markets
With Extreme Value Theory

2013

WORKING PAPER SERIES

Identification of Asset Price Misalignments on Financial Markets With Extreme Value Theory

Narcisa Kadlčáková
Luboš Komárek
Zlataše Komárková
Michal Hlaváček

14/2013

CNB WORKING PAPER SERIES

The Working Paper Series of the Czech National Bank (CNB) is intended to disseminate the results of the CNB's research projects as well as the other research activities of both the staff of the CNB and collaborating outside contributors, including invited speakers. The Series aims to present original research contributions relevant to central banks. It is refereed internationally. The referee process is managed by the CNB Research Department. The working papers are circulated to stimulate discussion. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the CNB.

Distributed by the Czech National Bank. Available at <http://www.cnb.cz>.

Reviewed by: Thomas Nitschka (National Bank of Slovakia)
Roman Horváth (Charles University, Prague)
Václav Žďárek (Czech National Bank)

Project Coordinator: Kamil Galuščák

© Czech National Bank, December 2013

Narcisa Kadlčáková, Luboš Komárek, Zlatuše Komárková, Michal Hlaváček

Identification of Asset Price Misalignments on Financial Markets With Extreme Value Theory

Narcisa Kadlčáková, Luboš Komárek, Zlatuše Komárková, and Michal Hlaváček*

Abstract

This paper examines the potential for concurrence of crises in the foreign exchange, stock, and government bond markets as well as identifying asset price misalignments from equilibrium for three Central European countries and the euro area. Concurrence is understood as the joint occurrence of extreme asset changes in different countries and is assessed with a measure of the asymptotic tail dependence among the distributions studied. However, the main aim of the paper is to examine the potential for concurrence of misalignments from equilibrium among financial markets. To this end, representative assets are linked to their fundamentals using a cointegration approach. Next, the extreme values of the differences between the actual daily exchange rates and their monthly equilibrium values determine the episodes associated with large departures from equilibrium. Using tools from Extreme Value Theory, we analyze the transmission of both standard crisis and misalignment-from-equilibrium formation events in the foreign exchange, stock, and government bond markets examined. The results reveal significant potential for co-alignment of extreme events in these markets in Central Europe. The evidence for co-movements is found to be very weak for the exchange rates, but is stronger for the stock markets and bond markets in some periods.

Abstrakt

Tento článek zkoumá potenciál pro souběh krizových období na devizových trzích, na akciových trzích a na trzích vládních dluhopisů a identifikaci odchylek cen těchto aktiv od rovnováhy, a to pro tři země střední Evropy a eurozónu. Souběh krizí je chápán jako současný výskyt extrémních změn cen aktiv v různých zemích a je zkoumán pomocí asymptotické závislosti chvostů zkoumaných statistických rozdělení. Hlavním cílem článku je nicméně zkoumat potenciál pro souběh odchylek od rovnováhy napříč finančními trhy. Za tímto účelem jsou ceny reprezentativních aktiv vztaženy k jejich fundamentálním faktorům s využitím kointegračního přístupu. V dalším kroku jsou extrémní hodnoty rozdílů mezi denními hodnotami devizových kurzů a jejich měsíčními rovnovážnými hodnotami vztaženy k obdobím s velkými odchylkami od rovnováhy. S použitím nástrojů teorie extrémních hodnot (Extreme Value Theory) pak analyzujeme transmissi standardních krizových událostí i odchylek od rovnováhy u devizových, akciových a dluhopisových trhů. Výsledky ukazují na významný potenciál pro souběh extrémních událostí na těchto trzích v rámci střední Evropy. Zjištěné náznaky souběhu jsou velmi slabé pro trh deviz, ale na akciových a dluhopisových trzích jsou v některých obdobích silnější.

JEL Codes: C58, E44, G12, C38.

Keywords: Cointegration, concurrence of extreme values, Extreme Value Theory, financial market.

* Narcisa Kadlčáková (narcisakad@yahoo.com), Luboš Komárek (lubos.komarek@cnb.cz), Zlatuše Komárková (zlatuse.komarkova@cnb.cz), and Michal Hlaváček (michal.hlavacek@cnb.cz) – all Czech National Bank. The research behind this paper was supported by the CNB under Project No. C4/2011. We thank Tomáš Holub, Václav Žďárek, Kamil Galuščák and Tomáš Adam (all CNB), Thomas Nitszka (Swiss National Bank), and Roman Horváth (Charles University) for their valuable comments and suggestions. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Czech National Bank. All errors and omissions remain entirely the fault of the authors.

Nontechnical Summary

This paper analyzes extreme movements in daily exchange rates, five-year government bond indices, and equity indices in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and the euro area. The aim is to uncover crisis episodes and to assess the degree of concurrence of such crises in the above-mentioned financial markets. In this respect, clusterings of extreme asset value changes offer evidence of crisis occurrences. Extremes values occur with low frequencies and, consequently, are found in the tails of the empirical distributions. Concurrence of crises is formalized as clustering of joint extreme events. Tools borrowed from Extreme Value Theory (EVT) are used to assess the degree of co-alignment of such crises.

The standard crisis approach is supplemented with an analysis of extreme departures from equilibrium values in the above-mentioned markets. The intention is to determine episodes of significant departure from equilibrium on the excessive buying side of each market, reflecting strong investor interest in owning the assets over and above what the economic fundamentals would suggest. Equilibrium is determined based on cointegration relationships estimated at a monthly level. The quest for fundamentals starts with a money-income model for the exchange rates and uses the same set of fundamentals for the government bond and equity markets.

The degree of concurrence of extreme movements is assessed with bilateral asymptotic (tail) dependence measures between the pairs of empirical distributions. Asymptotic dependence is formalized as the limit of the conditional probability that one random variable takes extreme values given that the other random variable is taking such values. The standard approach of Poon et al. (2004) is employed. It describes the asymptotic dependence structure with two measures, the first of which being a limit of the type defined above and the second being a measure of the speed of convergence of the conditional probabilities to zero.

The results show that crisis episodes in exchange rates and equity markets predominantly took place during the recent global crisis and seem quite coordinated. Extreme increases in five-year government bond yields are much more country specific compared with the other two markets. Extreme departures from equilibrium on the appreciation side were practically uniformly distributed in all the exchange rate markets studied. As an exception, a short episode of clustering can be observed at the beginning of 2009 in the Czech case. Extreme upward movements from equilibrium in equity indices also show a rather uniform distribution. The government bond market is again much more heterogeneous, displaying clear and less coordinated clusters of extreme downward movements from equilibrium in bond yields.

The estimated asymptotic dependence measures are significantly high in the majority of cases studied. This, however, hinders two potential explanations. On the one hand, crises show a clear coordinated pattern in certain cases and this is reflected in the estimated tail dependence measures. On the other hand, the evidence for crises or extreme departures from equilibrium is weak in other cases and extreme events are quite uniformly distributed. The high asymptotic values in these cases are, paradoxically, a consequence of the absence of crises and rather reflect coordinated extreme movements over long horizons. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the asymptotic dependence measures detect heterogeneity in the government bond markets. The only cases where asymptotic independence was found were in this market, and this result is fully concordant with the informal empirical evidence contained in the graphical representations.

Our results imply that financial stability policy makers should take into account the interlinkages identified between different parts of national financial markets. These interlinkages may manifest themselves only in the “tails,” as during the financial crisis. Similarly, the potential for increased cross-border linkages could be strong in crisis periods. Therefore, policy makers should closely monitor not only their own national financial markets, but also financial markets in other relevant countries.

1. Introduction

Recent developments in financial markets have shown that crises can have quick and often devastating effects in areas far beyond their epicenter. The speed with which the recent U.S. subprime crisis reached a global dimension took the majority of economists and policy makers by surprise. It proved that the global nature of the current market interlinkages makes the transmission of disequilibria across markets and regions a very likely outcome.

In this paper we look at disequilibrium transmission within the foreign exchange, government bond, and stock markets of three Central European countries (Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland) and the euro area. We analyze the *potential* for co-alignment of crises in this region. However, the main aim of the paper is to extend the standard analysis of financial crises by looking at alignment during episodes of significant departure from equilibrium asset values. This offers an insight into how likely it is that this type of disequilibrium will be transmitted in a coordinated manner across the above-mentioned markets in this area.

Concurrence during the disequilibrium formation process is examined using tools from cointegration and Extreme Value Theory (EVT). Concurrence is viewed as the occurrence of joint extreme events in different markets and is assessed with a measure of asymptotic tail dependence among the distributions studied. Crisis concurrence among financial markets is assessed in a standard way by focusing on the extremes of asset return distributions. The potential for disequilibrium concurrence is examined by firstly linking representative assets to their fundamentals using a cointegration approach. This gives the equilibrium values of assets at a coarser (monthly) frequency. Next, the data are considered at daily frequency and the extreme values of the differences between the actual daily asset values and their monthly equilibrium values determine the episodes associated with large departures from equilibrium. Consequently, an EVT-based approach is applied to these departures from equilibrium distributions.

The results reveal significant potential for extreme value alignment among the financial markets in Central Europe in terms of both crisis and disequilibrium formation. We examine both the right tail (upward movements) and the left tail (downward movements) of the asset distributions, with the tail threshold initially delimiting the 5% most extreme values on each side of the distribution. As a consistency check, all results are replicated by going further into the tails, i.e., with a threshold value of 3%. In the majority of cases our results reveal asymptotic dependence values close to one, which proves that the co-alignment of extremes in these markets is very high. In a certain sense, these results come as no surprise. The time horizon considered in this research paper contained the recent global financial crisis as the main crisis event. And even if the recent crisis might have affected the countries considered in different financial segments and with different intensities, one can *a priori* expect highly coordinated extreme changes and misalignments from equilibrium.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly discusses studies relating to analogous analyses focused on Central European countries. Section 3 offers a brief summary of some empirical approaches available in the literature for the identification and alignment assessment of extreme events by means of the Extreme Value Theory. The next section focuses on data description. Section 5 identifies the main crisis periods for exchange rate markets, stock markets, and government bond markets in Central Europe (the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland) and the euro area. Section 6

sheds light on the methodology employed – Extreme Value Theory. The main results of the empirical analysis are presented in Section 7. The main conclusions of the paper are contained in Section 8.

2. Extreme Events and Misaligned Asset Prices

The recent financial crisis has again turned the attention of economists to co-movement across different countries and markets over time, i.e., among (i) the same segment of the financial market in various countries (for example, the European stock market is affected by the U.S. stock market, and both have an influence on Czech stock market), or (ii) different segments of financial markets (for example, shocks in the FX market are propagated to the stock, government bond, and money markets). The primary objective of such research is to study extreme events where asset prices correspond to their fundamental values. The fact that asset prices move away from their fundamentals is not necessarily a sign of a “bubble.” Such an observation can be easily rationalized by investors’ expectations of future risk premia. Observationally, Cochrane (2013) showed that the explanation of bubble formation and rationally motivated behavior about the future risk premium are equivalent.

Whereas correlations and co-movements¹ are well defined through linkages based on fundamentals, the definition of contagion varies across the literature. Calvo and Reinhart (1996) term the transmission of shocks among countries due to real financial linkages as “fundamentals-based” contagion, whereas “pure” contagion describes the transmission of shocks among countries in excess of what should be ascribed to fundamental factors, i.e., it is characterized by excessive co-movements (see Gallegati, 2012). This type of contagion is usually caused by loss of confidence and panic in financial markets after the arrival of important negative news. Forbes and Rigobon (2002) define contagion in a similar way as a significant increase in cross-market linkages after a shock.

The occurrence of extreme market movements in different asset markets and potential spillovers were analyzed by Brunnermeier and Pedersen (2009), who developed a theoretical framework similar in spirit to Grossman and Miller (1988) for thinking about extreme market movements in different asset markets and potential spillovers. They link an asset’s market liquidity and traders’ funding liquidity, because traders provide market liquidity, which depends on the availability of funding. Their model explains, among other things, that market liquidity can suddenly dry up and has commonality across securities. They also showed that market liquidity has a strong influence on volatility, is subject to “flight to quality,” and co-moves with the market. Our analysis assesses the common movements or spillovers from extreme events in the foreign exchange market to other asset markets, i.e., the stock market and the government bond market, as well as cross-country spillovers.

2.1 Effect of Heavily Misaligned Asset Prices

Both heavily misaligned asset prices and asset price bubbles are phenomena which are highly deleterious to the real economy and can appear even in a low-inflation environment. The formation and collapse of a heavily misaligned asset price (bubble) leads to distortion of the economic decisions made in all sectors of the economy. Firstly, household consumption is affected through the wealth channel, i.e., growth in financial asset and property prices held by households is perceived as growth

¹ Co-movement can be seen as the correlated or similar movement of two or more assets. In comparison, spillover can be seen as the transmission of liquidity shocks from one asset to another.

in wealth and as a source of finance for consumption. Secondly, firms' investment decisions are incorrectly influenced in that the capital available for investment becomes cheaper as a result of growth in market equity prices. This, in the case of a growing asset price misalignment, implies an excessive decrease in the price of capital, and hence inefficient investments with negative effects in the future may be made. Thirdly, the banking sector balance sheet suffers due to unsustainable growth in prices of property, which often serves as collateral in lending operations. These effects of growing – and especially subsequently bursting – heavily misaligned asset price bubbles differ in strength over time and across economies, but they affect the real economy in the same direction. The issue of whether the performance of the economy will be affected when a bubble bursts does not depend solely – as we say in this article – on asset prices. Other important factors are the economic environment, the state of the financial sector, its ability to absorb shocks, its vulnerability and its fragility, and the subsequent likelihood and strength of a monetary or fiscal policy response.

The primary question relates to the process of formation of these extreme events and heavily misaligned asset prices (bubbles). On the one hand, each asset price can be theoretically decomposed into components arising from fundamental factors (e.g. indicators from the real economy and financial markets) and components affected by non-fundamental factors (e.g. euphoria or over-optimistic investment sentiment). On the other hand, empirically identified motivations explicitly featuring both components, i.e., fundamental and non-fundamental, are hard to identify. In cases where non-fundamental factors account for a major part of the asset price growth, identifying a bubble is more complicated, since non-fundamental factors are not directly measurable. The empirical literature suggests that neither *ex post* nor *ex ante* identification of serious misalignments is straightforward.

In the literature there are plenty of definitions of heavily misaligned asset prices and approaches to identifying them. DeMarzo, Kaniel, and Kremer (2007) tighten up the definition of a bubble by specifying three components: (i) the market price of an asset is higher than the discounted sum of its expected cash flows, with the discount factor being equal to the risk-free interest rate; (ii) cash flows have a non-negative correlation with aggregate risk; (iii) risk-averse investors rationally choose to hold the asset, despite their knowledge of (i) and (ii). In an attempt to estimate the fundamental value more realistically, Ofek and Richardson (2003) define a range for the fundamental value of an asset, with the upper boundary of the range being more significant. The upper boundary is formed on the basis of an estimate of the maximum achievable future cash flows of a company in a given sector and the minimum possible discount factor. Subsequently, if the market value of the asset is still higher than the fundamental value estimated in this way, a bubble in the price of the asset can be assumed.

Siegel (2003) proposes an operational definition of an asset price bubble as any time the realized asset return over a given future period is more than two standard deviations from its expected return. He argues that a bubble cannot be identified immediately, but one has to wait a sufficient amount of time to determine whether the previous prices can be justified by subsequent cash flows. Komárek and Kubicová (2011) define an asset price bubble as an explosive and asymmetric deviation of the market price of an asset from its fundamental value, with the possibility of a sudden and significant reverse correction.² Developing countries are most liable to higher asset price growth and volatility, which arise mainly from underdeveloped segments of the financial market. Therefore, we argue that for a final assessment of the risks of the presence of asset price bubbles or heavily misaligned asset prices,

² See Komárek and Kubicová (2011).

we have to bear market and country specifics in mind. Furthermore, the theories of asset price bubbles have not been sufficiently investigated for small open economies.

2.2 Empirical Investigation

Analyses of influences across countries in each segment of the financial market (the foreign exchange, stock, bond, or money market) are relatively common even for Central European countries, but analyses of the relationship between markets remain relatively scarce. The largest part of the literature examines the interdependence between the U.S. and countries of Western Europe. Baele (2005) and Baele and Inghelbrecht (2010) apply switching models to show that the intensity of co-movements and spillovers increased during the 1980s and 1990s with no evidence of significant contagion other than a small effect during the 1987 crash. Connolly et al. (2007) research co-movements between the U.S., UK, and German stock and bond markets and show that during high (low) implied volatility periods, the co-movements are stronger (weaker), whereas stock-bond co-movements tend to be positive (negative) following low (high) implied volatility days. Morana and Beltratti (2008) examine the stock markets of the U.S., the UK, Germany, and Japan between 1973 and 2004 and find increasing co-movements for all markets.

Frank and Hesse (2009) deal with the transmission of stress between advanced and emerging stock and bond markets using a GARCH model. They find that during the peak of the last crisis the increase in global risk aversion spilled rapidly to emerging economies and investors resorted to safe and liquid assets in their home markets. Pappas, Ingham, and Izzeldin (2013) examines the synchronization between the EU financial markets before and during the recent financial crisis. They adopt both a Dynamic Conditional Correlation-GARCH and a Markov-Switching regime approach, applied to stock market indices from 27 EU countries. They find evidence of integration between these economies.

Cappiello et al. (2006) carry out an analysis of returns on equity market indices. The results suggest that the integration of the new EU member states with the euro area increased during the process of EU accession. The Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland are found to exhibit return co-movements both between themselves and with the euro area. The co-movements between stock markets in these three Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs) on the one hand, and between the CEECs and Western European countries on the other, are also researched by Égert and Kočenda (2005). Evidence from intraday data reveals no robust co-integration relationship for either intra-CEEC or CEEC–Western European stock market linkages. The results suggest that it is transmission of volatility of returns, not linkages in the levels of returns, which occurs in reality.

For the CEE region, Hanousek and Filer (2000) identify interconnections between fluctuations in equity market returns and economic variables in selected CEE countries. An application of conditional heteroskedasticity (GARCH) analysis to stock market indices in the CEE region in relation to the G-7 is reported by Égert and Koubaa (2004). Stock markets in the CEE region are found to exhibit more asymmetry and volatility as compared to the G-7. Chmielwska (2010) provides an application of contagion for the stock and bond markets over the period from 2008 to 2010. Her results show some similarity factor among the CEE countries, but at the same time confirm that asset prices in the Czech Republic tend to follow the mature markets, while Polish and Hungarian assets can still be treated as a separate, relatively unified category. Babecký, Komárková, and Komárek (2013) primarily analyze financial integration in terms of convergence of returns on, among others,

the Czech, Hungarian, and Polish financial markets (the money, foreign exchange, government bond, and equity markets) with those on the financial market of the euro area (or Germany for the government bond market) at times of financial instability. Their empirical analysis – based on the price-based and news-based methods – reveals that the financial crisis caused temporary price divergence of the Czech, Hungarian, and Polish financial markets from the markets of the euro area (in the cases of the equity, money, and foreign exchange markets) and Germany (in the case of the government bond market).

3. Literature Review for Crisis Identification and Alignment Assessment

The empirical analysis undertaken in this paper draws intensively on cointegration and the vast amount of EVT literature relating to financial crises and contagion. In the EVT approach, financial crises are viewed as rare and extreme events whose occurrence is governed by different laws than those governing the entire domain of asset return distributions studied. The focus is on the tails of the distributions. This allows the avoidance of some typical misassumptions, of which the most commonly made are that (a) the analyzed empirical distributions follow normal distributions, and (b) the Pearson correlation is a good measure of crisis dependence.

In fact, it is a common finding in the economic literature that asset returns significantly depart from the normal distribution in the majority of markets and asset types studied. As a rule, empirical asset returns display fat tails, implying that the probability of extreme events is higher than studies based on the normal distribution usually assume. Additionally, asymptotic dependence or tail-based dependence measures are usually quite different from linear dependence measures proxied by Pearson correlation. Embrechts et al. (2002) and de Vries (2005), for instance, proved that tail dependence may still be significant among variables with a zero Pearson correlation. It is also true that asymptotic dependence is zero in the case of bivariate normal distributions with a non-zero but less than one Pearson correlation.

This paper draws inspiration from several papers employing EVT in the crisis context. Cumperayot and Kouwenberg (2011) used EVT to search for asymptotic dependence between exchange rates and several macroeconomic variables in an attempt to find early warning systems for currency crises. From a rather comprehensive list of macroeconomic variables, asymptotic dependence was found only between domestic real interest rates and exchange rates. Their methodology was based on the approach of Poon et al. (2004), who were the first to formalize two measures of asymptotic dependence/independence for two random variables – these will be used in this paper too.

The first measure is rather intuitive. Asymptotic dependence is examined based on the conditional probability that one variable takes extreme values given that the second variable is taking such values. If the limit of such a conditional probability goes to zero when we move more deeply into the tails of the distributions, then the two variables are said to be asymptotically independent. Otherwise, if the limit is non-zero, they are considered to be asymptotically dependent.

The second measure is the measure of extreme association in the tails. It shows the speed at which the above-mentioned conditional probability decays to zero. It has been proven (Ledford and Tawn, 1996) that this second measure equals one for all asymptotically dependent variables but is less than one for asymptotically independent ones. Consequently, the decision about asymptotic dependence is taken based on a test of equality to one of the second measure. If this hypothesis cannot be rejected,

the two variables are said to be asymptotically dependent and the limiting conditional probability is computed. If the above hypothesis can be rejected, the two variables are said to be asymptotically independent and the conditional probability is zero at the limit.

Poon et al.'s approach was discussed and applied in a comparative manner by Schmuki (2008), who also provided a Matlab code, which was modified by the authors of this paper, for its practical implementation. In this paper, we employ Poon et al.'s approach and a slightly adjusted version of Schmuki's code to compute the two measures of asymptotic dependence.

Contagion in other markets, using tools from EVT, has been studied by Hartmann et al. (2004). Focusing on the co-movement of extreme returns in bond and stock markets in the G5 countries, these authors found that the potential for co-crashes in stock markets and bond markets was substantial. Moreover, contagion from stock to bond markets was as frequent as flight to quality from stocks to bonds at times of stock market crises. International crisis linkages were similar to those found in the national context, a result that underscored the downside risk of financial integration. Hartmann et al. (2010) focused on contagion in exchange rate markets in relation to the statistical properties of exchange rate fundamentals. Although interesting insights are gained from these papers, their methodological approach is different from the one used in this paper and will not be further commented on here.

4. Data

Data from the financial markets (the exchange rate market, stock market, and government bond market for the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and the euro area) were collected at daily frequency from Thomson Reuters. We collected data from January 1, 2001 through July 26, 2013 at daily³ frequency (Table 1). The length of our data sample is a compromise between our attempts to achieve as long a data series as possible and the availability of data. For example, information on long-term Czech government bond yields is missing for older periods, as these bonds were not available.⁴ Our sample period necessarily includes several structural breaks such as the change of currency regime in Hungary, intervention periods, and institutional changes on stock markets. Consequently, the results should be taken with caution.

³ There is a small possibility that, in some events indicated in the empirical analysis, the result – especially for the stock market – was affected by lower market liquidity or trading activity. Deev and Linnertová (2012) found the Czech equity market to be (i) the most efficient after accession to the EU and until the beginning of the global financial crisis, and (ii) less efficient at the beginning of the new millennium and in its most recent developments. However, contradictory results of authors using different models indicate that the efficiency of the Czech market is slowly recovering to its previous level.

⁴ This is also why we used 5-year government bond indices instead of 10-year ones, which could be linked to the Maastricht criteria. In the Czech Republic, 10-year government bonds were first issued in 2004, so using them would shorten our data sample further.

Table 1: Financial Market Data Sources

	Foreign exchange market	Stock market	Government bond market
CZ	PRUSDSP	CZPXIDX	BMCZ05Y
EA	USECBSP	DJES50I	BMBD05Y
HU	HNUSDNB	BUXINDX	BMHN05Y
PL	POUSDSP	POLWIGI	BMPO05Y

Notes: CZ – Czech Republic, HU – Hungary, PL – Poland, EA – euro area (data for Germany were used in the case of the government bond market). The abbreviations are the Thomson Reuters codes of the series.

Source: Thomson Reuters.

A similar time length was chosen for the monthly variables (Appendix 7) which were used in the cointegration analysis (section 6.1). They were collected from the national central banks, national statistical offices, Eurostat, OECD, and Bloomberg.

5. Developments on Financial Markets and Crisis Episodes in Central Europe

In this section we identify the main crisis periods for the markets considered in the paper. A summary of the in-sample extreme exchange rate movements is displayed in Table 2.

Table 2: Extreme Values and Tail-Defining Thresholds of the Exchange Rates

	Left tail – Appreciation				Right tail – Depreciation			
	Minimum	Date	Tail	Date	Maximum	Date	Tail	Date
CZ	-5.74%	10/29/08	-1.27%	10/19/11	4.99%	04/04/02	1.29%	05/15/13
EA	-3.89%	12/18/08	-0.99%	09/08/09	4.74%	12/19/08	1.08%	06/22/10
HU	-5.52%	10/29/08	-1.53%	06/21/11	6.97%	10/10/08	1.65%	01/10/07
PL	-21.49%	01/05/09	-1.37%	01/26/09	23.06%	01/02/09	1.53%	06/13/05

Notes: CZ – Czech Republic, HU – Hungary, PL – Poland, EA – euro area.

Table 2 shows the lowest/highest daily changes of the exchange rates over the period January 1, 2001–July 26, 2013, together with the specific dates when these values occurred. For example, the maximum daily appreciation and depreciation values of the Czech crown were 5.74% (October 29, 2008) and 4.99% (April 4, 2002), respectively. To get a better glimpse of how crisis events are identified in the paper, the threshold values defining the 5% tails are also shown. For example, in the Czech case, extreme depreciation changes are those exceeding the 1.29% daily value, which is the 95% quintile of the empirical distribution of the Czech daily exchange rate changes.

It has to be noted that extreme events in our approach are also linked with administrative changes on the exchange rate markets, such as central bank interventions. For example, the maximum depreciation level in the Czech case mentioned above is clearly linked to an intervention episode (see Égert and Komárek, 2005). Similarly, the developments in Hungary were influenced until May 2001 by a different foreign currency regime (crawling band) and subsequently by its abandonment. Similarly, the other markets may have been influenced by other types of interventions by central banks or governments, such as changes to dividend tax rates with a clear impact on the stock markets.

We tried to estimate our model using sub-samples of the data series excluding these intervention periods, but the results were not substantially different from those presented here in the paper.

Looking at the time of occurrence of events exceeding the tail-defining threshold values, it became evident that these events occurred mainly during the period 2008–2011 for all the exchange rates considered. It was also interesting to note that extreme depreciation and appreciation events tended to alternate and that this took place in a very coordinated manner across countries.

Table 3 contains similar estimations for the stock markets.

Table 3: Extreme Values and Tail-Defining Thresholds of the Stock Exchange Indices

	Left tail – Downward movement				Right tail – Upward movement			
	Minimum	Date	Tail	Date	Maximum	Date	Tail	Date
CZ	-16.19%	10/10/08	-2.15%	08/16/01	12.36%	10/29/08	2.07%	03/06/07
EA	-12.65%	10/10/08	-2.52%	03/07/03	13.18%	10/13/08	2.31%	10/13/10
HU	-8.29%	10/15/08	-2.41%	08/13/08	6.08%	10/29/08	2.51%	12/05/03
PL	-8.21%	10/10/08	-2.01%	01/18/05	10.44%	10/29/08	2.10%	07/26/01

Notes: CZ – Czech Republic, HU – Hungary, PL – Poland, EA – euro area.

It is worth noting the coincidence of the dates when the minimum and maximum values occurred for these indices. At the same time, the extreme values exceeding the 5% thresholds on both sides of the distributions are clustered roughly during September 2008–November 2009, May 2010, and August–November 2011 for all indices. Unlike the exchange rates, a period of extreme movement occurrences in the stock indices was also visible during June–November 2002.

Table 4 displays a similar analysis for the government bond indices.

Table 4: Extreme Values and Tail-Defining Thresholds of the 5Y Government Bond Indices

	Left tail – Downward movement				Right tail – Upward movement			
	Minimum	Date	Tail	Date	Maximum	Date	Tail	Date
CZ	-17.42%	11/01/12	-2.49%	03/05/04	34.72%	05/01/13	2.22%	08/30/11
EA	-23.76%	02/26/13	-4.45%	03/21/12	31.31%	01/02/13	4.28%	04/25/12
HU	-42.63%	03/01/01	-1.79%	07/11/02	31.33%	06/20/03	1.60%	01/10/11
PL	-8.86%	02/26/09	-1.97%	06/07/05	10.17%	06/20/13	1.92%	03/28/07

Notes: CZ – Czech Republic, HU – Hungary, PL – Poland, EA – euro area.

The government bond indices showed changes of the highest magnitude among the asset segments studied. The periods of clustering of extreme values were August 2008–March 2009, April–May 2010, August–December 2011, and March–July 2013.

Appendix 1 provides a more detailed graphical visualization of the timing of the crises at the country level. We were interested in uncovering events of extreme depreciation in exchange rates, extreme decreases in stock prices, and extreme increases in bond yields.

As a rule, extreme depreciations were clustered around September 2008–January 2009 and September–December 2011 for all countries. Periods of stress in the stock markets appeared equally coordinated and were visible during the two to three months before and after the end of 2008 and in August–November 2011. Only in the euro area can one see a period of turbulence in the stock market

at the end of 2002/beginning of 2003. The situation is not so clear for the government bond markets. In this case one cannot identify a common pattern in the extreme upward movements in yields across the countries considered.

We are aware that this “crisis” identification method may rely considerably on in-sample information. However, perfectly objective guidelines for identifying asset crises are rarely available in empirical work. We think that our method is still superior to crisis identification criteria of the type “plus/minus two standard deviations,” which, besides the fact that they exploit the same in-sample information, may be subject to additional and often neglected limitations.⁵ The analysis undertaken here should be viewed just as an attempt to analyze coordinated extreme movements, offering policy makers in the countries concerned an indication of the potential for synchronized crises.

6. Methodology

In terms of EVT, a relatively standard approach is followed in this paper. At the univariate level we assess the degree of tail fatness of the distributions using the tail index. A distribution has heavy tails if it varies slowly at infinity, in other words if a positive parameter α exists such that:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - F(t \cdot x)}{1 - F(t)} = x^{-\alpha}, \quad x > 0, \quad (1)$$

where F denotes the cumulative distribution function, x is a positive observation, and α is the tail index. This means that in the case of a distribution with a fat tail, the tail probabilities decrease according to a power law. This is much slower than the exponential decay followed by the normal distribution.

The parameter α is called the tail index and is customarily estimated with the Hill estimator:

$$\alpha = \left[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{l=1}^K \ln \frac{X_{N-l+1}}{X_{N-K}} \right]^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

Here, K represents the number of observations in the right tail and the values in the sum are the values above the chosen tail threshold, i.e., X_{N-l+1} are the values of the empirical distribution higher than the tail threshold, and X_{N-K} is the value of the right threshold.

The inverse of the parameter α (γ , or the shape parameter) describes the shape of the tail. Positive values of γ are characteristic for distributions with fat tails, while a γ value of zero is representative for the normal distribution. For a positive γ , the number of moments of the distribution is determined with the tail index α . The number of moments that can be reliably computed for a distribution with fat tails equals the greatest integer that is less than or equal to α .

Turning to multivariate EVT, a measure of asymptotic dependence can be derived starting from conditional probabilities of the type:

⁵ To mention only one, there is the fact that the fat-tail properties of some empirical distributions might not even allow their second moment to be computed. In these cases, the “plus/minus two standard deviations” rule is completely flawed.

$$P(X > F_X^{-1}(q)Y > F_X^{-1}(q)) \quad (3)$$

This gives the probability that the random variable X takes an extreme value given the occurrence of an extreme event in Y . Here, extremeness is defined with the q quintile, which is in general bounded by the 10% value on both ranges of the distribution. Asymptotic dependence in the right tail is the limit of such a conditional probability when q tends to one:

$$\chi \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} P(X > F_X^{-1}(q)Y > F_X^{-1}(q)) \quad (4)$$

We follow the approach of Poon et al. (2004), who describe the asymptotic dependence structure in the bivariate case with the help of the two previously mentioned measures $(\chi, \bar{\chi})$, the first of which is a limit of the type defined above and the second is a measure of the speed of convergence of the conditional probabilities to zero. If χ is non-zero, the variables are said to be asymptotic dependent and the limit χ measures the degree of such dependence. If χ is zero, the variables are asymptotic independent but the parameter $\bar{\chi}$ measures the amount of extreme association or the speed with which extreme events converge to zero for both tails.

In this paper the approach of Poon et al. (2004) is closely followed. We first apply unit Fréchet transformations to the original data in order to eliminate the impact of the marginal distributions on the bivariate distribution function but to preserve the original dependence structure. The parameters χ and $\bar{\chi}$ are computed for the transformed series and the decision regarding asymptotic dependence/independence involves the following steps: (1) test the null hypothesis $\bar{\chi} = 1$ ($\bar{\chi}$ follows a normal distribution), (2) if this hypothesis is rejected the series are asymptotic independent ($\chi = 0$), (3) if $\bar{\chi} = 1$ cannot be rejected, the variables are asymptotic dependent and compute χ , the final asymptotic dependence measure.

7. Empirical Findings

The representative assets are the exchange rates vis-à-vis the U.S. dollar (FX), the 5Y government bond yield indices (GB), and the equity price indices (SE) of the three Central European countries mentioned above and the euro area. The quest for fundamentals for the exchange rates is based on a money-income model (see, for example, Engel and West, 2003) that is summarized by the following equation:

$$s_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot (m_t - m_t^*) + \alpha_2 \cdot (y_t - y_t^*) + \alpha_3 \cdot (p_t - p_t^*) + \alpha_4 \cdot (i_t - i_t^*) + \varepsilon_t. \quad (5)$$

Here, s_t is the logarithm of the nominal exchange rate versus the dollar, m_t is a measure of the money supply (M1), y_t is a proxy for output (industrial production, IP), p_t is the Consumer Price Index (CPI), and i_t is the money market interest rate (IR). Excepting the interest rates, which enter the regression as differences from the U.S. interest rate values, all the variables are expressed in logarithmic form and are measured relative to the corresponding U.S. variables.

Dividing the variables by the corresponding U.S. values offers a convenient way to isolate common external shocks affecting the variables. Relationship (5) can be viewed as a combination of different simple exchange rate determination models, i.e., purchasing power parity, interest parity conditions, and the asset view of the exchange rates, perceiving the ratio of two monetary stocks as a significant factor for the determination of the equilibrium level of exchange rates.

The same set of fundamentals is employed for government bond and equity indices, although the limitations of this approach are obvious. It is clear that important factors affecting these variables, such as measures of debt levels at the country level, are missing and this negatively impacts the reliability of our estimations. We could not include this sort of information in the models because these variables are usually available at quarterly or annual frequency. Using them would have necessitated either running cointegration tests with a small number of observations or, if using linear interpolations to fill the gaps at the monthly level, having to accept the negative implications for the stationary nature of the variables. The positive side of things is that we have a homogeneous set of fundamentals for all assets. Moreover, they prove to be relevant factors in the equilibrium model, as cointegration holds in almost all cases.

7.1 Cointegration

The variables mentioned in equation (5) were $I(1)$ for all the countries and markets studied. The existence of cointegration relationships of the type described in (5) was tested using the standard Johansen methodology. Cointegration was found in all cases with the exception of the Polish equity index. For this reason, this variable will not be further considered in the EVT estimations. A summary of the cointegration tests based on the Johansen methodology is contained in Appendix 2.

The cointegration relationships were estimated by the Canonical Cointegration Regression (CCR) method. The equilibrium exchange rates were computed as the fitted values from these CCRs. A graphical representation of the actual daily exchange rates and their monthly equilibrium levels is contained in Appendix 3. The deviations from equilibrium variables were obtained by subtracting the corresponding monthly equilibrium values from the daily values of the asset variables.

From the graphs included in Appendix 3 one can easily remark that the biggest departures from equilibrium for the exchange rates took place between 2008 and 2011. In the stock markets the deviations from equilibrium appear more prominently during 2006–2008 for the Czech Republic and the euro area, and slightly earlier, during 2004–2006, for Hungary. The evidence for government bond market disequilibrium is less obvious, partly due to the imperfections of the cointegration estimations mentioned above.

As in the standard crisis case, Appendix 4 provides a more detailed picture of the extreme departures from equilibrium formation in the markets examined. We focus on phenomena reflecting buyers' interest, i.e., extreme departures from equilibria on the appreciation side for the exchange rates, on the upturn side for stock indices, and on the downturn side for government bond yields.

The graphs in the exchange rate section show the time spots of the 5% strongest exchange rate values relative to their equilibrium values at the country level. It is worth remarking that these extreme exchange rate values are almost uniformly distributed in all cases and show a very weak clustering tendency.

For the stock exchange indices, one can observe periods of clustering of extreme upward deviations from equilibrium during 2005 in the Czech Republic, 2005–2006 in Hungary, and 2003 in the euro area. However, excepting these episodes, the remaining extreme values are also rather uniformly distributed.

Periods of clustering can be discovered in the bond case too – at the beginning of the period for Poland and the Czech Republic, in 2009 for the Czech Republic, the euro area and Hungary, at the end of 2011 in the euro area, and during the first part of 2013 in Hungary. We would like to point out again that the cointegration estimations were less reliable in the bond case; all these conclusions should therefore be accepted with care.

7.2 Extreme Value Theory

Implementing the EVT approach requires variables that are identically and independently distributed. However, the correlograms of the deviation from the equilibrium series obtained so far⁶ at daily frequency showed strong evidence of first-order autocorrelation and in some cases of second-order autocorrelation. Additionally, the variance of these series was not constant over time, implying that the assumption of homoskedasticity was also not met. For these reasons, we filtered out autocorrelation and heteroskedacity from the deviation series by estimating GARCH regressions in which the mean equation contained lagged terms of the required orders. In order to account for error term distributions with heavy tails, the error distributions in these regressions were assumed to follow Student’s *t*-distribution. In the case of the asset return series only the homoskedasticity assumption was not met. Thus, in this case the GARCH modeling employed only a constant in the mean equation and used more complex formulations for volatility.

The tail index parameters computed for the filtered residuals from these GARCH regressions are provided in Table 5. It is obvious that all γ parameters are positive, proving that all these empirical distributions do indeed have fat tails. This outcome allows us to implement the multivariate EVT approach, which will provide the final asymptotic dependence measures.

Table 5: Tail Index Estimations

		Left tail				Right tail			
		CZ	EA	HU	PL	CZ	EA	HU	PL
Asset returns	Exchange rates	3.572	4.074	4.101	4.011	3.435	4.003	3.787	3.366
	Government bonds	2.847	3.951	0.448	2.435	2.248	3.282	0.448	2.163
	Equity	3.252	3.958	3.706	3.233	3.636	4.012	4.619	4.124
Deviations from equilibrium	Exchange rates	3.166	2.953	3.063	2.806	2.843	3.056	2.907	2.625
	Government bonds	1.451	1.812	1.560	2.020	1.220	1.737	1.443	1.895
	Equity	2.138	2.644	1.840	-	2.443	2.387	2.069	-

Notes: CZ – Czech Republic, HU – Hungary, PL – Poland, EA – euro area.

The above-mentioned EVT tools in the multivariate case were applied to assess the degree of asymptotic dependence among different distributions. The analysis took into account both the left and

⁶ These residuals should not be confounded with the residuals from the cointegration tests, which should satisfy the i.i.d. condition if enough lagged terms are included in their specifications.

the right tails of asset returns and the deviations from equilibrium distributions. Extremeness was defined with the q quintiles set at the 5% and 3% levels. Unless evidence for a lack of asymptotic dependence was found under both tail-defining scenarios, we concluded that co-alignment of extremes was present.

Bilateral country asymptotic dependence measures were computed when examining concurrence across the three financial markets – bonds, equity, and exchange rates. Additionally, cross-asset concurrence within individual countries was considered, and this separately envisaged the co-movement and flight to quality scenarios as in Hartman et al. (2004).

The estimations of parameters χ and $\bar{\chi}$ for the exchange rate variables are shown in Table 6. The results suggest that significant tail dependence is present among all the pairs of exchange rate variables considered in this paper.

Table 6: Measures of Bilateral Asymptotic Dependence for Exchange Rates at the 5% Tail Threshold

a) Deviations from equilibrium series

	Depreciation (right tail)			Appreciation (left tail)		
	$\bar{\chi}$	Hypothesis $\bar{\chi}=1$	χ	$\bar{\chi}$	Hypothesis $\bar{\chi}=1$	χ
CZ_EA	0.8445	Rejected	-	0.8789	Not rejected	0.9323
CZ_HU	0.8900	Not rejected	0.9431	0.888	Not rejected	0.9323
CZ_PL	0.9384	Not rejected	0.9431	0.8816	Not rejected	0.9323
HU_EA	0.9537	Not rejected	0.9408	0.9724	Not rejected	0.9478
PL_EA	0.9307	Not rejected	0.9408	0.9613	Not rejected	0.9469
HU_PL	0.9501	Not rejected	0.948	0.9654	Not rejected	0.9469

Notes: CZ – Czech Republic, HU – Hungary, PL – Poland, EA – euro area.

b) Exchange rate return series

	Depreciation (right tail)			Appreciation (left tail)		
	$\bar{\chi}$	Hypothesis $\bar{\chi}=1$	χ	$\bar{\chi}$	Hypothesis $\bar{\chi}=1$	χ
CZ_EA	0.9846	Not rejected	0.9343	0.9569	Not rejected	0.9374
CZ_HU	0.9547	Not rejected	0.9425	0.9643	Not rejected	0.94
CZ_PL	0.9257	Not rejected	0.8928	0.9584	Not rejected	0.9374
HU_EA	0.9464	Not rejected	0.9343	0.9472	Not rejected	0.9381
PL_EA	0.8994	Not rejected	0.8928	0.9433	Not rejected	0.9381
HU_PL	0.9573	Not rejected	0.8928	0.9623	Not rejected	0.9455

Notes: CZ – Czech Republic, HU – Hungary, PL – Poland, EA – euro area.

All the other estimations assessing crisis concurrence are contained in Appendix 5 and those of a disequilibrium type in Appendix 6. The entries of the tables included in these two appendices provide estimations for the extreme association parameters $\bar{\chi}$ and, where parameters $\bar{\chi}$ are not significantly different from one, the corresponding asymptotic dependence measures χ . Where the $\bar{\chi}$ s are significantly different from one, no χ estimations are provided and the corresponding entries are empty.

As can be seen from those tables, the evidence for co-alignment of extremes was strong in the majority of the cases examined. This conclusion did not hold in just a few cases. Firstly, crises in government bond markets appeared to be uncoordinated between the Czech Republic and Hungary (Appendix 5, case A). Similarly, extreme upward changes in bond yields did not seem synchronized in Poland and Hungary. The two cases of a disequilibrium type in which concurrence did not manifest were again found in the government bond segment, namely, between the euro area and Hungary and between the euro area and Poland (Appendix 6, case A). It seems that extreme upward movements in government bond yields relative to fundamentals in the euro area are not transmitted in a coordinated manner to Poland and Hungary and extreme downward movements of the same variable are not transmitted to Poland. The overall conclusion is that the evidence for concurrence in extreme changes and extreme deviations from equilibrium in foreign exchange and stock markets is strong in this region. However, the evidence is less strong in government bond markets.

Our results expand the mosaic of understanding of behavior regarding segments of financial market of Central European Countries (CEC) based on comovement analysis of financial asset returns. Similarly, Babecký, Komárková and Komárek (2013) have provided an empirical analysis based on the financial asset returns in terms of the speed (beta-convergence) and level (sigma-convergence) of financial integration of inflation-targeting Central European economies (Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland) and advanced Western European economies (Sweden and the UK) in comparison with the euro area, regarding foreign exchange, money, bond and stock markets. The results for the CEC reveal that a process of increasing financial integration has been going on steadily since the end of the 1990s and also that the financial crisis caused only temporary price divergence of the CEC financial markets from the euro area market. Likewise, Benecká and Adam (2013) add some supportive evidence showing how the transmission of financial stress from the euro area to the Czech Republic has evolved over time. This analysis was made by means of a composite indicator of systemic stress based on information from the foreign exchange, stock, and bond markets, as well as financial intermediaries. It shows that the degree of spillover between financial markets, based on the constructed composite indicator of systemic stress, is heavily dependent on the stress level, and that this mechanism is significant.

In recent literature there is a wide variety of papers focusing on co-movements of returns in particular financial markets among CEC countries. In the case of the stock market there is for example the study of Baumöhl and Lyócsa (2011), Gjika and Horváth (2012) or Baumöhl (2013). Baumöhl and Lyócsa (2011) investigates whether the daily stock returns of CEC stock markets are covariance stationary. They show that contrary to the widely accepted assumption of covariance stationarity, the stock returns in CEC do not appear to be covariance stationary and that the occurrence of unconditional volatility shifts appears to be synchronized across stocks. Gjika and Horváth (2012) examine time-

varying stock market comovements in Central Europe by means of the DCC-GARCH⁷ model. They found that the correlations among stock markets in CEC and between CEC vis-à-vis the euro area are strong and increased over time (particularly after their EU entry and largely remained at these levels during the financial crisis). Similarly, Baumöhl (2013) studies the transition process of emerging CEC stock markets from segmented to integrated markets and hypothesizes that this process has been gradual over time. As a proxy for integration, co-movements with developed G7 markets are again estimated using asymmetric DCC-GARCH model. He found evidence of strengthening relationships among the stock markets in CEC.

In the case of foreign exchange market one can compare our results with study Bubák et al. (2011) or Gray (2014). Bubák et al. (2014) studied the dynamics of volatility transmission between CEC and main currency pair, i.e. EUR/USD foreign exchange using model-free estimates of daily exchange rate volatility based on intraday data. They found evidence of statistically significant intra-regional volatility spillovers among the Central European foreign exchange markets. Furthermore, With the exception of the Czech Koruna, they also found no significant spillovers running from EUR/USD to the Central European foreign exchange markets. Gray (2014) investigates co-movements between currency markets of CEC and the Euro in the year following the drying up of money markets in August 2007. The paper assesses the degree of foreign currency co-movement by correlation analysis, which can lead to concluding, erroneously, that financial contagion has not occurred. Afterwards, using cross-spectral methods, the paper shows that (following August 2007), there is increased in the intensity of co-movements, but non-linearly.

Finally, in the case of government bond market Büttner and Hayo (2010) employ DCC-MGARCH models to investigate conditional correlations between six CEEC-3 financial markets. They find that the short term money markets are isolated among countries, on the other hand they find tendency toward contagion for foreign exchange and stock markets. The bond markets are somewhere in between. Yang and Hamori (2013) investigate the conditional correlations between the bond markets in CEEC-3 and Germany using the asymmetric dynamic conditional correlation model. They find that financial integration had already evolved before the EU entry in the Czech Republic, while the financial integration process continues in Poland but not in Hungary. They also argue that financial contagion did not occur in the bond markets in CEEC-3 and Germany during the European sovereign debt crisis and that it is possible to observe asymmetric effects on returns over time. Similarly, Yang and Hamori (2014) while using copula models find that integration between CEEC-3 and Germany is greater in bond markets than it is in treasury markets but that it has decreased during the crisis period. They also find that structural dependence between CEEC-3 and German government securities markets is generally symmetric.

The above-mentioned results are not directly comparable with the results of our analysis as they are mainly focused only on selected markets; they use a different set of countries, apply a different methodology from ours, and formulate a different hypothesis. Our analysis is also different as it considers fat-tail events, while other analyses usually consider whole time series including “normal” times. Nevertheless, some of our conclusions may apply. Firstly, our results show similar periods of departures of actual prices from their equilibrium, which could be viewed as confirmation of previous studies’ conclusions. Secondly, like some other studies (e.g. Gjika and Horváth, 2012), our results indicate that the concurrence of extreme events is somehow more intense than traditional contagion

⁷ Dynamic Conditional Correlation multivariate GARCH model.

among countries as well as markets. Thus it seems that the co-movements of different asset markets become stronger in extreme events.

8. Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to empirically analyze the potential for crisis and disequilibrium formation co-alignment within three asset markets in Central Europe and the euro area. Tools pertaining to Extreme Value Theory offered a suitable methodological approach and were used in conjunction with cointegration.

The main finding of the paper is that the potential for co-alignment in terms of crises and departures from equilibrium in this region is particularly high across both countries and markets. In almost all cases we found high values of asymptotic dependence on both the upward/depreciation and downward/appreciation side.

Another interesting result of the paper is that support for cointegration was found, as a rule, among the asset variables and the small set of macro variables that we proposed as fundamentals. This result shows that these markets function in accordance with basic theoretical models, if not on a standalone basis, then at least as the interplay of multiple factors. Based on cointegration we were also able to distinguish episodes of extreme misalignments from equilibrium. It is worth noting that the evidence for persistent disequilibrium formation in the exchange rates was very weak. However, such evidence was stronger in the equity markets, predominantly in 2005–2006 for Hungary and the Czech Republic and in 2003 for the euro area. Such evidence was also found in the government bond markets, although the misalignment was much less synchronized in these markets.

Our results imply that financial stability policy makers should take into account the interlinkages identified between different parts of national financial markets. These interlinkages may manifest themselves only in the “tails,” as during the financial crisis. Similarly, the potential for increased cross-border linkages could be strong in crisis periods. Therefore, policy makers should closely monitor not only their own national financial markets, but also financial markets in other relevant countries.

References

- ADAM, T. AND BENECKÁ, S. (2013): "Financial Stress Spillover and Financial Linkages between the Euro Area and the Czech Republic." *Czech Journal of Economics and Finance*, vol. 63, pp. 46-64.
- ANDREWS, D. W. K. AND W. PLOBERGER (1994): "Optimal Tests When a Nuisance Parameter Is Present Only Under the Alternative." *Econometrica* 62(6), pp. 1383–1414.
- BABECKÝ, J., KOMÁREK, L. AND KOMÁRKOVÁ, Z. (2013): "Financial Integration at Times of Financial Instability". *Czech Journal of Economics and Finance*, vol. 63, pp. 25-45.
- BABECKÝ, J., L. KOMÁREK, AND Z. KOMÁRKOVÁ (2013): "Financial Integration at Times of Financial Instability." *Czech Journal of Economics and Finance* 63(1), pp. 25–45.
- BAELE, L. (2005): "Volatility Spillover Effects in European Equity Markets." *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 40(2): 373–401.
- BAELE, L. AND K. INGHELBRECHT (2010): "Time-Varying Integration, Inter-dependence and Contagion." *Journal of International Money and Finance* 29(5), pp. 1–28.
- BAUMÖHL, E. (2013): "Stock market integration between the CEE-4 and the G7 markets: Asymmetric DCC and smooth transition approach," MPRA Paper 43834, University Library of Munich, Germany.
- BAUMÖHL, E. AND LYÓCSA, Š. (2011): "Testing the covariance stationarity of CEE stocks". MPRA Working Paper 43432, University Library of Munich, Germany.
- BERNANKE, B. AND M. GERTLER (2001): "Should Central Banks Respond to Movements in Asset Prices?" *American Economic Review* 91(2), pp. 253–257.
- BLANCHARD, O. AND M. WATSON (1982): "Bubbles, Rational Expectations and Financial Markets" in: Wachtel, P. (ed.): *Crises in the Economic and Financial Structure*, Lexington Books.
- BORIO, C., W. ENGLISH, AND A. FILARDO (2003): "A Tale of Two Perspectives: Old or New Challenges for Monetary Policy?" BIS Working Papers, No. 127.
- BRUNNERMEIER, M. K. AND L. H. PEDERSEN (2009): "Market Liquidity and Funding Liquidity." *Review of Financial Studies* 22(6), pp. 2201–2238.
- BRUNNERMEIER, M. (2007): "Bubbles" in: Blume, L., and S. Durlauf (eds.): *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- BRUNNERMEIER, M. AND S. NAGEL (2004): "Hedge Funds and the Technology Bubble." *Journal of Finance* 59(5), pp. 2013–2040.


- BUBÁK, V., KOČENDA, E. AND ZIKEŠ, F. (2011): "Volatility transmission in emerging European foreign exchange markets," *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Elsevier, vol. 35(11), November, p. 2829-2841.
- BÜTTNER, D., HAYO, B. (2010) "News and correlations of CEEC-3 financial markets", *Economic Modelling*, Volume 27, Issue 5, September 2010, pp. 915–922.
- CALVO, S. AND C. M., REINHART (1996): "Capital Flows to Latin America: Is There Evidence of Contagion Effects." In: Calvo, G. A., M. Goldstein, and E. Hochreiter (eds.), *Private Capital Flows to Emerging Markets*, Institute for International Economics, Washington DC.
- CAPPIELLO, L., G. A. KADAREJA, AND S. MANGANELLI (2006): "Financial Integration of New EU Member States." ECB Working Paper Series, No. 683.
- CECCHETTI, S., H. GENBERG, J. LIPSKY, AND S. WADHWANI (2000): "Asset Prices and Central Bank Policy." *Geneva Reports on the World Economy*, No. 2 (Centre for Economic Policy Research, London).
- CHMIELEWSKA, A. (2010): "Volatility and Contagion Between the CEE and Eurozone Debt and Equity Markets – Multivariate GARCH Approach." Warsaw School of Economics (mimeo).
- COCHRANE, J. H. (2013): "Gene Fama's Nobel Prize." Manuscript, October 14, 2013. http://faculty.chicagobooth.edu/john.cochrane/research/papers/Fama_nobel.pdf
- CONNOLLY, R., C. STIVERS, AND L. SUN (2007): "Commonality in the Time-Variation of Stock-Stock and Stock-Bond Return Comovements." *Journal of Financial Markets* 10(2), pp. 192–218.
- CUMPERAYOT, P. AND R. KOUWENBERG (2011): "Early Warning Systems for Currency Crises: A Multivariate Extreme Value Approach." *Risk Management eJournal*, 2.
- DE VRIES, C. G. (2005): "The Simple Economics of Bank Fragility." *Journal of Banking and Finance* 29(4), pp. 803–825.
- DEEV, O. AND D. LINNERTOVÁ (2012): "Intraday and Intraweek Trade Anomalies on the Czech Stock Market." *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis*, LX(4), pp. 79–88.
- DEMARZO P., R. KANIEL, AND I. KREMER (2008): "Relative Wealth Concerns and Financial Bubbles." *Review of Financial Studies* 21(1), pp. 19–50.
- ÉGERT B. AND E. KOČENDA (2007): "Interdependence Between Eastern and Western European Stock Markets: Evidence from Intraday Data." *Economic Systems* 31(2), pp. 184–203.
- ÉGERT, B. AND L. KOMÁREK (2005): "Foreign Exchange Interventions and Interest Rate Policy in the Czech Republic: Hand in Glove?" CNB WP 7/2005.

- ÉGERT, B. AND Y. KOUBAA (2004): “Modelling Stock Returns in the G-7 and in Selected CEE Economies: A Non-linear GARCH Approach.” William Davidson Institute Working Paper, No. 663.
- EMBRECHTS, P., A. MCNEILL, AND D. STRAUMANN, (2002): “Correlation and Dependence Properties in Risk Management: Properties and Pitfalls.” *Risk Management: Value at Risk and Beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ENGEL, C. AND K. D. WEST (2004): “Exchange Rates and Fundamentals.” NBER Working Paper Series, 10723.
- FAVERO, C. A. AND F. GIAVAZZI (2002): “Is the International Propagation of Financial Shocks Non-linear? Evidence from the ERM.” *Journal of International Economics* 57(1), pp. 231–246.
- FORBES, K. J. AND R. RIGOBON (2002): “No Contagion, Only Interdependence: Measuring Stock Market Comovements.” *Journal of Finance* 57(5), pp. 2223–2261.
- FRANK, N. AND H. HESSE (2009): “Financial Spillovers to Emerging Markets During the Global Financial Crisis.” International Monetary Fund, Working Paper WP/09/104.
- GALLEGATI, M. (2012): “A Wavelet-Based Approach to Test for Financial Market Contagion.” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 56(11), pp. 3491–3497.
- GJIKA, D. AND HORVATH, R. (2012): “Stock Market Comovements in Central Europe: Evidence from Asymmetric DCC Model,” William Davidson Institute Working Papers Series wp1035, William Davidson Institute at the University of Michigan.
- GRAY, D. (2014) “Central European foreign exchange markets: a cross-spectral analysis of the 2007 financial crisis.” *The European Journal of Finance*. Volume 20, Issue 6, p. 550-567.
- GROSSMAN, S. AND M. MILLER (1988): “Liquidity and Market Structure.” *Journal of Finance* 43(3), pp. 617–637.
- GURKAYNAK, R. S. (2005): “Econometric Tests of Asset Price Bubbles: Taking Stock.” Finance and Economics Discussion Series, Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D.C.
- HANOUSEK, J. AND R. FILER (2000): “The Relationship Between Economic Factors and Equity Markets in Central Europe.” *Economics of Transition* 8(3), pp. 623–638.
- HARTMANN, P., S. STRAETMANS, AND C. G. DE VRIES (2004): “Asset Market Linkages in Crisis Periods.” *Review of Economics and Statistics* 86(1), pp. 313–326.
- HARTMANN, P., S. STRAETMANS, AND C. G. DE VRIES (2010): “Heavy Tails and Currency Crises.” *Journal of Empirical Finance* 17(2), pp. 241–254.
- KIM, D. AND P. PERRON (2009): “Unit Root Tests Allowing for a Break in the Trend Function at an Unknown Time Under Both the Null and Alternative Hypotheses.” *Journal of Econometrics* 148(1), pp. 1–13.





- KOMÁREK, L. AND I. KUBICOVÁ (2011): “The Classification and Identification of Asset Price Bubbles.” *Czech Journal of Economics and Finance* 61(1), pp. 34–48.
- LEDFORD, A. AND J. A. TAWN (1996): “Statistics for Near Independence in Multivariate Extreme Values.” *Biometrika* 83(1), pp. 169–187.
- MORANA, C. AND A. BELTRATTI (2008): “Comovements in International Stock Markets.” *International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money* 18(1), pp. 31–45.
- OFEK, E. AND M. RICHARDSON (2003): “DotCom Mania: The Rise and Fall of Internet Stock Prices.” NYU Stern School Working Paper, FIN-01-037, 58(3), p. 1113.
- PAPPAS, V., H. INGHAM, AND M. IZZELDIN (2013): “Financial Markets Synchronization and Contagion: Evidence from CEE and Eurozone.” University of Lancaster.
- PERRON, P. (1989): “The Great Crash, the Oil Price Shock, and the Unit Root Hypothesis.” *Econometrica* 57(6), pp. 1361–1401.
- PERRON, P. AND T. YABU (2007): “Testing for Shifts in Trend with an Integrated or Stationary Noise Component.” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 27(3), pp. 369–396.
- POON, S., M. ROCKINGER, AND J. TAWN (2004): “Extreme-Value Dependence in Financial Markets: Diagnostics, Models and Financial Implications.” *Review of Financial Studies* 17(2), pp. 581–610.
- SCHMUKI, S. N. (2008): “Tail Dependence: Implementation, Analysis, and Study of the Most Recent Concepts.” Master’s Thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich.
- SIEGEL, J. J. (2003): “What Is an Asset Price Bubble? An Operational Definition.” *European Financial Management* 9(1), pp. 11–24.
- SORNETTE, D. (2003): “Why Stock Markets Crash (Critical Events in Complex Financial Systems).” Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ.
- YANG, L., HAMORI, S. (2013) “EU Accession, Financial Integration, and Contagion Effects: Dynamic Correlation Analysis of CEEC-3 Bond Markets”, *Transition Studies Review* October 2013, Volume 20, Issue 2, pp. 179-189
- YANG, L., HAMORI, S. (2014) “Dependence structure between CEEC-3 and German government securities markets”, *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money* Volume 29, March 2014, pp. 109–125.

Appendix 1: Crisis Identification at the Country Level





A. *Extreme Depreciation*



B. Extreme Downturn Movements in Stock Indices



C. *Extreme Upward Movements in Bond Yields*



Appendix 2: Results of the Cointegration Tests - Johansen Methodology

A. Exchange Rates

Czech Republic									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical		Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical	
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.213	80.736	76.973	0.025	None *	0.213	35.499	34.806	0.041
At most 1	0.131	45.237	54.079	0.241	At most 1	0.131	20.803	28.588	0.353
At most 2	0.088	24.434	35.193	0.435	At most 2	0.088	13.670	22.300	0.493
At most 3	0.049	10.764	20.262	0.565	At most 3	0.049	7.367	15.892	0.625
At most 4	0.023	3.396	9.165	0.509	At most 4	0.023	3.396	9.165	0.509
Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level				
Euro area									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical		Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical	
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.278	99.057	88.804	0.008	None *	0.278	47.230	38.331	0.004
At most 1	0.146	51.827	63.876	0.336	At most 1	0.146	22.850	32.118	0.429
At most 2	0.084	28.978	42.915	0.563	At most 2	0.084	12.752	25.823	0.822
At most 3	0.075	16.225	25.872	0.475	At most 3	0.075	11.277	19.387	0.485
At most 4	0.034	4.948	12.518	0.604	At most 4	0.034	4.948	12.518	0.604
Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level				
Hungary									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical		Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical	
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.267	114.531	88.804	0.000	None *	0.267	46.361	38.331	0.005
At most 1 *	0.165	68.170	63.876	0.021	At most 1	0.165	26.891	32.118	0.190
At most 2	0.155	41.279	42.915	0.072	At most 2	0.155	25.151	25.823	0.061
At most 3	0.083	16.128	25.872	0.482	At most 3	0.083	12.840	19.387	0.341
At most 4	0.022	3.288	12.518	0.841	At most 4	0.022	3.288	12.518	0.841
Trace test indicates 2 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level				
Poland									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical		Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical	
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.200	95.190	88.804	0.016	None	0.200	32.788	38.331	0.189
At most 1	0.144	62.402	63.876	0.066	At most 1	0.144	22.804	32.118	0.433
At most 2	0.105	39.598	42.915	0.103	At most 2	0.105	16.277	25.823	0.520
At most 3	0.092	23.321	25.872	0.101	At most 3	0.092	14.178	19.387	0.243
At most 4	0.060	9.143	12.518	0.172	At most 4	0.060	9.143	12.518	0.172
Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates no cointegration at the 0.05 level				

* denotes rejection of the hypothesis at the 0.05 level

B. Government Bonds

Czech Republic									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical		Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical	
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.271	102.392	88.804	0.004	None *	0.271	46.805	38.331	0.004
At most 1	0.185	55.587	63.876	0.204	At most 1	0.185	30.303	32.118	0.082
At most 2	0.086	25.283	42.915	0.775	At most 2	0.086	13.385	25.823	0.774
At most 3	0.050	11.898	25.872	0.819	At most 3	0.050	7.538	19.387	0.861
At most 4	0.029	4.360	12.518	0.690	At most 4	0.029	4.360	12.518	0.690
Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level				
Euro area									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical		Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical	
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.255	101.940	88.804	0.004	None *	0.255	43.774	38.331	0.011
At most 1	0.180	58.166	63.876	0.138	At most 1	0.180	29.558	32.118	0.100
At most 2	0.099	28.608	42.915	0.586	At most 2	0.099	15.612	25.823	0.579
At most 3	0.058	12.995	25.872	0.739	At most 3	0.058	8.831	19.387	0.742
At most 4	0.028	4.164	12.518	0.718	At most 4	0.028	4.164	12.518	0.718
Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level				
Hungary									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical		Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical	
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.234	95.073	88.804	0.016	None *	0.234	39.456	38.331	0.037
At most 1	0.148	55.617	63.876	0.203	At most 1	0.148	23.678	32.118	0.370
At most 2	0.114	31.939	42.915	0.392	At most 2	0.114	17.872	25.823	0.387
At most 3	0.066	14.067	25.872	0.652	At most 3	0.066	10.052	19.387	0.613
At most 4	0.027	4.015	12.518	0.740	At most 4	0.027	4.015	12.518	0.740
Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level				
Poland									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical		Hypothesized		Trace	0.05 Critical	
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.193	74.316	69.819	0.021	None	0.193	31.672	33.877	0.090
At most 1	0.111	42.644	47.856	0.142	At most 1	0.111	17.463	27.584	0.540
At most 2	0.089	25.181	29.797	0.155	At most 2	0.089	13.810	21.132	0.381
At most 3	0.064	11.372	15.495	0.190	At most 3	0.064	9.753	14.265	0.229
At most 4	0.011	1.619	3.841	0.203	At most 4	0.011	1.619	3.841	0.203
Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates no cointegration at the 0.05 level				

* denotes rejection of the hypothesis at the 0.05 level




C. Equity Indices

Czech Republic									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized	Trace	0.05 Critical			Hypothesized	Trace	0.05 Critical		
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.287	92.944	88.804	0.024	None *	0.287	49.983	38.331	0.002
At most 1	0.111	42.961	63.876	0.738	At most 1	0.111	17.434	32.118	0.836
At most 2	0.084	25.528	42.915	0.763	At most 2	0.084	13.017	25.823	0.802
At most 3	0.058	12.510	25.872	0.775	At most 3	0.058	8.903	19.387	0.734
At most 4	0.024	3.608	12.518	0.798	At most 4	0.024	3.608	12.518	0.798
Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level									
Euro area									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized	Trace	0.05 Critical			Hypothesized	Trace	0.05 Critical		
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.222	83.374	69.819	0.003	None *	0.222	37.242	33.877	0.019
At most 1	0.157	46.133	47.856	0.072	At most 1	0.157	25.255	27.584	0.097
At most 2	0.079	20.878	29.797	0.365	At most 2	0.079	12.175	21.132	0.530
At most 3	0.057	8.703	15.495	0.394	At most 3	0.057	8.627	14.265	0.319
At most 4	0.001	0.076	3.841	0.783	At most 4	0.001	0.076	3.841	0.783
Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level				
Hungary									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized	Trace	0.05 Critical			Hypothesized	Trace	0.05 Critical		
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.319	110.096	88.804	0.001	None *	0.319	57.184	38.331	0.000
At most 1	0.146	52.912	63.876	0.294	At most 1	0.146	23.447	32.118	0.386
At most 2	0.095	29.466	42.915	0.534	At most 2	0.095	14.840	25.823	0.649
At most 3	0.071	14.625	25.872	0.606	At most 3	0.071	10.940	19.387	0.520
At most 4	0.024	3.686	12.518	0.787	At most 4	0.024	3.686	12.518	0.787
Trace test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level				
Poland									
Trace Test					Max-Eigenvalue Test				
Hypothesized	Trace	0.05 Critical			Hypothesized	Trace	0.05 Critical		
No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob	No. of CE(s)	Eigenvalue	Statistic	Value	Prob
None *	0.256	111.895	88.804	0.000	None *	0.256	43.707	38.331	0.011
At most 1 *	0.165	68.187	63.876	0.021	At most 1	0.165	26.747	32.118	0.197
At most 2	0.118	41.440	42.915	0.070	At most 2	0.118	18.537	25.823	0.337
At most 3	0.080	22.903	25.872	0.112	At most 3	0.080	12.314	19.387	0.387
At most 4	0.069	10.589	12.518	0.103	At most 4	0.069	10.589	12.518	0.103
Trace test indicates 2 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level					Max-eigenvalue test indicates 1 cointegrating eqn(s) at the 0.05 level				




* denotes rejection of the hypothesis at the 0.05 level

Appendix 3: Actual and Equilibrium Asset Values



A. Czech Republic






B. Hungary



C. Poland




D. Euro Area




Appendix 4: Extreme Deviations from Equilibrium Identification at Country Level


A. Exchange Rates on the Appreciation Side



B. Extreme Upward Movements From Equilibrium in Stock Indices



C. Extreme Downward Movements From Equilibrium in Bond Yield Indices



Appendix 5: Asymptotic Dependence for Asset Return Series – Standard Crisis Approach

A. Cross-Country

	Exchange rate returns - 5% quantile				Exchange rate returns - 3% quantile				
	Depreciation		Appreciation		Depreciation		Appreciation		
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	
CZ_EU	0.985	0.934	0.957	0.937	CZ_EU	0.942	0.940	0.920	0.932
CZ_HU	0.955	0.943	0.964	0.937	CZ_HU	0.889	0.940	0.932	0.934
CZ_PL	0.926	0.893	0.958	0.937	CZ_PL	0.965	0.832	0.940	0.934
EU_HU	0.946	0.934	0.947	0.938	EU_HU	0.889	0.946	0.921	0.932
EU_PL	0.899	0.893	0.943	0.938	EU_PL	0.963	0.832	0.934	0.932
HU_PL	0.957	0.893	0.962	0.946	HU_PL	0.944	0.832	0.924	0.947

	Government bond yield returns - 5% quantile				Government bond yield ret'd yield returns - 3% quantile				
	Upward movements		Downward movements		Upward movements		Downward movements		
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	
CZ_EU	0.897	0.941	0.976	0.921	CZ_EU	0.787	-	0.922	0.923
CZ_HU	0.803	-	0.917	0.878	CZ_HU	0.628	-	0.885	0.901
CZ_PL	0.898	0.945	0.915	0.940	CZ_PL	0.853	0.917	0.870	0.944
EU_HU	0.907	0.899	0.924	0.878	EU_HU	0.861	0.883	0.894	0.901
EU_PL	0.937	0.941	0.898	0.921	EU_PL	0.931	0.937	0.837	0.923
HU_PL	0.894	0.899	0.810	-	HU_PL	0.826	0.883	0.764	-

	Stock Exchange returns - 5% quantile				Stock Exchange returns - 3% quantile				
	Upward movements		Downward movements		Upward movements		Downward movements		
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	
CZ_EU	0.950	0.942	0.962	0.942	CZ_EU	0.926	0.939	0.922	0.942
CZ_HU	0.987	0.942	0.954	0.942	CZ_HU	0.952	0.939	0.913	0.941
CZ_PL	0.963	0.938	0.973	0.932	CZ_PL	0.945	0.939	0.956	0.934
EU_HU	0.966	0.943	0.916	0.945	EU_HU	0.940	0.945	0.890	0.941
EU_PL	0.973	0.938	0.963	0.932	EU_PL	0.899	0.945	0.893	0.934
HU_PL	0.969	0.938	0.930	0.932	HU_PL	0.938	0.947	0.913	0.934

B. Cross-Market in Individual Countries

Czech Republic

	5% quantile					3% quantile			
	Comovements					Comovements			
	Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes			Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.897	0.942	0.963	0.940	SE_GB	0.784	-	0.937	0.942
SE_FX	0.940	0.942	0.997	0.937	SE_FX	0.914	0.939	0.971	0.934
FX_GB	0.893	0.943	0.967	0.937	FX_GB	0.847	0.917	0.955	0.934

	5% quantile					3% quantile			
	Boom in the first var		Crash of the first var			Boom in the first var		Crash of the first var	
	Flight to quality		Flight to quality			Flight to quality		Flight to quality	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.960	0.940	0.900	0.942	SE_GB	0.934	0.939	0.807	-
SE_FX	0.984	0.937	0.937	0.942	SE_FX	0.962	0.934	0.911	0.940
FX_GB	0.972	0.940	0.893	0.937	FX_GB	0.927	0.940	0.775	-

Euro area

	5% quantile					3% quantile			
	Comovements					Comovements			
	Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes			Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.927	0.941	0.966	0.921	SE_GB	0.892	0.937	0.879	0.923
SE_FX	0.984	0.934	0.930	0.938	SE_FX	0.940	0.945	0.887	0.932
FX_GB	0.924	0.934	0.937	0.921	FX_GB	0.953	0.937	0.962	0.923

	5% quantile					3% quantile			
	Boom in the first var		Crash of the first var			Boom in the first var		Crash of the first var	
	Flight to quality		Flight to quality			Flight to quality		Flight to quality	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.972	0.921	0.938	0.941	SE_GB	0.903	0.923	0.908	0.937
SE_FX	0.929	0.938	0.984	0.934	SE_FX	0.901	0.932	0.948	0.944
FX_GB	0.986	0.921	0.974	0.938	FX_GB	0.942	0.923	0.934	0.932

Hungary

	5% quantile				3% quantile				
	Comovements				Comovements				
	Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes		Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes		
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.906	0.899	0.829	-	SE_GB	0.860	0.883	0.833	0.901
SE_FX	0.972	0.948	0.923	0.946	SE_FX	0.897	0.946	0.893	0.941
FX_GB	0.882	0.899	0.898	0.878	FX_GB	0.751	-	0.882	0.901

	5% quantile				3% quantile				
	Boom in the first var		Crash of the first var		Boom in the first var		Crash of the first var		
	Flight to quality		Flight to quality		Flight to quality		Flight to quality		
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.866	0.878	0.874	0.899	SE_GB	0.862	0.901	0.810	-
SE_FX	0.979	0.946	0.954	0.946	SE_FX	0.953	0.947	0.908	0.941
FX_GB	0.870	0.878	0.907	0.899	FX_GB	0.772	-	0.861	0.883

Poland

	5% quantile				3% quantile				
	Comovements				Comovements				
	Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes		Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes		
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.993	0.938	0.913	0.932	SE_GB	0.962	0.947	0.855	0.934
SE_FX	0.924	0.893	0.959	0.932	SE_FX	0.949	0.832	0.929	0.934
FX_GB	0.939	0.893	0.948	0.946	FX_GB	0.949	0.832	0.9111	0.947

	5% quantile				3% quantile				
	Boom in the first var		Crash of the first var		Boom in the first var		Crash of the first var		
	Flight to quality		Flight to quality		Flight to quality		Flight to quality		
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.920	0.9375	0.9783	0.9315	SE_GB	0.923	0.947	0.926	0.934
SE_FX	0.964	0.9375	0.9191	0.8928	SE_FX	0.956	0.947	0.928	0.832
FX_GB	0.971	0.8928	0.9703	0.9445	FX_GB	0.9446	0.8316	0.9396	0.9471

Appendix 6: Asymptotic Dependence for Deviation From Equilibrium Series

A. Cross-Country

	Exchange rate returns - 5% quantile				Exchange rate returns - 3% quantile				
	Depreciation		Appreciation		Depreciation		Appreciation		
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	
CZ_EU	0.845	-	0.879	0.932	CZ_EU	0.891	0.939	0.798	-
CZ_HU	0.890	0.943	0.888	0.932	CZ_HU	0.929	0.944	0.822	0.934
CZ_PL	0.938	0.943	0.882	0.932	CZ_PL	0.920	0.947	0.829	0.934
EU_HU	0.954	0.941	0.972	0.948	EU_HU	0.913	0.939	0.956	0.938
EU_PL	0.931	0.941	0.961	0.947	EU_PL	0.937	0.939	0.921	0.938
HU_PL	0.950	0.948	0.965	0.947	HU_PL	0.928	0.944	0.944	0.939

	Government bond yield returns - 5% quantile				Government bond yield returns - 3% quantile				
	Upward movement		Downward movement		Upward movements		Downward movements		
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	
CZ_EU	0.856	0.936	0.869	0.910	CZ_EU	0.761	-	0.852	0.922
CZ_HU	0.924	0.929	0.907	0.944	CZ_HU	0.974	0.929	0.922	0.940
CZ_PL	0.912	0.941	0.903	0.942	CZ_PL	0.929	0.929	0.900	0.940
EU_HU	0.772	-	0.766	-	EU_HU	0.768	-	0.807	-
EU_PL	0.791	-	0.758	-	EU_PL	0.822	0.934	0.776	-
HU_PL	0.979	0.929	0.986	0.942	HU_PL	0.932	0.934	0.953	0.944

	Stock Exchange returns - 5% quantile				Stock Exchange returns - 3% quantile				
	Upward movement		Downward movement		Upward movements		Downward movements		
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi	
CZ_EU	0.945	0.936	0.924	0.940	CZ_EU	0.908	0.940	0.919	0.936
CZ_HU	0.964	0.936	0.936	0.941	CZ_HU	0.926	0.942	0.932	0.932
CZ_PL	-	-	-	-	CZ_PL	-	-	-	-
EU_HU	0.964	0.941	0.888	0.940	EU_HU	0.955	0.940	0.830	0.932
EU_PL	-	-	-	-	EU_PL	-	-	-	-
HU_PL	-	-	-	-	HU_PL	-	-	-	-

B. Cross-Market in Individual Countries**Czech Republic****5% quantile**

	Comovements			
	Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.869	0.936	0.942	0.945
SE_FX	0.828	-	0.932	0.932
FX_GB	0.922	0.941	0.882	0.932

3% quantile

	Comovements			
	Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.816	-	0.936	0.940
SE_FX	0.896	0.942	0.885	0.934
FX_GB	0.923	0.929	0.871	0.934

5% quantile

Boom in the first var Crash of the first var

	Flight to quality		Flight to quality	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
	SE_GB	0.911	0.936	0.930
SE_FX	0.810	-	0.954	0.943
FX_GB	0.878	0.943	0.946	0.932

3% quantile

Boom in the first var Crash of the first var

	Flight to quality		Flight to quality	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
	SE_GB	0.870	0.940	0.873
SE_FX	0.826	0.934	0.918	0.947
FX_GB	0.891	0.940	0.971	0.929

Euro area**5% quantile**

	Comovements			
	Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.972	0.936	0.879	0.910
SE_FX	0.957	0.941	0.951	0.940
FX_GB	0.951	0.936	0.854	-

3% quantile

	Comovements			
	Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.939	0.934	0.847	0.922
SE_FX	0.926	0.939	0.923	0.936
FX_GB	0.909	0.934	0.840	0.922

5% quantile

Boom in the first var Crash of the first var

	Flight to quality		Flight to quality	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
	SE_GB	0.915	0.910	0.935
SE_FX	0.931	0.942	0.961	0.940
FX_GB	0.909	0.910	0.905	0.936

3% quantile

Boom in the first var Crash of the first var

	Flight to quality		Flight to quality	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
	SE_GB	0.883	0.922	0.893
SE_FX	0.889	0.938	0.937	0.936
FX_GB	0.874	0.922	0.860	0.934

Hungary

5% quantile					3% quantile				
Comovements					Comovements				
	Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes			Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.796	-	0.928	0.941	SE_GB	0.870	0.934	0.940	0.932
SE_FX	0.948	0.941	0.895	0.941	SE_FX	0.947	0.944	0.836	0.932
FX_GB	0.868	0.929	0.917	0.944	FX_GB	0.871	0.934	0.894	0.942

5% quantile					3% quantile				
Boom in the first var					Crash of the first var				
Flight to quality					Flight to quality				
	Flight to quality		Flight to quality			Flight to quality		Flight to quality	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	0.841	-	0.888	0.929	SE_GB	0.926	0.947	0.927	0.932
SE_FX	0.914	0.941	0.959	0.941	SE_FX	0.935	0.942	0.924	0.932
FX_GB	0.911	0.944	0.881	0.929	FX_GB	0.934	0.944	0.821	0.934

Poland

5% quantile					3% quantile				
Comovements					Comovements				
	Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes			Boom Episodes		Crash Episodes	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	-	-	-	-	SE_GB	-	-	-	-
SE_FX	-	-	-	-	SE_FX	-	-	-	-
FX_GB	0.932	0.941	0.894	0.942	FX_GB	0.898	0.947	0.861	0.939

5% quantile					3% quantile				
Boom in the first var					Crash of the first var				
Flight to quality					Flight to quality				
	Flight to quality		Flight to quality			Flight to quality		Flight to quality	
	chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi		chi bar	chi	chi bar	chi
SE_GB	-	-	-	-	SE_GB	-	-	-	-
SE_FX	-	-	-	-	SE_FX	-	-	-	-
FX_GB	0.944	0.942	0.886	0.941	FX_GB	0.883	0.944	0.879	0.939

Appendix 7: Data Sources

Country	Variable	Ticker	Description of time series	Source
CZ	M1	CZNMSM1.A	Czech Republic, M1 money supply, CZK millions	Czech National Bank
CZ	CPI	CZCONPRCF	Czech Republic, consumer prices, total, index, 1995=100	Czech National Bank
CZ	Industrial production	CZIPTOT.G	Czech Republic, production, total, SA, index, 2010=100	Czech National Bank
CZ	Money market rate	CZINTER3	Czech Republic, Prague interbank offer rate – 3-month (EP)	Czech National Bank
HU	M1	HNM1....A	Money supply: M1 (HUF billions)	National Bank of Hungary
HU	CPI	HNCONPRCF	Hungary, consumer prices, by commodity, all items, total, index, 1990=100	Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO)
HU	Industrial production	HNIPTOT.G	Hungary, production, gross output, excluding water and waste management, volume, cal adj, SA, index, 2010=100	Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO)
HU	Money market rate	HNINTER3	Hungary, 3-month interbank rate	National Bank of Hungary
HU	Money market rate	HNIBK3M	Hungary, 3-month interbank rate	National Bank of Hungary
PL	M1	POM1....A	Poland, M1, PLN millions	National Bank of Poland
PL	CPI	POCONPRCF	Poland, consumer prices, by commodity, total, index, 1998=100	Central Statistical Office, Poland
PL	Industrial production	POESINXCG	Poland, industry production index (NACE Rev. 2), industry production index, monthly data (2005=100) (NACE Rev. 2), mining; mfg; elec; gas, steam and AC, industrial production excluding construction, SA, index, 2010=100	Eurostat
PL	Money market rate	POOIR076R	Poland, 3-month or 90-day rates and yields, interbank rates, total, 3-month WIBOR	OECD
USA	M1	USM1....B	United States, M1 money supply, SA, USD	Federal Reserve, United States
USA	CPI	USCONPRCF	United States, all urban consumers, U.S. city average, consumer prices, all items, index, 1982–1984=100	U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)
USA	Industrial production	USIPTOT.G	United States, production, overall, total, volume, SA, index, 2007=100	Federal Reserve, United States
USA	Money market rate	USGBILL3	United States, Treasury bill rate – 3-month (EP)	Federal Reserve, United States
EA	M1	EMM1....B	Eurozone, M1, amount outstanding, SA, EUR	European Central Bank (ECB)
EA	CPI	EMCPHARMF	Eurozone, HICP – monthly data (index), CP00, CPI – all items (harmonized, NSA), index, 2005=100	Eurostat
EA	Industrial production	EKIPTOT.G	Eurostat, Eurozone, production, overall, NACE Rev. 2, B–D, Total, excluding construction, linked and rebased, SA, index, 2010=100	Eurostat
EA	Money market rate	EIBOR3M	3-month Euribor	European Banking Federation/The Financial Markets Association

CNB WORKING PAPER SERIES

14/2013	Narcisa Kadlčáková Luboš Komárek Zlataše Komárková Michal Hlaváček	<i>Identification of asset price misalignments on financial markets with Extreme Value Theory</i>
13/2013	Giovanni Calice RongHui Miao Filip Štěrba Bořek Vašíček	<i>Short-term determinants of the idiosyncratic sovereign risk premium: A regime-dependent analysis for European credit default swaps</i>
12/2013	Michal Skořepa Luboš Komárek	<i>Sources of asymmetric shocks: The exchange rate or other culprits?</i>
11/2013	Alexis Derviz	<i>Collateral composition, diversification risk, and systemically important merchant banks</i>
10/2013	Tomáš Konečný Oxana Babecká Kucharčuková	<i>Evaluating the links between the financial and real sectors in a small open economy: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
9/2013	Michal Franta	<i>The effect of non-linearity between credit conditions and economic activity on density forecasts</i>
8/2013	Jan Babecký Tomáš Havránek	<i>Structural reforms and economic growth: A meta-analysis</i>
7/2013	Michal Andrlé Jan Brůha Serhat Solmaz	<i>Inflation and output comovement in the Euro Area: Love at second sight?</i>
6/2013	Marek Rusnák	<i>Nowcasting Czech GDP in real time</i>
5/2013	Tomáš Havránek Roman Horváth Petra Valičková	<i>Financial development and economic growth: A meta-analysis</i>
4/2013	Peter Tóth	<i>Currency shocks to export sales of importers: A heterogeneous firms model and Czech micro estimates</i>
3/2013	Aleš Bulíř Jaromír Hurník Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Inflation reports and models: How well do central banks really write?</i>
2/2013	František Brázdík	<i>Expected regime change: Transition toward nominal exchange rate stability</i>
1/2013	Adam Geršl Jitka Lešanovská	<i>Explaining the Czech interbank market risk premium</i>
15/2012	Róbert Ambriško Jan Babecký Jakub Ryšánek Vilém Valenta	<i>Assessing the impact of fiscal measures on the Czech economy</i>
14/2012	Václav Hausenblas Ivana Kubicová Jitka Lešanovská	<i>Contagion risk in the Czech financial system: A network analysis and simulation approach</i>
13/2012	Michal Franta	<i>Macroeconomic effects of fiscal policy in the Czech Republic: Evidence based on various identification approaches in a VAR framework</i>
12/2012	Konstantin Belyaev Aelita Belyaeva Tomáš Konečný	<i>Macroeconomic factors as drivers of LGD prediction: Empirical evidence from the Czech Republic</i>

	Jakub Seidler Martin Vojtek	
11/2012	Adam Geršl Petr Jakubík Tomáš Konečný Jakub Seidler	<i>Dynamic stress testing: The framework for testing banking sector resilience used by the Czech National Bank</i>
10/2012	Tomáš Havránek Marek Rusnák	<i>Transmission lags of monetary policy: A meta-analysis</i>
9/2012	Volha Audzei František Brázdk	<i>Monetary policy and exchange rate dynamics: The exchange rate as a shock absorber</i>
8/2012	Alexis Derviz Jakub Seidler	<i>Coordination incentives in cross-border macroprudential regulation</i>
7/2012	Peter Claeys Bořek Vašíček	<i>Measuring sovereign bond spillover in Europe and the impact of rating news</i>
6/2012	Michal Franta Jan Libich Petr Stehlík	<i>Tracking monetary-fiscal interactions across time and space</i>
5/2012	Roman Horváth Jakub Seidler Laurent Weill	<i>Bank capital and liquidity creation: Granger causality evidence</i>
4/2012	Jaromír Baxa Miroslav Plašil Bořek Vašíček	<i>Changes in inflation dynamics under inflation targeting? Evidence from Central European countries</i>
3/2012	Soňa Benecká Tomáš Holub Narcisa Liliana Kadlčáková Ivana Kubicová	<i>Does central bank financial strength matter for inflation? An empirical analysis</i>
2/2012	Adam Geršl Petr Jakubík Dorota Kowalczyk Steven Ongena José-Luis Peydró Alcalde	<i>Monetary conditions and banks' behaviour in the Czech Republic</i>
1/2012	Jan Babecký Kamil Dybczak	<i>Real wage flexibility in the European Union: New evidence from the labour cost data</i>
15/2011	Jan Babecký Kamil Galuščák Lubomír Lízal	<i>Firm-level labour demand: Adjustment in good times and during the crisis</i>
14/2011	Vlastimil Čadek Helena Rottová Branislav Saxa	<i>Hedging behaviour of Czech exporting firms</i>
13/2011	Michal Franta Roman Horváth Marek Rusnák	<i>Evaluating changes in the monetary transmission mechanism in the Czech Republic</i>
12/2011	Jakub Ryšánek Jaromír Tonner Osvald Vašíček	<i>Monetary policy implications of financial frictions in the Czech Republic</i>
11/2011	Zlataše Komárková Adam Geršl	<i>Models for stress testing Czech banks' liquidity risk</i>

Luboš Komárek

10/2011	Michal Franta Jozef Barunik Roman Horváth Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Are Bayesian fan charts useful for central banks? Uncertainty, forecasting, and financial stability stress tests</i>
9/2011	Kamil Galuščák Lubomír Lízal	<i>The impact of capital measurement error correction on firm-level production function estimation</i>
8/2011	Jan Babecký Tomáš Havránek Jakub Matějů Marek Rusnák Kateřina Šmídková Bořek Vašíček	<i>Early warning indicators of economic crises: Evidence from a panel of 40 developed countries</i>
7/2011	Tomáš Havránek Zuzana Iršová	<i>Determinants of horizontal spillovers from FDI: Evidence from a large meta-analysis</i>
6/2011	Roman Horváth Jakub Matějů	<i>How are inflation targets set?</i>
5/2011	Bořek Vašíček	<i>Is monetary policy in the new EU member states asymmetric?</i>
4/2011	Alexis Derviz	<i>Financial frictions, bubbles, and macroprudential policies</i>
3/2011	Jaromír Baxa Roman Horváth Bořek Vašíček	<i>Time-varying monetary-policy rules and financial stress: Does financial instability matter for monetary policy?</i>
2/2011	Marek Rusnák Tomáš Havránek Roman Horváth	<i>How to solve the price puzzle? A meta-analysis</i>
1/2011	Jan Babecký Aleš Bulíř Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Sustainable real exchange rates in the new EU member states: What did the Great Recession change?</i>
15/2010	Ke Pang Pierre L. Siklos	<i>Financial frictions and credit spreads</i>
14/2010	Filip Novotný Marie Raková	<i>Assessment of consensus forecasts accuracy: The Czech National Bank perspective</i>
13/2010	Jan Filáček Branislav Saxa	<i>Central bank forecasts as a coordination device</i>
12/2010	Kateřina Arnoštová David Havrlant Luboš Růžička Peter Tóth	<i>Short-term forecasting of Czech quarterly GDP using monthly indicators</i>
11/2010	Roman Horváth Kateřina Šmídková Jan Zápál	<i>Central banks' voting records and future policy</i>
10/2010	Alena Bičáková Zuzana Prelcová Renata Pašaličová	<i>Who borrows and who may not repay?</i>
9/2010	Luboš Komárek Jan Babecký Zlatuše Komárková	<i>Financial integration at times of financial instability</i>
8/2010	Kamil Dybczak	<i>Effects of price shocks to consumer demand. Estimating the</i>

	Peter Tóth David Voňka	<i>QUAIDS demand system on Czech Household Budget Survey data</i>
7/2010	Jan Babecký Philip Du Caju Theodora Kosma Martina Lawless Julián Messina Tairi Rõõm	<i>The margins of labour cost adjustment: Survey evidence from European firms</i>
6/2010	Tomáš Havránek Roman Horváth Jakub Matějů	<i>Do financial variables help predict macroeconomic environment? The case of the Czech Republic</i>
5/2010	Roman Horváth Luboš Komárek Filip Rozsypal	<i>Does money help predict inflation? An empirical assessment for Central Europe</i>
4/2010	Oxana Babecká Kucharčuková Jan Babecký Martin Raiser	<i>A gravity approach to modelling international trade in South-Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States: The role of geography, policy and institutions</i>
3/2010	Tomáš Havránek Zuzana Iršová	<i>Which foreigners are worth wooing? A Meta-analysis of vertical spillovers from FDI</i>
2/2010	Jaromír Baxa Roman Horváth Bořek Vašíček	<i>How does monetary policy change? Evidence on inflation targeting countries</i>
1/2010	Adam Geršl Petr Jakubík	<i>Relationship lending in the Czech Republic</i>
15/2009	David N. DeJong Roman Liesenfeld Guilherme V. Moura Jean-Francois Richard Hariharan Dharmarajan	<i>Efficient likelihood evaluation of state-space representations</i>
14/2009	Charles W. Calomiris	<i>Banking crises and the rules of the game</i>
13/2009	Jakub Seidler Petr Jakubík	<i>The Merton approach to estimating loss given default: Application to the Czech Republic</i>
12/2009	Michal Hlaváček Luboš Komárek	<i>Housing price bubbles and their determinants in the Czech Republic and its regions</i>
11/2009	Kamil Dybczak Kamil Galuščák	<i>Changes in the Czech wage structure: Does immigration matter?</i>
10/2009	Jiří Böhm Petr Král Branislav Saxa	<i>Perception is always right: The CNB's monetary policy in the media</i>
9/2009	Alexis Derviz Marie Raková	<i>Funding costs and loan pricing by multinational bank affiliates</i>
8/2009	Roman Horváth Anca Maria Podpiera	<i>Heterogeneity in bank pricing policies: The Czech evidence</i>
7/2009	David Kocourek Filip Pertold	<i>The impact of early retirement incentives on labour market participation: Evidence from a parametric change in the Czech Republic</i>
6/2009	Nauro F. Campos	<i>Reform redux: Measurement, determinants and reversals</i>

	Roman Horváth	
5/2009	Kamil Galuščák Mary Keeney Daphne Nicolitsas Frank Smets Pawel Strzelecki Matija Vodopivec	<i>The determination of wages of newly hired employees: Survey evidence on internal versus external factors</i>
4/2009	Jan Babecký Philip Du Caju Theodora Kosma Martina Lawless Julián Messina Tairi Rõõm	<i>Downward nominal and real wage rigidity: Survey evidence from European firms</i>
3/2009	Jiri Podpiera Laurent Weill	<i>Measuring excessive risk-taking in banking</i>
2/2009	Michal Andrle Tibor Hlédik Ondra Kameník Jan Vlček	<i>Implementing the new structural model of the Czech National Bank</i>
1/2009	Kamil Dybczak Jan Babecký	<i>The impact of population ageing on the Czech economy</i>
14/2008	Gabriel Fagan Vitor Gaspar	<i>Macroeconomic adjustment to monetary union</i>
13/2008	Giuseppe Bertola Anna Lo Prete	<i>Openness, financial markets, and policies: Cross-country and dynamic patterns</i>
12/2008	Jan Babecký Kamil Dybczak Kamil Galuščák	<i>Survey on wage and price formation of Czech firms</i>
11/2008	Dana Hájková	<i>The measurement of capital services in the Czech Republic</i>
10/2008	Michal Franta	<i>Time aggregation bias in discrete time models of aggregate duration data</i>
9/2008	Petr Jakubík Christian Schmieder	<i>Stress testing credit risk: Is the Czech Republic different from Germany?</i>
8/2008	Sofia Bauducco Aleš Bulíř Martin Čihák	<i>Monetary policy rules with financial instability</i>
7/2008	Jan Brůha Jiří Podpiera	<i>The origins of global imbalances</i>
6/2008	Jiří Podpiera Marie Raková	<i>The price effects of an emerging retail market</i>
5/2008	Kamil Dybczak David Voňka Nico van der Windt	<i>The effect of oil price shocks on the Czech economy</i>
4/2008	Magdalena M. Borys Roman Horváth	<i>The effects of monetary policy in the Czech Republic: An empirical study</i>
3/2008	Martin Cincibuch Tomáš Holub Jaromír Hurník	<i>Central bank losses and economic convergence</i>
2/2008	Jiří Podpiera	<i>Policy rate decisions and unbiased parameter estimation in conventionally estimated monetary policy rules</i>

1/2008	Balázs Égert Doubravko Mihaljek	<i>Determinants of house prices in Central and Eastern Europe</i>
17/2007	Pedro Portugal	<i>U.S. unemployment duration: Has long become longer or short become shorter?</i>
16/2007	Yuliya Rychalovská	<i>Welfare-based optimal monetary policy in a two-sector small open economy</i>
15/2007	Juraj Antal František Brázdk	<i>The effects of anticipated future change in the monetary policy regime</i>
14/2007	Aleš Bulíř Kateřina Šmídková Viktor Kotlán David Navrátil	<i>Inflation targeting and communication: Should the public read inflation reports or tea leaves?</i>
13/2007	Martin Cinnibuch Martina Horníková	<i>Measuring the financial markets' perception of EMU enlargement: The role of ambiguity aversion</i>
12/2007	Oxana Babetskaia- Kukharchuk	<i>Transmission of exchange rate shocks into domestic inflation: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
11/2007	Jan Filáček	<i>Why and how to assess inflation target fulfilment</i>
10/2007	Michal Franta Branislav Saxa Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Inflation persistence in new EU member states: Is it different than in the Euro area members?</i>
9/2007	Kamil Galuščák Jan Pavel	<i>Unemployment and inactivity traps in the Czech Republic: Incentive effects of policies</i>
8/2007	Adam Geršl Ieva Rubene Tina Zumer	<i>Foreign direct investment and productivity spillovers: Updated evidence from Central and Eastern Europe</i>
7/2007	Ian Babetskii Luboš Komárek Zlataše Komárková	<i>Financial integration of stock markets among new EU member states and the euro area</i>
6/2007	Anca Pruteanu-Podpiera Laurent Weill Franziska Schobert	<i>Market power and efficiency in the Czech banking sector</i>
5/2007	Jiří Podpiera Laurent Weill	<i>Bad luck or bad management? Emerging banking market experience</i>
4/2007	Roman Horváth	<i>The time-varying policy neutral rate in real time: A predictor for future inflation?</i>
3/2007	Jan Brůha Jiří Podpiera Stanislav Polák	<i>The convergence of a transition economy: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
2/2007	Ian Babetskii Nauro F. Campos	<i>Does reform work? An econometric examination of the reform-growth puzzle</i>
1/2007	Ian Babetskii Fabrizio Coricelli Roman Horváth	<i>Measuring and explaining inflation persistence: Disaggregate evidence on the Czech Republic</i>
13/2006	Frederic S. Mishkin Klaus Schmidt- Hebbel	<i>Does inflation targeting make a difference?</i>
12/2006	Richard Disney Sarah Bridges	<i>Housing wealth and household indebtedness: Is there a household 'financial accelerator'?</i>

	John Gathergood	
11/2006	Michel Juillard Ondřej Kameník Michael Kumhof Douglas Laxton	<i>Measures of potential output from an estimated DSGE model of the United States</i>
10/2006	Jiří Podpiera Marie Raková	<i>Degree of competition and export-production relative prices when the exchange rate changes: Evidence from a panel of Czech exporting companies</i>
9/2006	Alexis Derviz Jiří Podpiera	<i>Cross-border lending contagion in multinational banks</i>
8/2006	Aleš Bulíř Jaromír Hurník	<i>The Maastricht inflation criterion: “Saints” and “Sinners”</i>
7/2006	Alena Bičáková Jiří Slačálek Michal Slavík	<i>Fiscal implications of personal tax adjustments in the Czech Republic</i>
6/2006	Martin Fukač Adrian Pagan	<i>Issues in adopting DSGE models for use in the policy process</i>
5/2006	Martin Fukač	<i>New Keynesian model dynamics under heterogeneous expectations and adaptive learning</i>
4/2006	Kamil Dybczak Vladislav Flek Dana Hájková Jaromír Hurník	<i>Supply-side performance and structure in the Czech Republic (1995–2005)</i>
3/2006	Aleš Krejdl	<i>Fiscal sustainability – definition, indicators and assessment of Czech public finance sustainability</i>
2/2006	Kamil Dybczak	<i>Generational accounts in the Czech Republic</i>
1/2006	Ian Babetskii	<i>Aggregate wage flexibility in selected new EU member states</i>
<hr/>		
14/2005	Stephen G. Cecchetti	<i>The brave new world of central banking: The policy challenges posed by asset price booms and busts</i>
13/2005	Robert F. Engle Jose Gonzalo Rangel	<i>The spline GARCH model for unconditional volatility and its global macroeconomic causes</i>
12/2005	Jaromír Beneš Tibor Hlédik Michael Kumhof David Vávra	<i>An economy in transition and DSGE: What the Czech national bank’s new projection model needs</i>
11/2005	Marek Hlaváček Michael Koňák Josef Čada	<i>The application of structured feedforward neural networks to the modelling of daily series of currency in circulation</i>
10/2005	Ondřej Kameník	<i>Solving SDGE models: A new algorithm for the Sylvester equation</i>
9/2005	Roman Šustek	<i>Plant-level nonconvexities and the monetary transmission mechanism</i>
8/2005	Roman Horváth	<i>Exchange rate variability, pressures and optimum currency area criteria: Implications for the central and eastern European countries</i>
7/2005	Balázs Égert Luboš Komárek	<i>Foreign exchange interventions and interest rate policy in the Czech Republic: Hand in glove?</i>
6/2005	Anca Podpiera Jiří Podpiera	<i>Deteriorating cost efficiency in commercial banks signals an increasing risk of failure</i>

5/2005	Luboš Komárek Martin Melecký	<i>The behavioural equilibrium exchange rate of the Czech koruna</i>
4/2005	Kateřina Arnoštová Jaromír Hurník	<i>The monetary transmission mechanism in the Czech Republic (evidence from VAR analysis)</i>
3/2005	Vladimír Benáček Jiří Podpiera Ladislav Prokop	<i>Determining factors of Czech foreign trade: A cross-section time series perspective</i>
2/2005	Kamil Galuščák Daniel Münich	<i>Structural and cyclical unemployment: What can we derive from the matching function?</i>
1/2005	Ivan Babouček Martin Jančar	<i>Effects of macroeconomic shocks to the quality of the aggregate loan portfolio</i>
10/2004	Aleš Bulíř Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Exchange rates in the new EU accession countries: What have we learned from the forerunners</i>
9/2004	Martin Cincibuch Jiří Podpiera	<i>Beyond Balassa-Samuelson: Real appreciation in tradables in transition countries</i>
8/2004	Jaromír Beneš David Vávra	<i>Eigenvalue decomposition of time series with application to the Czech business cycle</i>
7/2004	Vladislav Flek, ed.	<i>Anatomy of the Czech labour market: From over-employment to under-employment in ten years?</i>
6/2004	Narcisa Kadlčáková Joerg Keplinger	<i>Credit risk and bank lending in the Czech Republic</i>
5/2004	Petr Král	<i>Identification and measurement of relationships concerning inflow of FDI: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
4/2004	Jiří Podpiera	<i>Consumers, consumer prices and the Czech business cycle identification</i>
3/2004	Anca Pruteanu	<i>The role of banks in the Czech monetary policy transmission mechanism</i>
2/2004	Ian Babetskii	<i>EU enlargement and endogeneity of some OCA criteria: Evidence from the CEECs</i>
1/2004	Alexis Derviz Jiří Podpiera	<i>Predicting bank CAMELS and S&P ratings: The case of the Czech Republic</i>

CNB RESEARCH AND POLICY NOTES

2/2013	Jan Brůha Tibor Hlédik Tomáš Holub Jiří Polanský Jaromír Tonner	<i>Incorporating judgments and dealing with data uncertainty in forecasting at the Czech National Bank</i>
1/2013	Oxana Babecká Kucharčuková Michal Franta Dana Hájková Petr Král Ivana Kubicová Anca Podpiera Branislav Saxa	<i>What we know about monetary policy transmission in the Czech Republic: Collection of empirical results</i>

3/2012	Jan Frait Zlataše Komárková	<i>Macroprudential policy and its instruments in a small EU economy</i>
2/2012	Zlataše Komárková Marcela Gronychová	<i>Models for stress testing in the insurance sector</i>
1/2012	Róbert Ambriško Vítězslav Augusta Dana Hájková Petr Král Pavla Netušilová Milan Říkovský Pavel Soukup	<i>Fiscal discretion in the Czech Republic in 2001-2011: Has it been stabilizing?</i>
3/2011	František Brázdík Michal Hlaváček Aleš Maršál	<i>Survey of research on financial sector modelling within DSGE models: What central banks can learn from it</i>
2/2011	Adam Geršl Jakub Seidler	<i>Credit growth and capital buffers: Empirical evidence from Central and Eastern European countries</i>
1/2011	Jiří Böhm Jan Filáček Ivana Kubicová Romana Zamazalová	<i>Price-level targeting – A real alternative to inflation targeting?</i>
1/2008	Nicos Christodoulakis	<i>Ten years of EMU: Convergence, divergence and new policy priorities</i>
2/2007	Carl E. Walsh	<i>Inflation targeting and the role of real objectives</i>
1/2007	Vojtěch Benda Luboš Růžička	<i>Short-term forecasting methods based on the LEI approach: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
2/2006	Garry J. Schinasi	<i>Private finance and public policy</i>
1/2006	Ondřej Schneider	<i>The EU budget dispute – A blessing in disguise?</i>
5/2005	Jan Stráský	<i>Optimal forward-looking policy rules in the quarterly projection model of the Czech National Bank</i>
4/2005	Vít Bárta	<i>Fulfilment of the Maastricht inflation criterion by the Czech Republic: Potential costs and policy options</i>
3/2005	Helena Sůvová Eva Kozelková David Zeman Jaroslava Bauerová	<i>Eligibility of external credit assessment institutions</i>
2/2005	Martin Čihák Jaroslav Heřmánek	<i>Stress testing the Czech banking system: Where are we? Where are we going?</i>
1/2005	David Navrátil Viktor Kotlán	<i>The CNB's policy decisions – Are they priced in by the markets?</i>
4/2004	Aleš Bulíř	<i>External and fiscal sustainability of the Czech economy: A quick look through the IMF's night-vision goggles</i>
3/2004	Martin Čihák	<i>Designing stress tests for the Czech banking system</i>
2/2004	Martin Čihák	<i>Stress testing: A review of key concepts</i>
1/2004	Tomáš Holub	<i>Foreign exchange interventions under inflation targeting: The Czech experience</i>

CNB ECONOMIC RESEARCH BULLETIN

November 2013	<i>Macroeconomic effects of fiscal policy</i>
April 2013	<i>Transmission of monetary policy</i>
November 2012	<i>Financial stability and monetary policy</i>
April 2012	<i>Macroeconomic forecasting: Methods, accuracy and coordination</i>
November 2011	<i>Macro-financial linkages: Theory and applications</i>
April 2011	<i>Monetary policy analysis in a central bank</i>
November 2010	<i>Wage adjustment in Europe</i>
May 2010	<i>Ten years of economic research in the CNB</i>
November 2009	<i>Financial and global stability issues</i>
May 2009	<i>Evaluation of the fulfilment of the CNB's inflation targets 1998–2007</i>
December 2008	<i>Inflation targeting and DSGE models</i>
April 2008	<i>Ten years of inflation targeting</i>
December 2007	<i>Fiscal policy and its sustainability</i>
August 2007	<i>Financial stability in a transforming economy</i>
November 2006	<i>ERM II and euro adoption</i>
August 2006	<i>Research priorities and central banks</i>
November 2005	<i>Financial stability</i>
May 2005	<i>Potential output</i>
October 2004	<i>Fiscal issues</i>
May 2004	<i>Inflation targeting</i>
December 2003	<i>Equilibrium exchange rate</i>

Czech National Bank
Economic Research Department
Na Příkopě 28, 115 03 Praha 1
Czech Republic

phone: +420 2 244 12 321

fax: +420 2 244 14 278

<http://www.cnb.cz>

e-mail: research@cnb.cz

ISSN 1803-7070