

## **EMU AND EUROPEAN GOVERNMENT BOND MARKET INTEGRATION**

*Autoras: Pilar Abad<sup>(a)</sup>*

*Helena Chuliá<sup>(b)</sup>*

*Marta Gómez-Puig<sup>(c)</sup>*

P. T. N.º 12/10

(a) *Economic Analysis Department, University Rey Juan Carlos and RFA-IREA.*

(b) *Department of Economics and Business, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya and RFA-IREA.*

(c) *Economic Theory Department, University of Barcelona and RFA-IREA.*

**Acknowledgements:** The authors thank financial support from Institute of Fiscal Studies (IEF). Pilar Abad and Helena Chuliá acknowledge financial support from Fundación Ramon Areces. Marta Gómez-Puig wants to thank the support by the Government of Spain and FEDER under grant number SEJ2007-63298 and the Researchers in the European Central Bank Financial Markets Division for their hospitality during the summer of 2008 and their insightful comments on a previous version of the paper, as well as for providing us with part of the data used in the empirical analysis.

**N.B.:** Las opiniones expresadas en este trabajo son de la exclusiva responsabilidad de los autores, pudiendo no coincidir con las del Instituto de Estudios Fiscales.

Desde el año 1998, la colección de Papeles de Trabajo del Instituto de Estudios Fiscales está disponible en versión electrónica, en la dirección: ><http://www.minhac.es/ief/principal.htm>.

Edita: Instituto de Estudios Fiscales

N.I.P.O.: 602-10-026-2

I.S.S.N.: 1578-0252

Depósito Legal: M-23772-2001

## **INDEX**

1. INTRODUCTION
2. RELATED LITERATURE
3. MODEL
4. INSTRUMENTAL VARIABLES AND DATA
5. RESULTS
6. CONCLUSIONS

REFERENCES

SÍNTESIS. Principales implicaciones de política económica



## **ABSTRACT**

In this study we adopt the CAPM-based model of Bekaert and Harvey (1995) to compare the differences in the relative importance of two sources of systemic risk (world and Eurozone) on Government bond returns, in two groups of countries in EU-15. Results show that euro markets are less vulnerable to the influence of world risk factors, and more vulnerable to EMU risk factors. However, they are only partially integrated. For their part, the markets of the countries that decided to stay out of the Monetary Union present a higher vulnerability to external risk factors.

**JEL Classification Numbers:** E44, F36, G15.

**Keywords:** Monetary integration, sovereign securities markets, bond markets integration.



## I. INTRODUCTION

The market capitalization of international bond markets is much larger than that of international equity markets. However, compared to the large body of literature on international equity market linkages (see Bessler and Yang (2003), among others) few empirical studies have been carried out of bond systemic risk or international bond market co-movements. The extent of international bond market linkages merits investigation, as it may have important implications for the cost of financing fiscal deficit, monetary policymaking independence, modelling and forecasting long-term interest rates, and bond portfolio diversification. Conversely, more has been written on emerging countries, where a very important question in the study of yield co-movements is the analysis of the relative influence of fundamental variables on their behaviour (see Cifarelli and Paladino, 2006), and on volatility spillovers in international bond markets (see Cappiello *et al.* (2003), Christiansen (2003), or Skintzi and Refenes (2006), among others).

Little has been written on the sources of co-movements in Government bond markets in the European context. Studies of this issue include Geyer, Kossmeier and Pischer (2004), Gómez-Puig (2009a and 2009b), and Pagano and Von Thadden (2004). The aim and methodology of the present paper are completely different from those of the studies just mentioned. Here, we study financial integration, exploiting the implications of asset pricing models. In particular, following Barr and Priestley (2004) who assess the degree of integration of the US, UK, Japan, Germany and Canada bond markets, we adopt Bekaert and Harvey's CAPM-based model (1995). This model allows partially integrated markets and still has not been used to study bond markets integration in the European context. Moreover, it has only been used to analyse the impact of one kind of common or systemic risk factor over bond or stock returns behaviour (see Hardouvelis, Malliaropulos and Priestley (2006 and 2007)).

Ten years after the introduction of the euro, the aim of this paper is to compare the differences in the relative importance of two sources of systemic risk (world and Eurozone risk) on Government bond returns since January 1999. The model used in this paper draws on Barr and Priestley (2004), but goes beyond it. As far as we know, this is the first empirical study that applies this methodology to analyse the impact of the euro on European Government bond markets integration with a weekly dataset that covers almost ten years since the introduction of the common currency.

The main objective of this paper is to study whether the introduction of the euro had an impact on the degree of integration of European Government bond markets. Therefore, we will carry out a comparative analysis of the degree of integration of Government bond markets in two groups of EU-15 countries:



those that joined the European Monetary Union (EMU) and those that stayed out. Our sample will span the period since the beginning of Currency Union until June 2008. Our intention is to separate each individual country's Government bond return into three effects: a local (own country) effect, a regional (Eurozone) effect, and a global (world) effect, and to establish whether there are significant differences between EMU and non-EMU participating countries. That is, we analyse whether participation in the Monetary Union is an important factor which determines the differences in the impact of world and regional risk on each EU-15 Government bond market.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 summarizes the related literature. The model is explained in section 3. The instrumental variables and data are described in section 4. Section 5 reports the results and, finally, Section 6 draws the main conclusions.

## 2. RELATED LITERATURE

Some recent literature has assessed the relative importance of systemic and idiosyncratic risk in EMU sovereign yield spreads (see Geyer, Kossmeier and Pischler (2004), Gómez-Puig (2009a and 2009b) or Pagano and von Thadden (2004)). Geyer *et al.* (2004) estimate a multi-issuer state-space version of the Cox-Ingersoll-Ross (1985) model of the evolution of bond-yield spreads (over Germany) for four EMU countries (Austria, Belgium, Italy and Spain). Their main findings are that (i) one single ("global") factor explains a large part of the movement of all four processes, (ii) idiosyncratic country factors have hardly any explanatory power, and (iii) the variation in the single global factor can be explained, to a limited extent, by EMU corporate-bond risk, but by nothing else. The most striking finding of the Geyer *et al.* study is the virtual absence of country-specific yield-spread risk. Pagano and von Thadden (2004), despite the considerable differences in the methodology and data used, also agree that yield differentials under EMU are driven mainly by a common risk (default) factor and suggest that liquidity differences have at best a minor role in the time-series behaviour of yield spreads. Gómez-Puig (2009a and 2009b) estimates panel regressions for two groups of EU-15 countries (EMU and non-EMU) including both domestic (differences in market liquidity and credit risk) and international risk factors. Her results present evidence that it is domestic rather than international risk factors that mostly drive the evolution of 10-year yield spread differentials over Germany in all EMU countries during the seven years after the beginning of Monetary Integration. Conversely, in the case of non-EMU countries, adjusted yield spreads are influenced more by world risk factors. The fact that these countries do not share a common Monetary Policy might explain these results, which may also show that government bonds from EMU countries



have a better safe-haven status than those of non-EMU countries. These results are consistent with the empirical evidence presented by other authors like Cappiello, Hördahl, Kadareja, and Manganelli (2006), who used a completely different methodology to investigate whether the introduction of the euro had an impact on the degree of integration of European financial markets. Controlling for the impact of global factors, they document an overall increase in co-movements in euro area financial markets, especially in bond markets, suggesting that integration in the euro area has progressed since the introduction of the single currency. In contrast to previous studies, they propose two methodologies to measure integration: one that relies on time-varying GARCH correlations, and the other on a regression quantile-based co-dependence measure (see Cappiello, Gérard, Kadareja and Manganelli, 2005).

Another perspective is given by Christiansen (2003), who assesses volatility spillovers in European bond markets. She finds strong evidence of volatility-spillover effects from both the US and Europe into individual European bond markets. For EMU countries, regional effects have become dominant over both own country and global effects. The opposite applies to non-EMU countries where pure local volatility effects are substantial.

Finally, a number of papers have studied financial integration exploiting the implications of asset pricing models. The works by Barr and Priestley (2004) and Hardouvelis, Malliaropoulos and Priestley (2006 and 2007) are in this vein. In particular, Barr and Priestley (2004) use a version of Bekaert and Harvey's (1995) CAPM-based model to analyse the degree of integration of the US, UK, Japan, Germany and Canada bond markets, and find strong evidence that national markets are only partially integrated into world markets. Around one quarter of total expected excess returns is related to local market risk, the remainder being due to world bond market risk. A similar methodology is used by Hardouvelis *et al.* (2006 and 2007) to analyse the impact of EMU on European stock market integration. They present evidence linking the process of increased integration of European stock markets to the prospects of the formation of EMU and the adoption of the euro as the single currency. Specifically, these authors show that in the second half of the 1990s, expected stock returns in Europe became increasingly more determined by EU market risk and less by local risk. However, this methodology has not yet been used to study bond markets integration in the European context.

### **3. MODEL**

We assume that Government bond excess returns ( $r_t$ ) for country  $i$  are linearly related to world and local information variables as follows:



$$r_{i,t} = a_i + b_i^W z_{i,t-1}^W + b_i^L z_{i,t-1}^L + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

where  $z_i^W$  represents the world variables,  $z_i^L$  represents local variables for country  $i$ , and  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  is an error term.

Equation (1) is consistent with a range of asset pricing models, and with any level of integration. If a market is fully integrated, the local variables should be absent from Eq. (1). Similarly, if it is completely segmented, the world variables will be absent. We estimate this equation by OLS to identify the relevant world and local instruments.

Once the instruments are identified, we adopt Bekaert and Harvey (1995)'s CAPM-based model and assume that excess returns in country  $i$  are generated by the following version of the conditional international CAPM:

$$r_{i,t} = \theta^W \lambda_{w,t-1} \text{cov}_{t-1}(r_{w,t}, r_{i,t}) + (1 - \theta^W) \lambda_{i,t-1} \text{var}(r_{i,t}) + e_{i,t} \quad (2)$$

In equation (2),  $\theta^W$  is interpreted as a measure of the degree of integration with world bond markets,  $\lambda_{w,t}$  is the world price of risk, and  $\lambda_{i,t}$  is the local price of risk.

The excess return on the world portfolio Government's bonds is modelled similarly as:

$$r_{w,t} = \lambda_{w,t-1} \text{var}(r_{w,t}) + e_{w,t} \quad (3)$$

When markets are completely integrated the coefficient  $\theta^W$  takes the value 1, and the variance term in Equation (2) is reduced to zero. To model the conditional covariance matrix we use a multivariate GARCH model. Specifically, we use the BEKK model proposed by Engle and Kroner (1995). This model can be written as:

$$H_t = C'C + A'_{et-1} e'_{t-1} A + B' H_{t-1} B \quad (4)$$

where  $C$  is a  $(N \times N)$  symmetric matrix and  $A$  and  $B$  are diagonal  $(N \times N)$  matrices of constant coefficients. By doing this, we allow the variances to depend only on lagged squared errors and lagged conditional variances and the covariances to depend only upon cross-products of lagged errors and lagged conditional covariances (see Bollerslev *et al.* (1988) and De Santis and Gerard (1997, 1998)).

Following the financial literature (see Bekaert and Harvey, 1995 and De Santis and Gerard, 1997, among others), we model the price of risk as a function of a set of information variables. As the price of risk must be positive (see Merton, 1980), the functional form that we assume is:

$$\lambda_{w,t-1} = \exp(K'_w z_{t-1}^W) \quad (5)$$

$$\lambda_{i,t-1} = \exp(\delta'_L z_{i,t-1}^L) \quad (6)$$

We estimate a system of equations using the Quasi-Maximum Likelihood method. Bollerslev and Wooldridge (1992) show that the standard errors

calculated using this method are robust even when the normality assumption is violated. Then, we estimate equations (2), (3) and (4) jointly with the price of risk (equations (5) and (6)), for each of the local Government bond markets, and for the world Government bond market. This estimation is implemented in two steps. First, we estimate the world equation, and then impose the results on the individual countries in 13 bivariate regressions (10 EMU countries, and 3 EU-15 countries that did not join the euro in 1999). We thus restrict the estimates of the world Government bond market price of risk and of the coefficients in the conditional variance of the world market variance to be the same in all countries. Once these estimates are imposed on each bivariate regression, in the second step we will obtain the following for each country:  $\theta_i^W$  (the estimated level of integration with the world bond market) and  $\delta_i^L$  (the vector of estimated coefficients for the local price of risk).

As we explained in the previous sections, our analysis goes beyond Barr and Priestley (2004) and Hardouvelis *et al.* (2006 and 2007), who only analyse the impact of one kind of common or systemic risk factor over bond or stock returns behaviour respectively. Unlike them, our aim is to compare the differences in the relative importance of two sources of systemic risk (world and Eurozone risk) on Government bond excess returns since the beginning of Monetary Union, in the two groups of countries (EMU and non-EMU) in EU-15. This is the reason why we also assume that excess returns ( $r_t$ ) for country  $i$  are linearly related to regional (EMU) and local information variables as follows:

$$r_{i,t} = a_i + b_i^E Z_{i,t-1}^E + b_i^L Z_{i,t-1}^L + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (7)$$

where  $Z_i^E$  represents the regional (EMU) variables,  $Z_i^L$  represents local variables for country  $i$ , and  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  is an error term.

If we consider that  $r_{e,t}$  represents the excess return of the Eurozone Government bond portfolio and replace  $r_{w,t}$  by  $r_{e,t}$  in equations (2) to (5), we will obtain another system of equations for each of the local bond market and the Eurozone bond market. In particular, analogously to equation (5), the Eurozone price of risk will follow this functional form:

$$\lambda_{e,t-1} = \exp\left(K_E' Z_{t-1}^E\right) \quad (8)$$

We also estimate this system in two steps and obtain, for each country,  $\theta_i^E$  (the estimated level of integration with the Eurozone Government bond market), and  $\delta_i^L$  (the vector of estimated coefficients for the local price of risk).

Hence, two bivariate models will be estimated for each of the countries in our sample: one with world and local risk factors, and the other with European and local risk factors. The final goal is to analyse the impact on each EU-15 country's Government bond return of the three sources of risk: local (own country), regional (Eurozone), and global (world). We also aim to establish



whether  $\theta_i^W$  and  $\theta_i^E$  have differed between EMU and non EMU-countries and across the different countries of each group since the introduction of the euro.

#### 4. INSTRUMENTAL VARIABLES AND DATA

We use weekly data (sampled on Wednesdays) covering the period from January 1999 to June 2008. Using weekly data (compared to, e.g., daily data) partially overcomes the potential problem of non-synchronous data, which may arise because there are instances in which markets are closed in one country and open in another (Burns and Engle (1998) and Lo and MacKinlay (1990) study the effects of this problem). Moreover, we analyse European sovereign bond return behaviour with the perspective given by a long time period (almost 10 years since the beginning of Monetary Union). The empirical analysis makes use of the 10-year Government benchmark yields, and the sample includes 13 countries (all EU-15 countries with the exception of Luxembourg and Greece)<sup>1</sup>. Data have been collected from Datastream and Global Financial Data. Bond returns are continuously compounded and are computed with the following formula:

$$R_{it} = p_{it} - p_{it-1} = n(y_{it-1} - y_{it}) \quad (9)$$

Where  $R_{it}$  denotes the (weekly) returns on bonds,  $p_{it}$  the log price of the bond,  $p_{it} \equiv \ln(P_{it})$ ,  $y_{it}$  the log of the gross yield to maturity,  $y_{it} \equiv \ln(1 + Y_{it})$ , and  $n$  the maturity, which in our case is ten years. The dependent variable in our model ( $r_{it}$ ) is the excess return<sup>2</sup> which is calculated relative to the appropriate 1-month Euro-deposit rate quoted in London<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Luxembourg's public debt market is negligible and Greece did not join Monetary Union until January 2001. For these reasons, these two countries are not included in the analysis.

<sup>2</sup> International CAPM models (ICAPM) contain additional terms to reward exchange rate risk. Concretely, risk premium are based on the covariances of assets with exchange rates, in addition to the traditional premium based on the covariance with the market portfolio (see Solnik (1974) and Adler and Dumas (1983)). These models are mostly used to analyze the predictability of international stock returns, which is usually examined in terms of a common currency. However, since the volatility of exchange rates greatly exceeds that of interest rates (see Thomas and Wickens, 1993), the predictability of bond returns, however, is more usually analyzed only using local-currency returns (see Barr and Priestley, 2004). Otherwise, results might produce more evidence on the predictability of exchange rates than of bond returns. Consequently, in order to avoid this bias in the results, the dependent variable in this paper is the excess bond returns in local-currency.

<sup>3</sup> Euro-deposit rates are used as a proxy for the risk free rate due to the lack of a liquid Treasury bill market in some of the countries. The excess world return is calculated with reference to the rate on \$US deposits, whilst the excess Eurozone return is calculated with reference to the Euribor rate.

We use the following instrumental variables to capture the different prices of risk (world, regional and local risk): (1) the slope of the yield curve, as measured by the difference between the 10-year and the 3-year Treasury yield. Several studies (Campbell and Shiller, 1991; Ilmanen, 1996) have found that steeper yield curves are associated with higher subsequent yields on longer-maturity bonds. The interpretation of this finding is that the yield curve steepens primarily because of an increase in the risk premium. Moreover, the slope of the yield curve is also a proxy of the business cycle. (2) Lagged stock indexes returns are included to allow for the possibility that stock returns lead bond returns. In recent years, important cross-asset linkages between stocks, bonds and money market instruments have been observed. Fleming, Kirby and Ostdiek (1998) investigate the nature of volatility linkages between stocks, bonds and money markets and conclude that volatility linkages between the three markets are strong. In particular, stock market weakness has been associated with economic weakness, which has corresponded to bond market strength<sup>4</sup>. If equity market weakness gives rise to subsequent bond market strength, the coefficient on lagged stock indexes returns should be significantly negative (see Hunter and Simon, 2005)<sup>5</sup>. (3) Lagged 10-year Government returns are also added to the specification. Taking into account that some aspects of risk premiums (related to domestic factors such as liquidity or credit risk) do not change over the period considered, the objective will be to identify their relative importance in explaining fluctuations, rather than returns levels. With this aim a lag of the dependent variable is introduced in the model, which will allow for a slow dynamic adjustment to a long-term equilibrium value of Government returns. (4) Moreover, we include the difference between lagged 10-year Government returns and lagged stock index returns to capture bond markets relative risk compared to stock markets. Finally: (5) the difference between lagged corporate bond returns and 10-year Government returns is also an important information variable that will be included in the specification. It can be interpreted as a proxy of the credit cycle or, more importantly, as a proxy for time-varying credit risk premium in the bond market<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> Kim *et al.* (2006) present evidence that the introduction of the monetary union has Granger caused an apparent segmentation between bond and stock markets within Europe. Hence, the EMU has increased benefits of diversification across stocks and government bonds at the country level.

<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, note that other authors (see McQueen and Roley (1993)) demonstrate that the opposite results are obtained when market participants are concerned about an overheating economy. During these periods, data suggesting a weaker-than-expected economy lead to stronger bond and stock prices as this makes it less likely that the Federal Reserve will be forced to tighten monetary policy aggressively and possibly drive the economy into a recession.

<sup>6</sup> For each individual country (except for Ireland and Portugal due to the lack of available data) we use a corporate bond index which has been built by Lehman Brothers or The Economist, depending on the country. These data have been provided by Datastream.



The same five variables are used as information variables to capture the price of regional and world risk. In the case of regional risk, we use German returns (the German 10-year yield is the benchmark in the euro area) as proxies of the behaviour of Euro area debt markets. We think that this is a better way to capture regional risk effect than using the return of a synthetic Euro area bond that will always contain the evolution of its own local market return. Similarly, US data are used to capture the price of world risk<sup>7</sup>.

Therefore, the following regional instruments are used: (1) the slope of the German yield curve, as measured by the difference between the 10-year and the 3-year German Treasury yield. (2) The lagged return of the Eurostoxx50. We think that the use of this index is appropriate as it reflects the price evolution of the 50 most important firms in the euro area (unlike the Eurozone 10-year synthetic Government yield, it is not built up as an average of the different local market indexes). (3) The lagged value of the 10-year German Government return. (4) The difference between lagged 10-year German Government return and lagged Eurostoxx50 return. And (5): the difference between lagged German corporate bonds return and 10-year German Government return. For their part, the world instruments are: (1) the slope of the US yield curve, as measured by the difference between the 10-year and the 3-year US Treasury yield. (2) The lagged return of the Standard & Poor's 500. (3) The lagged value of the 10-year US Government return. (4) The difference between lagged 10-year US Government return and lagged Standard & Poor's 500 return. And (5): the difference between lagged US corporate bonds return and 10-year US Government return.

Then, we will estimate 13 bivariate models (all EU-countries except Luxembourg and Greece) which will contain local and world instruments, and 12 models (all EU-countries with the exception of Germany, Luxembourg and Greece) which will contain local and regional instruments.

## 5. RESULTS

First, we investigate the extent and sources of predictability in local bond markets. To do this, we estimate equation (1) using world and local instruments (Panel A in Table I) and regional and local instruments (Panel B in Table I). In each case we test the separate hypothesis that the coefficients associated with the world (regional) and local variables are zero. When we use world and local instruments jointly (Panel A) the  $R^2$ s range from 53% in Ireland to 93% in the Netherlands, indicating a high degree of predictability. For all countries we

---

<sup>7</sup> Barr and Priestley (2004) present evidence that the US-world return correlation is very high, reflecting the relatively large proportion of US bonds in the world portfolio.

reject the null hypothesis that both sets of instruments can be excluded. Then, we estimate equation (1) using the world and local instruments separately. In both cases, the results show clear patterns of predictability in all the local bond markets using local instruments. We observe that when we use only one set of instruments the  $R^2$ s are lower than when we use both sets, implying that it is necessary to include all kinds of instruments. Similarly, if we use regional and local instruments jointly (Panel B) the  $R^2$ s range from 68% in Denmark to 92% in the Netherlands, also indicating a high degree of predictability. The F-tests reveal that each set of instruments is separately and jointly significant. We also report estimated equations for local returns based on the regional instruments only. The results indicate that regional instruments are able to predict local bond returns in all markets. Overall, these results show that a set of world (regional) and local instruments are useful to predict local bond returns, suggesting incomplete integration.

Tables 2 and 3 present the results of the estimation of the system of equations [(2), (3), (4), (5) and (6)] using the Quasi-Maximum Likelihood method for each of the local Government bond markets jointly with the world (United States) Government bond market (Table 2) and the Eurozone (German) Government bond market (Table 3). Tables 4 and 5 show the standardized residuals analyses. It can be observed (with few exceptions) that the standardized residuals appear free from serial correlation and heteroskedasticity. In all cases, the necessary conditions for the stationarity of the process are satisfied.

All world instruments are relevant in forecasting the world price of risk, as it is shown in the first row of Table 2. The estimates of  $\delta_{\xi}^L$  in Table 2 indicate that all local instruments are also important in explaining the local price of risk except for the cases of Sweden and the UK, confirming its higher degree of dependence on world risk factors. The results of the estimation including world and local risk factors indicate that EMU and US Government bond markets present a low degree of integration. The estimated level of integration with the world bond market ( $\theta^W$ ) displays an average value of 0.052 in the countries that belong to the euro. This level seems low in view of the absence of major impediments to cross-country investment<sup>8</sup>. There are no significant differences within countries: Germany presents one of the highest degree of integration with the US Government bond market (0.067), only surpassed by Belgium

---

<sup>8</sup> Differences between bonds in different countries are small, so it seems reasonable to expect a high degree of integration in bond markets (much larger than in equity markets). However, there are some reasons for expecting that bond markets may not be “fully” integrated, which are basically related to “home bias” on both the investors and issuers’ side. For instance, one of the major impediments in the debt market is the currency matching rule widely adopted across countries. Pension funds for example are forced to invest a share of their funds in local currency.



(0.069). These results present clear evidence that it is domestic (idiosyncratic) rather than international (systemic) risk factors that mostly drive the evolution of 10-year Government debt returns in all EMU countries throughout almost all of the ten-year period after the beginning of Monetary Integration.

These results also indicate that the degree of integration with US markets clearly differs between euro and non-euro participating countries. Whilst the average value is 0.052 in the case of euro countries, it is 0.468 in the case of non-euro countries. Hence, in the case of non-EMU countries, Government debt returns are influenced more by world risk factors. The fact that these countries do not share a common Monetary Policy may explain their higher vulnerability to international (systemic) risk factors.

Finally, note that there are important differences in  $\theta^W$  value in the case of non-euro countries. Denmark is the country that presents the lowest degree of integration (0.086) with US debt markets. Actually, the fact that the exchange rate regime, in that country, links the evolution of its currency to the Euro explains why the Danish Government debt returns present a behaviour that is closer to EMU-countries than to non-EMU countries. Moreover, the degree of integration with US markets is much larger in the case of Sweden (0.936) than in the case of the United Kingdom (0.383). The fact that the British market is one of the most important European debt markets (the fourth biggest, after the Italian, the German and the French markets), could be the reason for its higher degree of independence from world risk factors.

The first row in Table 3 shows that all regional instruments are relevant in forecasting the regional price of risk. Similarly, all local instruments are also important in explaining the local price of risk (with few exceptions) As expected, the estimated level of integration with the German bond market ( $\theta_i^E$ ) differs between euro and non-euro participating countries. The average values are 0.376 and 0.078, respectively, for EMU and non-EMU countries. Within EMU countries, the Finnish market is the one that presents the lowest degree of integration (0.149), and The Netherlands presents the highest (0.627); the rest of the countries present very similar values, around 0.376 on average, indicating that euro-participating markets are only partially integrated with the German market. This fact captures the idea that European Government bond markets are still imperfect substitutes due to differences in their domestic risk factors (either market liquidity or default risk)<sup>9</sup>. Outside the Monetary Union, Denmark

---

<sup>9</sup> Gómez-Puig (2008) provides evidence that market size scale economies seem to have increased with Currency Union and that the smaller the debt market, the higher the rise. Therefore, the removal of the exchange rate barrier seems to have punished smaller countries twice (they are forced to compete in terms of liquidity with larger countries for the same pool of funding, only being able to offer smaller bond issues), by making them pay both higher liquidity and a higher default risk premium than larger ones.



is again the market that presents a behaviour that is much closer to euro than to non-euro participating countries. In addition, Britain and Sweden present a similar degree of integration with the German market, 0.049 and 0.044, respectively.

The introduction of the euro had a major impact on the degree of integration of European Government bond markets. Within the Currency Union, on average, the estimated level of integration with the world ( $\theta^W$ ) and German ( $\theta^G$ ) bond markets is 0.052 and 0.379 respectively. Conversely, outside the Monetary Union, these levels present the following average values: 0.468 and 0.067. Consequently, the markets of those countries that share a monetary policy are less vulnerable to the influences of world risk factors and more vulnerable to EMU risk factors. However, they are only partially integrated with the German market since their markets are still segmented and present differences in their market liquidity or default risk. The empirical evidence presented by Laopodis (2008) also shows a weak degree of integration among the EMU bond markets since the beginning of the Currency Union. These findings have important implications for investors in terms of portfolio diversification benefits, and are an argument against the issue of a single European bond, a matter that is currently under debate.

For their part, the countries that decided to stay out of Monetary Union and maintain monetary autonomy present a higher vulnerability to external risk factors. These results are in concordance with Gómez-Puig (2009b), who presents empirical evidence that it was mostly idiosyncratic rather than systemic risk factors that drove the evolution of 10-year yield spread differentials over Germany in all EMU countries during the first seven years of Monetary integration. Conversely, in the case of non-EMU countries, adjusted yield spreads (corrected from the foreign exchange factor) are influenced more by systemic risk factors.

Finally, we re-estimate the model to test the restriction of a constant price of risk. We use the likelihood-ratio test procedure to examine whether the reduced model (with a constant price of risk) provides the same fit as the full model (with a time-varying price of risk). Results (not reported) imply strong rejection of the null hypothesis of a constant price of risk and justify modelling the price of risk as a time varying function.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we analyse the impact of Monetary Union on European debt market integration. We look at integration both with world debt markets and with Eurozone debt markets. To do this, we separate each individual country's



Government bond return into three effects: a local (own country) effect, a regional (Eurozone) effect, and a global (world) effect. We examine whether there are significant differences between two different groups of European countries: those that joined the euro in 1999 and those that did not. The objective is to explore whether participation in the Monetary Union is an important factor that determines the difference in the impact of world and regional risk on each European Government bond market.

Our sample period goes from January 1999 to June 2008, covering almost ten years since the introduction of the common currency. We use Bekaert and Harvey's CAPM-based model (1995). This is the first time that this methodology has been used to analyse the differences in the relative importance of two sources of risk, systemic and idiosyncratic. In contrast to the previous literature, which has focused only on one kind of systemic risk, we distinguish between the world and the Eurozone risk.

The most important results of the paper are the following. First, the results show that apart from a set of world (regional) instruments, a set of local instruments are also able to predict local bond returns. This result suggests incomplete integration. Second, we find that EMU and US Government bond markets present a low degree of integration, indicating that it is domestic rather than international risk factors that mostly drive the evolution of government debt returns in EMU countries.

Third, the results show that the degree of integration with the US and German bond markets clearly differs between euro and non-euro participating countries. Government bond returns of non-EMU countries are more influenced by world risk factors. This result agrees with Gómez-Puig (2009b) and indicates that these countries present a higher vulnerability to external risk factors. On the other hand, Government bond returns of EMU countries are more influenced by Eurozone risk factors. In spite of this, EMU countries are only partially integrated with the German market since their markets are still segmented and present differences in their market liquidity or default risk. In a different context, Laopodis (2008) reached the same conclusion, suggesting that benefits from portfolio diversification are still possible within Monetary Union.

**Table 1**

**PREDICTING LOCAL EXCESS RETURNS**

	Germany	Austria	Belgium	Denmark	Spain	Finland	France	Ireland	Italy	Netherlands	Portugal	Sweden	UK
Panel (A). Word and local instruments													
R2	0.82	0.85	0.86	0.61	0.85	0.65	0.92	0.53	0.75	0.93	0.54	0.67	0.82
F-test	223.62 (0.00)	278.90 (0.00)	292.03 (0.00)	76.23 (0.00)	269.82 (0.00)	89.26 (0.00)	545.55 (0.00)	61.40 (0.00)	148.51 (0.00)	619.21 (0.00)	62.14 (0.00)	98.77 (0.00)	216.50 (0.00)
F-test exclude local	167.39 (0.00)	229.70 (0.00)	248.37 (0.00)	27.33 (0.00)	220.06 (0.00)	43.82 (0.00)	553.98 (0.00)	14.10 (0.00)	104.82 (0.00)	570.30 (0.00)	14.09 (0.00)	73.51 (0.00)	204.23 (0.00)
F-test exclude world	35.87 (0.00)	31.48 (0.00)	24.27 (0.00)	56.08 (0.00)	24.95 (0.00)	52.96 (0.00)	33.25 (0.00)	59.83 (0.00)	46.12 (0.00)	11.39 (0.00)	65.41 (0.00)	21.64 (0.00)	17.05 (0.00)
Local instruments only													
R2	0.76	0.80	0.82	0.39	0.81	0.46	0.89	0.24	0.64	0.92	0.22	0.60	0.79
F-test	303.08 (0.00)	401.08 (0.00)	452.03 (0.00)	61.61 (0.00)	413.28 (0.00)	81.93 (0.00)	795.09 (0.00)	39.56 (0.00)	171.58 (0.00)	1109.00 (0.00)	35.00 (0.00)	145.20 (0.00)	357.22 (0.00)
World Instruments only													
R2	0.51	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.49	0.45	0.48	0.49	0.50	0.48	0.42	0.43
F-test	103.46 (0.00)	98.14 (0.00)	94.98 (0.00)	98.55 (0.00)	98.50 (0.00)	93.62 (0.00)	80.58 (0.00)	89.61 (0.00)	93.14 (0.00)	97.78 (0.00)	90.84 (0.00)	71.17 (0.00)	74.22 (0.00)

(Follow)

(Continuation)

	Germany	Austria	Belgium	Denmark	Spain	Finland	France	Ireland	Italy	Netherlands	Portugal	Sweden	UK
Panel (B). Regional and local instruments													
R2	—	0.85	0.85	0.68	0.84	0.74	0.91	0.64	0.73	0.92	0.69	0.76	0.84
F-test	—	272.17 (0.00)	284.12 (0.00)	104.43 (0.00)	254.14 (0.00)	140.99 (0.00)	463.16 (0.00)	95.19 (0.00)	131.90 (0.00)	574.23 (0.00)	117.66 (0.00)	149.58 (0.00)	251.42 (0.00)
F-test exclude local	—	85.05 (0.00)	133.47 (0.00)	16.33 (0.00)	90.96 (0.00)	14.75 (0.00)	277.05 (0.00)	4.50 (0.00)	25.56 (0.00)	306.13 (0.00)	2.74 (0.03)	71.49 (0.00)	191.00 (0.00)
F-test exclude regional	—	28.84 (0.00)	21.46 (0.00)	90.66 (0.00)	18.96 (0.00)	109.21 (0.00)	15.24 (0.00)	105.79 (0.00)	34.07 (0.00)	4.11 (0.00)	143.10 (0.00)	62.49 (0.00)	32.04 (0.00)
Regional Instruments only													
R2	—	0.72	0.65	0.63	0.69	0.71	0.63	0.63	0.66	0.68	0.68	0.58	0.52
F-test	—	246.78	184.44	166.39	217.16	234.22	169.59	163.06	190.34	204.13	206.65	132.19	105.83

Note: The table reports OLS estimations of equation (1). R2 denote R-squared statistic. F-test denotes the F-statistic from a test of the hypothesis that all of the slope coefficients (excluding the intercept) in the regression are zero. F-test exclude X denotes the F-statistic from a test of the hypothesis that some coefficients (all excluding the set X) in the regression are zero. P-values are displayed in parentheses.

**Table 2**

**MODEL ESTIMATES FOR EACH OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOND MARKET JOINTLY  
WITH THE WORLD GOVERNMENT BOND MARKET**

$$r_{i,t} = \theta^W \exp(K'_W Z_{t-1}^W) \text{cov}_{t-1}(r_{W,t}, r_{i,t}) + (1 - \theta^W) \exp(\delta'_L Z_{t-1}^L) \text{var}(r_{i,t}) + e_{i,t}$$

$$r_{W,t} = \exp(K'_W Z_{t-1}^W) \text{var}(r_{W,t}) + e_{W,t}$$

$$H_t = C' C + A' e_{t-1} e'_{t-1} A + B' H_{t-1} B$$

	$K0_w$	$K1_w$	$K2_w$	$K3_w$	$K4_w$	$K5_w$	$C$	$A$	$B$		
	$\delta 0_L$	$\delta 1_L$	$\delta 2_L$	$\delta 3_L$	$\delta 4_L$	$\delta 5_L$	$C11$	$C22$	$C12$	$A22$	$B22$
World	-186.825 (0.000)	-40.500 (0.000)	-4.195 (0.000)	-23.031 (0.000)	-71.391 (0.000)	2.751 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.085 (0.000)	0.346 (0.000)		
Germany	-97.562 (0.000)	-15.238 (0.000)	-3.877 (0.000)	24.685 (0.000)	10.444 (0.000)	13.597 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.816)	0.005 (0.000)	-0.205 (0.025)	0.792 (0.007)
Austria	-20.903 (0.000)	-22.028 (0.000)	-4.855 (0.000)	1.709 (0.000)	-0.437 (0.000)	8.896 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.850)	0.005 (0.000)	-0.206 (0.026)	0.798 (0.007)
Belgium	-24.183 (0.000)	-4.331 (0.000)	0.614 (0.000)	1.377 (0.000)	0.646 (0.000)	-1.452 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.743)	0.005 (0.000)	0.243 (0.023)	0.802 (0.007)
Spain	-21.889 (0.000)	-455.78 (0.000)	-9.353 (0.000)	-0.298 (0.000)	0.744 (0.000)	0.545 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.785)	0.005 (0.000)	-0.170 (0.029)	0.803 (0.007)
Finland	-51.677 (0.000)	3.918 (0.000)	0.018 (0.000)	-10.936 (0.000)	-0.596 (0.000)	-12.460 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.804)	0.005 (0.000)	-0.173 (0.026)	0.797 (0.006)
France	-20.221 (0.000)	-78.632 (0.000)	24.850 (0.000)	0.496 (0.000)	1.582 (0.000)	-1.557 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.768)	0.005 (0.000)	0.242 (0.022)	0.819 (0.006)

(Follow)

(Continuation)

	$\delta_{0L}$	$\delta_{1L}$	$\delta_{2L}$	$\delta_{3L}$	$\delta_{4L}$	$\delta_{5L}$	$\theta^W$	C11	C22	C12	A22	B22
Ireland	-26.289 (9.667-1010)	0.824 (0.000)	0.211 (0.000)	0.055 (0.000)	-7.271 (0.000)	— (—)	0.047 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (2.561)	0.005 (0.000)	0.215 (0.024)	0.816 (0.005)
Italy	-42.269 (0.000)	-1.125 (0.000)	2.512 (0.000)	14.853 (0.000)	1.555 (0.000)	13.208 (0.000)	0.061 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.740)	0.005 (0.000)	0.242 (0.022)	0.819 (0.006)
Netherlands	-43.784 (0.000)	0.440 (0.000)	0.422 (0.000)	41.781 (0.000)	0.883 (0.000)	-2.258 (0.000)	0.051 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.876)	0.005 (0.000)	-0.184 (0.026)	0.793 (0.007)
Portugal	-22.893 (0.000)	-9.393 (0.000)	-4.333 (0.000)	2.152 (0.000)	0.908 (0.000)	— (—)	0.054 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.749)	0.005 (0.000)	0.223 (0.024)	0.814 (0.006)
Denmark	-29.084 (0.000)	1.359 (0.000)	0.874 (0.000)	3.091 (0.000)	-0.148 (0.000)	-1.324 (0.000)	0.086 (0.000)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.779)	0.005 (0.000)	-0.180 (0.026)	0.829 (0.006)
Sweden	5.024 (0.108)	-0.136 (0.163)	6.765 (4.253)	39.481 (12.271)	5.045 (2.772)	28.779 (1.004)	0.936 (0.007)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.529)	0.004 (0.000)	-0.192 (0.021)	0.850 (0.005)
UK	2.576 (0.135)	0.219 (0.132)	1.831 (4.052)	-22.187 (11.827)	3.797 (3.882)	169.543 (8.823)	0.383 (0.083)	0.012 (0.000)	0.000 (0.485)	0.004 (0.000)	-0.105 (0.030)	0.845 (0.004)

Note: We estimate a system of equations [(2), (3), (4) jointly with (5) and (6)] using the Maximum Likelihood method for each of the local Government bond market jointly with the world Government bond market. Standard errors are displayed in parentheses.

**Table 3**

**MODEL ESTIMATES FOR EACH OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOND MARKET JOINTLY  
WITH THE EUROZONE GOVERNMENT BOND MARKET**

$$r_{i,t} = \theta^W \exp(K'_w Z_{t-1}^W) \text{cov}_{t-1}(r_{w,t}, r_{i,t}) + (1 - \theta^W) \exp(\delta'_L Z_{t-1}^L) \text{var}(r_{i,t}) + e_{i,t}$$

$$r_{E,t} = \exp(K'_E Z_{t-1}^E) \text{var}(r_{E,t}) + e_{E,t}$$

$$H_t = C' C + A' e_{t-1} e'_{t-1} A + B' H_{t-1} B$$

	$K0_E$	$K1_E$	$K2_E$	$K3_E$	$K4_E$	$K5_E$	$\theta^E$	<b>C</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>A22</b>	<b>B22</b>
	$\delta 0_L$	$\delta 1_L$	$\delta 2_L$	$\delta 3_L$	$\delta 4_L$	$\delta 5_L$		<b>C11</b>	<b>C22</b>	<b>C12</b>	<b>A22</b>	<b>B22</b>
Germany	-282.034 (0.000)	6.968 (0.000)	-8.231 (0.000)	2.878 (0.000)	0.188 (0.000)	-12.081 (0.000)		0.000 (0.000)	0.156 (0.001)	0.812 (0.001)		
Austria	0.042 (0.140)	0.456 (0.143)	-6.973 (8.420)	-101.27 (11.195)	-3.530 (5.468)	166.624 (10.960)	0.320 (0.095)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.031)	0.006 (0.000)	0.089 (0.004)	0.750 (0.001)
Belgium	-0.747 (0.228)	1.449 (0.220)	-2.915 (9.304)	-93.850 (17.961)	6.511 (7.708)	151.250 (12.973)	0.446 (0.126)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.023)	0.005 (0.000)	0.004 (0.001)	0.809 (0.004)
Spain	-221.724 (3.568·10 <sup>7</sup> )	-3.936 (0.000)	0.202 (0.000)	-2.836 (0.000)	1.101 (0.000)	2.831 (0.000)	0.344 (0.000)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.006 (0.000)	0.070 (0.003)	0.758 (0.001)
Finland	-48.783 (2.078·10 <sup>5</sup> )	7.830 (951120865)	1.596 (0.000)	-5.830 (0.000)	3.428 (0.000)	0.609 (0.000)	0.149 (0.000)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.006 (0.000)	0.031 (0.001)	0.796 (0.003)
France	-47.139 (0.000)	10.942 (0.000)	0.544 (0.000)	-7.688 (0.000)	-0.252 (0.000)	1.977 (0.000)	0.336 (0.000)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.021)	0.004 (0.000)	0.230 (0.002)	0.859 (0.001)
Ireland	-26.544 (4.644·10 <sup>8</sup> )	0.663 (0.000)	1.005 (0.000)	0.026 (0.000)	-0.340 (0.000)	— (—)	0.365 (0.000)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.003)	0.004 (0.000)	0.171 (0.003)	0.881 (0.000)

(Follow)

(Continuation)

	$\delta_{0L}$	$\delta_{1L}$	$\delta_{2L}$	$\delta_{3L}$	$\delta_{4L}$	$\delta_{5L}$	$\theta^E$	C11	C22	C12	A22	B22
Italy	-25.503 (4.239·10 <sup>8</sup> )	-3.993 (0.000)	2.637 (0.000)	1.171 (0.000)	5.135 (0.000)	0.603 (0.000)	0.302 (0.000)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.050)	0.006 (0.000)	0.112 (0.007)	0.722 (0.002)
Netherlands	-27.558 (0.000)	-9.929 (0.000)	2.432 (0.000)	-144.99 (0.000)	55.365 (0.000)	1.429 (0.000)	0.627 (0.000)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.034)	0.006 (0.000)	0.068 (0.003)	0.765 (0.002)
Portugal	-30.077 (1.685·10 <sup>6</sup> )	-0.223 (0.000)	0.071 (0.000)	0.938 (0.000)	0.912 (0.000)	— (—)	0.495 (0.000)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.004 (0.000)	0.152 (0.005)	0.877 (0.001)
Denmark	-26.485 (0.000)	-0.451 (0.000)	0.496 (0.000)	0.369 (0.000)	0.670 (0.000)	1.333 (0.000)	0.106 (0.000)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.029)	0.006 (0.000)	0.070 (0.003)	0.758 (0.001)
Sweden	-26.247 (0.000)	-3.007 (0.000)	0.931 (0.000)	2.368 (0.000)	0.718 (0.000)	2.440 (0.000)	0.044 (0.000)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.029)	0.006 (0.000)	0.070 (0.003)	0.758 (0.001)
UK	-29.729 (5.712·10 <sup>5</sup> )	-1.376 (0.000)	-0.783 (0.000)	61.766 (0.000)	1.209 (0.000)	1.555 (0.000)	0.049 (0.000)	0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.518)	0.004 (0.000)	-0.0751 (0.0010)	0.916 (0.002)

Note: We estimate a system of equations [(2), (3), (4) jointly with (6) and (8)] using the Maximum Likelihood method for each of the local Government bond markets jointly with the Eurozone bond market. Note: Standard errors are displayed in parentheses.



**Table 4**

**SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR THE STANDARDIZED RESIDUALS OF THE MODEL ESTIMATES FOR EACH OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOND MARKETS JOINTLY WITH THE WORLD (UNITED STATES) GOVERNMENT BOND MARKET**

	<b>Maximum likelihood function value</b>	<b>Bera-Jarque</b>	<b>Q(20)</b>	<b>ARCH(20)</b>
World		3.440 (0.17)	26.025 (0.16)	38.346 (0.01)
Germany	3275.91	17.130 (0.00)	13.368 (0.86)	26.738 (0.14)
Austria	3260.24	20.214 (0.00)	15.209 (0.76)	25.992 (0.16)
Belgium	3282.51	31.298 (0.00)	17.739 (0.60)	33.663 (0.03)
Spain	3280.08	23.861 (0.00)	14.933 (0.78)	22.021 (0.34)
Finland	3269.00	20.520 (0.00)	18.063 (0.58)	27.672 (0.12)
France	3241.14	21.373 (0.00)	14.720 (0.79)	20.281 (0.44)
Ireland	3262.75	29.471 (0.00)	18.990 (0.52)	17.461 (0.62)
Italy	3241.14	21.373 (0.00)	14.720 (0.79)	20.282 (0.44)
Netherlands	3277.97	26.494 (0.00)	17.739 (0.60)	22.818 (0.30)
Portugal	3262.68	27.641 (0.00)	22.062 (0.34)	24.180 (0.23)
Denmark	3235.70	11.115 (0.00)	16.032 (0.17)	36.092 (0.01)
Sweden	3218.97	74.456 (0.00)	16.815 (0.66)	19.232 (0.51)
UK	3279.11	71.439 (0.00)	19.273 (0.50)	19.331 (0.50)

Note: The Bera-Jarque statistic tests for the normal distribution hypothesis and has an asymptotic distribution  $\chi^2(2)$ . Q(20) is the Ljung-Box test for twentieth order serial correlation in the standardized residuals. ARCH(20) is Engle's test for twentieth order ARCH, distributed as  $\chi^2(20)$ . The p-values of these tests are displayed in parentheses. In all cases the necessary conditions for the stationarity of the process are satisfied.

**Table 5**  
**SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR THE STANDARDIZED RESIDUALS OF THE MODEL ESTIMATES FOR EACH OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOND MARKETS JOINTLY WITH THE EUROZONE (GERMANY) GOVERNMENT BOND MARKET**

	Maximum likelihood function value	Normal	Q(20)	ARCH(20)
Germany		15.972 (0.00)	13.645 (0.85)	28.597 (0.09)
Austria	4012.35	23.970 (0.00)	16.769 (0.00)	23.676 (0.26)
Spain	4000.07	21.298 (0.00)	15.820 (0.73)	25.067 (0.20)
Belgium	3977.91	31.645 (0.00)	19.903 (0.46)	42.087 (0.00)
France	3872.16	20.988 (0.00)	14.468 (0.80)	18.372 (0.56)
Finland	4017.46	13.476 (0.00)	18.871 (0.53)	31.067 (0.05)
Ireland	3862.88	27.662 (0.00)	19.039 (0.52)	16.452 (0.69)
Italy	3929.65	20.439 (0.00)	13.481 (0.85)	29.673 (0.07)
Netherlands	4008.65	24.039 (0.00)	18.870 (0.53)	27.132 (0.131)
Sweden	3867.52	22.629 (0.00)	19.068 (0.50)	26.124 (0.113)
Portugal	3935.75	24.281 (0.00)	22.758 (0.30)	25.679 (0.18)
Denmak	3712.16	11.435 (0.00)	16.994 (0.65)	41.173 (0.00)
UK	3519.85	59.361 (0.00)	13.927 (0.83)	32.623 (0.04)

Note: The Bera-Jarque statistic tests for the normal distribution hypothesis and has an asymptotic distribution  $\chi^2(2)$ . Q(20) is the Ljung-Box test for twentieth order serial correlation in the standardized residuals. ARCH(20) is Engle's test for twentieth order ARCH, distributed as  $\chi^2(20)$ . The p-values of these tests are displayed in parentheses. In all cases the necessary conditions for the stationarity of the process are satisfied.

## REFERENCES

- ADLER, M. and DUMAS, B. (1983): "International portfolio selection and corporation finance: A synthesis". *Journal of Finance*, n.º 6, pp. 925-984.
- ADJAOUTÉ, K.; BOTTAZI, L.; DANTHINE, J.P.; FISCHER, A.; HAMAUI, R.; PORTES, R. and WICKENS, M. (2000): "EMU and Portfolio Adjustment". *CEPR Policy Paper*, n.º5.
- BARR, D.G. and PRIESTLEY, R. (2004). "Expected returns, risk and the integration of international bond markets". *Journal of International Money and Finance*, n.º 23.
- BEKAERT, G. AND HARVEY, C.R. (1995): "Time-Varying World Market Integration". *Journal of Financ*, vol. 1, n.º 2.
- BESSLER, D.A. and YANG, J. (2003): "The structure of interdependence in international stock markets". *Journal of International Money and Finance*, n.º 23, pp. 71-97.
- BOLLERSLEV, T.; ENGLE, R.F. and WOOLDRIDGE, J.M. (1988): "A capital asset pricing model with time-varying covariances". *Journal of Political Economy*, n.º 96, pp. 116-131.
- BOLLERSLEV, T. and WOOLDRIDGE, J.M. (1992): "Quasi-Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Inference in Dynamic Models with Time-Varying Covariances". *Econometric Review*, vol. 11(2), pp. 143-172.
- BURNS, P. and ENGLE, R. (1998): "Correlations and Volatilities of Asynchronous Data", *Journal of Derivatives*, n.º 5(4), pp. 7-18.
- CAMPBELL, J.Y. and SHILLER, R.J. (1991): "Yield Spreads and Interest Rate Movements: A Bird's Eye View," *Review of Economic Studies*, vol. 58(3), pp. 495-514, May.
- CAPPIELLO, L.; ENGLE, R.F. and SHEPPARD, K. (2003): "Asymmetric dynamics in the correlations of global equity and bond returns". *European Central Bank Working Paper*, n.º 204.
- CAPPIELLO, B.; GÉRARD, and MANGANELLI, S. (2005): "Measuring Comovements by Regression Quantiles". *European Central Bank Working Paper Series*, n.º 501.
- CAPPIELLO, L.; HÖRDAHL, P.; KADAREJA, A. and MANGANELLI, S. (2006). "The impact of the Euro on Financial Markets". *European Central Bank Working Paper Series*, n.º 598.
- CHRISTIANSEN, C. (2007): "Volatility-spillover effects in European bond markets". *European Financial Management*, n.º 13 (5), pp. 923-948.
- COX, J.C.; INGERSOLL, J. and ROSS, S.A. (1985): "A theory of the term structure of interest rates". *Econometrica*, n.º 53 (2), pp. 385-407.

- CIFARELLI, G. and PALADINO, G. (2006): “Volatility co-movements between emerging sovereign bonds: Is there segmentation between geographical areas? *Global Finance Journal*, n.º 16.
- DE SANTIS, G. and GERARD, B. (1997): “International asset pricing and portfolio diversification with time-varying risk” *Journal of Finance*, n.º 52, pp. 1881-1912.
- (1998): “How big is the premium for currency risk?” *Journal of Financial Economics*, n.º 49, pp. 375-412.
- ENGLE, R.F. and KRONER, K.F. (1995): “Multivariate Simultaneous Generalized Arch”. *Econometric Theory*, n.º 11, pp. 122-150.
- FLEMING, J.; KIRBY, C. and OSTDIEK, B. (1998): “Information and volatility linkages in the stock, bond and money markets”. *Journal of Financial Economics*, n.º 49, pp. 111-137.
- GEYER, A.; KOSSMEIER, S. and PICHLER, S. (2004): “Measuring Systematic Risk in EMU Government Yield Spreads”. *Review of Finance*, n.º 8.
- GÓMEZ-PUIG, M. (2008): Monetary Integration and the Cost of Borrowing. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, vol 27/3, pp. 455-479.
- (2009a): The Immediate Effect of Monetary Union over EU-15’s Sovereign Debt Yield Spreads, *Applied Economics*. Forthcoming.
- (2009b): “Systemic and Idiosyncratic Risk in EU-15 Sovereign Yield spreads After Seven Years of Monetary Union”, *European Financial Management*. Forthcoming.
- HARDOUVELIS, G.A.; MALLIAROPULOS, D. and PRIESTLEY, R. (2006): “EMU and European Stock Market Integration”. *Journal of Business*, vol. 79, n.º 1.
- (2007): “The impact of EMU on the equity cost of capital”. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, vol. 26, pp. 305-327.
- HUNTER, D.M. and SIMON, D.P. (2005): “A Conditional Assessment of the Relationships between the Major World Bond Markets”. *European Financial Management*, vol. 11, n.º 4, pp. 463-482.
- ILMANEN, A. (1996): “When do bond markets reward investors for interest rate risk? *Journal of Portfolio Management*. Winter.
- KIM, S-J.; FARIBORZ, M. and WU, E. (2006): “Evolution of International Stock and Bond Market Integration: Influence of the European Monetary Union”. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, vol. 30, pp. 1507-1534.
- LAOPODIS, N.T. (2008): “Government Bond Market Integration within European Union”. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, Issue, n.º 19, pp. 56-76.
- LO, A. and MACKINLAY, A.C. (1990): “An Econometric Analysis of Nonsynchronous Trading,” *Journal of Econometrics*, volume 45, Issues 1-2, pp. 181-211.
- MCQUEEN, G. and ROLEY, V.: ‘Stock prices, news, and business conditions’, *Review of Financial Studies*, vol. 6, pp. 683-707.

- MERTON, R.C. (1980): "On estimating the expected return on the market: An exploratory investigation". *Journal of Financial Economics*, n.º 8.
- PAGANO, M. and VON THADDEN, E.L. (2004): "The European Bond Markets under EMU". *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, vol. 20, n.º 4.
- SKINTZI, V.D. and REFENES, A.N. (2006): "Volatility spillovers and dynamic correlation in European bond markets". *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, n.º 16, pp. 23-40.
- SOLNIK, B. (1974): "Equilibrium in international asset markets under uncertainty". *Journal of Economic Theory*, n.º 8, pp. 500-524.
- TESAR, L. and WERNER, I. (1995): Home bias and high turnover. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, vol. 14, n.º 4, pp. 467-492.
- THOMAS, S.H. and WICKENS, M.R. (1993): "An International CAPM for bonds and equities". *Journal of International Money and Finance*, vol. 12, pp. 390-412.



## SÍNTESIS

### PRINCIPALES IMPLICACIONES DE POLÍTICA ECONÓMICA

La introducción del euro y la consecuente eliminación del riesgo de cambio en 1999, propició una importante integración de los mercados financieros de los países miembros de la Unión Monetaria Europea (UME). De hecho, la integración financiera representa un importante objetivo a alcanzar por parte de las autoridades monetarias europeas debido a la relevancia de sus implicaciones. Entre ellas, podemos destacar su contribución al crecimiento económico, a la eliminación de las dificultades y barreras al intercambio, a la asignación más eficiente del capital entre las diferentes oportunidades de inversión y al aumento de la competitividad y de la disciplina de mercado. Además, un sistema financiero sólido y bien integrado contribuye al buen funcionamiento del mecanismo de transmisión de la política monetaria del Banco Central Europeo (BCE) y tiene más capacidad para absorber las perturbaciones financieras, lo que fomenta la estabilidad financiera. Por todo ello, el BCE mantiene un firme compromiso con el proceso de integración financiera europeo.

No obstante, también existen algunas voces críticas al citado proceso de integración. El potencial incremento del contagio de los episodios de crisis entre los mercados junto con la eventual disminución de las posibilidades de diversificación del riesgo por parte de los inversores particulares son algunos de los argumentos que con más frecuencia se utilizan en este sentido.

En este contexto, el objetivo de nuestro trabajo ha sido el análisis del impacto de la introducción del euro sobre el grado de integración de los mercados de deuda pública europeos. Para ello, hemos realizado un análisis comparativo entre los países de la EU-15 que en 1999 se adhirieron a la moneda única y aquellos que prefirieron mantener una política monetaria propia. Para ambos grupos de países, hemos examinado su grado de integración relativa tanto con los mercados de deuda pública mundiales como con los mercados de deuda pública de la zona euro.

Los principales resultados de nuestro análisis pueden resumirse en dos. El primero apunta a una disminución de la vulnerabilidad (menor integración) ante los factores de riesgo globales por parte de los países pertenecientes a la UME frente a aquellos que mantuvieron su moneda propia (Reino Unido, Suecia y Dinamarca). Por consiguiente, corroboran la mayor resistencia ante eventuales crisis en los mercados financieros internacionales por parte de los países integrantes de la Unión Monetaria Europea.

El segundo resultado indica la existencia de una integración incompleta de los mercados de deuda pública de la zona euro, 10 años después de la implantación de la moneda única. Cabe señalar que el análisis se ha realizado para el período 1999-2008. Es decir, antes de inicio de la crisis financiera internacional y de los recientes episodios de crisis en los mercados de deuda pública europeos, éstos ya presentaban evidencia de imperfecta integración.

Entre los factores susceptibles de causar los anteriores resultados (más allá de algunas diferencias en la regulación que todavía pueden favorecer cierta segmentación de los mercados), cabe destacar el hecho de que la Unión Monetaria no ha venido acompañada de una Unión Fiscal en los países participantes. Así, en 2010 la deuda pública en la UME-12 continúa bajo el control de 11 emisores diferentes, con claras diferencias en sus balanzas fiscales y en el tamaño de sus mercados, que se traducen en diferencias en el riesgo de crédito y de liquidez que son tenidas en consideración por los agentes financieros en la asignación de las primas de riesgo.

En este escenario, en el que los diferenciales de rentabilidad distan de ser cero, todavía existen claras oportunidades de diversificación del riesgo por parte de los inversores particulares cuyo objetivo es la formación de una cartera con emisiones de los distintos países de la zona euro. No obstante, desde un punto de vista macroeconómico, los resultados apuntan a la necesidad de aumentar los esfuerzos por parte de las autoridades económicas ya que la integración financiera completa (con todos sus beneficios anteriormente mencionados) dista todavía de ser una realidad en los mercados de deuda pública de la zona euro.



## **NORMAS DE PUBLICACIÓN DE PAPELES DE TRABAJO DEL INSTITUTO DE ESTUDIOS FISCALES**

Esta colección de *Papeles de Trabajo* tiene como objetivo ofrecer un vehículo de expresión a todas aquellas personas interesadas en los temas de Economía Pública. Las normas para la presentación y selección de originales son las siguientes:

1. Todos los originales que se presenten estarán sometidos a evaluación y podrán ser directamente aceptados para su publicación, aceptados sujetos a revisión, o rechazados.
2. Los trabajos deberán enviarse por duplicado a la Subdirección de Estudios Tributarios. Instituto de Estudios Fiscales. Avda. Cardenal Herrera Oria, 378. 28035 Madrid.
3. La extensión máxima de texto escrito, incluidos apéndices y referencias bibliográficas será de 7000 palabras.
4. Los originales deberán presentarse mecanografiados a doble espacio. En la primera página deberá aparecer el título del trabajo, el nombre del autor(es) y la institución a la que pertenece, así como su dirección postal y electrónica. Además, en la primera página aparecerá también un abstract de no más de 125 palabras, los códigos JEL y las palabras clave.
5. Los epígrafes irán numerados secuencialmente siguiendo la numeración arábica. Las notas al texto irán numeradas correlativamente y aparecerán al pie de la correspondiente página. Las fórmulas matemáticas se numerarán secuencialmente ajustadas al margen derecho de las mismas. La bibliografía aparecerá al final del trabajo, bajo la inscripción “Referencias” por orden alfabético de autores y, en cada una, ajustándose al siguiente orden: autor(es), año de publicación (distinguiendo a, b, c si hay varias correspondientes al mismo autor(es) y año), título del artículo o libro, título de la revista en cursiva, número de la revista y páginas.
6. En caso de que aparezcan tablas y gráficos, éstos podrán incorporarse directamente al texto o, alternativamente, presentarse todos juntos y debidamente numerados al final del trabajo, antes de la bibliografía.
7. En cualquier caso, se deberá adjuntar un disquete con el trabajo en formato word. Siempre que el documento presente tablas y/o gráficos, éstos deberán aparecer en ficheros independientes. Asimismo, en caso de que los gráficos procedan de tablas creadas en excel, estas deberán incorporarse en el disquete debidamente identificadas.

***Junto al original del Papel de Trabajo se entregará también un resumen de un máximo de dos folios que contenga las principales implicaciones de política económica que se deriven de la investigación realizada.***



## **PUBLISHING GUIDELINES OF WORKING PAPERS AT THE INSTITUTE FOR FISCAL STUDIES**

This serie of *Papeles de Trabajo* (working papers) aims to provide those having an interest in Public Economics with a vehicle to publicize their ideas. The rules governing submission and selection of papers are the following:

1. The manuscripts submitted will all be assessed and may be directly accepted for publication, accepted with subjections for revision or rejected.
2. The papers shall be sent in duplicate to Subdirección General de Estudios Tributarios (The Deputy Direction of Tax Studies), Instituto de Estudios Fiscales (Institute for Fiscal Studies), Avenida del Cardenal Herrera Oria, nº 378, Madrid 28035.
3. The maximum length of the text including appendices and bibliography will be no more than 7000 words.
4. The originals should be double spaced. The first page of the manuscript should contain the following information: (1) the title; (2) the name and the institutional affiliation of the author(s); (3) an abstract of no more than 125 words; (4) JEL codes and keywords; (5) the postal and e-mail address of the corresponding author.
5. Sections will be numbered in sequence with arabic numerals. Footnotes will be numbered correlatively and will appear at the foot of the corresponding page. Mathematical formulae will be numbered on the right margin of the page in sequence. Bibliographical references will appear at the end of the paper under the heading "References" in alphabetical order of authors. Each reference will have to include in this order the following terms of references: author(s), publishing date (with an a, b or c in case there are several references to the same author(s) and year), title of the article or book, name of the journal in italics, number of the issue and pages.
6. If tables and graphs are necessary, they may be included directly in the text or alternatively presented altogether and duly numbered at the end of the paper, before the bibliography.
7. In any case, a floppy disk will be enclosed in Word format. Whenever the document provides tables and/or graphs, they must be contained in separate files. Furthermore, if graphs are drawn from tables within the Excell package, these must be included in the floppy disk and duly identified.

***Together with the original copy of the working paper a brief two-page summary highlighting the main policy implications derived from the research is also requested.***



## ÚLTIMOS PAPELES DE TRABAJO EDITADOS POR EL INSTITUTO DE ESTUDIOS FISCALES

### 2004

- 1/04 Una propuesta para la regulación de precios en el sector del agua: el caso español.  
*Autores:* M.<sup>a</sup> Ángeles García Valiñas y Manuel Antonio Muñoz Pérez.
- 2/04 Eficiencia en educación secundaria e *inputs* no controlables: sensibilidad de los resultados ante modelos alternativos.  
*Autores:* José Manuel Cordero Ferrera, Francisco Pedraja Chaparro y Javier Salinas Jiménez.
- 3/04 Los efectos de la política fiscal sobre el ahorro privado: evidencia para la OCDE.  
*Autores:* Montserrat Ferre Carracedo, Agustín García García y Julián Ramajo Hernández.
- 4/04 ¿Qué ha sucedido con la estabilidad del empleo en España? Un análisis desagregado con datos de la EPA: 1987-2003.  
*Autores:* José María Arranz y Carlos García-Serrano.
- 5/04 La seguridad del empleo en España: evidencia con datos de la EPA (1987-2003).  
*Autores:* José María Arranz y Carlos García-Serrano.
- 6/04 La ley de Wagner: un análisis sintético.  
*Autor:* Manuel Jaén García.
- 7/04 La vivienda y la reforma fiscal de 1998: un ejercicio de simulación.  
*Autor:* Miguel Ángel López García.
- 8/04 Modelo dual de IRPF y equidad: un nuevo enfoque teórico y su aplicación al caso español.  
*Autor:* Fidel Picos Sánchez.
- 9/04 Public expenditure dynamics in Spain: a simplified model of its determinants.  
*Autores:* Manuel Jaén García y Luis Palma Martos.
- 10/04 Simulación sobre los hogares españoles de la reforma del IRPF de 2003. Efectos sobre la oferta laboral, recaudación, distribución y bienestar.  
*Autores:* Juan Manuel Castañer Carrasco, Desiderio Romero Jordán y José Félix Sanz Sanz.
- 11/04 Financiación de las Haciendas regionales españolas y experiencia comparada.  
*Autor:* David Cantarero Prieto.
- 12/04 Multidimensional indices of housing deprivation with application to Spain.  
*Autores:* Luis Ayala y Carolina Navarro.
- 13/04 Multiple occurrence of welfare reciprocity: determinants and policy implications.  
*Autores:* Luis Ayala y Magdalena Rodríguez.
- 14/04 Imposición efectiva sobre las rentas laborales en la reforma del impuesto sobre la renta personal (IRPF) de 2003 en España.  
*Autoras:* María Pazos Morán y Teresa Pérez Barrasa.
- 15/04 Factores determinantes de la distribución personal de la renta: un estudio empírico a partir del PHOGUE.  
*Autores:* Marta Pascual y José María Sarabia.
- 16/04 Política familiar, imposición efectiva e incentivos al trabajo en la reforma de la imposición sobre la renta personal (IRPF) de 2003 en España.  
*Autoras:* María Pazos Morán y Teresa Pérez Barrasa.
- 17/04 Efectos del déficit público: evidencia empírica mediante un modelo de panel dinámico para los países de la Unión Europea.  
*Autor:* César Pérez López.

- 18/04 Inequality, poverty and mobility: Choosing income or consumption as welfare indicators.  
*Autores:* Carlos Gradín, Olga Cantó y Coral del Río.
- 19/04 Tendencias internacionales en la financiación del gasto sanitario.  
*Autora:* Rosa María Urbanos Garrido.
- 20/04 El ejercicio de la capacidad normativa de las CCAA en los tributos cedidos: una primera evaluación a través de los tipos impositivos efectivos en el IRPF.  
*Autores:* José María Durán y Alejandro Esteller.
- 21/04 Explaining. budgetary indiscipline: evidence from spanish municipalities.  
*Autores:* Ignacio Lago-Peñas y Santiago Lago-Peñas.
- 22/04 Local governments' asymmetric reactions to grants: looking for the reasons.  
*Autor:* Santiago Lago-Peñas.
- 23/04 Un pacto de estabilidad para el control del endeudamiento autonómico.  
*Autor:* Roberto Fernández Llera
- 24/04 Una medida de la calidad del producto de la atención primaria aplicable a los análisis DEA de eficiencia.  
*Autora:* Mariola Pinillos García.
- 25/04 Distribución de la renta, crecimiento y política fiscal.  
*Autor:* Miguel Ángel Galindo Martín.
- 26/04 Políticas de inspección óptimas y cumplimiento fiscal.  
*Autores:* Inés Macho Stadler y David Pérez Castrillo.
- 27/04 ¿Por qué ahorra la gente en planes de pensiones individuales?  
*Autores:* Félix Domínguez Barrero y Julio López-Laborda.
- 28/04 La reforma del Impuesto sobre Actividades Económicas: una valoración con microdatos de la ciudad de Zaragoza.  
*Autores:* Julio López-Laborda, M.<sup>a</sup> Carmen Trueba Cortés y Anabel Zárata Marco.
- 29/04 Is an inequality-neutral flat tax reform really neutral?  
*Autores:* Juan Prieto-Rodríguez, Juan Gabriel Rodríguez y Rafael Salas.
- 30/04 El equilibrio presupuestario: las restricciones sobre el déficit.  
*Autora:* Belén Fernández Castro.

## 2005

- 1/05 Efectividad de la política de cooperación en innovación: evidencia empírica española.  
*Autores:* Joost Heijs, Liliana Herrera, Mikel Buesa, Javier Sáiz Briones y Patricia Valadez.
- 2/05 A probabilistic nonparametric estimator.  
*Autores:* Juan Gabriel Rodríguez y Rafael Salas.
- 3/05 Efectos redistributivos del sistema de pensiones de la seguridad social y factores determinantes de la elección de la edad de jubilación. Un análisis por comunidades autónomas.  
*Autores:* Alfonso Utrilla de la Hoz y Yolanda Ubago Martínez.
- 4/05 La relación entre los niveles de precios y los niveles de renta y productividad en los países de la zona euro: implicaciones de la convergencia real sobre los diferenciales de inflación.  
*Autora:* Ana R. Martínez Cañete.
- 5/05 La Reforma de la Regulación en el contexto autonómico.  
*Autor:* Jaime Vallés Giménez.

- 6/05 Desigualdad y bienestar en la distribución intraterritorial de la renta, 1973-2000.  
*Autores:* Luis Ayala Cañón, Antonio Jurado Málaga y Francisco Pedraja Chaparro.
- 7/05 Precios inmobiliarios, renta y tipos de interés en España.  
*Autor:* Miguel Ángel López García.
- 8/05 Un análisis con microdatos de la normativa de control del endeudamiento local.  
*Autores:* Jaime Vallés Giménez, Pedro Pascual Arzoz y Fermín Cabasés Hita.
- 9/05 Macroeconomics effects of an indirect taxation reform under imperfect competition.  
*Autor:* Ramón J. Torregrosa.
- 10/05 Análisis de incidencia del gasto público en educación superior: nuevas aproximaciones.  
*Autora:* María Gil Izquierdo.
- 11/05 Feminización de la pobreza: un análisis dinámico.  
*Autora:* María Martínez Izquierdo.
- 12/05 Efectos del impuesto sobre las ventas minoristas de determinados hidrocarburos en la economía extremeña: un análisis mediante modelos de equilibrio general aplicado.  
*Autores:* Francisco Javier de Miguel Vélez, Manuel Alejandro Cardenete Flores y Jesús Pérez Mayo.
- 13/05 La tarifa lineal de Pareto en el contexto de la reforma del IRPF.  
*Autores:* Luis José Imedio Olmedo, Encarnación Macarena Parrado Gallardo y María Dolores Sarrión Gavilán.
- 14/05 Modelling tax decentralisation and regional growth.  
*Autores:* Ramiro Gil-Serrate y Julio López-Laborda.
- 15/05 Interactions inequality-polarization: characterization results.  
*Autores:* Juan Prieto-Rodríguez, Juan Gabriel Rodríguez y Rafael Salas.
- 16/05 Políticas de competencia impositiva y crecimiento: el caso irlandés.  
*Autores:* Santiago Díaz de Sarralde, Carlos Garcimartín y Luis Rivas.
- 17/05 Optimal provision of public *inputs* in a second-best scenario.  
*Autores:* Diego Martínez López y A. Jesús Sánchez Fuentes.
- 18/05 Nuevas estimaciones del pleno empleo de las regiones españolas.  
*Autores:* Javier Capó Parrilla y Francisco Gómez García.
- 19/05 US deficit sustainability revisited: a multiple structural change approach.  
*Autores:* Óscar Bajo-Rubio, Carmen Díaz-Roldán y Vicente Esteve.
- 20/05 Aproximación a los pesos de calidad de vida de los “Años de Vida Ajustados por Calidad” mediante el estado de salud autopercibido.  
*Autores:* Anna García-Altés, Jaime Pinilla y Salvador Peiró.
- 21/05 Redistribución y progresividad en el Impuesto sobre Sucesiones y Donaciones: una aplicación al caso de Aragón.  
*Autor:* Miguel Ángel Barberán Lahuerta.
- 22/05 Estimación de los rendimientos y la depreciación del capital humano para las regiones del sur de España.  
*Autora:* Inés P. Murillo.
- 23/05 El doble dividendo de la imposición ambiental. Una puesta al día.  
*Autor:* Miguel Enrique Rodríguez Méndez.
- 24/05 Testing for long-run purchasing power parity in the post bretton woods era: evidence from old and new tests.  
*Autor:* Julián Ramajo Hernández y Montserrat Ferré Cariacedo.

- 25/05 Análisis de los factores determinantes de las desigualdades internacionales en las emisiones de CO<sub>2</sub> *per cápita* aplicando el enfoque distributivo: una metodología de descomposición por factores de Kaya.  
*Autores:* Juan Antonio Duro Moreno y Emilio Padilla Rosa.
- 26/05 Planificación fiscal con el impuesto dual sobre la renta.  
*Autores:* Félix Domínguez Barrero y Julio López Laborda.
- 27/05 El coste recaudatorio de las reducciones por aportaciones a planes de pensiones y las deducciones por inversión en vivienda en el IRPF 2002.  
*Autores:* Carmen Marcos García, Alfredo Moreno Sáez, Teresa Pérez Barrasa y César Pérez López.
- 28/05 La muestra de declarantes IEF-AEAT 2002 y la simulación de reformas fiscales: descripción y aplicación práctica.  
*Autores:* Alfredo Moreno, Fidel Picos, Santiago Díaz de Sarralde, María Antiquera y Lucía Torrejón.

## 2006

- 1/06 Capital gains taxation and progressivity.  
*Autor:* Julio López Laborda.
- 2/06 Pigou's dividend versus Ramsey's dividend in the double dividend literature.  
*Autores:* Eduardo L. Giménez y Miguel Rodríguez.
- 3/06 Assessing tax reforms. Critical comments and proposal: the level and distance effects.  
*Autores:* Santiago Díaz de Sarralde Míguez y Jesús Ruiz-Huerta Carbonell.
- 4/06 Incidencia y tipos efectivos del impuesto sobre el patrimonio e impuesto sobre sucesiones y donaciones.  
*Autora:* Laura de Pablos Escobar.
- 5/06 Descentralización fiscal y crecimiento económico en las regiones españolas.  
*Autores:* Patricio Pérez González y David Cantarero Prieto.
- 6/06 Efectos de la corrupción sobre la productividad: un estudio empírico para los países de la OCDE.  
*Autores:* Javier Salinas Jiménez y M.<sup>a</sup> del Mar Salinas Jiménez.
- 7/06 Simulación de las implicaciones del equilibrio presupuestario sobre la política de inversión de las comunidades autónomas.  
*Autores:* Jaime Vallés Giménez y Anabel Zárate Marco.
- 8/06 The composition of public spending and the nationalization of party systems in western Europe.  
*Autores:* Ignacio Lago-Peñas y Santiago Lago-Peñas.
- 9/06 Factores explicativos de la actividad reguladora de las Comunidades Autónomas (1989-2001).  
*Autores:* Julio López Laborda y Jaime Vallés Giménez.
- 10/06 Disciplina crediticia de las Comunidades Autónomas.  
*Autor:* Roberto Fernández Llera.
- 11/06 Are the tax mix and the fiscal pressure converging in the European Union?  
*Autor:* Francisco J. Delgado Rivero.
- 12/06 Redistribución, inequidad vertical y horizontal en el impuesto sobre la renta de las personas físicas (1982-1998).  
*Autora:* Irene Perrote.



- 13/06 Análisis económico del rendimiento en la prueba de conocimientos y destrezas imprescindibles de la Comunidad de Madrid.  
*Autores:* David Trillo del Pozo, Marta Pérez Garrido y José Marcos Crespo.
- 14/06 Análisis de los procesos privatizadores de empresas públicas en el ámbito internacional. Motivaciones: moda política versus necesidad económica.  
*Autores:* Almudena Guarnido Rueda, Manuel Jaén García e Ignacio Amate Fortes.
- 15/06 Privatización y liberalización del sector telefónico español.  
*Autores:* Almudena Guarnido Rueda, Manuel Jaén García e Ignacio Amate Fortes.
- 16/06 Un análisis taxonómico de las políticas para PYME en Europa: objetivos, instrumentos y empresas beneficiarias.  
*Autor:* Antonio Fonfría Mesa.
- 17/06 Modelo de red de cooperación en los parques tecnológicos: un estudio comparado.  
*Autora:* Beatriz González Vázquez.
- 18/06 Explorando la demanda de carburantes de los hogares españoles: un análisis de sensibilidad.  
*Autores:* Santiago Álvarez García, Marta Jorge García-Inés y Desiderio Romero Jordán.
- 19/06 Cross-country income mobility comparisons under panel attrition: the relevance of weighting schemes.  
*Autores:* Luis Ayala, Carolina Navarro y Mercedes Sastre.
- 20/06 Financiación Autonómica: algunos escenarios de reforma de los espacios fiscales.  
*Autores:* Ana Herrero Alcalde, Santiago Díaz de Sarralde, Javier Loscos Fernández, María Antiquera y José Manuel Tránchez.
- 21/06 Child nutrition and multiple equilibria in the human capital transition function.  
*Autores:* Berta Rivera, Luis Currais y Paolo Rungo.
- 22/06 Actitudes de los españoles hacia la hacienda pública.  
*Autor:* José Luis Sáez Lozano.
- 23/06 Progresividad y redistribución a través del IRPF español: un análisis de bienestar social para el periodo 1982-1998.  
*Autores:* Jorge Onrubia Fernández, María del Carmen Rodado Ruiz, Santiago Díaz de Sarralde y César Pérez López.
- 24/06 Análisis descriptivo del gasto sanitario español: evolución, desglose, comparativa internacional y relación con la renta.  
*Autor:* Manuel García Goñi.
- 25/06 El tratamiento de las fuentes de renta en el IRPF y su influencia en la desigualdad y la redistribución.  
*Autores:* Luis Ayala Cañón, Jorge Onrubia Fernández y María del Carmen Rodado Ruiz.
- 26/06 La reforma del IRPF de 2007: una evaluación de sus efectos.  
*Autores:* Santiago Díaz de Sarralde Míguez, Fidel Picos Sánchez, Alfredo Moreno Sáez, Lucía Torrejón Sanz y María Antiquera Pérez.
- 27/06 Proyección del cuadro macroeconómico y de las cuentas de los sectores institucionales mediante un modelo de equilibrio.  
*Autores:* Ana María Abad, Ángel Cuevas y Enrique M. Quilis.
- 28/06 Análisis de la propuesta del tesoro Británico “Fiscal Stabilisation and EMU” y de sus implicaciones para la política económica en la Unión Europea.  
*Autor:* Juan E. Castañeda Fernández.

- 29/06 Choosing to be different (or not): personal income taxes at the subnational level in Canada and Spain.  
*Autores:* Violeta Ruiz Almendral y François Vaillancourt.
- 30/06 A projection model of the contributory pension expenditure of the Spanish social security system: 2004-2050.  
*Autores:* Joan Gil, Miguel Ángel Lopez-García, Jorge Onrubia, Concepció Patxot y Guadalupe Souto.

## 2007

- 1/07 Efectos macroeconómicos de las políticas fiscales en la UE.  
*Autores:* Oriol Roca Sagalés y Alfredo M. Pereira.
- 2/07 Deficit sustainability and inflation in EMU: an analysis from the fiscal theory of the price level.  
*Autores:* Óscar Bajo-Rubio, Carmen Díaz-Roldán y Vicente Esteve.
- 3/07 Contraste empírico del modelo monetario de tipos de cambio: cointegración y ajuste no lineal.  
*Autor:* Julián Ramajo Hernández.
- 4/07 An empirical analysis of capital taxation: equity vs. tax compliance.  
*Autores:* José M.<sup>a</sup> Durán Cabré y Alejandro Esteller Moré.
- 5/07 Education and health in the OECD: a macroeconomic approach.  
*Autoras:* Cecilia Albert y María A. Davia.
- 6/07 Understanding the effect of education on health across European countries.  
*Autoras:* Cecilia Albert y María A. Davia.
- 7/07 Polarization, fractionalization and conflict.  
*Autores:* Joan Esteban y Debraj Ray.
- 8/07 Immigration in a segmented labor market: the effects on welfare.  
*Autor:* Javier Vázquez Grenno.
- 9/07 On the role of public debt in an OLG Model with endogenous labor supply.  
*Autor:* Miguel Ángel López García.
- 10/07 Assessing profitability in rice cultivation using the Policy Matrix Analysis and profit-efficient data.  
*Autores:* Andrés J. Picazo-Tadeo, Ernest Reig y Vicent Estruch.
- 11/07 Equidad y redistribución en el Impuesto sobre Sucesiones y Donaciones: análisis de los efectos de las reformas autonómicas.  
*Autores:* Miguel Ángel Barberán Lahuerta y Marta Melguizo Garde.
- 12/07 Valoración y determinantes del stock de capital salud en la Comunidad Canaria y Cataluña.  
*Autores:* Juan Oliva y Néboa Zozaya.
- 13/07 La nivelación en el marco de la financiación de las Comunidades Autónomas.  
*Autores:* Ana Herrero Alcalde y Jorge Martínez-Vázquez.
- 14/07 El gasto en defensa en los países desarrollados: evolución y factores explicativos.  
*Autor:* Antonio Fonfría Mesa.
- 15/07 Los costes del servicio de abastecimiento de agua. Un análisis necesario para la regulación de precios.  
*Autores:* Ramón Barberán Ortí, Alicia Costa Toda y Alfonso Alegre Val.
- 16/07 Precios, impuestos y compras transfronterizas de carburantes.  
*Autores:* Andrés Leal Marcos, Julio López Laborda y Fernando Rodrigo Sauco.

- 17/07 Análisis de la distribución de las emisiones de CO<sub>2</sub> a nivel internacional mediante la adaptación del concepto y las medidas de polarización.  
*Autores:* Juan Antonio Duro Moreno y Emilio Padilla Rosa.
- 18/07 Foreign direct investment and regional growth: an analysis of the Spanish case.  
*Autores:* Óscar Bajo Rubio, Carmen Díaz Mora y Carmen Díaz Roldán.
- 19/07 Convergence of fiscal pressure in the EU: a time series approach.  
*Autores:* Francisco J. Delgado y María José Presno.
- 20/07 Impuestos y protección medioambiental: preferencias y factores.  
*Autores:* María de los Ángeles García Valiñas y Benno Torgler.
- 21/07 Modelización paramétrica de la distribución personal de la renta en España. Una aproximación a partir de la distribución Beta generalizada de segunda especie.  
*Autores:* Mercedes Prieto Alaiz y Carmelo García Pérez.
- 22/07 Desigualdad y delincuencia: una aplicación para España.  
*Autores:* Rafael Muñoz de Bustillo, Fernando Martín Mayoral y Pablo de Pedraza.
- 23/07 Crecimiento económico, productividad y actividad normativa: el caso de las Comunidades Autónomas.  
*Autor:* Jaime Vallés Giménez.
- 24/07 Descentralización fiscal y tributación ambiental. El caso del agua en España.  
*Autores:* Anabel Zárata Marco, Jaime Vallés Giménez y Carmen Trueba Cortés.
- 25/07 Tributación ambiental en un contexto federal. Una aplicación empírica para los residuos industriales en España.  
*Autores:* Anabel Zárata Marco, Jaime Vallés Giménez y Carmen Trueba Cortés.
- 26/07 Permisos de maternidad, paternidad y parentales en Europa: algunos elementos para el análisis de la situación actual.  
*Autoras:* Carmen Castro García y María Pazos Morán.
- 27/07 ¿Quién soporta las cotizaciones sociales empresariales?. Una panorámica de la literatura empírica.  
*Autor:* Ángel Melguizo Esteso.
- 28/07 Una propuesta de financiación municipal.  
*Autores:* Manuel Esteban Cabrera y José Sánchez Maldonado.
- 29/07 Do R&D programs of different government levels overlap in the European Union.  
*Autoras:* Isabel Busom y Andrea Fernández-Ribas.
- 30/07 Proyecciones de tablas de mortalidad dinámicas de España y sus Comunidades Autónomas.  
*Autores:* Javier Alonso Meseguer y Simón Sosvilla Rivero.
- 2008**
- 1/08 Estudio descriptivo del voto económico en España.  
*Autores:* José Luis Sáez Lozano y Antonio M. Jaime Castillo.
- 2/08 The determinants of tax morale in comparative perspective: evidence from a multilevel analysis.  
*Autores:* Ignacio Lago-Peñas y Santiago Lago-Peñas.
- 3/08 Fiscal decentralization and the quality of government: evidence from panel data.  
*Autores:* Andreas P. Kyriacou y Oriol Roca-Sagalés.
- 4/08 The effects of multinationals on host economies: A CGE approach.  
*Autores:* María C. Latorre, Oscar Bajo-Rubio y Antonio G. Gómez-Plana.

- 5/08 Measuring the effect of spell recurrence on poverty dynamics.  
*Autores:* José María Arranz y Olga Cantó.
- 6/08 Aspectos distributivos de las diferencias salariales por razón de género en España: un análisis por subgrupos poblacionales.  
*Autores:* Carlos Gradín y Coral del Río.
- 7/08 Evaluating the regulator: winners and losers in the regulation of Spanish electricity distribution (1988-2002).  
*Autores:* Leticia Blázquez Gómez y Emili Grifell-Tatjé.
- 8/08 Interacción de la política monetaria y la política fiscal en la UEM: tipos de interés a corto plazo y déficit público.  
*Autores:* Jesús Manuel García Iglesias y Agustín García García.
- 9/08 A selection model of R&D intensity and market structure in Spanish firms.  
*Autor:* Joaquín Artés.
- 10/08 Outsourcing behaviour: the role of sunk costs and firm and industry characteristics.  
*Autoras:* Carmen Díaz Mora y Angela Triguero Cano.
- 11/08 How can the decommodified security ratio assess social protection systems?.  
*Autor:* Georges Menahem.
- 12/08 Pension policies and income security in retirement: a critical assessment of recent reforms in Portugal.  
*Autora:* Maria Clara Murteira.
- 13/08 Do unemployment benefit legislative changes affect job finding? Evidence from the Spanish 1992 UI reform act.  
*Autores:* José M. Arranz, Fernando Muñoz Bullón y Juan Muro.
- 14/08 Migraciones interregionales en España y su relación con algunas políticas públicas.  
*Autora:* María Martínez Torres.
- 15/08 Entradas y salidas de la pobreza en la Unión Europea: factores determinantes.  
*Autores:* Guillermina Martín Reyes, Elena Bárcena Martín, Antonio Fernández Morales y Antonio García Lizana.
- 16/08 Income mobility and economic inequality from a regional perspective.  
*Autores:* Juan Prieto Rodríguez, Juan Gabriel Rodríguez y Rafael Salas.
- 17/08 A note on the use of calendar regressors.  
*Autor:* Leandro Navarro Pablo.
- 18/08 Asimetrías y efectos desbordamiento en la transmisión de la política fiscal en la Unión Europea: evidencia a partir de un enfoque VAR estructural.  
*Autor:* Julián Ramajo.
- 19/08 Institutionalizing uncertainty: the choice of electoral formulas.  
*Autores:* Gonzalo Fernández de Córdoba y Alberto Penadés.
- 20/08 A field experiment to study sex and age discrimination in selection processes for staff recruitment in the Spanish labor market.  
*Autores:* Rocío Albert, Lorenzo Escot, y José A. Fernández-Cornejo.
- 21/08 Descentralización y tamaño del sector público regional en España.  
*Autor:* Patricio Pérez.
- 22/08 Multinationals and foreign direct investment: main theoretical strands and empirical effects.  
*Autora:* María C. Latorre.

- 23/08 Una aproximación no lineal al análisis del impacto de las finanzas públicas en el crecimiento económico de los países de la UE-15, 1965-2007.  
Autor: Diego Romero Ávila.
- 24/08 Consolidación y reparto de la base imponible del Impuesto sobre Sociedades entre los Estados Miembros de la Unión Europea: consecuencias para España.  
Autores: Félix Domínguez Barrero y Julio López Laborda.
- 25/08 La suficiencia dinámica del modelo de financiación autonómica en España, 2002-2006.  
Autores: Catalina Barceló Maimó, María Marquès Caldentey y Joan Rosselló Villalonga.
- 26/08 Ayudas públicas en especie y en efectivo: justificaciones y aspectos metodológicos.  
Autores: Laura Piedra Muñoz y Manuel Jaén García.
- 27/08 Las ayudas públicas al alquiler de la vivienda. un análisis empírico para evaluar sus beneficios y costes.  
Autores: Laura Piedra Muñoz y Manuel Jaén García.
- 28/08 Decentralization and spatial distribution of regional economic activity: does equalization matter?.  
Autores: Santiago Lago-Peñas y Diego Martínez-López.
- 29/08 Childcare costs and Spanish mothers's labour force participation.  
Autora: Cristina Borra.
- 30/08 Pro-poor economic growth, inequality and fiscal policy: the case of Spanish regions.  
Autores: Luis Ayala y Antonio Jurado.

## 2009

- 1/09 Does the balance of payments constrain economic growth?. Some evidence for the new EU members.  
Autores: Oscar Bajo-Rubio y Carmen Díaz-Roldán.
- 2/09 Imputación a valor de mercado de los rendimientos de la vivienda en Propiedad del IRPF.  
Autores: Luis Ayala Cañón, Jorge Onrubia Fernández y María del Carmen Rodado Ruiz.
- 3/09 Income poverty and multidimensional deprivation: lessons from cross-regional analysis.  
Autores: Luis Ayala Cañón, Antonio Jurado y Jesús Perez-Mayo.
- 4/09 Reglas fiscales activas: el caso de España (1981-2007).  
Autor: Juan E. Castañeda Fernández.
- 5/09 Índices trimestrales de volumen encadenados, ajuste estacional y *Bechmarking*.  
Autores: Ana M.<sup>a</sup> Abad, Ángel Cuevas y Enrique M. Quilis.
- 6/09 Fiscal decentralization and economic growth in OECD countries: matching spending with revenue decentralization.  
Autores: Norman Gemmell, Richard Kneller e Ismael Sanz.
- 7/09 Una estimación del voto estratégico en las elecciones generales españolas, 2000-2008.  
Autores: Enrique García Viñuela y Joaquín Artés.
- 8/09 La tributación del transporte como instrumento frente al cambio climático.  
Autor: Miguel Buñuel González
- 9/09 The ins and outs of unemployment and the assimilation of recent immigrants in Spain.  
Autores: José I. Silva y Javier Vázquez.
- 10/09 Decomposing the determinants of health care expenditure: the case of Spain.  
Autores: David Cantarero Prieto y Santiago Lago-Peña.
- 11/09 La clase beta de medidas de desigualdad.  
Autores: Luis José Imedio Olmedo, Elena Bárcena Martín y Encarnación M. Parrado Gallardo.

- 12/09 Right incentives to enhance efficiency in public expenditure.  
*Autor:* Tamón A. Takahashi Iturriaga.
- 13/09 Fiscal decentralization and public sector employment: a cross-country analysis.  
*Autores:* Jorge Martínez-Vázquez y Ming-Hung Yao.
- 14/09 Factores explicativos de los resultados de las Comunidades Autónomas Españolas en PISA 2006.  
*Autores:* José Manuel Cordero Ferrera, Eva Crespo Cebada y Daniel Santín González.
- 15/09 A proposal to empirically evaluate the sensitivity of the speed of convergence in the EU.  
*Autoras:* Sonia de Lucas Santos, Inmaculada Álvarez Ayuso y M.<sup>a</sup> Jesús Delgado Rodríguez.
- 16/09 An assessment of the sustainability of current account imbalances in OECD countries.  
*Autores:* Mariam Camarero, Josep Lluís Carrion-i-Silvestre y Cecilio Tamarit.
- 17/09 Tax mimicking among local governments: some evidence from Spanish municipalities.  
*Autores:* Francisco J. Delgado y Matías Mayor-Fernández.
- 18/09 La desigualdad en las intensidades energéticas y la composición de la producción. Un análisis para los países de la OCDE.  
*Autores:* Juan Antonio Duro Moreno, Vicent Alcántara Escolano y Emilio Padilla Rosa.
- 19/09 On the sustainability of government deficits: some long-term evidence for Spain, 1850-2000.  
*Autores:* Oscar Bajo-Rubio, Carmen Díaz-Roldán y Vicente Esteve.
- 20/09 Who bears Social Security taxes? A meta-analysis approach.  
*Autores:* José Manuel González-Paramo and Ángel Melguizo.
- 21/09 Fostering the contributory nature of the Spanish retirement pension system: an arithmetic micro-simulation exercise using the MCVL.  
*Autores:* Ció Patxot, Guadalupe Souto y Jaime Villanueva.
- 22/09 Obtaining lifetime earnings patterns for Spain.  
*Autores:* Ignacio Moral-Arce, Ció Patxot y Guadalupe Souto.
- 23/09 Efectos del gasto militar sobre la rentabilidad de la industria de defensa en España.  
*Autor:* Antonio Fonfría Mesa.
- 24/09 El papel de la igualdad de género en la solución de la crisis económica.  
*Autora:* María Pazos Morán.
- 25/09 Inequality and polarization impact of the European redistribution architecture on the Spanish population: an analysis using microsimulation techniques.  
*Autores:* Xisco Oliver, Luca Piccoli y Amedeo Spadaro.

## 2010

- 1/10 Fostering delayed retirement in Spain: a micro simulation exercise using the MCVL.  
*Autores:* Ignacio Moral-Arce, Ció Patxot y Guadalupe Souto.
- 2/10 La imposición lineal de las sucesiones y donaciones. Análisis recaudatorio y redistributivo.  
*Autores:* Miguel Ángel Barberán Lahuerta, Julio López Laborda y Marta Melguizo Garde.
- 3/10 Popular support for egalitarian social welfare.  
*Autores:* Rafael Salas y Juan Gabriel Rodríguez.
- 4/10 Equidad y eficiencia en el sistema español de pensiones: una revisión crítica.  
*Autoras:* Diana Alonso San Alberto y María Pazos Morán.

- 5/10 Pérdidas laborales ocasionadas por las enfermedades y problemas de salud en España en el año 2005.  
*Autor:* Juan Oliva.
- 6/10 Combining incrementalism and exogenous factors in analyzing national budgeting: an application to Spain.  
*Autores:* José Caamaño Alegre y Santiago Lago Peñas.
- 7/10 Integrated results for GA and NTA for Spain: some implications for the sustainability of the welfare state.  
*Autores:* Concepció Patxot, Elisenda Rentería, Miguel Romero y Guadalupe Souto.
- 8/10 Consecuencias económicas de la modificación de la imposición sobre los cigarrillos en el mercado español.  
*Autores:* Nuria Badenes Plá y José M.<sup>a</sup> Labeaga Azcona.
- 9/10 Occupational segregation of immigrants in Spain.  
*Autoras:* Olga Alonso Villar y Coral del Río.
- 10/10 Objetivos presupuestarios, ciclo económico y descentralización en España.  
*Autores:* Roberto Fernández Llera y Carlos Monasterio Escudero.
- 11/10 Redistributive conflicts and preferences for tax schemes in Europe  
*Autores:* Antonio M. Jaime Castillo y José L. Sáez Lozano.
- 12/10 EMU and European government bond market integration.  
*Autoras:* Pilar Abad, Helena Chuliá y Marta Gómez Puig.