

The industry effects of monetary policy in Spain

Rodríguez-Fuentes, Carlos; Padron-Marrero, David

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Rodríguez-Fuentes, C., & Padron-Marrero, D. (2008). The industry effects of monetary policy in Spain. *Regional Studies*, 42(3), 375-384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400701291583>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



The industry effects of monetary policy in Spain

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2006-0110.R1
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	E52 - Monetary Policy (Targets, Instruments, and Effects) < E5 - Monetary Policy, Central Banking, and the Supply of Money and Credit < E - Macroeconomics and Monetary Economics, L60 - General < L6 - Industry Studies: Manufacturing < L - Industrial Organization
Keywords:	monetary policy, industry effects, monetary shocks, Spain

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The industry effects of monetary policy in Spain

Carlos J. Rodríguez-Fuentes

Department of Applied Economics

University of La Laguna

Campus de Guajara - 38071

S/C de Tenerife - Spain

Email: cjrodrig@ull.es

David Padrón-Marrero

Department of Applied Economics

University of La Laguna

Campus de Guajara - 38071

S/C de Tenerife - Spain

Email: dpadron@ull.es

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to analyze the presence of sectoral asymmetries in monetary policy transmission in Spain in the period prior to the introduction of the single monetary policy in Europe (1988-1998). Monetary policy shocks are identified both through a standard vector auto-regression model (VAR-shock) and the specification of a reaction function (RF-shock) for the monetary authority in Spain. The responses of the different industrial branches with regard to the estimated monetary shocks are then analyzed at national accounting sector and sub-sector levels. Our results confirm the presence of significant differences in the sectoral responses with respect to national monetary shocks in Spain. In addition, the sectoral asymmetries found in our study show a strong correlation with regard to the regional asymmetries found in a previous study.

Key words: monetary policy; industry effects; monetary shocks; Spain

JEL: E52 Monetary policy (targets, instruments and effects); L60 Industry Studies: Manufacturing (general)

1. Introduction.

The study of the transmission mechanism of monetary policy has traditionally focused on the aggregate level of the economy, specifically on the impact of monetary policy decisions on production and price levels. Nevertheless, the last decade has seen an increasing amount of research which concentrate on the study of asymmetries which can arise in the transmission of national monetary shocks, either in specific regions which make up the national economy (regional asymmetries), or among their respective productive sectors (sectoral asymmetries). Undoubtedly a significant portion of this literature is motivated by the loss of monetary sovereignty which some European Union (EU) countries have experienced as a result of their conversion into regions within the eurozone. These countries have all irreversibly lost their prior “national monetary identities” and as such have begun to be concern about the regional repercussions of the European Central Bank’s monetary policy (Rodríguez Fuentes 2005: 5-7).

The growing interest in the study of sectoral asymmetries in the transmission of monetary policy has also been stimulated by the forecast that the establishment of a single currency in the European Union would convert *sectoral* shocks in truly *regional* shocks (Krugman and Venables 1996), which in turn would lead to regional tensions in the process of European integration.¹ This forecast has also been reinforced by some empirical evidence in studies which emphasize the importance of the differences in the regional productive structure in the explanation of the different regional responses with regard to national monetary policy shocks (see, among

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 others, Carlino and DeFina 1996, 1998a, 1998b and 1999, Guiso et al. 1999 and
8
9 Arnold, 2001).

10
11
12
13
14 This paper analyses sectoral asymmetries in the transmission of national monetary
15
16 shocks in Spain and also explores possible relationships among estimated sector
17
18 shocks with the estimated regional shocks from an earlier one (Rodríguez Fuentes et
19
20 al. 2004).

21
22
23
24
25
26 The paper is divided into an introduction, four main sections and conclusions. The
27
28 body of the paper begins with a brief review of the empirical literature concerning
29
30 sectoral asymmetries in monetary policy transmission. The responses of the different
31
32 branches which make up the industrial sector in Spain are then studied in the next
33
34 two sections. Section 3 introduces the estimates of monetary policy shocks in Spain
35
36 for the period 1988-1998. It is well known that the estimation of monetary shocks is
37
38 a critical step in any study which attempts to analyze the effects of monetary policy,
39
40 and that the observed correlations between interest rates, output and prices can be
41
42 due to an inverse causation process. Consequently the exogenous component
43
44 (monetary shocks) must be isolated from its endogenous response. A VAR model is
45
46 used to identify these shocks. Most empirical literature employs the VAR model
47
48 when studying the monetary transmission mechanism. However our study does not
49
50 end with just the VAR model. In addition we estimate a reaction function for the
51
52 Bank of Spain in order to compare the robustness of the results obtained from our
53
54 VAR model. This new approach can be used, in our opinion, as a complement to the
55
56 traditional VAR literature. Section 4 studies the response of industrial production (by
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 sector and sub-sector) with regard to the estimated monetary policy shocks from the
8
9 previous section.² Our results confirm the presence of important differences in the
10
11 sectoral responses with respect to national monetary shocks in Spain and are
12
13 consistent with available empirical evidence of other countries. In addition the
14
15 sectoral asymmetries presented in this section show some similarities with the
16
17 regional asymmetries found in a previous work (Rodríguez Fuentes et al. 2004) since
18
19 the classification of the Spanish regions according to their implicit sectoral
20
21 sensitiveness reflect a strong correlation with the ordering which is obtained by using
22
23 their sensitivity when taking into account national monetary shocks (regional
24
25 asymmetries).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **2. Sectoral asymmetries in the transmission of monetary policy: an overview of** 34 **the empirical literature.** 35 36

37
38 A review of the literature on the sectoral effects of monetary policy based on
39
40 empirical evidence, leads to three important conclusions. Firstly, the choice of the
41
42 VAR model as the econometric technique to identify monetary shocks. Secondly,
43
44 that the strategy followed to value the measure of heterogeneity in the sectoral
45
46 response consists in estimating a VAR model for each one of the sectors studied.
47
48 This strategy leads to estimating as many reaction functions as sectors that are
49
50 considered in the study and, consequently, obtaining a series of different monetary
51
52 shocks³ for each one of the studied sectors (which hinders the validity of intersectoral
53
54 comparisons). The third conclusion is that most studies tend to incorporate among
55
56 the endogenous variables both national and sectoral variables (production and price
57
58 levels). In this case it is more common that national aggregates are placed ahead of
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 the monetary policy variable, while sectoral variables appear after that variable (see
8
9 Ganley and Salmon 1997 and Dedola and Lippi 2000 and 2005). This consideration
10
11 and the use of recursive identification methods (Cholesky decomposition method)
12
13 lead to the inclusion of the implicit assumption that monetary shocks do not have a
14
15 contemporaneous impact on national aggregates but do have an instantaneous effect
16
17 on sectoral variables, which could be interpreted as an inconsistency in the model.⁴
18
19

20
21
22
23 This analysis is found in the paper by Ganley and Salmon (1997) which studies the
24
25 responses of different production sectors with respect to monetary policy shocks in
26
27 the United Kingdom. This study estimates 24 VAR models (one for each one of the
28
29 sectors under study) which incorporate, as endogenous variables, short term interest
30
31 rate, the real GNP of the United Kingdom and its implicit deflator and, lastly, the
32
33 production index of each sector. The Cholesky decomposition method is used with
34
35 the variables ordered according to their previously mentioned description. Results
36
37 from the study indicate that monetary policy measures implemented by the Bank of
38
39 England have had varying impacts according to sectors. Examples can be found in
40
41 the construction sector, and to a lesser extent, in manufacturing, where both sectors
42
43 are subject to stronger and more rapid responses to national monetary shocks. In
44
45 addition, the authors confirm large variability in the response to each one of branches
46
47 that make up the manufacturing sector. For instance there are cases where some
48
49 branches offer a very weak response (industries linked to non-durables consumer
50
51 expenditures, as producers of food, drink and tobacco, textiles and footwear), while
52
53 other industries (industries supplying construction, as glass, tiles, concrete and bricks, and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 wood products; or industries linked to durables consumer expenditures, as vehicle
8
9 manufacture) react in a very clear manner.
10

11
12
13 Results obtained by Hayo and Uhlenbrock (2000) also suggest the presence of
14 important sectoral differences in their responses to national monetary shocks in West
15 Germany. Their findings show that approximately half of the analyzed branches
16
17 show a different response than the average one for the sector.
18
19
20
21
22

23
24
25 Dedola and Lippi (2000 and 2005) focus on the responses of industrial production in
26 five countries belonging to the OECD. They study the production sector response of
27
28 21 industrial branches in Germany, France, U.S., Italy and the United Kingdom by
29 using a common specification in the estimated VAR models. The results from these
30
31 papers indicate that the differences among sectoral responses with respect to
32
33 monetary shocks are much greater than those found in other countries. The authors
34
35 also investigated if the observed sector heterogeneity in the response to national
36
37 monetary shocks was due to industry-specific factors or country-specific factors.
38
39 They conclude that sectoral responses were similar among all of the different
40
41 countries studied. Their results also show that the impact of monetary shocks is
42
43 greater in production industries including durable goods, which place greater
44
45 demands on working capital and smaller borrowing capacity (Dedola and Lippi,
46
47 2005: 1565).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 As noted earlier, most of the empirical studies which analyze sectoral effects of
60 monetary policy tend to employ a VAR model to estimate each sector's response.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 This decision also assumes that national variables are not instantaneously affected by
8
9 monetary shocks whereas the sectoral variables are, which could be interpreted as an
10
11 inconsistency in the model. Various alternatives have been proposed to address this
12
13 inconsistency. One is seen in Raddatz and Rigobon (2003), where the authors
14
15 suggest estimating a single national VAR model, where national production is
16
17 substituted by the production levels in each sector under consideration. These authors
18
19 also introduce a non recursive identification method which allows them to sort the
20
21 obstacle, namely that monetary shocks do not have a contemporaneous effect on
22
23 national variables but do have an instantaneous effect on sectoral variables. Even so,
24
25 the results obtained by Raddatz and Rigobon (2003) also suggest the presence of
26
27 important sectoral asymmetries in the responses from different industrial branches in
28
29 the U.S. economy with respect to national monetary policy, where durable goods and
30
31 property investment are the two sectors that show the strongest response.
32
33 Nevertheless, the approach by Raddatz and Rigobon (2003) is not problem-free. For
34
35 instance, the complete identification of all structural parameters of the model
36
37 requires several assumptions. In addition the large number of estimated parameters
38
39 creates an important reduction in the degrees of freedom, a sensitive issue when
40
41 working with short time series.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Peersman and Smets (2002) propose a two-step strategy to value sectoral
53
54 asymmetries in monetary policy transmission in the euro zone. The first stage is
55
56 carried out by extracting monetary shocks from the estimates derived from a VAR
57
58 model for the national economy. The estimated national monetary shocks from the
59
60 first stage are then used in the second stage to explain the behaviour of the sectoral

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 production based upon its past behaviour and estimated national monetary shocks
8
9 from the prior stage. These estimated national monetary shocks will be equal for
10
11 each one of the studied sectors since they have been extracted from the national VAR
12
13 model.
14

15
16
17
18 We begin our study by incorporating the strategy used in Peersman and Smets (2002)
19
20 but will also estimate national monetary shocks by using the specification of a
21
22 reaction function for the Bank of Spain.
23
24

25 26 27 28 **3. Identification of monetary shocks: VAR models and reaction functions.** 29

30 Following the current orthodox empirical literature on monetary policy (Christiano et
31
32 al. 1999), we have identified the exogenous monetary shocks by means of a VAR
33
34 model and a reaction function of the central bank.⁵ This second approach is, in our
35
36 opinion, a novel contribution in the context of empirical literature regarding sectoral
37
38 asymmetries in the transmission of monetary policy. Details of the specification of
39
40 the VAR model as well as the reaction function follow.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 48 **3.1. VAR Model**

49 The general equation of the VAR model that we have chosen to identify the
50
51 monetary policy shocks Spain is of the form:
52

$$53 \begin{bmatrix} X_t \\ Y_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A(L) & B(L) \\ C(L) & D(L) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_{t-1} \\ Y_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} e_t^X \\ e_t^Y \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

54
55
56
57

58 where Y_t is the vector containing the endogenous variables of the system, all of
59
60 which refer to the set representing the national economy. This set is made up of these

variables in the following order, national industrial production index (IPI), the consumer price index (CPI), the German inter-bank interest rate (i_{AL}), the M3 monetary aggregate, the interest rate for three month non-transferable deposits (i_{ESP}) and the real effective exchange rate for the peseta (REER).⁶

$$Y_t = [IPI_t \quad CPI_t \quad i_{AL} \quad M3 \quad i_{ESP} \quad REER]' \quad (2)$$

We have also introduced an exogenous variable vector which includes a constant (const), a tendency (trend), and a world commodity price index (WCPI) to control possible external shocks.

$$X_t = [const \quad trend \quad WCPI_t]' \quad (3)$$

The VAR model has been estimated in levels, which allows us to control the possible existence of cointegration. Almost all variables are expressed in logarithmic form, the exception being the interest rates. Data have been taken from the Monthly Statistical Bulletin of the Bank of Spain and the sample covers the period from January, 1988 to December, 1998.⁷ The lag structure used in the model is two months, and the monetary policy shock that we have identified is a result of the Cholesky decomposition method, with the variables defined and ordered according to our earlier comments.⁸

Graph 1 depicts the impulse-response function of the most important variables, namely production and prices. This graph indicates that prices remain unaltered after an unexpected monetary policy shock, which could be justified by the high levels of

price (and nominal wages) rigidity that have been traditionally seen in the Spanish economy. The case of production, however, is consistent with other studies, where monetary policy reaches its maximum impact on production on the seventh month after the unexpected monetary shock took place.

Graph 1 NEAR HERE

3.2. Reaction function

The VAR methodology has played an important role in the empirical analysis concerning the impact of monetary policy actions on economy. Even so it has been questioned not only in its method for retrieving monetary shocks but also with the problems associated with capturing the forward-looking behaviour which modern monetary policy theory attributes to central banks (Clarida et al. 1999 and Svensson 1999). Under this scenario, the monetary authority considers the expected evolution of the relevant economic aggregates in the near future while making decisions in the present. This approach has grown in favour among a number of authors when evaluating the actions of central banks, and can be adapted to its inclusion in the specification of a reaction function for the monetary authority.

For this reason we also decided to estimate a reaction function for the Bank of Spain where the unexpected monetary shock is identified with the unexplained observed interest rates by deriving rates based on the estimated reaction function.

The reaction function that we estimated has the following form:

$$i_t = \rho i_{t-1} + (1 - \rho) [\alpha + \beta \pi_{t+k} + \gamma x_{t+p} + \lambda Z_t] + \varepsilon_t \quad (4)$$

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 where π is the interannual inflation rate, x is the output-gap, and Z represents a set
8
9 of variables which can affect interest rate decisions, independently of its explanatory
10
11 power on inflationary trends and the output-gap, which include the exchange rate and
12
13 a foreign interest rate. Our model specification includes the peseta/mark nominal
14
15 exchange rate and the German three month interest rate.
16
17

18
19
20
21 The proposed reaction function is a simple combination of a Taylor Rule type
22
23 reaction function (Taylor 1993) and a first order partial autoregression rule. The
24
25 Taylor Rule reaction function incorporates the forward-looking behaviour
26
27 assumption for the monetary authority (under the assumption of rational
28
29 expectations). The autoregression rule captures demonstrated tendencies by central
30
31 banks to smoothen interest rate changes.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The resultant reaction function was estimated by the Generalized Method of
39
40 Moments (GMM) by taking advantage of the following set of orthogonal conditions:
41

$$42 \quad E[\varepsilon_t / \Omega_t] = E[i_t - \rho i_{t-1} - (1 - \rho)(\alpha + \beta \pi_{t+k} + \gamma x_{t+p} + \lambda Z_t) / \Omega_t] = 0 \quad (5)$$

43
44
45
46
47

48 Possible problems of heterokedasticity and autocorrelation led us to use the Newey
49
50 and West method when calculating standard errors. The Hansen J statistic was also
51
52 calculated to control possible overidentification. Table 1 shows that the best results
53
54 were obtained by the forecast horizon $k=6 \cap p=3$. In addition we decided to omit the
55
56 peseta/mark nominal exchange rate since changes in the variable were not
57
58 statistically significant in any of the tested specifications.
59
60

Table 1 NEAR HERE

Graph 2 compares the accumulated monetary shocks obtained from VAR models with those derived from the reaction function. The resultant time profiles indicate that both series are quite similar, leading to an interpretation of favourable evidence regarding the robustness of our results. It is also worth mentioning the presence of a strong relationship between the shown path from the accumulated shocks and the short term interest rate. Consequently in the periods where the short term interest rate increases contracting shocks are seen, as in the opposite case for falling rates. Nevertheless, from 1996 to 1997 this relationship seems to stray from this trend. If this is the case these actions could be interpreted as deliberate actions by the Bank of Spain to tighten monetary policy and thus exercise stricter control on the inflation rate and satisfy the Maastricht criteria.

Graph 2. NEAR HERE

4. Sectoral asymmetries in the transmission of monetary shocks.

Following Peersman and Smets (2002), we study the industry effects of monetary policy shock in Spain⁹ by using the following expression which relates the trends from the production activity from each industrial branch with its past behaviour and the estimated accumulated monetary shock from the prior section:

$$ipi_{i,t} = \alpha_i + \sum_{j=1}^{12} \beta_i \cdot ipi_{i,t-j} + \gamma_i \cdot shock_{t-1} + \eta_{i,t} \quad (6)$$

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 where $ipi_{i,t}$ is monthly growth rate of the Industrial Production Index (IPI) of
8
9 branch i , shock ϵ_{t-1} is the accumulated monetary policy shock estimated previously
10
11 (VAR-shock and RF-shock) and $\eta_{i,t}$ is an error term. Given the possibility of
12
13 instantaneous correlation between the different Spanish industrial branches,
14
15 expression (6) has been estimated using the SUR (Seemingly Unrelated Regressions)
16
17
18
19
20 method.

21
22
23
24 Table 2 summarizes the estimated values from the response of the different industrial
25
26 sections in Spain with respect to a monetary shock (γ_i). This table indicates that the
27
28 production response with respect to an unexpected monetary shock is generally
29
30 negative. Another aspect which deserves our attention is the presence of clear
31
32 similarities among the obtained results for both VAR and RF shocks. These results
33
34 suggest that the contraction in production is greater among mining industries (section
35
36 C), while section E (Electricity, gas and water supply) are found at the opposite
37
38 extreme. However, the low statistical significance of the estimates for this
39
40 disaggregated level (sections) should be highlighted, since only the estimated
41
42 response for the mining industries from the RF-shock were seen to be statistically
43
44 significant.

45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Table 2. NEAR HERE

52
53
54
55 The lack of statistical significance from the obtained results at the section level of
56
57 industrial activity could be attributed to the presence of distinct behaviour among the
58
59 activity branches (subsections) which make up the different industrial sections. We
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 therefore proceed to analyze the sectoral responses at the subsection level, with the
8
9 results shown in table 3.
10

11
12
13
14 The estimated parameters are generally characterized by an expected negative sign,
15
16 indicating the (unexpected) tightening of monetary policy resulting in a contraction
17
18 of the different industrial branches under study. The results also indicate once again
19
20 that estimated parameters from the RF-shock are greater (in absolute value) than
21
22 those obtained from using the VAR-shock, in addition to having greater statistical
23
24 significance. Although there is a greater level of disaggregation in these estimates,
25
26 the comparison between the obtained sectoral responses from both VAR and RF
27
28 shocks allow us to offer some conclusions. Firstly, that subsection EA (electricity,
29
30 gas and water supply) once again is seen as one of the branches least sensitive to
31
32 monetary shocks, as in the case at the section level. Other branches also appear, such
33
34 as the manufacture of food products, beverages and tobacco (subsection DA), as well
35
36 as the manufacture of leather and leather products (subsection DC), the paper
37
38 industry (subsection DE) and the manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products
39
40 and nuclear fuels (subsection DF). Another observation is that the greater sensitivity
41
42 to national monetary shocks would take place in machinery and mechanical
43
44 equipment (subsection DK), the mining and quarrying of energy producing material
45
46 (subsection CA) and the mining and quarrying of other minerals (subsection CB).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3. NEAR HERE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Some important differences need to be mentioned when comparing the results from
8
9 the obtained estimates from the reaction function (RF-shock) and the VAR model
10 (VAR-shock). The first difference concerns the DM (Manufacture of transport
11 equipment) and DJ (Manufacture of basic metals and fabricated metal products)
12 subsections. While high sensitivity is observed with respect to estimated monetary
13 shocks based on the reaction function (RF-shock) of these subsections, the VAR-
14 shock produces much lower sensitivity. A second difference occurs in the different
15 manufacturing industries (subsection DN), where slight sensitivity with respect to
16 estimated monetary shocks based on the VAR model are noted (VAR-shock).
17
18 Nevertheless, the estimated response for the reaction function (RF-shock) ranks this
19 section in an intermediate position among all sectors.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The presence of sectoral asymmetries in the transmission of monetary policy has
36 obvious direct implications at the regional level. Indeed, given that Spanish regions
37 show important differences in industrial specialization, the presence of different
38 sectoral responses with respect to monetary policy impulses in Spain could convert
39 the sectoral shocks into regional ones. With the purpose of studying the link between
40 sectoral asymmetries and regional asymmetries in Spain, we calculated an index of
41 regional sensitivity (ISR-1)¹⁰ which, hypothetically, would reflect the sensitivity of
42 each Spanish region with respect to the monetary shocks based on the industrial
43 specialization profile. The comparison between this index, which reflects the
44 regional sensitivity due to the region's industry-mix, and the regional response with
45 respect to national monetary policy shocks¹¹, which we estimated in an earlier work,
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 indicates the presence of a high degree of correlation between regional and sectoral

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 asymmetries in Spain (graph 3), which is consistent with the traditional literature
8
9 regarding the interest rate transmission mechanism. Nevertheless, this correlation is
10
11 far from being perfect, so it seems reasonable that other factors different to the
12
13 sectoral-mix, such as those related to the financial structure and behaviour (see
14
15 Rodríguez Fuentes et al. 2004: 260-262), may also have played a relevant role in the
16
17 explanation of regional asymmetries in the transmission of monetary shocks in
18
19 Spain.
20
21

22
23
24 Graph 3. NEAR HERE
25
26
27

28 **4. Conclusions.**

29
30 This paper has studied sectoral asymmetries in the transmission of monetary policy
31
32 shocks in Spain in the period immediately prior to the establishment of the single
33
34 monetary policy (1988-1998). The identification of the monetary shocks was carried
35
36 out through the estimate of a VAR model and the specification of a reaction function
37
38 for the Bank of Spain. The monetary shocks obtained were then employed to study
39
40 the degree of sensitivity of the different activities that make up the industrial sector
41
42 in Spain. Our results are consistent with those available for other countries (Ganley
43
44 and Salmon 1997, Dedola and Lippi 2000 and 2005, Hayo and Uhlenbrock 2000,
45
46 Peersman and Smets 2002 and Raddatz and Rigobon 2003), namely the presence of
47
48 important differences in sectoral responses with respect to national monetary shocks
49
50 in Spain. In addition, the sectoral asymmetries found in our study show a strong
51
52 correlation with the regional asymmetries found in a previous study (Rodríguez
53
54 Fuentes et al. 2004). In particular, the resultant classification from ordering Spanish
55
56 regions according to the sensitivity of different industrial branches which make up
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 their respective industrial GDP reveals a high correlation with the ordering that is
8
9 obtained by using sensitivity with respect to national monetary shocks (regional
10
11 asymmetries). We can conclude from our results that at least during the period 1988-
12
13 1998, differences in industrial specialization are an important explanatory factor for
14
15 the regional asymmetries in the transmission mechanism of monetary policy in
16
17 Spain. However, aside from the fact that the correlation among sectoral and regional
18
19 shocks is less than one, we could also conclude that the explanation of the regional
20
21 differences with respect to national monetary shocks requires the inclusion of
22
23 different factors not found in regional productive specialization. Such factors would
24
25 include those related with the dimension and financial structure of the regional
26
27 business and financial sectors, as well as the levels of competition (both internal and
28
29 external) which are present in each sector.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

Arnold, I. J. M. (2001) The Regional Effects of Monetary Policy in Europe, *Journal of Economic Integration*, **16** (3), 399-420.

Arnold, I. J. M. and Vrugt (2002) Regional Effects of Monetary Policy in the Netherlands, *International Journal of Business and Economics*, **1** (2), 123-34.

Arnold, I. J. M., Kool, C. J. M. and Raabe, K. (2005) *New evidence on the firm size effects in US monetary policy transmission*, Tjalling C. Koopmans Research Institute, Discussion Paper Series No 05-11.

Bank of Spain (1997), *La política monetaria y la inflación en España*, Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Barth, M. J. and Ramey, V.A. (2001) "The cost channel of monetary transmission", in: Bernanke, B. and Rogoff, K (eds.), *NBER Macroeconomic Annuals 2001*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 199-240.

Bravo, H.F., García, C.J., Mies, V. and Tapia, M. (2003) *Heterogeneidad de la transmisión monetaria: efectos sectoriales y regionales*, Banco Central de Chile Working Paper n° 235, October.

Carlino, G. and DeFina, R. (1996) Does monetary policy have differential regional effects? *Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, Business Review*, March/April, 17-27.

Carlino, G. and DeFina, R. (1998a) The differential regional effects of monetary policy, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, **80** (4), 572-87.

Carlino, G. and DeFina, R. (1998b) *Monetary Policy and the U.S. States and Regions: Some Implications for the European Monetary Union*, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, Working Paper No 98-17. [reprinted in: von Hagen, J. y

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Waller, C.J. (2000) (eds.) *Regional Aspects of Monetary Policy in Europe*, Kluwer
8 Academic Publishers, London.]

9
10
11 Carlino, G. and DeFina, R. (1999) Do states respond differently to changes in
12 monetary policy? *Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, Business Review*,
13 July/August, 17-27.

14
15
16 Caruso, M. (2004) *Monetary policy impulses, local output and the transmission*
17 *mechanism*, Banca D'Italia, Temi di Discussione No 357, December.

18
19
20 Clarida, R., Galí, J. and Gertler, M. (1999) The science of monetary policy: a new
21 Keynesian perspective, *Journal of Economic Literature*, **37** (4): 1661-1707.

22
23
24
25
26
27
28 Christiano, Eichenbaum and Evans 1999 Christiano, L., Eichenbaum, M. and Evans,
29 C. (1999), Monetary policy shocks: what have we learned and to what end?, in J.
30 Taylor and M. Woodford (eds) *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, Amsterdam: North
31 Holland.

32
33
34
35
36
37 Dale, S. and Haldane, A. (1995) Interest Rates and the Channels of Monetary
38 Transmission: Some Sectoral Estimates, *European Economic Review*, **39** (9), 1611-
39 26.

40
41
42
43
44
45 Dedola, L. and Lippi, F. (2000) *The monetary transmission mechanism: evidence*
46 *from the industries of five OECD countries*, CEPR, Discussion Paper No. 2508, July.

47
48
49
50
51
52 Dedola, L. and Lippi, F. (2005) The monetary transmission mechanism: evidence
53 from the industries of five OECD countries, *European Economic Review*, **49**, 1543-
54 69.

55
56
57
58
59
60 Farès, J. and Srour, G. (2001) *The monetary transmission mechanism at the sectoral*
level, Bank of Canada, Working Paper No. 27, December.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Frankel, J.A. and Rose, A.K. (1998) The endogeneity of the Optimum Currency Area
8
9 Criteria, *Economic Journal*, **108** (449), 1009-25
10
11 Fratantoni, M. (2003) Monetary Policy, Housing, and Heterogeneous Regional
12
13 Markets, *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, **35** (4), 557-89.
14
15
16 Ganley, J. and Salmon, C. (1997) *The industrial impact of monetary policy shocks:*
17
18 *some stylized facts*, Bank of England, Working Paper No. 68.
19
20
21 Guiso, L., A.K. Kashyap, F. Panetta and D. Terlizzese (1999) Will a Common
22
23 European Monetary Policy Have Asymmetric Effects?, *Federal Reserve Bank of*
24
25 *Chicago, Economic Perspectives*, fourth quarter, 56-75.
26
27
28 Hayo, B. and Uhlenbrock, B. (1999) *Industry Effects of Monetary Policy in*
29
30 *Germany*, Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI), Working Paper B14.
31
32 [reprinted in von Hagen, J. and Waller, C.J. (2000) (eds.) *Regional Aspects of*
33
34 *Monetary Policy in Europe*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London.]
35
36
37 Ibrahim, M.H. (2005) Sectoral Effects of Monetary Policy: Evidence from Malaysia,
38
39 *Asian Economic Journal*, **19** (1), 83-102.
40
41
42 Krugman, P. and Venables, A.J. (1996) Integration, specialization and adjustment,
43
44 *European Economic Review*, **40**, 959-67.
45
46
47 McCallum, B.T. (2001) Analysis of the monetary transmission mechanism:
48
49 methodological issues, in Deutsche Bundesbank (ed.), *The monetary transmission*
50
51 *process. Recent developments and lessons for Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan, New
52
53 York.
54
55
56 Mies, V.; Morandé, F. and Tapia, M. (2002) *Política monetaria y mecanismos de*
57
58 *transmission: nuevos elementos para una vieja discusión*, Banco Central de Chile,
59
60 Working Paper No. 181, September.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Peersman, G. and Smets, F. (2002) *The industry effects of monetary policy in the*
8
9 *Euro Area*, European Central Bank, Working Paper No. 165. [also published in
10
11 *Economic Journal*, **115**, 319-42.]

12
13
14 Raddatz, C. and Rigobon, R. (2003) *Monetary policy and sectoral shocks: did the*
15
16 *FED react properly to the High-Tech Crisis?*, Mimeo.

17
18 Rodríguez Fuentes, C.J. (2005) *Regional Monetary Policy*, Routledge: London.

19
20 Rodríguez Fuentes, C.J.; Padrón Marrero, D. and Olivera Herrera, A. (2004) Estructura
21
22 financiera regional y política monetaria. Una aproximación al caso español, *Papeles de*
23
24 *Economía Española*, **101**, 252-65.

25
26 Serju, P. (2003) *Monetary policy and the Jamaican economy: a sectoral analysis*,
27
28 Bank of Jamaica, Research Service Department, Working Paper No. 02/09.

29
30
31 Svensson, L. (1999) *Monetary policy issues for the eurosystem*, Seminar Paper No.
32
33 667, Institute for International Economic Studies.

34
35 Taylor, J.B. (1993) Discretion versus policy rules in practice, *Carnegie-Rochester*
36
37 *Conference Series on Public Policy*, **39**, 195-214.

38
39
40 Zucardi Huertas, I.E. (2002) *Efectos regionales de la política monetaria en*
41
42 *Colombia*, Banco de la República de Colombia, Centro de Estudios Económicos
43
44 Regionales, Working Paper on Regional Economics No. 32, July.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


APPENDIX

Table A.1. Sectoral and regional asymmetries of monetary policy in Spain

	ISR-1	ISR-2
Andalucia	0,58	0,22
Aragon	0,99	0,60
Asturias	0,83	0,52
Baleares	0,39	0,12
Canarias	0,39	0,28
Cantabria	0,70	0,56
Castilla-Leon	0,74	0,77
Castilla-Mancha	0,67	0,06
Cataluña	0,70	0,60
Extremadura	0,34	0,17
Galicia	0,76	0,48
Madrid	0,62	0,38
Murcia	0,63	0,26
Navarra	1,00	0,68
Pais Vasco	0,95	0,77
Rioja	0,66	1,00
Valencia	0,69	0,60
Correlation coefficient	0,394	
<p>ISR-1: This index is the result of multiplying, for each region, the estimated sensitivity from the RF-shock (table 3) for each one of the industrial subsections by its respective participation in the regional industrial GDP in 1998. The values shown in the table are the result of dividing each region's response by the maximum value.</p> <p>ISR-2: The index reflects the response of the regional industrial production to unexpected monetary policy from a reaction function for the Bank of Spain (further details in Rodríguez Fuentes et al. 2004: 260). The values shown in the table are the result of dividing each region's response by the maximum regional response.</p>		


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Graph 1. Function of impulse-response of industrial production (IPI) and prices (CPI) with respect to a monetary shock (one standard deviation)



Note: The estimates were carried out using Eviews.

Graph 2. Monetary shocks and short term interest rates in Spain



Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Graph 3. Sectoral and regional asymmetries




Table 1. Results from estimating the reaction function for the Bank of Spain

	k = 3 p = 3	k = 6 p = 6	k = 12 p = 12	k = 6 P = 3	k = 12 p = 3	K = 12 p = 6	k = 3 p = 3 Z = i _{AL}	k = 6 p = 3 Z = i _{AL}
ρ	0,905**	0,949**	0,973**	0,924**	1,006**	1,002**	0,898**	0,897**
α	-0,485	-2,015	-0,249	-1,943*	33,049	81,290	-0,414	-1,204
β	2,054**	2,556**	1,532**	2,252**	-0,700	-4,583	1,895**	1,523**
γ	0,223**	0,088	-0,337*	0,423**	-2,662	-3,986	0,205**	0,226**
λ	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,122	0,561**
R^2	0,986	0,985	0,982	0,983	0,982	0,982	0,986	0,985
S.E.	0,419	0,424	0,444	0,458	0,439	0,443	0,419	0,433
J-test	17,12 [0,998]	17,32 [0,998]	16,69 [0,998]	17,60 [0,997]	17,22 [0,998]	17,39 [0,997]	16,99 [0,997]	17,75 [0,995]

Note: The estimates were carried out using Eviews.

* and ** denotes that a variable is significant at the 5 and 1% level, respectively.

The following variables were used in the estimation: constant, i_{t-1} , i_{t-2} , i_{t-3} , i_{t-4} , i_{t-5} , i_{t-6} , i_{t-9} , i_{t-12} , π_{t-1} , π_{t-2} , π_{t-3} , π_{t-4} , π_{t-5} , π_{t-6} , π_{t-9} , π_{t-12} , X_{t-1} , X_{t-2} , X_{t-3} , X_{t-4} , X_{t-5} , X_{t-6} , X_{t-9} , X_{t-12} , q_{t-1} , q_{t-2} , q_{t-3} , q_{t-4} , q_{t-5} , q_{t-6} , q_{t-9} , q_{t-12} , m_{t-1} , m_{t-2} , m_{t-3} , m_{t-4} , m_{t-5} , m_{t-6} , m_{t-9} , m_{t-12} . Where q is the change in the nominal peseta-mark exchange rate and m is the rate of growth in the M3 monetary aggregate. The table also shows the J-statistic and the probability of accepting the null hypothesis.

Table 2.- Response from different industrial branches with respect to a monetary shock (γ_i)

RF-shock			VAR-shock		
Section	Coefficient	t-statistic	Section	Coefficient	t-statistic
C	-1,260707	-2,648278	C	-0,665141	-1,641380
D	-0,490532	-1,509285	D	-0,229419	-0,973417
E	-0,025145	-0,103596	E	0,221215	0,869998

C (Mining and quarrying), D (Manufacturing) and E (Electricity, gas a water supply)

Table 3.- Response by industrial subsections with respect to monetary shock (γ_i)

FR-shock			VAR-shock		
Subsection	Coefficient	t-statistic	Subsection	Coefficient	t-statistic
DA	0,107995	0,367364	EA	0,245455	0,968357
DC	-0,032593	-0,082099	DN	0,208370	0,460732
EA	-0,051506	-0,213997	DF	0,070817	0,185372
DE	-0,081628	-0,342259	DE	-0,033691	-0,139498
DF	-0,224908	-0,668028	DA	-0,090756	-0,293388
DG	-0,292967	-0,733748	DC	-0,095969	-0,228702
DI	-0,412020	-1,659494	DH	-0,276524	-0,644695
DN	-0,537933	-1,236804	DI	-0,314554	-1,506139
DL	-0,823875	-1,465081	DJ	-0,339709	-1,129706
DD	-0,861333	-1,646532	DM	-0,391174	-0,435383
DB	-0,948324	-2,477780	DL	-0,515330	-0,896411
DH	-1,088006	-2,424762	DG	-0,535510	-1,533995
DJ	-1,090333	-2,990396	DB	-0,551075	-1,706137
CB	-1,126873	-1,988770	DD	-0,630545	-1,298233
CA	-1,560122	-3,520476	CA	-0,715491	-1,580320
DK	-1,925580	-3,067467	CB	-0,819522	-1,629274
DM	-2,002185	-2,523202	DK	-1,111361	-2,136371
Wald test					
FR-shock			VAR-shock		
	Chi-square (probability)			Chi-square (probability)	
Total sample	34,60183 (0,0045)		Total sample	20,32358 (0,2060)	
7 + and 5 -	29,93248 (0,0016)		7 + and 5 -	17,41318 (0,0962)	
3 + and 3 -	24,76408 (0,0002)		3 + and 3 -	12,56997 (0,0278)	
CA = Mining and quarrying of energy producing materials CB = Mining and quarrying, except of energy producing materials DA = Manufacture of food products, beverages and tobacco DB = Manufacture of textiles and textile products DC = Manufacture of leather and leather products DD = Manufacture of wood and wood products DE = Manufacture of pulp, paper and paper products; publishing and printing DF = Manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel			DG = Manufacture of chemicals, chemical products and man-made fibres DH = Manufacture of rubber and plastic products DI = Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products DJ = Manufacture of basic metals and fabricated metal products DK = Manufacture of machinery and equipment n.e.c. DL = Manufacture of electrical and optical equipment DM = Manufacture of transport equipment DN = Manufacturing n.e.c. EA = Electricity, gas and water supply		

ENDNOTES

¹ Nevertheless, this hypothesis has been questioned by other authors, who point out that the shape of a monetary union also reinforces bilateral trade among its members.

This effect would result in higher levels of correlation in their respective cycles and a lower probability of experiencing asymmetric shocks (Frankel and Rose 1998).

² We have not been able to include the services in our analysis due to the lack of statistics in Spain in this regard.

³ This result is unconvincing since Central Bank decisions will always cause a single (and common) monetary shock, which undoubtedly might produce different effects on certain sectors; but it is the response that might differ across sectors not the shock itself.

⁴ Nevertheless, Dedola and Lippi (2005: 1551) point out that, the estimated parameter associated with the instantaneous response of the production sector monetary shock is not far from zero, and such an inconsistency would not be relevant in their model.

⁵ It is important to note that our study is only considering the unanticipated monetary policy, that is, the monetary policy “surprises” or exogenous shocks, which is the common practice in the current empirical literature on sectoral effects of monetary policy (Ganley and Salmon 1997, Hayo and Uhlenbrock 2000, Peersman and Smets 2002 and Dedola and Lippi 2005). However, we are aware that the monetary policy decisions also have a systematic component which is at least as important as the ‘monetary surprises’ (McCallum 2001: 38), but its identification usually requires the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

estimation of structural models which are highly demanding in terms of data (not available to the authors).

⁶ The reasoning behind the inclusion of the German interest rate is to acknowledge Spain's membership in the EMS and the "anchoring" role performed by the German economy within the EMS. We also considered the insertion of the M3 due to the importance attributed by the Bank of Spain to monetary aggregates (in its monetary strategy) during most of the period under study (Bank of Spain 1997: 89-119).

⁷ The reasoning for using this period is to avoid the period of monetary instability present during the 70's and early 80's, where monetary policy of the Bank of Spain (BS) focussed on the strict control of monetary aggregates. Starting with the mid 80's the growing financial opening of the Spanish economy, with its membership in the EMS, and especially the liberalization process of the Spanish financial system created important changes in the strategy followed by the BS, resulting in the growing importance of interest rates in the execution of monetary policy. We chose 1988 as the beginning date for this second period, thus avoiding the important variability experienced in interest rates during 1987 (see Bank of Spain 1997 for further details, particularly pages 89-119).

⁸ By acting this way we assume unexpected monetary policy actions do not have an instantaneous impact on output (IPI) and prices (CPI).

⁹ Data restrictions limit the estimates for the industrial activity branches to the period 1991-1998.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹⁰ This parameter was calculated as the result of multiplying, for each region, the estimated sensitivity from the RF-shock (table 3) for each one of the industrial subsections by its respective participation in the regional industrial GDP in 1998.

¹¹ The values of both parameters are shown in Table A.1 of the appendix.