Temi di discussione

(Working Papers)

Using credit variables to date business cycle and to estimate the probabilities of recession in real time

by Valentina Aprigliano and Danilo Liberati

Temi di discussione

Using credit variables to date business cycle and to estimate the probabilities of recession in real time

by Valentina Aprigliano and Danilo Liberati

The papers published in the Temi di discussione *series describe preliminary results and are made available to the public to encourage discussion and elicit comments.*

The views expressed in the articles are those of the authors and do not involve the responsibility of the Bank.

USING CREDIT VARIABLES TO DATE BUSINESS CYCLE AND TO ESTIMATE THE PROBABILITIES OF RECESSION IN REAL TIME

by Valentina Aprigliano[*] and Danilo Liberati[*]

Abstract

Following the debate on the relationship between business and financial cycle rekindled in the last decade since the global financial crisis, we assess the ability of some financial indicators to track the Italian business cycle. We mostly use credit variables to detect the turning points and to estimate the probability of recession in real time. A dynamic factor model with Markov-switching regimes is used to handle a large dataset and to cope with the nonlinear evolution of the business cycle. The in-sample results strongly support the capacity of credit variables to estimate the probability of recessions and the implied coincident indicator proves their ability to fit the business cycle. Also in real time the contribution of credit is not negligible compared to that of the industrial production, currently used for the conjunctural analysis

Contents

_____

[*] Bank of Italy, Economic Research and International Relations.

1 Introduction[1]

Detecting the turning points of the economy and catching the short-term evolution of GDP in real time has always been a crucial task for the policy maker. The global financial crisis has reignited the long-standing debate over the relationship between business and financial cycle. Much attention is particularly devoted to credit, whose role in driving macroeconomic variables is being increasingly emphasized. A number of seminal papers investigated credit as a force that amplifies and propagates the shocks hitting the real economy. In the light of the recent economic turmoil, it becomes reasonable wondering whether credit could even herald economic collapses.

In this paper, we carry out a real time analysis to inspect the ability of some credit variables to track the Italian business cycle, and in particular bank loans, as they are the principal source of financing for small and medium-sized firms in Italy. Credit variables are suitable for the conjunctural analysis because they are released a few days after the reference month and they are not affected by huge historical revisions as the official estimates of many macroeconomic aggregates, notoriously. The real-time perspective helps to overcome the criticism by Gadea Rivas and Perez-Quiros (2015), who claim that all the research on the role of credit to predict macroeconomic fluctuations *does not take into account that recession dating is uncertain in real time*. The authors find that the contribution of credit to forecast turning points is distorted by the Great Recession, which explains most of the covariance between credit and economic aggregates.

We select 20 out of 100 series compiled among bank loans to non financial corporations and households, interests rates on deposits and loans in the interval January 1998 - December 2016; we use the quarterly growth rate of the GDP (at monthly frequency) as the target variable. As in Kim and Nelson (1998), we set up a factor model cast in state-space form with Markov switching to cope with the nonlinear evolution of the business cycle. The model is estimated by a multimove Gibbs sampling, which makes approximation-free inference for non-Gaussian and nonlinear state-space models feasible. As a benchmark, we take a model including only the industrial production index.

The in-sample results definitely bolster the coincident relationship between GDP and credit. The probabilities of recession obtained are consistent with GDP's dynamics and they are comparable to those estimated by the benchmark model. Also the composite coincident index fits well the cyclical phases of the Italian economy.

The real-time upshots are encouraging. The credit model fairly assigns the probability of being in a recession phase during the financial crisis and it works better than the benchmark on average. Most importantly, credit variables are more sensitive than the industrial production index to signal the negative turning points. The credit model struggles in the first part of teh sovereign-debt crisis; since the end of 2012 credit variables track the economic activity swings as well as the industrial production index. In the last period it works better than the benchmark to signal the recovery.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the long-standing debate over the relationship between credit and business cycle, going through the most seminal papers. Section 3 describes the information set. Section 4 presents the model. Section 5 reports the results and

section 6 concludes.

2   Literature review

The interplay between financial and business cycles has been long debated in the economic literature. Gertler (1988) surveys the milestones of the academic research from the 'money view' endorsed by Friedman and Schwartz (1963), who emphasize the role of money supply to explain the macroeconomic fluctuations, to the 'credit view', reignited in the seminal papers by Mishkin (1978) and Bernanke (1983), according to which the credit supply is a crucial force moving the economic aggregates and the financial disruption may dramatically affect the depth and the persistence of the recession. Bernanke and Gertler (1995) and Bernanke et al. (1999) investigate how frictions in credit markets may influence the monetary policy transmission by amplifying and propagating the conventional interest rate effect. Particular attention was devoted to the capacity of credit of sparking and prolonging economic recessions. In Kiyotaki and Moore (1997), endogenous credit constraints help to understand how relatively small and temporary shocks to technology or income distribution may trigger large and persistent fluctuations in output and how sector-specific shocks may spill over into the entire economy.

In the light of the last decade turmoils in the financial sector, this strand of literature addressing the relationship between credit and business cycle has been elaborated further. Adrian et al. (2012) document different stylized facts based on the evidence of the financial crisis 2007-09. They highlight that although bank lending to firms declines during the crisis, the increase of bond financing closes much of the gap. Then, in their model, real activity is affected more by risk premiums rather than from contraction in the total quantity of credit. Several authors argue that credit spread can be used as leading indicator of the business cycle (Stock and Watson, 1989). Guha and Hiris (2002) show that turning points of the long term credit spread can anticipate those of the business cycle. Gilchrist et al. (2009) show that shocks to corporate credit spreads account for a significant fraction of the variance in U.S. economic activity.

Schularick and Taylor (2012) use a very large dataset on 14 countries over 140 years to figure out whether credit booms could herald financial crisis; based on the same information set, Jordá et al. (2011) pin down the credit trend as a better predictor of financial instability than external imbalances. Dell'Ariccia and Garibaldi (2005) argue that a persistent credit contraction may have delayed the recovery after 1991 crisis; this point is also underlined in Reinhart and Rogoff (2009), who find that bank crisis materially affect the severity of employment and output decline. In Claessens et al. (2012) and Mendoza and Terrones (2008) credit crunches and house prices burst emerge as determinants of the severity and duration of recessions.

A number of paper stress the crucial role of household debt to shape the business cycle. Jordá et al. (2015) and Jordá et al. (2016) show that loose monetary conditions boosts the real estate lending and this may cause house prices bubbles and enhances the risk of financial crises, deeper recessions and slower recoveries. Furthermore, as shown by Mian et al. (2017) and Mian et al. (2013), the negative relationship between the change of households debt and GDP growth depends on both the level and the distribution of debt: the output decline is larger for higher levels of household debt, particularly in presence of tighter monetary constraints; shocks to the wealth of heterogeneous families, with different marginal propensity to consume out of housing wealth, can amplify aggregate dynamics.

Gadea Rivas and Perez-Quiros (2015) doubt the ability of credit variables to track the turning points of the economy effectively, being the relationship between business and credit cycle mostly affected by the the Great Recession. We propose a real-time exercise to overcome this criticism.

The role of the bank credit in macroeconomy is a particularly sensitive issue in Italy, because it is the main financing resource for business. De Bonis and Silvestrini (2014) propose an historical description of the Italian financial cycle over 150 years. Bartoletto et al. (2017) introduce a joint dating of both business and financial cycles, by using a dating algorithm à la Bry and Boschan (1971). In the same strand, Bulligan et al. (2019) employ univariate and multivariate trend-cycle decomposition based on unobserved component models to study the relationship between business and financial cycle. Our paper adds to this strand of literature by inspecting the relationship between business and financial cycles in 'normal' times other than during economic turmoils.

As stated in Burns and Mitchell (1946), the business cycle is characterized by both the co-movement among a number of macroeconomic variables and a nonlinear dynamics, depending on the states of the economy. However, these two features were usually addressed separately. It is worth mentioning the numerous contributions by Stock and Watson (1989, 1991, 1993), where the authors stress the first characteristic of the business cycle, by collapsing the information carried by a large dataset into few common factors. On the other side, Hamilton (1989) estimate a univariate model with regime-switching to take into account how the evolution of the business cycle depends on whether the economy is in an expansionary or contraction phase. Diebold and Rudebusch (1996) is one of the first attempt to model both comovement and nonlinearity jointly. They estimate a dynamic factor model with regime-switching by approximated maximum likelihood. An approximation-free inference is proposed by Kim and Nelson (1998), who run a multimove Gibbs sampling algorithm to estimate the model.

3 Data

We have scanned more than 100 monthly time series on bank credit, regarding both quantities and prices of loans to households (HHs, onward) and non-financial corporations (NFCs, onward). These variables come from two flows of data produced by the Bank of Italy for the ECB: the monetary and financial institutions interest rates and information on banks' balance sheets. We have selected $n = 20$ time series in the interval January 1998 - December 2016 (see Table 1 for a detailed description) on the basis of a descriptive inspection. These series constitute the information set of our 'credit' model; they are available 15 days after the reference period, far earlier than the official statistics on the main macroeconomic aggregates (the preliminary estimate of the GDP is released 30 days after the reference quarter; the first official estimate is published 60 days later than the end of the quarter[2]), and they provide a very reliable signal in real time. From Figure 1 we appreciate the strong relationship among bank interest rates and the quarterly growth rate of the GDP (q-o-q GDP), which is the target variable of the model; even before the global financial crisis they comove closely. Figure 2 shows as new financial transactions to households and firms – the flows of loans calculated by adjusting the changes in the stocks to take account of exchange rate fluctuations, value adjustments, reclassifications, and all other variations that do not originate from financial transactions – seem to anticipate the drop of GDP in the run-up to the global financial collapse. Some series underwent seasonal adjustment, by using seasonal dummies. It is the case of the new financial transactions to households and of the annualized agreed rate[3] on loans to households. Credit variables are often characterized by outliers, which can been pinned down straightfowardly because they are mainly caused by some technical or administrative innovations,[4] like the reorganisation of leading banking groups. We identify the outliers as those observations (centered with respect to the historical mean) greater than, at least, 1.5 the standard deviation, and they are replaced by the average of the neighbouring observations. Also using the series on the new financial transactions, instead of the stocks, helps us to smooth some of the numerous outliers recorded throughout the sample considered in the analysis.

The quarterly GDP is disaggregated at monthly frequencies by applying the Chow-Lin filter, based on the manufacturing Purchasing Manager Index (PMI) as regressor.[5]

---

[2]Before May 2018, the preliminary estimate of the GDP were issued 45 days later than the end of the quarter, while now it is published 30 days later.

[3]The annualized agreed rate is a measure of the interest rates which does not include commissions and other burdens.

[4]See the technical notes in the Statistical Report on Banks and Money, published monthly by the Bank of Italy `https://www.bancaditalia.it/pubblicazioni/moneta-banche/2017-moneta/en_BAM_note-met.pdf?language_id=1`.

[5]The Purchasing Manager Indexes are issued by Markit (`markit.com`).

Figure 1: Interest rates and GDP

Figure 2: Financial transactions and GDP

Table 1: Information set

Description	Treat.
Italy, Financial transactions, Loans, Households	out SA
Italy, Financial transactions, Loans, Non financial corporations	-
Italy, Outstanding amounts, Loans, Households	Δ out
Italy, Outstanding amounts, Lending for house purchase, Households	Δ out
Italy, Outstanding amounts, Credit consumption and other lending, Households	Δ out
Italy, Outstanding amounts, Deposit liabilities, Households	Δ out SA
Italy, Spread between 3-5y gross yield at issuance	-
Italy, Interest rate on stock, Revolving loans, overdrafts, credit cards, Households	Δ out SA
Italy, Interest rate on stock, Revolving loans, overdrafts, credit cards, Non financial corporations	Δ
Italy, Interest rate on stock, Total deposits, Households and Non financial corporations	Δ
Italy, Interest rate on stock, Overnight deposits, Households	Δ
Italy, Interest rate on stock, Overnight deposits, Non financial corporations	Δ
Italy, Interest rate on stock, Loans, Households	Δ
Italy, Interest rate on stock, Loans, Non financial corporations	Δ
Italy, Interest rate on stock, Lending for house purchase, Households	Δ
Italy, Interest rate on new business, Loans, Non financial corporations	Δ
Italy, Interest rate on new business, Lending for house purchase, Households corporations	Δ

SA=Seasonal adjustment; Δ = First difference; out = Outlier management.

4 The Model

We employ the dynamic factor model with Markov switching phases proposed by Kim and Nelson (1998). A large-scale multivariate model meets our scope of inspecting the ability of a number of credit variables to tracking the business cycle without impairing the efficiency of the estimates. Within our factor model, all the information is collapsed in one factor, which represents the business cycle.[6] More formally, the growth rate of the n observable indicators included in the model, ΔY_{it} for $i = 1, \ldots n$ and $t = 1, \ldots T$, is driven by an individual component, $D_i + e_{it}$ (where D_i represents the intercept), and by a common component ΔC_t. The latter can be interpreted as the cyclical component of the economic activity according to the definition of business cycle by Burns and Mitchell (1946). ΔC_t is a stationary and strongly autocorrelated process, which can be correctly fitted by an AR(1) model with a long-term average split into two components: δ, which is constant over time, and μ_{S_t}, which varies depending on the state of the economy, S_t.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta Y_{it} &= \lambda_i(L)\Delta C_t + D_i + e_{it} & (1) \\
\Phi(L)(\Delta C_t - \mu_{S_t} - \delta) &= v_t, \quad v_t \sim iidN(0,1) & (2) \\
\Psi_i(L)e_{it} &= \epsilon_{it}, \quad \epsilon_{it} \sim iidN(0, \sigma_i^2) & (3)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\mu_{S_t} = \mu_0 + \mu_1 S_t, \quad \mu_1 > 1, \quad S_t = \begin{cases} 0, \text{if recession} \\ 1, \text{if expansion} \end{cases} \tag{4}
$$

The Markov process is appropriate to shape the non linear evolution of the business cycle, characterized by expansionary and recessionary phases:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Pr\left[S_t = 1 | S_{t-1} = 1\right] &= p \\
Pr\left[S_t = 0 | S_{t-1} = 0\right] &= q
\end{aligned} \tag{5}
$$

Due to nonlinearity, the estimation of the model is performed by using a Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm (MCMC onward). After setting up some priors about the starting values of the processes ΔC_t and S_t as well as the paramenters, we first generate the entire process of the cyclical component ΔC_t. Based on this estimate, we generate the regimes S_t and finally the parameters. More specifically, we use a multi-move Gibbs sampling introduced by Carter and Kohn (1994).[7] The sampler takes just 1000 replications to converge (see Figure A.3.1 in the Appendix). The first 20% draws are discared to obtain stable estimates. Finally, we construct a composite coincident index, which fits the cyclical phases of the Italian economy.[8]

---

[6]When we handle macroeconomic data, the first factor is likely to represent the business cycle because it explains a significant portion of the covariance among the original variables.

[7]The Gibbs sampling is an MCMC algorithm used to approximate the joint distributions by sampling from the conditional distributions and then sparing cumbersome calculations. The multimove Gibbs sampler generates the whole vectors $\Delta \tilde{C}_T = [\Delta C_1, \ldots, \Delta C_T]$ and $\tilde{S}_T = [S_1, \ldots, S_T]$, gaining in computational efficiency and faster convergence than the single-move algorithm, which generates one element at time.

[8]See the Appendix for all the technical details.

5 Results

Our credit model is compared with a benchmark model including only GDP as target and the industrial production index as exogenous variable (IP model, onward). The latter is one of the most important indicator currently used in the real-time assessment of the economic activity, especially in Italy, which is the second manufacturing engine of euro area.

We carried out an in-sample analysis, on the time interval from January 1998 to December 2016, to figure out how well credit variables fit the business cycle. We also simulated an out-of-sample estimation of the model to investigate to what extent the criticism by Gadea Rivas and Perez-Quiros (2015) could be overcome. We used an expanding window and the first estimation sample spans 7 years, from January 1998 to January 2006 while the last sample goes up to December 2016. The last available vintage of data is cut month-by-month, being careful to replace the pattern of missing values at the end of the sample.[9]

Table 2 reports the prior and the posterior distributions of a selection of parameters from the in-sample exercise.[10] We use noninformative priors for p and q (both set to 0.5), which imply a duration of expansions and recessions equal to two months.[11] μ_0 and μ_1 turn out to be significantly different from zero and this result bolsters the definition by Burns and Mitchell (1946) of the business cycle as characterized by two different phases.

Table 2: Bayesian prior and posterior distributions

Parameter	Prior Distribution		Posterior Distribution				
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Median	5%	95%
p	0.5	0.289	0.716	0.230	0.832	0.207	0.912
q	0.5	0.289	0.706	0.091	0.702	0.559	0.868
ϕ_1	0.0	1.000	0.916	0.007	0.917	0.904	0.928
μ_0	0.0	1.000	-0.797	1.037	-0.713	-2.602	0.867
μ_1	0.0	1.000	1.299	0.639	1.280	0.217	2.407

Results from in-sample exercise are clear-cut in favor of the role of credit variables to tracking the business cycle. Figure 3 shows the probabilities of recession (grey bars) estimated by the credit model for each month compared with the monthly growth rate of the GDP. Our model correctly assigns high probability to the event 'recession' when the economy actually undergoes a downturn. Credit turns out to be a good competitor of IP to pin down the contraction of activity as displayed in Figure 4. This also shows the recessionary phases (shadowed areas) to prove the reliability of our results compared to the chronology of the business cycle.[12] In the run-up to all the economic

---

[9]As a matter of fact, only GDP and IP have missing values at the end of the sample because they are released 30 days and 45 days lather than the reference period unlike the credit variables, which are available just 15 days belatedly. GDP (after being converted in monthly frequency by Chow-Lin based on the manufacturing PMI) and IP are projected up to the nowcasting date by an autoregressive model.

[10]For the sake of simplicity, we do not report the statistics relative to the autoregressive polynomial $\Psi_i(L)$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. They are available upon request.

[11]Let p be the probability of being in expansion between $t-1$ and t, the expected duration of the positive cyclical phase is given by $\frac{1}{1-p}$.

[12]The official dating provided by the National Institute of Statistics in the Annual Report issued in 2010 was reviewed to take into account the historical revisions of GDP estimates occured in the meanwhile. Furthermore, we also considered the tecnical recessions, defined as two straight quarters of negative growth.

turmoils depicted in the figure, credit seems to be more sensitive than IP to herald the decline of the GDP. In 2001.Q2, the credit model assigned probability 0.91 in June to the contraction of the GDP instead of 0.80 estimated by the IP model; in 2003.Q1, based on credit we would have bet 0.77 on the decline of the GDP, while the IP model indicated 0.59. The other way round, credit model corrected downward the probability of recession more quckly than the IP model on October and November 2003, when the Italian economy started recovering. Credit variables did better than IP in signaling the storm looming on the economy in the run-up to the financial crisis. Credit model also estimated a 50% lower probability of recession between July 2009 and June 2011, when the headwinds faded. In the summer 2011, credit model assigned a higher probability to recession than the benchmark model, when Italian GDP slowed down markedly. In the wake of the sovereign-debt crisis, credit variables were more effective than IP to depict the recovery: between Januay 2015 and December 2016, credit model assigned on average 30% lower probability to the event 'recession' than IP model.

The coincident composite index (see Figure 5) is consistent with the cyclical phases of the Italian economy.

Figure 3: Probability of recession (grey bars; left side axis) and monthly GDP growth (blue line; right side axis)

Figure 4: Probability of recession estimated by credit (red bars) and by IP (black bars) on the left side axis; monthly GDP growth (red dots; right side axis); recession phases (shadowed area)

Figure 5: Composite Coincident Indicator (red line); recession phases (shadowed area)

In real time the results are generally still encouraging. Credit variables are more responsive than IP to signalling the start of the global financial crisis. In the two monts April-May of 2007 (the starting date of the negative turning point), credit model assigned to recession a probability of 0.71 against 0.54 estimated by IP model (see Figure 6). Credit model struggles to track the sovereign-debt crisis, in particular during the first phase of the downturn while IP model gives a more stable signal of recession. Starting from the end of 2012, credit model catches up with IP one throughout the European crisis (see Figure 7). In the first quarter of 2015 credit model on average beats benchmark to signal the recovery. If we exlude the third quarter, when GDP actually stagnated and credit model correctly signalled a higher risk of recession than IP model, credit variables did better than IP to track the positive path of the economy since January 2015 up to the end of the sample (December 2016) as shown in Figure 8. These results, notably during the financial crisis, answer the criticism by Gadea Rivas and Perez-Quiros (2015). The real-time simulation shows that the credit variables do not need to take advantage of the entire span of information to track the business cycle but as news pile up month by month, they grasp an approaching turning point correctly.

Figure 6: Probability of recession estimated by credit (red bars) and by IP (black bars): global financial crisis

Figure 7: Probability of recession estimated by credit (red bars) and by IP (black bars): sovereign debt crisis


Figure 8: Probability of recession estimated by credit (red bars) and by IP (black bars): recovery

In Table 3 we present the relative Brier score (BS onward) of the two competing models.[13] In-sample results show that the credit model outperforms the IP model throughout all the cyclical phases of the Italian economy (pinned down as explained in the footnote 12), showing a 34% lower BS. The credit variables are 30% better than IP to catch the negative quarterly variation of GDP, irrespective of whether the latter reflects a recession or a temporary halt. The credit model performs 56% better than the IP model to estimating the probability of recession during the sovereign-debt crisis and it works better also during the following recovery. In real time, overall credit model is still well performing during financial crisis and the most recent recovery while it turns out to be less reliable than IP to track the sovereign-debt crisis and the downturns of GDP.[14]

Table 3: Relative Brier score

	$\frac{\text{Credit model}}{\text{IP model}}$	
	In-sample	Real-time
Cyclical phases	0.66	- -
Negative q-o-q GDP	0.70	1.43
Financial crisis	0.88	0.95
Sovereign-debt crisis	0.44	2.32
Recovery since January 2016	0.75	0.93

---

[13]The relative BS is the ratio between BS of the credit model and BS of the IP model. Therefore, the closer to 0 the relative BS is, the better the credit model performs.

[14]The real-time simulation starts from January 2006, therefore it is not possible to calculate BS for the cyclical phases and the BS corresponding to negative GDP growth does not cover the same period of the in-sample simulation.

6 Conclusions

We compiled many credit variables from banks' balance sheet and from the flow of data on monetary and financial institutions interest rates, including (various measures of) loans to the private sector and interest rates on loans. Then we set up a large-scale dynamic factor model cast in state-space form with Markov switching governing the transition between expansion and recession.

Based on our analysis, bank credit helps tracking the business cycle in Italy. In-sample estimates provide strong evidence of the ability of credit variables to detect the turning points and to correctly estimate the probability of recession. Their performance is comparable to that of IP, which is one of the most important indicators for the real time analysis of the state of the economy. As a matter of fact, credit seems to be more sensitive than IP to signal whether the economy is approaching a turning point. In the run-up to the economic crisis in the last decade credit model put on average an higer probability on the event 'recession' than the IP model and it signalled fairly better the following recoveries. We implicitly obtained a composite coincident index that fits well the Italian cyclical phases.

Also in real time results are encouraging. Credit model performs well during the global financial turmoil but fails to track the sovereign debt crisis especially in the first phase of the economic downturn while since the end of 2012 credit catches up with IP in signaling the contraction of GDP. In the aftermath of the most recent crisis, credit variables outperform IP by assigning on average lower probabilities to the downturn.

These results are consistent with the central role of bank credit in the financing of the private sector (both firms and households) for the Italian economy. Our results may have relevant implications for conjuctural analysis, as information on loans and interest rates is available with a short delay and are subject to small revisions unlike the most part of the macroeconomic indicators.

These encouraging results pave the way to an extension of the analysis to euro area and its major countries. There is room to improve the real-time upshots by investigating which credit variables weaken the overall performance of the credit model during the sovereign debt crisis.

Appendix A

A.1 Model setting

For identification purposes, all the variables are expressed as deviation from mean, i.e. $\Delta y_{it} = Y_{it} - \Delta \bar{Y}_i$ and $\Delta c_t = \Delta C_t - \delta$. The suitable transformation $\Psi_i(L)\Delta y_{it} = \Delta y_{it}^* = \lambda_i(L)\Psi_i(L)\Delta c_t + \epsilon_{it}$ is adopted to simplify the calculations; both the common and the idiosyncratic components are assumed to follow an AR(1) process and $\lambda_i(L) = \lambda_i$. The model is cast in state-space form:

$$\Delta y_t^* = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & -\lambda_1\psi_{11} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \lambda_n & -\lambda_n\psi_{n1} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \Delta c_t \\ \Delta c_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{1t} \\ \vdots \\ \epsilon_{nt} \end{bmatrix} \tag{A.1.1}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta c_t \\ \Delta c_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi(L)\mu_{S_t} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} \Delta c_{t-1} \\ \Delta c_{t-2} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} v_t \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{A.1.2}$$

A.2 Gibbs sampling

Nonlinearity due to unobservable states in the transition equation (A.1.2) impedes the application of the Gaussian Kalman filter for the estimation. Therefore, we run the multimove Gibbs sampling algorithm introduced by Carter and Kohn (1994).[15]

Let us illustrate the notation. The subscript $t|t$ indicates the estimate made at time t by using the information up to time t while $x_{t|t,x_{t+1}}$ indicates that the estimate of x_t has been updated by combining the information contained in $x_{t|t}$ and that contained in the generated x_{t+1}.

A.2.1 Generation of the cyclical component

We generate the path of the cyclical component $\Delta\tilde{c}_T = [\Delta c_1, \ldots, \Delta c_T]$ from its posterior distribution:

$$p(\Delta\tilde{c}_T|\Delta\tilde{y}_T^*) = p(\Delta c_T|\Delta\tilde{y}_T^*)\prod_{t=1}^{T-1} p(\Delta c_t|\Delta\tilde{y}_t^*, \Delta c_{t+1}) \tag{A.2.1}$$

with

$$\Delta c_T|\Delta\tilde{y}_T^* \sim N(\Delta c_{T|T}, P_{T|T}) \tag{A.2.2}$$

$$\Delta c_t|\Delta\tilde{y}_t^*, \Delta c_{t+1} \sim N(\Delta c_{t|t,\Delta c_{t+1}}, P_{t|t,\Delta c_{t+1}}), \quad t = T-1, \ldots, 1 \tag{A.2.3}$$

where $\Delta c_{T|T} = E(\Delta c_T|\tilde{y}_T^*)$, $P_{T|T} = Cov(\Delta c_T|\tilde{y}_T^*)$, $\Delta c_{t|t,\Delta c_{t+1}} = E(\Delta c_t|\Delta c_{t|t}, \Delta c_{t+1})$ and $P_{t|t,\Delta c_{t+1}} = Cov(\Delta c_t|\Delta c_{t|t}, \Delta c_{t+1})$. These objects are obtained by the Kalman recursions. The updating equation of the Kalman filter produces $\Delta c_{t|t}$ and $P_{t|t}$ for $t = 1, \ldots, T$ and we use the last iteration to generate Δc_T from equation (A.2.2). For $T = T-1, \ldots, 1$ it is straightforward to generate Δc_t from equation (A.2.3) given

$$\Delta c_{t|t,\Delta c_{t+1}} = \Delta c_{t|t} + P_{t|t}[\phi_1 \quad 0]\eta_t/R_t$$

$$P_{t|t,\Delta c_{t+1}} = P_{t|t} - P_{t|t}[\phi_1 \quad 0]'[\phi_1 \quad 0]P_{t|t}/R_t$$

where $\eta_{t+1|t} = \Delta c_{t+1} - \Phi(L)\mu_{S_{t+1}} - [\phi_1 \quad 0]\Delta c_{t|t}$ and $R_t = [\phi_1 \quad 0]P_{t|t}[\phi_1 \quad 0]' + var(v_t)$.

---

[15]As for ψ_i plotted in Figure A.3.1, it corresponds to the GDP.

A.2.2 Generation of the regimes

Once $\Delta\tilde{c}_T$ has been obtained, we generate the path of the Markow switching indicators $\tilde{S}_T = [S_1, \ldots, S_T]$ from the following posterior distribution:

$$p(\tilde{S}_T | \Delta\tilde{c}_T) = p(S_T | \Delta\tilde{c}_T) \prod_{t=1}^{T-1} p(S_t | \Delta\tilde{c}_t, S_{t+1}) \tag{A.2.4}$$

The Hamilton (1989) filter produces $p(S_t | \Delta\tilde{c}_t)$ for $t = 1, \ldots, T$. The last iteration of the filter is used to sample S_T. The result

$$p(S_t | \Delta\tilde{c}_t, S_{t+1}) = \frac{p(S_{t+1} | S_t) p(S_t | \Delta\tilde{c}_t)}{p(S_{t+1} | \Delta\tilde{c}_t)}$$

is used to generate S_t for $T = T - 1, \ldots, 1$. We firstly calculate $p(S_t = 1 | \Delta\tilde{c}_t, S_{t+1})$ and then we compare it with a random number α from a uniform distribution on the interval $[0, 1]$. If the latter is less than or equal to the former, then we set $S_t = 1$ and viceversa.

A.2.3 Generation of the parameters

Within the Bayesian framework the parameters are treated as random variables. Then, we draw them from their posterior distributions. The parameters λ_i for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, which load the common cyclical component in the state equation (A.1.1), are sampled from

$$\lambda_i \sim N\Big((A_i^{-1} + \sigma_i^{-2}\Delta\tilde{C}^{*'}\Delta\tilde{C}^*)^{-1}(A_i^{-1}a_i + \sigma_i^{-2}\Delta\tilde{C}^{*'}\Delta\tilde{y}_i^*),$$
$$(A_i^{-1} + \sigma_i^{-2}\Delta\tilde{C}^{*'}\Delta\tilde{C}^*)^{-1}\Big)$$

with prior $\lambda_i \sim N(a_i, A_i)$ and

$$\Delta\tilde{C}^* = \psi_i(L)[\Delta c_t]_{t=1,\ldots,T}$$
$$\Delta\tilde{y}_i^* = \psi_i(L)[\Delta y_{it}]_{t=1,\ldots,T}$$

The parameters $\tilde{\psi}_i = \psi_{i1}$, associated with the AR(1) process of the idiosyncratic component, are sampled from

$$\tilde{\psi}_i \sim N\Big((\Pi_i^{-1} + \sigma_i^{-2}\tilde{X}'\tilde{X})^{-1}(\Pi_i^{-1}\pi_i + \sigma_i^{-2}\tilde{X}'\tilde{Z}),$$
$$(\Pi_i^{-1} + \sigma_i^{-2}\tilde{X}'\tilde{X})^{-1}\Big)$$

with prior $\tilde{\psi}_i \sim N(\pi_i, \Pi_i)$ and

$$Z_t = \Delta y_{it} - \lambda_i\Delta c_t$$
$$\tilde{Z} = [Z_t]_{t=1,\ldots,T}$$
$$\tilde{X} = [\psi_{i1}Z_{t-1}]_{t=1,\ldots,T, i=1,\ldots n}$$

The variance of the idiosyncratic component, σ_i^2, is drawn from the inverted gamma distribution

$$\sigma_i^2 \sim IG\left(\frac{v_i + T}{2}, \frac{f_i}{2} + \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{Z} - \tilde{X}\tilde{\psi}_i)'(\tilde{Z} - \tilde{X}\tilde{\psi}_i)\right)$$

with prior $\sigma_i \sim IG(\frac{v_i}{2}, \frac{f_i}{2})$.

The parameters $\tilde{\phi} = \phi_1$, associated with the AR(1) process of the common component, are sampled from

$$\tilde{\phi} \sim N\left((A^{-1} + \tilde{Q}'\tilde{Q})^{-1}(A^{-1}\alpha + \tilde{Q}'\tilde{G}),\right.$$
$$\left.(A^{-1} + \tilde{Q}'\tilde{Q})^{-1}\right)$$

with prior $\tilde{\phi} \sim N(\alpha, A)$ and

$$\tilde{G} = [\Delta c_t - \mu_{S_t}]_{t=1,\dots,T}$$
$$\tilde{Q} = [\phi_1(\Delta c_{t-1} - \mu_{S_{t-1}})]_{t=1,\dots,T}$$

The parameters $\tilde{\mu} = [\mu_0^*, \mu_1]$, which represent the means of the common components depending on the state of the economy, are drawn from

$$\tilde{\mu} \sim N\left((A^{*-1} + \tilde{Q}^{*'}\tilde{Q}^*)^{-1}(A^{*-1}\alpha^* + \tilde{Q}^{*'}\tilde{G}^*),\right.$$
$$\left.(A^{*-1} + \tilde{Q}^{*'}\tilde{Q}^*)^{-1}\right)_{[I_{\mu_1>0}]}$$

with prior $\tilde{\mu} \sim N(\alpha^*, A^*)_{[I_{\mu_1>0}]}$ and

$$\tilde{G}^* = [\Delta c_t - \phi_1\Delta c_{t-1}]_{t=1,\dots,T}$$
$$\tilde{Q}^* = [\mu_1(S_t - \phi_1 S_{t-1})]_{t=1,\dots,T}$$
$$\mu_0^* = \mu_0(1 - \phi_1)$$

Finally, the transition probabilities, p and q, are sampled from the beta distributions

$$q|\tilde{S}_T \sim \beta(u_{00} + n_{00}, u_{01} + n_{01})$$
$$p|\tilde{S}_T \sim \beta(u_{11} + n_{11}, u_{10} + n_{10})$$

where n_{ij} indicates the number of transitions from state $S_{t-1} = i$ to state $S_t = j$, for $i, j = 0, 1$ and $u_{00}, u_{01}, u_{11}, u_{10}$ are known (uninformative) priors.

A.2.4   The Composite Coincident Index

It is straightforward calculating the composite coincident index, C_t for $t = 1, \dots, T$, after having set the starting point C_0 and the mean of Y_i due to the common component, δ:

$$\delta = E_1'[I_k - (I_k - K^*H)F]^{-1}K^*\Delta\bar{Y} \tag{A.2.5}$$

where $\Delta \bar{Y} = [\Delta \bar{Y}_i \ldots \Delta \bar{Y}_n]$, $E_1' = [1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \ldots \quad 0]$ is a selection matrix, K^* is the steady-state Kalman gain and k is the dimension of F

$$
F = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \psi_{11} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \psi_{n1} \end{bmatrix}
\tag{A.2.6}
$$

The composite coincident index is therefore

$$
C_t = \Delta c_t + C_{t-1} + \delta, \quad t = 1, \ldots, T
\tag{A.2.7}
$$

A.3 Convergence of the Gibbs sampling

As shown in Figure A.3.1, the sampler converges very quckly as claimed in Carter and Kohn (1994). A burn-in period of 20% is enough to obtain stable estimates.

Figure A.3.1: Sampler convergence: generated values of parameters

References

Adrian, T., Colla, P. and Shin, H. S. (2012). 'Which Financial Frictions? Parsing the Evidence from the Financial Crisis of 2007 to 2009', *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 159–214.

Bartoletto, S., Chiarini, B., Marzano, E. and Piselli, P. (2017). 'Business Cycles, Credit Cycles, and Bank Holdings of Sovereign Bonds: Historical Evidence for Italy 1861-2013', CESifo Working Papers, No. 5318, CESifo.

Bernanke, B. S. (1983). 'Nonmonetary Effects of the Financial Crisis in the Propagation of the Great Depression', *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 73, No. 3, pp. 257–276.

Bernanke, B. S. and Gertler, M. (1995). 'Inside the Black Box: The Credit Channel of Monetary Policy Transmission', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 27–48.

Bernanke, B. S., Gertler, M. and Gilchrist, S. (1999). The Financial Accelerator in a Quantitative Business Cycle Framework, *in* J. B. Taylor and M. Woodford (eds), *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, Vol. 1C, pp. 1341–1393.

Bry, G. and Boschan, C. (1971). 'Cyclical Analysis of Economic Time Series: Selected Procedures and Computer Programs', NBER Technical Working Paper, No. 20, NBER.

Bulligan, G., Burlon, L., Delle Monache, D. and Silvestrini, A. (2019). 'Real and Financial Cycles: Estimates with Unobserved Component Models for the Italian Economy', *Statistical Methods and Applications*, Vol. fothcoming.

Burns, A. F. and Mitchell, W. C. (1946). Measuring Business Cycles, New York, NBER.

Carter, C. K. and Kohn, P. (1994). 'On Gibbs Sampling for State Space Models', *Biometrica*, Vol. 81, No. 3, pp. 541–553.

Claessens, S., Kose, M. A. and Terrones, M. E. (2012). 'How Do Business and Financial Cycles Interact?', *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 87, No. 1, pp. 178–190.

De Bonis, R. and Silvestrini, A. (2014). 'The Italian financial cycle: 1861-2011', *Cliometrica*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 301–334.

Dell'Ariccia, G. and Garibaldi, P. (2005). 'Gross Credit Flows', *The Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 72, No. 2, pp. 665–685.

Diebold, F. X. and Rudebusch, G. D. (1996). 'Measuring Business Cycles: A Modern Perspective', *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 78, No. 1, pp. 66–77.

Friedman, M. and Schwartz, A. J. (1963). A Monetary History of the United States, 1867-1960, Princeton University Press.

Gadea Rivas, M. D. and Perez-Quiros, G. (2015). 'The Failure to Predict Great Recession - A View through the Role of Credit', *Journal of European Economic Association*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 534–559.

Gertler, M. (1988). 'Financial Structure and Aggregate Economic Activity: An Overview', *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, Vol. 20, No. 3, Part 2: Recent Developments in Macroeconomics, pp. 559–588.

Gilchrist, S., Yankov, V. and Zakrajsek, E. (2009). 'Credit market Shocks and Economic Fluctuations: Evidence from Corporate Bond and Stock Markets', *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 56, No. 4, pp. 471–493.

Guha, D. and Hiris, L. (2002). 'The Aggregate Credit Spread and the Business Cycle', *International Review of Financial Analysis*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 219–227.

Hamilton, J. (1989). 'A New Approach to the Economic Analysis of Nonstationarity Time Series and the Business Cycle', *Econometrica*, Vol. 57, No. 2, pp. 357–384.

Jordá, O., Schularick, M. and Taylor, A. M. (2011). 'Financial Crises, Credit Booms, and External Imbalances: 140 Years of Lessons', *IMF Economic Review*, Vol. 59, No. 2, pp. 340–378.

Jordá, O., Schularick, M. and Taylor, A. M. (2015). 'Betting the House', *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 96, No. S1, pp. S2–S18.

Jordá, O., Schularick, M. and Taylor, A. M. (2016). 'The Great Mortgaging: Housing Finance, Crises and Business Cycles', *Economic Policy*, Vol. 31, No. 85, pp. 107–152.

Kim, C.-J. and Nelson, C. R. (1998). 'Business Cycle Turning Points, a New Coincident Index, and Tests of Duration Dependence based on a Dynamic Factor Model with Regime Switching', *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 80, No. 2, pp. 188–201.

Kiyotaki, N. and Moore, J. (1997). 'Credit Cycles', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 105, No. 2, pp. 211–248.

Mendoza, E. G. and Terrones, M. E. (2008). 'An Anatomy Of Credit Booms: Evidence From Macro Aggregates And Micro Data', NBER Working Paper, No. 14049, NBER.

Mian, A., Rao, K. and Sufi, A. (2013). 'Household Balance Sheets, Consumption, and the Economic Slump', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 128, No. 4, pp. 1687–1726.

Mian, A., Sufi, A. and Verner, E. (2017). 'Household Debt and Business Cycles Worldwide', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 1755–1817.

Mishkin, F. (1978). 'The Household Balance Sheet and the Great Depression', *The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 918–937.

Reinhart, C. M. and Rogoff, K. S. (2009). 'The Aftermath of Financial Crises', *American Economic Review*, Vol. 99, No. 2, pp. 466–472.

Schularick, M. and Taylor, A. M. (2012). 'Credit Booms Gone Bust: Monetary Policy, Leverage Cycles, and Financial Crises, 1870-2008', *American Economic Review*, Vol. 102, No. 2, pp. 1029–1061.

Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (1989). 'New Indexes of Coincident and Leading Indicators', *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, Vol. 4, pp. 351–394.

Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (1991). A Probability Model of the Coincident Economic Indicators, *in* K. Lahiri and G. H. Moore (eds), *Leading Economic Indicators: New Approaches and Forecasting Records*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 63–90.

Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (1993). A Procedure for Predicting Recessions with Leading Indicators: Econometric Issues and Recent Experience, *in* J. H. Stock and M. W. Watson (eds), *Business Cycle, Indicators and Forecasting*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press for NBER, pp. 255–284.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED "TEMI" (*)

N. 1208 – *The Economic Effects of Big Events: Evidence from the Great Jubilee 2000 in Rome*, by Raffaello Bronzini, Sauro Mocetti and Matteo Mongardini (February 2019).

N. 1209 – *The added value of more accurate predictions for school rankings*, by Fritz Schiltz, Paolo Sestito, Tommaso Agasisti and Kristof De Witte (February 2019).

N. 1210 – *Identification and estimation of triangular models with a binary treatment*, by Santiago Pereda Fernández (March 2019).

N. 1211 – *U.S. shale producers: a case of dynamic risk management*, by Fabrizio Ferriani and Giovanni Veronese (March 2019).

N. 1212 – *Bank resolution and public backstop in an asymmetric banking union*, by Anatoli Segura Velez (March 2019).

N. 1213 – *A regression discontinuity design for categorical ordered running variables with an application to central bank purchases of corporate bonds*, by Fan Li, Andrea Mercatanti, Taneli Mäkinen and Andrea Silvestrini (March 2019).

N. 1214 – *Anything new in town? The local effects of urban regeneration policies in Italy*, by Giuseppe Albanese, Emanuele Ciani and Guido de Blasio (April 2019).

N. 1215 – *Risk premium in the era of shale oil*, by Fabrizio Ferriani, Filippo Natoli, Giovanni Veronese and Federica Zeni (April 2019).

N. 1216 – *Safety traps, liquidity and information-sensitive assets*, by Michele Loberto (April 2019).

N. 1217 – *Does trust among banks matter for bilateral trade? Evidence from shocks in the interbank market*, by Silvia Del Prete and Stefano Federico (April 2019).

N. 1218 – *Monetary policy, firms' inflation expectations and prices: causal evidence from firm-level data*, by Marco Bottone and Alfonso Rosolia (April 2019).

N. 1219 – *Inflation expectations and firms' decisions: new causal evidence*, by Olivier Coibion, Yuriy Gorodnichenko and Tiziano Ropele (April 2019).

N. 1220 – *Credit risk-taking and maturity mismatch: the role of the yield curve*, by Giuseppe Ferrero, Andrea Nobili and Gabriele Sene (April 2019).

N. 1221 – *Big-city life (dis)satisfaction? The effect of living in urban areas on subjective well-being*, by David Loschiavo (June 2019).

N. 1222 – *Urban agglomerations and firm access to credit*, by Amanda Carmignani, Guido de Blasio, Cristina Demma and Alessio D'Ignazio (June 2019).

N. 1223 – *The international transmission of US tax shocks: a proxy-SVAR approach*, by Luca Metelli and Filippo Natoli (June 2019).

N. 1224 – *Forecasting inflation in the euro area: countries matter!*, by Angela Capolongo and Claudia Pacella (June 2019).

N. 1225 – *Domestic and global determinants of inflation: evidence from expectile regression*, by Fabio Busetti, Michele Caivano and Davide Delle Monache (June 2019).

N. 1226 – *Relative price dynamics in the Euro area: where do we stand?*, by Pietro Cova and Lisa Rodano (June 2019).

N. 1227 – *Optimally solving banks' legacy problems*, by Anatoli Segura and Javier Suarez (June 2019).

2017

AABERGE, R., F. BOURGUIGNON, A. BRANDOLINI, F. FERREIRA, J. GORNICK, J. HILLS, M. JÄNTTI, S. JENKINS, J. MICKLEWRIGHT, E. MARLIER, B. NOLAN, T. PIKETTY, W. RADERMACHER, T. SMEEDING, N. STERN, J. STIGLITZ, H. SUTHERLAND, *Tony Atkinson and his legacy,* Review of Income and Wealth, v. 63, 3, pp. 411-444, **WP 1138 (September 2017).**

ACCETTURO A., M. BUGAMELLI and A. LAMORGESE, *Law enforcement and political participation: Italy 1861-65,* Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, v. 140, pp. 224-245, **WP 1124 (July 2017).**

ADAMOPOULOU A. and G.M. TANZI, *Academic dropout and the great recession,* Journal of Human Capital, V. 11, 1, pp. 35–71, **WP 970 (October 2014).**

ALBERTAZZI U., M. BOTTERO and G. SENE, *Information externalities in the credit market and the spell of credit rationing,* Journal of Financial Intermediation, v. 30, pp. 61–70, **WP 980 (November 2014).**

ALESSANDRI P. and H. MUMTAZ, *Financial indicators and density forecasts for US output and inflation,* Review of Economic Dynamics, v. 24, pp. 66-78, **WP 977 (November 2014).**

BARBIERI G., C. ROSSETTI and P. SESTITO, *Teacher motivation and student learning,* Politica economica/Journal of Economic Policy, v. 33, 1, pp.59-72, **WP 761 (June 2010).**

BENTIVOGLI C. and M. LITTERIO, *Foreign ownership and performance: evidence from a panel of Italian firms,* International Journal of the Economics of Business, v. 24, 3, pp. 251-273, **WP 1085 (October 2016).**

BRONZINI R. and A. D'IGNAZIO, *Bank internationalisation and firm exports: evidence from matched firm-bank data,* Review of International Economics, v. 25, 3, pp. 476-499 **WP 1055 (March 2016).**

BRUCHE M. and A. SEGURA, *Debt maturity and the liquidity of secondary debt markets,* Journal of Financial Economics, v. 124, 3, pp. 599-613, **WP 1049 (January 2016).**

BURLON L., *Public expenditure distribution, voting, and growth,* Journal of Public Economic Theory,, v. 19, 4, pp. 789–810, **WP 961 (April 2014).**

BURLON L., A. GERALI, A. NOTARPIETRO and M. PISANI, *Macroeconomic effectiveness of non-standard monetary policy and early exit. a model-based evaluation,* International Finance, v. 20, 2, pp.155-173, **WP 1074 (July 2016).**

BUSETTI F., *Quantile aggregation of density forecasts,* Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, v. 79, 4, pp. 495-512, **WP 979 (November 2014).**

CESARONI T. and S. IEZZI, *The predictive content of business survey indicators: evidence from SIGE,* Journal of Business Cycle Research, v.13, 1, pp 75–104, **WP 1031 (October 2015).**

CONTI P., D. MARELLA and A. NERI, *Statistical matching and uncertainty analysis in combining household income and expenditure data,* Statistical Methods & Applications, v. 26, 3, pp 485–505, **WP 1018 (July 2015).**

D'AMURI F., *Monitoring and disincentives in containing paid sick leave,* Labour Economics, v. 49, pp. 74-83, **WP 787 (January 2011).**

D'AMURI F. and J. MARCUCCI, *The predictive power of google searches in forecasting unemployment,* International Journal of Forecasting, v. 33, 4, pp. 801-816, **WP 891 (November 2012).**

DE BLASIO G. and S. POY, *The impact of local minimum wages on employment: evidence from Italy in the 1950s,* Journal of Regional Science, v. 57, 1, pp. 48-74, **WP 953 (March 2014).**

DEL GIOVANE P., A. NOBILI and F. M. SIGNORETTI, *Assessing the sources of credit supply tightening: was the sovereign debt crisis different from Lehman?,* International Journal of Central Banking, v. 13, 2, pp. 197-234, **WP 942 (November 2013).**

DEL PRETE S., M. PAGNINI, P. ROSSI and V. VACCA, *Lending organization and credit supply during the 2008–2009 crisis,* Economic Notes, v. 46, 2, pp. 207–236, **WP 1108 (April 2017).**

DELLE MONACHE D. and I. PETRELLA, *Adaptive models and heavy tails with an application to inflation forecasting,* International Journal of Forecasting, v. 33, 2, pp. 482-501, **WP 1052 (March 2016).**

FEDERICO S. and E. TOSTI, *Exporters and importers of services: firm-level evidence on Italy,* The World Economy, v. 40, 10, pp. 2078-2096, **WP 877 (September 2012).**

GIACOMELLI S. and C. MENON, *Does weak contract enforcement affect firm size? Evidence from the neighbour's court,* Journal of Economic Geography, v. 17, 6, pp. 1251-1282, **WP 898 (January 2013).**

LOBERTO M. and C. PERRICONE, *Does trend inflation make a difference?,* Economic Modelling, v. 61, pp. 351–375, **WP 1033 (October 2015).**

MANCINI A.L., C. MONFARDINI and S. PASQUA, *Is a good example the best sermon? Children's imitation of parental reading,* Review of Economics of the Household, v. 15, 3, pp 965–993, **WP No. 958 (April 2014).**

MEEKS R., B. NELSON and P. ALESSANDRI, *Shadow banks and macroeconomic instability,* Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, v. 49, 7, pp. 1483–1516, **WP 939 (November 2013).**

MICUCCI G. and P. ROSSI, *Debt restructuring and the role of banks' organizational structure and lending technologies,* Journal of Financial Services Research, v. 51, 3, pp 339–361, **WP 763 (June 2010).**

MOCETTI S., M. PAGNINI and E. SETTE, *Information technology and banking organization,* Journal of Journal of Financial Services Research, v. 51, pp. 313-338, **WP 752 (March 2010).**

MOCETTI S. and E. VIVIANO, *Looking behind mortgage delinquencies,* Journal of Banking & Finance, v. 75, pp. 53-63, **WP 999 (January 2015).**

NOBILI A. and F. ZOLLINO, *A structural model for the housing and credit market in Italy,* Journal of Housing Economics, v. 36, pp. 73-87, **WP 887 (October 2012).**

PALAZZO F., *Search costs and the severity of adverse selection,* Research in Economics, v. 71, 1, pp. 171-197, **WP 1073 (July 2016).**

PATACCHINI E. and E. RAINONE, *Social ties and the demand for financial services,* Journal of Financial Services Research, v. 52, 1–2, pp 35–88, **WP 1115 (June 2017).**

PATACCHINI E., E. RAINONE and Y. ZENOU, *Heterogeneous peer effects in education,* Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, v. 134, pp. 190–227, **WP 1048 (January 2016).**

SBRANA G., A. SILVESTRINI and F. VENDITTI, *Short-term inflation forecasting: the M.E.T.A. approach,* International Journal of Forecasting, v. 33, 4, pp. 1065-1081, **WP 1016 (June 2015).**

SEGURA A. and J. SUAREZ, *How excessive is banks' maturity transformation?,* Review of Financial Studies, v. 30, 10, pp. 3538–3580, **WP 1065 (April 2016).**

VACCA V., *An unexpected crisis? Looking at pricing effectiveness of heterogeneous banks,* Economic Notes, v. 46, 2, pp. 171–206, **WP 814 (July 2011).**

VERGARA CAFFARELI F., *One-way flow networks with decreasing returns to linking,* Dynamic Games and Applications, v. 7, 2, pp. 323-345, **WP 734 (November 2009).**

ZAGHINI A., *A Tale of fragmentation: corporate funding in the euro-area bond market,* International Review of Financial Analysis, v. 49, pp. 59-68, **WP 1104 (February 2017).**

2018

ACCETTURO A., V. DI GIACINTO, G. MICUCCI and M. PAGNINI, *Geography, productivity and trade: does selection explain why some locations are more productive than others?,* Journal of Regional Science, v. 58, 5, pp. 949-979, **WP 910 (April 2013).**

ADAMOPOULOU A. and E. KAYA, *Young adults living with their parents and the influence of peers,* Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, v. 80, pp. 689-713, **WP 1038 (November 2015).**

ANDINI M., E. CIANI, G. DE BLASIO, A. D'IGNAZIO and V. SILVESTRINI, *Targeting with machine learning: an application to a tax rebate program in Italy,* Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, v. 156, pp. 86-102, **WP 1158 (December 2017).**

BARONE G., G. DE BLASIO and S. MOCETTI, *The real effects of credit crunch in the great recession: evidence from Italian provinces,* Regional Science and Urban Economics, v. 70, pp. 352-59, **WP 1057 (March 2016).**

BELOTTI F. and G. ILARDI *Consistent inference in fixed-effects stochastic frontier models,* Journal of Econometrics, v. 202, 2, pp. 161-177, **WP 1147 (October 2017).**

BERTON F., S. MOCETTI, A. PRESBITERO and M. RICHIARDI, *Banks, firms, and jobs,* Review of Financial Studies, v.31, 6, pp. 2113-2156, **WP 1097 (February 2017).**

BOFONDI M., L. CARPINELLI and E. SETTE, *Credit supply during a sovereign debt crisis,* Journal of the European Economic Association, v.16, 3, pp. 696-729, **WP 909 (April 2013).**

BOKAN N., A. GERALI, S. GOMES, P. JACQUINOT and M. PISANI, *EAGLE-FLI: a macroeconomic model of banking and financial interdependence in the euro area,* Economic Modelling, v. 69, C, pp. 249-280, **WP 1064 (April 2016).**

BRILLI Y. and M. TONELLO, *Does increasing compulsory education reduce or displace adolescent crime? New evidence from administrative and victimization data,* CESifo Economic Studies, v. 64, 1, pp. 15–4, **WP 1008 (April 2015).**

BUONO I. and S. FORMAI *The heterogeneous response of domestic sales and exports to bank credit shocks,* Journal of International Economics, v. 113, pp. 55-73, **WP 1066 (March 2018).**

BURLON L., A. GERALI, A. NOTARPIETRO and M. PISANI, *Non-standard monetary policy, asset prices and macroprudential policy in a monetary union,* Journal of International Money and Finance, v. 88, pp. 25-53, **WP 1089 (October 2016).**

CARTA F. and M. DE PHLIPPIS, *You've Come a long way, baby. Husbands' commuting time and family labour supply,* Regional Science and Urban Economics, v. 69, pp. 25-37, **WP 1003 (March 2015).**

CARTA F. and L. RIZZICA, *Early kindergarten, maternal labor supply and children's outcomes: evidence from Italy,* Journal of Public Economics, v. 158, pp. 79-102, **WP 1030 (October 2015).**

CASIRAGHI M., E. GAIOTTI, L. RODANO and A. SECCHI, *A "Reverse Robin Hood"? The distributional implications of non-standard monetary policy for Italian households,* Journal of International Money and Finance, v. 85, pp. 215-235, **WP 1077 (July 2016).**

CECCHETTI S., F. NATOLI and L. SIGALOTTI, *Tail co-movement in inflation expectations as an indicator of anchoring,* International Journal of Central Banking, v. 14, 1, pp. 35-71, **WP 1025 (July 2015).**

CIANI E. and C. DEIANA, *No Free lunch, buddy: housing transfers and informal care later in life,* Review of Economics of the Household, v.16, 4, pp. 971-1001, **WP 1117 (June 2017).**

CIPRIANI M., A. GUARINO, G. GUAZZAROTTI, F. TAGLIATI and S. FISHER, *Informational contagion in the laboratory,* Review of Finance, v. 22, 3, pp. 877-904, **WP 1063 (April 2016).**

DE BLASIO G, S. DE MITRI, S. D'IGNAZIO, P. FINALDI RUSSO and L. STOPPANI, *Public guarantees to SME borrowing. A RDD evaluation,* Journal of Banking & Finance, v. 96, pp. 73-86, **WP 1111 (April 2017).**

GERALI A., A. LOCARNO, A. NOTARPIETRO and M. PISANI, *The sovereign crisis and Italy's potential output,* Journal of Policy Modeling, v. 40, 2, pp. 418-433, **WP 1010 (June 2015).**

LIBERATI D., *An estimated DSGE model with search and matching frictions in the credit market,* International Journal of Monetary Economics and Finance (IJMEF), v. 11, 6, pp. 567-617, **WP 986 (November 2014).**

LINARELLO A., *Direct and indirect effects of trade liberalization: evidence from Chile,* Journal of Development Economics, v. 134, pp. 160-175, **WP 994 (December 2014).**

NUCCI F. and M. RIGGI, *Labor force participation, wage rigidities, and inflation,* Journal of Macroeconomics, v. 55, 3 pp. 274-292, **WP 1054 (March 2016).**

RIGON M. and F. ZANETTI, *Optimal monetary policy and fiscal policy interaction in a non_ricardian economy,* International Journal of Central Banking, v. 14 3, pp. 389-436, **WP 1155 (December 2017).**

SEGURA A., *Why did sponsor banks rescue their SIVs?,* Review of Finance, v. 22, 2, pp. 661-697, **WP 1100 (February 2017).**

2019

ARNAUDO D., G. MICUCCI, M. RIGON and P. ROSSI, *Should I stay or should I go? Firms' mobility across banks in the aftermath of the financial crisis,* Italian Economic Journal / Rivista italiana degli economisti, v. 5, 1, pp. 17-37, **WP 1086 (October 2016).**

CAPPELLETTI G., G. GUAZZAROTTI and P. TOMMASINO, *Tax deferral and mutual fund inflows: evidence from a quasi-natural experiment,* Fiscal Studies, v. 40, 2, pp. 211-237, **WP 938 (November 2013).**

CIANI E., F. DAVID and G. DE BLASIO, *Local responses to labor demand shocks: a re-assessment of the case of Italy,* Regional Science and Urban Economics, v. 75, pp. 1-21, **WP 1112 (April 2017).**

CIANI E. and P. FISHER, *Dif-in-dif estimators of multiplicative treatment effects,* Journal of Econometric Methods, v. 8. 1, pp. 1-10, **WP 985 (November 2014).**

CHIADES P., L. GRECO, V. MENGOTTO, L. MORETTI and P. VALBONESI, *Fiscal consolidation by intergovernmental transfers cuts? The unpleasant effect on expenditure arrears,* Economic Modelling, v. 77, pp. 266-275, **WP 985 (July 2016).**

COLETTA M., R. DE BONIS and S. PIERMATTEI, *Household debt in OECD countries: the role of supply-side and demand-side factors,* Social Indicators Research, v. 143, 3, pp. 1185–1217, **WP 989 (November 2014).**

COVA P., P. PAGANO and M. PISANI, *Domestic and international macroeconomic effects of the Eurosystem Expanded Asset Purchase Programme,* IMF Economic Review, v. 67, 2, pp. 315-348, **WP 1036 (October 2015).**

GIORDANO C., M. MARINUCCI and A. SILVESTRINI, *The macro determinants of firms' and households' investment: evidence from Italy,* Economic Modelling, v. 78, pp. 118-133, **WP 1167 (March 2018).**

MONTEFORTE L. and V. RAPONI, *Short-term forecasts of economic activity: are fortnightly factors useful?,* Journal of Forecasting, v. 38, 3, pp. 207-221, **WP 1177 (June 2018).**

MERCATANTI A., T. MAKINEN and A. SILVESTRINI, *The role of financial factors for european corporate investment,* Journal of International Money and Finance, v. 96, pp. 246-258, **WP 1148 (October 2017).**

NERI S. and A. NOTARPIETRO, *Collateral constraints, the zero lower bound, and the debt–deflation mechanism,* Economics Letters, v. 174, pp. 144-148, **WP 1040 (November 2015).**

RIGGI M., *Capital destruction, jobless recoveries, and the discipline device role of unemployment,* Macroeconomic Dynamics, v. 23, 2, pp. 590-624, **WP 871 (July 2012).**

FORTHCOMING

ALBANESE G., M. CIOFFI and P. TOMMASINO, *Legislators' behaviour and electoral rules: evidence from an Italian reform,* European Journal of Political Economy, **WP 1135 (September 2017).**

ALBANESE G., G. DE BLASIO and P. SESTITO, *Trust, risk and time preferences: evidence from survey data,* International Review of Economics, **WP 911 (April 2013).**

APRIGLIANO V., G. ARDIZZI and L. MONTEFORTE, *Using the payment system data to forecast the economic activity,* International Journal of Central Banking, **WP 1098 (February 2017).**

ARDUINI T., E. PATACCHINI and E. RAINONE, *Treatment effects with heterogeneous externalities,* Journal of Business & Economic Statistics, **WP 974 (October 2014).**

BELOTTI F. and G. ILARDI, *Consistent inference in fixed-effects stochastic frontier models,* Journal of Econometrics, **WP 1147 (October 2017).**

BUSETTI F. and M. CAIVANO, *Low frequency drivers of the real interest rate: empirical evidence for advanced economies,* International Finance, **WP 1132 (September 2017).**

CIANI E. and G. DE BLASIO, *European structural funds during the crisis: evidence from Southern Italy,* IZA Journal of Labor Policy, **WP 1029 (October 2015).**

CORSELLO F. and V. NISPI LANDI, *Labor market and financial shocks: a time-varying analysis,* Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, **WP 1179 (June 2018).**

COVA P., P. PAGANO, A. NOTARPIETRO and M. PISANI, *Secular stagnation, R&D, public investment and monetary policy: a global-model perspective,* Macroeconomic Dynamics, **WP 1156 (December 2017).**

D'AMURI F., *Monitoring and disincentives in containing paid sick leave,* Labour Economics, **WP 787 (January 2011).**

D'IGNAZIO A. and C. MENON, *The causal effect of credit Guarantees for SMEs: evidence from Italy,* Scandinavian Journal of Economics, **WP 900 (February 2013).**

ERCOLANI V. and J. VALLE E AZEVEDO, *How can the government spending multiplier be small at the zero lower bound?,* Macroeconomic Dynamics, **WP 1174 (April 2018).**

FEDERICO S. and E. TOSTI, *Exporters and importers of services: firm-level evidence on Italy,* The World Economy, **WP 877 (September 2012).**

FERRERO G., M. GROSS and S. NERI, *On secular stagnation and low interest rates: demography matters,* International Finance, **WP 1137 (September 2017).**

GERALI A. and S. NERI, *Natural rates across the Atlantic,* Journal of Macroeconomics, **WP 1140 (September 2017).**

GIACOMELLI S. and C. MENON, *Does weak contract enforcement affect firm size? Evidence from the neighbour's court,* Journal of Economic Geography, **WP 898 (January 2013).**

LIBERATI D. and M. LOBERTO, *Taxation and housing markets with search frictions,* Journal of Housing Economics, **WP 1105 (March 2017).**

NATOLI F. and L. SIGALOTTI, *Tail co-movement in inflation expectations as an indicator of anchoring,* International Journal of Central Banking, **WP 1025 (July 2015).**

RAINONE E., *The network nature of otc interest rates,* Journal of Financial Markets, **WP 1022 (July 2015).**

RIZZICA L., *Raising aspirations and higher education. evidence from the UK's widening participation policy,* Journal of Labor Economics, **WP 1188 (September 2018).**

SEGURA A., *Why did sponsor banks rescue their SIVs?,* Review of Finance, **WP 1100 (February 2017).**