TIME-VARYING INTEGRATION IN EUROPEAN GOVERNMENT BOND MARKETS*

Pilar Abad[a] Helena Chuliá[b] and Marta Gómez-Puig[c]

January 2011

Abstract

Bond market integration clearly changes with economic and financial conditions since the level of risk aversion changes and investors require time varying compensation for accepting a risky payoff from financial assets. In this paper we examine the dynamic behavior of European Government bond markets integration using an asset pricing model based on that of Bekaert and Harvey (1995). Our sample period begins in 2004 after a period of calm and tranquility and ends in 2009 with a significantly widening of sovereign bond spreads. Our results show evidence of time-varying level of integration for all countries and suggest that from the beginning of the financial market tensions in August 2007 the markets have moved towards a higher segmentation and differentiation of country risk factors has increased substantially across countries.

JEL Classification Numbers: E44, F36, G15.

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

* [a]Pilar Abad: University Rey Juan Carlos & RFA-IREA. [b]Helena Chuliá: University of Barcelona & RFA-IREA. [c]Marta Gómez-Puig: University of Barcelona & RFA-IREA. Pilar Abad and Helena Chuliá acknowledge financial support from Fundación Ramon Areces. This paper is based upon work supported by the Government of Spain and FEDER under grant number ECO2010-21787-C03-01, ECO2008-02752/ECON and ECO2009-14457-C04-04. Corresponding author: hchulia@ub.edu

1. Introduction

Since the introduction of the single currency, euro area monetary policy authorities have had a keen interest in the integration and efficient functioning of the financial system in Europe, and especially in European and Monetary Union (EMU) countries. Indeed, financial integration is of key importance for the conduct of the single monetary policy, is also relevant for financial stability, and improves access to financial markets (see European Central Bank, 2010). However, on the other hand, it is worth noting that a high degree of financial integration may decrease the opportunity for risk diversification and raise the scope for spillover effects and contagion as the sovereign debt crisis in the Eurozone during 2010 has revealed.

In this paper, we will go on the analysis presented in Abad, Chuliá and Gómez-Puig (2010) –ACGP (2010) hereafter– and focus our attention in bond markets integration in the European Union (EU). The main objective of our previous paper was to study whether the introduction of the euro had an impact on the degree of integration of EU-15 Government bond markets. Since the extent to which integration has progressed in EU bond market can be assessed by measuring the relative importance of country components versus other factors in explaining bond returns, we applied a CAPM based model and separated each individual country's government bond return into two effects: a local (own country), and a systemic effect (either a regional/Eurozone or a global/world effect). It is intuitive that as integration advances, the proportion of the total return explained by local effects should decrease. Our results presented evidence that during the first ten years after its introduction, the euro had a major impact on the degree of integration of European government bond markets. The main conclusions of our analysis were, on the one hand, that markets of countries that shared a monetary policy were less vulnerable to the influences of world risk factors and more vulnerable to EMU risk factors and, on the other, that Eurozone markets were only partially integrated with the German market. The proportion of the total return explained by country effects was still important and investors could benefit from portfolio risk diversification.

An important restriction of the ACGP (2010) analysis was that, for each country, we estimated "the average level" of integration with the US and with the German bond markets during the ten year period (1999-2008) and ignored that bond market integration changes over time. Nevertheless, the financial market tensions that started in August 2007 and that were followed by a global financial and economic crisis led to significantly rising yield spreads in European government bond markets along with increased differentiation of country risk across the Eurozone. This situation made obvious that bond market integration clearly changes with economic and financial conditions since the level of risk aversion changes and investors require time varying compensation for accepting a risky payoff from financial assets. For this reason, some studies have allowed integration to vary over time and with events (see Bekaert and Harvey, 1995, or Hardouvelis et al. 2006 among them).

This paper aims to address this question and provide empirical evidence on the "dynamic nature of bond market integration" among EU-15[1] (euro and non euro participants) and three economies that belong to the central and eastern European (CEE) group of countries and that became member States of the European Union in 2004, even though they have not yet adopted the euro. This is the case of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. The choice of these countries has been determined by economic and financial factors. The abovementioned economies are the largest amongst the new incoming members and, compared to their neighbors, they are large issuers of sovereign debt. They have, indeed, the largest and most liquid government debt markets among the new EU members.

Although, little has been written on the sources of co-movements in government bond markets in the EU-15 context (studies of this issue include ACGP, 2010, Geyer, Kossmeier and Pischer, 2004, Gómez-Puig, 2009a and 2009b, and Pagano and Von Thadden, 2004), much more scarce is the literature focused on the new EU members (Gardó and Martin, 2010, Kim et al., 2006 or Nickel et al., 2009). Therefore, whilst there is some evidence about the degree of integration of bond markets within the EU-15, much less is known about the level and dynamics of financial integration within

[1] With the exception of Luxembourg due to the fact that its debt market is negligible.

the new EU members. However, it is worth noting that with varying pace, these countries are being integrated in the world economy and international financial markets. Moreover, by some indicators, they may still carry the characteristics of emerging economies whereas other indicators, notably with a forward-looking perspective, may suggest their classification as developed economies.

The choice of the countries that integrate our sample has determined the period of time of our analysis which begins in January 2004, when Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary joined the European Union, and finishes in November 2009 just before the start of the huge sovereign debt crisis in Europe in order to be isolated from its influence. We honestly think that it is better to omit data corresponding to 2010 from the study because the analysis of the recent sovereign debt crisis deserves a specific consideration due to the fact that not only macroeconomic and fiscal risk perception but also speculation against the very existence of the euro might be behind it. On the other hand, the omission of the period 1999-2003 from our study will not affect substantially the results, since after the introduction of the euro in January 1999 and up until the subprime crisis hits global financial markets in August 2007, spreads on bonds of Eurozone members had moved in a narrow range with only modest differentiation across countries (see Figure 1). Actually, the stability and convergence of spreads was considered a hallmark of successful financial integration within the Eurozone.

Nevertheless, severe tensions emerged in financial markets worldwide, including in the Eurozone bond market, after the subprime crisis in 2007. Furthermore, following the collapse of the US financial institution Lehman Brothers on 15 September 2008, the period of financial turmoil turned into a global financial crisis that began to spread to the real sector, with a rapid and synchronized deterioration in economic conditions in most major economies. At the same time the financial crisis has shown that imbalances within the Eurozone still exist since interest rate differentials between government bond issues of participating countries that had reached levels close to zero between 2003 and 2007, reemerged again. Actually, risk premia on EMU government bonds that, as it is shown in Figure 1, had followed a secular downward trend over the past, started to increase strongly in 2008, reflecting investor perceptions of upcoming macroeconomic and fiscal risks[2].

In this scenario, the aim of this paper is to study the dynamic behavior of bond market integration with the Eurozone bond market, which is proxied by the German market, in the abovementioned 16 EU countries: 13 EU-15 countries jointly with Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, during a period of time that begins after a period of calm and tranquility in EMU markets and ends with a significantly widening of sovereign bond spreads. In order to analyze the dynamic nature of integration we use an asset pricing model based on that of Bekaert and Harvey (1995) and consider that the time-varying coefficient that captures the degree of integration with the Eurozone market is dependent on a set of domestic economic instruments relative to Germany.

We find evidence of time-varying level of integration for all countries and as expected the level of integration with the Eurozone is higher in EMU than in non-EMU. From August 2007 there is a clear decrease in the level of integration which, for some countries, is more pronounced after the collapse of Lehman Brothers. These results suggest that from the beginning of the financial market tensions in August 2007 the markets have moved towards a higher segmentation and differentiation of country risk factors has increased substantially across countries.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 lays out the methodology we use to estimate time-varying integration. Section 3 describes the bond market data and the instruments for the price of risk and the time-varying integration parameter. Section 4 discusses the empirical results. Finally, Section 5 concludes.

2. Model

[2] Borri et al. (2010) present a model in which bond prices depend not only on the borrowers' economic conditions, but also on the lenders' time-varying risk-aversion.

Following Hardovelius *et al.* (2006), who analyse European stock market integration, our model builds on Bekaert and Harvey (1995)'s CAPM-based model and assume that excess returns in country i are generated by the following version of the conditional international CAPM:

$$r_{i,t}= \theta_{i,t}\, \lambda_{E,t}\, \mathrm{cov}_{t-1}\, (\mathrm{r}_{E,t}, \mathrm{r}_{i,t}) + (1- \theta_{i,t})\, \lambda_{i,t}\, \mathrm{var}_{t-1}\, (\mathrm{r}_{i,t}) + e_{i,t} \qquad (1)$$

where $\mathrm{r}_{i,t}$ is the excess return on the local bond market, $\mathrm{r}_{E,t}$, is the excess return on the Eurozone bond market, cov_{t-1} is the conditional covariance operator, var_{t-1} is the conditional variance operator, $\boldsymbol{\lambda_{E,t}}$ is the Eurozone price of risk, and $\boldsymbol{\lambda_{i,t}}$ is the local price of risk. The time-varying parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta_{i,t}}$ is interpreted as a measure of the conditional level of integration of market i with Eurozone bond market. When markets are completely integrated the coefficient $\boldsymbol{\theta_{i,t}}$ takes the value 1, thus the variance term in Equation (1) is reduced to zero and only covariance with the Eurozone bond market is priced. If $\boldsymbol{\theta_{i,t}}$ takes the value zero, only the variance is priced.

The time-varying parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta_{i,t}}$ is conditioned on a set of variables that measure integration:

$$\theta_{i,t}=\exp(-|g_i' X_{i,t}|) \qquad (2)$$

where g_i is a vector of country-specific parameters (including a constant), and $X_{i,t}$ is a vector of country-specific predetermined information variables related to convergence toward EMU. We take the absolute value of $g_i' X_{i,t}$. Thus, we assume that deviations of the information variables from zero, independent of their sign, reduce the degree of integration. By construction $\theta_{i,t}$ takes a value between zero and unity.

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

$$r_{E,t}= \lambda_{E,t}\, \mathrm{var}_{t-1}(\mathrm{r}_{E,t}) + e_{E,t} \qquad (3)$$

To model the conditional covariance matrix we use a multivariate GARCH model. Specifically, we use the BEKK model proposed by Engle and Kroner (1995). This model can be written as:

$$H_t = C'C + A'e_{t-1}\, e'_{t-1} A + B' H_{t-1} B \tag{4}$$

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

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

$$\lambda_{E,t} = \exp\left(K'_E\, Z^E_t \right) \tag{5}$$

$$\lambda_{i,t} = \exp\left(\delta'_i\, Z^L_{i,t} \right) \tag{6}$$

where Z^E represents Eurozone variables, $Z^L_{i,}$ represents local variables for country i, and K'_E and δ'_i are vectors of coefficients.

We estimate a system of equations using the Quasi-Maximum Likelihood method. Bollerslev and Wooldridge (1992) show that the standard errors calculated using this method are robust even when the normality assumption is violated. Then, for each local Government bond market we estimate a system of 6 equations, (1) to (6). This estimation is implemented in two steps. First, we estimate a univariate model of the Eurozone bond market return (equation 3) and the relevant variance-covariance elements of equation (4). Then we impose the results on the individual countries in N bivariate regressions. Thus, we restrict the estimates of the Eurozone Government bond market price of risk and of the coefficients in the conditional variance of the Eurozone market variance to be the same in all countries. Once these estimates are imposed on each bivariate regression, in the second step we will obtain the following for each country: $\boldsymbol{\theta_{i,t}}$ (the estimated conditional level of integration with the Eurozone bond market), K_E (the vector of estimated coefficients for the Eurozone price of risk) and δ_i (the vector of estimated coefficients for the local price of risk).[3]

3. Data

3.1. Returns

The empirical analysis makes use of the 10-year JPMorgan Government Bond Index (JPMGBI), in terms of a common currency, the euro, and the sample includes 16 European countries. Our study focuses on 10 EMU-15 (Austria, Belgium, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Finland, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain) and 6 non-EMU countries (Denmark, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Sweden and UK). Data have been collected from Thompson Datastream. We use daily data[4] covering the period from January 2004 to November 2009, except for two new EU countries: The Czech Republic and Hungary where the start date is November 2004. Returns are calculated as first log differences.

The dependent variable in our model (r_{it}) is the excess return which is calculated relative to the appropriate 1-month Euro-deposit offered rate quoted in London[5]. In our analyses, we choose to use the German government bond index as the proxy for the entire Eurozone given that it has a correlation of 0.99 with the JP Morgan EMU government index (over the same sample period) which can also be obtained from Thompson Datastream. Thus, we think that this is a better way to capture regional risk effect than using the return of a synthetic Eurozone bond index that will always contain the evolution of its own local market return.

Table 1 reports summary statistics on the bond returns. There is not a clear different pattern between returns and variances of EMU and non-EMU members. The highest mean return

[3] According to Bekaert and Harvey (1995), this procedure imposes the restriction that the price of Eurozone market risk is the same in each country, which leads to more powerful tests. A disadvantage to this approach is that the usual standard errors are likely to be understated since we ignore the sampling error in the first-stage parameter estimates.
[4] Bond markets for the countries under consideration are approximately open over the same hours during the day.
[5] Euro-deposit rates are used as a proxy for the risk free rate due to the lack of a liquid Treasury bill market in some of the countries.

corresponds to the Czech Republic and the lowest to the UK. Hungary presents the highest return variance and Ireland the lowest. In general, the distributional properties of the return series appear to be non-normal. Almost all return series have negative skewness and are leptokutic. Non-EMU countries (except Denmark y UK), Ireland, Italy, Spain and Portugal have larger (in magnitude) skewness than the rest. The excess kurtosis of Czech Republic, Denmark, Greece, Hungary and Poland are larger than the other markets. The Ljung-Box test indicates significant autocorrelation in returns at the 10% significance level. Finally, the ARCH test reveals that bond returns exhibit conditional heteroskedasticity which is clear evidence of time-varying volatility in these markets.

3.2. Instruments for the Price of Risk

Similar to ACGP (2010), we use the following instrumental variables to capture the different prices of risk (Eurozone and local risk): (1) the slope of the yield curve, as measured by the difference between the 10-year and the 3-year JPMorgan government bond index. Several studies (Campbell and Shiller, 1991; Ilmanen, 1996) have found that steeper yield curves are associated with higher subsequent yields on longer-maturity bonds. The interpretation of this finding is that the yield curve steepens primarily because of an increase in the risk premium. Moreover, the slope of the yield curve is also a proxy of the business cycle. (2) Lagged stock indexes returns are included to allow for the possibility that stock returns lead bond returns. In recent years, important cross-asset linkages between stocks, bonds and money market instruments have been observed. Fleming, Kirby and Ostdiek (1998) investigate the nature of volatility linkages between stocks, bonds and money markets and conclude that volatility linkages between the three markets are strong. In particular, stock market weakness has been associated with economic weakness, which has corresponded to bond market strength[6]. If equity market weakness gives rise to subsequent bond market strength, the coefficient on lagged stock indexes returns should be significantly negative (see Hunter and Simon, 2005).[7] (3) Lagged 10-year Government returns are also added to the specification. Taking into account that some aspects of risk

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

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

premiums (related to domestic factors such as liquidity or credit risk) do not change over the period considered, the objective will be to identify their relative importance in explaining fluctuations, rather than returns levels. With this aim a lag of the dependent variable is introduced in the model, which will allow for a slow dynamic adjustment to a long-term equilibrium value of Government returns.[8] Finally, (4) we include the difference between lagged 10-year Government returns and lagged stock index returns to capture bond markets relative risk compared to stock markets.

Since we use German returns as proxies of the Eurozone, the following Eurozone instruments are used: (1) the slope of the German yield curve, as measured by the difference between the 10-year and the 3-year German Treasury yield. (2) The lagged return of the DAX-30. We think that the use of this index is appropriate as it reflects the price evolution of the 30 most important firms in the German stock market. (3) The lagged value of the 10-year German Government return and (4) The difference between lagged 10-year German Government return and lagged DAX-30 return.

Table 2 reports results from regressing the excess returns of the 16 local markets on both the local and the Eurozone instruments as follow:

$$r_{i,t}=a_i+b^E_i Z^E_{t-1}+b^L_i Z^L_{i,t-1}+\varepsilon_{i,t} \qquad (7)$$

where for every country i, we assume that Government bond excess returns ($r_{i,t}$) are linearly related to Eurozone (Z^E)and local (Z^L_i) information variables. We estimate this equation by OLS to identify the relevant instruments. Furthermore, we test the separate hypothesis that the coefficients associated with the Eurozone and local variables are zero. The results are reported in Table 2.

The R2s range from 49% in Sweeden to 91% in France or Spain, indicating a high degree of predictability in local bond markets. The F-tests reveal that each set of instruments is separately and jointly significant. For all countries we reject the null hypothesis that local instruments can be

[8] In addition, a lag of the dependent variable is necessary due to the existence of autocorrelation (see Table 1).

excluded. We also reject the null hypothesis that Eurozone instruments can be excluded at the 10% significance level with the exceptions of France and Hungary.

Then, we estimate equation (7) using the local and Eurozone instruments separately. The results show clear patterns of predictability in all local bond markets using local instruments. We observe that when we only use local instruments the R2s are similar than when we use all instruments whilst when we only use Eurozone instruments the R2s are lower. Thus, the predictability power of local instruments is higher than that of regional instruments in all countries. Moreover, in some countries (Czech Republic, Finland and Hungary) the usefulness of regional instruments is quite reduced, even the F-tests reveal that both sets of instruments are significant. Overall, the results show that a set of Eurozone and local instruments are useful to predict local bond returns, suggesting incomplete integration.

3.3. Instruments for the Time-Varying Integration Parameter

In our model, each country has its own time-varying degree of integration. The degree of integration is conditioned on a set of domestic economic instruments relative to Germany: (1) The inflation differential, (2) the industrial production index rate of growth differential and (3) the debt-to-GDP rate of growth differential[9]. The use of domestic indicators to explain the behavior of the time-varying degree of integration is justified on the ground that external imbalances necessary have internal counterparts[10].

In particular, the inflation differential and the industrial production index rate of growth differential (a proxy of the business cycle) relative to Germany are included to take account of the argument put forward by Mody (2009) and Alfonso (2010) that countries' sensitivity to the financial crisis is more pronounced the greater the loss of competitiveness and growth potential.

---

[9] Reinhart and Rogoff (2010) present empirical evidence about the relationship between debt levels, growth and inflation.
[10] See European Commission (2010).

On the other hand, as Mody (2009) points out, after the failure of Lehman Brothers, countries with higher debt levels faced more stress on their debt servicing capabilities and, hence, were penalized more as a consequence of the substantial reevaluation of global growth prospects that took place. Actually, an important point that Reinhart and Rogoff (2008) make is that the eventual rise in public debt is only partly due to the direct costs of rescuing distressed financial institutions: the bulk of the rise in the public debt-to-GDP ratio reflects the slowdown in growth associated with the banking/economic crisis. This is also likely to be the case for the ongoing crisis which has revealed a rising influence of the loss of competitiveness and slowdown in growth on the rise in the public debt-to-GDP ratio and Government yield spreads. However, there are statistical challenges in identifying the relationship between public debt and the high-frequency changes in spreads (see Pagano and von Thadden, 2004). Indeed, the change in public debt ratios differentials relative to Germany has been relatively modest over the period under consideration. This is the reason why we will use a flow instead of a stock variable in our study. Concretely, the relative rate of growth of debt-to-GDP ratios will be the instrument that we will include to study the time-varying degree of integration with the German bond market.

All the variables that have been used to build up the instruments (the Harmonized Index of Consumer Prices, the Production Index[11], the Government debt and the GDP) have been collected from Eurostat. Daily data have been linear interpolated from monthly and quarterly observations.

4. Results

Table 3 presents the results of the estimation of the system of equations (1) to (6) using the Quasi-Maximum Likelihood method for each of the local Government bond markets jointly with the German Government bond market. Table 4 shows the standardized residuals analyses. It can be observed (with few exceptions) that the standardized residuals appear free from serial correlation

[11] We have used the seasonally adjusted production index.

and heteroskedasticity. In all cases, the necessary conditions for the stationarity of the process are satisfied.

Most of the Eurozone and local instruments are significant suggesting that they are relevant in forecasting the Eurozone and local price of risk. All the coefficients in the (co)variance equations (not reported) are significant confirming the existence of time-varying volatilities.

The estimates of the instruments for the time-varying integration parameter reported in the last four columns of Table 3 indicate that our instruments are important determinants of the bond market integration. Both the industrial production and the debt-to-GDP growth differential are statistically significant in all countries, whilst the inflation differential is significant in 12 out of 16 cases.

For an easier interpretation of the results, Table 5 shows the average level of integration for the total sample period and three sub-sample periods: (1) From 4 January 2004 to 8 August 2007, (2) from the beginning of the subprime crisis on 9 August 2007 to 14 September 2008 and (3) from the collapse of Lehman Brothers on 15 September 2008 to 30 November 2009. We have divided the total period into these subsamples because after the introduction of the euro in January 1999 and up until the subprime crisis hits global financial markets in August 2007, spreads on bonds of Eurozone members had moved in a narrow range with only modest differentiation across countries. However, the financial market tensions that started in August 2007 and that were followed by a global financial and economic crisis after the collapse of Lehman Brothers in September 2008 led to significantly rising yield spreads in European government bond markets (see Figure 1). Therefore, the time-varying degree of integration with the German market should have decreased after the abovementioned episodes of financial turbulence.

Thus, our aim is to analyze whether these episodes of financial crisis have had a different impact in the degree of integration of European sovereign bond markets with the German one. In our analysis we have divided European markets into four different groups: (1) Non-EMU new EU (Check Republic, Hungary and Poland), (2) non-EMU EU-15 (Denmark, Sweden and UK), (3) EMU EU-15 peripheral (Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain), and (4) EMU EU-15 central bond markets (Austria, Belgium, Finland, France and the Netherlands).

To test the equality of means of the level of integration in the three sub-sample periods, we have carried out an ANOVA test with different null hypothesis. First we have tested the null hypothesis that the mean of the level of integration is equal before the beginning of the subprime crisis and after it, second we tested the null hypothesis that the mean of the level of integration is equal in the second sub-period and in the third sub-period and finally, the joint test with the null hypothesis that the mean of the level of integration is equal in the three sub-samples. In all cases, the results of the test (not reported) reject the null hypothesis indicating that the means of the level of integration in the different sub-periods are statistically different.

Table 5 shows that as expected the level of integration with the German market is higher in EMU than in non-EMU countries. Within non-EMU countries, the average level of integration during the whole period of the new EU countries (0.30) is slightly lower than that from non-EMU EU-15 countries (0.36). Within EMU countries, it is worth noting that, on average, peripheral countries also present a level of integration (0.51) which is lower than that of central countries (0.60): Greece, Ireland and Portugal are the Eurozone countries with the lowest degree of integration whilst the Netherlands and France are the ones with the highest level (the average level of integration is 0.37 in the case of the Greek market and 0.70 in the case of the French one).

Figures 2a to 2d display the estimated level of integration of bond markets grouped in the different categories. These figures show time-varying integration for all countries and provide a number of interesting insights. First, the time-series pattern of the degree of integration is similar across new EU-15 members (Figure 2a) until 9 August 2007 but the subprime crisis and the Lehman Brothers' failure do not have the same impact in them. In the case of the Check Republic the level of integration begins to decrease with the subprime crisis coinciding with a sharp increase in its inflation rate and a worsening of its growth potential (measured by the production index). Nevertheless, in Poland and Hungary the level of integration remains stable until the collapse of Lehman Brothers and decreases after it. In this respect, it is worth noting that Poland is the country that presents the highest loss of competitiveness and Hungary the most important deterioration in its production growth relative to Germany at the end of the sample period. The results for these countries also suggest that these markets are more segmented than integrated with Germany: over the entire sample period, the degree of integration never exceeds 0.30. On the other hand, Table 6 shows that the dispersion within countries of the time varying degree of integration registers an increase at the end of the sample period, coinciding with the beginning of the financial turbulence in August 2007 [12].

Second, Figure 2b shows that the level of integration of non-EMU EU-15 countries also follows a similar pattern. The level of integration is stable around 0.40 until 15 August 2008 and after this date it is evident that markets move towards a higher segmentation coinciding with the collapse of Lehman Brothers. The average level of integration registers a decrease of 42%. This decrease is more pronounced in the case of Denmark and the UK, the countries in this group that register the highest raise in the rate of growth of their debt-to-GDP and most important loss of competitiveness (measured by the inflation differential) relative to Germany in the studied period. Moreover, it is noticeable that, contrary to what happens to former group of countries, the dispersion within countries of the time varying degree of integration decreases coinciding with the subprime crisis, just to increase again with the Lehman Brothers fall (see Table 6).

Regarding EMU EU-15 countries, as it has been explained, we differentiate between peripheral and central countries'. In the case of peripheral countries (see Figure 2c), it can be observed an important increase in the dispersion of the level of integration across countries since the collapse of the Lehman Brothers (the coefficient of variation registers an average increase around 178%, see

[12] Table 6 shows the average of the daily coefficient of variation of the time-varying degree of integration for the four group of countries which correspond to figures 2a-2d.

Table 6). Moreover, after mid-September 2008 Ireland, Greece and Spain show a dramatic decrease in their degree of integration (67%, 36% and 28%, respectively). In the case of Ireland and Spain this decrease coincides with a significant rise in their public debt-to-GDP growth relative to Germany. Conversely, as it is displayed in Figure 2d, in the case of EMU central countries, all bond markets with the exception of Finland and France follow a similar pattern up until the subprime crisis when their level of integration drops sharply until the end of 2008 just to begin again an upward trend until the end of the sample period jointly with an increase of the dispersion within countries (see Table 6).

Overall, our results display a clear decrease in the level of integration over the sample period for most of the countries, suggesting that, once the financial market tensions that started in August 2007 turned to a global financial and economic crisis, differentiation of country risk factors increased substantially across EU countries. Consequently, since the relative importance of country components versus other factors in explaining bond returns raises with the deterioration of the economic situation (which has a different impact across European countries) the dynamic CAPM based model we have applied in the analysis seems to be a suitable one to examine the time-varying degree of integration of European government bond markets.

5. Conclusions

The 2007-08 financial turmoil affected the Eurozone bond market in ways that differed considerably across countries. A consequence was a significantly rising yield spreads in European government bond markets along with increased differentiation of country risk across the Eurozone. In this paper we analyse the evolving nature of bond market integration with the Eurozone bond market, which is proxied by the German market. Our sample includes 16 EU countries divided into four different groups: (1) Non-EMU new EU (Check Republic, Hungary and Poland), (2) non-EMU EU-15 (Denmark, Sweden and UK), (3) EMU EU-15 peripheral (Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain), and (4) EMU EU-15 central bond markets (Austria, Belgium, Finland, France and the Netherlands).

Our sample period begins in 2004 after a period of calm and tranquility in EMU markets and ends in 2009 with a significantly widening of sovereign bond spreads. Our model builds on Bekaert and Harvey (1995)'s CAPM-based model and we consider that the time-varying coefficient that captures the degree of integration with the Eurozone market is dependent on a set of domestic economic instruments relative to Germany: the inflation differential, the industrial production index rate of growth differential and the debt-to-GDP rate of growth differential.

We provide empirical evidence for time-varying level of integration. As the financial market tensions that started in August 2007 turned to a global financial and economic crisis, the level of integration decreased for all countries, suggesting that, differentiation of country risk factors increased substantially across EU countries.

We also show that the domestic instruments used to describe the time-varying level of integration (industrial production, debt-to-GDP growth differential and inflation differential) are important determinants of the bond market integration. As expected the level of integration with the German market is higher in EMU than in non-EMU countries. Within non-EMU countries, the average level of integration during the whole period of the new EU countries is slightly lower than that from non-EMU EU-15 countries. Within EMU countries, peripheral countries also present a level of integration (on average) which is lower than that of central countries.

Finally, we find that in general the patterns in the level of integration are similar within groups of countries until the beginning of the financial tensions. However, after the 2007-08 financial turmoil the dispersion within countries of the time varying degree of integration registers an increase, being peripheral countries those which show the highest increase in the dispersion of the level of integration across countries.

6. References

1. Abad, P.; H. Chuliá and M. Gómez-Puig (2010). "EMU and UE-15 Government Bond Market Integration*". Journal of Banking and Finance,* n.34, pp.2851–2860.
2. Afonso, A.; H.D. Grüner and C. Kolerus (2010). "Fiscal Policy and Growth: Do Financial Crises make a difference?". *European Central Bank Working Paper Series n. 1217, June.*
3. Bekaert, G, and C.R. Harvey (1995). "Time-Varying World Market Integration". *Journal of Finance vol. 1, n.2.*
4. Bollerslev, T., R.F. Engle, and J.M. Wooldridge (1988). "A capital asset pricing model with time-varying covariances". *Journal of Political Economy No.96, 116-131.*
5. Bollerslev, T. and J.M. Wooldridge (1992). "Quasi-Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Inference in Dynamic Models with Time-Varying Covariances". *Econometric Review,* vol. 11(2), 143-172.
6. Borri, N. and A. Verdelhan (2010). "Sovereign risk premia". *American Finance Association 2010 Atlanta Meetings.*
7. Campbell, J.Y., and R.J. Shiller (1991). "Yield Spreads and Interest Rate Movements: A Bird's Eye View". *Review of Economic Studies*, vol. 58(3), pp. 495-514, May.
8. De Santis, G., and B. Gerard (1997). "International asset pricing and portfolio diversification with time-varying risk" *Journal of Finance No.52, 1881-1912.*
9. De Santis, G., and B. Gerard (1998). "How big is the premium for currency risk?" *Journal of Financial Economics No.49, 375-412.*
10. European Central Bank (2010). "Financial Integration in Europe", *April.*
11. European Commission (2010). "Enhancing economic policy coordination for stability, growth and jobs. Tools for stronger EU economic governance", *June.*
12. Engle, R.F., and K.F. Kroner (1995). "Multivariate Simultaneous Generalized Arch". *Econometric Theory, No.11, 122-150.*
13. Fleming, J., Kirby, C., & Ostdiek, B. (1998). "Information and volatility linkages in the stock, bond and money markets". *Journal of Financial Economics, 49, 111–137.*
14. Gardó, S. and R. Martin (2010). "The impact of the global economic and financial crisis on central, eastern and south-eastern Europe: A Stock-taking exercise". *European Central Bank Occasional Paper Series n. 114, June.*
15. Geyer, A., S. Kossmeier and S. Pichler (2004). "Measuring Systematic Risk in EMU Government Yield Spreads". *Review of Finance n. 8.*
16. Gómez-Puig M. (2009a). "The Immediate Effect of Monetary Union over UE-15's Sovereign Debt Yield Spreads". *Applied Economics,* 41, 929-939.

17. Gómez-Puig, M. (2009b) *'*Systemic and Idiosyncratic Risk in UE-15 Sovereign Yield Spreads After Seven Years of Monetary Union*", European Financial Management.* Vol. 15, No. 5, 971–1000.
18. Hardouvelis, G.A., D. Malliaropulos and R. Priestley (2006) "EMU and European Stock Market Integration". *Journal of Business, vol. 79, nº 1.*
19. Hunter, D.M., and D.P. Simon (2005). "A Conditional Assessment of the Relationships between the Major World Bond Markets". *European Financial Management, Vol. 11, No. 4, 463–482*
20. Ilmanen, A. (1996). "When do bond markets reward investors for interest rate risk? *Journal of Portfolio Management. Winter.*
21. Kim, S-J, M. Fariborz and E. Wu (2006). "Evolution of International Stock and Bond Market Integration: Influence of the European Monetary Union". *Journal of Banking and Finance, vol. 30, pp. 1507-1534.*
22. McQueen, G. and Roley, V. (1993) 'Stock prices, news, and business conditions', *Review of Financial Studies, Vol. 6, pp. 683–707.*
23. Merton, R.C. (1980). "On estimating the expected return on the market: An exploratory investigation". *Journal of Financial Economics 8.*
24. Mody, A. (2009). "From Bear Stearns to Anglo Irish: How Eurozone Sovereign Spreads Related to Financial Sector Vulnerability". *International Monetary Fund Working Papers 09/108.*
25. Nickel, C.; P.C. Rother and J.C. Rülke (2009). "Fiscal variables and bond spreads: Evidence from eastern European countries and Turkey". *European Central Bank Working Paper Series n. 1101, October.*
26. Pagano, M. and E.L. von Thadden. (2004). "The European Bond Markets under EMU". *Oxford Review of Economic Policy, vol. 20, n.4.*
27. Reinhart, C. and K.S. Rogoff (2008). "Banking Crises: An Equal Opportunity", *NBER Working Paper No. 14587, December.*
28. Reinhart, C. and K.S. Rogoff (2010). "Growth in a Time of Debt", *American Economic Review, Vol. 100 No. 2, May.*

Table 1. Descriptive statistics on daily 10-year JPMorgan Government Bond Index (JPMGBI), (%)

	Mean	Variance	Skewness	Excess Kurtosis	Q(20)	ARCH(20)
Germany	0.028	0.325	-0.194 (0.00)	2.671 (0.00)	43.977 (0.00)	32.112 (0.04)
Austria	0.021	0.184	-0.123 (0.00)	2.325 (0.00)	30.168 (0.07)	231.442 (0.00)
Belgium	0.019	0.239	-0.101 (0.10)	3.261 (0.00)	37.540 (0.01)	280.689 (0.00)
Czech Republic	0.033	0.315	-0.267 (0.00)	6.296 (0.00)	47.515 (0.00)	385.378 (0.00)
Denmark	0.019	0.228	-0.075 (0.00)	5.026 (0.00)	51.607 (0.00)	334.405 (0.00)
Finland	0.017	0.360	0.092 (0.13)	4.608 (0.00)	55.463 (0.00)	330.555 (0.00)
France	0.022	0.231	-0.124 (0.04)	2.222 (0.00)	34.876 (0.02)	228.171 (0.00)
Greece	0.013	0.230	-0.199 (0.00)	6.462 (0.00)	58.883 (0.00)	301.872 (0.00)
Hungary	0.020	1.920	-0.814 (0.00)	12.822 (0.00)	57.075 (0.00)	489.802 (0.00)
Ireland	0.017	0.161	-0.235 (0.00)	3.590 (0.00)	39.425 (0.00)	300.456 (0.00)
Italy	0.021	0.197	-0.328 (0.00)	2.504 (0.00)	30.423 (0.06)	183.082 (0.00)
Netherlands	0.022	0.242	-0.163 (0.00)	2.356 (0.00)	33.922 (0.02)	239.590 (0.00)
Poland	0.029	0.816	-0.243 (0.00)	11.041 (0.00)	57.652 (0.00)	424.483 (0.00)
Portugal	0.013	0.206	-0.217 (0.00)	3.454 (0.00)	29.656 (0.07)	269.042 (0.00)
Spain	0.018	0.286	-0.260 (0.00)	3.697 (0.00)	40.152 (0.00)	339.1055 (0.00)
Sweden	0.015	0.291	0.283 (0.00)	3.983 (0.00)	29.496 (0.07)	263.412 (0.00)
U.K.	0.005	0.500	-0.011 (0.85)	3.900 (0.00)	65.906 (0.00)	360.257 (0.00)

Note: The sample period goes from 5 January, 2004 to 30 November, 2009, except for Czech Republic and Hungary whose start date is 1 November, 2004. Q(20) is the Ljung-Box test for twentieth order serial correlation in the return series. ARCH(20) is Engle's test for twentieth order ARCH, distributed as chi-square distribution with 20 degrees of freedom. P-values are displayed in parentheses.

Table 2. Predicting local excess returns

$r_{i,t}=a_i+b^E_iZ^E_t+b^L_iZ^L_{i,t}+\varepsilon_{i,t}$

	R2	F-test	F- test exclude Eurozone	F- test exclude local	*Local instruments only* R2	*Local instruments only* F-test	*Eurozone instruments only* R2	*Eurozone instruments only* F-test
Austria	0.86	1201.27 (0.00)	249.82 (0.00)	15.72 (0.00)	0.85	2238.53 (0.00)	0.64	676.08 (0.00)
Belgium	0.90	1653.81 (0.00)	150.29 (0.00)	6.70 (0.00)	0.89	3187.32 (0.00)	0.68	822.45 (0.00)
Czech Republic	0.78	588.38 (0.00)	146.03 (0.00)	26.13 (0.00)	0.73	909.25 (0.00)	0.04	13.62 (0.00)
Denmark	0.87	1292.72 (0.00)	203.02 (0.00)	13.45 (0.00)	0.86	2421.78 (0.00)	0.55	472.68 (0.00)
Finland	0.35	102.47 (0.00)	53.07 (0.00)	3.49 (0.01)	0.28	145.78 (0.00)	0.09	35.91 (0.00)
France	0.91	1943.85 (0.00)	927.93 (0.00)	1.52* (0.19)	0.91	3886.74 (0.00)	0.69	874.98 (0.00)
Greece	0.87	1270.78 (0.00)	262.54 (0.00)	10.13 (0.00)	0.86	2354.36 (0.00)	0.46	323.63 (0.00)
Hungary	0.56	212.65 (0.00)	133.30 (0.00)	0.39* (0.82)	0.56	422.11 (0.00)	0.01	3.42 (0.01)
Ireland	0.81	829.47 (0.00)	92.42 (0.00)	14.29 (0.00)	0.78	1356.42 (0.00)	0.41	269.58 (0.00)
Italy	0.88	1390.23 (0.00)	190.60 (0.00)	4.40 (0.00)	0.88	2710.95 (0.00)	0.57	504.68 (0.00)
Netherlands	0.90	1822.68 (0.00)	618.39 (0.00)	2.14 (0.07)	0.90	3620.25 (0.00)	0.70	878.34 (0.00)
Poland	0.54	221.24 (0.00)	48.92 (0.00)	53.79 (0.00)	0.37	228.80 (0.00)	0.16	72.35 (0.00)
Portugal	0.86	1145.85 (0.00)	92.79 (0.00)	11.38 (0.00)	0.83	1936.31 (0.00)	0.56	482.10 (0.00)
Spain	0.91	1988.94 (0.00)	97.66 (0.00)	4.75 (0.00)	0.91	3829.03 (0.00)	0.67	764.89 (0.00)
Sweden	0.49	181.35 (0.00)	79.40 (0.00)	14.15 (0.00)	0.37	222.59 (0.00)	0.14	64.10 (0.00)
U.K.	0.72	504.52 (0.00)	366.27 (0.00)	38.41 (0.00)	0.59	558.26 (0.00)	0.19	89.16 (0.00)

Note: : The sample period goes from 5 January, 2004 to 30 November, 2009, except for Czech Republic and Hungary whose start date is 1 November, 2004. This table reports OLS estimations of the equation. R2 denote R-squared statistic. F-test denotes the F-statistic from a test of the hypothesis that all of the slope coefficients (excluding the intercept) in the regression are zero. F-test exclude X denotes the F-statistic from a test of the hypothesis that some coefficients (all excluding the set X) in the regression are zero. P-values are displayed in parentheses.

<u>Table 3</u>. Model estimates for each of the local Government bond market jointly with the Eurozone Government bond market

$$r_{i,t}= \theta_{i,t}\,\lambda_{e,t}\,\mathrm{cov}_{t-1}\,(r_{e,t}, r_{i,t})+ (1- \theta_{i,t})\,\lambda_{i,t}\,\mathrm{var}_{t-1}\,(r_{i,t}) + e_{i,t}$$

$$r_{E,t}= \lambda_{E,t}\,\mathrm{var}(r_{E,t}) + e_{E,t}$$

$$\theta_{i,t}=\exp(-|g'_i X_{i,t}|),\ \lambda_{E,t}= \exp\,(K'_E\,Z^E_t),\ \lambda_{i,t}= \exp\,(\delta'_L\,Z^L_{i,t})$$

$$\mathbf{H}_t=\mathbf{C'C} + \mathbf{A'}\boldsymbol{e}_{t-1}\,\boldsymbol{e}'_{t-1}\,\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B'}\,\mathbf{H}_{t-1}\mathbf{B}$$

	$K0_E$	**$K1_E$**	**$K2_E$**	**$K3_E$**	**$K4_E$**				
Germany	3.600***	52.099***	1.329	10.286	26.148***				
	$\delta0_L$	**$\delta1_L$**	**$\delta2_L$**	**$\delta3_L$**	**$\delta4_L$**	***g0***	***g1***	***g2***	***g3***
Austria	3.975***	22.973**	13.249***	-25.594***	17.898***	0.521***	0.019***	0.292***	0.011***
Belgium	5.933***	95.518***	12.270***	-32.829***	17.132***	-0.589***	-0.008**	-0.231***	-0.013***
Czech Republic	7.684***	185.261***	-0.082	23.427***	18.974***	1.312***	-0.023	0.180***	0.025***
Denmark	3.893***	175.368***	11.286***	1.783	7.531***	1.091***	-0.007	0.234***	0.014***
Finland	3.229***	324.211***	1.926**	-53.058***	35.261***	-0.712***	0.010***	-0.036***	-0.018***
France	7.176***	-22.342***	6.564***	-16.984***	27.845***	-0.385***	-0.013***	-0.018***	-0.005***
Greece	2.145***	326.078***	4.299	2.712	-7.156***	0.837***	0.023***	0.081***	0.038***
Hungary	3.156***	198.452***	-2.013	22.356***	1.054	-1.015***	-0.017	-0.056***	-0.031***
Ireland	4.023***	382.565***	0.113	11.654*	7.174***	0.598***	0.019***	-0.011***	0.013**
Italy	2.768***	276.168***	13.930***	-14.638***	-33.674***	0.551***	0.030***	0.151***	-0.043***
Netherlands	5.789***	-169.457***	17.751***	2.067	11.725***	-0.485***	0.001***	-0.219***	-0.002***
Poland	2.337***	63.115***	6.422	15.430	29.623***	1.075***	0.012***	0.091***	0.018**
Portugal	4.873***	314.400***	9.147***	-15.340***	10.390***	-0.775***	0.001	0.129***	0.042***
Spain	3.656***	156.874***	18.951***	-42.897***	1.295	-0.782***	-0.055***	-0.051***	-0.015***
Sweden	6.865***	583.140***	-3.967	-8.356	1.516	1.220***	0.025***	0.147***	0.012***
U.K.	9.262***	87.446***	-0.665	2.692	26.886***	0.989***	0.015***	0.134***	0.010***

Note: : The sample period goes from 5 January, 2004 to 30 November, 2009, except for Czech Republic and Hungary whose start date is 1 November, 2004. We estimate a system of equations [(1) to (6)] using the Maximum Likelihood method for each of the local Government bond markets jointly with the Eurozone bond market. Note: The superscripts *** , ** and * indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% level, respectively.

Table 4. Summary statistics for the standardized residuals of the model estimates for each of the local Government bond markets jointly with the Eurozone (Germany) Government bond market

	Maximum likelihood function value	Q(20)	ARCH(20)
Germany		30.784 (0.05)	3.603 (0.99)
Austria	14228.899	19.339 (0.49)	1.350 (0.99)
Belgium	14591.622	24.859 (0.21)	3.938 (0.99)
Czech Republic	9981.915	23.159 (0.28)	1.064 (0.99)
Denmark	13817.149	19.486 (0.49)	3.511 (0.99)
Finland	13691.701	22.930 (0.29)	1.975 (0.99)
France	15230.485	26.798 (0.14)	3.752 (0.99)
Greece	13402.859	22.111 (0.33)	2.700 (0.99)
Hungary	9337.573	28.004 (0.10)	43.076 (0.00)
Ireland	13499.308	19.712 (0.47)	2.700 (0.99)
Italy	13594.454	20.550 (0.42)	1.304 (0.99)
Netherlands	15343.510	26.112 (0.16)	7.557 (0.88)
Poland	11175.189	35.775 (0.02)	13.002 (0.99)
Portugal	13457.336	17.511 (0.61)	2.930 (0.99)
Spain	14331.815	26.511 (0.15)	7.463 (0.99)
Sweden	12249.642	18.475 (0.55)	2.922 (0.099)
U.K.	11808.142	27.355 (0.12)	2.026 (0.99)

Note: Q(20) is the Ljung-Box test for twentieth order serial correlation in the standardized residuals. ARCH(20) is Engle's test for twentieth order ARCH, distributed as chi-square distribution with 20 degrees of freedom.. The p-values of these tests are displayed in parentheses. In all cases the necessary conditions for the stationarity of the process are satisfied.

Table 5. Average level of the time-varying degree of integration				
	05/01/2004-08/08/2007	**09/08/2007-14/09/2008**	**15/09/2008-30/11/2009**	**Total period**
Austria	0,548	0,547	0,513	0,540
Belgium	0,579	0,477	0,515	0,547
Czech Republic	0,312	0,160	0,210	0,254
Denmark	0,436	0,367	0,195	0,374
Finland	0,573	0,558	0,419	0,538
France	0,716	0,699	0,643	0,698
Greece	0,467	0,418	0,293	0,422
Hungary	0,316	0,262	0,270	0,234
Ireland	0,640	0,459	0,196	0,515
Italy	0,555	0,676	0,561	0,579
Netherlands	0,670	0,774	0,509	0,656
Poland	0,315	0,326	0,211	0,296
Portugal	0,540	0,484	0,506	0,523
Spain	0,550	0,663	0,416	0,544
Sweden	0,365	0,361	0,263	0,343
U.K.	0,384	0,385	0,216	0,350

Note: This table shows the average level of integration for the total sample period and three sub-sample periods: (1) From 4 January 2004 to 8 August 2007, (2) from the beginning of the subprime crisis on 9 August 2007 to 14 September 2008 and (3) from the collapse of Lehman Brothers on 15 September 2008 to 30 November 2009. : The total period goes from 5 January, 2004 to 30 November, 2009, except for Czech Republic and Hungary whose start date is 1 November, 2004.

Table 6. Average level of the coefficient of variation of the time-varying degree of integration

	05/01/2004-08/08/2007	09/08/2007-14/09/2008	15/09/2008-30/11/2009	Total period
New EU countries (Fig. 2a)	14,93	35,17	15,81	19,51
Non-EMU EU-15 countries (Fig. 2b)	10,01	9,36	17,73	11,47
Peripheral EMU EU-15 countries (Fig. 2c)	15,59	24,89	43,35	23,01
Central EMU EU-15 countries (Fig. 2d)	13,72	22,79	21,39	16,98

Note: This table shows the average of the daily coefficient of variation [(Standard Deviation / Mean) x 100] for the four groups of countries which correspond to figures 2a-2d. The coefficient of variation is a measure of variability that provides a unitless measure of the variation by translating it into a percentage of the mean value. This measure can be used when comparing two samples that have different means and standard deviations. The total period goes from 5 January, 2004 to 30 November, 2009, except for Czech Republic and Hungary whose start date is 1 November, 2004

<u>Figure 1</u>. EMU EU-15 10 year yield spreads over Germany (1999-2009)



Figure 2. Estimates of the conditional level of integration of market *i* with the German bond market ($\theta_{i,t-1}$)

Figure 2a. New EU countries



Figure 2b. Non-EMU EU-15 countries



Figure 2c. Peripheral EMU EU-15 countries



Figure 2d. Central EMU EU-15 countries