

Armelius, Hanna; Bertsch, Christoph; Hull, Isaiah; Zhang, Xin

**Working Paper**

## Spread the word: International spillovers from central bank communication

Sveriges Riksbank Working Paper Series, No. 357

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Central Bank of Sweden, Stockholm

*Suggested Citation:* Armelius, Hanna; Bertsch, Christoph; Hull, Isaiah; Zhang, Xin (2018) : Spread the word: International spillovers from central bank communication, Sveriges Riksbank Working Paper Series, No. 357, Sveriges Riksbank, Stockholm

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/189957>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

SVERIGES RIKSBANK  
WORKING PAPER SERIES

357



# Spread the Word: International Spillovers from Central Bank Communication

*Hanna Armelius, Christoph Bertsch, Isaiah Hull and Xin Zhang*

September 2018

WORKING PAPERS ARE OBTAINABLE FROM

[www.riksbank.se/en/research](http://www.riksbank.se/en/research)

Sveriges Riksbank • SE-103 37 Stockholm

Fax international: +46 8 21 05 31

Telephone international: +46 8 787 00 00

The Working Paper series presents reports on matters in the sphere of activities of the Riksbank that are considered to be of interest to a wider public.

The papers are to be regarded as reports on ongoing studies and the authors will be pleased to receive comments.

The opinions expressed in this article are the sole responsibility of the author(s) and should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of Sveriges Riksbank.

# Spread the Word: International Spillovers from Central Bank Communication\*

Hanna Armelius      Christoph Bertsch      Isaiah Hull      Xin Zhang

Sveriges Riksbank Working Paper Series

No. 357

September 2018

## Abstract

We use text analysis and a novel dataset to measure the sentiment component of central bank communications in 23 countries over the 2002-2017 period. Our analysis yields three key results. First, using directed networks, we show that comovement in sentiment across central banks is not reducible to trade or financial flow exposure. Second, we find that geographic distance is a robust and economically significant determinant of comovement in central bank sentiment, while shared language and colonial ties are economically significant, but less robust. Third, we use structural VARs to show that sentiment shocks generate cross-country spillovers in sentiment, policy rates, and macroeconomic variables. We also find that the Fed plays a uniquely influential role in generating such sentiment spillovers, while the ECB is primarily influenced by other central banks. Overall, our results suggest that central bank communication contains systematic biases that could lead to suboptimal policy outcomes. (*JEL* E52, E58, F42)

**Keywords:** communication, monetary policy, international policy transmission.

---

\*We would like to thank Fabio Canova, Ulrike Malmendier, Jesper Lindé, Paulina Restrepo-Echavarria, Karl Walentin, and various seminar and conference participants. All authors are researchers at Sveriges Riksbank, SE-103 37 Stockholm, Sweden. The opinions expressed in this article are the sole responsibility of the authors and should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of Sveriges Riksbank.

# 1 Introduction

This paper offers the first study of international spillovers from central bank communication sentiment using a novel dataset. We ask four research questions. First, is there evidence for international spillovers from central bank communication sentiment? Second, do sentiment spillovers exhibit a different pattern than trade and financial flows? Third, which other factors contribute to the observed comovement in central bank sentiment? And fourth, do central bank sentiment spillovers matter for critical macroeconomic and policy variables?

A broad and growing literature has documented the domestic impact of central bank communication (Bernanke et al., 2004; Gürkaynak et al., 2005; Schmeling and Wagner, 2016), which has grown in degree and scope since the 1990s (Woodford, 2005; Bernanke, 2013). As Hansen and McMahon (2015) demonstrated, communication appears to be particularly salient during periods of unconventional policy, such as during the use of forward guidance. The claim that conventional monetary policy generates international spillovers is well-established<sup>1</sup>, and has recently been extended by a large body of work on the spillover effects from unconventional policy.<sup>2</sup> Cross-country spillover effects from monetary policy, and the communication thereof, also gained attention in the recent policy debate (Rajan, 2014; Fischer, 2014; Bernanke, 2015).<sup>3</sup> Prior to this paper, however, there was no assessment of the qualitative and quantitative aspects of international spillovers from central bank communication. Our work offers a first step in this direction by studying the international spillovers from central bank communication sentiment, which is the latent, low-frequency

---

<sup>1</sup>This line of research dates back to Mundell (1963) and Fleming (1962), who studied the impact of exchange rate regimes on capital mobility. Canova (2005) and Maćkowiak (2007) identify the effects of U.S. monetary shocks on Latin American and East Asian countries, while di Giovanni and Shambaugh (2008) look at the effect of foreign interest rates on output growth in other countries. Dedola et al. (2017) offer a study extended to high income countries with a focus on the financial dimension. Rey (2015) relates spillovers in emerging markets to the global financial cycle governed by monetary conditions in the center.

<sup>2</sup>See, e.g., Eichengreen and Gupta (2015), who analyze the impact of the Federal Reserve’s tapering talk on emerging markets; Neely (2014), who demonstrates the impact of unconventional monetary policy in the U.S on international bond yields and exchange rate; and Berge and Cao (2014), who show how it affects asset price responses. Morais et al. (2017) document how the corporate loan supply and risk-taking in Mexico is affected by foreign monetary policy shocks. For a study on the spillovers from unconventional policy measures in the Eurozone, see Fratzscher et al. (2016).

<sup>3</sup>Policymakers in emerging markets aired concerns that their economies were being negatively affected by loose U.S. monetary conditions, which initially generated a surge of capital inflows and exchange rate appreciations (Chen et al., 2014). These were later reversed in the so-called “taper tantrum” (Neely, 2014).

component in central bank communication, best captured central bank speeches (Andersson et al., 2006).

We approach our research questions by constructing a novel dataset that contains central bank speech data from 23 countries over the 2002-2017 period.<sup>4</sup> We measure the net positivity of central bank speech sentiment for each country using dictionary-based methods outlined in Loughran and McDonald (2011). To establish evidence for international spillovers in central bank communication, we start by describing the new dataset, focusing initially on how communication is transmitted across central banks. We do this by generating sentiment networks with the technique introduced in Billio et al. (2012), which allows us to uncover Granger-causal relations across central banks. Relative to trade or financial networks, edges in the sentiment network are more numerous and the relationships across countries are more complex. This suggests that comovement in communication across countries is unlikely to be driven entirely by exposure to trade and financial flows. Thus, it is possible that one central bank can generate policy spillovers through its influence over another central bank's communication, even if it does not directly affect bilateral trade or financial flows.

Next, we find that outgoing Granger casual communication sentiment links are not necessarily a function of the prominence of the bank. As expected, the Federal Reserve (Fed) has a strong impact on sentiment at other central banks; however, the Bank of Japan (BoJ) and the European Central Bank (ECB), are primarily influenced by other central banks, even though Japan and the Eurozone generate trade and financial flow exposures for many countries in the network. This, again, suggests that foreign central bank sentiment could influence domestic central bank sentiment, which could ultimately affect policy decisions and domestic movements in macroeconomic variables.

Having established the dissonance between trade and financial flows, and central bank sentiment, we next address the third research question: namely, which factors beyond real and financial linkages explain comovement in central bank sentiment? We do this by regressing the bilateral correlation in quarterly central bank communication sentiment on a dummy for shared language, a dummy for colonial ties, a measure of geographic distance between central banks, and a broad set of controls, including comovement in real GDP growth,

---

<sup>4</sup>The speeches are obtained from the Bank for International Settlements (BIS): <https://www.bis.org/cbspeeches/>.

bilateral trade flows, bilateral financial flows, country fixed effects, and a shared continent dummy. Our results suggest that shared language and colonial ties generate economically significant, but not robust, increases in central bank sentiment comovement. Furthermore, geographic distance between central banks emerges as a uniquely robust and economically significant predictor of central bank sentiment comovement. In the specification with the most extensive set of controls and fixed effects, distance remains significant at the 1% level. Furthermore, its economic significance is substantial, and implies that an 8,000km increase in distance (i.e. Beijing to London) is associated with a 45% reduction in sentiment correlation for the median pair of central banks.

We next consider the fourth research question, which asks whether spillovers from central bank communication sentiment matter for the real economy. To answer this question, we measure the impact of a shock to sentiment at one country’s central bank on domestic and foreign sentiment, policy variables, and macroeconomic variables. We do this by running sign-restricted vector autoregressions (VARs). We first perform VARs on a set of domestic variables for a subset of countries in our network with a high number of speeches, independent monetary policy, and complete data on policy and macroeconomic variables for the 2002-2017 period. We show that a shock to central bank sentiment is associated with immediate increases in the most likely channels for international transmission: equity price growth, the exchange rate, and imports. The maximum impact on the policy rate and unemployment arrive with delay of up to 4 quarters.

We also consider the impact of spillovers more directly in a set of two-country sign-restricted VARs. Here, we place sign restrictions on the domestic variables only and make no assumptions about the impact of foreign central bank sentiment shocks on foreign sentiment, policy, or macroeconomic variables. In an analysis of large, influential central banks, we find that a positive, structural shock to Fed sentiment has a positive impact on ECB sentiment, a positive impact on the ECB’s policy rate with a 4-quarter lag, and a negative impact on unemployment in eurozone countries with a 5-quarter lag. In all cases, the domestic impacts of sentiment (i.e. Fed sentiment on U.S. macro variables) are larger than the impact on ECB and eurozone variables. We find similar effects for a positive Fed sentiment shock on Bank of England (BoE) communication and policy, and U.K. macroeconomic variables.

In line with the network analysis, we find that structural shocks to BoE sentiment gen-

erate spillovers for ECB sentiment and policy rates, and eurozone unemployment; however, structural shocks to ECB sentiment affect neither the BoE nor the Fed. Finally, we show that BoJ sentiment shocks do not appear to influence foreign sentiment or macroeconomic variables. Similarly, Japan and the BoJ are relatively unaffected by foreign sentiment.

Overall, the VAR exercise provides evidence that central bank communication generates international spillovers for sentiment, policy, and macroeconomic variables. It also appears to act faster on the most salient channels for transmission: sentiment, equity price growth, exchange rates, and imports. The largest and most durable spillovers appear to be generated by the Fed, while the ECB primarily internalizes sentiment generated elsewhere. Together with our earlier findings, this suggests that domestic central bank sentiment can be influenced by foreign central bank sentiment and that comovement in sentiment across central banks is not reducible to trade and financial flow exposure. As a result, foreign central bank sentiment can have direct implications for domestic policy and macroeconomic variables, as well as indirect implications via domestic central bank sentiment. Moreover, if central bank communication is not primarily influenced by the countries to which that central bank is most exposed, but systematically affected by other factors, then communication may be misaligned, yielding suboptimal policy.

With respect to methods, we use the rejection approach introduced in Rubio-Ramirez et al. (2010) for the structural VAR exercise. This allows us to recover impulse responses to structural sentiment shocks with relatively few assumptions. Guided by theory, we apply the weakest possible set of sign restrictions, assuming that central banks conduct monetary policy following a Taylor-type interest rate. Most importantly, we exclusively use sign-restrictions for the effects on domestic variables on impact.

We use a dictionary-based method to extract the sentiment content from central bank speeches (Loughran and McDonald, 2011). This allows for interpretability and applicability across different central banks' speeches. Even though speeches address various topics, our measure will reflect the overall sentiment of central bank officials. This differs from the approach in Hansen and McMahon (2015), which shows how advanced computational linguistics can be used to gain insight into different dimensions of communication. While tools such as dynamic topic modeling may provide stronger predictions, we regard a dictionary-based approach suitable for our context, since it offers a general solution that captures overall



sentiment in a speech database with a diversity of topics and central banks. One caveat is that a dictionary-based method is unable to isolate different components of central bank communication. That is, it does not distinguish explicitly between a central bank’s assessment of the state of the economy and its use of forward guidance. We will, however, show that a simple dictionary based index can reveal a central bank’s latent position and predict its future policy rate decisions. Based on our findings, it is reasonable to infer that this measure does not entirely overlap with forward guidance information, or with the quantitative forecast of the central bank. We should treat sentiment as a mixture of the central bank’s private information on the economy and “implicit” forward guidance with the former tending to dominate in our sample period.

Our paper extends the literature on monetary policy spillovers (Canova, 2005; Maćkowiak, 2007; di Giovanni and Shambaugh, 2008; Dedola et al., 2017) by analyzing spillovers of central bank communication sentiment. We, thereby, complement Hansen and McMahon (2015), who use textual analysis to study the domestic effects of central bank communication. Related work documents that central bank communication appears to predict policy decisions (Apel and Grimaldi, 2014), and movements in interest rates and equity prices (Schmeling and Wagner, 2016). Central bank communication is often used to prepare markets and typically has the strongest effect in advance of decisions (Ehrmann and Fratzscher, 2007b). Moreover, the effects from communication appear to have persisted during the zero lower bound (ZLB) period, but were primarily concentrated in long term yields (Carvalho et al., 2016).

Existing work on central bank communication spillovers has demonstrated a significant impact on exchange rates (e.g., Fratzscher (2006), Fratzscher (2008), and Burkhard et al. (2010)), but little is known about how communication affects foreign macroeconomic variables and foreign central bank communication. Our paper attempts to fill this gap in the literature. Beyond the gap on spillovers, the existing literature also focuses on central bank press conferences, where the impact of communication is measured in a short window around such the monetary policy announcement (e.g., Schmeling and Wagner (2016) and Ehrmann and Talmi (2017)). In contrast, we focus on the low-frequency component of central bank communication and its relationship with foreign macroeconomic variables, such as unemployment, output, inflation, and interest rates. Speech data is best suited to this task because it captures the low frequency component of communication (Andersson et al., 2006). Further-

more, focusing on speeches allows us to measure central bank sentiment beyond the carefully planned and highly anticipated announcements, and to characterize how communication at one central bank affects communication at others.

Finally, on a conceptual level, our paper is also related to the literature on sentiment and business cycle fluctuations (e.g., Angeletos and La'O (2013)). Central banks are key players in the economy, which gives them a naturally important role in the coordination of market participant beliefs (Morris and Shin 2002). In our paper, we identify the component of sentiment that is affected by foreign central banks. Moreover, we document its cross-country transmission, as well as its effect on domestic macroeconomic variables.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the data and the process by which sentiment scores are computed. Section 3 describes the network analysis, the cross-sectional sentiment regressions, and the sign-restricted VAR exercise. And finally, Section 4 concludes.

## 2 Data

We first compiled a database of English-translated central bank speeches. We did this by scraping the Bank for International Settlements' (BIS) speech archive for the 2002-2017 period, collecting both speech text and metadata for all documents. This yielded 12,024 speeches, which were associated with 474 unique institution identifiers.

We also collected data on real GDP growth, trade flows, and financial flows for all 23 countries in the networks we construct. Additionally, for the United States, the United Kingdom, the Eurozone, Sweden, and Japan—the countries we examine in greater detail in the VAR exercise—we also collected data on unemployment, the policy rate, equity price growth, the exchange rate, and imports. All real GDP growth data came from the OECD, Eurostat, or the Atlanta Fed.<sup>5</sup> Unemployment, policy rate, equity price growth, exchange rate, and import data was also collected from the OECD or ECB. Bilateral trade flows were collected from the World Integrated Trade Solution (WITS) database. And finally, bilateral private financial flows were reconstructed from the BIS's Locational Banking Database. We used the X-13 approach to deseasonalize when seasonally-adjusted series were not available.

---

<sup>5</sup>We used the Atlanta Fed's series for quarterly Chinese GDP because it covers our entire sample period.

Finally, for the cross-sectional regression exercise, we collected additional data on geographic distance, language, and colonial ties. We used great circle distances in thousands of kilometers to measure the distance between country capitals. For the shared language variable, we required central banks in a pair to have at least one matching official language. Finally, for colonial ties, we required at least one country to have been a colony of another or to have gained independence from the other. We used the ICOW Colonial History Database (Hensel, 2014) to construct this variable.

## 2.1 Identifying the Institution

Since each central bank typically has multiple institutional identifiers, we next attempted to associate a unique institution with each speech. We did this by identifying the longest substring that is contained in all references to the central bank, and then checked each institution name for a match.


For some central banks, identifying the institution was straightforward, since the country was always contained in the central bank’s name. Thus, searching for the country name is sufficient. In other cases, the name of the country was not always contained in references to the central bank. Figure I provides a list of speech counts for the five central banks that we examined in greater detail in the VAR exercise. Specifically, we selected the five most frequent communicators, subject to two constraints: 1) they must have control over their own monetary policy; and 2) they must have complete data for all macroeconomic and policy variables needed for the VARs.

Among the 474 institutions identified, we found 53 unique central banks.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, within those 53 central banks, 23 gave at least 100 speeches over the 2002-2017 period. We restricted our sample to these institutions.

---

<sup>6</sup>Here, we treat the ECB and ESCB member central banks separately, even though ESCB banks coordinate and have strong ties. There could be a strategic component of the national banks’ communication; however, we leave this question to future research.

Figure I: Speech Counts by Institution



This table provides speech counts for the central banks associated with the following monetary unions and countries: the ECB (Eurozone), the Fed (U.S.), the Bank of Japan (Japan), the Bank of England (U.K.), and the Riksbank (Sweden). All speeches were collected from the BIS’s English language archive over the 2002-2017 period.

## 2.2 Cleaning the Data

Since our dataset consists of unstructured text contained in central bank speeches, we had to first clean the data and convert it to a useable format before we could use it to construct networks and perform regressions. We used the following procedure to format each text:

1. Convert the document from pdf to txt format.
2. Clean the document to remove all punctuation and special characters.
3. Remove stopwords, such as articles and prepositions.

The resulting documents are suitable for use in text analysis, which we perform next.

## 2.3 Measuring Sentiment

The final step in the data production process entails converting the text into a numeric format that is suitable for use in the construction of networks and the estimation of regressions. In this paper, we focus exclusively on the sentiment component of the texts, which tells us the extent to which a central bank official was positive or negative in his or her assessment of the economy. It also captures indications of potential paths for forward guidance. If, for instance, a monetary policy committee remains divided, speeches may give hints about about individual committee member positions.

We adopt the most commonly-used, dictionary-based method of measuring sentiment in economic and financial documents, which was constructed by Loughran and McDonald (2011).<sup>7</sup> This method was originally developed to assess the sentiment content of 10-K financial sentiments; and consists of a dictionary of words, which are classified as either positive or negative. The positivity,  $P$ , and negativity,  $N$ , of a document are then measured as follows, where net positivity is defined  $P_N = P - N$ :

$$P = \frac{\# \text{ of Positive Words}}{\# \text{ of Total Words}} \quad N = \frac{\# \text{ of Negative Words}}{\# \text{ of Total Words}}. \quad (1)$$


Figure II shows plots of normalized speech sentiment for the Fed and ECB over the 2002-2017 period. The line in each plot is the rolling net sentiment mean of the 40 most recent speeches. Note that Fed sentiment deteriorated earlier than ECB sentiment and prior to the financial crisis in 2007. Later, there is a noticeable uptick in Fed sentiment in 2012, a few years before the Federal Open Market Committee (FOMC) published its “Policy Normalization Principles and Plans” (FOMC, 2014), which proceeded the eventual increase in the Fed funds rate in December of 2015. The upward trend in Fed sentiment lasted till 2014 and experienced only a temporary dip during the taper tantrum in 2013. While Fed sentiment stabilized at a pre-crisis level after 2013, the ECB sentiment remained muted throughout, as additional crises afflicted the Eurozone.

Table I shows cross-country correlations for real GDP growth and central bank speech sentiment for the U.S., U.K., Eurozone, Japan, and Sweden. We select these four countries

---

<sup>7</sup>Apel and Grimaldi (2014) and Carvalho et al. (2016) have found that similar indices contain predictive content about future policy decisions and interest rates.

Figure II: Rolling Speech Sentiment for the Fed (top) and ECB (bottom).



The plots above show the normalized net sentiment scores associated with Fed (top) and ECB (bottom) speeches. The line shows the rolling net sentiment mean of the 40 most recent speeches. Sentiment scores are computed using a dictionary-based approach documented in Loughran and McDonald (2011).

and one monetary union because they communicate most frequently among the subset of central banks that 1) have complete data on macroeconomic variables; and 2) have control over their own monetary policy. One clear pattern that emerges is that real linkages, captured by real GDP growth, are not sufficient to explain comovement in cross-country central bank sentiment. Thus, it is unlikely that comovement in sentiment across countries is simply a reflection of comovement in business cycles across countries.

Table I: Cross-Country Correlations: Sentiment and Output

	Eurozone	U.S.	Japan	U.K.	Sweden
<i>Real GDP Growth</i>					
Eurozone	1.00	0.61	0.63	0.79	0.72
U.S.	-	1.00	0.43	0.62	0.61
Japan	-	-	1.00	0.53	0.51
U.K.	-	-	-	1.00	0.58
Sweden	-	-	-	-	1.00
<i>Central Bank Speech Sentiment</i>					
Eurozone	1.00	0.38	0.37	0.38	0.34
U.S.	-	1.00	0.49	0.47	0.54
Japan	-	-	1.00	0.21	0.45
U.K.	-	-	-	1.00	0.37
Sweden	-	-	-	-	1.00

*Notes:* This table provides cross-country correlations from our selection of five central banks. Cross-correlations are computed on quarterly sentiment data.

If, for instance, we look at the relationship between the U.S., the U.K., and the Eurozone, we can see that U.K. real GDP growth comoves most strongly with real GDP growth in the Eurozone; however, comovement in U.K. speech sentiment is strongest with U.S. speech sentiment. Similarly, real GDP growth in Japan comoves most strongly with the Eurozone, but sentiment comoves more strongly with the U.S. than with the Eurozone.

This basic, descriptive finding is non-trivial. It suggests that certain central banks may be attuned to the communication of certain other central banks in a way that is not justified by business cycle comovement. Since the literature has demonstrated that central bank communication affects policy-making and macroeconomic variables, this could be sufficient to generate international spillovers, even if there were no direct transmission of shocks from

foreign sentiment to domestic variables. If historical relationships, geographic distance, or linguistic ties cause central banks to overweight responses to the wrong country’s shocks,<sup>8</sup> this could lead to suboptimal policy-making and hamper monetary policy transmission. A similar situation may arise if financial linkages cause central banks to overweight responses by more than is warranted.<sup>9</sup> We explore these hypotheses in greater detail in a cross-sectional regression.

The quarterly plots of net sentiment in Figure III further reinforce this relationship across central banks. Both Sweden and the United Kingdom appear to be more closely aligned with Fed sentiment than with the ECB, despite having stronger real linkages with the Eurozone. This feature could be related to historic or linguistic ties, as well as the role the U.S. Dollar plays in global financial markets.

Our analysis proceeds in three steps. First, we characterize the macroeconomic and sentiment linkages between countries and central banks using Granger-causality networks in the style of Billio et al. (2012) for sentiment and directed networks for trade and financial flows. Next, we perform a set of cross-sectional regressions to determine whether a shared language, colonial ties, or geographic distance explains comovement in sentiment across central banks. Finally, we use sign-restricted vector autoregressions (VARs) to explore the impact of sentiment shocks on domestic policy and macroeconomic variables, as well as spillovers to foreign countries and central banks.

## 2.4 Interpreting Sentiment

For simplicity, we will follow the literature (see, e.g., Blinder et al. (2008) for an overview) and assume that central banks conduct monetary policy using a Taylor-type interest rate rule, as shown in equation (2), where  $i_t$  is the nominal interest rate,  $x_t$  is a vector of economic variables,  $F_t$  is the rule’s (possibly) time-varying functional form, and  $\epsilon_t$  is a deviation:


---

<sup>8</sup>See David (1994) and Eichengreen (1985) for a historical exploration.

<sup>9</sup>International capital flows are considerably more volatile than output, especially for emerging markets (see, e.g. Federico et al. (2013), for descriptive statistics on total gross capital inflow volatility and domestic output volatility). Broner and Rigobon (2006) document that only a small share of capital flow dynamics is explained by domestic and foreign macroeconomic variables.



Figure III: Quarterly Speech Sentiment for the U.S., U.K., Eurozone, and Sweden



The plots above show quarterly speech sentiment for the U.S., U.K., Eurozone, and Sweden. Quarterly sentiment is computed as the mean speech sentiment of all speeches given by a central bank official within the quarter.

$$i_t = F_t(x_t) + \epsilon_t. \quad (2)$$

Such a central bank may wish to communicate its views on the state of the economy,  $x_t$ , or its intent to deviate from the rule,  $\epsilon_t$ , including through the use of forward guidance. Alternatively, it might wish to communicate that it is changing how it responds to economic inputs—that is, how it modifies the functional form of  $F_t$ . New board members, for instance, might place different weights on the components of  $x_t$ . This could also happen if a central bank decided to adopt an explicit inflation target.

One general problem we encounter when analyzing the effects of central bank communication is identification. Financial markets are volatile and could be reacting to information other than the central bank communication over long measurement windows. The most common approach for dealing with this issue is to focus on a narrow window around each monetary policy statement. While this approach is sensible for measuring forward guidance shocks, it may be less reliable for subtler forms of communication. If, for instance, a central bank wanted to communicate that it had changed the way it interprets some underlying economic trend, a speech might be a better channel to disseminate this information. This is particularly true in the case where no policy decision has yet been reached. For instance, a member of the central bank’s board might use a speech to argue that high inflation is temporary and, thus, does not warrant an interest rate response. The financial market’s reaction to such a speech might not be measurable until the next inflation data release. Furthermore, a speech might reveal a board member’s optimism, which could ultimately have an impact on policy in the future, but would not be detectable in policy statements initially. Indeed, other work has shown that speeches appear to capture the low frequency component of communication better than statements and announcements (Andersson et al., 2006).

Beyond the frequency of the signal contained in central bank communication, it is also important to discern the likely economic content. A large body of existing work measures market responses to central bank communication. Hansen and McMahon (2015) use a factor-augmented vector autoregression (FAVAR) and computational linguistics to separately measure the impact of forward guidance and the state of the economy in FOMC statements. They find that information about forward guidance has more explanatory power. Gürkaynak et

al. (2005) show that FOMC announcements account for most of the movement in longer-term treasury yields. While there is ample evidence that communication in connection with interest rate decisions does influence financial markets, the evidence on the impact of central bank speeches is more mixed. Kohn and Sack (2004) and Reeves and Sawicki (2007) find no significant effects of speeches on financial markets, while Ehrmann and Fratzscher (2007a) and Andersson et al. (2006) find the opposite. As we demonstrate later in the paper, the low frequency component of sentiment appears to primarily capture the central bank’s optimism about the underlying state of the economy; however, it also contains predictive content about future policy decisions that can be treated as “implicit” forward guidance.

We make a first attempt at describing the economic content of speech sentiment by computing its principal components. We do this using 23 countries that each gave over 100 speeches during the 2002-2017 period. Figure IX in the Appendix plots the variance share explained by the principal components. Note that the first principal component explains 28% of the variance; however, this declines rapidly, with the second principal component explaining only 12%. The first five principal components explain just over 50% of the variance and the first ten are needed to account for 75%. This suggests that the sentiment content of central bank speeches are not simply reducible to Fed, ECB, or BoE sentiment.

Figure X in the Appendix plots the first, second, and third principal components, along with their correlations with central bank sentiment for each of the 23 countries. Note that the first principal component appears to capture the underlying sentiment that drives central bank policy. This component declines prior to the Great Recession, remains flat until the 2013, begins to rise in response to the unwinding of asset purchase programs, and then rises again as central banks consider increasing rates for the first time. The first principal component also appears to be positively correlated with all countries considered, except China, whose monetary policy was less constrained by the Great Recession. In contrast to the first principal component, the second appears to be more closely associated with financial and macroeconomic variables, and begins to recover rapidly after the Great Recession.

Importantly, speech sentiment appears to contain central bank interpretations of macroeconomic and financial data; and, as we will show later, is predictive of central bank policy. One possible explanation for this is that central bankers have access to private information that could potentially influence the way they interpret incoming news about macroeconomic

variables. Their access to information relating to undisclosed financial stress-testing data is one clear example; however, they also have privileged conversations with political and private market representatives that might yield non-public information that is unavailable to other forecasters. Central bankers also attend international meetings and communicate with each other both formally and informally. It is possible that central banks that are larger or more transparent, or for other reasons have more listeners, could influence other central banks to interpret incoming data in the same way.

Another potential factor is that central bank communication can play a role in coordinating market participants’ beliefs about macroeconomic fundamentals, as well as their interpretations of relevant macroeconomic information (Amato and Shin, 2002; Morris and Shin, 2002; Svensson, 2006). In other words, the reach of central bank communication and the role of central banks as key players in the economy gives them the ability to establish reference points for the beliefs of market participants and for other central banks. A stark example of this is when central banks strive to underpin market confidence, as was the case, for instance, with ECB president Mario Draghi’s “whatever it takes” speech. More generally, central banks may attempt to influence the overall sentiment in the economy and thereby business cycle fluctuations (Angeletos and La’O 2013).

## **3 Empirical Section**

In this section, we provide an empirical analysis of central bank communication spillovers, focusing specifically on network structure and impulse response functions. Additionally, we examine what role a shared language, colonial ties, and geographic distance plays in generating sentiment comovement.

### **3.1 Directed Networks: Trade and Financial Flows**

We construct two types of directed networks in this paper. The first type, which we cover in this subsection, captures the direction of the trade and financial flows. The second type, which is based on the concept of Granger causality, is covered in the following subsection. Since bilateral trade and financial flows involve both countries and are, thus, directionally

ambiguous, we instead use a measure that captures the importance of such flows for the first type of networks: whether a country is a top five partner for trade or finance with another country. If, for instance, Japan is one of Indonesia’s largest importers, but Indonesia is not one of Japan’s largest importers or exporters, then the relationship is important for Indonesia, but not necessarily for Japan.

The trade network is constructed using data on bilateral import and export flows from the World Integrated Trade Solution (WITS) database and depicted in Figure XI in the Appendix. Edges in the network connect pairs of nodes where at least one country (node) is a top five import or export partner of the other. For the direction of the relationship, we use the concept described in the previous paragraph. If, for instance, China is one of the five countries from which Australia receives the most imports or one of the five countries to which Australia sends the most exports, then an edge will connect Australia to China in the network. Furthermore, an arrow will point from China to Australia, since this relationship is important for Australia, but not necessarily China. If Australia is also one of the top five destinations for China’s exports or is one of top five sources of imports in China, then an additional edge will connect the two, but with an arrow pointing at China.

The financial flows network is constructed using information on bilateral financial claims from the BIS’s Locational Banking Statistics (LBS) database and depicted in Figure XII in the Appendix. Similar to the trade network, the financial flows network has an edge between each pair of countries for which at least one country is a top five provider or receiver of cross-border funding flows. We also use a concept of direction that is similar to what we used in the trade networks: if Canada is a top five source or destination of funds for Mexico, then the arrow will point from Canada to Mexico. Furthermore, if Mexico is a top five source or destination of funds for Canada, then a separate edge will connect the two with an arrow that points from Mexico to Canada.

The purpose of constructing directed trade and financial flow networks is to provide a comparison for sentiment networks. In the following section, we will introduce sentiment networks, which will use a different concept of directionality, since sentiment is defined separately for each central bank. We will also compare the trade and financial flows networks with the sentiment networks. This will allow us to demonstrate that the sentiment network is not be explained by trade and financial flow exposure.

### 3.2 Granger Causality Networks: Sentiment

In the previous section, we constructed quarterly measures of net sentiment for 23 central banks. We will now use these time series to construct Granger causality networks. Specifically, we follow Billio et al. (2012), who construct linear Granger causality networks with inter-relationships that take the following form:

$$R_{t+1}^i = a^i R_t^i + b^{ij} R_t^j + e_{t+1}^i \quad (3)$$

$$R_{t+1}^j = a^j R_t^j + b^{ji} R_t^i + e_{t+1}^j. \quad (4)$$

Here, entities are indexed by  $i$  and  $j$ . Furthermore, it is assumed that entity  $j$  Granger-causes entity  $i$  when  $b^{ij}$  is significantly different from zero; and entity  $i$  Granger-causes entity  $j$  when  $b^{ji}$  is significantly different from zero. We then modify the process to deal with potential non-stationarity in the series using the following approach, which is outlined in Toda and Yamamoto (1995) and consists of four steps:

1. Compute  $m = \max\{m_i, m_j\}$ , where  $m_j$  is the order of integration of  $R_t^j$ .
2. Recover the maximum lag length,  $p$ , for model variables using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC).
3. Take the specification determined in step 2 and add  $m$  lags to each variable.
4. Apply a Wald test for Granger non-causality on the first  $p$  coefficients for the foreign entity in each equation.

The adjusted model equations are as follows:

$$R_{t+1}^i = a_0^i + \sum_{s=0}^{p+m} a_s^i R_{t-1-s}^i + \sum_{s=0}^{p+m} b^{ij} R_{t-1-s}^j + e_{t+1}^i \quad (5)$$

$$R_{t+1}^j = a_0^j + \sum_{s=0}^{p+m} a_s^j R_{t-1-s}^j + \sum_{s=0}^{p+m} b^{ji} R_{t-1-s}^i + e_{t+1}^j. \quad (6)$$

If the test rejects the null of Granger non-causality in step 4, we claim that there is evidence for Granger causality. We perform the same test for each country pair. In each case, we run separate VARs and perform separate Granger causality tests for real GDP growth and for net central bank speech sentiment.


We then construct a network diagram for net central bank sentiment using the following procedure:

1. Each country pair with at least one Granger causal link in either direction is connected by an edge.
2. If the Granger causal connection runs from country  $j$  to country  $i$ , then the arrow on the edge connecting  $j$  and  $i$  will point to  $i$ .

Figure XIII in the Appendix shows the Granger causal net sentiment network across central banks. Importantly, there are stark differences between the network structure for trade and financial flows, and central bank speech sentiment. The network for central bank net sentiment contains many more edges and features substantially more complex relationships; however, the most obvious difference is the directionality of relationships. We can also see that some of the largest network nodes have many incoming and outgoing Granger causal connections. In the rest of this section, we will examine the trade and sentiment subnetworks for the largest nodes, including their incoming and outgoing connections. We will skip a detailed analysis of the financial flows network due to its similarity to the trade network.

We will start with the subnetworks for the United States, which are depicted in Figure IV. The network on the left shows the linkages in trade between all countries and the United States. As we might expect, the U.S. is a top source of imports and destination of exports for many countries. It also has inbound links from large economies, such as the Eurozone, China, the United Kingdom, Japan, Germany, and Canada. With respect to sentiment transmission, the U.S. has a tighter network, but affects large central banks, such as the ECB and BoJ. Furthermore, it does not have inbound links, which suggests it is a generator, rather than receiver, of central bank sentiment. Overall, this largely conforms to what we might expect for a large economy. As we will show later in a VAR exercise, the Fed appears to have unique statistical and economic significance as a generator of central bank sentiment.

Figure IV: Trade and Sentiment Networks: United States




The subnetwork on the left depicts trade flows for the United States. The subnetwork on the right shows central bank sentiment for the United States.

Figure V shows the equivalent subnetworks for Japan. The trade network aligns well with our expectations for a large economy. Japan has strong trade connections with neighboring countries, such as South Korea, China, Indonesia, and Australia. It also has ties to North American countries: the United States, Mexico, and Canada. Most of these connections are outgoing, which suggests that Japan tends to create trade exposures, rather than accepting them. The sentiment network, however, is distinctly different from the U.S.'s and also distinctly different from Japan's trade network. Rather than having many outgoing causal connections, incoming connections dominate for the BoJ. They primarily emanate from large economies and financial centers, such as the U.S., Switzerland, and Germany, and geographically close countries, such as Australia and India. Countries with both incoming and outgoing causal connections in sentiment are primarily large trading partners located within Europe.

We next consider the Eurozone subnetwork, which is shown in Figure VI. Note that we treat speeches given by national banks in the Eurozone separately from the ECB. Here, we



Figure V: Trade and Sentiment Networks: Japan




The subnetwork on the left depicts trade flows for Japan. The subnetwork on the right shows central bank sentiment for Japan.

find a stark difference between the trade and sentiment networks. While most Eurozone trade links are outbound, virtually all sentiment links are inbound. This could be related to the ECB's institutional mandate as the representative of all Eurozone countries.

Next, we examine the trade and sentiment networks for the United Kingdom, shown in Figure VII. We can see that the United Kingdom is an important trade partner for many countries. It has outgoing links to many small and large economies, as well as inbound links from large economies, such as China, the United States, France, and Germany. With respect to sentiment, however, the Bank of England exclusively has outgoing links, but to relatively fewer banks. Most notably, it affects sentiment at the ECB, but is not affected by the ECB in a Granger causal sense.

Finally, we consider the networks for Sweden. With respect to trade, Sweden is the smallest economy we consider and, thus, has only two outgoing links to Norway and to the Eurozone. The remaining incoming links come from the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom, Norway, and the Eurozone. Importantly, however, Sweden appears to have

Figure VI: Trade and Sentiment Networks: Eurozone




The subnetwork on the left depicts trade flows for the Eurozone. The subnetwork on the right shows central bank sentiment for the Eurozone.

a stronger impact on the sentiment of other central banks with outbound links pointing at the Czech Republic, Belgium, Austria, Italy, and the Eurozone.

Overall, we find substantial differences across large nodes in the network. Some primarily take in sentiment from other central banks. Others primarily or exclusively influence other central banks' sentiment. We also find substantial differences between exposure to trade and financial flows, and comovement in sentiment across countries.

As stated earlier, the network construction exercise should be interpreted primarily as descriptive. The purpose of using Granger causality is to generate directed networks. For this reason, we will revisit the idea of spillovers later in a sign-restricted VAR exercise with an extended vector of variables to tease out international spillover effects. However, we will first take a more detailed look at the drivers of sentiment comovement in the following section.

Figure VII: Trade and Sentiment: United Kingdom



The subnetwork on the left depicts trade flows for the United Kingdom. The subnetwork on the right shows central bank sentiment for the United Kingdom.


### 3.3 Cross-Sectional Regressions

We have now demonstrated that a shock to central bank sentiment affects domestic macroeconomic variables, and may spillover to foreign central bank sentiment, policy rates, and macroeconomic variables. We also showed that sentiment cannot be reduced to exposure to trade and financial flows. In fact, in some extreme cases, countries that have a broad reach with respect to trade and financial flows are receivers, rather than generators, of central bank sentiment. In the empirical exercise in this subsection, we consider what explains strong comovement in sentiment between pairs of central banks. In particular, we estimate equation (7):

$$\rho_{i,j} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_{i,j} + \beta_2 L_{i,j} + \beta_3 C_{i,j} + \beta_4 X_{i,j} + \gamma_{i,j} + \zeta_{i,j} + e_{i,j}. \quad (7)$$

Note that  $i$  and  $j$  in the equation above index countries  $i$  and  $j$ . The dependent variable,  $\rho_{i,j}$ , is the cross-country correlation in central bank sentiment. Our variables of interest

Figure VIII: Trade and Sentiment Networks: Sweden



The subnetwork on the left depicts trade flows for Sweden. The subnetwork on the right shows central bank sentiment for Sweden.

are  $D_{i,j}$ ,  $L_{i,j}$ , and  $C_{i,j}$ , where  $D_{i,j}$  is the distance in thousands of kilometers between a pair of central banks;<sup>10</sup>  $L_{i,j}$  is a binary variable that is equal to 1 if the pair of countries share a common language; and  $C_{i,j}$  indicates whether one country was a colony of or gained independence from the other. The vector,  $X_{i,j}$ , is a set of control variables. And finally,  $\gamma_{i,j}$  are country fixed effects and  $\zeta_{i,j}$  is a binary variable that indicates whether a pair of central banks is located on the same continent.

Our results are given in Table IV in the Appendix. Column 1 shows the results for distance,  $D_{i,j}$ , with no controls included. Column 2 adds shared language,  $L_{i,j}$ , and colonial ties,  $C_{i,j}$ . Column 3 adds three controls,  $X_{i,j}$ : 1) the pairwise correlation in real GDP growth; 2) a dummy variable that is equal to 1 if at least one of the two countries is a top five import or export partner of the other; and 3) a dummy variable that is equal to 1 if at least one of the two countries is a top five provider or receiver of private financial flows to the other.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup>We compute this as the great circle distance between a pair of countries' capital cities.

<sup>11</sup>Private financial flows are constructed using the Bank for International Settlements' Locational Banking Statistics database.

Column 4 includes a control for the natural logarithm of the number of speeches given by the pair. Column 5 adds country fixed effects,  $\gamma_{i,j}$ , which indicate whether either country  $i$  or  $j$  is country  $k$ . Column 6 includes a dummy,  $\zeta_{i,j}$ , for whether the two central banks are located on the same continent. Column 7 clusters standard errors at the continent level, rather than using heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors, as is done in all other specifications. Columns 8 and 9 drop China and the U.S., respectively.

Columns 1-4 indicate that all three variables of interest—distance, shared language, and colonial ties—have at least a weak impact on the correlation in sentiment across central banks. The coefficient on shared language implies that two central banks with a common language have, on average, a 0.0645 higher correlation in sentiment. This is a 21% increase for the median pair of central banks. Similarly, if one central bank in a pair is located in a country that was a colony of the other or gained independence from the other, this is associated with a 0.1149 increase in sentiment correlation. This amounts to a 37% increase in correlation for the median pair of central banks. Importantly, however, shared language and colonial ties are robust to the inclusion of economic control variables, but not country fixed effects. This suggests that the channel might be somewhat subtler. Namely, being a colony or a colonizer or sharing a language with many other countries may explain a substantial share of the comovement in sentiment with other central banks.

Finally, we consider the impact of distance, which is our most robust finding. It remains significant at the 1% level in all specifications, even when economic control variables, country fixed effects, and shared continent dummies are included. It also remains significant if the U.S. or China is dropped, and does not appear to be sensitive to method used to construct standard errors. Moreover, it remains significant even in specifications where the correlation in real GDP growth does not. Our preferred specification in column 6 suggests that a 1,000 kilometer (km) increase in distance between a pair of central banks is associated with a 0.0175 reduction in central bank sentiment correlation. Thus, an 8,000km increase in distance (e.g. from London to Beijing) is associated with a 0.14 decrease in central bank sentiment correlation. This is a 45% reduction for the median central bank pair.

Our findings have important implications for policy. Namely, they suggest that distance remains an important factor in the alignment of central bank communication. Even when country, language, colonial ties, continent, and business cycle comovement are controlled

for, distance stands alone as a uniquely statistically and economically significant predictor of comovement in central bank sentiment. If central bank communication is influenced more by distance than by exposure to common shocks, then it might be possible to reap substantial policy gains by adjusting communication to correct for this bias.

### 3.4 Sign-Restricted VARs

With the basic network structure of sentiment transmission across central banks in place, we next quantify the impact shocks to central bank communication have on domestic and foreign macro and policy variables. We do this by performing sign-restricted VARs with the rejection method described in Rubio-Ramirez et al. (2010). This approach allows for partial identification of impulse responses functions (IRFs) to a single structural shock. In each case, we examine the impact of a shock to net domestic speech sentiment on domestic or foreign variables. We focus specifically on the five central banks with the highest number of speeches, among those with complete data and independent monetary policy. Furthermore, we do not differentiate between sentiment that contains news about the underlying state of the economy and news that signals future policy. More precisely, a shock to net speech sentiment is the combined effect of central bank reactions to perceived changes in the underlying state of the economy and central bank signaling about future policy.

We perform two sets of VARs. The first captures the domestic impact of sentiment shocks with an expanded set of macroeconomic variables. For each central bank, we perform a sign-restricted VAR with quarterly measures of central bank speech sentiment, the policy rate, unemployment, equity price growth, the real exchange rate, and imports.<sup>12</sup> The second set of VARs are quarterly and also have six variables: domestic and foreign central bank sentiment, domestic and foreign central bank policy rates, and domestic and foreign unemployment. Note that for the second set of VARs, we drop equity price growth, the real exchange rate, and imports. We make the following sign restrictions on all VARs in this subsection:

1. A positive structural shock to domestic central bank sentiment has a weakly positive

---

<sup>12</sup>We have also tried alternative specifications that included real GDP growth and inflation. We generally find that the impact of a sentiment shock on real GDP growth is weaker than the impact on unemployment. Additionally, the impact on inflation is minimal for the period we consider, other than for developing countries with high and volatile inflation rates.

effect on domestic central bank sentiment on impact.

2. A positive structural shock to domestic central bank sentiment has a weakly positive effect on the domestic policy rate on impact.
3. A positive structural shock to domestic central bank sentiment has a weakly negative effect on domestic unemployment on impact.
4. A positive structural shock to domestic central bank sentiment has a weakly positive effect on domestic equity price growth on impact.
5. A positive structural shock to domestic central bank sentiment has a weakly positive effect on the real broad effective exchange rate on impact.
6. A positive structural shock to domestic central bank sentiment has a weakly positive effect on imports on impact.

While the first sign restriction is self-explanatory, the remaining sign restrictions are based on the theory discussed in section 2.4. A positive structural shock to domestic central bank sentiment has a direct and positive effect on the domestic policy rate if the change in sentiment signals future policy. Instead, if the shock to domestic central bank sentiment stems from the positive assessment of the underlying state of the economy, then a weakly positive effect on the domestic policy rate follows from the Taylor rule in equation (2). In both cases, we arrive at the postulated sign restriction.

Next, a positive structural shock to domestic central bank sentiment, which stems from a positive assessment of the underlying economy, has a direct effect that is weakly negative on unemployment at impact. At the same time, a positive assessment of the economy is likely to be associated with subsequent contractionary policy under the Taylor rule. This indirect effect via an increase of the domestic policy rate may be associated with an increase in unemployment. However, such an indirect effect would come with a delay of several quarters.<sup>13</sup> Taken together, the direct effect associated with a weakly negative effect on

---

<sup>13</sup>C.J. et al. (1999) document in the Handbook of Macroeconomics that a U.S. monetary policy shock affects U.S. real GDP with about a year's lag, and the effect on unemployment would, if anything, come even later.

unemployment dominates the indirect effect—at least on impact—thereby justifying the third sign restriction.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, we expect the initial positive assessment to have similar effects on impact on equity price growth, the real exchange rate, and imports, justifying the imposed sign restrictions.

Importantly, we do not make any assumptions about the effect on foreign country or foreign central bank variables. Rather, we exclusively make assumptions about the effect on impact for domestic variables that are in line with the existing literature on central bank communication and are justified through theory. Additionally, our results are qualitatively robust to adjustments on the sign restriction for domestic unemployment. In particular, we find similar results if we instead assume that the impact comes with a single-quarter delay. Finally, consistent with the literature, all IRFs shown use 68% confidence intervals.

We will start by examining the results for the domestic VARs. Table II provides a summary of the impulse responses from five single-country VARs. All entries that contain an ‘-’ correspond to IRFs with no statistically significant result. Other entries correspond to IRFs with significance in at least one period. For instance, +1 indicates that the maximum effect was positive and occurred on impact. Note that the impact of a positive sentiment shock on sentiment is largest and positive in the first period for all single-country VARs. Similarly, the maximum impacts on channels that are critical for international transmission—such as equity price growth, the real exchange rate, and imports—arrive within the first quarter. The impact on the policy rate arrives later, generating a positive and significant effect after 2-4 additional quarters. Similarly, the impact on unemployment is negative and appears 1-3 quarters after impact of a positive sentiment shock.

Next, we consider whether central bank communication generates international spillovers. The results of 20 VARs with both domestic and foreign variables are summarized in Table III. All results shown are for spillovers from the “domestic” to “foreign” country or monetary union. The first entity listed receives the shock to domestic central bank speech sentiment. Again, all results with a sign (+/-) and a period of maximum impact were statistically significant in at least that period.

Our results indicate that Fed communication has the most expansive impact of all central

---

<sup>14</sup>If we instead assume that the impact comes with a single-quarter delay, results are qualitatively similar.



Table II: VAR Summary: Domestic Impact

	Sentiment	Policy Rate	Unemployment	Equity Price Growth	Exchange Rate	Imports
Eurozone	+1	+5	-4	+1	+1	+1
U.S.	+1	+4	-4	+1	+1	+1
Japan	+1	+3	-2	+1	+1	+1
U.K.	+1	+4	-4	+1	+1	+1
Sweden	+1	+3	-4	+1	+1	+1

*Notes:* This table provides a summary of the single-country VAR IRFs for the Eurozone, U.S., Japan, U.K., and Sweden. Each VAR contains sentiment, the policy rate, unemployment, equity price growth, the real broad effective exchange rate, and imports of goods and services. In each case, we examine the response to a domestic sentiment shock. We indicate the sign of the maximum impact and the quarter in which it arrived. For example, +1 indicates that the maximum effect was positive and occurred on impact.

banks considered, generating spillovers to sentiment, the policy rate, and unemployment in the Eurozone and the U.K., and spillovers to sentiment and the policy rate in Sweden. Furthermore, consistent with the weaker network structure results, none of the central banks considered appear to affect U.S. sentiment, the policy rate, or unemployment.

The ECB, which communicates more frequently than any other central bank, affects sentiment, the policy rate, and unemployment in Sweden, but does not affect any of the other central banks. The BoJ does not appear to have an impact on communication directly, but does influence policy rates at other central banks. Finally, the BoE appears to have a substantial impact on the ECB and Eurozone and a weaker impact on Sweden. The Riksbank affects the ECB policy rate with a delay and sentiment at the BoE.

We next examine relationships between the most frequent communicators within a selected group of central banks: the Fed, the BoE, and the ECB. We will start with the ECB and BoE. Note that all IRFs are shown in the Appendix. Figure XIV shows the impact of a positive structural shock to BoE sentiment on domestic and foreign (ECB and Eurozone) policy and macroeconomic variables. Here, we find that the impact on domestic sentiment lasts 4 quarters, but has a longer impact on the BoE's policy rate and domestic unemployment. We also see symmetric effects on ECB sentiment, the ECB's policy rate, and Eurozone unemployment. These effects, however, arrive with a substantial delay for the ECB policy rate and Eurozone unemployment.

Table III: VAR Summary: Cross-Country Spillovers

	Sentiment	Policy Rate	Unemployment
<i>Eurozone</i>			
Eurozone → U.S.	–	–	–
Eurozone → U.K.	–	–	–
Eurozone → Japan	–	–	–
Eurozone → Sweden	+1	+5	-4
<i>U.S.</i>			
U.S. → Eurozone	+1	+5	-5
U.S. → Japan	–	–	–
U.S. → U.K.	+2	+3	-6
U.S. → Sweden	+2	+5	–
<i>Japan</i>			
Japan → Eurozone	–	+5	–
Japan → U.S.	–	–	–
Japan → U.K.	–	+2	–
Japan → Sweden	–	+2	–
<i>U.K.</i>			
U.K. → Eurozone	+2	+7	-6
U.K. → U.S.	–	–	–
U.K. → Japan	–	–	–
U.K. → Sweden	–	+2	–
<i>Sweden</i>			
Sweden → Eurozone	–	+5	–
Sweden → U.S.	–	–	–
Sweden → Japan	–	–	–
Sweden → U.K.	+2	–	–

*Notes:* This table provides a summary of spillover effects from two-country VAR IRFs for the Eurozone, U.S., Japan, U.K., and Sweden. Each VAR contains foreign and domestic sentiment, policy rates, and unemployment. In each case, we examine the response to a domestic sentiment shock, where the “domestic” country is listed first. We indicate the sign of the maximum impact and the quarter in which it arrived. For example, +1 indicates that the maximum effect was positive and occurred on impact. Finally, note that ‘–’ alone indicates that there were no significant results.

Importantly, as shown in Figure XV, the impact of a structural shock to ECB sentiment on ECB, Eurozone, BoE, and U.K. variables is not symmetric. The shock to ECB sentiment

has only a small, one-quarter impact on domestic macroeconomic variables and policy variables. Additionally, there are no spillovers from ECB sentiment shocks to the U.K. or to BoE sentiment or policy.

Next, we consider the impact of Fed sentiment on the U.S. and on the Eurozone in Figure XVI, and the impact of ECB sentiment on the Eurozone and the U.S. in Figure XVII. Here, we find that a positive shock to Fed sentiment has stronger and more persistent effects on future Fed sentiment, the target policy rate, and unemployment. We also find larger and more persistent effects on ECB sentiment and policy, as well as Eurozone unemployment.

Again, we do not find spillovers from a positive shock to ECB sentiment to the Fed or to U.S. unemployment. Along with the network analysis, this suggests that the ECB primarily takes in sentiment from large foreign central banks, rather than influencing it. While this may appear counterintuitive, it is likely consistent with its mandate as an institution that represents many countries within the Eurozone.

Finally, we examine spillovers between the Fed and the BoE in Figures XVIII and XIX. Figure XVIII suggests that there are weak spillovers from Fed sentiment to BoE policy rates and U.K. unemployment. And Figure XIX suggests that these spillovers do not flow in the opposite direction from the BoE to the Fed.

Overall, we find evidence for international spillovers from sentiment to sentiment, sentiment to policy rates, and sentiment to unemployment. These effects are typically only in one direction; and the Fed appears to generate particularly large and durable spillover effects. The prominence of the Fed in affecting central bank sentiment is rather intuitive, and there are a few channels that may explain this result. One possible explanation is that the U.S. economy has been a strong growth driver for the world economy. This could explain why other central banks are highly influenced by the Fed’s speech sentiment. Alternatively, it could reflect the Fed’s key role in setting the risk free interest rate in the integrated global financial market. Investors across the world pay close attention to Fed communication, and other central banks react accordingly. Another explanation is that this finding could be the result of the Fed being in a unique position to interpret global business cycle shocks or to affect global sentiment. In our sample, the Federal Reserve System delivers a large number of speeches, which could potentially update market participants on the Fed view of the economy. It is, however, challenging to test these channels separately.

## 4 Conclusion

We construct a novel dataset using English-translated central bank speeches from the BIS’s archive. We extract the sentiment content from speeches given by 23 of the central banks over the 2002-2017 period by applying the Loughran and McDonald (2011) dictionary. Using the net positivity measure, we perform three exercises. First, we construct directed networks to capture trade and financial flow exposure, and Granger causality networks to capture sentiment linkages between central banks. Second, we examine the drivers of comovement in sentiment across central banks in a cross-sectional regression. And third, we revisit the network results, focusing specifically on important nodes in greater detail by performing sign-restricted VARs for selected country pairs.

We show that the central bank speech sentiment network is not reducible to exposure to trade, financial flows, or business cycle comovement. This is important because it suggests that cross-country comovement in sentiment is not simply driven by comovement in output over the business cycle. Rather, there is a component of cross-country sentiment comovement that is unrelated to real linkages. Since the existing literature has demonstrated that a central bank’s own communication predicts policy and macroeconomic variables, this alone suggests that the sentiment-to-sentiment spillovers we observe in the network may imply that policy and macroeconomic outcomes could be affected by common communication strategies, relationships between central banks, or shared conceptual frameworks for understanding the macroeconomy. Furthermore, our network analysis also shows that the largest central banks are not necessarily the most influential. While the Fed and BoE tend to influence sentiment at other central banks, the BoJ and the ECB are primarily influenced by other central banks.

In a separate cross-sectional regression exercise, we delve deeper into the underlying drivers of central bank sentiment comovement. We show that having either a shared language or colonial ties tends to generate positive comovement in central bank speech sentiment. Furthermore, we find that geographic distance between central banks is a uniquely statistically and economically significant predictor of comovement in central bank sentiment. This relationship persists in the presence of country fixed effects, a shared continent dummy, and controls for business comovement, trade, and financial flows.

Finally, we use sign-restricted VARs to demonstrate that there are substantial interna-

tional spillovers in sentiment, policy rates, and macroeconomic variables between important nodes in the central bank communication network. In particular, we document that positive shocks to Fed and BoE sentiment predict increases in ECB sentiment, increases in the ECB’s policy rate, and decreases in Eurozone unemployment. Furthermore, the relationship does not flow in the opposite direction: ECB sentiment shocks do not affect U.S. or U.K. macroeconomic or policy variables. Importantly, we establish these findings by making identification assumptions exclusively about the impact on domestic sentiment, policy variables, and macroeconomic variables.

We leave it to future research to consider the impact of sentiment on inflation in countries with high or volatile inflation rates. Furthermore, future research might make use of the data introduced in this paper to study international policy cooperation.

## References

- Andersson, M., H. Dillén, and P. Sellin**, “Monetary Policy Signaling and Movements in the Term Structure of Interest Rates,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2006, *53* (8), 1815–1855.
- Angeletos, G.-M. and J. La’O**, “Sentiments,” *Econometrica*, 2013, *81* (2), 739–779.
- Apel, M. and M.B. Grimaldi**, “The Information Content of Central Bank Minutes,” *Review of Economics*, 2014, *11* (4), 47–89.
- Berge, T.J. and G. Cao**, “Global effects of U.S. monetary policy: is unconventional policy different?,” *Economic Review*, 2014, *Q* (I), 5–31.
- Bernanke, B.S.**, “Communication and Monetary Policy,” *Speech at the National Economists Club Annual Dinner*, 2013.
- , “Federal Reserve Policy in an International Context,” *Speech at the 16th Jaques Polak Annual Research Conference*, November 5-6, 2015.
- , **V.R Reinhart, and B. Sack**, “Monetary Policy Alternatives at the Zero Bound: An Empirical Assessment,” *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2004, *2*, 1–78.
- Billio, M., M. Getmansky, A. Lo, and L. Pelizzon**, “Econometric measures of connectedness and systemic risk in the finance and insurance sectors,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2012, *104*, 535–559.

- Blinder, A.S., M. Ehrmann, M. Fratzscher, and D.J. Jansen**, “Central Bank Communication and Monetary Policy: A Survey of Theory and Evidence,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 2008, 46 (4), 910–945.
- Broner, F. and R. Rigobon**, “Why are Capital Flows so Much More Volatile in Emerging than in Developed Countries?,” in Ricardo Caballero, César Calderón, and Luis Felipe Céspedes, eds., *External Vulnerability and Preventive Policies*, Santiago, Chile: Central Bank of Chile, 2006, pp. 15 – 39.
- Burkhard, L., A. Fischer, and M. Andreas**, “Communicating Policy Options at the Zero Bound,” *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 2010, 28 (5), 742–754.
- Canova, F.**, “The transmission of US shocks to Latin America,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 2005, 20 (2), 229–251.
- Carvalho, C., E. Hsu, and F. Nechio**, “Measuring the Effect of the Zero Lower Bound on Monetary Policy,” *Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Working Paper*, 2016.
- Chen, J., T. Mancini-Griffoli, and R. Sahay**, “Spillovers from United States Monetary Policy on Emerging Markets: Different This Time?,” *IMF Working Paper*, 2014, 14 (240).
- C.J., Lawrence, M. Eichenbaum, and C.L. Evans**, “Chapter 2 Monetary policy shocks: What have we learned and to what end?,” in “Handbook of Macroeconomics,” Vol. 1, Elsevier, 1999, pp. 65 – 148.
- David, P.A.**, “Why are institutions the “carriers of history”? Path dependence and the evolution of conventions, organizations and institutions,” *Structural change and economic dynamics*, 1994, 5 (2), 205–220.
- Dedola, L., G. Rivolta, and L. Stracca**, “If the Fed sneezes, who catches a cold?,” *Journal of International Economics*, 2017, (108), 23–41.
- di Giovanni, J. and J.C. Shambaugh**, “The impact of foreign interest rates on the economy: The role of the exchange rate regime,” *Journal of International Economics*, 2008, 74 (2), 341–361.
- Ehrmann, M. and J. Talmi**, “Starting from a blank page? Semantic similarity in central bank communication and market volatility,” *ECB Working Paper*, 2017.
- **and M. Fratzscher**, “Communication by Central Bank Committee Members: Different Strategies, Same Effectiveness?,” *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 2007, 39 (509-541).
- **and —**, “The Timing of Central Bank Communication,” *European Journal of Political Economy*, 2007, 23 (1), 124–145.
- Eichengreen, B.**, “International policy coordination in historical perspective: a view from the interwar years,” in “International economic policy coordination,” Cambridge University Press, 1985, pp. 139–183.


- and **P. Gupta**, “Tapering Talk: The Impact of Expectations of Reduced Federal Reserve Security Purchases on Emerging Markets,” *Emerging Markets Review*, 2015, 25 (1-15).
- Federico, P., C. Vegh, and G. Vuletin**, “The Effect of Capital Flows Composition on Output Volatility,” *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 6386*, 2013, (March).
- Fischer, S.**, “The Federal Reserve and the Global Economy,” *Speech by Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System delivered as the Per Jacobsson Foundation Lecture 2014 Annual Meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank Group Washington*, 2014.
- Fleming, M.J.**, “Domestic Financial Policies under Fixed and under Floating Exchange Rates,” *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers*, 1962, 9, 369–380.
- FOMC**, “Policy Normalization Principles and Plans,” *Press release, Washington, D.C., 17 September 2014*, available at: <http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/press/monetary/20140917c.htm>, 2014.
- Fratzscher, M.**, “On the Long-Term Effectiveness of Exchange Rate Communication and Interventions,” *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 2006, 25 (1), 146–167.
- , “Oral Interventions versus Actual Interventions in FX Markets: An Event-Study Approach,” *Economic Journal*, 2008, 118 (530), 1079–1106.
- , **M. Lo Duca, and R. Straub**, “ECB Unconventional Monetary Policy: Market Impact and International Spillovers,” *IMF Economic Review*, 2016, 64 (1), 36–74.
- Gürkaynak, R.S., B. Sack, and E. Swanson**, “Do Actions Speak Louder Than Words? The Response of Asset Prices to Monetary Policy Actions and Statements,” *International Journal of Central Banking*, 2005, 1 (1).
- Hansen, S. and M. McMahon**, “Shocking language: Understanding the macroeconomic effects of central bank communication,” *Journal of International Economics*, 2015, 99, 114–133.
- Hensel, Paul R.**, “ICOW Colonial History Data Set, version 1.0,” Available at <http://www.paulhensel.org/icowcol.html>, 2014.
- J.D., Stephen M. Amato and H.S. Shin**, “Communication and Monetary Policy,” *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 2002, 18 (4), 495–503.
- Kohn, D. and B. Sack**, “Central Bank Talk: Does It Matter and Why?,” *Macroeconomics, Monetary Policy, and Financial Stability*, 2004, pp. 175–206.
- Loughran, T. and B. McDonald**, “When is a liability not a liability? Textual analysis, dictionaries, and 10-Ks,” *Journal of Finance*, 2011, 66 (1).

- Maćkowiak, B.**, “External shocks, U.S. monetary policy and macroeconomic fluctuations in emerging markets,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2007, 54 (8), 2512–2520.
- Morais, B., J.-L. Peydró, and C. Ruiz Ortega**, “The International Bank Lending Channel of Monetary Policy Rates and Quantitative Easing: Credit Supply, Reach-for-Yield, and Real Effects,” *The Journal of Finance* (forthcoming), 2017.
- Morris, S. and H.S. Shin**, “Social Value of Public Information,” *American Economic Review*, 2002, 92 (5), 1521–1534.
- Mundell, R.A.**, “Capital Mobility and Stabilization Policy under Fixed and Flexible Exchange Rates,” *Canadian Journal of Economic and Political Science*, 1963, 29, 475–485.
- Neely, C.J.**, “Lessons from the Taper Tantrum,” *Economic Synopsis, St. Louis Fed*, 2014, 2.
- Rajan, R.**, “Competitive monetary easing - is it yesterday once more?,” *Remarks by Dr Raghuram Rajan, Governor of the Reserve Bank of India, at the Brookings Institution, Washington DC, 10 April 2014*, available at: <https://www.bis.org/review/r140414b.htm>, 2014.
- Reeves, R. and M. Sawicki**, “Do Financial Markets React to Bank of England Communication,” *European Journal of Political Economy*, 2007, 23, 207–227.
- Rey, H.**, “Dilemma not Trilemma: The global Financial Cycle and Monetary Policy Independence,” *paper presented at Global Dimensions of Unconventional Monetary Policy, Jackson Hole, Federal Reserve Bank, August 22-24*, 2015.
- Rubio-Ramirez, J., D.F. Waggoner, and T. Zha**, “Structural Vector Autoregressions: Theory of Identification and Algorithms for Inference,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 2010, 77, 665–696.
- Schmeling, M. and C. Wagner**, “Does Central Bank Tone Move Asset Prices?,” *Mimeo*, 2016.
- Svensson, L.E.O.**, “Social Value of Public Information: Comment: Morris and Shin (2002) Is Actually Pro-Transparency, Not Con,” *American Economic Review*, 2006, 96 (1), 448–452.
- Toda, H.Y. and T. Yamamoto**, “Statistical Inference in Vector Autoregressions with Possibly Integrated Processes,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 1995, 77, 225–250.
- Woodford, M.**, “Central bank communication and policy effectiveness,” *NBER Working Papers*, 2005.




## 5 Appendix

Figure IX: Explained Variance Ratio for Principal Components




The plot above shows the share of variance explained for each principal component. Note that the first principal component explains over 25% of the variation in the data. We performed principal components on the net sentiment series for 23 countries over the 2002-2017 period.

Figure X: First, Second, and Third Principal Component and Correlations




The top panel shows the time series of the first principal component (left) and correlations between the first principal component and country series (right). In the mid and bottom panels we do the same for the second and third principle component, respectively. All analysis is done for 23 countries over the 2002-2017 sample period.

Figure XI: Directed Network: Trade




The network diagram above shows a directed network of trade flows. Edges indicate that at least one country is a top five import or export partner of the other. Arrows point to the country for which the trade relationship is important. An arrow pointing from Germany to Luxembourg indicates that Germany is a top five import or export partner of Luxembourg. Note that the size of each node is proportional to total trade.

Figure XII: Directed Network: Financial Flows




The network diagram above shows a directed network of private financial flows. Edges indicate that at least one country is a top source or destination of funds from the other. Arrows point to the country for which the flow is important. An arrow pointing from Switzerland to Italy indicates that Switzerland is either a top five provider of funds to Italy or a top five destination of funds for Italy. Note that size of each node is proportional to gross financial flows.

Figure XIII: Granger Causality Network: Central Bank Sentiment




The network diagram above shows Granger causal connections in sentiment between each pair of countries in our dataset. Edges indicate the presence of at least one Granger causal connection between two nodes. Arrows indicate the direction of causality. Node size is proportional to the total number of speeches given by officials at the central bank over the 2002-2017 period.

Figure XIV: Impact of Positive Shock to BoE Speech Sentiment on U.K. and Eurozone




The plots above show IRFs from a positive structural shock to Bank of England speech sentiment. We computed the IRFs using the rejection method introduced by Rubio-Ramirez et al. (2010). For identification, we exclusively make assumptions about first period impacts on domestic variables.

Figure XV: Impact of Positive Shock to ECB Speech Sentiment on Eurozone and U.K.



The plots above show IRFs from a positive structural shock to European Central Bank speech sentiment. We computed the IRFs using the rejection method introduced by Rubio-Ramirez et al. (2010). For identification, we exclusively make assumptions about first period impacts on domestic variables.


Figure XVI: Impact of Positive Shock to Fed Speech Sentiment on U.S. and Eurozone



The plots above show IRFs from a positive structural shock to Federal Reserve speech sentiment. We computed the IRFs using the rejection method introduced by Rubio-Ramirez et al. (2010). For identification, we exclusively make assumptions about first period impacts on domestic variables.




Figure XVII: Impact of Positive Shock to ECB Speech Sentiment on Eurozone and U.S.




The plots above show IRFs from a positive structural shock to European Central Bank speech sentiment. We computed the IRFs using the rejection method introduced by Rubio-Ramirez et al. (2010). For identification, we exclusively make assumptions about first period impacts on domestic variables.

Figure XVIII: Impact of Positive Shock to Fed Speech Sentiment on U.S. and U.K.



The plots above show IRFs from a positive structural shock to Federal Reserve speech sentiment. We computed the IRFs using the rejection method introduced by Rubio-Ramirez et al. (2010). For identification, we exclusively make assumptions about first period impacts on domestic variables.

Figure XIX: Impact of Positive Shock to BoE Speech Sentiment on U.K. and U.S.



The plots above show IRFs from a positive structural shock to Bank of England speech sentiment. We computed the IRFs using the rejection method introduced by Rubio-Ramirez et al. (2010). For identification, we exclusively make assumptions about first period impacts on domestic variables.

Table IV: Impact of Distance, Shared Language, and Colonial-Ties on Central Bank Sentiment Correlation

	(1) (OLS)	(2) (OLS)	(3) (OLS)	(4) (OLS)	(5) (OLS)	(6) (OLS)	(7) (OLS)	(8) (OLS)	(9) (OLS)
Distance	-0.0115*** (0.0026)	-0.0112*** (0.0026)	-0.0104*** (0.0029)	-0.0112*** (0.0031)	-0.0157*** (0.0030)	-0.0175*** (0.0049)	-0.0175*** (0.0002)	-0.0148*** (0.0051)	-0.0183*** (0.0052)
Shared Language		0.0730** (0.0332)	0.0639** (0.0312)	0.0645** (0.0301)	-0.0052 (0.0341)	-0.0035 (0.0352)	-0.0035 (0.0175)	-0.0032 (0.0345)	-0.0263 (0.0376)
Colonial Ties		0.0896* (0.0537)	0.1149*** (0.0438)	0.1139*** (0.0436)	0.0297 (0.0567)	0.0258 (0.0607)	0.0258 (0.0051)	0.0119 (0.0614)	0.0693 (0.0648)
Real GDP Correlation			0.1972*** (0.0625)	0.1916*** (0.0602)	-0.0930 (0.0848)	-0.1057 (0.0863)	-0.1057 (0.0273)	-0.0091 (0.0897)	-0.1460* (0.0875)
Trade Flows			-0.0818*** (0.0279)	-0.0923*** (0.0300)	-0.0066 (0.0239)	-0.0043 (0.0249)	-0.0043 (0.0211)	-0.0015 (0.0248)	-0.0184 (0.0262)
Private Financial Flows			-0.0070 (0.0291)	-0.0111 (0.0295)	0.0009 (0.0258)	0.0019 (0.0259)	0.0019 (0.0013)	0.0380 (0.0239)	0.0015 (0.0301)
Log(Speeches)				0.0200 (0.0195)	-0.0011 (0.0205)	-0.0040 (0.0209)	-0.0040 (0.0354)	-0.0252 (0.0207)	-0.0462 (0.0366)
Country FE	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Shared Continent FE	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Standard Errors	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	RE	CE	RE	RE
No China	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO
No U.S.	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Adj. R-squared	0.058	0.072	0.139	0.139	0.568	0.567	0.5667	0.373	0.600
N	231	231	231	231	231	231	231	210	210

Notes: The dependent variable is the bilateral correlation in quarterly central bank sentiment over the 2002-2017 period. "Distance" is the great circle distance in thousands of kilometers between the capital cities of each country pair. "Colonial Ties" is a dummy variable equal to 1 if either country in the pair was a colony of the other or gained independence from it. "Real GDP Correlation" is the correlation in real GDP growth per capita between the country pair. "Private Financial Flows" is an indicator for whether at least one country is a top 5 counterpart to the other country's private financial claims. We construct this variable using bilateral private financial flows from the BIS's Locational Banking Statistics. "Trade Flows" indicates whether at least one country is either a top 5 importer or export partner for the other. Finally, "Log(Speeches)" is the natural logarithm of the sum of the speech counts for the central banks in the pair. Standard errors are either heteroskedasticity robust (RE) or are clustered at the continent level (CE). \*\*\* indicates significance at 1%, \*\* indicates significance at 5%, and \* indicates significance at 10%.

# Earlier Working Papers:

For a complete list of Working Papers published by Sveriges Riksbank, see [www.riksbank.se](http://www.riksbank.se)

Estimation of an Adaptive Stock Market Model with Heterogeneous Agents <i>by Henrik Amilon</i>	2005:177
Some Further Evidence on Interest-Rate Smoothing: The Role of Measurement Errors in the Output Gap <i>by Mikael Apel and Per Jansson</i>	2005:178
Bayesian Estimation of an Open Economy DSGE Model with Incomplete Pass-Through <i>by Malin Adolfson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Mattias Villani</i>	2005:179
Are Constant Interest Rate Forecasts Modest Interventions? Evidence from an Estimated Open Economy DSGE Model of the Euro Area <i>by Malin Adolfson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Mattias Villani</i>	2005:180
Inference in Vector Autoregressive Models with an Informative Prior on the Steady State <i>by Mattias Villani</i>	2005:181
Bank Mergers, Competition and Liquidity <i>by Elena Carletti, Philipp Hartmann and Giancarlo Spagnolo</i>	2005:182
Testing Near-Rationality using Detailed Survey Data <i>by Michael F. Bryan and Stefan Palmqvist</i>	2005:183
Exploring Interactions between Real Activity and the Financial Stance <i>by Tor Jacobson, Jesper Lindé and Kasper Roszbach</i>	2005:184
Two-Sided Network Effects, Bank Interchange Fees, and the Allocation of Fixed Costs <i>by Mats A. Bergman</i>	2005:185
Trade Deficits in the Baltic States: How Long Will the Party Last? <i>by Rudolfs Bems and Kristian Jönsson</i>	2005:186
Real Exchange Rate and Consumption Fluctuations following Trade Liberalization <i>by Kristian Jönsson</i>	2005:187
Modern Forecasting Models in Action: Improving Macroeconomic Analyses at Central Banks <i>by Malin Adolfson, Michael K. Andersson, Jesper Lindé, Mattias Villani and Anders Vredin</i>	2005:188
Bayesian Inference of General Linear Restrictions on the Cointegration Space <i>by Mattias Villani</i>	2005:189
Forecasting Performance of an Open Economy Dynamic Stochastic General Equilibrium Model <i>by Malin Adolfson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Mattias Villani</i>	2005:190
Forecast Combination and Model Averaging using Predictive Measures <i>by Jana Eklund and Sune Karlsson</i>	2005:191
Swedish Intervention and the Krona Float, 1993-2002 <i>by Owen F. Humpage and Javiera Ragnartz</i>	2006:192
A Simultaneous Model of the Swedish Krona, the US Dollar and the Euro <i>by Hans Lindblad and Peter Sellin</i>	2006:193
Testing Theories of Job Creation: Does Supply Create Its Own Demand? <i>by Mikael Carlsson, Stefan Eriksson and Nils Gottfries</i>	2006:194
Down or Out: Assessing The Welfare Costs of Household Investment Mistakes <i>by Laurent E. Calvet, John Y. Campbell and Paolo Sodini</i>	2006:195
Efficient Bayesian Inference for Multiple Change-Point and Mixture Innovation Models <i>by Paolo Giordani and Robert Kohn</i>	2006:196
Derivation and Estimation of a New Keynesian Phillips Curve in a Small Open Economy <i>by Karolina Holmberg</i>	2006:197
Technology Shocks and the Labour-Input Response: Evidence from Firm-Level Data <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Jon Smedsaas</i>	2006:198
Monetary Policy and Staggered Wage Bargaining when Prices are Sticky <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Andreas Westermarck</i>	2006:199
The Swedish External Position and the Krona <i>by Philip R. Lane</i>	2006:200

Price Setting Transactions and the Role of Denominating Currency in FX Markets <i>by Richard Friberg and Fredrik Wilander</i>	2007:201
The geography of asset holdings: Evidence from Sweden <i>by Nicolas Coeurdacier and Philippe Martin</i>	2007:202
Evaluating An Estimated New Keynesian Small Open Economy Model <i>by Malin Adolfson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Mattias Villani</i>	2007:203
The Use of Cash and the Size of the Shadow Economy in Sweden <i>by Gabriela Guibourg and Björn Segendorf</i>	2007:204
Bank supervision Russian style: Evidence of conflicts between micro- and macro-prudential concerns <i>by Sophie Claeys and Koen Schoors</i>	2007:205
Optimal Monetary Policy under Downward Nominal Wage Rigidity <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Andreas Westermarck</i>	2007:206
Financial Structure, Managerial Compensation and Monitoring <i>by Vittoria Cerasi and Sonja Daltung</i>	2007:207
Financial Frictions, Investment and Tobin's $q$ <i>by Guido Lorenzoni and Karl Walentin</i>	2007:208
Sticky Information vs Sticky Prices: A Horse Race in a DSGE Framework <i>by Mathias Trabandt</i>	2007:209
Acquisition versus greenfield: The impact of the mode of foreign bank entry on information and bank lending rates <i>by Sophie Claeys and Christa Hainz</i>	2007:210
Nonparametric Regression Density Estimation Using Smoothly Varying Normal Mixtures <i>by Mattias Villani, Robert Kohn and Paolo Giordani</i>	2007:211
The Costs of Paying – Private and Social Costs of Cash and Card <i>by Mats Bergman, Gabriella Guibourg and Björn Segendorf</i>	2007:212
Using a New Open Economy Macroeconomics model to make real nominal exchange rate forecasts <i>by Peter Sellin</i>	2007:213
Introducing Financial Frictions and Unemployment into a Small Open Economy Model <i>by Lawrence J. Christiano, Mathias Trabandt and Karl Walentin</i>	2007:214
Earnings Inequality and the Equity Premium <i>by Karl Walentin</i>	2007:215
Bayesian forecast combination for VAR models <i>by Michael K. Andersson and Sune Karlsson</i>	2007:216
Do Central Banks React to House Prices? <i>by Daria Finocchiaro and Virginia Queijo von Heideken</i>	2007:217
The Riksbank's Forecasting Performance <i>by Michael K. Andersson, Gustav Karlsson and Josef Svensson</i>	2007:218
Macroeconomic Impact on Expected Default Frequency <i>by Per Åsberg and Hovick Shahnazarian</i>	2008:219
Monetary Policy Regimes and the Volatility of Long-Term Interest Rates <i>by Virginia Queijo von Heideken</i>	2008:220
Governing the Governors: A Clinical Study of Central Banks <i>by Lars Frisell, Kasper Roszbach and Giancarlo Spagnolo</i>	2008:221
The Monetary Policy Decision-Making Process and the Term Structure of Interest Rates <i>by Hans Dillén</i>	2008:222
How Important are Financial Frictions in the U S and the Euro Area <i>by Virginia Queijo von Heideken</i>	2008:223
Block Kalman filtering for large-scale DSGE models <i>by Ingvar Strid and Karl Walentin</i>	2008:224
Optimal Monetary Policy in an Operational Medium-Sized DSGE Model <i>by Malin Adolfson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Lars E. O. Svensson</i>	2008:225
Firm Default and Aggregate Fluctuations <i>by Tor Jacobson, Rikard Kindell, Jesper Lindé and Kasper Roszbach</i>	2008:226
Re-Evaluating Swedish Membership in EMU: Evidence from an Estimated Model <i>by Ulf Söderström</i>	2008:227

The Effect of Cash Flow on Investment: An Empirical Test of the Balance Sheet Channel <i>by Ola Melander</i>	2009:228
Expectation Driven Business Cycles with Limited Enforcement <i>by Karl Walentin</i>	2009:229
Effects of Organizational Change on Firm Productivity <i>by Christina Håkanson</i>	2009:230
Evaluating Microfoundations for Aggregate Price Rigidities: Evidence from Matched Firm-Level Data on Product Prices and Unit Labor Cost <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Oskar Nordström Skans</i>	2009:231
Monetary Policy Trade-Offs in an Estimated Open-Economy DSGE Model <i>by Malin Adolfson, Stefan Laséen, Jesper Lindé and Lars E. O. Svensson</i>	2009:232
Flexible Modeling of Conditional Distributions Using Smooth Mixtures of Asymmetric Student T Densities <i>by Feng Li, Mattias Villani and Robert Kohn</i>	2009:233
Forecasting Macroeconomic Time Series with Locally Adaptive Signal Extraction <i>by Paolo Giordani and Mattias Villani</i>	2009:234
Evaluating Monetary Policy <i>by Lars E. O. Svensson</i>	2009:235
Risk Premiums and Macroeconomic Dynamics in a Heterogeneous Agent Model <i>by Ferre De Graeve, Maarten Dossche, Marina Emiris, Henri Sneessens and Raf Wouters</i>	2010:236
Picking the Brains of MPC Members <i>by Mikael Apel, Carl Andreas Claussen and Petra Lennartsdotter</i>	2010:237
Involuntary Unemployment and the Business Cycle <i>by Lawrence J. Christiano, Mathias Trabandt and Karl Walentin</i>	2010:238
Housing collateral and the monetary transmission mechanism <i>by Karl Walentin and Peter Sellin</i>	2010:239
The Discursive Dilemma in Monetary Policy <i>by Carl Andreas Claussen and Øistein Røisland</i>	2010:240
Monetary Regime Change and Business Cycles <i>by Vasco Cúrdia and Daria Finocchiaro</i>	2010:241
Bayesian Inference in Structural Second-Price common Value Auctions <i>by Bertil Wegmann and Mattias Villani</i>	2010:242
Equilibrium asset prices and the wealth distribution with inattentive consumers <i>by Daria Finocchiaro</i>	2010:243
Identifying VARs through Heterogeneity: An Application to Bank Runs <i>by Ferre De Graeve and Alexei Karas</i>	2010:244
Modeling Conditional Densities Using Finite Smooth Mixtures <i>by Feng Li, Mattias Villani and Robert Kohn</i>	2010:245
The Output Gap, the Labor Wedge, and the Dynamic Behavior of Hours <i>by Luca Sala, Ulf Söderström and Antonella Trigari</i>	2010:246
Density-Conditional Forecasts in Dynamic Multivariate Models <i>by Michael K. Andersson, Stefan Palmqvist and Daniel F. Waggoner</i>	2010:247
Anticipated Alternative Policy-Rate Paths in Policy Simulations <i>by Stefan Laséen and Lars E. O. Svensson</i>	2010:248
MOSES: Model of Swedish Economic Studies <i>by Gunnar Bårdsen, Ard den Reijer, Patrik Jonasson and Ragnar Nymoen</i>	2011:249
The Effects of Endogenous Firm Exit on Business Cycle Dynamics and Optimal Fiscal Policy <i>by Lauri Vilmi</i>	2011:250
Parameter Identification in a Estimated New Keynesian Open Economy Model <i>by Malin Adolfson and Jesper Lindé</i>	2011:251
Up for count? Central bank words and financial stress <i>by Marianna Blix Grimaldi</i>	2011:252
Wage Adjustment and Productivity Shocks <i>by Mikael Carlsson, Julián Messina and Oskar Nordström Skans</i>	2011:253

Stylized (Arte) Facts on Sectoral Inflation <i>by Ferre De Graeve and Karl Walentin</i>	2011:254
Hedging Labor Income Risk <i>by Sebastien Betermier, Thomas Jansson, Christine A. Parlour and Johan Walden</i>	2011:255
Taking the Twists into Account: Predicting Firm Bankruptcy Risk with Splines of Financial Ratios <i>by Paolo Giordani, Tor Jacobson, Erik von Schedvin and Mattias Villani</i>	2011:256
Collateralization, Bank Loan Rates and Monitoring: Evidence from a Natural Experiment <i>by Geraldo Cerqueiro, Steven Ongena and Kasper Roszbach</i>	2012:257
On the Non-Exclusivity of Loan Contracts: An Empirical Investigation <i>by Hans Degryse, Vasso Ioannidou and Erik von Schedvin</i>	2012:258
Labor-Market Frictions and Optimal Inflation <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Andreas Westermarck</i>	2012:259
Output Gaps and Robust Monetary Policy Rules <i>by Roberto M. Billi</i>	2012:260
The Information Content of Central Bank Minutes <i>by Mikael Apel and Marianna Blix Grimaldi</i>	2012:261
The Cost of Consumer Payments in Sweden <i>by Björn Segendorf and Thomas Jansson</i>	2012:262
Trade Credit and the Propagation of Corporate Failure: An Empirical Analysis <i>by Tor Jacobson and Erik von Schedvin</i>	2012:263
Structural and Cyclical Forces in the Labor Market During the Great Recession: Cross-Country Evidence <i>by Luca Sala, Ulf Söderström and Antonella Trigari</i>	2012:264
Pension Wealth and Household Savings in Europe: Evidence from SHARELIFE <i>by Rob Alessie, Viola Angelini and Peter van Santen</i>	2013:265
Long-Term Relationship Bargaining <i>by Andreas Westermarck</i>	2013:266
Using Financial Markets To Estimate the Macro Effects of Monetary Policy: An Impact-Identified FAVAR* <i>by Stefan Pitschner</i>	2013:267
DYNAMIC MIXTURE-OF-EXPERTS MODELS FOR LONGITUDINAL AND DISCRETE-TIME SURVIVAL DATA <i>by Matias Quiroz and Mattias Villani</i>	2013:268
Conditional euro area sovereign default risk <i>by André Lucas, Bernd Schwaab and Xin Zhang</i>	2013:269
Nominal GDP Targeting and the Zero Lower Bound: Should We Abandon Inflation Targeting?*	2013:270
<i>by Roberto M. Billi</i>	
Un-truncating VARs* <i>by Ferre De Graeve and Andreas Westermarck</i>	2013:271
Housing Choices and Labor Income Risk <i>by Thomas Jansson</i>	2013:272
Identifying Fiscal Inflation* <i>by Ferre De Graeve and Virginia Queijo von Heideken</i>	2013:273
On the Redistributive Effects of Inflation: an International Perspective* <i>by Paola Boel</i>	2013:274
Business Cycle Implications of Mortgage Spreads* <i>by Karl Walentin</i>	2013:275
Approximate dynamic programming with post-decision states as a solution method for dynamic economic models <i>by Isaiah Hull</i>	2013:276
A detrimental feedback loop: deleveraging and adverse selection <i>by Christoph Bertsch</i>	2013:277
Distortionary Fiscal Policy and Monetary Policy Goals <i>by Klaus Adam and Roberto M. Billi</i>	2013:278
Predicting the Spread of Financial Innovations: An Epidemiological Approach <i>by Isaiah Hull</i>	2013:279
Firm-Level Evidence of Shifts in the Supply of Credit <i>by Karolina Holmberg</i>	2013:280



Lines of Credit and Investment: Firm-Level Evidence of Real Effects of the Financial Crisis <i>by Karolina Holmberg</i>	2013:281
A wake-up call: information contagion and strategic uncertainty <i>by Toni Ahnert and Christoph Bertsch</i>	2013:282
Debt Dynamics and Monetary Policy: A Note <i>by Stefan Laséen and Ingvar Strid</i>	2013:283
Optimal taxation with home production <i>by Conny Olovsson</i>	2014:284
Incompatible European Partners? Cultural Predispositions and Household Financial Behavior <i>by Michael Haliassos, Thomas Jansson and Yigitcan Karabulut</i>	2014:285
How Subprime Borrowers and Mortgage Brokers Shared the Piecial Behavior <i>by Antje Berndt, Burton Hollifield and Patrik Sandås</i>	2014:286
The Macro-Financial Implications of House Price-Indexed Mortgage Contracts <i>by Isaiah Hull</i>	2014:287
Does Trading Anonymously Enhance Liquidity? <i>by Patrick J. Dennis and Patrik Sandås</i>	2014:288
Systematic bailout guarantees and tacit coordination <i>by Christoph Bertsch, Claudio Calcagno and Mark Le Quement</i>	2014:289
Selection Effects in Producer-Price Setting <i>by Mikael Carlsson</i>	2014:290
Dynamic Demand Adjustment and Exchange Rate Volatility <i>by Vesna Corbo</i>	2014:291
Forward Guidance and Long Term Interest Rates: Inspecting the Mechanism <i>by Ferre De Graeve, Pelin Ilbas &amp; Raf Wouters</i>	2014:292
Firm-Level Shocks and Labor Adjustments <i>by Mikael Carlsson, Julián Messina and Oskar Nordström Skans</i>	2014:293
A wake-up call theory of contagion <i>by Toni Ahnert and Christoph Bertsch</i>	2015:294
Risks in macroeconomic fundamentals and excess bond returns predictability <i>by Rafael B. De Rezende</i>	2015:295
The Importance of Reallocation for Productivity Growth: Evidence from European and US Banking <i>by Jaap W.B. Bos and Peter C. van Santen</i>	2015:296
SPEEDING UP MCMC BY EFFICIENT DATA SUBSAMPLING <i>by Matias Quiroz, Mattias Villani and Robert Kohn</i>	2015:297
Amortization Requirements and Household Indebtedness: An Application to Swedish-Style Mortgages <i>by Isaiah Hull</i>	2015:298
Fuel for Economic Growth? <i>by Johan Gars and Conny Olovsson</i>	2015:299
Searching for Information <i>by Jungsuk Han and Francesco Sangiorgi</i>	2015:300
What Broke First? Characterizing Sources of Structural Change Prior to the Great Recession <i>by Isaiah Hull</i>	2015:301
Price Level Targeting and Risk Management <i>by Roberto Billi</i>	2015:302
Central bank policy paths and market forward rates: A simple model <i>by Ferre De Graeve and Jens Iversen</i>	2015:303
Jump-Starting the Euro Area Recovery: Would a Rise in Core Fiscal Spending Help the Periphery? <i>by Olivier Blanchard, Christopher J. Erceg and Jesper Lindé</i>	2015:304
Bringing Financial Stability into Monetary Policy* <i>by Eric M. Leeper and James M. Nason</i>	2015:305
SCALABLE MCMC FOR LARGE DATA PROBLEMS USING DATA SUBSAMPLING AND THE DIFFERENCE ESTIMATOR <i>by MATIAS QUIROZ, MATTIAS VILLANI AND ROBERT KOHN</i>	2015:306

SPEEDING UP MCMC BY DELAYED ACCEPTANCE AND DATA SUBSAMPLING <i>by MATIAS QUIROZ</i>	2015:307
Modeling financial sector joint tail risk in the euro area <i>by André Lucas, Bernd Schwaab and Xin Zhang</i>	2015:308
Score Driven Exponentially Weighted Moving Averages and Value-at-Risk Forecasting <i>by André Lucas and Xin Zhang</i>	2015:309
On the Theoretical Efficacy of Quantitative Easing at the Zero Lower Bound <i>by Paola Boel and Christopher J. Waller</i>	2015:310
Optimal Inflation with Corporate Taxation and Financial Constraints <i>by Daria Finocchiaro, Giovanni Lombardo, Caterina Mendicino and Philippe Weil</i>	2015:311
Fire Sale Bank Recapitalizations <i>by Christoph Bertsch and Mike Mariathasan</i>	2015:312
Since you're so rich, you must be really smart: Talent and the Finance Wage Premium <i>by Michael Böhm, Daniel Metzger and Per Strömberg</i>	2015:313
Debt, equity and the equity price puzzle <i>by Daria Finocchiaro and Caterina Mendicino</i>	2015:314
Trade Credit: Contract-Level Evidence Contradicts Current Theories <i>by Tore Ellingsen, Tor Jacobson and Erik von Schedvin</i>	2016:315
Double Liability in a Branch Banking System: Historical Evidence from Canada <i>by Anna Grodecka and Antonis Kotidis</i>	2016:316
Subprime Borrowers, Securitization and the Transmission of Business Cycles <i>by Anna Grodecka</i>	2016:317
Real-Time Forecasting for Monetary Policy Analysis: The Case of Sveriges Riksbank <i>by Jens Iversen, Stefan Laséen, Henrik Lundvall and Ulf Söderström</i>	2016:318
Fed Liftoff and Subprime Loan Interest Rates: Evidence from the Peer-to-Peer Lending <i>by Christoph Bertsch, Isaiah Hull and Xin Zhang</i>	2016:319
Curbing Shocks to Corporate Liquidity: The Role of Trade Credit <i>by Niklas Amberg, Tor Jacobson, Erik von Schedvin and Robert Townsend</i>	2016:320
Firms' Strategic Choice of Loan Delinquencies <i>by Paola Morales-Acevedo</i>	2016:321
Fiscal Consolidation Under Imperfect Credibility <i>by Matthieu Lemoine and Jesper Lindé</i>	2016:322
Challenges for Central Banks' Macro Models <i>by Jesper Lindé, Frank Smets and Rafael Wouters</i>	2016:323
The interest rate effects of government bond purchases away from the lower bound <i>by Rafael B. De Rezende</i>	2016:324
COVENANT-LIGHT CONTRACTS AND CREDITOR COORDINATION <i>by Bo Becker and Victoria Ivashina</i>	2016:325
Endogenous Separations, Wage Rigidities and Employment Volatility <i>by Mikael Carlsson and Andreas Westermarck</i>	2016:326
Renovatio Monetæ: Gesell Taxes in Practice <i>by Roger Svensson and Andreas Westermarck</i>	2016:327
Adjusting for Information Content when Comparing Forecast Performance <i>by Michael K. Andersson, Ted Aranki and André Reslow</i>	2016:328
Economic Scarcity and Consumers' Credit Choice <i>by Marieke Bos, Chloé Le Coq and Peter van Santen</i>	2016:329
Uncertain pension income and household saving <i>by Peter van Santen</i>	2016:330
Money, Credit and Banking and the Cost of Financial Activity <i>by Paola Boel and Gabriele Camera</i>	2016:331
Oil prices in a real-business-cycle model with precautionary demand for oil <i>by Conny Olovsson</i>	2016:332
Financial Literacy Externalities <i>by Michael Haliasso, Thomas Jansson and Yigitcan Karabulut</i>	2016:333

The timing of uncertainty shocks in a small open economy <i>by Hanna Armelius, Isaiah Hull and Hanna Stenbacka Köhler</i>	2016:334
Quantitative easing and the price-liquidity trade-off <i>by Marien Ferdinandusse, Maximilian Freier and Annukka Ristiniemi</i>	2017:335
What Broker Charges Reveal about Mortgage Credit Risk <i>by Antje Berndt, Burton Hollifield and Patrik Sandås</i>	2017:336
Asymmetric Macro-Financial Spillovers <i>by Kristina Bluwstein</i>	2017:337
Latency Arbitrage When Markets Become Faster <i>by Burton Hollifield, Patrik Sandås and Andrew Todd</i>	2017:338
How big is the toolbox of a central banker? Managing expectations with policy-rate forecasts: Evidence from Sweden <i>by Magnus Åhl</i>	2017:339
International business cycles: quantifying the effects of a world market for oil <i>by Johan Gars and Conny Olovsson</i>	2017:340
Systemic Risk: A New Trade-Off for Monetary Policy? <i>by Stefan Laséen, Andrea Pescatori and Jarkko Turunen</i>	2017:341
Household Debt and Monetary Policy: Revealing the Cash-Flow Channel <i>by Martin Flodén, Matilda Kilström, Jósef Sigurdsson and Roine Vestman</i>	2017:342
House Prices, Home Equity, and Personal Debt Composition <i>by Jieying Li and Xin Zhang</i>	2017:343
Identification and Estimation issues in Exponential Smooth Transition Autoregressive Models <i>by Daniel Buncic</i>	2017:344
Domestic and External Sovereign Debt <i>by Paola Di Casola and Spyridon Sichlimiris</i>	2017:345
The Role of Trust in Online Lending <i>by Christoph Bertsch, Isaiah Hull, Yingjie Qi and Xin Zhang</i>	2017:346
On the effectiveness of loan-to-value regulation in a multiconstraint framework <i>by Anna Grodecka</i>	2017:347
Shock Propagation and Banking Structure <i>by Mariassunta Giannetti and Farzad Saidi</i>	2017:348
The Granular Origins of House Price Volatility <i>by Isaiah Hull, Conny Olovsson, Karl Walentin and Andreas Westermark</i>	2017:349
Should We Use Linearized Models To Calculate Fiscal Multipliers? <i>by Jesper Lindé and Mathias Trabandt</i>	2017:350
The impact of monetary policy on household borrowing – a high-frequency IV identification <i>by Maria Sandström</i>	2018:351
Conditional exchange rate pass-through: evidence from Sweden <i>by Vesna Corbo and Paola Di Casola</i>	2018:352
Learning on the Job and the Cost of Business Cycles <i>by Karl Walentin and Andreas Westermark</i>	2018:353
Trade Credit and Pricing: An Empirical Evaluation <i>by Niklas Amberg, Tor Jacobson and Erik von Schedvin</i>	2018:354
A shadow rate without a lower bound constraint <i>by Rafael B. De Rezende and Annukka Ristiniemi</i>	2018:355
Reduced "Border Effects", FTAs and International Trade <i>by Sebastian Franco and Erik Frohm</i>	2018:356





Sveriges Riksbank  
Visiting address: Brunkebergs torg 11  
Mail address: se-103 37 Stockholm

Website: [www.riksbank.se](http://www.riksbank.se)  
Telephone: +46 8 787 00 00, Fax: +46 8 21 05 31  
E-mail: [registratorn@riksbank.se](mailto:registratorn@riksbank.se)