



In This Issue

- 1 Surges in Capital Flows: Why History Repeats Itself
- 1 The LIC-BRIC Linkage: Growth Spillovers
- 6 Conversations with Visiting Scholars
- 8 Q&A: Seven Questions on Monetary Transmission in Low-Income Countries
- 9 IMF Working Papers
- 14 Conferences, Seminars, and Other Events
- 15 *IMF Economic Review* Receives Its First Impact Factor
- 15 IMF Fellowship Program: Call for Applications
- 16 Staff Discussion Notes
- 16 Visiting Scholars

Online Subscriptions

The *IMF Research Bulletin* is available exclusively online. To receive a free email notification when quarterly issues are posted, please subscribe at www.imf.org/external/cntpst. Readers may also access the Bulletin at any time at www.imf.org/researchbulletin.

Research Summaries

Surges in Capital Flows: Why History Repeats Itself



Mahvash S. Qureshi

As the world economy limped out of the global financial crisis, there was a resurgence of capital flows to emerging market economies (EMEs)—followed by an even sharper reversal in the aftermath of the U.S. sovereign downgrade. Recent months have seen capital flows to EMEs resume again. This article summarizes recent research on what causes these mercurial movements of capital flows to emerging markets, and what factors determine how much capital countries receive during surge episodes.

After collapsing during the 2008 global financial crisis, capital flows to emerging market economies (EMEs) surged in late 2009 and 2010, raising both macroeconomic challenges and financial-stability concerns. By the second half of 2011, however, capital flows receded rapidly, eliminating much of the cumulated currency gains, and leaving EMEs grappling with sharply depreciating currencies in

(continued on page 2)

The LIC-BRIC Linkage: Growth Spillovers



Issouf Samake,
Yongzheng Yang, and
Catherine Pattillo

Trade and financial ties between low-income countries (LICs) and emerging market economies (EMEs) have expanded rapidly in recent years. This leads to the potential for economic developments in EMEs to exert spillovers on LICs growth. The most likely and important source countries of such spillovers are the so-called BRICs—Brazil, Russia, India, and China. This article summarizes recent IMF research on these spillovers.

Research on business cycle transmission has regained attention in the wake of the recent global financial crisis. The IMF has recently carried out several studies that examine spillovers from systemically important countries (notably, the United States, European Union, Japan, and China) to the rest of the world (IMF, 2011a–2011e). Similar to earlier IMF work in this field, Bayoumi and Swiston (2007), Helbling and others (2007), and Kose and others (2003) almost exclusively focus on spillovers among advanced and major emerging market economies,

(continued on page 4)

Surges in Capital Flows: Why History Repeats Itself

(continued from page 1)

their wake. The trend seems to have reversed again since the beginning of 2012, with flows to EMEs rebounding, and in some cases reaching the peaks seen in 2010 and early 2011.

While such volatility is nothing new—historically, capital flows have been episodic—it has reignited questions about the nature of capital flows to EMEs. Several commentators argued that the immediate post-crisis surge was largely a result of country-specific determinants—or domestic “pull” factors such as improved macroeconomic fundamentals, better institutional quality, and lower country risk in EMEs (Fratzscher, 2011). But if so, the sharp reversal following the U.S. sovereign downgrade and rise in market risk-aversion is certainly puzzling—after all, the EMEs in question did not experience overnight a marked change in fundamentals.

The debate on what drives capital flows dates back at least to the mid-1930s—when the U.S. was contending with a surge in capital inflows—and helped shape the post-war international monetary order and the IMF’s *Articles of Agreement*. The debate resumed in the 1990s when, as a result of capital account liberalization (as well as recovery from the 1980s debt crisis), many EMEs—especially in Latin America and Asia—began to attract substantial portfolio flows from private foreign investors. Subsequent studies analyzed the determinants of these flows by characterizing them as “push” and “pull” factors. Push factors reflect external conditions (or supply-side factors) that induce investors to increase exposure to EMEs—for example, lower interest rates, weak economic performance in advanced economies, lower risk aversion, and booming commodity prices. Pull factors are recipient country characteristics (or demand-side factors) that affect risks and returns to investors such as macroeconomic fundamentals, official policies, and market imperfections.

Since, in equilibrium, flows must reflect the confluence of supply and demand, it is not surprising that most studies on the determinants of capital flows to EMEs find that both push (supply-side) and pull (demand-side) factors matter (for example, Papaioannou, 2009; IMF, 2011). But studies examining the volatility of capital flows present a more mixed picture. For example, Mercado and Park (2011) find a dominant role for domestic pull factors as well as regional contagion in determining the volatility of capital flows, while Broto and others (2011) find that both global and domestic factors affect capital flow volatility, but the significance of the former has increased in the last decade.

More recently, some studies have attempted to characterize the dynamics and determinants of large capital inflows—or surges—on the grounds that their characteristics may be different from more normal variations. Additionally, from a policy perspective, large upward swings are of particular interest both because of their greater impact on the exchange

“While such volatility is nothing new—historically, capital flows have been episodic—it has reignited questions about the nature of capital flows to EMEs.”

rate and competitiveness, and because they are more likely to overwhelm the domestic regulatory framework, thus raising financial-stability risks. Reinhart and Reinhart (2008) and Cardarelli and others (2009) catalog net capital flow surges in both advanced and emerging economies, and show a strong correlation between these episodes and global factors such as U.S. interest rates, world output growth, and commodity prices, as well as with local characteristics, notably the current account deficit and real GDP growth. Forbes and Warnock (2011) use gross capital flows to differentiate between episodes of surges, stops, flight, and retrenchment, and find that global risk aversion, liquidity, and growth matter for surge occurrence. But in contrast to most other studies, they find that advanced economy interest rates are unimportant—though this may be because their sample comingles advanced and emerging economies (so any effect of higher advanced economy interest rates in reducing flows to EMEs may be offset by their positive impact on flows to advanced economies).

Focusing on EMEs, Ghosh and others (2012a) identify surges based on net flows and document three stylized facts. First, surges have become more common in recent years—with the share of surge observations almost tripling from the 1980s to the last decade—and are synchronized internationally. Second, surges are relatively concentrated even in periods of high global capital mobility, with never more than half of the EMEs in the sample experiencing them at any point of time, and some experiencing them repeatedly. Third, the amount of capital received in a surge varies considerably across countries.

To explain these patterns, Ghosh and others (2012a) examine systematically the factors causing surges, and the magnitude of flows conditional on surge occurrence. Their results indicate that global factors, including U.S. inter-

est rates and global risk aversion, are key determinants of whether capital surges toward EMEs—which helps to explain why surges are synchronized internationally and why they recur. At the same time, whether a particular EME experiences a surge also depends on its own attractiveness as an investment destination; hence, pull factors—particularly, economic growth, external financing need, capital account openness, and institutional quality—matter, which explains why some countries do (and others do not) experience surges when aggregate flows toward EMEs rise. Although conditional on the surge occurring, pull factors—including the nominal exchange rate regime, extent of real exchange rate overvaluation, capital account openness, and external financing needs—are important in determining the surge magnitude, while global factors appear to play a limited role.

In addition, Ghosh and others (2012a) differentiate between surges caused mainly by changes in residents' liabilities (liability-driven surges), which are associated with the investment decisions of foreigners, and those caused by changes in foreign assets (asset-driven changes), which are associated with the investment decisions of domestic residents. They find that surges to EMEs are mainly liability-driven—though asset-driven net flow surges have been increasing in recent years. The factors driving the two types of surges turn out to be quite similar: lower U.S. interest rates encourage capital to flow to EMEs while increased global market uncertainty leads capital to flow out toward traditional safe-haven assets. Foreign investors are equally attuned to local conditions as domestic investors, but tend to be more sensitive to changes in the real U.S. interest rate and global market volatility, and are also more subject to regional contagion than domestic investors.

A related strand of literature examines the ending of surge episodes, and finds that they are associated with a higher likelihood of debt, financial, and currency crises (Reinhart and Reinhart, 2008; Furceri and others 2011). The domestic macroeconomic policy response over the surge episode however seems to matter in how a surge episode ends—for example, Cardarelli and others (2009) find that growth declines have been significant after episodes that are associated with fiscal expansions and greater resistance to exchange market pressures. Similarly, Ghosh and others (2012b) find that EMEs are more likely to experience a hard landing (defined as a reversal of net flows) when there is a deterioration of fiscal and external balances, and a domestic lending boom over the surge episode; but there is also some evidence that countries with higher foreign exchange reserves tend to experience a soft

landing. Moreover, changes in global conditions matter—with an increase in U.S. interest rates, for example, raising the likelihood of a hard landing.

The research to date clearly points to the key role of global factors in pushing large flows of capital to EMEs. While improved fundamentals in EMEs—particularly relative to the advanced economies—imply that they are likely to remain attractive destinations to investors at least in the medium term; inasmuch as the global factors could reverse abruptly, some variability in capital flows appears inevitable. The challenge for policymakers is to craft the right mix of macroeconomic and prudential policies (including possibly temporary capital controls (Ostry and others, 2011)) factoring in whether the surge is liability- or asset-driven, and to formulate “rules of the road” to ensure multilaterally consistent policy responses, so that as the history of surges repeats, the consequences are more benign.

References

- Broto, Carmen, Javier Díaz-Cassou, and Aitor Erce-Domínguez, 2011, “Measuring and Explaining the Volatility of Capital Flows Towards Emerging Countries,” *Journal of Banking and Finance*, Vol. 35 (8), pp. 1941-1953.
- Cardarelli, Roberto, Selim Elekdag, and Ayhan Kose, 2009, “Capital Inflows: Macroeconomic Implications and Policy Responses,” IMF Working Paper 09/40 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Forbes, Kristin, and Francis Warnock, 2011, “Capital Flow Waves: Surges, Stops, Flight and Retrenchment,” NBER Working Paper 17351 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Bureau of Economic Research).
- Fratzscher, Marcel, 2011, “Capital Flows, Push versus Pull Factors and the Global Financial Crisis,” NBER Working Paper 17357 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Bureau of Economic Research).
- Furceri, Davide, Stephanie Guichard, and Elena Rusticelli, 2011, “Episodes of Large Capital Inflows and the Likelihood of Banking and Currency Crises and Sudden Stops,” OECD Economics Department Working Papers No. 865 (Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development).
- Ghosh, Atish, Jun Kim, Mahvash Qureshi, and Juan Zalduendo, 2012a, “Surges,” IMF Working Paper 12/22 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Ghosh, Atish, Mahvash Qureshi, and Juan Zalduendo, 2012b, “Crashes,” (unpublished; Washington: International Monetary Fund).

(continued on page 6)

The LIC-BRIC Linkage: Growth Spillovers

(continued from page 1)

with limited attention to transmission to LICs, including spillovers from major EMEs such as BRICs.

Several recent Fund studies, however, have examined the impact on LICs of the global financial crisis and the prospects for recovery. IMF research (2009; 2010) found that the shocks that reverberated around the globe in 2008–09 affected LICs mainly through real economy channels, primarily trade, foreign direct investment (FDI), and remittances; financial channels played a minor role because of the limited exposure of these countries to the financial sector in advanced economies. It was noted that the pace of recovery in LICs would vary across regions mirroring growth in their key trading partners.

Berg and others (2011) examined the short-run effects of the 2008–09 global financial crisis on growth in (mainly non-fuel exporting) LICs. They found that for many individual LICs, 2009 was not extraordinarily calamitous; however, aggregate LIC output declined sharply because LIC economies were unusually synchronized. They also found that the growth declines were on average well explained by the decline in export demand, and as the global economy recovered, their growth should rebound sharply. Compared to previous episodes of global crises, the terms-of-trade decline had a relatively small impact on LIC growth.

Neither the IMF (2009 and 2010) nor Berg and others (2011) differentiated the role of EMEs from that of advanced countries in determining the impact of the crisis and the pace of recovery. In these studies, the external shocks to LICs were mostly treated as global. However, the IMF studies did look at the impact of a global downturn on LICs in different regions based on these countries' regional trade shares. More recent IMF studies (2011f; 2011g) also differentiated commodity importers from commodity exporters in examining their vulnerabilities to exogenous shocks. The relative resilience of the BRIC economies during the 2008–09 crisis suggests that LICs' trade and financial ties with EMEs may have helped them cushion the severe contraction of import demand in advanced countries. Moreover, the mild terms-of-trade effect in 2009 compared with previous global crises owe to a large extent to the continued, albeit slower, growth of EMEs during the crisis.

In light of the ever-increasing importance of EMEs—BRICs in particular—for LIC economies, an IMF team undertook a major project to examine the growing linkages

between LICs and BRICs—trade, FDI, and development financing. Key results of this project were summarized in an IMF paper (2011h), and reported in detail in several background papers (Mlachila and Takebe, 2011; Mwase, 2011; Mwase and Yang, 2011; Samake and Yang, 2011; Yang, 2011). Although the main focus of that project was to analyze the benefits as well as the challenges posed by the growing LIC-BRIC linkages, its detailed analysis of each of these linkages made it clear that the relationship is sufficiently strong to have a material impact on LICs' growth performance. In what follows, we summarize the key findings on growth spillovers based on Samake and Yang (2011).

“Several recent Fund studies, however, have examined the impact on LICs of the global financial crisis and the prospects for recovery.”

The study by Samake and Yang employs several techniques to investigate the extent of business cycle transmission from BRICs to LICs through both direct and indirect channels. A global vector autoregression (GVAR) model is estimated to quantify the direct impact on LIC growth cycles of bilateral trade, FDI, productivity, and exchange rates, while a structural VAR model is used to estimate the effects of BRIC demand and technological change on global commodity prices, demand, and interest rates, which in turn affect growth in LICs. The indirect effect on LICs, obtained by feeding VAR results into the GVAR model, forms part of the overall spillover. Finally, an existing model (Berg 2011) is used to simulate the short-run impact of BRICs on growth in LICs during the global financial crisis.

The estimation results show that there are significant direct spillovers from BRICs to LICs. The most important direct channel of transmission is trade, although productivity improvements in BRICs and FDI flows from BRICs to LICs also matter. Trade accounts for around 60 percent of the impact on growth in LICs and is the most significant and persistent channel of transmission of shocks for all regions. The response in African LICs is particularly strong, reflecting the growing trade ties that these countries have forged with BRICs in recent years. The direct impact of BRICs' productivity changes, in turn, represents around 13 percent of the total impact. Asian LICs seem subject to the strongest impact of BRIC productivity change, probably reflecting the

closer integration of Asian LICs into global manufacturing supply chains, in which BRICs (particularly China and India) play a critical role. The FDI channel also matters but, compared with other spillover channels, its impact on LIC growth is more modest.

Spillovers from BRICs to LICs through global demand and price channels are also significant, though generally smaller than the direct spillovers. BRICs' demand and productivity growth exert considerable influence over changes in some global variables. Spillovers through world commodity prices are the largest in the short run, and those through global demand and interest rates are generally small or negligible. In particular, roughly one third of changes in world oil prices can be attributed to shocks originating in BRICs. Such indirect impact of BRIC demand and productivity through global markets accounts for around 30 percent of the total impact of BRICs on LIC growth.

The overall (direct and indirect) impact of BRICs on low-income-country growth appears to be both substantial and becoming larger. A 1 percentage point increase in BRICs' demand and productivity leads to 0.7 percentage point increase in LICs' output over 3 years and 1.2 percentage points over 5 years. These magnitudes are broadly similar to the direct impact of demand and productivity increases in advanced economies in the literature. (A forthcoming study by Dabla-Norris and others (2012) also reports similar estimates of the spillovers from a selected group of emerging market economies to LICs.) The impact has increased from the pre-2007 period; simulations show that LIC growth would have been 0.3 percentage point to 1.1 percentage points lower during the crisis had BRIC GDP declined at the pace at which advanced economies did.

These results have significant policy implications. They point to the potential that increasing linkages with BRIC economies could change the volatility of LIC growth in the short run and contribute to their sustainable growth rates in the long run. Particularly, increasing LIC-BRIC trade and financial ties will only strengthen their business cycle synchronization over time. As long as BRIC business cycles are not fully synchronized with those of advanced countries, these growing ties should help dampen growth volatility in LICs. Thus, in assessing the macroeconomic policy prospects and growth potential in LICs, greater attention should be paid to developments in BRICs and other EMEs as well as their linkages with LICs both via direct and indirect channels.

References

- Andrew Berg, Chris Papageorgiou, Catherine Pattillo, Martin Schindler, Nikola Spatafora, and Hans Weisfeld, 2011, "Global Shocks and their Impact on Low-Income Countries: Lessons from the Global Financial Crisis," IMF Working Paper 11/27 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Bayoumi, T. and A. Swiston, 2007, "Foreign Entanglements: Estimating the Sources and Size of Spillovers across Industrial Countries," incomplete.
- Dabla-Norris, E., R. Espinoza, and S. Jahan "Spillovers to Low-Income Countries: Importance of Systemic Emerging Markets," IMF Working Paper, forthcoming (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Helbling, T., P. Berezin, M. A. Kose, M. Kumhof, D. Laxton, and N. Spatafora, 2007, "Decoupling the Train? Spillovers and Cycles in the Global Economy," *World Economic Outlook* (April 2007), pp. 121–60.
- International Monetary Fund, 2009, "The Implications of the Global Financial Crisis for Low-Income Countries," SM/09/57, February 26, 2009 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- International Monetary Fund, 2010, "Emerging from the Global Crisis—Macroeconomic Challenges Facing Low-Income Countries," SM/10/266, October 6, 2010 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- International Monetary Fund, 2011a, "Consolidated Spillover Report—Implications from the Analysis of the Systemic-5," July 11, 2011 (<http://www.imf.org/external/pp/longres.aspx?id=4584>)
- , 2011b "United Kingdom: Spillover Report for the 2011 Article IV Consultation and Supplementary Information" July 2011, IMF Country Report No. 11/225 (<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/longres.aspx?sk=25114.0>)
- , 2011c "People's Republic of China: Spillover Report for the 2011 Article IV Consultation and Selected Issues," July 2011, IMF Country Report No. 11/193 (<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/longres.aspx?sk=25068.0>)
- , 2011d "Japan: Spillover Report for the 2011 Article IV Consultation and Selected Issues," July 2011, IMF Country Report No. 11/183 (<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/longres.aspx?sk=25052.0>)
- , 2011e "The United States: Spillover Report—2011 Article IV Consultation," July 2011, IMF Country Report No. 11/203 (<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/longres.aspx?sk=25083.0>)

(continued on page 7)

Conversations with Visiting Scholars

Prakash Loungani Interviews IMF Fellow Olivier Coibion

Loungani: Congratulations on your selection as an IMF Fellow. Is this your first stint at a policy institution?

Coibion: Thanks, I'm thrilled to be here! I worked for a year at the CEA (U.S. Council of Economic Advisers) in 2000–01. It gave me an enduring sense of how economic theory and empirical methods can help address policy questions and make a difference in people's lives. And because I happened to be there during the transition from the Clinton to the Bush administration, it was fascinating to see the change in style and personalities—and in the dress code. The suits got much more sober and I even had to start wearing a tie once the Bush administration was in place.

Loungani: Dress is casual at the IMF over the summer. You will see the suits out in full force in the fall. What will you work on during your year here?

Coibion: I'll continue some of my work on inequality. One project will look at links between inequality and financial crises, which folks at the IMF have also studied. I've also been studying the impact of monetary policy on inequality—who gains, who loses when the Fed changes its policy. This gets debated in policy circles a lot, but not much in academia. Ron Paul says that expansionary monetary policies, or debasing the currency as he always puts

it, raises income inequality; people on the left like Jamie Galbraith say the opposite.

Loungani: What do you find?

Coibion: Expansionary monetary policy has typically reduced U.S. inequality in the short run. This suggests that when the central bank can't cut interest rates any more—when rates hit the so-called “zero lower bound,” as is the case at present—inequality will be higher than it would be otherwise. To avoid these additional increases in inequality at a time of crisis, the government should use other tools, such as targeted fiscal policies. I hope to do some more work on this while I'm here. More generally, I'll be studying how best to sequence fiscal and monetary policies when the multipliers—the impact of the policies on the economy—associated with each may vary with the state of the economy.

Loungani: Do you think the Fed has done enough to promote recovery?

Coibion: I think the zero lower bound [on interest rates] has certainly limited the size of their response. They would be lowering rates further if they could. But as the IMF's latest review of the U.S. economy noted, the Fed still has a few options to further support economic activity, given the weak

Surges in Capital Flows: Why History Repeats Itself

(continued from page 1)

IMF, 2011, *World Economic Outlook: April 2011* (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

Mercado, Rogelio, and Cyn-Young Park, 2011, “What Drives Different Types of Capital Flow and Their Volatilities in Developing Asia?” *International Economic Journal*, Vol. 25 (4), pp. 655–680.

Ostry, Jonathan, Atish Ghosh, Karl Habermeier, Luc Laeven, Marcos Chamon, Mahvash Qureshi, and Annamaria

Kokenyne, “Managing Capital Inflows: What Tools to Use?” IMF Staff Discussion Note 11/06 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

Papaioannou, Elias, 2009, “What Drives International Financial Flows? Politics, Institutions and Other Determinants,” *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 88 (2), pp. 269–281.

Reinhart, Carmen, and Vincent Reinhart, 2008, “Capital Flow Bonanzas: An Encompassing View of the Past and Present,” NBER Working Paper 14321 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Bureau of Economic Research).



state of labor markets and given the significant downside risks that still exist.

Loungani: Do you think that to avoid hitting the zero lower bound in the future, central banks should raise the target rate of inflation?

Coibion: No, I don't. A higher inflation rate also has economic costs. Therefore, raising the target inflation rate will confer the benefit that we'll be less likely to hit the zero lower bound. But such episodes are rare; and the high benefits conferred on rare occasions have to be balanced against the small but frequent costs of having higher inflation. In some of my research, it turns out that the costs consistently outweigh the benefits for inflation rates above 2 percent. So rather than raise the target rate of inflation to deal with

future episodes like the Great Recession, I'd prefer the more aggressive use of temporary policies designed for precisely this kind of episode, such as additional quantitative easing or fiscal policy.

Some Recent Articles by Olivier Coibion

- “The Optimal Inflation Rate in New Keynesian Models: Should Central Banks Raise their Inflation Targets in Light of the ZLB?” (with Yuriy Gorodnichenko and Johannes Wieland), forthcoming in *Review of Economic Studies*.
- “Why Are Target Interest Rate Changes So Persistent?” (with Yuriy Gorodnichenko), forthcoming in *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*.
- “What Can Survey Forecasts Tell Us About Informational Rigidities?” (with Yuriy Gorodnichenko), 2012, *Journal of Political Economy* 120(1), 116-159.
- “One for Some or One for All? Taylor Rules and Interregional Heterogeneity” (with Daniel Goldstein), 2012, *Journal of Money Credit and Banking* 44(2:3), 401-432.
- “Are the Effects of Monetary Policy Shocks Big or Small?” 2012, *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 4(2), 1-32.
- “Strategic Complementarity among Heterogeneous Price-Setters in an Estimated DSGE Model” (with Yuriy Gorodnichenko), 2011, *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 93(3), 920-940.
- “Monetary Policy, Trend Inflation, and the Great Moderation: An Alternative Interpretation” (with Yuriy Gorodnichenko), 2011, *The American Economic Review* 101(1), 341-370.

The LIC-BRIC Linkage: Growth Spillovers

(continued from page 1)

- , 2011f, “Managing Volatility: A Vulnerability Exercise for Low-Income Countries.” Available via the internet at: www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2011/030911.pdf
- , 2011g, “Managing Volatility—A Vulnerability Exercise for Low-Income Countries” FO/DIS/11/44, March 10, 2011.
- , 2011h, “New Growth Drivers for Low-Income Countries: The Role of BRICs.” Available via the internet: <http://www.imf.org/external/pp/longres.aspx?id=4534>
- Kose, M. A., E. S. Prasad, and M. Terrones, 2003, “How Does Globalization Affect the Synchronization of Business Cycles?” *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*, Vol. 93, pp. 57–62.

- Mlachila, Montfort and Misa Takebe, 2011, “FDI from BRICs to LICs: Emerging Growth Driver?” IMF Working Paper 11/178 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Mwase, Nkunde, 2011, “Determinants of Development Financing Flows from Brazil, Russia, India, and China to Low-Income Countries,” IMF Working Paper 11/255 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Mwase, Nkunde and Yongzheng Yang, 2011, “BRICs’ Philosophies for Development Financing and Their Implications for LICs,” IMF Working Paper, forthcoming, (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Samake, I. and Yongzheng Yang, 2011, “Low-Income Countries’ BRIC Linkage: Are There Growth Spillovers?” IMF Working Paper 11/267 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).
- Yang, Yongzheng, 2011, “Global Rebalancing: Implications for Low-Income Countries,” IMF Working Paper 11/239 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).



Seven Questions on Monetary Transmission in Low-Income Countries

Prachi Mishra and Peter Montiel*

There are strong a priori reasons for believing that the monetary transmission mechanism in low-income countries (LICs) is fundamentally different from that in economies with more sophisticated financial systems. A review of the existing literature also suggests little confidence in the strength of monetary transmission in low-income countries. It is important to distinguish between the “facts on the ground” and “methodological deficiencies” explanations for the absence of evidence for strong monetary transmission. There is evidence that “facts on the ground” are an important part of the story. If this conjecture is correct, the stabilization challenge in developing countries is acute indeed, and identifying the means of enhancing the effectiveness of monetary policy in such countries is an important challenge. This piece addresses the main questions in the literature on the monetary transmission mechanisms in low-income countries.

8

Question 1: What are the assumptions underlying the discussion of monetary transmission in advanced countries?

As argued in Mishra, Montiel, and Spilimbergo (2012), the conventional description of monetary transmission relies on effective arbitrage along several margins: between different domestic short-term securities, between domestic short-term and long-term securities, between long-term securities and equities, between domestic and foreign securities, and between domestic financial and real assets. A discussion on monetary transmission is therefore clearly intended to apply to an economy with a highly developed and competitive financial system. As such, it implicitly assumes the following institutional setup, which is typically taken for granted in discussions of monetary transmission in advanced countries:

- (i) A strong institutional environment, so that loan contracts are protected and financial intermediation is conducted through formal financial markets.
- (ii) An independent central bank.
- (iii) A well-functioning and highly liquid interbank market for reserves.
- (iv) A well-functioning and highly liquid secondary market for government securities with a broad range of maturities.

- (v) Well-functioning and highly liquid markets for equities and real estate.
- (vi) A high degree of international capital mobility.
- (vii) A floating exchange rate.

Question 2: Do we expect monetary transmission in a low-income country context to be different from what we are familiar with in industrial countries?

Yes. There are strong a priori reasons for believing that the monetary transmission mechanism in low-income countries (LICs) is fundamentally different from that in economies with more sophisticated financial systems. First, the complete absence or poor development of domestic securities markets suggests that both the short-run and long-run interest rate channels should be weak. Second, small and illiquid markets for assets such as equities and real estate would tend to weaken the asset channel. Third, in countries that are imperfectly integrated with international financial markets and tend to maintain relatively fixed exchange rates, the exchange rate channel would tend to be completely absent, or relatively weak.

Question 3: Which channel of monetary transmission, if any, is likely to be at play in low-income countries?

In general, the financial structure of low-income countries should lead us to expect the interest rate, asset, and exchange rate channels to be weak or nonexistent in such countries. By a process of elimination, the bank lending channel remains the most viable general mode for monetary transmission in LICs.

Question 4: What conditions would determine the strength of the bank-lending channels? Are these conditions likely to hold in LICs?

The relevant properties of the bank lending channel concern two links in the causal chain from monetary policy actions to aggregate demand: that between monetary policy actions and the availability and cost of bank credit, and that between the availability and cost of bank credit and aggregate demand. When the formal financial sector is small, as is true in the vast majority of low-income countries, the second of these links is likely to be weak. But the link between

*Peter Montiel is a professor of economics at Williams College.

monetary policy actions and the availability and cost of bank credit may be weak as well. Specifically, the literature suggests that bank-lending channels may be undermined by two factors: (i) if the banking industry is noncompetitive, changes in banks' costs of funds may be reflected in bank profit margins, rather than in the supply of bank lending. (ii) If a poor institutional environment increases the cost of bank lending, banks may conduct lending activity in a manner that weakens the effects of monetary policy actions on the supply of loans.

Question 5: Is there any cross-country evidence on the strength and reliability of the bank-lending channel in LICs?

Mishra, Montiel, and Spilimbergo (2012) examine broad cross-country differences in the links between central bank policy actions and bank lending rates by computing some simple correlations among the relevant financial variables in advanced, emerging, and low-income economies. They focus on the association between central bank policy rates and money market rates, as well as that between money market rates and bank lending rates. In doing so, they seek to unearth suggestive empirical regularities, rather than to identify specific causal relationships. They find a much weaker link between the policy instrument and market rates in LICs than for advanced and emerging economies, both in the short and in the long run. The short-term partial correlation between money market rates and lending rates is also significantly weaker among LICs than among either advanced or emerging economies, and while differences in long-term effects are not as pronounced, they remain weaker in low-income countries. Most importantly, changes in money market rates explain a much smaller proportion of the variance in lending rates in low-income countries than in either advanced or emerging economies.

Question 6: What does the country-specific evidence on monetary transmission in LICs suggest?

There is indeed a large VAR-based empirical literature examining the effects of monetary policy innovations (as measured through a variety of monetary policy variables including, but not limited to, policy interest rates) on aggregate demand (as indicated by the behavior of output and/or prices) in a large number of individual LICs. This literature does not restrict the specific channels through which monetary policy may affect aggregate demand. Mishra and Montiel (2012) conclude that it is very hard to come away from their review of the evidence with much confidence

in the strength of monetary transmission in low-income countries. They fail to uncover any instances in which more than one careful study confirmed results for the effects of monetary shocks on aggregate demand that are similar to the consensus effects in the United States or other advanced countries. The question is how to interpret this state of affairs. As suggested by Egert and Macdonald (2009) (for the case of transition economies in Central and Eastern Europe), it is likely to reflect some combination of the "facts on the ground" and shortcomings in the empirical methods that have been applied to this issue.

We suspect, however, that "facts on the ground" may indeed be an important part of the story. The failure of a wide range of empirical approaches to yield consistent and convincing evidence of effective monetary transmission in low-income countries, and that the strongest evidence for effective monetary transmission has arisen for relatively prosperous and more institutionally-developed countries such as some Central and Eastern European transition economies (at least in the later stages of their transition) and countries such as Morocco and Tunisia, make us doubt whether methodological shortcomings are the whole story.

Question 7: So, what are the policy implications?

We interpret the evidence in Mishra, Montiel, and Spilimbergo (2012), as well as that of the broader VAR-based literature, as creating a strong presumption that in the financial environment that tends to characterize many LICs, monetary policy is likely to have both weak and unreliable effects on aggregate demand. If this is true, the stabilization challenge in developing countries is acute indeed, and identifying the means of enhancing the effectiveness of monetary policy in such countries is an important challenge.

When domestic monetary policy is weak and unreliable activist policy is less desirable, and the adoption of policy regimes that raise the stakes associated with attaining publicly-announced monetary objectives should be postponed or their design should be modified to take the uncertainty about monetary policy effects into account. In addition, weak and unreliable monetary transmission diminishes arguments for floating exchange rates as well as for capital account restrictions under fixed exchange rates.

(continued on page 10)

Seven Questions on Monetary Transmission in Low-Income Countries *(continued from page 9)*

References

Mishra Prachi, Peter Montiel, and Antonio Spilimbergo, 2012, “Monetary Transmission in Low-Income Countries: Effectiveness and Policy Implications,” *IMF Economic Review*, Vol. 60, No. 2, pp. 270–302.

Mishra Prachi and Peter Montiel, “How Effective Is Monetary Transmission in Low-Income Countries? A Survey of

the Empirical Evidence,” IMF Working Paper 12/143 (Washington: International Monetary Fund).

Égert, Balázs and Ronald MacDonald (2009), “Monetary Transmission Mechanism in Central and Eastern Europe: Surveying the Surveyable.” *Journal of Economic Surveys*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 277–327.

IMF Working Papers

Working Paper 12/107

Assessing Competitiveness Using Industry Unit Labor Costs: An Application to Slovakia

de Broeck, Mark; Guscina, Anastasia; Mehrez, Gil

Working Paper 12/108

Mobilizing Revenue in Sub-Saharan Africa: Empirical Norms and Key Determinants

Drummond, Paulo; Daal, Wendell; Srivastava, Nandini; Oliveira, Luiz E.

Working Paper 12/109

The Future of Oil: Geology versus Technology

Benes, Jaromir; Chauvet, Marcelle; Kamenik, Ondra; Kumhof, Michael; Laxton, Douglas; Mursula, Susanna; Selody, Jack

Working Paper 12/110

Dynamic Loan Loss Provisioning: Simulations on Effectiveness and Guide to Implementation

Wezel, Torsten; Chan-Lau, Jorge A.; Columba, Francesco

Working Paper 12/111

Natural Resources, Volatility, and Inclusive Growth: Perspectives from the Middle East and North Africa

Arezki, Rabah; Nabli, Mustapha K.

Working Paper 12/112

Commodity Price Shocks and Fiscal Outcomes

Spatafora, Nicola; Samaké, Issouf

Working Paper 12/113

Fiscal Consolidation in Southeastern European Countries: The Role of Budget Institutions

Olden, Brian; Last, Duncan; Ylaoutinen, Sami; Sateriale, Carla

Working Paper 12/114

Bank Capitalization As a Signal

Hardy, Daniel C.

Working Paper 12/115

China’s Impact on World Commodity Markets

Roache, Shaun K.

Working Paper 12/116

Country Stress Events: Does Governance Matter?

Caceres, Carlos; Kochanova, Anna

Working Paper 12/117

Foreign Banks and the Vienna Initiative: Turning Sinners into Saints?

De Haas, Ralph; Korniyenko, Yevgeniya; Loukoianova, Elena; Pivovarsky, Alexander

Working Paper 12/118

Alternative Monetary Policy Rules for India

Patra, Michael Debabrata; Kapur, Muneesh

Working Paper 12/119

Tracking Short-Term Dynamics of Economic Activity in Low-Income Countries in the Absence of High-Frequency GDP Data

Opoku-Afari, Maxwell; Dixit, Shiv

Working Paper 12/120

Capital Inflows, Financial Development, and Domestic Investment: Determinants and Inter-Relationships

Luca, Oana; Spatafora, Nicola

Working Paper 12/121

Interest Rate Rules, Endogenous Cycles, and Chaotic Dynamics in Open Economies

Airaudo, Marco; Zanna, Luis-Felipe

Working Paper 12/122

Appraising Credit Ratings: Does the CAP Fit Better Than the ROC?

Irwin, R. John; Irwin, Timothy C.

Working Paper 12/123

Determinants of Credit Growth and Interest Margins in the Philippines and Asia

Tan, Tatum Blaise Pua

Working Paper 12/124

Do Dynamic Provisions Enhance Bank Solvency and Reduce Credit Procyclicality? A Study of the Chilean Banking System

Chan-Lau, Jorge A.

Working Paper 12/125

Why House Price Indexes Differ: Measurement and Analysis
Silver, Mick

Working Paper 12/126

Exchange Rate Pass Through to Prices in Maldives
Masha, Iyabo; Park, Chanhoo

Working Paper 12/127

As You Sow So Shall You Reap: Public Investment Surges, Growth, and Debt Sustainability in Togo
Andrle, Michal; David, Antonio; Espinoza, Raphael A.; Mills, Marshall; Zanna, Luis-Felipe

Working Paper 12/128

Quantifying Structural Subsidy Values for Systemically Important Financial Institutions
Ueda, Kenichi; Weder di Mauro, Beatrice

Working Paper 12/129

The Effects of Government Spending under Limited Capital Mobility
Shen, Wenyi; Yang, Shu-Chun S.

Working Paper 12/130

Surging Capital Flows to Emerging Asia: Facts, Impacts, and Responses
Balakrishnan, Ravi; Nowak, Sylwia; Panth, Sanjaya; Wu, Yiqun

Working Paper 12/131

Productivity Growth and Structural Reform in Bulgaria: Restarting the Convergence Engine
Mitra, Pritha; Pouvelle, Cyril

Working Paper 12/132

Monetary Policy Transmission in the GCC Countries
Espinoza, Raphael A.; Prasad, Ananthakrishnan

Working Paper 12/133

RMB Internationalization: Onshore/Offshore Links
Maziad, Samar; Kang, Joong Shik

Working Paper 12/134

The Volatility Trap: Precautionary Saving, Investment, and Aggregate Risk
Cherif, Reda; Hasanov, Fuad

Working Paper 12/135

Optimal Liquidity and Economic Stability
Han, Linghui; Lee, Il Hoon

Working Paper 12/136

Welfare Effects of Monetary Integration: The Common Monetary Area and Beyond
Asonuma, Tamon; Debrun, Xavier; Masson, Paul R.

Working Paper 12/137

Walking Hand in Hand: Fiscal Policy and Growth in Advanced Economies
Cottarelli, Carlo; Jaramillo, Laura

Working Paper 12/138

Managing Large-Scale Capital Inflows: The Case of the Czech Republic, Poland, and Romania
Chowdhury, Ibrahim; Keller, Leonor

Working Paper 12/139

Tariff-Tax Reforms in Large Economies
Ganelli, Giovanni; Tervala, Juha

Working Paper 12/140

Financial Intermediation Costs in Low-Income Countries: The Role of Regulatory, Institutional, and Macroeconomic Factors
Poghosyan, Tigran

Working Paper 12/141

Exchange Rate Pass-Through in Sub-Saharan African Economies and Its Determinants
Razafimahefa, Ivohasina Fizara

Working Paper 12/142

Credit Growth and the Effectiveness of Reserve Requirements and Other Macroprudential Instruments in Latin America
Tovar Mora, Camilo Ernesto; Garcia-Escribano, Mercedes; Vera Martin, Mercedes

Working Paper 12/143

How Effective Is Monetary Transmission in Low-Income Countries? A Survey of the Empirical Evidence
Mishra, Prachi; Montiel, Peter

Working Paper 12/144

Public Investment, Growth, and Debt Sustainability: Putting Together the Pieces
Buffie, Edward F.; Berg, Andrew; Pattillo, Catherine A.; Portillo, Rafael; Zanna, Luis-Felipe

Working Paper 12/145

Intra-Regional Spillovers in South America: Is Brazil Systemic After All?
Adler, Gustavo; Sosa, Sebastian

Working Paper 12/146

Local Governments' Fiscal Balance, Privatization, and Banking Sector Reform in Transition Countries
Crivelli, Ernesto

Working Paper 12/147

Inflation and Income Inequality: Is Food Inflation Different?
Walsh, James P. Yu, Jiangyan

Working Paper 12/148

The Relationship between the Foreign Exchange Regime and Macroeconomic Performance in Eastern Africa
Stotsky, Janet Gale; Ghazanchyan, Manuk; Adedeji, Olumuyiwa; Maehle, Nils O.

(continued on page 12)

IMF Working Papers *(continued from page 11)*

Working Paper 12/149

Policy Analysis and Forecasting in the World Economy: A Panel Unobserved Components Approach
Vitek, Francis

Working Paper 12/150

What Determines Government Spending Multipliers?
Corsetti, Giancarlo; Meier, André; Müller, Gernot

Working Paper 12/151

What's in It for Me? A Primer on Differences Between Islamic and Conventional Finance in Malaysia
Krasicka, Olga; Nowak, Sylwia

Working Paper 12/152

Systemic Risk and Asymmetric Responses in the Financial Industry
López-Espinosa, Germán; Moreno, Antonio; Rubia, Antonio; Valderrama, Laura

Working Paper 12/153

Fiscal Foresight and Information Flows
Leeper, Eric M.; Walker, Todd B.; Yang, Shu-Chun S.

Working Paper 12/154

Global and Regional Spillovers to Pacific Island Countries
Sheridan, Niamh; Tumbarello, Patrizia; Wu, Yiqun

Working Paper 12/155

Banks' Liability Structure and Mortgage Lending During the Financial Crisis
Dagher, Jihad; Kazimov, Kazim

Working Paper 12/156

Fiscal Transparency, Fiscal Performance and Credit Ratings
Arbatli, Elif; Escolano, Julio

Working Paper 12/157

Threshold Effects of Sovereign Debt: Evidence from the Caribbean
Greenidge, Kevin; Craigwell, Roland; Thomas, Chrystol; Drakes, Lisa

Working Paper 12/158

Government Bonds and Their Investors: What Are the Facts and Do They Matter?
Andritzky, Jochen R.

Working Paper 12/159

Monitoring Systemic Risk Based on Dynamic Thresholds
Lund-Jensen, Kasper

Working Paper 12/160

Monetization in Low- and Middle-Income Countries
McLoughlin, Cameron; Kinoshita, Noriaki

Working Paper 12/161

Too Much Finance?
Arcand, Jean-Louis; Berkes, Enrico; Panizza, Ugo

Working Paper 12/162

Leverage? What Leverage? A Deep Dive into the U.S. Flow of Funds in Search of Clues to the Global Crisis
Bhatia, Ashok Vir; Bayoumi, Tamim

Working Paper 12/163

Systemic Banking Crises Database: An Update
Laeven, Luc; Valencia, Fabian

Working Paper 12/164

Quantifying Impact of Aging Population on Fiscal Space
Park, Seok Gil

Working Paper 12/165

Factor Endowment, Structural Coherence, and Economic Growth
Che, Natasha Xingyuan

Working Paper 12/166

Peru: Monetary and Exchange Rate Policies, 1930–1980
Pastor, Gonzalo C.

Working Paper 12/167

Evolution of Debt Sustainability Analysis in Low-Income Countries: Some Aggregate Evidence
Baduel, Benedicte; Price, Robert T.

Working Paper 12/168

Commodity Prices and Exchange Rate Volatility: Lessons from South Africa's Capital Account Liberalization
Arezki, Rabah; Dumitrescu, Elena; Freytag, Andreas; Quintyn, Marc

Working Paper 12/169

On the Extrapolation with the Denton Proportional Benchmarking Method
Di Fonzo, Tommaso; Marini, Marco

Working Paper 12/170

The Impact of Longevity Improvements on U.S. Corporate Defined Benefit Pension Plans
Kisser, Michael; Kiff, John; Oppers, Stefan E.; Soto, Mauricio

Working Paper 12/171

Japan out of the Lost Decade: Divine Wind or Firms' Effort?
Ogawa, Kazuo; Saito, Mika; Tokutsu, Ichiro

Working Paper 12/172

Paths to Eurobonds
Claessens, Stijn; Mody, Ashoka; Vallée, Shahin

Working Paper 12/173

Public Expenditure in the Slovak Republic: Composition and Technical Efficiency
Grigoli, Francesco

Working Paper 12/174**Equity Returns in the Banking Sector in the Wake of the Great Recession and the European Sovereign Debt Crisis**

Chan-Lau, Jorge A.; Liu, Estelle X; Schmittmann, Jochen M.

Working Paper 12/175**International Capital Flows and Debt Dynamics**

Evans, Martin D. D.

Working Paper 12/176**Global Commodity Prices, Monetary Transmission, and Exchange Rate Pass-Through in the Pacific Islands**

Peiris, Shanaka J.; Ding, Ding

Working Paper 12/177**Estimating the Implicit Inflation Target of the South African Reserve Bank**

Klein, Nir

Working Paper 12/178**Intertwined Sovereign and Bank Solvencies in a Model of Self-Fulfilling Crisis**

Adler, Gustavo

Working Paper 12/179**The (Other) Deleveraging**

Singh, Manmoh

Working Paper 12/180**Environmental Tax Reform: Principles from Theory and Practice to Date**

Heine, Dirk; Norregaard, John; Parry, Ian W.H.

Working Paper 12/181**Macroprudential Policy in a Fisherian Model of Financial Innovation**

Bianchi, Javier; Boz, Emine; Mendoza, Enrique G.

Working Paper 12/182**Quality of Government and Living Standards: Adjusting for the Efficiency of Public Spending**

Grigoli, Francesco; Ley, Eduardo

Working Paper 12/183**Building Blocks for Effective Macroprudential Policies in Latin America: Institutional Considerations**

Jácome, Luis Ignacio; Nier, Erlend; Imam, Patrick A.

Working Paper 12/184**Great Recession and Fiscal Squeeze at U.S. Subnational Government Level**

Jonas, Jiri

Working Paper 12/185**Accelerating and Sustaining Growth: Economic and Political Lessons**

Virmani, Arvind

Working Paper 12/186**Foreign Aid and Revenue: Still a Crowding Out Effect?**

Benedek, Dora; Crivelli, Ernesto; Gupta, Sanjeev; Muthoora, Priscilla S.

Working Paper 12/187**Fiscal Rules in Response to the Crisis: Toward the “Next-Generation” Rules—A New Dataset**

Schaechter, Andrea; Kinda, Tidiane; Budina, Nina; Weber, Anke

Working Paper 12/188**Riding Global Financial Waves: The Economic Impact of Global Financial Shocks on Emerging Market Economies**

Adler, Gustavo; Tovar Mora, Camilo Ernesto

Working Paper 12/189**On Price Stability and Welfare**

Yehoue, Etienne B.

Working Paper 12/190**Successful Austerity in the United States, Europe, and Japan**

Batini, Nicoletta; Callegari, Giovanni; Melina, Giovanni

Working Paper 12/191**Lost in Transmission? The Effectiveness of Monetary Policy Transmission Channels in the GCC Countries**

Cevik, Serhan; Teksoz, Katerina

Working Paper 12/192**Inflation Dynamics in Mongolia: Understanding the Roller Coaster**

Barnett, Steven; Bersch, Julia; Ojima, Yasuhisa

Working Paper 12/193**Latin America: Vulnerabilities Under Construction?**

Cubeddu, Luis M.; Tovar Mora, Camilo Ernesto; Tsounta, Evridiki

Working Paper 12/194**Measuring Systemic Liquidity Risk and the Cost of Liquidity Insurance**

Severo, Tiago

Working Paper 12/195**Barriers to Household Risk Management: Evidence from India**

Cole, Shawn; Gine, Xavier; Tobacman, Jeremy; Topalova, Petia; Townsend, Robert M.; Vickery, James

IMF Working Papers and other IMF publications can be downloaded from the **Research at the IMF** website: www.imf.org/research.

Conferences, Seminars, and Other Events

Research Conference

“Financial Crises: Causes, Consequences, and Policy Responses”

September 14, 2012

The IMF over the years has analyzed extensively the causes and consequences of financial crises. Many lessons have been extracted from past experiences, including from the most recent episode. Despite significant advances in our knowledge on the causes of crises, their aftermath, and policy responses, these issues remain topics of great policy relevance. The quest for knowledge on the best policy responses to financial crises is an ongoing task. The conference on Financial Crises: Causes, Consequences, and Policy Responses to be held at IMF Headquarters will review lessons on the antecedents of financial crises, the policy responses—in terms of bank, households, financial institutions and sovereign restructurings and their aftermath. The keynote address of the conference will be delivered by Carmen Reinhart (Peterson Institute for International Economics). The policy panel will feature presentations by Jose De Gregorio (Universidad de Chile), Hyun Shin (Princeton University), and Alan Taylor (University of Virginia). The contributions by the conference participants, together with a selection of research pieces on financial crises by IMF staff, will be published in a book.

For further information on the conference program, please visit <http://www.imf.org/external/np/seminars/eng/2012/fincrisis/index.htm>

Thirteenth Jacques Polak Annual Research Conference

“Labor Markets through the Lens of the Great Recession”

November 8-9, 2012

The International Monetary Fund will hold the Thirteenth Jacques Polak Annual Research Conference at its headquarters in Washington, DC on November 8–9, 2012. The conference promises to be an exciting opportunity to discuss topical policy issues related to unemployment and labor markets.

The ARC Program Committee has lined up an excellent set of papers for the conference from Laurence Ball (Johns Hopkins University), Daniel Leigh (IMF) and Prakash Loungani (IMF); Tito Boeri (Bocconi University), Pietro Garibaldi (Collegio Carlo Alberto) and Espen Moen (Norwegian Business School); Michael Burda (Humboldt University of Berlin); Olivier Coibion (University of Texas, Austin), Yuriy Gorodnichenko (University of California, Berkeley), Lorenz Kueng (University of California, Berkeley) and John Silva (Wells Fargo); Ángel Estrada (Bank of Spain), Jordi Gali (CREI) and David López-Salido (Federal Reserve Board); Teresa Fort (Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth), John Haltiwanger (University of Maryland), Ron S. Jarmin (Bureau of the Census) and Javier Miranda (Bureau of the Census); Shigeru Fujita (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia) and Giuseppe Moscarini (Yale University); Kyle F. Herkenhoff (UCLA) and Lee E. Ohanian (UCLA); Bart Hobijn (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco) and Ayşegül Şahin (Federal Reserve Bank of New York); Andrei A. Levchenko (University of Michigan) and Jing Zhang (University of Michigan); and Thomas Piketty (Paris School of Economics) and Emmanuel Saez (University of California at Berkeley).

Peter Diamond (MIT) will deliver the Mundell-Fleming Lecture.

For further information on the program and details on how to register for the conference, please visit the IMF website (www.imf.org) or email ARC@imf.org.

IMF Economic Review Receives Its First Impact Factor



In June, *IMF Economic Review* received its first Impact Factor—2.100—with the release of Thomson Reuters' latest Journal Citation Reports (JCR). This is a notable achievement for a journal that only published its first issue in August 2010.

Olivier Blanchard, the IMF's Economic Counselor, commented: "We are

very pleased with this outcome. It is very hard to introduce a new journal and get it so fast on the map."

IMF Economic Review was ranked 39th (out of 320 journals) in the Economics category and 9th (out of 80 journals)

in the Business and Finance category. The rank-in-category is based on the journal impact factor.

IMF Economic Review is fast realizing its potential to become an outlet that competes with the top business and economic journals in the field. Its Impact Factor score was either higher or comparable to *Journal of International Economics*, *Journal of Development Economics*, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, and *Economic Policy*. The JCR impact factor is a measure of the frequency with which the average article in a journal has been cited in a particular year or period.

Please visit www.palgrave-journals.com/imfer to:

- Explore free sample content
- Read author guidelines and submit your papers online
- Find subscription and pricing information

IMF Fellowship Program: Call for Applications

The IMF invites applications for its Fellowship Program for 2013–14. The program aims to support policy-relevant research of interest to the international financial community.

IMF Fellows will spend the year working on mutually agreed topics that are relevant to the work of the IMF. While hosted by the Research Department, Fellows will also be expected to interact with staff in other departments of the IMF. The work produced over the year can be disseminated through IMF Working Papers and other channels.

The IMF provides a unique environment for researchers interested in working on macroeconomic and financial issues given its close monitoring of economic developments around the world, its access to information, and the presence of a large, knowledgeable, professional staff with whom to interact. Salary and other benefits are competitive, and include allowances for relocation and conference travel.

Fellows will be chosen through a competitive application process. Applicants are expected to have a substantial publication record in leading journals and a strong interest in the policy-relevant work conducted at the IMF.

Applications should be sent no later than November 30, 2012 to imffellowshipprogram@imf.org and should consist of a CV, a 1–2 page outline of the proposed research project(s) to be carried out while at the IMF, and links to 1–2 research papers. The selection of 2013–14 Fellows will be announced by the end of February 2013.

The IMF Fellowship Program was launched in 2011. The 2012–13 Fellows are Olivier Coibion, Chris Erceg, and Sebnem Kalemli-Ozcan.



IMF Research Bulletin

M. Ayhan Kose
Editor

Prakash Loungani
Co-Editor

Patricia Loo
Assistant Editor

Tracey Lookadoo
Editorial Assistant

Feras Abu Amra
Systems Consultant

Multimedia Services
Composition

The **IMF Research Bulletin** (ISSN: 1020-8313) is a quarterly publication in English and is available free of charge. The views expressed in the Bulletin are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the IMF or IMF policy. Material from the *Bulletin* may be reprinted with proper attribution. Editorial correspondence may be addressed to The Editor, *IMF Research Bulletin*, IMF, Room HQ1-9-612, Washington, DC 20431 USA; or e-mailed to resbulletin@imf.org.

For Electronic Notification

Sign up at www.imf.org/external/cntpst to receive notification of new issues of the *IMF Research Bulletin* and a variety of other IMF publications. Individual issues of the *Bulletin* are available at www.imf.org/researchbulletin.

Staff Discussion Notes

Staff Discussion Notes showcase new policy-related analysis and research by IMF departments. These papers are generally brief and written in nontechnical language, and are aimed at a broad audience interested in economic policy issues. For more information on this series and to download the papers in this series, please visit: www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/createx/Publications.aspx?page=sdn.

No. 12/04

Fiscal Frameworks for Resource Rich Developing Countries

Thomas Baunsgaard, Mauricio Villafuerte, Marcos Poplawski-Ribeiro, and Christine Richmond

No. 12/05

Externalities and Macroprudential Policy

Gianni De Nicolò, Giovanni Favara, and Lev Ratnovski

No. 12/06

Policies for Macrofinancial Stability: How to Deal with Credit Booms

Giovanni Dell'Ariccia, Deniz Igan, Luc Laeven, and Hui Tong, with Bas Bakker and Jérôme Vandenbussche

No. 12/07

Fostering Growth in Europe Now

Bergljot Barkbu, Jesmin Rahman, Rodrigo Valdés, and a staff team

No. 12/08

Income Inequality and Fiscal Policy

Francesca Bastagli, David Coady, and Sanjeev Gupta

No. 12/09

What Lies Beneath: The Statistical Definition of Public Sector Debt An Overview of the Coverage of Public Sector Debt for 61 Countries

Robert Dippelsman, Claudia Dziobek, and Carlos A. Gutiérrez Mangas



Visiting Scholars, June 2012–September 2012

Christopher Adam, University of Oxford, UK: 8/14/12–8/24/12

Laurence Ball, Johns Hopkins University: 5/1/12–4/30/13

Edward Buffie, Indiana University: 6/11/12–7/6/12

Kevin Clinton: 7/2/12–8/31/12

Martin Fukac, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City: 6/25/12–7/6/12

Vivek Ghosal, School of Economics at Georgia Institute of Technology: 7/23/12–7/27/12

Joao Jalles, European Central Bank/University of Aberdeen: 6/4/12–7/13/12

Robert Johnson, Dartmouth College: 2/23/12–8/31/12

Alberto Miguel Martin, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain: 7/16/12–7/20/12

Maurice Obstfeld, University of California, Berkeley: 7/17/12–7/27/12

Kalyan Raman, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University: 5/1/12–4/30/13

Jack Selody, Bank of Canada: 4/23/12–4/30/13

Jay Shambaugh, Dartmouth College: 12/12/11–12/31/12



UNDERSTANDING ECONOMICS

Get the Basics at our one-stop shop

Now online: a useful compilation for students and others seeking clear, straightforward explanations of basic concepts in economics

The “**Back to Basics**” feature has been a mainstay of the IMF’s *Finance & Development* magazine for the past decade. We have revisited the series, updating, revising, and compiling the most relevant stories in one place. The series is ongoing and we will add new stories as they appear in the magazine.

Go to

www.imf.org/basics



Also find us on Facebook

www.facebook.com/FinanceandDevelopment

