

Imre Vámos

State Audit Office of Hungary, Hungary
E-mail: vamosz@vipmail.hu

Zsuzsanna Novák

Magyar Nemzeti Bank
Directorate Monetary policy instruments, foreign exchange reserves and risk management, Hungary
E-mail: novakzs@mnb.hu

FOUR CURRENCIES OUTSIDE THE EUROZONE

JEL classification: F31

Abstract

In the European Union only a few countries have remained outside the eurozone. Among these countries with independent monetary policies few pursue a floating exchange regime: the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Romania (IMF, 2013). It is worth examining whether there is a cointegrating relationship between underlying economic fundamentals and the real and nominal exchange rate of these countries against the euro. The paper points out that it is difficult to prove the existence of any such relationship: on the basis of data between 2001-2014 making forecasts of the paths of equilibrium exchange rates is hampered by the lack of an adequate model, the short time series and the strong volatility of these currencies, especially the Hungarian forint and the Romanian leu. An alternative approach to estimate equilibrium exchange rates is the unobserved components model proposed by Chen and MacDonald (2010) which does not necessitate the existence of a cointegrating relationship for defining permanent equilibrium exchange rates. As Dick et al. (2015) reveals good exchange rate estimates rely on the forecaster's ability to understand the relation between fundamentals and the exchange rates mostly in times when exchange rate more strongly deviate from their PPP value. Therefore, applying more approaches for exchange rate analysis helps us better observe this relationship.

Key words: exchange estimates, cointegration, eurozone membership

1. INTRODUCTION

After all the Baltic countries have joined the eurozone and Slovenia and Slovakia chose the currency zone within five years of European Union membership currently six Eastern members of the EU are still outside the eurozone. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Romania today maintain a floating exchange rate and pursue inflation targeting as monetary policy, whereas Croatia has targeted the exchange rate in the frames of a less flexible exchange rate system in the last fifteen years and Bulgaria conducts its monetary and exchange policy under a currency board regime. As floating rates are naturally more set out to market forces, for an examination of how domestic currencies move against the euro countries with flexible exchange rates are the most adequate sample. In the current analysis the exchange rates of the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Romania are estimated with the help of macroeconomic fundamentals in the period between 2000 and 2014.

The Czech Republic shifted to floating exchange regime as early as in May 1997 and since then the monetary authority has not announced explicit exchange rate bands, though it has strongly been intervening in the foreign currency markets lately to prevent the koruna from notable appreciation. The aim is to maintain the exchange rate of the koruna against the euro close to CZK 27/EUR in accordance with the Bank Board's decision. Since the end of 2013 the Czech National Bank therefore uses the exchange rate as monetary policy instrument and intervenes to keep its "one-sided commitment" (only appreciation is avoided) to the exchange rate. Hungary introduced a fixed exchange rate system with a $\pm 15\%$ band in 2001 and irrevocably switched over to a floating system at the beginning of 2008. From time to time the Central Bank of Hungary also intervenes but it does not follow any declared explicit or implicit target exchange rate. Poland introduced a floating regime in spring 2000 after a five year period of crawling band system. Romania was gradually converging to managed float by applying different intermediate systems until 2004. Romania also manages external shocks by currency intervention if economic conditions make it necessary. Taking account of the introduction of flexible exchange rates at the beginning of the years 2000 the fifteen year period promises to be adequate for examining the influence of market forces on the currency exchange.

2. BACKGROUND

In an equation based on balance of payments equilibrium MacDonald (2000) suggests that the productivity differential (explaining the trade balance), the interest differential (determining capital flows) of the two countries whose currency is compared and the net foreign assets are a good starting point of any equilibrium exchange estimate. To explain the deviation of the exchange rate from its long-run path (marked by the purchasing power parity or in case of comparing a less developed and a more developed country by the Balassa-

Samuelson effect or by simple different productivity dynamics) a lot of models have been developed in the last some twenty years. The group of those which do not have a normative equilibrium framework but use macroeconomic variables which might well explain the exchange rate are called behavioural equilibrium exchange rate theories.

To gauge the impact of the Balassa-Samuelson effect and the misalignment of the currency from its equilibrium path a lot of research was conducted in the Central and Eastern European countries with the help of the behavioural equilibrium exchange rate approach and other estimation methods. Borowski et al. (2003) used fundamental and behavioural equilibrium exchange calculations to define the equilibrium level of the Polish zloty and forecast the expected real appreciation of the Polish currency until the introduction of the euro. Beza-Bojanowska (2009) carried out behavioural equilibrium exchange rate and permanent exchange rate analysis in which terms of trade, Balassa-Samuelson-effect, foreign reserves, risk premium and the long-term differential of interest rates and budgetary deficit turned out to have significant explanatory power. Égert et al. (2005) question the Balassa-Samuelson effect but conclude that dual (tradable and non-tradable) productivity differential – similarly to terms of trade and public consumption with less explanatory power – cause currency appreciation in the CEECs. They found that some variables such as openness and public spending can have contradictory effects on exchange rates. Dumitrescu and Dedu (2009) made a behavioural equilibrium exchange estimate by approximating the real effective exchange rate of the Romanian currency with productivity differential in terms of the non-tradable and tradable sector, total consumption, net foreign assets and degree of openness. The model building was based on both internal and external macroeconomic equilibrium. Komárek and Moti (2012) estimate the Czech Koruna exchange rate (both nominal and real) with the help of productivity differential, real investment to GDP, net foreign assets and net export and find that the strong appreciation of the Czech Koruna against the euro came to a halt in 2009 as a consequence of slowing productivity dynamics in the Czech Republic.

In the following we use the model and methodology suggested by MacDonald (2000) and Chen and MacDonald (2010) – drawing on the results of the Central European research papers – with a slight modification: instead of using the net foreign asset variable, we apply the debt-to-GDP ratio as one of the variables influencing investors' motive to purchase assets in an emerging economy. Public debt has become a very important benchmark variable of countries since the financial crisis which underpins the selection of this variable. The sharply increasing public debt in Central Europe was often financed from foreign currency credit and accompanied by the accumulation of foreign currency reserves which is another reason for including this variable. In addition, Vámos (2014) used an equation including public-debt-to-GDP to regress the Hungarian forint and Polish zloty nominal exchange rate and Vámos (2013) also applied a model relying on productivity dynamics, interest differentials and public debt for

a panel regression encompassing 15 Central and South Eastern European countries. The research thus builds upon previous empirical findings and discusses whether the same model can be applied for countries at different levels of economic development, openness and debt characteristics.

3. THE VARIABLES OF THE MODEL

We use the quarterly time series of the nominal and CPI based real domestic/EUR exchange rate of the four countries covered in this paper and investigate their relationship with the productivity (y/emp), interest differential ($i-i^*$) against the eurozone, public debt-to-GDP ($debt$) and terms of trade (tot). The data used for estimations is quarterly and collected from the Eurostat and Ameco databases except the terms of trade indices which are annual OECD data. The variables are indexed to 2005 (as 100%) and logarithmised before testing their statistical characteristics.

The basic equation we consider to be adequate for approximating the nominal and real exchange rates of the Czech Koruna, Hungarian Forint, Polish zloty and Romanian leu is the following:

$$s_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1(s_{t-1}) + \beta_1(y/emp_t) - \beta_2(y/emp_t^*) + \gamma_1(i_t - i_t^*) + \gamma_2(debt_t) + \gamma_3(tot_t) + u_t \quad (1)$$

As we use the euro exchange as units of the domestic currency (depreciation means higher values) and the real exchange rate in contrast showing an increase when appreciating, the expected coefficients of the variables will be opposite for the estimation of the nominal and real variables. (Therefore we depicted the change in nominal exchange rates in revers order in the diagrams.)

First we start by comparing the path of the real and nominal exchange rates and then depicting the variables one by one with both.



Figure 1 Nominal and real exchange rate (2000-2014) in Hungary




Figure 2 Real exchange rate and productivity in Hungary



Figure 3 Interest differential and real exchange rates in Hungary




Figure 4 Nominal and real exchange rate (2000-2014) in the Czech Republic




Figure 5 Real exchange rate and productivity in the Czech Republic



Figure 6 Interest differential and real exchange rates in the Czech Republic



Figure 7 Nominal and real exchange rate (2000-2014) in Poland




Figure 8 Real exchange rate and productivity in Poland




Figure 9 Interest differential and real exchange rates in Poland




Figure 7 Nominal and real exchange rate (2000-2014) in Romania




Figure 11 Real exchange rate and productivity in the Czech Republic




Figure 12 Interest differential and real exchange rates in the Czech Republic

In the case of three countries out of the four nominal and real exchange rates follow very similar paths. In Romania, however, the two variables start with a very different trend probably due to the more rigid exchange regime in Romania at the beginning of the 2000s. Whereas productivity and real exchange rate move strongly together there is no evident relationship (either positive or negative) between interest differentials and real exchange rates (the same holds for the debt-to-GDP ratio). The difference in interest rates between 2000 and 2002 was more significant in all the four countries. The continuously decreasing difference (except Romania) can be well observed in three countries. Between 2002 and 2004 the interest differentials moved together with the real exchange rate, similar tendency evolved in the period after 2012 as can be seen in all the four diagrams. It can be presumed that behind the strong comovement the investors risk avoiding behaviour played a role beside the low interest level. In the interim period the interest differential and the real exchange show opposite cyclicity which is an expected long term phenomenon.

4. TESTING DATA FOR UNIT ROOT AND COINTEGRATION

To reveal possible stationarity the logarithmised variables were submit to ADF and KPSS unit-root tests. (See results in Appendix.) Most of the variables seem to follow an I(1) process but some variables are likely to be stationary before differencing them (e.g. the nominal exchange rate in Romania and the interest differential in the Czech Republic, Poland and Romania on the basis of the ADF test, real productivity in the eurozone (with trend), nominal and real exchange rate in Poland in KPSS test statistics).

The data are suitable for cointegration tests but first we checked the relationship between the exchange rates and the explanatory variables with the help of simple OLS regression estimates. In the case of all countries the regression estimates pointed at a strong influence of regressors on the dependent variable, in the case of Hungary the change of the interest rate differential, in the Czech Republic the one-period lagged value of the same proved to be statistically significant. The debt-to-

GDP variable had almost nil explanatory power in the Czech Republic and mostly the terms of trade of the domestic economy proved to be less significant than the same eurozone statistics for both the nominal and real exchange rate estimate in the case of all the countries under examination. (It is interesting to note that the interest differentials usually contributed to the depreciation of the currency at time t and to appreciation at $t-1$).

The cointegration test results proved to be significant only in the case of Poland especially for the nominal exchange rate as dependent variable. The coefficients also show economically justifiable relations. The Czech data are also close to be significant but the coefficients contradict the economic rationale and the regression results. For Hungary and Romania the two cointegration show paradox results for the real exchange rate estimates, the one supports the existence of cointegration, the other refuses the same and the signs of the coefficients cannot be interpreted.

Table 1
Engel-Granger and Johansen cointegration tests on nominal exchange rates
(quarterly time series, number of lags=2)

	Poland		Czech Republic	
<i>Engel-Granger</i>	test st.	p value	test st.	p value
constant	-4,39195	0,0001	-2,49483	0,1167
<i>Johansen</i>	test st.	p value	test st.	p value
rank=1	60,329	0,6198	39,172	0,3381
estimated coefficients	normalized beta			
nominal exchange rate	1		1	
productivity diff.	-0,73213		0,47644	
government debt	-0,60614		0,18173	
interest diff.	-0,89437		-6,1612	
terms of trade-domestic	-5,7449		-	
terms of trade_eur	3,1882		0,019325	

Table 2
Engel-Granger and Johansen cointegration tests on real exchange rates (quarterly
time series, number of lags=2)

	Hungary		Romania	
<i>Engel-Granger</i>	test st.	p value	test st.	p value
constant	-4,79916	0,005903	-3,43088	0,3589
<i>Johansen</i>	test st.	p value	test st.	p value
rank=1	22,033	0,3461	39,172	0,6620
estimated coefficients	normalized beta			
nominal exchange rate	1		1	
productivity diff.	-0,56092		-3,0203	
government debt	-		-0,093186	
interest diff.	-0,53595		-6,1612	
terms of trade_eur	1,1147		0,019325	

The tested model does not seem to be capable of forecasting equilibrium exchange rates in a simple cointegration framework, and a much more refined statistical approach is needed to assess the long-term equilibrium values of the four currencies. In international literature it is an often raised problem that government expenditure and debt-to-GDP ratio as well as interest differentials have a different impact in the short and the long run. (Public debt can increase productivity if it finances fixed capital investment but can crowd out private investment and increase CDS premia at a time). Chen and MacDonald (2010) therefore suggest the application of unobserved component model and separate the permanent and temporary effects of the same variables. In addition to the methodological problems it is also to be taken into consideration that Romania and the Czech Republic often use foreign currency intervention which might distort the effect of economic fundamentals on the exchange rate.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the case of a cointegrating relationship of strongly related economic fundamentals it is possible to separate permanent and temporary components of exchange fluctuations and detect the presence of currency misalignment. However, Central European currencies undergo great fluctuations which are often counterbalanced by currency market interventions. In the current study encompassing a fifteen-year time interval no cointegrating relationship could be unequivocally established in the case of three out of four Central European currencies, therefore the adoption of an unobserved component framework and the use of dummies for periods with extreme fluctuations and central bank intervention could help further develop the model to make it capable of forecasting equilibrium exchange rates.

REFERENCES

- Beza-Bojanowska, J. (2009). Behavioral and Permanent Zloty/Euro Equilibrium Rate. *Central European Journal of Economic Modelling and Econometrics*
- Borowski, J., Brzoza-Brzezina, M., Szpunar, P. (2003). Exchange Rate Regimes and Poland's. Participation in ERM II, *Bank i Kredyt 1/2003*, NBP. Warsaw
- Chen, X. - MacDonald, R. (2010). Revisiting the Dollar-Euro Permanent Equilibrium Exchange Rate: Evidence from Multivariate Unobserved Components. Department of Economics, University of Glasgow, *Working Papers* 01/2010
- Dick, C. D. – McDonald, R. – Menkhoff, L. (2015). Exchange rate forecasts and expected fundamentals. *Journal of International Money and Finance*. May 2015. pp. 235-256.
- Dumitrescu, B. A. - Dedu, V. (2009). The Estimation of the Equilibrium Real Exchange Rate for Romania. *European Research Studies*. Volume XII., Issue (1)

Égert B., Halpern L., MacDonald R. (2005). Equilibrium Exchange Rates in Transition Economies: Taking Stock of the Issues. *William Davidson Institute Working Paper*, Number 793. October 2005

IMF (2013): Annual report on Exchange Arrangements and Exchange Restrictions 2013. <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/nft/2013/areaers/ar2013.pdf>

Josifidis, K. – Allegret, J-P – Beker Pukar, E. (2009). Monetary and Exchange Regimes Changes: The Cases of Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Republic of Serbia. *Panoeconomicus*. 2. pp. 199-226.

Komárek, L. – Moti, M. (2012). Behavioural and Fundamental Exchange Rate of the Czech Koruna. *Politická Economie*, 2/2012. pp. 147-166

MacDonald, R. (2000). Concepts To Calculate Equilibrium Exchange Rates: An Overview. Economic Research Group of The Deutsche Bundesbank: *Discussion Paper 3/0*, July 2000

The exchange rate as a monetary policy instrument – FAQ. www.cnb.cz. downloaded on 12.05.2015

Vámos, I. (2013). Exchange rate and public debt in Central Europe. 1st Dubrovnik International Economic Meeting. DIEM 2013 „Scientific Conference on Innovative Approaches to the Contemporary Economic Problems” University of Dubrovnik. Department of Economics and Business Economics. 27th-29th September 2013, Dubrovnik. ISBN 978-953-7153-30-4 (University of Dubrovnik)

Vámos, I. (2014). Equilibrium exchange estimates and the crisis. *Business Sciences and Management Journal (BSMJ)*, Volume 9, Dec

APPENDIX

ADF tests

Hungary

test with constant	level			diff		
	estimated value of (a - 1)	test statistic: tau_c(1)	asymptotic p-value	estimated value of (a - 1)	test statistic: tau_c(1)	asymptotic p-value
nominal exchange rate	-0,105567	-1,55235	0,5004	-1,64834	-6,39862	1,24E-08
GDP/employed persons_hu	-0,142191	-2,68039	0,07742	-2,662	-10,6611	2,43E-21
GDP/employed persons_eur	-0,0395634	-1,4536	0,5573	-2,96378	-12,7637	3,468E-28
public debt/GDP	-0,0273035	-0,87461	0,7896	-1,0283	-7,65896	1,18E-08
interest differential	-0,184684	-2,43835	0,1312	-0,839632	-6,37863	9,01E-07
terms of trade hu	-0,0430725	-1,10574	0,708	-1,00529	-7,52298	1,84E-08
terms of trade eur	-0,0836567	-1,55005	0,5015	-1,00069	-7,4885	2,058E-08
real exchange rate (2005 = 100)	-0,167632	-2,82125	0,06141	-1,24826	-6,71961	1,85E-09
real productivity hu	-0,185608	-2,31292	0,1679	-3,59035	-21,7849	4,34E-50
real productivity eur	-0,105315	-1,34872	0,6089	-2,34435	-8,95792	6,447E-16
GDP/employed persons hu/eur						
real productivity hu/eur						

Czech Republic

test with constant	level			diff		
	estimated value of (a - 1)	test statistic: tau_c(1)	asymptotic p-value	estimated value of (a - 1)	test statistic: tau_c(1)	asymptotic p-value
nominal exchange rate	-0,059447	-1,98417	0,2929	-0,967015	-7,25422	4,46E-08
GDP/employed persons cz	-0,0666037	-2,25522	0,1869	-2,37521	-9,13926	1,76E-16
GDP/employed persons_eur	-0,0395634	-1,4536	0,5573	-2,96378	-12,7637	3,47E-28
public debt/GDP	-0,0467494	-2,57574	0,09804	-0,474435	2,90596	0,04465
interest differential	-0,195154	-2,77273	0,06223	-0,818422	-6,46263	6,72E-07
terms of trade cz	-0,119455	-2,18112	0,2152	-1,00453	-7,51732	1,87E-08
terms of trade eur	-0,0836567	-1,55005	0,5015	-1,00069	-7,4885	2,06E-08
real exchange rate (2005 = 100)	-0,0581685	-1,97736	0,2958	-0,925455	-6,94994	1,25E-07
real productivity cz	-0,103199	-1,81494	0,3736	-3,38676	-17,0422	7,24E-41
real productivity eur	-0,105315	-1,34872	0,6089	-2,34435	-8,95792	6,45E-16
GDP/employed persons cz/eur	-0,0763618	-2,51849	0,111	-1,56448	-9,41243	2,46E-17
real productivity cz/eur	-0,0920689	-1,71237	0,425	-3,4804	-18,823	4,45E-45

Poland

test with constant	level			diff		
	estimated value of (a - 1)	test statistic: tau_c(1)	asymptotic p-value	estimated value of (a - 1)	test statistic: tau_c(1)	asymptotic p-value
nominal exchange rate	-0,227106	-2,68967	0,08184	-0,970341	-7,33478	3,41E-08
GDP/employed persons pl	-0,0725415	-1,44747	0,5604	-2,28987	-9,00576	4,58E-16
GDP/employed persons_eur	-0,0395634	-1,4536	0,5573	-2,96378	-12,7637	3,468E-28
public debt/GDP	-0,0587048	-1,56548	0,4937	-0,932235	-6,97824	1,13E-07
interest differential	-0,0855486	-4,39195	0,0001	-0,319108	-2,65336	0,08238
terms of trade pl	-0,0656937	-1,39638	0,5781	-1,01378	-7,58715	1,49E-08
terms of trade eur	-0,0836567	-1,55005	0,5015	-1,00069	-7,4885	2,058E-08
real exchange rate (2005 = 100)	-0,242882	-2,82136	0,06139	-0,978019	-7,36264	3,11E-08
real productivity pl	-0,158536	-1,60312	0,481	-3,88002	-36,1091	1,12E-33
real productivity eur	-0,105315	-1,34872	0,6089	-2,34435	-8,95792	6,447E-16
GDP/employed persons pl/eur	-0,131745	-2,13293	0,2329	-2,00296	-7,63293	5,77E-12
real productivity pl/eur	-0,130555	-1,26551	0,6478	-3,89631	-34,9042	3,05E-37

Romania

test with constant	level			diff		
	estimated value of (a - 1)	test statistic: tau_c(1)	asymptotic p-value	estimated value of (a - 1)	test statistic: tau_c(1)	asymptotic p-value
nominal exchange rate	-0,0964132	-4,59711	0,0004114	-0,52724	-3,01672	0,03338
GDP/employed persons_ro	-0,0678421	-1,37945	0,5941	-3,51418	-18,9247	2,71E-45
GDP/employed persons_eur	-0,0395634	-1,4536	0,5573	-2,96378	-12,7637	3,468E-28
public debt/GDP	-0,0202016	-0,938446	0,7765	-0,416193	-2,86081	0,05007
interest differential	-0,0841565	-3,58574	0,00607	-0,800946	-5,912	1,95E-07
terms of trade ro						
terms of trade eur	-0,0836567	-1,55005	0,5015	-1,00069	-7,4885	2,058E-08
real exchange rate (2005 = 100)	-0,0602786	-1,53796	0,5076	-1,01712	-7,60862	1,39E-08
real productivity ro	-0,131884	-1,82753	0,3674	-3,79848	-29,6223	5,10E-49
real productivity eur	-0,105315	-1,34872	0,6089	-2,34435	-8,95792	6,447E-16
GDP/employed persons ro/eur	-0,0709837	-1,38973	0,589	-3,46081	-17,6103	2,69E-42
real productivity ro/eur	-0,110467	-1,88334	0,3405	-3,67219	-23,0989	2,09E-51

KPSS tests Hungary

	level		level_tred		diff		diff_tred	
	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value
nominal exchange rate	1,55798	0,010	0,292052	0,010	0,077761	0,100	0,020775	0,100
GDP/employed persons_hu	1,62773	0,010	0,455834	0,010	0,228279	0,100	0,031906	0,100
GDP/employed persons_eur	2,06137	0,010	0,256884	0,010	0,051292	0,100	0,02476	0,100
public debt/GDP	1,9206	0,010	0,170139	0,037	0,119163	0,100	0,119681	0,100
interest differential	0,47321	0,048	0,081777	0,100	0,050365	0,100	0,041669	0,100
terms of trade hu	1,60673	0,010	0,138533	0,068	0,102031	0,100	0,102041	0,100
terms of trade eur	1,24032	0,010	0,131231	0,081	0,082854	0,100	0,073525	0,100
real exchange rate (2005 = 100)	1,27067	0,010	0,347424	0,010	0,206956	0,100	0,021855	0,100
real productivity hu	1,63147	0,010	0,458042	0,010	0,086807	0,100	0,032375	0,100
real productivity eur	1,68237	0,010	0,116824	0,100	0,022145	0,100	0,021793	0,100
GDP/employed persons hu/eur								
real productivity hu/eur								

Czech Republic

	level		level_tred		diff		diff_tred	
	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value
nominal exchange rate	1,72314	0,010	0,335595	0,010	0,291479	0,100	0,054162	0,100
GDP/employed persons cz	1,92263	0,010	0,452653	0,010	0,353081	0,099	0,027456	0,100
GDP/employed persons_eur	2,06137	0,010	0,256884	0,010	0,051292	0,100	0,02476	0,100
public debt/GDP	1,75209	0,010	0,162208	0,042	0,345216	0,100	0,16566	0,039
interest differential	0,257836	0,010	0,245678	0,010	0,128675	0,100	0,046839	0,100
terms of trade cz	0,498074	0,045	0,228183	0,010	0,222624	0,100	0,132408	0,079
terms of trade eur	1,24032	0,010	0,131231	0,081	0,082854	0,100	0,073525	0,100
real exchange rate (2005 = 100)	1,74545	0,010	0,282707	0,010	0,261269	0,100	0,060415	0,100
real productivity cz	1,84834	0,010	0,439807	0,010	0,113891	0,100	0,027131	0,100
real productivity eur	1,68237	0,010	0,116824	0,100	0,022145	0,100	0,021793	0,100
GDP/employed persons cz/eur	1,76968	0,010	0,454592	0,010	0,459675	0,051	0,037026	0,100
real productivity cz/eur	1,81506	0,010	0,479297	0,010	0,180517	0,100	0,029566	0,100

Poland

	level		level_tred		diff		diff_tred	
	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value
nominal exchange rate	0,19742	0,100	0,103106	0,100	0,036435	0,100	0,035639	0,100
GDP/employed persons pl	1,97976	0,010	0,107796	0,100	0,042098	0,100	0,030351	0,100
GDP/employed persons_eur	2,06137	0,010	0,256884	0,010	0,051292	0,100	0,02476	0,100
public debt/GDP	1,52592	0,010	0,12035	0,100	0,104524	0,100	0,059387	0,100
interest differential	0,931001	0,010	0,388534	0,010	0,535522	0,039	0,139822	0,066
terms of trade pl	1,3244	0,010	0,283153	0,010	0,063117	0,100	0,062641	0,100
terms of trade eur	1,24032	0,010	0,131231	0,081	0,082854	0,100	0,073525	0,100
real exchange rate (2005 = 100)	0,180693	0,100	0,092848	0,100	0,038402	0,100	0,035831	0,100
real productivity pl	1,76882	0,010	0,061949	0,100	0,032549	0,100	0,032201	0,100
real productivity eur	1,68237	0,010	0,116824	0,100	0,022145	0,100	0,021793	0,100
GDP/employed persons pl/eur	1,79915	0,010	0,097367	0,100	0,038966	0,100	0,032835	0,100
real productivity pl/eur	1,77675	0,01	0,093996	0,1	0,035887	0,1	0,033621	0,1

Romania

	level		level_tred		diff		diff_tred	
	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value	test statistic	P-value
nominal exchange rate	1,43403	0,010	0,222569	0,010	0,600409	0,029	0,197133	0,020
GDP/employed persons_ro	1,95251	0,010	0,418164	0,010	0,075855	0,100	0,031325	0,100
GDP/employed persons_eur	2,06137	0,010	0,256884	0,010	0,051292	0,100	0,02476	0,100
public debt/GDP	0,782272	0,010	0,447821	0,010	0,447304	0,057	0,161732	0,042
interest differential	1,44103	0,010	0,407264	0,010	0,584761	0,031	0,120019	0,100
terms of trade ro								
terms of trade eur	1,24032	0,010	0,131231	0,081	0,082854	0,100	0,073525	0,100
real exchange rate (2005 = 100)	1,30326	0,010	0,264342	0,010	0,120649	0,100	0,074887	0,100
real productivity ro	1,83962	0,010	0,339276	0,010	0,04949	0,100	0,034358	0,100
real productivity eur	1,68237	0,010	0,116824	0,100	0,022145	0,100	0,021793	0,100
GDP/employed persons ro/eur	1,9015	0,010	0,418327	0,010	0,07597	0,100	0,033149	0,100
real productivity ro/eur	1,81273	0,01	0,333049	0,01	0,050715	0,1	0,034695	0,1